

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

