

acid odor by the positive pole. Electricity produces sometimes an acid, sometimes a saline taste, when applied to the tongue.

From what we have said, our readers will perceive the great dependence which vital actions have on various physical agencies, for their origination and continuance. Whilst vitality is *essentially distinct* from all those forces which operate through mere inorganic matter, it appears to be convertible into, and replaced by them when it ceases to exist. Let vitality become extinct in a part or whole of the body, and how quickly does "decay's effacing finger" obliterate all the distinguishing features. No sooner has the dread influences of disease so changed the "*material substratum*" necessary for the manifestations of life—no sooner has the "breath of man left his nostrils," than a revolution of all parts into their original chemical constituents commences. The vital force is immediately succeeded by chemical affinity.

What is matter? What is mind? The greatest intellectual efforts have been called forth in attempts to arrive at satisfactory solutions of those two questions. Tomes innumerable have been written on the subject. Tomes replete with reasoning of the highest order, and thoughts of the deepest profundity. Tomes, nevertheless, too often defaced by acrimonious language and unjust recrimination. Materialism has been the bugbear of one class of enquirers. Spiritualism has been the derision and laughing-stock of the other—and why? Evidently because they have both allowed violent prejudices to warp their judgments. They have looked at the ultraisms of each other's belief, and formed their decisions accordingly. The spiritualist has too often formed his idea of materialism from the contemplation of the essentially gross views propounded by Voltaire and the French Encyclopedists, Helvetius, Diderot, and D'Alembert. With him materialism and infidelity are convertible terms. And truly so in keeping with his idea. But, unfortunately, the term materialism has been applied to some peculiar views held by great and good men; and, consequently, such views, and the enunciators of them, have been held up to public reprobation. Yet the views are strictly logical—in accordance with the truths of science, and not opposed to scriptural truth. The *name* has been the millstone around their neck. The most orthodox opinion would scarcely float with such a weight. Locke and Lawrence have been *ostracised* for holding so-called materialistic tenets. The former asserted that, independently of revelation, the immateriality of the soul could not be demonstrated—principles of philosophy failed to teach it. The latter, that from physiological research alone, we could not discover the separate existence of spirit. And yet both held the opinion of the immateriality of the soul. "I presume," says Locke, "it is not the idea of a thinking or rational