

partial views — in that common failing of literary men, to attempt to group every thing under a favorite science, and explain every thing by it. And further, when I find even professedly Christian men defending materialism, and some of its ablest advocates admitting that the soul may be something “immortal, subtle, immaterial, diffused through the brain,”\* (I use their very words,) I cannot believe that the views of such men, as to the nature of the soul, differ much in reality from those of the strict immaterialist, although they use different terms. Nor will the practical influence of their opinions, false as they undoubtedly are, when understood in their strict sense, be likely to be very disastrous; although there is a grosser form of materialism, that is made the basis of a hateful system of atheism.

There are two recent offsets from physiology, which have been supposed fraught with influences unfavorable to religion. I refer to phrenology and mesmerism. The first has been thought to favor materialism, and to lessen human responsibility; and the latter, to bring miracles into disrepute, and to direct us, for the cure of the body and the soul, to a class of dreaming pretenders, whose responses are about as much to be relied on as those of the oracle of Delphos, the god of Ekron, or the witch of Endor, and whom it is about as impious to consult. The merits of these new branches of science, this is not the proper occasion to discuss; nor is it easy as yet to ascertain definitely what principles in them are settled. But admitting their pretensions, the first seems to leave the question of materialism just where it found it; since it is as easy to see how an immaterial soul should act through a hundred organs as through one. Nor does it seem to me more difficult, on natural principles, to see how the mind may

\* Elliotson's Physiology, p. 39.