

important distinction between mind and personality, but are left greatly in the dark when we ask for the precise nature of the difference. It is not enough to be told (p. 213) that personality is conscious individuality; and is the fact that the amoeba splits into two instead of dying (pp. 220—221) really pertinent to the Christian hope of immortality? 'Creation' is another ambiguous term of constant recurrence. What does Dr. Greenwood mean when he tells us (p. 197) that "man's mind is of the same nature and essence" as the infinite mind behind the universe, "for it does (within its limited scope) the same creative things"?

God, in creating, creates *ex nihilo*, that is, with no material to work on other than himself. In this lies the radical difference between His creative act and the releasing of pent-up energy

from an inert chaos with which it is identified in an earlier passage (p. 47). Perfect inertness and complete absence of organization are not 'nothing' in the absolute sense demanded by orthodox theism. The analogy between divine and human creation has been treated recently, with much more subtlety and caution, by Miss Dorothy Sayers in "The Mind of the Maker".

We offer these criticisms in the hope that Dr. Greenwood may find time, amid his many useful avocations, to develop his constructive argument to theism in more detail. That he has the ability to do this is shown by his convincing refutation of materialism. But there is much in his more positive contentions that needs expansion and clearing up. As it is, he has set himself to prove a little too much and has actually proved much too little.

W. G. DE BURGH.

## ADJUSTMENT IN MARRIAGE

### Happy Marriage

By Norman E. Himes. English edition revised by Lella Secor Florence. Pp. 368. (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1941.) 12s. 6d. net.

FEW people would care to deny that marriage relations constitute an important source of the variance of total social happiness. A reasonable interpretation of available evidence makes it likely that marriage originally came into existence as an institution in response to the need for safeguarding the family and its property and hence to acquire rights over the procreative activities of the female. But monogamous marriage in modern society, *de jure* if not entirely *de facto*, still exercises proper functions in regulating the sexual and parental impulses and in providing for various other social and psychological needs. The permanence and stability of marriage are very sensitive to economic and ecological conditions in society. One current difficulty comes to mind. The exigencies of war, compelling prolonged separation and abstinence and, consequently, frustration and conflict, have certainly raised the incidence of psychoneuroses in married women. It is surprising therefore that so little scientific attention has been given to the conditions of a stable and happy union on one hand and of the difficulties that may arise from this union on the other.

The admirable work of Prof. L. M. Terman and his associates at Stanford University is outstanding in this field, and much that is of value in the book under review is a diluted account of

Terman's conclusions. Dr. Himes is not concerned in the present study to deal with fundamental problems nor are any new data presented. The reader is offered a handbook of prudent guidance enriched by long experience in the medical problems of contraception. Excursions into economic advice for prospective couples to which a few chapters are devoted may serve a purpose for some of the more suggestible members of the public.

Late age at marriage, by curtailing the child-bearing period, is one factor contributing to a reduced fertility, and it is encouraging to see the strong plea made in this book for earlier marriages both in the interests of fertility and to facilitate sex adjustments in general. The most useful chapters are those that deal with pre-marital and marital sex relations, contraceptive techniques, sterility and venereal disease.

Two points deserve comment. First, the excess of males in the sex ratio is not, as Dr. Himes supposes, due to the higher death-rate of females *in utero* but to the greater number of males conceived; the death-rate of male is higher than that of female embryos. Secondly, to advocate homogeneity of the prospective partners in respect of race, religion, economic and social status, age, education and outlook is dangerous when little or no evidence is adduced in support of the merits of this advice. Such restrictions would strengthen existing class and group stratification and obstruct genetic combinations which are in the interests of the community as a whole.

JOHN COHEN.