

body has well said that we credit ourselves with our successes while fate affords a convenient loophole in case of failure. That is why men attempt the same thing, two or more times, unsuccessfully.

We cannot decipher ourselves because we do not apply the same tests that we apply in the case of others. If any person doubts this statement let him scrutinize the opinion he has formed of another and inquire into the reasons which have led him to the conclusion he has reached. One man he finds a bore because he will not listen patiently to long winded platitudes upon the beauties of astronomy. Of another he has a very high opinion because the ideas of both agree upon the higher criticism. An outsider knows that neither of them has ever studied the subject in earnest. Our hero finds another intolerable because his jokes and puns are pronounced insufferably stale. Of course the sufferer proceeds to regale the next victim and is rewarded when he finds that the new confidant never heard them before. Our example is a man who writes poetry and wants it criticized. This criticism must be favorable or there is a towering passion not always so well founded as the bases of *Ætna*; and the critic finds out that to be liked a man must keep his opinions to himself. The critic is a football player and retorts (somewhat irrelevantly) with the glories of that game. The other calls it an extraordinary game and they part in agreement though cheating the referee is in the mind of one and the patience of the man at the bottom of a "log heap" uppermost in the thinking-machine of the other. Kindred cases occur among the ladies but we appeal to the saying "*semper mutabile est femina*"(?); and leave the task of pointing them out to any of the fair sex who is willing to undertake the easy though thankless task.

These examples serve to illustrate the difference between our point of view and that of the other man. How is it to be surmised? By our studying the reasons for the point of view of others; and their acting in the same way in forming an opinion of us. As a general rule they are not more biassed than we are and if our opinions differ there must be reasons which calmly studied will give us a deeper insight into their characters and incidentally into our own. When a man has done something silly in our estimation it is always best before passing a final opinion to try to get to the bottom of the affair, to study it upon historical principles. When all the concomitant circumstances are thus lighted up the truth dawns upon us that we do not differ so much from the other man after all that placed in the same position we should behave pretty much as he has. Even if we would act differently full knowledge leaves us unconvinced of the silliness of his action and gradually forces us to look at our own actions from a broader point of view. Hence we start to study ourselves logically, that is from the standpoint of others. There is no use laughing at this; its truth is perceived practically not theoretically.

Every man has within him a witness in regard to the right