

Psychology, p. 93). It is obvious that the discrimination limen must be larger for the merely accommodating eye, for a given degree of accommodation is sufficient for a certain extent of the line of sight. I submitted that the line of accommodation may be one factor accounting for the larger monocular limen actually found in the experiment.

Finally, respecting the value of my suggestions for future research, I need only add that it is judicious to suspend judgment until they have been subjected to rigorous test. I submit that the problem has not been closed for all time and that it has not yet reached its final stage of development.

J. E. WALLACE WALLIN.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE PSYCHOLOGICAL REVIEW.

Sir: Our attention has recently been called to an article entitled 'Personal Sources of Christian Science,' by Prof. I. Woodbridge Riley, of the University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, Canada, published in the November issue of the PSYCHOLOGICAL REVIEW. In reading this able article we cannot help feeling that the Professor's talents are worthy of a higher use than that of attempting to disprove the authority of Christian science and the genuineness of the work of its discoverer and founder.

Without entering into the arena of public controversy, or attempting to take up the sword of hostile argument, we will relate some of the things that Christian science has done and is doing in our very midst, and then leave the decision of its merits to the judgment of the impartial reader.

The world has had many religions, philosophies and systems of therapeutics, both physical and metaphysical, all of which when weighed in the balance have been found wanting in some respects, and we ask — is there any fairer standard by which to judge their relative values than that injunction of the Holy Scriptures 'by their fruits ye shall know them'?

The writer's first impressions of Christian science were gathered from reading Mrs. Eddy's book *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures*, in the early part of 1892, at the time he was suffering from a disordered liver and chronic dyspepsia, which had defied skillful medical aid. About three weeks after the commencement of this study a distinct physical improvement was remarked, and although there was no help received outside of the reading of Mrs. Eddy's book, this healing influence continued until every symptom of the old diseases had completely vanished. This wholly unexpected recovery created a

desire for a better understanding of the law governing this physical phenomenon, and a close study of this great metaphysical principle during the past twelve years has conclusively proved its efficacy under all conditions where circumstances make its demonstration possible.

Any intellectual effort to contradict Christian science by theoretical argument, no matter how able and scholarly the attempt may be, will tend to emphasize the vast difference between the wisdom of man and the divine Intelligence, and the gulf existing between them can only be bridged over by yielding the former in favor of the latter.

The repeated attempts to endow the illiterate and materialistic P. P. Quimby with the credit of having originated Christian science are too far fetched for serious consideration. No claim has ever been established in his behalf which can be considered in the slightest degree tangible. In criticising Mrs. Eddy's writings it would have been, in our judgment, fairer to have quoted from her later editions, instead of from the first, which embodied her early effort to state a subject at once novel and abstruse. If the professor would look for the good in Mrs. Eddy's life and philosophy, we feel assured that he would find so much that his pen would not again be used in the attempt to overthrow a system which is benefiting thousands of the human race. Professor Riley however makes an honest admission when he says, 'That Mrs. Eddy has been successful in treating many nervous, non-organic troubles cannot be denied.'

If a thing is good, would it not be wise to encourage its progress? If on the other hand it is not good, the best possible way to get rid of it is to offer something better, and public opinion will invariably decide in favor of that which is best. Instead of expending our useful and God-given ability in profitless discussion, which will do nobody any good, let us remember the Scriptural quotation—“The kingdom of God cometh not with observation; neither shall they say, Lo here! or lo there! for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you.” (Luke 17: 20, 21.)

MARCH 15, 1904.

RICHARD P. VERRALL,
Christian Science Publication Committee,
State of New York.

BOOKS RECEIVED FROM APRIL 7 TO MAY 7.

Ergographie de la Main droite et de la Main gauche. H. SCHOUTEDEN. Brussels, Hayes, 1904. Pp. 28.

Bibliography of the Published Writings of G. Stanley Hall.
Publ. Clark Univ. Library. Vol. I., No. 1, 1903. [196 titles,