

are found. But these point on to an earlier and more primitive stage of root forms or impersonal thought. Once more we find the passage from the impersonal to the discursive form of thought co-eval with a passage from a merely conscious stage to a stage in which the opposition between subject and object begins to appear. Impersonal judgments, as it were, begin to appear just below the threshold of what we ordinarily term self-consciousness, and on the threshold itself. In short, they seem to form the connecting link in thought between animal and human intelligence, as well as indicating the form of experience in which the differentiation as a whole is made.

This conclusion to which we have been led through the investigation of the impersonal judgment should be compared with certain results reached by Romanes from the standpoint of comparative psychology. From a close study of animal life he was led to believe that a definite type of thought was present in the life of the higher animals. Through this "receptual" thought, as he designated it, the life of these animals was distinguished, on the one hand, from mere sense-experience, and, on the other hand, from the self-conscious life of man.

When we inquire into the nature of this receptive process, we find that it corresponds exactly to what we have shown to be the true nature of the impersonal judgment. It distinguishes itself from sense-experience in that it is composite, taking up into itself the results of past experience. It is distinguished from distinctively human experience in that it is immediate merely. Differences are felt rather than abstracted. This we have found to be characteristic of the impersonal judgment, the childish "concept," and the racial root. The agreement in outcome thus materially strengthens each position, and forces us to believe more strongly than ever that in the impersonal we have the original form of judgment and the connecting link between the conscious and the self-conscious stages of experience.<sup>1</sup>

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.

There remains the task of a brief recapitulation of the general movement and outcome of our investigation.

Previous investigations of the impersonal judgment have been unsatisfactory because of a general presupposition in regard to the

<sup>1</sup> A criticism of Romanes' position at once suggests itself. To him the order of succession in thought is that of percept, recept, concept. For reasons which will be evident from the whole standpoint of the essay, percept and concept arise together.