

ment of a purely physiological operation, viz., the co-ordination of muscular movement.

If we grant this, then, we cannot allow that any analogies can be drawn between such dissimilar processes as those of the illative sense and taste and skill.

I may not, perhaps, have been as explicit in this part of my criticism as I could wish to have been. What I am trying to show is that, if indeed by these analogies His Eminence wishes to teach us nothing more than the fact that, just as taste and skill are, to a certain extent, natural gifts, so there are men who excel in argumentative ability, my strictures will not, of course, lie. But if he means that, just as a good ear can detect a false note, and a good eye will appreciate a beautiful combination of form and colour, so there is a faculty in the mind that intuitively grasps truth and eschews error, then I cannot but maintain that no such analogy exists. But for the proof of this, as I have remarked, I must rely upon my general line of argument.

III. We are forced, then, to the conclusion that the credentials of this shadowy sense are spurious; we shall further find that all its actions are explicable on other and well-known grounds.

We are told that it is an "extra-logical" faculty, a faculty superior to the "apparatus of verbal reasoning." But what are we to understand by this decrial of "verbal reasoning?" I fail to appreciate the deprecation of this reasoning, until it is shown to be other than that which the mind spontaneously performs reduced to scientific forms. And this the Cardi-