

science. But so long have these subjects been in the hands of charlatans, or of men with limited and partial views, that able and respectable philosophers, especially among the clergy, shrink from their investigation, lest the title of phrenologist, or mesmerist, or spiritualist should destroy their reputation and usefulness. It ought not so to be; and I am satisfied that not until this thorough investigation takes place will these branches of knowledge be placed upon the same sure footing on which other departments of experimental science rest. At present they seem to me like some large temple, or palace, mostly buried by rubbish, with only here and there some tower, or minaret, or column projecting above the surface. Around these detached parts groups are gathered, endeavoring to show that each tower or column is a complete temple. But not till the vast piles of rubbish are removed will the real temple exhibit its true proportions and character. When this is done, I fancy that the structure will be found a noble one, and worthy of the infinite Architect.

I have time to derive only one other lesson from history and observation on this subject. They show us how unwise it is to denounce any new discovery, or theory in science, when they are first broached, as hostile to religion; and especially to take the ground that if the new views are true, the Bible must be false. There is a strong temptation to do this. Men of ardent temperament, who love the Bible, when any thing is advanced which can be construed into hostility to its statements, feel as we all do when any thing is suggested derogatory to the character of a near friend. We rush to the defence without waiting for the dictates of prudence; and thus we may injure instead of assisting our friend. Much more liable are we to injure the Bible. There is no need of such haste. Christianity stands on too firm and broad a base