

book on the soul,* he will revere introspection as the eye of the soul itself, which sees not only the divine objects of knowledge, but also interprets for us the vast bulk of our external experience. Such, too, will be his reverence for introspection if he has studied those giants of modern philosophy, Kant, Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel. It was well said of these men by a writer in *The Dial* fifty years ago: "These four philosophers would have been conspicuous in any age, and will hereafter, we think, be named with Plato, Aristotle, Bacon, Descartes, and Leibnitz, among the great thinkers of the world. Silently these lights arose and went up the sky without noise, to take their place among the fixed stars of genius and shine with them—names that will not fade out of heaven until some ages shall have passed away. These men were thinkers all—deep, mighty thinkers. . . . They sat on the brink of the well of Truth and continued to draw for themselves and the world. Take Kant alone, and in the whole compass of thought we scarce know his superior. From Aristotle to Leibnitz we do not find his equal. No, nor since Leibnitz. Need we say it? Was there not many a Lord Bacon in Immanuel Kant?"

But the beginner in mental science is excusable if he does not admit the claims of introspection; for it is a higher faculty which grows slowly with painstaking culture—of great worth, but costing hard mental work. Although the weakest mind possesses introspection in the fact that it is conscious of itself, it does not yet

* Let him use the splendid text-book of Edwin Wallace, "Aristotle's Psychology in Greek and English."