

It contained in its Table of Contents the following announcement of subjects:—

“ Note.—‘ On the possibility of developing by the microscope or by other means *the mental working plan* and visible action of the senses and the brain.’ ”

“ Memorial light to darkness.”

“ Memorial white to black.”

“ Conclusive sapidity.”

“ The mutative vividness of the Vagabond.”

“ The mutative vividness of the Hero.”

“ Of the estimated and prospective qualities of a Prince.”

“ The supposed future mind of a Prince.”

“ Of the popular and conforming mind of the Physician.”

“ Of the narrow and protracting mind of the Lawyer.”

“ Of the Lawyer-like mind of the Judge.”

“ Of the versatile and disjointed mind of the People.”

It would be improper to multiply extracts. These quotations from the title pages will serve at least to show “ the versatile and disjointed mind ” of the author. In the opinion of the plaintiffs these volumes were designed to teach infidelity, and in the light of that conviction their duty seemed to be very plain. A single extract from the chapter entitled, “ The common mode of drawing character,” will be sufficient to justify this conclusion. “ We may here find,” Dr. Rush writes, “ a motive for reversing the account in the Jewish biography of Adam, ‘ that God made man in his own divine image ; ’ to the *more probable fact that Moses, or somebody else, may, in his own metaphysical creation, have made a God to himself, not only in the image of his own outward form,* “ but in the muddled and degraded resemblance to his perverted constituents and qualities.”

The bill charged that these books “ contain infidel and atheistical sentiments and arguments, and that said works

