

is defined in the standard dictionary as "the theory of the grounds of knowledge"; but I take a wider view of the science than is here indicated, and view and treat it as being the science of cognition, or of knowledge and knowledge-taking. *Inter alia*, this science deals with the important question: how do I know that I know correctly? As the science is comparatively new, more liberty than might otherwise be seemly may, perhaps, be exercised regarding what is, or ought to be, included therein.

Modern psychology sometimes essays to deal with inner religion, but it does so only as if *ex gratia*, or in amateur fashion. The treatment of religion by the psychology of the day is as a rule exceedingly unscientific. Its procedure is frequently self-inconsistent and otherwise illogical; but perhaps its most radical defect is that the branch of the science which deals with religion is engaged in, as a rule, by men who have no direct, or first-hand, access to the main materials which form their professed subject-matter. In other words, these men are personally inexperienced on the subject of which they undertake to treat scientifically. They can, therefore, proceed at best only on hearsay, which, it is needless to say, no competent scientist ever attempts to do. These men must, therefore, lack the essential inner verifying conditions for dealing with their subject. For instance, the spiritual teaching of the Bible must be to them at best only an unverified and unverifiable hypothesis. Two whole chapters, and part of other chapters, in the first volume of the series on *Soul-Science* are devoted to a discussion of this subject.

The Science of Comparative Religion is a science