

*V. Holmes
Jun*

ANNALS

OF

PHRENOLOGY;

TO CONSIST OF

ARTICLES FROM THE EDINBURGH, PARIS, AND LONDON
PHRENOLOGICAL JOURNALS, AND OF SUCH ORIGINAL
PAPERS AS MAY BE SELECTED AND APPROVED BY
THE 'BOSTON PHRENOLOGICAL SOCIETY.'

No. 1.

OCTOBER, 1833.

BOSTON:
MARSH, CAPEN & LYON.
1833.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE I.—Phrenology Vindicated, in Remarks on Article III. of the July Number, 1833, of the North American Review, headed 'Phrenology.' By Charles Caldwell, M. D.....	1
ART. II.—London Phrenological Society. Conversion of an Anti-Phrenologist.....	103
ART. III.—On the American Scheme of establishing Colonies of Free Negro Emigrants on the Coast of Africa, as exemplified in Liberia. [From the Edinburgh Journal.].....	113
ART. IV.—Practical Utility of Phrenology.....	134
ART. V.—Cases by Mr. J. L. Levison, of London.....	141
NOTICES.....	144

PROSPECTUS

FOR PUBLISHING

A QUARTERLY PERIODICAL

TO BE ENTITLED

ANNALS OF PHRENOLOGY;

TO CONSIST OF

ARTICLES FROM THE EDINBURGH, PARIS, AND LONDON PHRENOLOGICAL JOURNALS, AND OF SUCH ORIGINAL PAPERS AS MAY BE SELECTED AND APPROVED BY THE
'BOSTON PHRENOLOGICAL SOCIETY.'

Since the visit of DR. SPURZHEIM to this country, the Science of Phrenology has assumed an interesting aspect, and intelligent men of every class, have become engaged in the investigation of it. This Journal is proposed with a view to facilitate free and general inquiry into the truths and objects of Phrenology, to ascertain its bearings upon the Physical, Moral, and Intellectual condition of man.

'I speak literally, and in sincerity, when I say, that were I at this moment offered the wealth of India on condition of Phrenology being blotted from my mind forever, I would scorn the gift; nay, were everything I possess in the world placed in one hand, and Phrenology in the other, and orders issued for me to choose one, PHRENOLOGY, without a moment's hesitation, would be preferred.'

GEORGE COMBE, Esq. of Edinburgh.

Each number will contain 128 octavo pages, with such engravings as the subjects introduced may require. The work will be printed on fine paper and in the best style.

Price \$3,00 per annum, payable on delivery of the first number. Any person becoming responsible for five copies, will be entitled to the sixth copy gratis.

All letters and communications must be addressed (*post paid*) to
MARSH, CAPEN & LYON, Publishers
133 Washington Street, Boston.

ANNALS OF PHRENOLOGY.

NO. I.—OCTOBER, 1833.

ART. I. — *Phrenology Vindicated, in Remarks on Article III. of the July Number, 1833, of the North American Review, headed 'Phrenology.'* By Charles Caldwell, M. D.

CONSIDERED under all the circumstances that characterize it, the Article we are about to examine, is one of the most extraordinary we have ever read. As it is our intention to treat it unceremoniously, from first to last, we begin by pronouncing it reprehensible and offensive. And such, we doubt not, will be the general opinion of it, at no distant period. Were any one to complain of this early condemnation of it, as abrupt and uncompromising beyond what is usual, we should not pause to defend ourselves against the charge, regardless whether it be well founded or not. As we are engaged in handling an unusual production, we deem it optional, to treat it in a common or an uncommon way. More solicitous about matter than form, our chief care shall be, to say nothing unjust of it.

As one of its lightest faults, the Article is wanting in that respectful observance, which should mark not only the intercourse of polished minds, but every form of intercourse, in which either letters or science are concerned. Comparatively trivial as this omission may be thought, it is not destitute of weight and influence. An entire absence of good nature and good breeding, in such a case — for both are involved in it — is always disagreeable.

ble, and not unfrequently a source of mischief. It awakens fresh feelings not friendly to impartial inquiries, produces usually a return of discourtesy, and, by strengthening prejudices and jealousies already existing, tends to perpetuate disagreements, prevent the co-operation of minds in a common cause, and thus retard the progress of knowledge.

But the Article possesses other characteristics much more objectionable. It possesses, indeed, but few that are free from objections. We dislike its whole tone, taste, temper, order, spirit, and, in fact, all its qualities, except its *errors*, *want of strength*, and *inconclusiveness*. Our reason for not disliking these, is, that they render the paper harmless, in its attack on a science we have long delighted in, and which we believe to be founded in truth, and destined to be highly beneficial to man. We further dislike the production, because the arts and devices of the witting, and the cavilling sciolist, mingled with the cant of the pretender to orthodoxy, too often usurp the place in it, which ought to be occupied by the facts and arguments of the conscientious inquirer. Above all, we dislike it on account of the determined spirit of falsification and obloquy which pervades it to an extent that has scarcely a parallel.

Shall we be told that some of these charges are serious and weighty, and ought not to be preferred, except on authority not to be questioned? Our reply is, that we know this, and have brought the matter intentionally to such an issue. But we also know the ground we are acting on, and the resources we can command; and our purpose is, to make the charges yet weightier, by loading them with proof. We have not, like the writer of the Article, embarked in the contest, with no other arms than *imputation* and *assertion*. Our means of action will be found to consist of better materials. We shall assert nothing, which we are not prepared to back with evidence. Finally; though it is not our province either to banter or boast, yet we shall close our remarks on this point, by saying, on us be the responsibility, should we fail to make good the charges we have stated. Conditioned, on the other hand, that we succeed in our object, the writer need scarce-

ly be warned of the recompense that awaits him. In either case, the testimony being before them, an intelligent public will not be slow in affixing the odium of false accusation on the real offender ; and there let it rest.

The faults of the Article, to which reference has been made, are chiefly moral. Its intellectual and literary ones will be exposed generally in the progress of our analysis of it. Of one or two of them, however, we think it best to speak at present, because we shall have to encounter them in every stage of our discussion. The composition of the paper is inordinately loose and indefinite, desultory and irregular. It dwells steadily on nothing, grapples closely with nothing, presents no formal chain of argument, is crowded and encumbered with isolated and irrelevant assertions, and flutters so incoherently from one point to another, that it is scarcely possible to follow it. It reminds us of a troublesome, yet worthless description of fish, that often evoke the execration of the angler, by constantly nibbling at the bait, but never swallowing it.

These qualities of the Article will necessarily render our examination of it protracted. They will compel us to pursue it through its windings and doublings, and reply to it in detail ; instead of meeting and answering it summarily in mass. Each disjointed assertion and unassorted point will call for a distinct argument ; and it is well known, that one writer can assert, in a sentence or a line, what will require an essay from another to refute. From these circumstances, we say, our examination of the paper is likely to be of considerable length, and our quotations from it more numerous than we could wish them to be.

Nor is there wanting another fault, which we may best specify in the form of a preliminary. The Article is a compound of worn-out matter. There is no originality in it. The allegations of the writer are but the mouldering remains of the sophistry of his predecessors.* They have been presented to us so often, in

* If any one doubt this, let him look into the tirades against Phrenology, contained in the Edinburgh Review, Blackwood's Magazine, the London Quarterly, and the Literary Gazette, and he will doubt no longer. He will there find

so many shapes, and with such shifting and patching of their tattered garments, that they have grown stale and musty to us, and begin to pall offensively on our sight. Should we be able so far to restrain our feelings of scorn toward them, as to treat them with any sort of civility, it will be because we cannot forget either ourselves or the cause we are defending. Respect for *them* will have no share in the issue.

Nor is it the *matter* of the Article alone that is borrowed or purloined. Of its form and manner, the same is true. Taken 'for all in all,' it is a lineal descendant from the European stock, and is strongly retentive of family-likeness. Its lineage might be easily traced. We do not pronounce it a copy of any single production. Nor do we believe it such. But we do believe and aver, that, in manner and spirit, as well as in matter, it may be made up, with but little concoction, out of the scraps and parings of sundry productions easily accessible. Like them, it employs assertions instead of facts, misrepresents the character and tendency of Phrenology, misstates the views and declarations of its advocates, deals in jaded wit or sarcasm, when it should examine and discuss, substitutes invective or insidious imputations for serious argument, and addresses the feelings and prejudices, instead of the understanding. Its object, like theirs, seems to be, to achieve, by stratagem, a temporary victory for the individual over his opponents; not a permanent one, by honest inquiry, for truth

all our author has said — and more too. And he will find it said in a much better, at least, in a much stronger manner. When Mr. Jeffrey wrote his celebrated anti-phrenological article, for the 88th No. of the Edinburgh Review, he showed clearly, that even *he* was entirely ignorant of the history of Phrenology. Hence he urged against it, as if they were fresh, a batch of stale objections, most of them nearly twenty years old — and all repeatedly answered and refuted. Of this, Mr. Combe informed him, in his reply, and no doubt made him blush, for his want of information on the subject, and the sorry figure he cut in the controversy, in consequence of it.

Could any act of folly and presumption in our author surprise us, it would be, that he should engage in the contest against Phrenology, after the overthrow of such champions as Jeffrey, Gordon, and Brown! But self-conceit is often blind, and never more so than in the case before us.

over error. Altogether, it is but a second edition of what has been published in Europe, with few additions, with more defects, and no amendments. For the truth of these charges, as well as the former ones, we hold ourselves responsible.

Should the question be put to us, 'If the Article be so futile, why is it replied to?' we answer, Because it has a place in a Journal of high standing, and derives from that privilege a degree of consideration, of which it is unworthy. Had it appeared as a pamphlet, or in an ordinary periodical, few would have read it, and none would have condescended to answer it. Most assuredly *we* should not. We should have consigned it to the only purposes it can ever usefully subserve — those of the grocer and the book-worm.

We shall here propose a few interrogatories, with some accompanying remarks, which may concern others, besides the writer of the Article before us.

Where is the probable usefulness, expedience, or becomingness, of thus, in matter, form, and manner, renewing, in the United States, the European crusade against Phrenology? Is it, in any degree, likely, that the friends of the science here can be discomfited, or the science itself arrested in its progress, by means that have been found insufficient elsewhere? We know not where a probability to that effect lies, or why a hope of the kind should be cherished. If we mistake not, all things that bear on the subject speak a language the contrary of this.

Phrenology is now in its juvenescence, and attaining daily maturer age and greater strength. Its advocates are multiplying with a velocity beyond that of any former period.* Every en-

* A very striking sign of the times, and one peculiarly favorable to Phrenology is, the deep interest which the medical class of Edinburgh are beginning to feel in the science, notwithstanding the pains taken to prejudice them against it. At the Hunterian Medical Society, two phrenological papers were read last winter, (1832-3) and discussed with great animation. And, 'at the annual supper of the Society, the memory of Gall and Spurzheim was made one of the regular toasts of the evening, and was drunk unanimously,' and with the most flattering enthusiasm. These are indications which cannot be mistaken. They speak triumph to the friends of Phrenology, and despair to its enemies.

lightened spot in christendom testifies to this. Able works * in exposition and defence of it are now extensively circulated and read. Societies for the cultivation and promotion of it are growing in number in our own country; and in Great Britain and France they are already abundant—and still on the increase. The Parent Society, with two or three auxiliary ones, is flourishing in Edinburgh; several of the kind exist in London; three in Glasgow; one or two in Dublin, and one in almost every populous town in the kingdom. The Paris Phrenological Society is a host in itself. Its members, many of them men of the highest standing in science and letters, are scattered throughout every department of France, and can scarcely fail, in a few years, to proselyte the nation.

But the picture is yet incomplete. Not only are the friends of Phrenology increasing; its enemies are, in much more than an equal ratio, reduced, not alone in number, but in activity, energy, and the hope of success. Comparatively, they are paralyzed in everything. In proof of this, let the former hostile operations of the British press be contrasted with its present unbelligerent condition, and the testimony will be found conclusive. The Edinburgh Review, Blackwood's Magazine, and the London Quarterly, which once formed the holy Antiphrenological Alliance, and led the war against the science, have retired from the field, their shields broken, and their laurels withered, and will never renew

* The following is an extract from a letter, just received from a distinguished correspondent in Europe:

'Mr. Combe's System of Phrenology has been translated into German, and has just been printed at Leipsic. His "Constitution of Man" is in the course of being printed at Paris, in the French language. Four numbers of the French Phrenological Journal have appeared, and are extensively circulated and read.' — 'The science is in a very flourishing condition in Edinburgh. Mr. Combe's Lectures (on Phrenology) last winter, (1832-3) were attended by a class of two hundred auditors. In Glasgow there have been several phrenological discussions, in which some of the most eminent physicians and anatomists of the place defended the science.'

To the foregoing may be added, that the writings of Spurzheim are beginning to be extensively read in the United States, and that an American edition of Combe's works will soon issue from a Boston press.

the hopeless conflict. Of several other British periodicals, the same is true ; and not a few of them have changed sides, and become active phrenological partizans. In plain terms, opposition to Phrenology in Great Britain and France is nearly at an end ; and the few, who still feebly persist in it, have nothing else in view than to retreat slowly, and withdraw from the contest, with the least practicable mortification and disgrace. Nor, once out of it, will they ever jeopard their standing in it again. Of physicians and naturalists, who, from the character of their pursuits, are best prepared for the study of the science, this is peculiarly true. A young and distinguished philosophical naturalist or physician, in Great Britain, France, or the United States, opposed to Phrenology, would be now a rarity.

Such being the case, we repeat the question, Why is it, that a war is commenced against Phrenology on this side of the Atlantic, to be carried on in the same manner, and by the same means, with that which failed so signally on the other side ? If the science withstood those means, and even flourished under the worst they could do against it, when it was yet but in the gristle of infancy, when its advocates were few, and its opponents in legions, when but one or two works in favor of it had appeared, and their circulation was exceedingly limited, and when there did not exist a Society to sustain it — if, we say, it bade defiance to falsehood, invective, denunciation, and abuse, and flourished in spite of them, when it was in the tenderness and debility of infancy, and comparatively friendless, is it likely to be vanquished by them now, when its infancy is over, its strength augmented, works in defence of it circulating widely, numerous Societies laboring in behalf of it, and its friends multiplied a thousand-fold ? Can any one subscribe to a belief so preposterous ?

No ; if Phrenology be doomed to extinction, (which we deem as improbable as that the sun will retrograde on his path) the work must be effected by other means. Misrepresentation, denunciation, and all the shuffling devices of unfairness, on the part of its adversaries, have had their time, and have failed to perform their allotted task. They must therefore cease, and observation,

inquiry, and argument begin. By such means only can truth be elicited, to whatever side of the controversy it may incline. And though it would astonish us greatly, were it to declare against Phrenology; yet, if the contest be thus to terminate, the sooner the better. Phrenologists are laboring for the attainment of truth, and will delight to give in exchange for it their most cherished hypotheses. They therefore invite their opponents to state frankly their objections to the science, *as expounded by its advocates, and as it is in itself*, not as misrepresented by its enemies, and those who are ignorant of it. They invite them moreover to make their statements gravely and courteously, like philosophers and men of breeding; not rudely and sneeringly, like coarse jesters, and charletans in science. Should it be made to appear, in the course of our inquiry, that the author of the Article belongs to the latter class, the fault is his own. Nor will the public, we trust, attach any blame to us, should we openly expose to them so many and such gross violations of truth, in his paper, as to destroy entirely his credibility as a writer. One preliminary more, and then to our task.

There is a natural affinity between language and the thing represented by it, which ought to be held sacred; because it cannot be violated with entire safety. Some form of mischief will as certainly result from the act, as from any other breach of the laws of nature. Phrenology will be obscured or weakened by it; or its true meaning may be lost, in exchange for a false one. It is on this ground, that, in good writing, the sound is made often an echo to the sense. As respects *natural* objects and events, nobody disputes this. It is known to every one, that

‘— When loud surges lash the sounding shore,
 ‘The hoarse, rough verse should like the torrent roar.’

Nor is the fact less true, or less important, in its relation to *morals*. A violent and atrocious act cannot be suitably depicted in mild and delicate language. An attempt to that effect presents an incongruity. Nor is that the greatest evil it produces. It takes from the deep hue of the enormity described, and protects

it, in part, from the abhorrence it deserves. Truth concurs with taste in requiring, that most things be called by their proper names. It is for this reason, that we shall be compelled frequently to use strong language, in exposing our author's moral offences, especially his misrepresentations, as often as they may appear to be intentional and malicious. Harsh language is not our choice. But if the gentleman has so acted, as to force it on us, he must abide the consequence. We shall disobey intentionally neither judgment nor taste, nor do violence to the true meaning of the English tongue, to accommodate his feelings, or take a shade from the native complexion of his faults. Justice is all he is entitled to expect from us; and that he shall have. We trust, moreover, that the reader will not ascribe our occasional employment of severe terms, or contemptuous or indignant expressions, to any delight we take in *them*, but to our deep *aversion from what they point to*. In the very commencement of his paper, the writer manifests his insolence and disregard of truth.

The following extract is in proof of this :

' We have had our doubts about the expediency of meddling with the subject of the works at the head of this article. It seems, on the one hand, at least proper to notice a doctrine which has occupied of late a good deal of the public attention, while, on the other, the probability that any individual, at all acquainted with physiology or mental philosophy, can seriously believe it, is so small, that the question seems to be hardly worth arguing. On the whole, however, we have concluded to offer a few remarks on the subject, if it be only for the purpose of showing our colors; as we have noted, among other analogous dispositions of the Professors of Phrenology, a determination to regard every one as for them, who is not decidedly against them.' * * * * 'The cry of persecution and interested opposition, indeed, is not peculiar to phrenologists. Its uses have been long well known to mankind. The ignorant empiric, while he puffs his infallible nostrum, takes care to hint that its virtues would be universally admitted, if it were not for the opposition of a set of lazy and purse-proud doctors, whose emoluments would be endangered by the general use of the elixir. The low-bred pettifogger calls for the sympathy of the mob against a combination of the grandes of the bar, who are jealous of his superior acuteness. The would-be legislator bemoans the evils which overshadow the land, from the predominance of an aristocratic junto. The vulgar infidel clamors against priestcraft; and the editor of an incipient newspaper casts about for a prosecution for libel.

‘ That some tendency to get up this sort of cry on the subject of Phrenology prevails occasionally among the ranks of the initiated, we think no one can doubt, who takes the trouble to examine the history of the rise and progress of this delusion ; and whilst its promulgators continue to pour out their abuse of that portion of the thinking community, who have not chosen to admit their pretensions, nothing can surpass the cries of horror and indignation, which greet any return of the civility.’ pp. 59, 60.

An example of arrogance and presumption more high-wrought than this, can scarcely be imagined. Certainly, as far as our information reaches, nothing to surpass it has ever been *executed*. To be made fully sensible of the extent and effrontery of it, it would be necessary to be correctly informed, who the North American Reviewer is, and who the phrenologists collectively are, whom he treats with such rudeness and affected derision. That the reader therefore, may be somewhat prepared to judge for himself, we shall furnish him with such information on the subject as we deem admissible.

As respects the Reviewer, we must speak with reserve, and in general terms,—the impropriety of being minutely personal, and our dislike of the practice, forbidding us to do more. In science and letters, he has no standing, even in Boston, where he resides ; and out of it, his name is unknown. Were Phrenology destined to be overthrown, it would not fall by him. His is not the arm to bring the fated arrow to its mark. The task is above him.

Such is the writer in the North American — the contemner of phrenology and phrenologists ; who was at a loss to decide, whether it became his rank and dignity, to stoop from his high station, to notice things so far beneath him !! A brief account of his opponents, will enable the reader to decide whether, in discussion, he is best entitled to sneer at them, or they at him.

In intellect and science, many phrenologists rank with the foremost characters of the day. In literature, some of them are no less conspicuous. For their knowledge of man, and of the animal kingdom in general, especially as respects the phenomena of mind and their laws, Gall and Spurzheim had a decided pre-eminence over all their contemporaries, no less than their predecessors. We cannot pause to adduce the proof of this, which their

writings and lectures, and the multiplied exhibitions, during life, of their attainment and skill, abundantly furnish. The public is becoming daily more and more acquainted with the evidence bearing on these points; and the time is not distant when no one will question them.

Of the followers of these two distinguished men, as far as the fundamental principles of their science are concerned, a long and splendid catalogue might be presented. The list would include the two Combes and Dr. Gregory, of Edinburgh; Drs. Eliotson, Conolly, and Johnson, and the late Mr. Abernethy, of London; the Rev. Drs. Welsh and Chalmers, of Scotland, two of the ablest divines of the age; the late Baron Cuvier, notwithstanding his Report to the Institute of France, Messrs. Andral, Blainville, Adelon, Megendière, and the two Broussais, of Paris; Professor Otto, of Copenhagen; the late Professor Uccelli, of Florence; and hundreds of others, of great distinction, in various parts of the world. And the number is daily and rapidly increasing, shedding fresh lustre on the science, and giving it, with an augmentation of strength, such an imposing aspect, as must paralyze opposition, by rendering it hopeless.

Such is the band of philosophers and men, of whose opinions and works, the writer of the Article (the only thing, for aught we know, he has ever written,) thinks so humbly, that he could scarcely, we say, determine, whether it comported with his elevated standing, to condescend to notice them!! We shall take leave of this monument of self-conceit, with a single remark. Had the great fabulist been acquainted with it, instead of composing the *fiction* of the frog vying with the ox, he might have described the *reality* of our author, in contest with the phrenologists, and his moral would have been perfect.

Though holding ourselves one of the humblest members of that distinguished corps, we cannot feel the intended insult offered by the writer, in likening phrenologists to 'empirics,' 'pettifoggers,' demagogue 'legislators,' 'vulgar infidels,' and *starving newsmongers*. Such low gasconade spends its force on groveling objects,

and is impotent toward those of a higher order. True, it disgusts and offends the refined and judicious portion of the community, and impairs the tone of morals among the youthful and uncultivated, by vitiating their taste. But it is on its author that it exerts its most fatal influence. After having been indulged in by him, for a time, it clings to him, like the shirt to Hercules, and inflicts on him mental plague-spots, which nothing can heal. The question, whether effusions so loathsome should be allowed to soil the pages of respectable journals, one of whose objects is to improve public taste and morals, we leave to be discussed and settled by others.

In looking down on the writer, at the depth of disgrace to which the scurrility of his Article has sunk him, we should feel pity for the degraded man, were it not for our abhorrence of the heartless ribald. His manifest design, in the passage we are considering, no one can mistake. It is to weaken the cause of Phrenology, not by manly opposition and argument, but by slandering its advocates, and dishonoring them, if possible, in public opinion. In this, however, as in all his other schemes, he has failed, and must now be regarded, by the intelligent and pure-minded, as fallen to the bottom of the pit he had prepared for others.

Thersites immortalized himself by scandalizing his betters, and Eratostratus by setting fire to the temple of Diana; and our author, actuated by a like ambition, is seeking fame, by libelling phrenologists. Nor shall it be our fault, if he does not succeed to such fame as he deserves.

‘The probability that any individual, *at all acquainted with physiology, or mental philosophy*, can seriously believe it, (Phrenology) *is so small, that the question seems to be hardly worth arguing!*’

In this sentence, the writer virtually asserts, that no physiologist or mental philosopher is a believer in Phrenology. An assertion in more open violation of truth cannot be made. Whether ignorance, or a spirit of mendacity be its source, we neither know nor care. The fact is all that concerns us; and that we can maintain. Had the writer declared, that there is no physiologist of note, in any part of christendom, who is *not* a phrenologist, he

would have been nearer being correct. As far as Great Britain, France, and the United States are concerned, his ground would have been tenable. We challenge the writer to name, in either of those countries, a single individual, under forty-five or fifty years of age, distinguished in physiology, who is not substantially a phrenologist. All such concur in the fundamental principles of the science ; though some of them may be undecided respecting its details, on the ground, that they have not sufficiently examined them. And in Germany, Italy, Denmark, and other parts of continental Europe, the doctrines of Gall and Spurzheim are gaining ground.

The Rev. Mr. Welsh, moreover, a firm and devoted phrenologist, is one of the ablest mental philosophers in Scotland. Testimony in proof of both these points, may be derived from that gentleman's excellent biography of the late Dr. Brown.

Every system of physiology, with one or two exceptions, written within the last twelve years, into which we have looked, admits the general soundness of Phrenology, and adopts both its tenets and terms. Of almost every work of merit, treating of the diseased functions of the brain and nerves, that has appeared since the year 1820, the same is true. Even the authors of such books who do not openly profess themselves phrenologists, adopt the principles and language of the science, and apply them to their purposes, with decided benefit, as well to their own reputation, as to their readers. Time does not permit us to descend to specifications, in proof of all this. Nor does the occasion require it. If, however, we mistake in anything, the correspondent of the North American ought to be able to correct us ; and we invite him to do so. Nor, as truth alone is our object, will we hesitate to acknowledge and rectify any error we may have committed, as soon as it shall be disclosed to us. And we will thank even *him*, for making the disclosure.

Again. The Article represents, that, ' whilst the promulgators (of Phrenology) continue to *pour out their abuse* of the thinking portion of the community, who have not chosen to admit their pretensions, nothing can surpass the *cries of horror and indignation*, which greet any *return* of the civility.'

This is another perversion of truth. It is tantamount to an assertion, that phrenologists causelessly commenced the conflict; which the world knows to be contrary to fact. The war was unfeelingly opened on them, when they were calmly and *unoffendingly* pursuing their inquiries; except so far as the adherents of old opinions always *take offence* at those who broach new ones. This is history; and if the writer be wanting in the knowledge of it, it is because he has never sought it. We assert, moreover, that phrenologists have never 'poured out abuse,' without deep provocation, on either the 'thinking,' or unthinking 'portion of the community;' nor have they ever, in any case, raised 'cries of horror,' under the wrongs they have sustained. On the contrary, they have been patient endurers of immeasurable 'abuse,' as will be presently made to appear; and, for a long period, they endured it in silence. This period lasted more than the *fifth part* of a century — from about the year 1799 or 1800, to 1822. This is susceptible of satisfactory proof. On the part of Gall and Spurzheim, this was an era of reasoning and demonstration, not of invective or 'abuse;' though they were the devoted objects of both. This also is history, open to all who choose to consult it. If phrenologists were ultimately roused to active and determined resistance, and, at times, even turned against their antagonists and persecutors their own weapons, the event only testified that they *were men*, subject, like others, to human passions. It evinced that they could be urged to some degree of retaliation; though they went into the measure slowly and reluctantly. And, in every conflict between the parties, the amount of 'abuse poured out' by the anti-phrenologists, was immeasurably the greatest. That all this is true, no one of veracity, acquainted with the phrenological contest, will deny. And, if it were denied, facts innumerable could be adduced in proof of it. But the friends of truth *will* not deny it, and when met and confronted, the enemies *dare* not. The writer proceeds:

'The truth is, that the whole charge of undiscerning hostility (against Phrenology) on the part of the scientific, is extremely ab-

surd; it has no foundation. Nothing has been more characteristic of this class of men, during the *last half century*, than *their catholic eagerness for the advancement of science*. The wildest opinions of professed discoverers meet with a *candid reception*.'

The precise source of the assertion here made, we pretend not to know, nor shall we pause to inquire. It must, however, be ignorance, or a spirit of falsity. Nothing else could prompt to it. The writer therefore may take his choice. Either cause is abundantly disgraceful to him, and sufficient to destroy his credibility with the public. It shall be our business to prove that his statement is untrue.

It is again matter of history, that only about the *third* of a century ago, a portion of the 'scientific' and learned of Vienna induced the Austrian government to prohibit Dr. Gall from lecturing on Phrenology. The consequence was, that he and Dr. Spurzheim, then his pupil, became voluntary exiles from their native land, sought the privilege of expounding their doctrines elsewhere, and have published none of their works in the German language — so deep and lasting was their sense of the intolerance of their country, and of the persecution they sustained. This act of tyranny did not manifest much 'catholic eagerness for the advancement of science,' nor a very 'candid reception' of new 'opinions' by 'scientific' men, in the capital of Germany. Nor is this all. Though Gall and his pupil, during their travels, were kindly received, and candidly listened to, by many of the 'scientific,' they were fiercely opposed, denounced, and persecuted, or treacherously dealt with, by not a few of them. But little honest encouragement was extended to them, and no effective aid given them, in the prosecution of their inquiries. Nor was it until long after their settlement in Paris, that this state of things terminated. — But much yet remains to be revealed; and authentic records and specifications shall be our oracles. They will be listened to and believed, by the candid and intelligent; and that is all we need, to maintain the truth, and refute our opponents.

It was in Great Britain that the war against Phrenology was most furious and unsparing. Not content with conquest, its aim

was extermination. It was excited chiefly, and greatly aggravated by Dr. Spurzheim's visit to that kingdom, and the lectures he delivered in various parts of it, in 1815. Dr. Gordon, of Edinburgh, was among the first and ablest of the champions that took the field against him. His bearing was fierce, we might say ferocious; his denunciations bitter, and his menaces boastful; but his achievements were feeble — rather, he achieved nothing but self-mortification. Unable to cope with his opponent in fact and argument, he assailed him with abuse, and made an exhibition of his 'catholic eagerness for the advancement of science,' by pronouncing the doctrines of Phrenology 'incredible and disgraceful nonsense, absurd theories, trash, and despicable trumpery!' Such was the 'candid reception' which the 'professed discoveries' of phrenologists met with from this man of science. His war-whoop was soon succeeded by peals of others equally savage. To exemplify some of them:

'We look on the whole doctrines taught by these two peripatetics, (Gall and Spurzheim,) anatomical, physiological, and physiognomical, as a piece of *thorough quackery*, from beginning to end,'—*Vid. Edin. Rev. No. 49.*

* * * * *

'There are a certain number of individuals however, in every community, who are destined to be the *dupes of empirics*. So it would be a matter of surprise, if these *itinerant philosophers* did not make some proselytes wherever they came.

'Well has the learned and most witty historian of John Bull's indisposition remarked, there is nothing so impossible in nature, but *mountebanks* will undertake; nothing so *incredible* but they will affirm.'—*Ibid.*

* * * * *

'Were they (Gall and Spurzheim,) to succeed in shaking off the suspicion of *malades*, which we apprehend is *inseparably attached to their character*, we should not hesitate,' &c. &c.—*Ibid.*

* * * * *

'We have two objects in view, in a formal *exposé* and *exposure* of the volume before us. The first is to contradict, directly, various statements in point of fact, made by Drs. Gall and Spurzheim, with *unparalleled boldness and effrontery*, which persons perfectly satisfied of the general absurdity of their opinions, may not have the same opportunities of refuting as ourselves; the second, and by *far the most important*, is to save the purses of our readers, if possible, before it

be too late, by satisfying their curiosity, which might otherwise lead them to purchase the books themselves, or attend the lectures of these cunning craniologists.'—*Ibid.*

The plain English of this avowal is, that the Edinburgh Review was resolved to forestall the public judgment, confirm prejudice and antipathy, and, if possible, prevent the doctrines of Phrenology from coming before the community, in their true shape, lest extensive proselytism might be the result. It preferred giving its own distorted version of them, (*it never did exhibit them correctly,*) to avert the effect it so much deprecated. In fine, the object of the Journal was, to acquire and maintain a full control over both the judgment and conscience of the people, and thus hold them stationary in their creed, whether right or wrong—a singular manifestation of that 'catholic eagerness for the advancement of science,' which we are told has existed for the 'last half century!'

* * * * *

'To enter on a particular refutation of them (the opinions of Gall and Spurzheim,) would be to *insult the understandings of our readers.* Indeed, we will flatter the authors so far as to say, that their observations are of a nature to set criticism at defiance. They are a collection of *mere absurdities, without truth, connexion, or consistency; an incoherent rhapsody, which nothing could have induced any man to have presented to the public, under a pretence of instructing them, but absolute insanity, gross ignorance, or the most matchless arrogance.*'—*Ibid.*

* * * * *

'Such is the *trash, the despicable trumpery,* which two men, (Gall and Spurzheim) calling themselves scientific inquirers, have the *impudence* gravely to present to the physiologists of the nineteenth century, as specimens of reasoning and induction.—*Ibid.*

The paper in the Edinburgh Review, from which the foregoing extracts are taken, closes with the following extraordinary paragraph :

'The writings of Drs. Gall and Spurzheim *have not added one fact to the stock of our anatomical knowledge,* respecting either the structure or functions of man ; but consist of such a mixture of *gross errors, extravagant absurdities, downright mistatements,* and unmeaning quotations from Scripture, as can leave no doubt, we apprehend,

in the minds of honest and intelligent men, as to the *real ignorance, the real hypocrisy, and the real empiricism of the authors.*'

The London Quarterly, though more measured in its abuse and denunciation of Phrenology and its authors, than the Edinburgh Review, rejects the science notwithstanding, as 'sheer nonsense,' and triumphantly proclaims Dr. Spurzheim 'a fool'!! No. xxv. p. 128. To Dr. Gall it had previously offered a similar greeting. And, in a subsequent review of Madame de Staël's 'L'Allmagne,' it lets off the following supplementary squib :

'The natural philosophers of Germany are too well known to need commendation; but Madame de Staël is by far too *indulgent to such ignorant and interested quacks as the craniologist Dr. Gall, and the magnetist Dr. Marnuduc, if she regards them in any other light than that of impostors.*'

Such is the character of one of the first men of the age, sketched by a conceited cockney, who had never perhaps been out of the atmosphere of London, and therefore saw everything discolored by smoke, and distorted by haze. Yet have his opinions been re-echoed, as oracular, by hundreds of thousands in the United States!

For the following delicate and tasteful character of Phrenologists, we are indebted to Blackwood's Magazine, and the London Literary Gazette :

'We have already said, that, in our opinion, *fool* and *Phrenologist* are terms as nearly synonymous, as can be found in any language.' — 'These *infernal idiots, the phrenologists*' — 'A tribe of crazy sciolists, denominating themselves craniologists' * * 'These *visionary abortions*' * * 'This crew'!!

How does our author relish this picture, drawn by the scientific?'

Nor was this abuse of Phrenology and its votaries confined to the journals to which we have referred. There was scarcely a periodical of distinction, in Great Britain, whether daily, weekly, monthly, or quarterly, literary or political, scientific or theological,

that did not unite in it. To exterminate Phrenology would seem to have become almost as much *an affair of the empire*, as it had recently been to triumph over Napoleon. Even the pulpits joined the chorus of execration, and issued their thunders in the terms 'infidel,' 'deist,' 'atheist,' 'abandoned of God,' 'candidate for 'hell,' and other like charitable appellations; all intended for the same purpose — to accumulate odium on the names of Gall and Spurzheim, and foreclose the public ear against their doctrines. *

* A more recent example of the 'candid reception of professed discoveries,' by the 'Scientific,' and their 'catholic eagerness for the advancement of science,' was exhibited on the death of Professor Uccelli, of Florence, March 1st, 1832. From a notice of the decease of that distinguished teacher, by M. Casimer Broussais, of Paris, we extract the following passage :

'That physician (Uccelli.) of extensive knowledge, of the highest skill in the anatomical sciences, filled with the love of truth, and with independence of character, had composed an important work in which he gave an exposition of the doctrine of Gall, and supported it by observations. A blind fanaticism saw in that profound and conscientious treatise, a blow directed against those superstitions which it was interested in maintaining; and it resolved to embitter his life. Condemnation of his works, deprivations — nothing was spared to afflict and humiliate him.' * * * * 'Even after death, the same power which had persecuted him during life continued to pursue him. The censorship prohibited the publication of biographical accounts of him, and suppressed, in a notice which was purely necrological, a passage which stated that the students had accompanied his body to the grave. The young men intended to perform a funeral service in their church; but they were prohibited from doing so, and even from asking permission.' — Yet our author has the hardihood to assert, that no obstacles have been thrown across the path of phrenologists! — 'Fie on't! O fie!' — What 'an unweeded garden' does his mind present, 'that grows to seed! things rank and gross in nature possess it merely.'

'One fact more, which we had nearly forgotten. When Dr. Spurzheim visited Edinburgh, we believe in 1815, he bore a letter of introduction to Dugald Stuart, with which he repaired to that gentleman's country residence to deliver. But, though the fact seems scarcely possible, it is notwithstanding true that the aged Professor refused to receive him, or to offer him even the courtesy of a chair! Why? Because he was a Phrenologist!

'The robber Arab opens his tent to the stranger, and the North American savage his wigwam, spread out their mats and buffalo robes for him, and supply him with food. Yet a mental philosopher, part of whose profession it had been, to expound and recommend benevolence, philanthropy, and all the mi-

Such was the rancorous and unsparing warfare, carried on against Phrenology, especially in Great Britain, from 1815 to 1827, when victory declared in favor of the science, by the overthrow of Jeffrey, its most formidable adversary. The persecution of Roger Bacon, Gallileo, Descartes, Harvey, and other great men, on account of their discoveries and improvements in science, in former ages, was scarcely more embittered. Nor would any but persons of consummate firmness, possessing an entire confidence in the truth of their doctrines, have breasted the storm, and persevered in their labors. Yet the correspondent of the North American contends, that the charge of 'hostility, on the part of the scientific world, against Phrenology 'has no foundation', but that 'during the last half century,' 'that class of men,' have cherished and manifested 'a catholic eagerness for the advancement of science !!'

Comment on the foregoing would be out of place. Language must fail, in an attempt to depict the wanton folly, or the mendacious hardihood, that could tempt an individual to expose himself so irretrievably. We shall only ask, who can credit, in aught he may say, a writer convicted of such open untruth? Must not disbelief so far cling to all his works as to destroy their influence? The public will answer these questions, each one for himself, and shape their creed and course accordingly.

But, disagreeable as the task is to ourselves, and no less so, we fear, to our readers, we are not yet done with exposing this gentleman's misstatements. In reference to the proposition, that the strength of a mental faculty is in proportion to the development of its organ, he says, —

'The phrenological writers themselves admit the statement not to be correct, when they declare, in the case of any particular organ, that the surrounding organs may be so much developed (we use the orthodox phrase) that this organ, though *absolutely projecting*, may in a mechanical sense (another orthodox term) be *depressed*.' pp. 61, 62.

nor charities of life, sternly shut his door against a younger brother in philosophy, because he had dared to differ from him in opinion! On such an act, silent indignation is the only suitable comment.

We ask the author what phrenological writers have made the declaration here imputed to them? and we assert, in self-reply, that, as here stated, no *intelligent* phrenologist ever made it, nor ever will, because it is self-contradictory, and involves an *impossibility*. An organ at the same time 'projecting' and 'mechanically depressed'! advancing outwardly, and retreating inwardly! As well may it be represented as, at once, round and triangular — hot and cold — *in* existence and *out* of it. True; an organ may project or reach a certain distance from its root, and still be relatively depressed; because its neighboring organs, being largely developed, may project beyond it. But that is not what phrenologists mean, by the projection of an organ. To project, in the true phrenological sense, the organ must be prominent, not sunken. But the whole matter is only

'A thing devised by the enemy'—

a petty fabrication, designed to prejudice Phrenology, by representing it as inconsistent with itself, and unworthy of belief. It is thus perpetually. Anti-phrenologists never assail the science, *as it is*, but as they misrepresent it. They construct a disjointed and feeble fabric, of their own devising, and then demolish it, and proclaim victory. We have never witnessed an attack on the genuine Phrenology of Gall and Spurzheim. The reason is plain. When viewed and examined, in its true character, it is perceived to be proof against assault. No enemy therefore ventures to molest it. We should rather say, that, when seen in its real symmetry, strength, and beauty, it *has* no enemy. All those who have been such, become its friends. We defy its opponents to adduce a single instance, in which it has been attacked, without having been, at the same time, falsely spoken of. Hence, no one who has studied it thoroughly, and fully comprehended it, has ever failed to become a proselyte to it. Nor can an example of apostasy from it be cited.

The chief reason why the public are opposed to Phrenology is, that they are made acquainted only with the Phrenology of the newspapers and other periodicals of the country, and of common

rumor, which, from the absurdities attached to it, is incredible and ridiculous. A chief device of the enemies of the science is, thus to distort it in all its features, and then proclaim it incongruous and unfounded. From this stratagem has arisen much of their temporary success, in retarding its progress. Let it be correctly expounded and comprehended, and it must soon become the creed in mental philosophy of the whole enlightened portion of the community.

One *unqualified falsehood* more, (though we could specify dozens of them) and adieu to that part of the discussion.

' We remember one learned gentleman, who, in the warmth of his zeal, declared that he was conscious that he studied metaphysics with one part of his head, and enjoyed poetry and light reading with the other.' p. 76.

This is as positive a departure from truth, as the history of fiction can furnish. Nor do we consider it accidental. Our charity is not so flexible and accommodating. We are compelled to believe it a premeditated fabrication, intended for mischief.

The 'learned gentleman' referred to, in the extract, is intimately known to us. So are his views and discussions on Phrenology. And we assert positively, on authority which cannot be held doubtful, that he never made the remark here ascribed to him. He has said, and is prepared to repeat, that, when engaged in intense intellectual labor, he is *conscious that his brain is in action*; and that the part immediately exercised, is *that which lies in front*.* Farther than this, he has never gone, in discussing the

*Thousands of others are prepared to say the same, were they not afraid of being 'laughed at' for the 'notion.' Moral timidity is an unfortunate infirmity. It takes from men much of their capability to be useful, especially as relates to any thing new. The *moral aspen* is in a perpetual tremor, lest his popularity should suffer, by any thing of novelty either in theory or practice. Hence, as a natural consequence, the progress of science and art is retarded. Many facts might be cited to prove the action of the brain, during intense thought, and also its augmentation in size, as the result of that action, when it is habitual. The following is a striking one:

subject. Should the correspondent of the North American be dissatisfied with these remarks, he is invited to name the 'learned gentleman' he has alluded to, and he will receive from himself a similar statement, accompanied probably by a sterner rebuke, than any contained in this paper, for the numerous violations of truth he has been guilty of. We say again, that there are many other palpable misrepresentations, in the paper before us, to some of which it may possibly be requisite for us to refer hereafter.

We may observe, that, apart from his direct and open falsifications, the author of the Article is *inaccurate* in many of his statements; we might almost have said, in all of them. A paper so replete with faults of this description, interwoven with a sort of shuffling sophistry, we have rarely, if ever, before perused. Passages in it to this effect are so numerous, and so much on a par with each other, as to render a selection from them difficult. We shall therefore notice a few of them promiscuously, regardless whether they are the most striking or not. The following is a fair sample of most of them:

'Education is of two kinds, physical and intellectual or moral. As to the importance of the former, and the evils of neglecting it, particularly in females, phrenologists seem to claim the investigation, if not *the discovery of it*, as *their peculiar merit*.' p. 73.

This is a mistake. Phrenologists make no such 'claim.' Nor do they consider any 'discovery' respecting the importance of bodily exercise to females, as 'peculiar' to their science. *General education* is a much more fashionable topic of discussion now, than it was in former years; and Phrenology has shed already,

The late Mr. Herschel did not commence the study of astronomy, as a profession, until about his fortieth year. Mr. Deville has two casts of his head; one, taken before he became an astronomer, and the other many years afterwards. In the latter the cerebral organs chiefly exercised in the study of his favorite science are considerably the largest. Nor will any thorough-bred physiologist be surprised at this, or deem it incredible. He will recognize in it the operation and its result of a settled law of living matter. The sciolist alone will affect wisdom, by curling his lip at it.

and continues to shed, much valuable light on it. If, therefore, in treating of its practical administration, the advocates of that science earnestly recommend, that females at boarding-schools, and other places of instruction, as well as in manufactories, should take more exercise in the open air, than is usually allowed them, they do this, not exclusively as phrenologists, but as men and philanthropists, who have bestowed on the subject more perhaps, than ordinary attention. They do believe, however, that their science aids them in the investigation of it; and, in this, the world will yet concur with them. They know, moreover, that corporeal exercise, judiciously taken, contributes to the health and vigor of the brain, and therefore to intellectual efficiency in all its forms. Hence, on this ground also, they urge its importance both to males and females. It is not a little mortifying as well as annoying to us, to be obliged to defend phrenologists against charges of so idle and improbable a cast. Yet were we not to defend them, our silence would, no doubt, be construed into evidence unfavorable to them.

From the language he has used, our author evidently considers 'intellectual and moral' education *identical*. This, though a matter of no great moment, is another inaccuracy. They are not identical, any more than *physical* and *moral* education. Hence they can be pursued *separately* — except so far as the moral and intellectual organs of the brain are connected by sympathy. With this exception, the moral faculties can be educated and strengthened, independently of the intellectual, and the intellectual in like independence of the moral. No one, versed in mental analysis and education, will deny this; yet none can so perfectly realize it, as the phrenologist. Again:

'Now, our own opinion is, that the evidence in favor of the fact, that the *human brain does not increase in size, after the age of seven, is stronger than we have seen adduced for any phrenological fact whatever.*' p. 73.

In justice to the amount of mind he possesses, be it great or small, we must here express our conviction, that, on this point,

our author has merely repeated the lesson taught him by others. He has never observed or experimented on the subject, else he could not have strayed so widely from the truth, especially as it may be so easily reached. The notion, he states, has been reiterated by anti-phrenologists an hundred times, and as often refuted. To redeem him from his mistake, if it be an honest one, we offer him the following simple but effectual experiment; premising, that the size of the brain is ascertained by that of the head.

To be convinced then of his *inaccuracy*, in the present instance, the writer has only to provide himself with a piece of tape or riband, select promiscuously fifty boys 'of seven,' and an equal number of full-grown men, in the same way, measure their heads, and note the result. Unless he be proof against the evidence of sense, this will satisfy him. He will find the *adult heads much the largest*. Nor is there, in Boston, a hatter's boy of the age 'of seven,' who cannot profitably instruct the writer for the North American, on this point — notwithstanding the *measurements he says* he has taken with Mr. Combe's craniometer. The boy will assure him, on the ground of daily observation and experience, that his own head is not as large as that of his master, or of other gentlemen to whom he sells hats. If asked for the reason of his belief, he will reply, that the crowns of hats which fit full-grown men, are 'too big' for him — and that he is certain of this, because he has 'tried them on.'

Further; should the writer ever make a voyage to London or Paris, he may there receive additional information to the same effect. Let him, in those places, visit the great hat-factories, many of which have been carried on in the same buildings for centuries. He will there learn, that, without even an acquaintance with the term Phrenology, the manufacturers, or their employers, have *four* general and distinct* measures for the crowns of hats. Of

* We are not confident that there are *four* sizes of hat-crowns, kept in the large London and Paris factories. But we are certain that there are *three*; and that crowns for boys and servants are the smallest.

these, the smallest is for boys, under twelve years of age ; the next for servants and ordinary day-laborers ; a larger size for farmers and common mechanics ; and the largest of all, for the more *cultivated and intellectual classes*, such as professional men generally, authors, mechanics and artists of high standing, legislators, and ministers of state. And he will further learn, that such has been the arrangement, in those factories, almost time out of mind. On this, we make no comment. Every intelligent reader can draw from it the proper inference. We merely state the fact, and vouch for its truth. Once more.

Mere hatter's measure does not determine the *entire* magnitude of the brain. It only gives its extent in one direction — *horizontally*. It does nothing toward ascertaining the depth of it *perpendicularly* — we mean from its base to its arch or top. One man may require a larger hat than another, and yet have a smaller brain, on account of the greater depression of the top of his head. The Carib furnishes a striking exemplification of this. The same is true, to a certain extent, in boys, the upper portion of whose brain is not yet developed. That development does not take place, until the period of puberty, when the reflecting and the moral organs attain their growth, and the youth becomes a being of *morality* and *reason* in a much higher degree than he was before. Even after the brain has ceased to enlarge horizontally, then, it continues to grow in the other direction. Though the boy, when thirteen, therefore, should require as large a hat as he does when he is a man of twenty-five, it does not follow, that his whole head and brain must be as large — nor are they.

There is still another reason, why the boy, before puberty, and even for several years afterwards, is not so mature and vigorous, in his moral and reflecting faculties, as he becomes at a later period. The organs of those faculties, though of full size, are not yet complete in their structure and tone — they are not themselves perfectly *organized*. Their *fibrosity* is not yet perceptible — or in but a very slight degree. They are pulpy and immature. Nor do they become fully ripe, until the prime of manhood, when, like

the muscles, and other parts of the system, they have attained all the perfection, of which they are susceptible. Then, and not before, does the mind operate in full vigor; precisely as muscular power is then at its height. In the case of each, the cause is the same. Both the muscles and the brain had been previously immature, and comparatively inefficient. This is common sense; the fruit of observation, and intelligible to every one. Our author's objection to it, is the offspring of ignorance, or prejudice, or both; and such will be hereafter the decision of the world.

In speaking of modes of education, the writer remarks:

'The insinuated notion (by phrenologists) is, that we have some mode of directly treating the organs (of the brain) other than the usual mode of operating on the mind through the medium of the senses.' p. 73.

What phrenologist has made this insinuation either directly or indirectly, plainly or by construction? None, certainly, of whom we have any knowledge. Can the insinuation be found in any phrenological work? The writer will not answer affirmatively. Or if so, he can name the work. But he will decline that, for the best of reasons — he cannot. What then is the necessary inference from the facts which thus present themselves? It is so plain that even childhood might draw it. The whole matter is but a sham — a mere fiction, by the author, as weak as it is malicious. It is of a piece with his other stratagems, in which he attempts to defeat, by misrepresentation, what he cannot injure by truth.

After stoutly denying, as a point of vital moment, what no enlightened phrenologist maintains, that the strength of a mental faculty is to be estimated *exclusively* by the *size* of its organ, our author embarks in a captious, but loose and mystified discussion, of which, though we comprehend but little of it, we feel it our duty to take some notice. From the obscurity and unmeaningness which mark it — obscure and unmeaning at least to us — we are convinced that the writer did not understand himself; for he who thinks clearly and to the point, will always speak and write so. To give him, however, a fair chance to make himself under-

stood, and that we may not stand chargeable with misrepresenting him, we shall give his *notions or reveries*, (the reader may take his choice of terms, after perusing the extract) in his own words :

' Let us, however, follow out the matter patiently. Let us admit, for the present, that there are no such difficulties in the way, as the difference between the outer and inner surfaces of the skull, a fact of which any one may satisfy himself by passing a piece of the bone between his thumb and finger. Let us leave these out of the case, and in the very teeth of our senses of sight and touch, let us suppose that skulls are, as to their outer and inner surfaces, equal and parallel. Let us enter with a humble teachableness the schools of Phrenology. We are first pointed to a head, in which a particular organ is large. Large and small being relative terms, we naturally set about examining different heads, to settle an average or standard. This method of proceeding, however, is cut short by the remark, that the size of organs is not to be estimated by the organs of other heads, but by those of the same head. The destructiveness is large, in comparison to the benevolence, which is small. This attempt to escape from the difficulties of an average standard, we take to be utterly futile. There is no escape at all. Organs, of course, compared with each other, are necessarily large, or small. Thus if we judge from the plaster busts, the organ of destructiveness in any man's head is always larger than the organ of music. The question, in any particular case, is not whether the organ of destructiveness is absolutely large, compared to the organ of benevolence, but how the excess of the former over the normal standard compares with the excess or deficiency of the latter in regard to the same standard. There is no such thing as getting along without such a standard, or understanding a relation in one of its terms. The only philosophical mode of trying these experiments, is by means of the craniometer of M. Combe. Measure the diameter of the organs fairly, — express them in numbers and enter them in tables. We had some little experience in this way, some years since, and we wish nothing worse to Phrenology, than that its converts should follow this practice over a few of the *crania* of their acquaintance. It will never abide inches and decimals; that they may lay their account with. The objections of its shrewder advocates to practices of this sort is evidence enough to us, if any were wanting, of the inferences they are likely to lead to.' pp. 69, 70.

The first part of this strange piece of trumpery is intended, we suppose, as a denial, that the size and figure of the brain can be ascertained by the size and figure of the head. It alleges that

the external and internal tables of the skull, are not, in all places, equidistant, and do not therefore correspond with each other, in their projections and indentations. This objection, like all the others presented by the author, has nothing new in it. It is one of the first that occurred to anti-phrenologists, and has been hundreds of times stated by them, in writing, debate, and colloquial disputations, and replied to as often. The reply, moreover, is simple and satisfactory. The whole matter can be easily brought to the test of experiment, the ablest arbiter in the settlement of controversies. We invite our author to the following trial of it.

Let him take twenty, or even an hundred skulls, of different figures and dimensions, and make in the cavity of each a wax or plaster cast, by filling it with either of those materials, in a proper state of preparation. That these casts will be precisely similar, in *size and figure*, to the brains which the skulls respectively contained, will not be denied. Nor will they be less similar in *those points*, to the skulls in which they were made. In evidence of this, a practised eye, or even one not much experienced in such examinations, can immediately indicate the skull, which served as the mould of each cast.* On this experiment, which we think a fair one, we are willing to hazard the issue of the whole controversy. Or, if it be considered unfair, by the writer, let him say, in what respect, and we will propose another mode of decision. It is our wish that the question be settled. We shall only add, that it is not long since we silenced the cavils of a noted anti-phrenologist, by this experiment — we mean his cavils on the point we are considering. On other points, which appeared to us equally untenable by him, he ‘held fast his integrity,’ and seemed resolved, like the devotee, to ‘persevere unto the end,’ ‘through good report, and through bad;’ and not give up his creed, until he should ‘give up the ghost.’ Nor do we consider

* This is particularly the case in relation to all striking skulls — all that are remarkable, we mean, for either size or form. The casts made in them can be recognized as far as they can be distinctly seen.

his relapse into his primitive heresy, respecting the identity of figure of the skull and the brain, an improbable event. So true is it, that

‘ He that’s convinced against his will,
Is of the same opinion still.’

As to the writer’s inquiry after an ‘ average standard ’ of heads by which to test the characters of individuals, as far as we are able to penetrate its drift, if indeed it has any, it is an absurdity ; and the very proposition involving it shows clearly, that the gentleman knows nothing of the matter.* Each man must be judged of, by his own head, not by that of his neighbor ; by the average of the organs of his own brain, not by that of the brains of the whole human race. Admit the establishment of an ‘ average standard ’ of muscular size, for all mankind — a thing, by the way, which could not be attained — but admit it, we say, for argument’s sake. What

* We have again thrown our eye over what our author has said about this same magic ‘ average,’ and from the earnestness he has shown, and the seemingly profound meaning, with which he has spoken, we are almost tempted to imagine that there is in the matter some marvellous ABRACADABRA, not penetrable to ordinary vision. May we ask the gentleman then for a full revelation of it, the next time he opens his oracular shrine, to give to the winds, or to give wind to, his loose and tattered Sybillian leaves ? In a special manner, will he disclose to us something of the *cui bono* — the real usefulness of this ‘ average ? ’ Will he farther inform us, whether we have not just as accurate an ‘ average ’ of the human brain, as we have of the human person ? and whether we have not, in our mind, as precise an idea, when we say, ‘ that man has a big head,’ as we have when we say, ‘ that is a big man ? ’ In neither case is the ideal ‘ average,’ by which ‘ size ’ is estimated, the result of mechanical measurement. It is the product of observation, and is sufficiently correct for all practical purposes. In our intercourse with the world, we learn that there is a common personal size, which men usually attain, and which comparatively few exceed, or fall short of. This we assume as a standard ; and call those who surpass it *large*, and those who fall below it *small*. Of the head, as a part of the individual, the same is true. And we make as few mistakes in the one case, as in the other. Has the writer any ‘ average size ’ for the human nose ? We suspect not. Yet he, no doubt, speaks, like other people, of large noses, and small ones, and has a meaning in what he says.

useful result, either in theory or practice, would it produce? None certainly, that we can perceive. Could the bodily strength of every individual be ascertained by it? Would every one *below* the standard be necessarily weaker than every *one at* it, or even every one *above* it? No; he would not. Some persons falling short of it, would frequently surpass in strength many of those considerably beyond it. On what ground? The well-known fact, that *tone* often serves as a counterbalance of size; that a superabundance of *intensity* makes amends for a deficiency of *extensity*. As respects the muscular system, no one doubts this. It is a matter of every-day observation and experience. Nor is it less true, in relation to the brain. It only requires more practice and nicer discernment to perceive it. Yet it *can* be perceived by those who will make it a subject of observation aided by reason. In every estimate we attempt to make of either muscular or cerebral strength, we must keep tone and temperament in view, else we shall be deceived.

After all, perhaps phrenologists have made some slight approach toward the establishment of an average cerebral standard; but not for all mankind; nor because they expect to throw any light by it on individual character. As already stated, every one's character rests on his own developments; and it will be found that something like this is also true of the different varieties of mankind, and even of the inhabitants of different nations, though they belong to the same variety. The average standard of the Caucasian must differ materially from that of the Mongolian, and still more from the standards of the African and the North American Indian. The average size of the brain of the Asiatic and the European Caucasian, is not the same, that of the latter being the largest; nor is the standard of the French and the British the same. Even the standard of the English and the Scotch, differs somewhat; and the standard in the United States will differ from all others. But we repeat, that we do not fully comprehend our author, on the subject of his 'average standard;' because he has expressed himself so indefinitely and obscurely. Should we have

mistaken his meaning, therefore, we hope he will be candid *for once*, and charge a portion of the error to his *own account*. And farther; if he will resume the subject, and speak of it more clearly, and more to the point; and, at the same time, so treat it, as to convince us that it has any practical and useful bearing, either on Phrenology or anything else, we may again notice his notions respecting it: not otherwise.

The writer dwells with some earnestness, and apparent satisfaction, on the measurement of the brain, by Mr. Combe's craniometer — pronounces the result unfriendly to Phrenology, and asserts that he has himself 'had *some little experience* in this way, some years since.'

'Some little experience!' We apprehend it was *very little* indeed — a negative quantity, amounting, we verily believe, to less than *unity*. In plain English, the thing is a fiction intended for effect, and never existed, as we feel convinced, except in fancy.

'The air hath baubles, as the water has,
And these are some of them.'

There are dreams of the day, as well as dreams of the night, and they are sometimes equally delusive.

When and where was this 'experience' with the chronometer had? who aided in it? or witnessed it? whose heads were measured? what was the precise result? where is the record of it? and why was the matter, bruited now, never spoken of before? These are grave questions, and, as things stand, call for an answer. And unless the replies to them be backed by evidence not liable to doubt, the whole affair will be deemed a fabrication. The deceptive cry of 'wolf! wolf!' has been heard so repeatedly, from the same quarter, that it will be no longer credited, on other testimony, than the sight of the prowler approaching the fold.

We venture to say that the writer does not possess a craniometer, and never did. Nor can he use one accurately, if he had it. And if he could thus use it, he would not, in his present mood, do so, but would act unfairly, to discredit the science. We have

known tricks of this sort practised ; and we would suspect our author of such a fraud, as readily as any body else. It is painful to us to question, thus openly, the gentleman's word and honesty of purpose. But he has given us cause of suspicion, and the effect follows of course. If we do him injustice, he has his remedy, and can apply it. Let him establish his craniometrical experiments, and he will have put us in the wrong, so far as that matter is concerned. His misrepresentations on many other points, are past redemption.

But there is another mode, besides a reference to 'inches and decimals,' to show that the characters of individuals depend on their cerebral developments ; and it is much the better mode of the two. It is purely practical, and consists in a reference to recorded and current phrenological events — to what phrenologists have repeatedly done, and are daily doing, in presence of hundreds of competent witnesses. It is the *fact*, that they have often expounded, and are still expounding character by development, with a degree of accuracy, which astonishes beholders ; and which, a century and a half ago, would have brought down on them, the charge of a criminal intercourse with evil spirits. Had Deville, of London, lived in that metropolis in the seventeenth century, and done what he is now doing, he would have been drowned in the Thames, or burnt in Smithfield. No stranger repairs to him, to have his head examined, without becoming a proselyte to Phrenology ; so accurately does he unfold to him his character.* Mr. Combe is but little, if at all inferior in the art, to the London Phrenologist ; and what Gall and Spurzheim have done, in the same line, is matter of history, as well as of remembrance by

* For a very striking and well-described instance of this, the reader is referred to the travels of a German Prince, in England, Scotland, and Ireland, in 1830—1, Letter XVI. p. 185. Another example of skill in practical Phrenology, scarcely less remarkable, may be seen in No. XXXVI, p. 206, of the Edinburgh Phrenological Journal. The Phrenologists, in this case, were Messrs. Cox and Simpson.

† On the occasion of his visit to the Monitorial School in Boston, an account of which may be found in Mr. Capen's Biography, Dr. Spurzheim exhibited his

many persons still living.† Most of these performances have been so often described, are already known to so many, and correct accounts of them are so easily accessible to all who desire to know them, that we deem it unnecessary to give any details of them. They are recorded in the *Edinburgh Phrenological Journal*, a work rich in matter, of great interest and value, and which cannot be too eagerly sought for and read, by every one who wishes to become versed in the science of which it treats.

Does our author affect to disbelieve that the phrenologists referred to, have deciphered character, by inspecting the head? If so, what is the ground of his disbelief? Is it because he cannot do the same thing himself, nor has ever seen it done by others? Does he then make his own competencies, or those of his acquaintance a measure for the competencies of the human race? His conceit, overweening as it is, will not, we think, so deeply delude him. Or, does he deem his knowledge so unbounded, as to embrace the utmost extent of human capacity and achievement?—that he can say of the deeds of man, ‘thus far may they go, but no farther?’ That would be to assume to himself capabilities and resources far beyond those he denies to phrenologists. Original fitness for any pursuit, united to well-directed and long-continued practice in it, has often resulted in such skill and dexterity, as have produced astonishment. An Italian artist, now living, has learnt to enchant Europe, and excite its wonder, by the music of his violin, with but a single string. So may persons, having an aptitude for Phrenology, attain such skill and accuracy in the application of it to the deciphering of character, as to astonish those who witness their performance. And, as heretofore stated, already has the deed been repeatedly done. Hereafter it will become so common, as to astonish no one.

Will it be stated, in the form of an objection, that much is said of what phrenologists have done, in foreign countries, in the expo-

skill in practical Phrenology to great advantage; and no less to the surprise than to the pleasure of the teacher and his pupils. This event must have been known to the writer of the article, and therefore clearly shows with what deliberation and ‘malice aforethought’ he can falsify and slander.

sition of character, but that no marvellous exploits of the kind have been performed by them in the United States? — that we have no one among ourselves, to convince us of the truth of the science, by its practical application? that, in fact, all is *talk* without either positive proof or profit? This, in part, is true; and the reason is plain. We want practice in the United States. Spurzheim, who made a deep impression in Boston, as well by his prompt and accurate interpretation of character, as by his lectures, is dead; and we have yet no native phrenologist, sufficiently versed in practice, to fill his place. The period, however, is approaching, when the case will be different. Practical phrenologists will spring up in our country, to rival those of Europe; and opposition to the science will be extinguished by their performances.

In the United States, the arts in general are in an incipient condition. But a career of prosperity and glory is opening to them. But a few years back, and we had no native performer of eminence, on the American stage. We now have several. Our painters and engravers, as well as our writers, are advancing rapidly in number and excellence. As respects manufactures, whether of useful or ornamental articles, the same is true. Of late, but few native Americans were engaged in these lines of industry, and *they* wanted skill. Now there are many who have attained eminence in them.

As relates to practical Phrenology, time and industry will do the same. Eminent professors of it will be numerous in our country. The issue of this state of things is too obvious, to require a spirit of prophesy to foretell it. All experience points it out. Those who are now neutral and silent, in relation to the science, will then show zeal and speak loudly in its behalf; and even pseudo-wits, and practised cavillers at it, ceasing to be troublesome, will unite with its friends, and become its defenders. A somerset of this sort in the person of our author himself, would not surprise us.

With a degree of physiological ignorance, which we had not looked for *even in him*, our author denies the power of *action*,

not only to the brain and nerves, but to every organ of the body, except the muscles. For what reason? — O! for no *reason* certainly; but an *entire want* of it — simply *because* other organs do not *visibly* act; as if mere *sensible contraction* were the only form of vital action, on which all the phenomena of the animal and vegetable economy depend. But, that he may not be misinterpreted by us, the writer shall tell his story himself.

‘Hence the notion of regarding the efficiency of organs as proportioned to their size: — a circumstance true of the muscles, but not at all of the glands, to which in general appearance the brain bears a much greater resemblance. Again, the notion of kinds of action is evidently derived entirely from this source. But in the muscles this is matter of observation. We see that certain short and thick muscles, as those of the back, maintain contraction for a very long period, while other long and rapidly moving muscles, as those of the arm, are greatly fatigued by being contracted firmly for a long period, sometimes even for a few minutes. Why may not the same be the case with the fibres of the brain? Why not, indeed, except for the old proverbial reason, ‘*de non apparentibus*,’ etc.? Nobody ever witnessed any thing of the kind in the case of the brain, any more than in that of the hair and nails, which have something of a fibrous appearance. The whole brain palpitates or starts, with the alternate action of the heart and arteries, just as the foot does, when one leg is rested over the knee of the other, and from the same cause. But no other motion was ever seen, so far as we remember, to take place in any mass of living nervous matter whatever, and the notion of the action of organs in any sense, that can be applied to the material structure, is pure hypothesis.’

This is, perhaps, the grossest blunder the gentleman has committed — if indeed any discrimination can be made between blunders, where all are so gross. No action in living matter! Do we comprehend our author? We have examined his expressions critically, and think we do. What then is the source of all the secreted fluids of the body; and what the cause of absorption, the conversion of food into chyle, and of chyle into blood? The writer will not contend that these changes in matter result from *sensible muscular contraction*. Are they then to be referred to *inaction*? In other words, are they *causeless*? Between *action* and *inaction* there is no intermediate state. From one or the other of

them, therefore, the phenomena just specified must arise. But, to contend that they come from *inaction*, would be absurd. It would be to assert the production of *something* out of *nothing*. From *action* then they must proceed. No matter whether the *action itself* be visible or not. Its *effects are*; and that is sufficient to satisfy reason and common sense, on the topic we are considering. To the positive inference, that action exists, wherever a change in matter occurs, nothing but a spirit of cavil, or a false pretension to profound knowledge will take exception. We have it in our power, however, to proceed from *inference* to *fact*, and furnish the writer with evidence palpable to sight, that the brain does act, during the process of thought. The following is, in brief, the substance of a case, reported by Dr. Pierquin, as having fallen under his notice in one of the hospitals of Montpellier, in the year 1821.

The subject of it was a female, at the age of twenty-six, who had lost a large portion of her scalp, skull-bone, and dura mater, in a neglected attack of Lues Venerea. A corresponding portion of her brain was consequently bare, and subject to inspection. When she was in a *dreamless sleep*, her brain was *motionless*, and *lay within* the cranium. When her sleep was *imperfect*, and she was agitated by dreams, her brain *moved*, and *protruded without* the cranium, forming *cerebral hernia*. In *vivid* dreams, reported as such by herself, the protrusion was considerable; and when she was perfectly awake, especially if engaged in active thought, or sprightly conversation, it was still greater. Nor did the protrusion occur in jerks, alternating with recessions, as if caused by the impulses of the arterial blood. It remained steady, while conversation lasted. This case furnishes, we think, something very much like proof, not only that the brain *moves* and *acts* — though forbidden to do so by our author — but also that it is really the organ of thought — the disapprobation of all orthodox anti-phrenologists to the contrary, notwithstanding. In fact, it would not be more preposterous to deny the action of the heart, as the instrument of circulation, than that of the brain, as the or-

gan of the mind. From this truth no enlightened physiologist will withhold his assent. To assert that a single portion of living organized matter, whatever may be its structure, is doomed to a state of perpetual inaction, while in a healthy condition, is the product of ignorance, disgraceful to any one, who professes to have studied medicine, in the nineteenth century. Action, adapted to its organization, is essential, not merely to the well-being, but to the vital existence of every part of our bodies. Nothing but a want of physiological knowledge, which must forever degrade him, in the eyes of the profession, could have betrayed the writer into the assertion, that 'nobody ever witnessed any thing of the kind (*action*) in the case of the brain, any more than in that of the hairs and nails, which have something of a fibrous appearance!' (p. 68.) The drift of this extraordinary sentence, is not merely to aver, that the action of the brain *is not seen*, but that *it does not exist* — that, in reality, that organ, so essential to all the functions of human life, is as *actionless* (to coin a word for the occasion) as the 'hair or the nails.' In the present case, had the entire brain been visible, we doubt not that certain portions of it would have been perceived to act more vigorously than others, according to the subject of thought and conversation. The organ of Form would have shown itself most active when the individual talked of form; of Color, when she talked of color; of Locality, when she talked of place; and of Tune, when her attention was turned to music. This we offer as an opinion, not as a fact.

Another absurdity, scarcely less glaring, contended for by our author, in the foregoing extract, is that the 'efficiency,' that is, the secretory power 'of glands is not proportioned to their size.' The kidney of an adult then secretes no more urine, than the kidney of a child, and the liver of an ox no more bile, than that of a calf! As we design to make it appear hereafter, that, other things being equal, the power of an organ always corresponds with its size, we shall do no more, at present, than express our surprise, that the contrary belief ever found an advocate among

sensible men. As well might it be asserted, that the *whole* is in no respect superior to a *part*.

Finding himself unable to meet the doctrines of Phrenology, resist their force, and check their progress, by fair argument, our author resolved to have recourse to a stratagem of a dishonorable and ignominious cast — such as is usually resorted to, by scheming politicians and hireling demagogues. This was an endeavor to rouse the honest prejudices, and inflame the passions of the community against those doctrines, by falsely representing them, as dangerous in their tendency to morality and religion. In his resolution to reach his object, he was unsparing of everything that stood in his way. Hence his insidious and unmanly attack on the reputation of a late distinguished philosopher, who was one of the most unoffending and amiable of men, and whose mild but powerful voice and pen, reposing in the grave, could no longer answer him. We allude to Dr. Spurzheim, whose greatest weakness, and deepest fault, if any infirmities of the kind attached to him, were strength and virtue, contrasted with the highest excellencies the correspondent of the North American possesses.

Although compelled to acknowledge, that it is the *abuse* of Phrenology that may become demoralizing, (and has not the *abuse* of Christianity done the same?) the writer, notwithstanding, endeavors to maintain, that the science must prove highly prejudicial to society. Yet he declines to tell us why? or in what way? *his own word* being the only evidence adduced to sustain his notion, — and we know not where to find worse authority. His attack on the opinions and character of Dr. Spurzheim, is made through the ‘Philosophical Catechism’ of that *savant*, in the following words: —

The philosophy of the Philosophical Catechism differs little from that of Voltaire, Diderot, D’Holbach, and others of the skeptical school of the last century. There is something more indeed of respect for the present state of public opinion. The necessary inferences are not always so clearly shadowed out; but the general drift appears to us substantially the same.

The following questions and answers in the Philosophical Catechism may possibly startle some, who are looking forward, with sanguine expectation, to the general prevalence of Phrenology and its avowed consequences.

“ ‘ *Ques.* What is the touchstone by which the excellence of a law, styled revealed, or any interpretation of it, may be tried ?

Ans. Laws styled revealed, and interpretations of them are perfect in proportion as they harmonize with the laws of the Creator, or possess the characteristics of a natural law.’ ”

This is not quite so broad, but it has much the same apparent drift, to our notions, with the following passages in Paine's *Age of Reason*.

“ ‘ There may be many systems of religion, but there can be but one that is true; and that one must, as it ever will, be consistent with the ever existing word of God, *that we behold in his works*. But such is the strange construction of the Christian faith.’ ”
&c. &c.

‘ Does not the creation, the universe we behold, preach to us the existence of an Almighty power that governs and regulates the whole; and is not the evidence that this creation holds out to our senses infinitely stronger than anything we can read in a book, that any impostor might make, and call it the word of God ? ’ ”

Again.

“ ‘ *Ques.* Is this source (revelation) fertile in results ?

Ans. Yes, by far the greater number of religious systems have been received as revelations: the divinities of the ancients, and the Deity, by whatever title designated, of the moderns, are reputed to have manifested their will, whether directly or indirectly, to man. Judges in Israel, Druids among the Celts, Incas among the Peruvians,—in a word, a priesthood have always been the interpreters of the celestial decrees.’ ”

After a few further quotations of a somewhat similar tenor, and intended to produce a similar effect, our author dismisses the subject, with these remarks:—

‘ It seems to us sufficiently clear, from these extracts, that however the conclusion may be evaded by the convenient phrase, ‘ Pure Christianity,’—the doctrines of that work are entirely incompatible with any kind of Christianity that we have any notion of; and it is equally clear that these doctrines are legitimate deductions from the phrenological premises, as far as we can understand them. Considering, therefore, that there is no evidence of the truth of Phrenol-

ogy, and a good deal in favor of Christianity, we incline to prefer the latter. Christian philosophers have united to condemn in the strongest terms systems of the character of that developed in the Philosophical Catechism, as the products of the skeptical Philosophy, which, less than half a century since, arrayed a ferocious mob in undistinguishing hostility to the altar and Deity.

Our main business with this portion of the article, we are considering, may be despatched in a few words. *It has no direct bearing on Phrenology, either for it, or against it.* It is not true, as asserted by the writer, that the doctrines contained in the 'Philosophic Catechism' are 'legitimate deductions from the phrenological principles.' Their strongest, if not their *only* connexion with Phrenology is, that they were written by a Phrenologist. But are they therefore necessarily of a phrenological character? Certainly not. The divine does not always write or talk on divinity, the politician on politics, nor the lawyer on jurisprudence. Nor is the phrenologist constantly dealing out Phrenology. This is peculiarly true in the present instance. The errors of a phrenologist moreover are not necessarily the errors of Phrenology. They may arise from imperfections in the *man*, not in the science. Were the Christian religion made answerable for all the doctrinal errors of the clergy and their followers, its whole strength and purity would be scarcely sufficient to sustain a responsibility so enormous.

The Philosophical Catechism, as its title imports, sets forth the sentiments of Dr. Spurzheim, as a philosopher, not *especially* as a phrenologist. Most of what that little book contains may be false, and still Phrenology be true; or it may be true, and Phrenology false. They have, I say, no necessary dependence on each other. Of this our author must be himself sensible, else he is more ignorant and undiscerning than we have thought him. If they are naturally connected, as premiss and deduction, will he do us the favor, and himself the justice, to show wherein the connexion consists? It concerns whatever reputation he possesses, to do so, otherwise he will lie under the charge of having asserted here, as in many other cases, what he cannot prove.

To save the gentleman unnecessary trouble, we shall ourselves construct a fair syllogism out of the material she has furnished, and leave to the reader to judge of the legitimacy of dependence of the conclusion on the premises. The two following propositions, to use the author's own language, 'cover the whole phrenological ground,' and are therefore clearly his premises in the case before us.

'*First.* The human brain consists of a number of separate portions, of which the general figure may be considered as that of a cone, the apex of which is situated somewhere about the *medulla oblongata*, and the basis at the surface of the brain. We do not understand, that they are supposed to be literal and right-lined cones, but only conical in their character, — commencing in a small bundle of nervous fibres, and, though the course of these may be more or less devious, ending finally in an expansion on the surface, which gives rise to another set of expanded fibres, that again converge to the original point or apex of the cone.

'*Secondly.* That the liability of any individual of the human race to be the subject of those affections, which are commonly considered and treated of as mental, or of certain modes and varieties of them, is in direct proportion to the relative development of these portions of the brain. p. 62.

Such we say, are the writer's premises, expressed in his own words; and though they are obscure, defective, and slovenly, we receive them as they are. The following passages which he has himself extracted from the Catechism, to sustain his charges, are *some* of his *numerous* deductions (for there is a book full of them) which he pronounces 'legitimate.'

'Laws styled revealed, and interpretations of them are perfect in proportion as they harmonize with the laws of the Creator, or possess the characteristics of a natural law.

'By far the greater number of religious systems have been received as revelations; the divinities of the ancients, and the Deity, by whatever title designated, of the moderns, are reputed to have manifested their will, whether directly or indirectly, to man. Judges in Israel, Druids among the Celts, Incas among the Peruvians — in a word, a priesthood have always been the interpreters of the celestial decrees.

'Natural morality recognizes no one species of exclusive love, as a supreme law; love of native land is admitted, but still as subordi-

nate to universal love. Partiality is an attribute of the animal nature, general love of proper humanity alone.'—*Cum multis aliis similibus.*'

Such, we say, according to his own showing, are the premises and the 'legitimate deductions' of our author. The syllogism is *virtually his own*. The reader is now prepared to pronounce on it, without any aid from us.* We take the liberty, however, of adding that were some one, assuming the entire specimen of the author's logic, as *his* premises to infer, that the writer of such trumpery is an ignoramus in all that pertains to reason, *his* 'deduction would be much more 'legitimate,' and 'germaine to the matter,' than either of the preceding ones.

On the point we are discussing the writer's own evidence may be turned against him. He asserts that the doctrines of the Philosophical Catechism are substantially the same with those maintained by Voltaire, Diderot, D'Holbach, and Thomas Paine, *who were no Phrenologists*. How comes it then, that they 'are legitimate deductions from Phrenology,' when they were entertained *before the discovery of that science*, by philosophers, who of course were ignorant of its name? Strange deduction, that precedes its premiss! And still *more* strange, the infatuation, that can lead a

* That a clear view may be had of our author's absurdity, let his two propositions, which cover, as he says, 'the whole phrenological ground,' be read over first, as premises, and then the word *therefore* or *hence* being pronounced or understood, let all his quotations from the Philosophical Catechism be recited, as 'legitimate deductions,' — let this, we say, be done (and the proceeding will be perfectly fair) and the gentleman's incongruity must appear as striking as folly can make it.

Just as well might he say, and pronounce the 'deduction legitimate,' — 'the rein-deer loves the Frigid, and the jackall the Torrid zone; therefore the ass brays and the nightingale sings' — or 'the poppy flourishes in Turkey, and the orange in St. Augustine; therefore codfish abound on the Banks of Newfoundland, and herring on the coast of Labrador — or any other incoherence, a crazed imagination can wander into. Such is the logic of the *anti-phrenological champion* of the United States. We commend him to his followers, as a suitable leader.

man of the least discernment into such a striking incongruity ! The writer charges Phrenology with the heresies of the philosophers of France, and refutes his charge, in the same breath, by showing that those heresies preceded Phrenology. They cannot therefore be its offspring. Nor would any logic less loose and fatuous than that of the writer, pronounce them so. With equal consistency might he impute the atrocities of Robespierre, to the machinations of the French revolutionists of the present day. We shall dismiss this point, by repeating that it is matter of no direct concern to Phrenology and Phrenologists, more than to other forms of science and their cultivators, whether the doctrines of the Catechism are true or false, innocent or dangerous. They are free from all participation in them — as completely so, as astronomy and astronomers are, mathematics and mathematicians, or political economy and those who study it. With as much truth and fairness therefore may they be charged as heresies against the latter sciences, as against the former.

Thus far of the catechismal doctrines, and their connexion with Phrenology. Let it not be inferred however from any thing here stated, that we are hostile to those doctrines. It is not our intention to sit in judgment on them, as respects either their truth or tendency. Like all other forms of opinion, they must stand or fall, not on the ground of any evidence we could offer, but on that contained within themselves. Yet we may be permitted to observe, that whatever fate may await them, they will not meet it alone ; but that however widely they may have departed from the path of reputed orthodoxy, they have strayed in *good company*. As far as we comprehend them, they are not more in accordance with the sentiments of Voltaire and his associates, than with those of Bishop Butler, Dr. Dodridge, Dr. Barrow, and many others, we could name, acknowledged to have been among the most pious and distinguished teachers in the Christian church. Let the matter be fairly tested.

A leading object of the author of the *Philosophical Catechism* is, to inculcate the tenet, that the verity of all laws written *by man*,

is to be determined by reason, and a strict comparison of them with the laws written *by the finger of God, in the works of creation*. In other words, that the truth of *revealed* religion may be best decided, by bringing it to the standard of *natural* religion. And we apprehend it will be difficult to convince the enlightened portion of the community, that this is a heresy. Let us listen to Bishop BUTLER on this point.

‘*Natural religion*, says that eminent prelate, is the *foundation and principal part of Christianity*. * * * * “Christianity teaches natural religion, in its genuine simplicity.” * * *

‘*Reason* can and ought to judge, not only of the meaning, but also of the *morality and evidence* of Revelation.’ * * *

‘Let *reason* be kept to, and if any part of the scriptural account of the Redemption of the world by Christ, can be shown to be really contrary to it, *let the scripture, in the name of God, be given up*.’ In what part of his Catechism has Spurzheim surpassed this, in boldness and liberality? Palpably in none.

DR. DODDRIDGE. ‘Those rules of action, which a man may discover, *by the use of reason*, to be agreeable to the *nature of things*, and on which his happiness will appear to him to depend, may be called *the law of nature*; and when these are considered as intimations of the divine will and purpose, they may be called *the natural laws of God*.’ * * * ‘For any one to pour contempt upon these *natural laws of God*, under pretence of extolling any *supposed divine revelation*, or intimation of God’s will, in an *extraordinary manner*, will appear *very absurd*.’ * * * * ‘No discovery (meaning revelation) can be supposed so particular, as not to need the use of *reason upon the principles of the law of nature*, in explaining and applying it to particular cases.’

DR. BARROW. ‘The *first excellency* peculiar to the Christian doctrine is, that it gives us a true, proper, and complete character or notion of God, such as perfectly agrees with what the *best reason dictates, the works of nature declare*, ancient tradition doth attest, and common experience testify.’

* * * * * 'Every religion that should, in this case, *clash with the law of nature*, would bear upon it *the marks of reprobation*, and it could not come from the ΑΥΤΗΟΚ of nature, who is always consistent, always faithful.'

We could cite many other passages, of like import, from the same authors' as well as from the writings of other pious and distinguished divines. And we repeat, that between their general scope and meaning, and those of the Philosophical Catechism we perceive no material discrepancy. In spirit and substance they are the same. Will our author, in his tender regard for religion, empty the vials of his wrath on all these writers, and condemn them, by the lump, to the penalties of infidelity, here and hereafter, because they entertained opinions, in unison, on some points, with those of Voltaire and Thomas Paine? And will he doom to the same fate all the living clergy and others, who concur in these opinions? If so, his condemnations will swell almost to infinity. He will consign to the worm that never dies, an hundred fold more of the human race, than ever bled beneath the sword of the most sanguinary conqueror. The whole *enlightened and liberal* portion of mankind will fall under his ban. And the numbers will augment hereafter, in direct proportion to the progress of knowledge. Finally; we might defy him to show any material disagreement between the tenets of the Philosophical Catechism, and those of the Christian religion, stripped of sectarian dogmas, and unintelligible subtleties.

The truth is, that the correspondent of the North American made, in the present case, a mere stalking-horse of religion, to produce effect, and injure, *by cant*, what he could not effect by argument. And his awkwardness in the management of it, proves his want of familiarity with it. Destitute of adroitness in his trade, he has yet to learn how to reach, and injure, by a *jaded expedient*, an individual immeasurably above him.

Could we condescend to compare him, in any way, with the lamented Spurzheim, we would say, that the latter was, theoretically, as well as in practice, infinitely the better Christian of the

two. The lessons of morality which he taught in his public lectures, and often touched on, in private discourse, were as pure and practical as ever issued from the lips of a teacher. They would not have dishonored the Sermon on the Mount.* His veneration, moreover, for the Christian religion, in its original purity, was deep and fervent. And he lived up to his profession. He was mild, benevolent, and charitable; patient under suffering and wrong; prompt to forgive injuries, and liberal toward those who differed from him in opinion, and opposed his doctrines conscientiously and fairly. In controversy, he was calm, courteous, and manly. It was literally true of him, that, when reviled, he reviled not again; and, surrendering himself up to the bent of his nature, he went about doing good. To complete the beauty and attractiveness of his character, and impart to it a finish of moral sublimity, he died a martyr in the cause of humanity.

Yet we witness this distinguished philosopher and philanthropist accused of infidelity, and of being the author of works calculated to demoralize man, and spread corruption through society!

Such instances of popular persecution, is almost always the difference between the character of the victims, and that of their pursuers — the mildness and innocence of the lamb, contrasted with the rage and blood-thirstiness of the wolf! Witness the case of Galileo and his persecutors, Socrates and his murderers, Seneca and his, and that of the AUTHOR of the Christian religion, and those who accused and tormented him first, and afterwards slew

* We intend, by this comparison, no irreverence toward the great occasion to which it refers. Far from it. We regard the whole occurrence on the Mount, as one of the most august and godlike scenes the earth has witnessed. Still, we retract nothing we have said respecting Dr. Spurzheim. We consider him one of the most apostolic characters of modern times. And we could extract from his writings innumerable passages testifying to the fact. His whole life testified to it. Nor did his death either contradict or weaken it. It put the seal to it. Yet is he made the subject of scandalous obloquy, by those who are scarcely worthy to unbind his shoes! So true is it, that 'Be thou as chaste as ice, as pure as snow, thou shalt not escape calumny' — 'especially,' the poet might have added, 'if thou be eminent, and throw the ignominious into shade.'

him. Most of these examples, moreover, present a scene of the same description — the *ignorant and unprincipled*, persecuting the *virtuous and enlightened*, on account of *imputed heresy and impiety!* Whether, in this respect, the case we are examining bears any resemblance to the others, the public will decide.

A word more respecting the Catechism. Our author has neither treated it fairly, nor intended to do so. He has extracted from it a few insulated passages, which he deemed the most exceptionable it contained, as specimens of the whole work. These he pronounces erroneous, and of evil tendency, and virtually extends this sentence of condemnation to the entire volume. Is this just? Can any work sustain an ordeal so severe? — severe, because partial and unfair. Not one — not even the Scriptures themselves. We can extract from both the Old and the New Testaments, hundreds of texts, which, viewed apart from the context, will appear error, or nonsense. We say again, what we have said in substance before, that, after an attentive examination of the Catechism, we are not prepared to point out a single passage in it hostile, in our opinion, to sound Christianity, but can show many that strongly harmonize with it. It might be used as a text-book for moral and theological lectures, in the form of commentary and amplification. Finally; it appears to us, that Spurzheim's 'Catechism,' Combe on the 'Constitution of Man,' and Pope's 'Essay on Man,' contain more of the true philosophy of our moral and intellectual nature, than all other books we have ever read. But what is correct in morality, cannot be at variance with pure religion.

We now advance to what our author considers the main point of his attack on Phrenology, in carrying which, he must secure to himself a triumph over the whole. In preparing for this struggle, he seems to have collected all his resources; and, in pressing it, to have expended them all. If there be, in his manner, an approach toward regularity anywhere, it is here. We allude to his denial that the human brain is a *multiplex viscus*, composed of a number of subordinate parts, each being the distinct organ of a

distinct mental faculty ; and his effort to disprove it. His caviling, in a previous paragraph, about the meaning of Phrenology, we pass by, as a specimen of literary buffoonery, unworthy of notice. We envy neither the spirit that dictates, nor the taste that relishes such efforts.

The author lays down two propositions, which, in his ignorance, or from some more reprehensible motive, he represents as embracing the *entire science* of Phrenology, while in fact they exclude important parts of it. The second, moreover, is expressed in language so obscure and equivocal, as to be scarcely intelligible. Of these propositions the most essential clauses have been quoted already. The whole of them is as follows : —

‘ *First.* The human brain consists of a number of separate portions, of which the general figure may be considered as that of a cone, the apex of which is situated somewhere about the *medulla oblongata*, and the base at the surface of the brain. We do not understand, that they are supposed to be literal and right-lined cones, but only conical in their character, — commencing in a small bundle of nervous fibres, and, though the course of these may be more or less devious, ending finally in an expansion on the surface, which gives rise to another set of expanded fibres, that again converge to the original point or apex of the cone.

‘ *Secondly.* That the liability of any individual of the human race to be the subject of those affections, which are commonly considered and treated of as mental, or of certain modes and varieties of them, is in direct proportion to the relative development of these portions of the brain.’—*p. 62.*

Let us accompany the writer, in some of his remarks respecting the former of these.

‘ The first proposition is clearly a matter for experiment and demonstration. Whoever pretends that there are any such natural divisions in the brain, is bound to show them, when a fair opportunity is presented. He must either dissect one or more of them fairly out, or at least point out distinctly the natural lines of separation. Now we apprehend, that so far from this having been satisfactorily shown, it has not even been pretended to be shown. We find it stated, indeed, by Dr. Spurzheim, that he read before the Royal Society of London, a paper on the boundaries of the organs, which they did not think worthy of publication ; but we are

yet to learn on what occasion such demonstration has been offered to the public. Who ever saw such a dissection, and when, where, and with what degree of publicity has it been performed or pretended to be performed? Sure are we, that if such things have been seen they can be shown, and we may take for granted, that no evidence of any such natural division into organs has ever been offered to anatomists, — that in short it is a pure hypothesis. We except, of course, the case of the *cerebellum*, which we understand to be a distinct organ, — and which we shall have occasion to consider by and by.' — p. 63.

Speaking again of the same organs, or subdivisions of the brain, he says,

'It is a *sine qua non* that the boundaries be pointed out, or else all discussion is at an end.' — *Ibid.*

The overweening confidence, and spirit of triumph, with which these remarks are made by the writer, show clearly the importance he attaches to them. He manifestly considers them, or at least wishes his readers to believe he considers them conclusive of the controversy. In his own estimation, he is the philosophical conqueror of the age, who has beaten down the phrenologists, terminated the thirty-years'-war, and dictated peace on his own terms. Let us weigh his pretensions, and ascertain their value.

That the human brain has never yet been so thoroughly analyzed, as to have all its subdivisions separated from each other, and exhibited each in an isolated condition, is perhaps true. Yet Dr. Spurzheim, whose veracity none who knew him will question, has repeatedly said, that in some of his most successful dissections of the brain, he had so far separated its different organs from each other, as to render them almost as distinctly visible, as the nerves which arise from it. We do not know that he has left behind him any drawings of these dissections.

On this topic we submit to the reader the following thoughts, and respectfully solicit his serious attention to them. We do not as phrenologists, attach such vital importance to an actual demonstration of the subdivisions of the brain, as some others do.

True, the demonstration would silence all carping and cavil, with regard to the existence of those subdivisions, and entirely disarm the enemies of the science. It would render Phrenology as indisputable to every one on this point, as it already is on most others.

Whatever might be our advantages, however, in possessing this demonstration, we do not consider the want of it a privation so grievous, as to mar materially the condition of the science. Though it leaves it an object for quibblers to exercise their powers on, it neither lessens its credibility, nor detracts from its weight, with those possessing intellects of an elevated order.

Such is the constitution of our minds, that our belief is not limited to things alone that are objects of sense. Were this the case, its circumscribed condition would detract, in a degree not a little humiliating to us, as well from our comforts, as from our standing in creation. The mind would embrace but few things beyond the narrow terrestrial sphere, which each individual occupies. All that is connected with the Deity, heaven, immortality, and a future state generally, would be matter of scepticism, because we cannot see them, measure them, and weigh them, and reduce them to 'inches and decimals,' penny-weights and grains. We would also doubt of the existence of mind or spirit, as a portion of man, because we cannot separate, with our scalpels, that ethereal essence from our grosser parts, and subject it to an examination, by one or all of our external senses. Nor, for the same reason, would we believe in the presence of a principle of life in any part of our frames. We cannot perceive the 'boundaries' of that principle, extract it, or in any way lay it bare, look at it, and ascertain its color, shape and size. Thus restricted, as our author seems to wish us, we should be as mere beings of sense, as the inferior animals, — disqualified alike to deduce causes from effects, or effects from causes. In truth, we could do little more than eat, drink breathe, and sleep, — our intelligence being reduced to such narrow limits, as to be insufficient for existence of a higher cast.

We have two classes of intellectual faculties, the *perceptive* or *observing*, and the *reflective* or *reasoning*; and in collecting and maturing knowledge, as well as in applying it to its various uses, we employ them both. The latter, however, is the most elevated, and is peculiarly instrumental in bestowing on man his earthly supremacy. Yet these are the faculties which most persons — our author being of the number — hold in comparative disrepute; whereas they ought to be most highly prized, and most zealously cultivated. It is by the instrumentality of them, that our knowledge is so enlarged, and puts on so refined and ethereal a character, as to pass from the *visible* to the *invisible*, the *latter* being as justly appreciated, and as firmly believed in as the *former*. It is by them that we ascend from the sphere of mere sense and perception, and become beings of reason. They are possessed in perfection only by the highly gifted *few*, and are the chief agents in philosophy; while the *many*, possessing them in a lower degree, make comparatively but little use of them, and set too low an estimate on them, because they do not *feel* and therefore cannot understand their true value. We shall only add, that the judicious application of these faculties to the subject before us, will disclose to us a ground of belief in the compound character of the brain, nearly as satisfactory, as if that viscus were fairly unfolded, and its several subdivisions presented to us, each in a state of separation from the others. Let the experiment be tried. Before entering on it however, we shall offer a few remarks on the different kinds of spinal nerves, whose separate existence and functions are now demonstrated. The applicability of what we shall say on this topic to the point we are considering will be obvious.

Mr. Bell has succeeded in demonstrating, that the spinal cord is composed of three kinds of nerves, each sort distinct in its being and different in its function from the others — nerves of feeling — nerves of voluntary motion — and nerves of involuntary motion. The *demonstration*, however, which is a *matter of sight*, is an event of comparatively recent origin. It was completed, or at

least published, in the year 1818. Several years before that, the fact was announced, as a *matter of reason*; and it was probably a previous *belief* in it, that led Mr. Bell to commence the investigation, and pursue it to its issue. Whether this belief originated with Mr. Bell, or was derived by him from somebody else, is no concern of ours. Nor is it of any moment, as respects the point we are discussing. It is sufficient for our purpose to know, that the suggestion was first made by a phrenologist. In a note to his work on 'Insanity,' published in 1817, one year before Mr. Bell's publication, Dr. Spurzheim has made the following remarks, which, for several years previously, he had offered in his lectures:—

'It has long been observed, that in palsy, voluntary motion and the sense of touch were generally destroyed at the same time; but that sometimes the one ceased, while the other remained. From this it has been *inferred*, that there are two sets of nerves. Anatomy has not yet *demonstrated* them; but I believe that they exist, and for the following reasons. The same nervous fibres do not go to the muscles and to the skin, and each of these parts has a distinct function. The nerves which are necessary for voluntary motion cannot propagate the impressions of the sense of touch, nor the latter impression of movement.'

It is worthy of remark, that other *quibblers* took the same exception to this opinion of Dr. Spurzheim, previously to the demonstration by Mr. Bell, that *our author* does to the belief, that the brain is made up of different organs. The cause is plain. They were beings of *sight*, not of *reason*—more of *animals* than of *men*. They were wanting in the higher powers of the mind. Reasoning therefore could not convince them; because they could neither sufficiently comprehend its drift, nor feel its force. Demonstration brought the matter to the clearest of their senses; and they were convinced and silenced. Such will be the case with our author, as respects the multiplex character of the brain. He cannot be *reasoned* into the belief of it, because his reasoning faculties are weak, as his writings testify. Others, more amply

endowed with those faculties, *can* be thus convinced ; while ultimate demonstration, the product of further improvements in anatomy, will, in the end, convince even *him*, and the entire *eye-sight class*, to which he belongs. — To return.

That the mind of man, of whatever substance it may be formed, is an *uncompounded* essence, is so universally admitted, that we shall receive it, and reason on it, as an established truth.

The admission is equally universal, that the same cause, acting under the same circumstances, always produces the same effect, and can produce no other ; and that therefore a cause *perfectly simple* can never produce of itself, a multiplicity of effects. Were a simple cause, unaided, to give rise to *several different* effects, the event would be a subversion of the laws of causation ; and *reasoning* would become an empty name. Nor is it less clear, that such a cause, acting through a single or simple instrument, can produce but one simple and uniform effect.

That the brain is the organ of the mind, is another proposition we shall simply assume, because it is as susceptible of proof, as that the eye is the instrument of vision, or the ear of hearing.

Our last postulate is, that the mental faculties are numerous, each one differing from the rest, and are the joint product of the mind and the brain. The truth of this is as obvious, and will be as readily admitted, as that of either of the others.

But were the mind and the brain both simple — were each of them a unit, and nothing more, it would be impossible, according to the preceding axioms, for the mental faculties, as their product, to be either numerous or different. *They* must be single also — must be *one*. The term '*they*' could not be applied to them, because they would want *plurality*. For them to be numerous, the mind and the brain being each a unit, would be in direct contradiction of all we know of cause and effect. It would be a phenomenon without a parallel. As far as we can look through creation, we find the universal order to be, simplicity of cause, simplicity of effect ; complexity of cause, complexity of effect ; the cause and the effect in every case corresponding.

Are we asked, then, in what way we would bestow multiplicity on the mental faculties, the mind being a unit? We reply, — By giving it a multiplex brain, as its organs, it being itself the spring of action. In that case, the action produced would receive its character from the organ, and have the necessary variety. — To explain.

Our view may be illustrated by the structure and operation of various kinds of machinery. The steam-engine will serve our purpose.

The power of steam, which is the spring of action, is simple. It is *mechanical propulsion*, and nothing more. Alone and unaided, it can produce but one effect. But its effects are varied, according to the machinery, which it sets in motion. Acting on one form of machinery, it spins; on another, it weaves; on a third, grinds corn; on a fourth, propels a boat; on a fifth, a carriage; on a sixth, it saws boards and planes them, or cuts and dresses window-sashes; and on a seventh, works a printing-press. But, great as its power is, steam could produce none of these effects, without the aid of suitable apparatus.

A second illustration of our views may be drawn from the principle of gravity. That principle is also simple, being nothing but a tendency toward the centre of the earth. Let it, by acting on a pendulum, put in motion one kind of machinery, and the passing hours will be told, by the striking of a hammer on a bell; another, a cuckoo will call the hours, or a finch or a sparrow will sing them; a third, a butcher will tell them, by striking with his axe on the forehead of an ox, the animal falling with the blow that indicates the last hour, and both he and his conqueror disappearing by the same doors, through which they entered; a fourth, a fierce-looking trumpeter will start up, and proclaim the hour by the blasts of his trumpet; and a fifth, and two Herculeses, in waiting, will raise their clubs, and beat the hour, by alternate strokes on a massive bell.

The action of water on machinery, would afford another illus-

tration ; but perhaps the most suitable may be derived from the diversified operation of the principle of life. That spring of action, being simple, can do nothing of itself ; but, by its influence on one form of organization — say, that of the skin — perspirable matter is secreted ; on that of the liver, bile ; on that of the stomach, gastric juice ; on that of the pancreas, the *liquor pancreaticus* ; and on that of the kidneys, urine. It might be easily shown, that, in the vegetable kingdom, the results of vital action are multiplied and diversified on the same ground. One kind of organization produces the peach ; another, the apple ; a third, the pear ; a fourth, the pomegranate ; a fifth, the plumb ; a sixth, the orange ; and a seventh, the grape ; — the same principle exciting action in each.

In like manner, by the influence of the mind on one cerebral organ, tune is produced ; on another, locality ; on a third, benevolence ; on a fourth, conscientiousness ; on a fifth, comparison ; and on a sixth, causality. On no other principle, as it appears to us, can any conception be formed of the production of the mental faculties, so numerous, and so different in kind as they are. To refer it to the mind alone, as a unit ; to the brain, as a unit ; or to the mind acting on the brain, *as a single organ*, would be, in our estimation, alike preposterous. It would certainly be in direct opposition to all our conceptions of cause and effect.

Shall we be told, that we must not reason about the powers of action of the mind, which is a spiritual and mysterious essence, as we do about the powers and functions of gross material agents ? We reply, that we know of but one code of laws, to be observed in reasoning ; and that if we do not use them, in discussing the subject of spirit, we ought not to attempt to reason about it at all. We apprehend, that whatever is fair and reasonable, as respects the powers and operations of matter, must bear the same relation to those of spirit. If not, all conceptions of spirituality had best be abandoned by us, as no better than

dreams. Will it be again objected to us, that reasoning *a priori*, to which we have just had recourse, is metaphysical, rather than philosophical; and specious, rather than conclusive; and ought not therefore to be exclusively relied on? We answer, that we do not mean to rely on it exclusively, but to unite it with reasoning *a posteriori*, as we shall do presently; and that the two forms, when they concur in support of the same doctrine, sustain each other, and strengthen the argument. We proceed to a less abstracted form of discussion. All analogy, that can be brought to bear on it, whether it be drawn from nature or art, favors the belief, that the brain is a compound viscus, and that each subdivision of it performs a function peculiar to itself. But, in the absence of *positive* proof, strong analogy forms a very valuable basis for opinions to rest on. If it be not strictly philosophical, it makes a near approach to it, and gives the height of probability to the doctrines which it favors. We shall only add, that the Newtonian system of astronomy is built on it. On the gravitation of ponderous bodies toward the centre of the earth, is founded, *by analogy*, the belief that the primary planets gravitate toward the sun, and the secondary toward them. Instead of improperly rejecting analogy then, as a source of evidence, let us briefly contemplate the strong support which Phrenology derives from it.

Throughout all nature, as far as we are conversant with it, there prevails an exclusive connexion and fitness between the thing done, and that which does it; and the general course pursued, and that which pursues it. And no one form of being is fitted to take the place of another, and do what it has done. An experiment to that effect would lead directly to disorder and mischief. The fish cannot subsist and pursue its pleasures *out of* water, nor the bird *in* it. The reptile cannot bound like the quadruped, nor the quadruped fly like the bird. Nor can any one species of fish, birds, reptiles, or quadrupeds follow, with impunity, precisely the same mode of life with another. Each

kind of animal must live and act in conformity to its organization and propensities. Every deviation from this proves injurious, and, if great, may be fatal. The eagle cannot adopt the economy of the pheasant or the turkey, and prosper under it; the swan that of the kite or the hawk; the buffalo that of the tiger, nor the lion that of the rein-deer. Each of these beings is a living machine, differing from the other, and must necessarily act therefore in a different way — but conformably to its own constitution. Of the specific and necessary aptitudes of plants to their localities and modes of existence, the same may be affirmed. Each species has a fitness for its own peculiar economy, which cannot be violated without injury.

Again. Every animal function is performed by an organ appropriated to itself. Nor can any one organ execute the office of another. The stomach digests food, but cannot secrete bile; the liver secretes bile, but cannot perform respiration; the heart circulates the blood, but cannot secrete pancreatic juice or tears; the optic nerve subserves vision, but not hearing, taste, or touch; while the auditory, gustatory, and tactual nerves are suited only to the latter functions. A nerve of voluntary is unfit for the work of involuntary motion; and neither of them is qualified for the function of sensation.

Even in processes of art, each distinct operation requires a distinct and specific instrument. The painter cannot paint with a chissel, nor the sculptor work in marble with a pencil; the hunter cannot shoot with an axe; nor the woodman fell trees with a rifle; the carpenter cannot saw with a sledge, nor the blacksmith forge a ploughshare with a saw. The auger and the gimlet are fitted to bore holes; the hatchet to chop; the plane to smooth boards, and the hammer to drive nails. Nor can any one imaginable kind of instrument perform all these operations.

Why then are we called on, in opposition to all we see, know, or can fancy, to believe that the mind or the brain, singly, as *units*, or both united, can perform between thirty and forty mental

processes, each as different from the others as seeing is from hearing, taste from touch, or the secretion of bile from the arterialization of the blood? A proposition more unreasonable, and we might add with propriety, more absurd, cannot be submitted to human credence. That nature makes the *seventh son* a *physician from birth*, or that old women, who have beards and a withered skin, hold intercourse with evil spirits, does not surpass it. Every body knows that the same nerve cannot subserve the double purpose of sensation and motion. Yet we are denounced for not believing that the same portion of cerebral matter, analogous in its general character to nervous, is the organ of Benevolence and Hope, Conscientiousness and Comparison, Causality, and Language, and every other mental faculty. We are denounced, in fact, for attempting to emerge from the delusive gloom of mystery and prejudice, to the truth-giving light of reason and common sense.

These arguments are addressed to the intelligent and liberal, by whom they will be fairly judged of and received for what they may be worth; not to the prejudiced and narrow-minded, who will necessarily reject them, because they are at war with their ancient notions. Of course, they are not intended for the author of the Article, on whom they would be lost. His conversion to any doctrine where reason predominates, and mere sense is held subordinate, we deem as hopeless as the conversion of the Mussulman, by argument, from Mahometanism to Christianity.

But we have not yet finished our discussion of this subject. It is universally admitted, that the theory which best explains the greatest number of the phenomena it bears on, comes nearest to the truth; and that if it explains them all, it is itself truth. Let us try the theory of the multiplex character of the brain by this rule.

When we direct our attention to the lower orders of animals, we perceive an accurate correspondence between their brains and intellects. Are the former very simple? So are the latter. Has

the brain, for example, few convolutions? The mind has few faculties. As we ascend through the higher grades of animals, they both increase in complexity alike, until we rise to man, who has as well the most complex brain, as the most complex intellect. All this is well known to comparative anatomists, and thorough-bred naturalists. The human brain contains many convolutions not found in the brain of any other animal; and the human mind has several faculties exclusively its own; the supernumerary convolutions and the supernumerary faculties corresponding.

The history of the growth of our own brain, with the gradual development of its faculties furnishes evidence to the same effect. In passing from its embryotic to its mature condition, it assumes progressively much of the character of the brains of most orders of the inferior animals. It begins in great simplicity, as a seeming appendage to the spinal cord, which is formed before it, and becomes more and more complex, until its completion, exhibiting, in the several stages of its growth, as just stated, somewhat of the condition of the brains of the several grades of inferior animals, ascending from the lower to the higher. The *medulla oblongata* is developed first, then the cerebellum, and afterwards the other portions of the viscus, until the whole is complete. Nor, as heretofore stated, does this completion, as respects the size of parts, take place until long after birth. And the manifestation of mental faculties keeps pace with the cerebral development. The animal organs, making the base of the brain behind and at the sides, are formed first, and the animal propensities are first shown. Hence the character of the infant is exclusively animal. Then come the knowing organs, which constitute the lower part of the brain in front, accompanied by the faculties which belong to them. These, which, as heretofore mentioned, are sometimes called the perceptive faculties, and faculties of observation, become active in children at an early age. Next in the order of development are the reflecting and moral organs, which constitute the upper

part of the front, and the entire arch or top, of the brain. Associated with this growth is the manifestation of the moral and reflecting faculties, modified by circumstances formerly referred to. Add to these the development of the organ of Amativeness, with its attendant propensity, which occurs at the period of puberty, and the brain is complete in growth, and the mental faculties in manifestation. Nor can any competent observer, we think, fail to perceive, that these two conditions — development and manifestation — are related to each other as cause and effect. Maturity of organ gives maturity of faculty.

That this is a correct representation of the progressive appearances of the mental faculties no one will deny. Universal observation testifies to it.* But, on the hypothesis of the unity of the brain, it is inexplicable; while on the ground of the multiplex character of that viscus, the explanation is so easy, that any one can give it, and so plain that all can comprehend it. It is briefly as follows: —

Different portions of the brain, in the capacity of distinct organs, come to perfection at different periods, and the faculties belonging to them appear and ripen, in the same order. Hence there exists between the brain, and the other organs of the body, a strong

* The reflecting faculties are never powerfully manifested, at a very early period of life. The knowing or perceptive ones alone are, at times, inordinately vigorous in infancy. Hence none of the precocious geniuses that appear excite astonishment, by their reasoning powers. They are distinguished in music, numbers, drawing, painting, modelling, and language; but not in any thing that depends on depth of reflection; such as general philosophy, political economy, or abstract metaphysics. In these latter branches of science, precocious geniuses rarely attain eminence at any period of their lives. Nature would seem to have so exhausted her resources in giving unwonted luxuriance in them to the knowing organs of the brain, as to have but little left to bestow on the reflecting ones, which come to maturity at a later period. Hence it has passed almost into a proverb, that 'early geniuses, who are men among boys, are apt to be afterwards boys among men.' Infant Rosciuses are mere mimics and verbalists, their organs of Imitativeness and Language being inordinately developed; and they seldom go beyond mimicry during their lives. We recollect no instance of an *infant Roscius* becoming an *adult one*.

analogy, as relates to the performance of their respective functions. In the progress of growth, from infancy to adult age, the latter, as well as the former, act with a degree of perfection proportioned to their maturity.

Other facts, speaking a similar language, are not wanting. Different individuals are distinguished by the superior activity and vigor of different faculties. One has Tune in great perfection, but is weak in Number. Another is strong in Locality, but feeble in Color. A third has great power of Constructiveness and Language, but very little of Comparison or Causality. This is no fancy-piece, but a faithful copy of what nature presents to us. How can it be explained? Only on the theory of the multiplicity of the brain. The subordinate portions of that viscus are so independent of each other, that they do not all grow alike. Some of them surpass the rest in size and vigor; and of course in the superior strength of their faculties. Were the brain a unit, this phenomenon, like the preceding ones would be inexplicable; but on the ground of its multiplicity, the explanation is so easy, that every reader can give it for himself, without any further assistance from us.

It is a fact, familiar to those who are engaged in acquiring a general education, that when fatigued even to dullness, by long and severe attention to one branch of study, they can abandon it and apply themselves immediately with equal ardor to another, not only without additional fatigue, but with feelings of refreshment. Is the fatigue brought on by the study of language? The individual removes it, by applying himself to mathematics. Is he weary of algebra or astronomy? He amuses and refreshes himself by music, conversation, or a game at chess; and he finds relief from metaphysics, in the bowers of the Muses. It is to be borne in mind, that, in this case, mental refreshment is experienced, not only by passing from a heavier to a lighter study; but also the reverse — by the exchange of an easier for a more difficult one.

On the theory of the multiplicity of the brain, this phenomenon is easily explained ; on that of its unity, it cannot be explained at all. In pursuing any given study, only one or two of the cerebral organs become fatigued by the intensity of their action. By passing to a fresh study, in which other organs are chiefly employed, the vigor of the exhausted ones becomes renovated by repose. Were the brain single, the case would be different. When overworked, it would be fatigued, not in parts, but *in toto* ; and its lost power could be restored only, by a temporary abandonment of all study. Thus, when, in any single-handed muscular process, one arm becomes fatigued, its vigor can be restored by rest, — the other arm, in the mean time, supplying its place. But if both arms and the whole body are exhausted by labor, that labor must be abandoned, and no other substituted for it, else the exhaustion will not be removed.

Dreams. These consist in imperfect sleep, and are explicable only on the theory we are defending. Some faculties of the mind are awake in them, and others in a state of repose. A much more correct form of expression would be, that some portions of the brain are in action, and others are at rest. But this could not be the case were the brain a unit. It could not then act vigorously in some parts, and not at all in others. It must all act, or all cease to act. Its function could not be divided. Not so when the brain is composed of distinct organs. Then the partial action of dreams may arise. It is not necessary that all those organs should be at once in the same condition either of action or repose. Nothing forbids them to be, some in one state and some in another, their harmony and control of each other being for the time lost. Hence the irregularity of their action, and the incongruous product of it, which constitutes dreams.

Somnambulism is explicable only on the same ground ; and on that it may be easily explained. Some parts of the brain are in action, others at rest. The most active portion would seem to

be that which has the control of voluntary muscular motion ; while that which forms the seat of *feeling*, appears to be most profoundly buried in sleep. Be this opinion, however, as it may, it cannot be denied, that the phenomenon testifies strongly to the multiplicity of the brain.

Stronger still, perhaps, is the evidence to the same effect, derived from *Monomania*. This, as the term implies, is madness *on a single subject* ; a complaint which occurs much oftener than is generally imagined.

All enlightened pathologists now admit, that madness is exclusively an affection of the brain,— the mind, as a separate substance, being no more diseased in it, than in other complaints. But suppose it otherwise ; grant that the *mind* is the seat of the malady, how can it, as an indivisible essence, be partially diseased ? How can one of its faculties be deranged and all the others sound ? That which is not made up of parts, cannot suffer in part. It must be all well, or all ill. Of the brain, as a simple organ, the same is true. Each portion of it must be alike concerned in all its functions. Any morbid affection of it, therefore, must derange all those functions equally. It cannot derange one of them, and allow the others to remain sound.

Shall we be told, that though the brain is not actually divided into separate organs, yet different portions of it subserve different offices ? Such a position would be at once, absurd, and a surrender of the question. If the brain be absolutely simple, it is identical in all its parts. No one of them, then, can act differently from another. And if it differ in different parts, either in action, or structure, or both, this dissimilitude is tantamount to a division of it into separate organs. All this is as plain and substantial as demonstration can make it. In fact, a simple brain is incompatible with any reasonable or intelligible view we can take of the mental faculties, either in a diseased or a healthy condition.

On the theory of the compound character of the brain, *Monomania* is as easily understood, as any other complaint. Each cerebral organ is the seat of a distinct mental faculty ; and the

organs are so independent of each other, that one or more of them may be diseased, and the remainder sound. Is any one of them thrown into a morbid condition? The faculty attached to it is deranged; precisely as the secretory processes of the liver or the kidneys are deranged, when the organs themselves are laboring under disease. In this view of the subject, the organs of the brain stand related to each other, like the organs of the external senses. Vision may be in a morbid condition, and hearing sound; or hearing may be disordered, and vision sound. Of the other external senses the same is true. They are so independent of each other, that either of them may be sound or unsound singly. Yet they have their *real seat in different portions of the brain*. Vision is not seated in the eye, hearing in the ear, taste in the tongue, smelling in the nostrils, nor touch in the fingers, neither are they seated in the *nerves* of those organs. The eye, ear, tongue, nose, and fingers are but the *externals* of the senses, while the nerves are but *intermediates*. The very fact, then, that different portions of the brain are appropriated to the external senses, and that the functions of those portions are as different as the functions of the nerves they receive — for each portion must be in harmony with its own nerves — this fact alone, we say, proves the brain to be a compound viscus. In confirmation of the general view here taken, it is well known that blindness, deafness, and an extinction of the other external senses, often depend not on any diseased condition of the external or intermediate apparatus, but *on a morbid affection of the brain*. A severe blow on the head often deprives an individual, for a time, of all external sense, while his brain alone is the injured part.

Topical lesions of the Brain. It has been long known, that these, at times, derange single faculties of the mind, without impairing any others. Wounds, and concussion from severe blows or falls, inflicted on the brain immediately behind and above the

eye, have taken from the individual the power of remembering words, especially the names of persons and things, while form, size, color, sound, and place were all remembered as distinctly as before. In other instances, an injury done to the brain, in another place, has deprived the person of the faculty of recognizing *familiar places*, or remembering them, when no longer in view, all the other mental faculties continuing unimpaired. A third cerebral lesion has deranged or destroyed the faculty of perceiving or distinguishing colors, leaving the remaining faculties untouched.

Cases of the description here mentioned are recorded by the Baron Larey, and other writers on military surgery. It need scarcely be added, that they can be explained only on the theory of the compound character of the brain; and on that they are easily explained.

Will it be observed to us, as it often has been, that the brain does not consist of various subdivisions, differing from each other in function, inasmuch as it is all alike in structure, or at least so much alike, that no variety in this respect has been detected? We reply, that this objection has no weight, and deserves therefore no serious consideration? It rests on our defective attainments in minute anatomy; and we are not permitted to make a *premiss* of our *ignorance* with a view either to circumscribe or extend our *knowledge*, by an *inference* from it. Though one class of nerves is known, from observation, to be subservient only to sensation, and another to motion — one class again to voluntary, and another to involuntary motion — though this is true, yet the most expert and skilful anatomist cannot, from any perceptible difference in their structure, distinguish one of these classes from another. Nor can any difference be pointed out between the structure of the optic and that of the auditory nerve, nor between that of the olfactory and the gustatory, notwithstanding the well known difference in their functions.

The difference in the functions of these classes of nerves was discovered, not by anatomical dissections of *dead* bodies, but by

physiological observations on *living* ones. And the difference in the functions of the various parts of the brain rests on the same foundation. It was discovered by the observations of Gall and Spurzheim, as their writings prove, and has been confirmed by that of other phrenologists.

Might we adduce, in this discussion, high authority as an argument to prove the multiplicity of the brain, it presents itself abundantly. Not to mention the belief of it entertained by a few ancient philosophers, the doctrine was advocated five hundred years ago, by some of the most distinguished *savans* of the time. Nor has it been without partizans and defenders, many of them profound thinkers, extensive inquirers, and rich in renown, from that period to the present. For the standing, however, it now possesses, and the shape it wears, it is indebted to Gall and Spurzheim and their followers. They have done for it what Harvey did for the circulation of the blood, Newton for astronomy, and Franklin for electricity — reduced it, from scattered facts and loose thoughts, to system and science.

Finally; the complicated structure and appearance of the brain, so far surpassing those of any other organs of the body, testify strongly to its compound character. When placed by the side of the liver, lungs, stomach, heart, kidney, or any other viscus, and strictly examined, and compared with either of them, in its entire composition, it presents the appearance of great *multiplicity*, contrasted with *unity*. No reflecting mind can believe, that all its parts, differing in several respects, widely from each other, can unite in the performance of the same functions.

Such are the leading considerations, which constitute the foundation of the belief of phrenologists, in the compound character of the brain; and we confess we think them sufficiently solid, to form the ground of any belief. Few doctrines, either moral or physical, are so firmly supported. In our view, the argument is irresistible; and we ask for nothing more.

True — the testimony adduced does not amount to anatomical

demonstration. No matter. To candid and enlightened minds, capable of weighing evidence, feeling its force, and perceiving its drift, it can scarcely be less conclusive than demonstration; inasmuch as not a single fact or analogy appears against it. The entire opposition to it is made up of cavil, cant, and dogged denial. And what doctrine is there, that cannot be thus opposed, when interest or prejudice furnishes the motive?

In the administration of justice, *circumstantial* evidence is often preferred to *positive*. It is deemed more probable, that a witness may swear falsely, either through intention or mistake, than that a large number of undoubted facts, connected with no interested motive, should concur in supporting an unfounded accusation. In science, the same is true. An experimenter or an observer may be honestly mistaken; or a preconceived hypothesis may tempt one to distort facts, or prevaricate as to results. But a host of well-known and acknowledged phenomena, harmonizing in their drift, and throwing their undivided weight into the scale of a controverted doctrine, while neither fact nor analogy is adduced to counterbalance them, would seem to be conclusive. In such a case, opposition is nugatory.

But all this has been shown to be strictly true, in relation to the phenomena, which testify to the multiplicity of the organs of the brain. To assert, then, in the face of them, that, unless the 'boundaries' of those organs be 'pointed out,' the belief in their existence must be rejected, and 'all discussion respecting them be at an end,' is to trifle with argument, and play the caviller, to an extent that does not merit a reply. It is to oppose a single *negative* to hosts of *positives*, and, on this flimsy ground, proclaim victory. As if mere *denial*, which is more frequently the product of the temper than of the understanding, had the shadow of evidence in it. As well may the gentleman, in defiance of reason, deny the existence of ultimate particles of matter, because their 'boundaries' cannot be shown to him, and offer his disbelief as proof of his hypothesis. If such reasoning be allow-

ed to pass for evidence, to unsettle old opinions or discountenance new ones, all certainty is subverted, and science is at an end. — There are many muscles in the human body, whose exact ‘boundaries’ were not discovered for centuries after their existence was known. We venture to add, that even now there are dozens of muscles, whose precise ‘boundaries’ the writer cannot demonstrate; else his anatomical is much superior to his physiological knowledge. The anatomy of the brain is yet imperfect. Time and industry will mature it; and then will the organs of the brain be demonstrated, ‘boundaries’ and all. We therefore commend the writer to patience.

The silliness of the gentleman’s views on this point may be still further exposed. Would he prevent inquirers from *reasoning* or even *conjecturing* first, and then having recourse to observation or experiment, to test their conjectures? Is he so ignorant of the history of discoveries and improvements as not to know that they have frequently resulted from a procedure like this? Did not Columbus, relying on reasoning and conjecture, sail in quest of a New World, before he was acquainted with its *whereabout* and ‘boundaries’? And if he had not thus dared and thus acted, would that world have ever been discovered? Had our author been the counsellor of that illustrious adventurer, his advice would have been, not to weigh anchor towards the new region, until he had seen it; and America would have been yet an uncultivated waste.

Had not Franklin reasoned first, and then experimented, where would have been our knowledge of the identity of the electricity of the Leyden jar, and that of the thunder-cloud? And had not our forefathers acted on the same ground — had they not reasoned or conjectured as to their military prowess and power first, and afterwards tried them, the United States would have been now but British Provinces, and we, of course, but British subjects. — Away! away! with such childish prattle, as that our author has indulged in, on this occasion! It reminds us of a declaration we

once heard from the lips of a sage Bœotian, that he never intended to compose any thing, until he had learnt to compose well ! In like manner, the writer never means to go in quest of knowledge, until he has found it !

When observation, hundreds of times repeated, steadily testifies, that an unusual protrusion or fulness of the region of the same skull is uniformly associated with a strong manifestation of the same mental faculty, and that the protrusion of the skull is caused by the protrusion of the portion of brain it covers — when such facts co-exist, as settled occurrences, they furnish evidence sufficient to satisfy candid inquirers that the same portion of brain, which produces the fulness, produces also the manifestation. Nor will any one of a liberal and enlightened mind deny this, merely because the precise ‘ boundaries ’ of the protruding portion of the brain has not been indicated.

Our author charges phrenologists with asserting that the power of a cerebral organ is in *direct proportion to its size*, and then pronounces the assertion unfounded. This, as we shall see presently, is another specimen of his want of knowledge, or want of veracity.

We have two replies to make, to meet the two branches of the charge.

Phrenologists do not assert, that the size of a cerebral organ is the *exact and only* measure of its power. They represent it as but *one* of the *conditions* of power. Another condition, no less important, is the *tone* or *intensity* of the organ. Of this our author has taken no notice — from what motive — want of knowledge, or want of candor — we presume not to say.

The distinct phrenological proposition, on this point, is, that, *other things being alike*, the size of a cerebral organ is the measure of its power. And this is true. Nor is it so of cerebral organs only. It is true of every organ, and of every thing we are acquainted with in nature, of which power is predicable. A few remarks will illustrate our meaning, and prove our position. To contemplate the matter on an extensive scale.

The sun being the largest body in the solar system, is also the most powerful, and holds the others to their orbits. Because the primary planets are larger than the secondary, they are superior to them in power, and therefore control them. As relates to terrestrial objects, the same law prevails. Size gives power. A large mountain, river or lake has more influence than a small one. Other things being alike — the metal, we mean, being equally pure — a large piece of gold is heavier than a small one ; that is, it gravitates towards the centre with greater power. Other things being equal, a large animal is stronger than a small one. And this is as true of man, as of the beings beneath him. It is true also of the various organs of animals. How can it be otherwise ? It is but tantamount to the maxim, that the whole is greater, and of higher influence, than a part. Of the organs of the body, all things in them being equal, different portions of the same size (say a cubic inch) possess, of necessity, the same sum of power. But the union of the several sums inherent in these portions, makes up the aggregate power of the organ. The greater the number of these separate and equal portions, therefore, that enter into the composition of an organ, the greater is its power. But a large organ contains more cubic inches of matter than a small one, and hence is more powerful.

It is known to comparative anatomists and physiologists, that a large visual auditory or tactual apparatus, is more powerful and efficient for the purposes of sense, than a small one. Hence, all animals that see, hear, and feel with unusual acuteness, have the organs and nerves of these senses correspondingly large. These positions are susceptible of demonstration. The anatomy and physiology of the eagle, the long-eared bat, the monkey, and the elephant furnish it. It is a further truth, equally demonstrable, that large nerves of motion have more power than small ones. Hence animals possessing that class of nerves of inordinate dimensions, are stronger than those in which they are small, when the size of the muscles in both is equal. And those particular parts

of animals, most remarkable for strength, are supplied with the largest motive nerves. The tail of the kangaroo, whose power is disproportioned to the other parts of that animal, is an example of this. So is the trunk of the elephant.

Man has the sense of feeling in a higher degree than the inferior animals, and his nerves of feeling are proportionably larger. Most of the inferior animals, again, are stronger than man, in proportion to the size of their muscles; and their nerves of motion surpass his equally in bulk. These truths, we repeat, are familiar to comparative anatomists and physiologists. If our author therefore possess but half the knowledge of physiology he pretends to, he cannot be ignorant of them. Should they be unknown to him, however, as we suspect they are — for we take him to be but a pretender in science of every description — we refer him to the writings of Desmoulins, for further information. The applicability of the foregoing remarks to the subject we are considering, is obvious.

The brain is a mass of nervous matter; or at least is so considered, in the present state of anatomical science. Analogy, therefore, justifies us in inferring, that, *other things being the same*, its size is the measure of its power. Were the case otherwise, that viscus would present an anomaly in nature. It would show itself to be governed by laws different from those of every thing else. We do not however rest our position on analogy. Observation testifies to its correctness. Other things being alike; that is, the *tone or intensity*, and the *figure* being the same, *a large brain is more powerful, and gives more intellect and character than a small one*. Let this be tested by the following experiment. Select an hundred men with large heads, and an equal number with small ones, and, all things but size being the same, the amount of intellect and character possessed by the party with large heads, will be the greatest. This result will be uniform. Again. Enter a legislative or other deliberative body, and, paying due attention to such collateral circumstances as are admitted to possess an

influence, you may usually indicate the leading members, by the size of their heads. Mirabeau was the master spirit of the National Assembly of France, and *his head was enormous*. Franklin ruled in the councils of his country, and *his was the same*. The superior power of the late Messrs. Dexter and Pinckney, whose heads were inordinately large, was acknowledged alike in the forum and the council-chamber; and the surpassing magnitude of the head of a distinguished statesman,* whom we shall not name, points him out to every intelligent observer, as the controlling genius of the present Senate of the United States.

No man with a small head has ever been truly great. None such has ever originated or led revolutions in science, letters, religion or government; or in any way stamped an image of himself on his country or age. All history as well as observation testifies to this. Such an event would be as extraordinary and unnatural, as the existence of gigantic muscular strength in the person of a dwarf. From Pericles, Aristotle, and Alexander, passing through the Cæsars, and Ciceros, and Bacons, down to Napoleon, Fox, and Scott, every great conqueror, statesman and writer, has had a large head — and a corresponding brain. Should our author deny this, we shall strongly suspect he has a *personal* reason for it; and his *hat* or *looking-glass*, or Combe's cranioneter, will tell him what it is.

The scholarship of the following paragraph may perhaps amuse the reader; and truly we fear he needs some amusement, after the tedious discussion, through which he has accompanied us.

'The difficulty then, in our view of the matter, with Phrenology, is the utter absence of any evidence in favor of it. But may it not be true that the differences of the qualities of mind may corres-

* The intensity of this gentleman's brain, and the high tone of his general temperament, do much in bestowing on him his gigantic powers. Were his cerebral developments, fine as they are, united to a phlegmatic temperament his intellect would be much less vigorous and commanding.

pond with those, which exist between certain portions of the head? Certainly; and also in those between certain portions of the palm of the hand. No doubt people have always been ready to fancy some such things. Such notions are as old as the world. The ancients, however, were disposed to confine the intellectual part of man to the head, and to associate the moral part, the affections, with other organs; and certainly with vastly more reason. That the heart, and not the head, is the organ of hope, fear, or love, if organs they must have, seems to us really a pretty defensible position. Will any man in his senses undertake to defend the claims of any part of man's head to influence his moral character, against those of his stomach? Dyspepsia herself would smile at the notion. Is not a large heart the proverbial emblem of courage, and a white liver that of cowardice? If Phrenology were, what the phrase truly and literally imports, the doctrine of the diaphragm, we might find some savor in it.'

On this precious morsel of science and literature, our remarks shall be brief. We cannot mend it, and have no wish to mar it beyond what its author has done. It sets criticism at defiance. No possible alteration in it, short of *regeneration*, can make it either better or worse. It is difficult to tell, whether, in writing it, the author was serious, or meant to play the part of the 'king's jester.' Be this matter as it may, the gentleman has our permission to locate *his* faculties, moral, intellectual, and all others he possesses, in his head, 'palm,' heart, belly, or where else he pleases — no matter where — to what region of his carcass he may transplant them, — upper, middle, or lower — they cannot suffer by the change.

'The wretched have no more to fear.'

'O! that mine enemy,' said the Wise Man, 'had written a book!' Why? That he might expose his ignorance and folly, in indelible characters. Our unfortunate author, as an enemy to phrenologists, *has* written a book; and all *his* enemies united could not have inflicted on him such irremediable degradation. But we must proceed in our analysis of the present extract.

'Is not a *large heart* the proverbial emblem of *courage*, and a

white liver that of cowardice? Yes; with such *hybrid philosophers*, as he who asks the question — none else. The heart of Napoleon was *unusually small*, and his liver, if our memory deceive us not, *grayish*. Had not our author better write an essay, to prove that the Conqueror of Europe *wanted courage?* or that from the superior size of his heart, the cur is more courageous than the terrier, and the male of the common barn-door fowl, than the bantam? Such disquisitions would be quite suitable to such a disquisitor.

Seriously : we are surprised that even such a novice in physiology, as he has shown himself to be, should fall in with the vulgar error, that the heart, a mere muscular mass, destined exclusively for the circulation of the blood, is the seat and source of courage, or any other mental affection. As well may he locate such affections in the glutæus maximus. He ought to know, that many animals of the lower orders *have no heart*, and yet manifest burning courage.

Once more. In what new-fangled glossary of the Greek tongue, or from what profound modern Theban has the writer learnt, that the term 'Phrenology' means 'the *doctrine of the diaphragm?*' The rare information is contained in no *ancient* classical authority with which we are acquainted : φρην signifies 'truly and literally' the *mind*, whatever may be its supposed seat — never the *diaphragm*, except *metaphorically*, '*tanquam mentis sedes.*' As the writer affects scholarship, he can perhaps translate this Latin scrap himself.

As the gentleman has given us an opportunity to show *our* learning, a favor rarely met with by a *Greek and Latin scholar*, in these 'piping times' of plain English, we inform him, in grateful return, that *diaphragm*, having no cousin-germanship, or other degree of blood-relation, to φρην, πνεῦμα ψυχῆ, or any other term, meaning *mind or spirit*, comes from the plain, homely Greek word, diaphragma, signifying a *hedge fence, or partition-boundary*, and is bestowed, as a very significant and appropriate name, on a certain membrane, '*quæ cor et pulmonem a jecore et*

liene distinguit ;' and that the diaphragma is derived from *δια*, *between*, and *φρασσω*, *sive φραττω*, to make a hedge, or build a fence, because it forms a *partition-fence between* the two great cavities of the body. — The writer has now a dash of *our* classical scholarship. Had he made no effort to show off *his*, we might have given him credit for possessing some.

After having toiled through many pages of mistake, prevarication, and shuffle, with here and there a fragment of battered sarcasm and pointless wit, but not a solitary attempt at argument — after a course of this description, our author issues the following proclamation of his labors and their success : —

' We have thus far gone upon the supposition that there are no natural boundaries to the organs; there is, as we noticed above, one exception to this, the *cerebellum*. This, as we understand it, is a distinct organ, the seat of a distinct propensity; and it is remarkable that it affords us an opportunity of applying the test of experience directly and fatally. The anatomical reader will find, in Ferussac's Bulletin for October, 1831, under *Medical Sciences*, the details of a case, in which this part of the *encephalon* did not exist at all, while the propensity was rather remarkably developed. So much for showing us the boundaries of the organs; and so much for the difficulties, which embarrass the first step of Phrenology, the simple and mechanical question, whether any organ is large or small.'

We have here another memorable example of the writer's trickishness and misrepresentation — memorable even in the midst of his own offences of the kind. It is not true, that, in the individual mentioned in Ferussac's Bulletin, for October, 1831, the '*cerebellum* did not exist at all.' There did exist the *remains of a diseased cerebellum*; and such remains as indicated clearly that the part had been *in a chronic state of excessive excitement*; a condition precisely calculated to lead to the practice, of which the individual had been guilty.

But why has the writer merely referred to the case reported in the Bulletin, giving his own one-sided construction of it, and drawing from it his own unwarranted inference? Why has he not traced at least the leading features of it, that the reader might

judge of the matter for himself? The answer is easy. Such procedure would not have suited his sinister purpose, because it would not have sustained the views he wished to establish. Detection in his unfairness, and the frustration of his hopes, would have been the consequence of it — yet charity, but slightly exercised, might perhaps suggest for his conduct a different course. Such may be his anatomical and pathological ignorance, that he cannot distinguish *a diseased cerebellum from no cerebellum at all*.

The subject of the case was a female child, born of a *sickly and irregular*, if not *profligate* mother — ‘*usée par des excès de tout genre*’ — and was herself deeply diseased from her birth. She became early addicted to self-pollution, and died near the close of her tenth year. On an examination of the brain, it was found that the cerebellum *was not entirely wanting*, but greatly diminished in size, and so changed in structure as to resemble a *gelatinous* membrane, surrounded by a large quantity of serum — ‘*une grande quantité de sérosité*’ — ‘*Je trouvai à la place du cervelet une membrane gelatineforme, de forme circulaire, tenant à la moelle allongé, par deux pedoncles.*’

This gelatinous membrane was doubtless the *remains of the cerebellum*, reduced to its then present condition by disease; and that disease was of a highly *excitve*, if not *inflammatory* character, calculated to throw the part prematurely into a state of preternatural action. Hence the vice into which the child fell, at so early a period. The precocity and strength of the sexual propensity can be in no other way explained. And this explanation seems satisfactory. That an inflammatory or highly excited condition of the cerebellum awakens strong libidinous desires, is proved by hundreds of instances, occurring at various periods of life, from early childhood to advanced old age. That this is the pathology of *erotomania*, is proved, not only by the symptoms and successful treatment of that complaint, but also by dissections after death.

Are we asked, why we consider the cerebellum, in the present case, to have been in a state of *chronic inflammation*? We reply, *Because it presented the effects of chronic inflammation*? A su-

perabundant secretion of serum is a common result of sub-acute inflammation of serous membranes, in every part of the body ; and the structure of portions of the brain is known to be often reduced, by the same morbid condition, to a sort of *gelatinous* mass. Why should it not? We might almost ask, How can it be otherwise? The brain consists, in a high degree, of albumen, tenderly organized. Demolish its structure, by sub-acute inflammation, and that substance shows itself in somewhat of a pultaceous or jelly-like form. Such is the condition, in which the cerebellum of confirmed anatomists has been found after death. Softened, and somewhat disorganized, by a constant state of high and unnatural excitement, that portion of the brain has assumed the appearance of a gelatinous mass, surrounded by serum or penetrated by it. Several dissections in the large hospitals of Paris testify to this. So does the late dissection of a case, reported in No. II. of the *Journal of the Phrenological Society of Paris*. And, from its extreme tenderness and imperfect organization, the brain of a mere child must be more easily reduced to a semi-fluid condition than that of an adult.

This view of the subject renders the cause of the early vice of the female child, mentioned in the *Bulletin*, sufficiently plain, and strengthens Phrenology, instead of injuring it. Pathologists know, that intense excitement in an organ adds to the vigor of the function it performs. It often throws it into a furious orgasm of action. Witness the production of rage, by the excessive excitement of *Combativeness* and *Destructiveness*. Nor is this true of the animal organs of the brain only. It is no less so of the intellectual ones. A slight inflammation of the brain has often bestowed intelligence on idiots, during its continuance ; and when the optic nerve is inflamed, the feeble light of a taper seems as bright, and is as intolerable, as the blaze of the sun is to the nerve when sound. Instead of feeling themselves discomfited or discouraged, then, by *Ferussac's Bulletin*, phrenologists have reason to thank our author, for directing public attention to it. Nor is it the first time that incompetent persons have missed their

aim, become the victims of their own devices, and benefited the cause they designed to injure.

It is necessary to remark, that the case in the Bulletin is very defectively reported, especially in reference to Phrenology. In particular, no notice is taken of the cranial development of the child, in the region of the cerebellum. Was it very large? From a knowledge of what has been observed, in all similar cases that have been satisfactorily examined, we doubt not it was. In every instance of early onanism, or even strong sexual passion, that we have seen accurately reported, the cerebellum was preternaturally large. The sexual organs also, and the parts adjacent to them, usually exhibited premature marks of puberty. We shall only add, that the Bulletin case throughout was *pathological* and therefore very ill-suited to warrant *physiological* inferences. By their torturing and mutilation of living animals, thereby changing *healthy* into *diseased* action, yet still representing the result as *natural*, physiological experimenters have broached some of the wildest doctrines, and deepest heresies in medical science. In the case before us, indeed, the pathological condition of the patient was not the product of intentional experiment, but of casual disease. No matter, however, in what way the condition was produced. It existed in all its perverting effects; and that was sufficient to attach uncertainty to every deduction made from it. Were our author either a physiologist or pathologist, he would be sensible of this. But he is neither, as every page in his article demonstrates. Does he wish to learn something of the extent of the mutative power of disease, on the functions of the nervous and cerebral system? If so, we recommend to his attention the following case, reported by Mr. Andral, in a late lecture on 'Animal Magnetism.' After describing the general features of the case, which was one of the class he calls 'spontaneous ecstasy,' the Professor observes— 'In addition to these symptoms, something extraordinary was one day noticed. It was found that while he (the patient) was utterly insensible to, and unconscious of, all sounds directed to the ear, he perceived them distinctly, if directed to the *pit of the stomach*.

To questions addressed there, in the most inaudible whisper, he returned immediate replies; but of all that was spoken to his ear, he was perfectly ignorant.' — This singular case shows how cautious we should be of drawing inferences from the general condition, or any of the phenomena of the body, when diseased, with a view to throw light on its functions during health. Will not our author find evidence here sufficient to confirm him in his creed, that the belly is truly the seat of the mind? Such a conclusion, from the premises laid down, would be worthy of his attainments in physiology and mental philosophy, and of his skill in logic.

We do not know that we can close our remarks on the case in Ferussac's Bulletin more suitably, than by subjoining the following extract from the 'Lexington Journal of Medicine and the Associate Sciences.' It contains a summary of the principal reasons, for considering the cerebellum the organ of Amativeness.

'The truth is, that there are but few positions in anatomy or physiology, which appear to us to be more satisfactorily settled, than those of the seat and function of the organ of physical love. The following are a few of our reasons for entertaining this belief. Previously however to detailing them, it is requisite we should state, that a large development of that organ creates a fulness and thickness or unusual breadth of the back of the neck, at its junction with the head — in more technical language, that it protrudes outward that portion of the cranium, which, lying between the petrous processes of the temporal bones, covers the cerebellum. We shall begin with testimony derived from inferior beings.

'Among the lower orders of animals, those that have no cerebellum, nor any ganglion tantamount to one, have no sexual propensity; while all possessed of a cerebellum, or a ganglion as a substitute, have; and the larger the cerebellum, in individuals of any given species, the stronger is this propensity in them, compared to other individuals of the same species, in which it is smaller. This latter statement is illustrated and sustained by various and innumerable well-known facts. Male pigeons, and the

males of the common domestic fowl that have the thickest necks, we mean the greatest protuberances where the head and neck join are always the most amorous. The same is true of the un-mutilated males of all our domestic quadrupeds — the horse, the cow, the sheep, and the hog kind. The thicker the neck, at the point designated, the stronger and more ardent is the venereal appetite. And those of them, in whom the cerebellum is earliest developed, manifest that appetite at the earliest period. The cerebellum of those animals, whose season of love and copulation occurs periodically, such as hares, deer, and most kinds of birds, sustains, during that season, a very striking change. It is fuller and more copiously injected with blood, and therefore much redder, than at any other time; a condition which indicates a preparation for more vigorous action.

‘The emasculation of the males of our domestic quadrupeds, at an early period of life, is known to prevent the development of the cerebellum. Hence the smallness of the neck of the castrated horse, ox, sheep, and hog, compared to that of the uncastrated one. And those that are castrated when young, have no sexual propensity. But in those castrated after maturity, some share of the propensity remains, although the power of performance is taken away. And in these the cerebellum is diminished in size after castration, but never becomes so small as it would have been, had they been castrated at an early period. To intelligent and observing agriculturists these facts are familiar; and they show satisfactorily a close connexion and strong reciprocal influence between the cerebellum and the genital organs. It is to be observed, that emasculation affects materially no other portion of the brain, but the cerebellum. The removal of one testicle diminishes the size of the cerebellar lobe on the opposite side.

‘In the human race the cerebellum is very small until puberty, bearing to the cerebrum the proportion of about *one to fifteen* or *sixteen*; but after puberty, when the sexual passion is developed, the proportion is as *one to six* or *seven*. The commencement of physical love then, and the growth of this organ at puberty, are

synchronous. Is the cerebellum inordinately developed, at an early period in a boy? So is sexual desire. Of this, many striking instances might be mentioned, were not the subject too delicate for public discussion. Male children at the age of three years have clearly manifested the propensity; and boys, from five to seven years old, have attempted violence on females of the same age. These are no fictions, but recorded truths; and, in every instance, the precocious passion has been accompanied by a precocious cerebellar development.

‘When the human race have attained maturity, the cerebellum in man is much larger, in proportion to the cerebrum, than in woman. And his passion is known to be much stronger. The larger, moreover, the cerebellum is in man or woman, all other things being equal, the stronger is the propensity. In corroboration of this, many direct and incontestible facts might be adduced, were the citation of them admissible. The correspondence in this respect between the characters and developments of, Raphael and Mary Maciunes is striking and full of instruction. It might be fitly recommended to the attention of our author. Further; in men far advanced in years, the cerebellum diminishes in size, with the declension and disappearance of the sexual passion. Again; it is well known, and has been known and recorded for centuries, that during paroxysms of love inordinately strong, a burning and unpleasant sensation is experienced in the cerebellum. The same is true, in the case of habitual onanists; and their cerebellum has been always found, on examination, to be diseased.

‘The effect of emasculation on male children and small boys, is well known. Their necks continue proverbially small. Even their vocal organs (we mean that portion of them formed by the larynx) are never as fully developed, as in the perfect man. Hence the semi-feminine shrillness of their voice. The eunuch always sings in tenor or treble. Bass is too deep for his slender organs. In him the cerebellum is smaller than in woman. And, if mutilated early, he has no masculine desires. If he be mutilated

after puberty, or *at* that period, those desires remain, but are feeble.

‘Injuries done to the cerebellum affect sexual feeling according to the condition they produce in that organ. Do they concuss and paralyze it? The feeling is extinguished. Do they inflame it? The feeling is rendered more intense. Wounds and blows received by soldiers in battle, and by men, on other occasions, prove all this. Blisters applied, and setons introduced, immediately over the cerebellum, might be cited to the same effect. By communicating sympathetically irritation to the cerebellar organ beneath them, and producing, at times, some inflammation in it, they awaken strong venereal desires. At other times, by acting revulsively, and drawing irritation from it, they moderate those desires. The Baron Larrey, and other writers on military medicine and surgery, record cases in which injuries inflicted on the cerebellum produced a diminution, and, at times, a disappearance of the testicles. Yet those authors were no Phrenologists; they had, therefore, no theories to sustain. They faithfully reported the cases they had witnessed. They have recorded also many other facts corroborative of the doctrine we are defending.

‘It is now satisfactorily established, that erotomania consists in an inflammatory affection of the cerebellum; and it is further ascertained, that that disease usually occurs in those whose cerebellum is largely developed. The temperature of their skin, moreover, immediately over that portion of the brain is preternaturally high. The most successful treatment of the complaint testifies also very strongly to its seat and character. It consists in venesection, united to topical blood-letting, by leeches or cups, from the occipital region, and cold applications to the same part. Applications to the genital organs are nugatory. Nor is this all. When confirmed lechers die of apoplexy (an event by no means uncommon) it is almost always of the *cerebellar* kind. In such cases, venereal desires, inordinately strong, usually premonish of the attack.

‘Such are some of our reasons, but far from the whole of them, for believing that the organ of Amativeness is seated in the cerebellum. And what has Dr. Jackson to oppose to them? A few

experiments made by Flourens about ten years ago, but never fully confirmed by any subsequent ones. Our author tells us indeed, that those made by Bouillaud and Magendie confirmed the experiments of Flourens 'to a great extent.' But we reply — and facts sustain us in doing so — that they fell to *no small extent short* of such confirmation. And similar experiments, made by others, gave them no degree of confirmation at all.

'What were the experiments of Flourens, Bouillaud and Magendie? — Torturing 'vivisection' of animals, which turned *physiology* into *pathology* — *health* into *disease* of exquisite acuteness — and could not fail, therefore, to alter very greatly, if not to subvert and destroy entirely, all natural action. This is more especially true of 'vivisection,' when perpetrated on *nervous matter*, the most easily affected of any in the system. And that is the very kind, on which the experimenters made havock. They *mutilated* and *destroyed* nervous matter, to learn its healthy and *natural mode of acting* !! No wonder they did not discover the truth they sought for. It would have been wonderful if they had. If we wish to discover natural and healthy nervous phenomena, we must look for them in a natural and healthy condition of the system; not amidst the tortures and mutilations of *live-dissection*. As well might we seek for healthy bile in a disordered liver, healthy urine in disordered kidneys, or sanity of mind in a deranged brain. We fully concur with Charles Bell, that 'it is doubtful whether the *contradictory* practice of cultivating *physiology*, by the cutting up of living bodies, and thus throwing them into a *pathological* state, has not propagated more error than truth. As evidence in favor of this view of the subject, it is well known, that it is a rare occurrence for any two of those experimenters to agree in their results.'*

We shall notice another misrepresentation of our author, which, however gross in its nature and reprehensible in its design, is still more remarkable, on account of its impudence. It shows clearly that the only limit of the writer's falsification, is his inability to extend it. It is as follows: —

* *Lexington Journal of Medicine, &c.* pp. 257 — 261.

'*Discoveries in Anatomy.* (By Gall and Spurzheim.) We apprehend that these cannot be considered of a very clear and decided importance, so long as their *reality* is disputed by *eminent anatomists.*' * * * 'For our own part, we cannot be perfectly satisfied of the reality and undoubted claim of the great apostles of Phrenology to more than *one discovery*, and that is the swelling in the *spinal marrow of the calf.*' — pp. 72–73.

The reality of the anatomical discoveries of Gall and Spurzheim declared to be disputed by 'eminent anatomists!' and the memory of those illustrious men taunted, by the expression of a doubt, whether they ever discovered any thing, save the 'swelling in the spinal marrow of the calf.' Unheard of effrontery and brazenness in untruth! and matchless impertinence in the manner of expressing it!! Who and where are the 'eminent anatomists,' that *now* dispute what every *common anatomist* is prepared to prove? Let them be named, that their pretension to eminence, and their denial, may be a matter of record. But they cannot; because they do not exist; nor, however, the case might have stood previously, have any such existed for many years. All qualified judges, whether phrenologists, or anti-phrenologists, friends or foes, have long acknowledged the importance of the contributions of Gall and Spurzheim, to the science of anatomy. They first taught and exhibited practically, the true method of analyzing the brain * — that which is now universally pur-

* Hear what is said on this subject by a late able writer in the *Foreign Quarterly Review.* No. III. p. 11.

'Previously to these anatomists (Gall and Spurzheim) the brain was considered as a pulpy mass, in which the whole nervous system had its origin. If by chance any attempt was made to assign a function to any particular part, to explain its use or nature, the success was as small, as the epithets by which those parts were named were uncouth. Neither was this extraordinary. Let us suppose that any muscle of the body, the soleus maximus, for instance, had always been cut though transversely, it would always have presented a transverse section of its mass; but no such idea as we now have of its fibrous texture could have been formed. But the mere inspection of a muscle at once denotes its fibrous texture, which in the brain is not so evident; and the *phrenological anatomists* have the merit of a very important discovery, in showing that the white substance of the brain is not less truly fibrous than the soleus muscle.' * * * Let it be remembered that two great facts have been incontroverti-

sued. Nor does their merit, as anatomists, consist *exclusively in what they themselves have done*. Their example turned the attention of other anatomists to the brain and nerves, much more generally and actively, than it had ever been before. From this have resulted the discoveries of Mr. Bell, and other inquirers, in that department of the animal system, whose influence is so paramount over all the rest. But for Gall and Spurzheim, those discoveries might have been postponed for ages. Great men do more good by exciting and directing the labors of others, than by their own personal exertions. The leader of an army, though his sword be idle on the day of battle, may be, notwithstanding, the main cause of the victory gained. — If the writer does not know all this, his ignorance is much deeper than we thought it; and if he does, we leave to others to comment on his principles and conduct as they deserve.

But perhaps the most atrocious part of the Article remains to be noticed. It is that in which the writer speaks of the tendency of Phrenology to encourage crime. His views shall be given in his own words.

bly established (by Gall and Spurzheim) — 1st, the possibility of unrolling the convolutions of the brain; 2d, the fibrous texture of the white substance.'

Of the same character is the evidence furnished by Reil, Loder, and Cloquet, themselves distinguished for their knowledge of anatomy. The former of these has declared publicly that in witnessing a dissection or two of the brain, by Dr. Gall, he had learnt more than he thought it possible for a man to discover in the course of a life-time. Loder also speaks in the highest terms of Gall and Spurzheim's discoveries in cerebral anatomy. And in his great work on the Anatomy of Man, Cloquet has copied every plate of the human brain, published previously by the founders of Phrenology. Why? Because they were the best extant. In other words, they were an improvement on all that had preceded them.

Other instances of testimony to the same effect might be adduced in abundance. In fine; the discovery of the circulation of the blood is not more universally conceded to Harvey, nor that of the identity of electricity and lightning to Franklin, than the discovery of the present improved mode of dissecting the brain is to Gall and Spurzheim. Yet we are audaciously told, that those two great anatomists never discovered any thing, save a 'swelling in the spinal marrow of the calf.'!!

‘There seems to us to be a little too much of that excessive charity about it, which weeps over the sufferings of the atrocious malefactor, and is especially anxious, lest the strict execution of the laws should encroach a little on the rights of scoundrels. The direct and necessary conclusion from Phrenology, in our view of it, is that great allowance should be made in cases of crime, which indeed we should rather incline to regard as evidence of insanity, or organic derangement; and though such a conclusion is not distinctly perceived by phrenologists,—certainly not by all of them,—some very decided approaches to it seem to us to appear in the ‘Elementary Principles of Education,’ of which, indeed, the whole tendency, in our view, is to diminish the horror of guilt. The motto, ‘principles not men,’ has often served as a decent disguise for the most slavish truckling,—and we believe that it is in like manner possible to refine away our objections to wicked agents into an impersonality of crime, which, as it can have no existence, can excite little horror and no alarm. Every thing is to be treated gently. It is wrong to believe that infanticide is a more unnatural crime than any other murder; because “the natural love of offspring is very weak in some women.”’ p. 74.

Of the style in which these charges are expressed we forbear to speak. It is so coarse that it cannot be suitably commented on, except in terms which we must not use. But on the charges themselves we shall offer a few remarks; though even they can scarcely be spoken of in a tone becoming the sobriety of science.

Are the charges true? To this question, the author himself, *practised and petrified as he is in mendacity*, will not dare, with an uplifted hand, to answer affirmatively. He would dread some fearful vengeance from the skies, in retribution of such an act.

That through indiscretion and headlong enthusiasm, coupled with a want of judgment, some of the tenets of Phrenology may have been pushed so far, by a forced interpretation of them, as to assume a *seeming* tendency to extenuate crime, may perhaps be true. Much mischief has been done to the science, by incompetent pretenders to it. What then? Must we forego the certain benefits that are to result from the *use* of every discovery or improvement, lest we may possibly be injured by the *abuse* of it? Must no risk of temporary evil be incurred, for the sake of attaining a permanent good? — Away with such silliness! — and the article in the North American abounds in it. What is there so

valuable and impervertible, that abuse may not turn it to bad account? Nothing, as all experience shows. The most accomplished chirographers and engravers become the most dangerous counterfeiters; eloquence has been fruitful in bloodshed and crime; and even liberty, literature, science, and religion, have all, by abuse, been perverted, at times, to the safety of 'malefactors,' the benefit of 'scoundrels,' and the annoyance and prejudice of innocence and virtue. But men who were themselves the worst of malefactors have been the cause of this. The evil produced was not incorporated in the nature of the things abused. It was the result of the mal-administration of them. Nor does he deserve to be accounted a benefactor of his race, who, under color of the possible injuries a discovery may occasion, endeavors to prevent its certain benefits.

That Medical Jurisprudence is yet in a very defective condition, is acknowledged by all who have a competent acquaintance with it. It scarcely ranks among the sciences. That in judicial proceedings, many persons have been convicted of crimes, and sentenced to punishment, who ought to have been pronounced insane, consigned to hospitals and subjected to medical treatment, cannot be doubted. Instances of this description might be easily adduced. In the writings of Spurzheim and other phrenologists they are numerous. The case of Earl Ferrers, who was executed for murder, in 1760, might be cited as a striking example. That that unfortunate nobleman was deranged in his intellect, we think it impossible for any one to doubt, who knows aught of the difference between sanity and insanity. His whole conduct was indicative of *ferocious* madness. To complete the evidence to this effect, madness was hereditary in his family. Yet, in the face of all this, a court and a jury, for want of sufficient information on the subject, adjudged him guilty, and the law was executed on him.

Not a little of the evil here referred to, arises from the ignorance that prevails in courts of justice, and in society at large, on the subject of *Monomania*. It is not generally understood or believed — indeed it *can* be understood by but few, that an indi-

vidual may be completely and even highly insane on *one* subject, and perfectly sane on every other. The reason of this want of knowledge and belief is plain. The mass of mankind are uninformed of the compound character of the brain. They do not know, therefore, that one portion of it may be diseased, producing partial madness, while all the other portions, being in a healthy condition, the few faculties attached are sound.

On this topic, so essential to the due administration of justice, phrenologists are anxious to shed the requisite light, convinced that Phrenology is the only source of *true* light in relation to it. In this they are not, according to the insinuation of our author, actuated by a wish to *prevent* the *encroachment of the law* on the '*rights of scoundrels.*' Leaving that business to *himself*, as an agent better fitted for it, their object is, to prevent, if possible, undeserved encroachment on the rights of the innocent, the unfortunate, and the virtuous. And that end can be attained only by diffusing through society such knowledge, as may enable judges and jurors to decide correctly, who *is* innocent and unfortunate, and who vicious and guilty — who has committed an act of violence under the influence of *a diseased* propensity, which he *could not resist*; and who, in a state of freedom from disease, has done it, in gratification of depraved passions, which he *made no effort to resist*. This it is, in the phrenological code, constitutes the difference between sanity and insanity, guilt and innocence; and to render it an object of stricter inquiry, and more cautious and better directed deliberation, with those who control judicial proceedings, is one of the earnest wishes of phrenologists, and one of the tendencies of their science. And though witlings may, for a few years more, continue to assail them with their stale jests, sciolists and fanatics censure and denounce them, and conceited coxcombs affect to sneer at them, the enlightened and judicious will approve of their labors, the virtuous will applaud them, and the world at length afford them its sanction, and adopt their doctrines. Encouraged by this belief, and ambitious of co-operating with their brethren in Europe, in the establishment of truth, and the im-

provement of their race, the phrenologists of the United States, respectfully inviting the high and fair-minded of their fellow-citizens to an unprejudiced examination of the tenets they profess, and the views they maintain, and setting at defiance the artifices of their enemies, are resolved to persevere in their exertions, until the great work of the science shall be complete. That their course is obstructed by difficulties, which nothing but patience and toil can surmount, they have not now to learn. But they have counted the cost and are prepared to meet it. Nor will they suffer themselves to be insulted and slandered with impunity. Assuming, as their motto, *Nemo nos impune lacessit*, they will convince their opponents, should they persist in their unfair and offensive course, that blows must be taken as well as given. But they will meet and reciprocate manly discussion, not only without dissatisfaction, but with real pleasure.

We shall extract from the article one passage more, on which comment is unnecessary, and might perhaps be held superfluous. It stands self-degraded and self-condemned. It runs thus, a blot in literature : —

‘Of the principal phrenological writers, including Gall and Spurzheim, and with one exception in favor of Mr. Combe, who appears to us to have allowed his natural acuteness and professional tendency to hair-splitting to bias his better judgment, — we can say with sincerity, that to judge from their works, they are alike deficient in learning and accuracy. They appear to us to have picked up, by casual association with well-informed persons, a mass of odds and ends of information, which they have engrafted on their system, without much solicitude about their exact fitness. They have been at the feast of learning, and stolen the scraps.

‘The convenient paganism of ancient Rome, in her march towards universal dominion, took care, that the worshipper every where should find his own Deity among the Gods of the empire. And, in like manner, this doctrine is ready to adopt, without a scruple, whatever any body happens to think wise and interesting, and call it Phrenology, — careless, so long as a multitude can be found to throw up their caps at the word of their leader, whether they know or believe the peculiar doctrines, whether they worship the hawk-billed divinities of Dendera, or the Jupiter of the Capitol.’

Though, as already intimated, we shall not animadvert on this passage to any extent, perhaps a few remarks on it may aid the reader, in deciding fully on its character, and completing the opinion he should entertain of its author.

Who, then, we ask, are the 'principal phrenological writers,' against whom this sweeping sentence of condemnation and intended degradation is levelled? At the head of them stand Gall and Spurzheim, whose names in science and letters Fame has registered, in her fairest characters, and Death has affixed his seal to the record. On them, eulogy can bestow no additional honors, nor can obloquy reach them.

The train of followers of these two illustrious men is worthy of such leaders. We cannot name them all; and to particularize among them might seem invidious. That we may not, however, like our author, deal on any topic, only in assertions, we point to the following individuals. Dr. Andrew Combe, whom no one accounts inferior to his brother; Messrs. Mackenzie, Scott, and Simpson, writers of note in the *Edinburgh Phrenological Journal*, and elsewhere; Dr. Gregory of Edinburgh, one of the ablest medical teachers of the day; the Rev. Mr. Welsh, one of the most gifted and learned of the Scottish divines; Professors Elliotson and Connolly, of London; Professor Otto, of Copenhagen; Professor Uccelli, of Florence (recently dead); M. E. de Las Casas, President of the Phrenological Society of Paris, and member of the Chamber of Deputies; M. Cassimer Broussais, Secretary General of said Society; F. J. V. Broussias, M. D., one of the most celebrated physicians of the age; Demarait, Le Blanc, Vimont, M. Royer, of the *Jardin des Plantes*, Paris, (also dead); with scores of others of like standing. We do not say that all these have written extensively on Phrenology, or that they deserve to be denominated 'principal phrenological writers.' They are advocates however of the science, and have written enough to bring them under the ban of their accuser. All these have testified publickly to the truth of Phrenology, and are, therefore, according to the decision of our article-writer, 'deficient

in learning and accuracy' — have all 'picked up, by casual association with well-informed persons, a mass of odds and ends of information,' which they had not even the ability to put decently together — have, in fact, only 'been at the feast of learning, and stolen the scraps' ! !

Such are the calumny, and the insolent manner of uttering it, for which a writer who cants about morality and religion, and pretends to literature, science and refinement, has rendered himself accountable. True ; his name is not attached to the libel ; and therefore no earthly record appears against him. On this ground he is yet secure. But is there no condemnatory record in the court of his own conscience, to which bitter remembrance compels him to plead guilty ? Above all, does nothing whisper to him of a record hereafter, that may appear against him *unsatisfied*, with ample testimony to render it valid ? Or has inveterate habit rendered him callous to conscience, and regardless of **HEREAFTER**, with all its concerns ? We have put the questions. Let him answer them, at his leisure, to the public — and his God.

In any imaginable case, the outrage here committed by our author would have been unpardonable. But, in the case he selected, circumstances were incorporated which not only increased the magnitude of his fault, but trebled its offensiveness.

It is but a few months, since Dr. Spurzheim, one of the great leaders in Phrenology, was flourishing in Boston, in the meridian of his usefulness, and the pride of his fame. From every section and rank of that enlightened city he had won 'golden opinions !' But one sentiment was cherished toward him ; and that was as flattering as it was just. He was admired for his talents and attainments, esteemed for his virtues, venerated for the purity of his life, and an acknowledged sanctity which marked his character, and beloved for the amiable qualities that adorned him.* Will the

* To show that there is no extravagance in this representation, we request the attention of the reader to the following passage, extracted from the 'Ladies' Magazine and Literary Gazette,' a very respectable Boston periodical.

'Those who saw and heard him (Dr. Spurzheim) and in that number is com-

writer deny aught of this? or allege that the tribute to the illustrious stranger was unjust? No; he will not dare to do either. The act would bring down on him public indignation.

Overcome by his labors for the benefit of his race, Spurzheim died, and received sepulchral honors, in which thousands united, and which every one approved, such as had never before been bestowed on a *stranger* in the United States, nor perhaps elsewhere. For this, Boston merited and has received the thanks and praises of a large portion of the philosophical world. And millions yet unborn, will unite, in coming years, to swell the tribute. Let the sequel be marked. It contrasts strongly with the scenes which preceded it.

Scarcely had the voice of the philosopher faded on the ears that had listened to it with rapture, and the tomb closed on his corporeal remains, when with a fellness of purpose scarcely short of sacrilege, the writer breaks into the sanctuary of the dead, and rends asunder the cerements of the grave, drags to light the intellectual and moral remains of the **GREAT DECEASED**, and offers them indignities, from which every human feeling recoils! Thus does the hyena glut itself on the grave. But it has a motive, which all must obey, and therefore approve: hunger impels it. Not so with the contributor to the *North American*. A heartless wantonness, or some other cause more dark and damnatory, urged him to the act. If, under the recollection of all this his days are tranquil, and his nights peaceful, his condition is deplorable.

With this we take leave of the article, though many points in it remain untouched. Nor could we reply fully to them all, detached and unconnected as they are, without extending this paper to a treatise. We have discussed, however, the most important of them; with what effect the public will judge. Of the remainder we shall only say, that they are neither more substantial nor better

prised our best and most eminent people, gave him not merely their admiration, but their esteem, reverence, and love. They felt that he was a friend of the human race, and that in honoring him they honored the noblest of human virtues, benevolence.'

handled than those we have examined. They are stated as uncandidly, and as feebly maintained, and accompanied by a manner no less objectionable. It is with real satisfaction, therefore, that we turn from them to something else less offensive. Nor shall any thing short of a sense of duty not to be resisted, induce us to admit them again to our thoughts.

We have heard, of late, as well as formerly, apprehensions expressed, by intelligent and conscientious men, as to some of the supposed tendencies of Phrenology, especially that towards FATALISM, and the *legitimation of crime*. It is not our practice to trouble ourselves much about the probable influence of opinions in science, before inquiring into their foundation. Nor without such inquiry, as may lead to a thorough understanding of them, is it possible to foresee their influence. If, on examination, we find an opinion to be true, we adopt it, fully convinced that its tendency is good; if untrue, we reject it, under an equal conviction, that its tendency is evil. For, that truth is always salutary, and error prejudicial in its effects, is as unquestionable as any other law of nature. Let the conscientiously scrupulous, then, make themselves correctly acquainted with Phrenology, and they will be competent to judge of all its tendencies. Nor will they find one of them at war with the interests of man, either here or hereafter: on the contrary, they concur in direct promotion of them. On the point we are considering, this might be deemed a sufficient reply; and it is tantamount to that we have usually given. On the present occasion, however, it is our wish to afford every possible satisfaction, and to remove, as far as we can, all objections, even in the form of scruples, to the science we are defending. We shall, therefore, so far deviate from our customary rule, as to offer a few remarks on the dreaded tendency of Phrenology to Fatalism.

Here, as in all other cases, the apprehension and dislike cherished towards the science arise either from an entire ignorance of it or the entertainment of unfounded opinions respecting it. The dread of it has been excited not by the Phrenology of Gall and

Spurzheim, but by that of the Edinburgh Review, the London Quarterly, Blackwood's Magazine, and other like establishments, that have made it their business to traffic in counterfeits of it, to bring its genuine currency into disrepute. Such is the prostitution of the press, in science and letters, no less than in politics.

If, say those who doubt and fear, some men bring into the world with them organs of theft and lying, combat and murder, they will and must exercise them in the commission of crime, as certainly and naturally, as the wasp stings, the serpent bites, or the tiger indulges his appetite for blood. Nature has looked on them with an evil eye, and branded them as felons, by a malign organization; and the hand of Destiny drags them into guilt. In its relation to such persons, *crime* is but a name, and points to deeds as innocent in them, as in the inferior animals. If some men receive, from the hand of their Creator, the fatal gift of an organ in the brain, rendering them as fierce and blood-thirsty as catamounts or tigers, they are no more culpable than those animals for acting in obedience to it. Where, in justice, is the moral responsibility of such beings, for aught they may perpetrate, under an impulse, the native growth of their constitution, and which therefore they cannot resist? and how unfounded and how dangerous — how hostile to all that is correct in principle, and valuable in practice, must Phrenology be, in inculcating such tenets? It confounds virtue and vice, and proclaims the malefactor as innocent as the philanthropist; or, rather, it expunges the term malefactor from the English language, and its synonyme from every language. Such is the train of thought, which many honest men indulge respecting the science, and such the remarks they frequently utter.

We reply to them, that Phrenology teaches no such doctrine as is here ascribed to it. The view thus given of it is at war with all its fundamental principles, and exists only in the fancy of those who have no knowledge of it, or is the fabrication of its enemies, who have conspired to destroy it.

Man brings into the world with him no organs *necessarily* of theft and murder; but such as may become so, by *neglect and*

abuse. He has no organs naturally and essentially of evil tendency ; but he has such as may lead to evil, if not disciplined and held under due control ; and whether he will thus train and govern them, is a matter of choice with him. He has received from nature the capacity to do so, and if he neglect to avail himself of it, the fault and the misfortune are both his own. His CREATOR has done him justice ; and all things will go well, provided he be just to himself. In a word, all men not defective in constitution receive from nature the same cerebral organs, accompanied by their respective faculties, differing only in strength ; and, instead of being any of them evil in the abstract, they are all in themselves necessary and useful, fitting our race for the station it occupies ; and if the exercise of them be productive of evil, the cause will be found in its excess or misapplication ; both of which may be easily prevented. In no case, therefore, does Destiny lead to guilt ; in none is nature to blame ; nor does man suffer except by his own neglect or misdeeds. Such is the general doctrine of Phrenology, on the topic we are considering. To come directly to the point.

To all correct observers of human nature it is known, that different persons bring into the world with them propensities differing greatly in strength, and *ruling* propensities not only different, but opposite in their characters. Some persons are instinctively benevolent, generous, just, and forgiving ; and others, morose quarrelsome, selfish, trickish, and vindictive. Children born of the same parents, and educated under the same roof, and by the same instructors and governors, often manifest, from the cradle, these opposite dispositions. While some of them will weep over an injury done to a companion or a domestic animal, others often rejoice in inflicting it ; and while some liberally distribute among their associates their cakes, apples, marbles, and toys, others lay their accounts to hoard to the utmost, or, in some way, convert to their own gratification all that is given to them, and, by overreaching their playmates, to add to their store. These facts, we say, are familiar to every observer.

It is plain then that some individuals are, *by nature*, more prone to excesses and vices, than others, and will be led to the commission of them by weaker temptations. By metaphysicians and those accounted orthodox moralists, this proneness is located in the *mind*, and by phrenologists in the *brain*; and this is the only difference between them. They both acknowledge its existence, and also its influence on character, but entertain discordant views respecting its seat.

In what respect then is there more of fatalism in the doctrine of phrenologists, than in that of metaphysicians? Both admit that nature incorporates in the constitution of man, certain propensities, which if not restrained, may lead to vice. Is it clear that those propensities may be more easily and certainly restrained, by being rooted in *spirit*, than if rooted in *matter*? We confess ourselves unable to perceive any just ground of conviction, that such is the case; nor do we believe that any exists: on the contrary, we are inclined to consider the reverse the more probable opinion. It seems to us an easier task to change compound matter, than simple spirit; and a less hazardous or rather pernicious one when performed. To *change* that which is *simple*, is, from the very nature of the case, to *revolutionize* it so completely, as to transform it into something entirely different — to take from it its former mode of existence, or rather its former *self*, and convert it into a *new and distinct entity*. That which does not consist of parts, admits of no *partial* change. In such a being, one alteration is as thorough as another; and every one is *entire*, and amounts to revolution. In the necessity of things, we say, this must be so. Nor can one part of spirit be arrayed against another, to counterbalance its propensity; because, in relation to it, part and whole are the same. Hence, the prospect of changing or eradicating a vicious propensity, were it seated in the mind, is hopeless — except by the transformation of the mind into another being, different in its substance, and in all its qualities. Besides; a change of the bad qualities of spirit is necessarily ac-

accompanied by a change of its good ones also ; inasmuch as the same qualities cannot be inherent in two entities radically different. According to this, the spirit of a person, after receiving an education, must differ as essentially from his spirit, before he was educated, as a quadruped differs from a reptile, or a bird from a fish.

But, with regard to a propensity seated in *compound matter*, the case is different. *It* can be changed, without a revolution, or any destruction of identity. It arises from the character of the organ, in which it is located ; and that organ can be altered in its qualities, and still remain the same in its substance. To the truth of this, observation and reason jointly testify. Daily experience evinces, that all living matter can be greatly changed and improved by training. And this is as true of cerebral matter, as of any other kind. The brain can be increased in size, and amended in tone, by suitable exercise, as certainly as either the arm of the blacksmith, or the leg of the opera-dancer. And this change can be produced in *parts* of that viscus, as easily as in the whole of it. All this may be tested by experiment, and is therefore susceptible of proof, if true, and of refutation, if false.

On these principles, it is easy to show, that, far from being friendly to Fatalism, Phrenology is the only scheme of mental philosophy that is directly opposed to it. It is the only one that embraces and explains that beautiful system of checks and balances, which the mental faculties constitute ; and which, to escape Fatalism, they *must* constitute. Did all these faculties lean in one direction, they would inevitably run to excess, and lead of necessity to crime, because counterbalances would be wanting. But leaning, as they do, in different and opposite directions, nothing is necessary to form the balance, but to apportion the strength of the faculties to each other. And that end can be attained by sound education. In illustration of this view of the subject, it may be aptly enough observed, that the several parts of the body — the limbs, trunk, and neck — are retained in their position, by

sets of *antagonizing* muscles. These sets, when sound, check and balance each other, and keep all things straight. But, if one of them become paralyzed, or otherwise debilitated, its antagonizers, continuing to act, drag the part out of its natural direction, and produce deformity and mischief. And such would be the case with the mental faculties, did they not antagonize and balance each other.

Men are seduced into vice, by their animal faculties, and withheld from it by their moral and reflecting ones. Let the latter be so strengthened by education, then, as to predominate over the former, and a life of morality and virtue will be the result. To explain this more fully.

The crimes that disturb society, and people our jails and penitentiaries with culprits, are murder, theft, assault and battery, fraud, treason, arson, and rape; and these are the product of five unrestrained animal propensities; Destructiveness, Combativeness, Acquisitiveness, Secretiveness, and Amativeness. Let these propensities be held in due subordination, by the higher faculties, to be mentioned presently, and the crimes referred to will cease to exist. Restrain Destructiveness, and there will be no arson or murder; Combativeness, no assaults; Acquisitiveness, neither theft nor robbery; Secretiveness, no fraud or treason; and Amativeness, no violation of female chastity. And education, judiciously conducted, and carried to the proper extent, *can* place these propensities under the control of morality and reason. Merely because they have an existence, then, and are the growth of cerebral organs, they do not lead of necessity to guilt. Under proper regulation, they are not only innocent, but essential to the being and the well-being of man. Their *excesses* and *abuses* alone are criminal and injurious. And, as already mentioned, *they* can be effectually prevented by means of education. We need scarcely repeat, that this is not the doctrine of Fatalism. But the matter may be still further simplified, and placed, we think, beyond denial or equivocal.

Is Destructiveness the unruly organ? and is the propensity in the individual, to commit murder, strong? That propensity stands alone, and is opposed *directly* by *six* other organs and their faculties, two or three of them nearly or quite as powerful as itself. These are Benevolence, which whispers kindness and mercy; Veneration, which interposes the prohibitions of religion; Conscientiousness, which proclaims the injustice of the deed; Cautiousness, which exclaims to the perpetrator, 'Beware!' Love of Approbation, which warns of the loss of reputation the crime may produce; and Causality, which admonishes of the ruinous effects of such lawless violence, not on the murderer alone, but also on society. Several other faculties join this moral and intellectual confederacy, and exert an indirect influence in the prevention of murder.

Does Acquisitiveness invite strongly to theft or robbery; Secretiveness, to fraud or treachery; Combativeness, to the commission of an unprovoked assault; or Amativeness, to the violation of female honor? The same moral, reflective, and social faculties rise in array, to prohibit the crime. And, in a mind well disciplined, the prohibition is certain. To neither Fatalism, nor the legitimation of crime, therefore, is Phrenology favorable. On the contrary, the analysis of the human mind it presents, and the scheme of education it recommends, are directly opposed to both of them — much more directly, as well as more powerfully and effectually, than any thing and every thing in the writings of metaphysicians, from Aristotle to Abercrombie. Indeed, as far as we are informed, Phrenology is the only system of mental philosophy, which demolishes Fatalism, and gives freedom to the mind. On the principles it has unfolded, **FREE WILL**, the gordian knot, which no metaphysician has been able either to cut or untie, becomes a problem easily solved. Nor is it possible to solve it by any system, except one which gives to uncompounded mind a compound apparatus, to work with, so arranged, that one part of it may counterbalance and rectify another. It is thus that, through-
out creation,

'All Nature's difference keeps all Nature's peace.'

All other systems are impotent, in their struggle against Fatalism, and, in their effort to evade it, run into contradiction, mysticism, and absurdity. Being erroneous themselves, they cannot *annihilate* erroneous doctrines. One error may *supplant* another, but not *destroy* it. One volume of morning mist, rolling against another, may derange and displace it; but the solar radiance only can dissipate them both. In like manner, truth alone extinguishes error. Hence the extinction of Fatalism, by Phrenology.

We marvel much, that our author did not prefer against Phrenology the fashionable charge of a tendency to Materialism. To have done so would have been quite worthy of his sapience and orthodoxy.

Had he availed himself of this artifice, our reply would have been, that Phrenology can be shown, by a fair analysis of the subject, to be as free from materialism, as any other system of mental philosophy. Every system calls in matter to the aid of mind, in certain intellectual operations; and Phrenology only calls it in to take part in the whole of them. The one therefore is as genuine materialism as the other, only not quite so broad and rational.

As well may we deny to mind all participation in the phenomena of matter as to matter all participation in those of mind. The two substances are so mutually essential in the economy of our systems, that without the one the other would be useless. Were we all matter, we should be just as well adapted to our present situation, and as competent to our duties, as we would be, were we all mind. The union of both is indispensable in all we do, as moral and intellectual beings. In our present condition, the hypothesis of pure spirituality, as connected with any act we perform, is as gross an error, as it would be, to allege that matter is alone capable of thought. Our CREATOR united our mind and our matter, and made them essential to each other, in every earthly act. And

what **HE** has joined together, let no man put asunder — even in imagination.

To conclude. Though, in composing this article, we have restrained ourselves, as far as we thought the case required, in the employment of terms and expressions of disapprobation and reproach, some persons may, notwithstanding, consider the language used at times toward our author unnecessarily severe. However strong our desire may be to defer and conform to public taste and feeling, we can neither concede nor apologize for aught we have said. The writer of the article has been proved to be a high, and we fear an irreclaimable offender against all that renders life a boon to be desired — truth, honor, justice, reputation ; and whatever pertains to the minor virtues of charity and candor, decorum and courtesy. His claim to lenity and generous treatment, therefore, is forfeited. He who recklessly violates both law and custom in relation to others, *outlaws himself*.

ART. II. — *London Phrenological Society, Panton Square, Haymarket. Commencement of a New Session. Monday, Nov. 5th, 1832. [From the London Lancet.]*

ON Monday last, the first meeting of a new session of the Phrenological Society of London was held at the usual place of assembly in Panton Square. Dr. Elliotson, President, in the chair. The benches were pretty well filled, and a very interesting paper, written by the Marquis de Moscati, which we subjoin, was read. Previous to this, however, the members were briefly addressed by

THE PRESIDENT, who took the opportunity of adverting to the present state of the Society. It was, he observed, the eighth season of its existence, — a liberal and flourishing association, which had arisen from the ashes of a despotic and decaying one. Conducted on bad principles, the original society contained within itself the elements of discord and disunion, and came to the ground. Those of its members who entertained liberal and enlarged feelings, withdrew from their uncongenial associates, and formed a new society, — the old institution suffering at once the inevitable fate of all despotic assemblies. In the old Society the powers of government were wielded by the few. In the new one, the principle of self-government was fully established, and the members enjoyed the right of electing the officers by whom the business was to be conducted. The principle was successful, and had brought the Society, happily and prosperously, to its eighth year, notwithstanding the continued and spiteful attacks of a whole tribe of authors, lecturers, and other enemies, and numerous deaths

and removals amongst its members. The triumph was a great one, and owing entirely to the justness of the principles on which the Society was founded. The number of its supporters had gradually and largely increased, and they had had the additional satisfaction of seeing many other similar Societies formed throughout the kingdom, besides a most important one in Paris, in which city, as well as in England, a large number of the most eminent men of the day had added themselves to the ranks of the phrenologists, — verifying, by the number of institutions which had been thus established, the observation of the founder of the first phrenological society, that he should live to see edition after edition of his work. In London, especially, had the science obtained numerous supporters. Large numbers of men existed in this capital, as firm believers in it as any one then present, and who would willingly also proclaim themselves ardent phrenologists, had they but courage to withstand the absurd railings of its ignorant and interested opponents. He (the President) in fact never now met with any person who knew anything of the science, who spoke against it. (*Hear, hear.*) Indeed, phrenology had lived to see the day in which it had, by the force of its truth, overcome all the ridicule of its enemies. At this moment it was thought, even by its greatest opponents, absurd to object *altogether* to its doctrines, as was formerly the case. There were few who did not admit the truth of the leading principles of the science, though they would not confess to a belief in its details. If, however, they believe so much of phrenology, he was well satisfied that they believed enough to make them yield credence to a great deal more, and become good phrenologists, if they would but continue the same course of observation that led them so far on the road to truth. As a sign of the times, he would mention the fact of a gentleman being now about to give lectures on phrenology at one of the largest scientific institutions in England — Mr. Grainger's school of anatomy and medicine in the Borough; and also the commencement of lectures on phrenology at the London Hospital. In

fact he had lately seen advertisements announcing lectures on that science, for the first time at three public and celebrated places, the London Institution being the third. These were facts which their adversaries had once little contemplated, and he had no doubt that a fourth source of congratulation would ere long be presented to them at the University of London, where, though he had never for one moment attempted to press the subject, he had no doubt he should live to see phrenology taught, in the natural course of events. He had for a long time lectured phrenologically on insanity at St. Thomas's Hospital, taking Gall and Spurzheim as a text-book in his remarks, without being in any way opposed in doing so, matters being there conducted in a very liberal way; and every year he should continue to enlarge on those views. In conclusion, he pressed on the Society the duty of each individual endeavoring to procure as many new members to the institution, as they had opportunities of securing. He would now draw their attention to a paper which had been addressed to him by a gentleman of extraordinary talents and acquirements, M. de Moscati, an Italian, at present residing in London, and now a warm supporter of the views of phrenologists, a military man, who had in early life joined the standard of Napoleon, and been with him in all his campaigns. In the midst of his duties, however, as a soldier, he had contrived to devote many hours to study, and amongst other of his extraordinary faculties was an almost unexampled power of learning languages, which he turned to such an account that he had made an acquaintance with not less than thirty-six languages, and was a perfect master of twenty of them, (Mazzofanti of Bologne being the only man who excels him in the knowledge of languages,) — the Latin, Hebrew, and Greek being amongst the latter number. The learned President concluded amidst the warm applause of the members.

The following is the paper of this extraordinary linguist, which we may preface by stating, that it is printed verbatim from the MS. drawn up by the author, without, as we have clearly ascertained, his having derived the slightest aid towards the perfection

of its composition in the English language from any individual, either in the orthography or the choice of words. This mastery of the language was obtained in about four months, at the end of which period from commencing its study (within twelve months of this time) the Marquis lectured in English at the Royal Institution. The paper was addressed to the President, and may be headed as follows : —

HISTORY AND CONVERSION OF AN ANTI-PHRENOLOGIST.

Invidus, iracundus, iners, vinosus, amator.
 Nemo adeo ferus est, ut non mitescere possit,
 Si modo culturæ patientum accommodet aurem.

Horace, Epist. Lib. 1, Epist. 1.

For a long period of years I was, if not an able, certainly one of the most obstinate adversaries of craniology and phrenology. When the celebrated Dr. Gall published his first Essay on Craniology, I was an active soldier, but in the mean time a well-informed and very studious young man. Excited by the novelty of the system, I perused his work with great attention, and thinking that it was imposture, I wrote in the *Efemeridi Letterarie di Venezia*, a criticosatirical article against it. Dr. Gall did me the honor of replying to my remarks, and refuted all of them by a series of facts. However, he could not convince me, for I was stubborn as a mule, and I answered his experimental observations with acrimony, and accused him of quackery and insanity.

Dr. Gottfried of Heildeberg, with whom I was acquainted, informed me that Dr. Gall wished to have an interview with me, in order to demonstrate to me, on the skulls, *the truth* of what he advanced, and I disbelieved ; but I declined, and did everything in my power to ridicule his system in society, with all my military friends, and through the German, French, and Italian periodicals. But when I saw that notwithstanding my repeated diatribes, and the opposition of the medical faculty, Dr. Gall went on in making converts to his doctrine, I determined to see him, and endeavored to deceive

him by presenting myself under the dress of a servant. Colonel Bucher, of the fifth dragoons, took me with him to the house of Dr. Gall, who was in Paris, and told him that he wished to know his opinion about my head ; that I was an Italian, had lived with him as a servant for seven years, and during that interval had been much attached and very faithful to him ; that it was for those good qualities that he had endeavored to have me instructed, but that although he had given me several masters, *for nearly three years*, I had scarcely learnt to read and write *Italian*, but had not yet acquired the French language.

I remember as if it were now, Dr. Gall opened his large eyes, fixed them on my countenance with a look of surprise and doubt, and then began to feel my head. While he was making his observations, he now and then murmured, ‘ *Ce n’est pas vrai ! Ce n’est pas possible !!* ’ Shortly after having examined my cranium, he said to Bucher that an individual with a head so well formed could not be of *the character* he had just mentioned ; that on the contrary, unless I was blind and deaf, by the conformation of my cranium, he thought I was able to acquire *general knowledge, particularly the languages*, and geographical and astronomical sciences. Moreover, that if I had applied according to the development of my organs, I must be a distinguished person and a *mad poet*. When I heard this last remark, I told Bucher, *Ce n’est pas bien ! tu as trahi mon secret*. I do not wonder at the Doctor’s accuracy. Bucher swore that he had not betrayed me. Gall remonstrated against my suspicion, and assured me of his being totally unacquainted with my trick ; but I remained doubtful about the sincerity of both of them, and continued to be an adversary to Gall and his system.

However, from that day I began to study craniology, and made use of the skulls of the killed in battle ; but I studied as one of those who *oculos habent, et non vident, aures habent et non audiunt*, and my obstinacy rendered me inaccessible to persuasion. Often when I knew well the character of some of my soldiers who died, I sent the skulls to Dr. Gall, and requested his opinion, and

I must say, that more than *once* his remarks were truly astonishing; but I persisted in my incredulity. In 1810, one of my lieutenants was killed at the battle of Lintz; he was a Pole of a very violent temper, a bloody duellist, and much addicted to sensuality. I forwarded his skull to Dr. Gall, and in answer to my question, he replied, that it belonged to an individual *very violent, ferocious, and a sensualist*. This time I was the only depository of my secret, and therefore, I determined to remain indifferent to craniology.

For nearly *eight years* I kept my determination; but, in 1817, being in Rome, I was informed that the Inquisitor-General had demanded, and obtained the excommunication of Gall, and of his system. When I read the bull of Pius VII. — *omnibus, ac singulis mandamus*, I was so indignant, that I resolved to vindicate Gall from the usurped despotism of the church, and addressed to M. Julien, of Paris, an article in favor of Gall, and against the bull of Pius VII. and it was published in the *Revue Encyclopédique*. It was also at that epoch that I began seriously to think about craniology, and seeing the great antipathy the inquisitors manifested against it, it seemed to me that it might probably be useful to mankind. Prince Louis of Bavaria, the present king, was at that time in Rome, and, contrary to custom, was one of the most liberal men on earth. Although naturally inclined to *theocracy*, he was favorable to the system of Gall, and at his residence we often discussed on craniology. Canova, Thorvaldsen, Wigar, Landi, Kotzebue, and Professor Atterbom of Stockholm, were warm partizans of Gall, but I in my heart, did not approve of all the inventions of Gall.

In 1824 I saw again Gall at Paris, followed regularly his courses, frequented his society, and was continually putting to him the most difficult questions against his system, and not seldom did this in rather a hasty manner. But Gall, who was a true philosopher, always answered with mildness, and often had the patience of taking several skulls of his collection to prove the truth of his system, and the inaccuracy of my studied cavilling. At this

epoch Spurzheim had remodelled the system of Gall, and had called it phrenology. I must say that Gall was not pleased with his innovations, and more than once in my presence spoke violently against him, calling him a plagiarist, and a quack. However, before his death, Gall approved of several inventions of Spurzheim, and spoke well of his former disciple.

In 1826 I went to Dr. Spurzheim, being quite unknown to him, and requested his opinion with regard to my head. After having examined my cranium for more than five minutes, he gave me a fair description of my moral qualities, and of my intellectual organs. Having asked him whether he thought I was endowed with a great memory, he told me that from the development of several of my intellectual organs, he thought that I had *a local and an almost ocular memory*. This is one of the most striking proofs of the utility and truth of phrenology; for I have had a wonderful memory, but it has only consisted in my almost seeing the place, the book, the page, and the words, of which I was speaking or writing.

In the month of January last, Mr. George Bennett and Mr. William Hall desired me to go with them to Mr. Deville, in the Strand, for they wished to know what he would say about my head. I complied with their request, and was introduced to Mr. Deville as a foreigner, who was anxious of having his opinion on my phrenological conformation. Mr. Deville almost directly gave me a short history of my feelings, of my characteristic propensities, and of my mental qualities. This last convincing proof of the accuracy of phrenological science triumphed over my still reigning uncertainty, and I became a phrenologist, and am convinced that mankind, through the well-applied scientific knowledge of phrenology, may obtain the easiest method of improving the mind, of acquiring the sciences and the arts, of preventing the increase of evil passions, and of removing many, both natural and *governmental* obstacles, which are opposed to the much-desired era of general civilization and general happiness.

Having thus related my aversion and my conversion to phrenol-

ogy, I will now mention the difference I discovered in the manner of examining of the three abovementioned practical phrenologists. Gall generally looked on my countenance with an attentive eye for about a minute, and felt the cranium by putting both his hands on my head, his thumbs touching one another on the organ of benevolence, and the rest of his fingers on the other organs, sentimental and intellectual. After this, he examined the animal part, and then the organs of the forehead. This done, he removed his hands, and begun his observations.

Spurzheim did not look at me, felt my head with both his hands in rather a hasty manner, was for a considerable time feeling my animal propensities, and then, without feeling my frontal organs, keeping his hands on my head, gave me his remarks.

Deville looked at me, but not with the penetrating eye of Gall, removed the hair that covered my forehead, and then felt my head with his right hand, and made his observations in feeling each of my organs.

I must now apologize for my having been so prolix, and beg to be allowed to add, that although we are greatly indebted to Gall and Spurzheim for their obstinate industry, assiduous labors, and unparalleled zeal, with which they have forwarded and promoted the study of craniology and phrenology, they are unjustly styled the *inventors* of the science, for really they have only revived this branch of philosophy which was certainly known to the best ancient philosophers. In fact, Jamblicus informs us, that the disciples of Pythagoras did not admit into their schools any individual, before his visage and head had been diligently examined. Plutarch, in his life of Socrates, says that that philosopher, after having examined the head of Alcibiades, predicted that he would be raised to the highest dignity of his country. Aristotle also, in his philosophical works, has left us convincing proof of his being acquainted with this science, and Gall has often followed his opinions. Plato, in one of his divine dialogues, says, — ‘*Ex fronte, ex capite, ex vultu, etiam in ipso oris silentio, natura loquitur.*’ But to come to an end, I will here relate the following

anecdote. From 1778 to 1782 the Marquis Mascardi was the criminal chief justice of Naples. He had studied the works of La Porta, and the physiology of Cabanis. Whenever a criminal was to be sentenced to death, and although the witnesses proved him to be guilty, he would not confess, he ordered that he should be brought to his residence, and there he diligently examined his head; and here I give two of his judgments:— 1st. ‘*Auditus testibus pro, et contra, visa faciæ, et examinato capite, ad furcas damnamus.*’ 2d, ‘*Auditus testibus pro, et contra, reo ad dene-gandum obstinato, visa faciæ, et examinato capite, non ad furcas, sed ad catenas damnamus.*’

From what I have already mentioned, I think that I have clearly proved my assertions; and in reward of my confession and conversion, I only request to be admitted to the meeting of the Phrenological Society, in order to profit by their scientific researches. (*Great applause.*)

As may readily be supposed, the paper excited great interest, and became the the subject of several remarks, principally from Dr. MOORE, who expressed a desire to know whether there was anything in the development of the learned author’s cranium which could develop the cause of the long and obstinate disbelief of phrenology in the face of evidence so strong and convincing in its favor. The author being present on the occasion here came forward, and offered to submit his head to the examination of the members. The scrutiny, however, was deferred until a careful one could be instituted on another occasion, on a cast which had been taken by (we believe) Mr. Deville, and was to be sent to the Society.

In concluding our notice, we took this opportunity of introducing the able and very learned gentleman to public attention in another character besides that of a phrenologist. A devoted advocate of the truth in the political as well as the literary world, the Marquis Moscati, is at present an exile from the continent, deprived of every farthing of an ample property, and thrown for subsistence

wholly on those talents which were so highly cultivated in youth, and have been so assiduously improved in manhood, and now writes on his cards, in place of high title and splendid domain, the modest, but highly honorable address of 'F. M. Moscati, Professor of the Greek, Latin, Italian, and French Languages, 35, South Bank, Regent's Park.'

To the list of languages enumerated, we might add the German and a score of others, but here are enough named to suggest to our readers the excellent opportunity which the laudable and invaluable offer of the Marquis presents for acquiring a knowledge either of the living or the dead tongues. Such an almost magical learner must be a no less magical teacher, and can only need an introduction to the members of the medical profession and the public in general, to be invited, in innumerable quarters, to communicate to others some portion of the knowledge which he himself possesses to so splendid an extent. Let us add, phrenologically, that organs the most amiable, distinguish the cranium of the noble and worthy professor, and that his connexions in London are, we have every reason to believe, of the highest and most respectable character.

ART. III. — *On the American Scheme of establishing Colonies of Free Negro Emigrants on the Coast of Africa, as exemplified in Liberia.* [From the Edinburgh Phrenological Journal.]

It is a direct consequence of the ignorance which prevails in society of sound practical principles of human nature and its relations, that in public affairs, controversy takes the place of deliberation, decision, and action. Till such principles shall be adopted and acknowledged as standards, the schemes and doings of man must, from their first conception to their last consequences, be an inextricable mass of disputation, — a chaos of conflicting impulses, feelings, and prejudices. The *business* of the most enlightened legislature is *debate*; and parties marshal themselves for combat, each in its own impregnable position, from no two of which do social and national affairs present an aspect approaching to similarity. In Mr. Combe's work on 'the Constitution of Man, considered in relation to external objects,' which offers the practical philosophy for human guidance which is so lamentably wanted, but which is making its way to an assured prevalence, there is a passage strongly impressed on our mind. 'We require only,' says Mr. Combe, 'to attend to the scenes daily presenting themselves in society, to obtain irresistible demonstration of the consequences resulting from the want of a true theory of human nature and its relations. Every preceptor in schools, every professor in colleges, every author, editor, and pamphleteer, every member of parliament, councillor, and judge, has a set of notions of his own, which, in his mind, hold the place of a system of the philosophy of man; and, although he may not have methodized his ideas, or even acknowledged them to himself as a theory, yet they constitute a standard to him, by which he practically judges of all questions in morals, politics, and religion: he advo-

cates whatever views coincide with them, and condemns all that differ from them, with as unhesitating dogmatism as the most pertinacious theorist on earth. Each also despises the notions of his fellows, in so far as they differ from his own. In short, the human faculties too generally operate as instincts, exhibiting all the confliction and uncertainty of mere feeling, unenlightened by perception of their own nature and objects. Hence public measures in general, whether relating to education, religion, trade, manufactures, the poor, criminal law, or to any other of the dearest interests of society, instead of being treated as one general system of economy, and adjusted each on scientific principles in harmony with all the rest, are supported or opposed on narrow and empirical grounds, and often call forth displays of ignorance, prejudice, selfishness, intolerance, and bigotry, that greatly obstruct the progress of improvement. Indeed, unanimity, even among sensible and virtuous men, will be impossible, so long as no standard of mental philosophy is admitted to guide individual feelings and perceptions. But the state of things now described could not exist, if education embraced a true system of human nature and its relations. If Phrenology be true, it will, when matured, supply the deficiencies now pointed out.⁷

Broad as the satire is, that the affairs of society are as yet a ceaseless controversy, we are sometimes apt, for a moment, to forget this inconvenient fact, to expect exceptions, and too rashly to count upon unanimity in what appear, to us at least, very self-evident propositions for social benefit. We confess we did commit this oversight with regard to the settlement of Liberia. If ever there was a human act which seemed to satisfy all our feelings and faculties, it might have been expected to be the first projection and effective realization of that admirable scheme, whose very essence appeared to us to be brotherly love and peace. In a former number,* we adduced Liberia as an example, unique on the face of the earth, of a community based on peace and Christian good-will; and while we unsuspectingly indulged in a luxu-

* Vol. vii. p. 581.

rious contemplation of something like a realization, in our own day, of the paramount truth which Phrenology and Christianity have both made plain, that the Creator has connected happiness, social as well as individual, with the supremacy of the moral sentiments and intellect over the animal propensities, in the mind of man, we did not even glance at the American Association, to which is due the merit of the beautiful experiment, nor dreamed that any friend of justice and mercy could have found a fault in the motives or the acts of that society upon which to hang a censure. We had returned with fresh pleasure to the subject of Liberia,* when investigating the subject of the Negro's capacity for freedom and free labor; and it was after our observations were in type, that we heard that Liberia — yes, even Liberia — was a controversy! that against the American colonizationists, there had risen up certain clamorous and even abusive opponents, who imputed to them sinister designs, hypocritical professions, mischievous intentions, cowardly fears, oppression, cruelty, treachery, and infidelity! In our then total want of information on the grounds of these astounding accusations, suspecting, from the incredible aggravation of the imputations, that feeling more than intellect was operating, and judging of the American Society by its fruits, we could not believe that so fair a child as Liberia could have such a parentage; and we published our continued approbation, resolving to presume favorably of the Society, till irresistible evidence should constrain us to believe the monstrous charges preferred against it.

We have now seen the articles of impeachment, and perused what is called their evidence; and our original surprise at the possibility of accusations at all, is fully equalled by our amazement, that, by persons educated above the pitch of a village school, such abject futility, such unqualified drivelling, could have been actually printed and published.

We are struck with the important fact, that the writers against the Liberian scheme, and their followers, are all, as far as we

* Vol. viii. p. 87.

know, what are termed *Immediatists*, in the slavery abolition question ; — the '*ruat cælum*' philanthropists, who prefer justice with ruin, to justice without it; who, in America, are rendering more difficult and more distant the slave's complete deliverance, by embarrassing the legislatures in their views of its safety and certainty; and in England, are fortunately disregarded by a government that has resolved on measures at once more wise, and more efficiently philanthropic. The outcry against the Colonization Society originated in America, and has been echoed on this side of the water, with a disregard of fact, a want of fairness, and absence of logic, and a confusion of thought, in every way worthy of the class of minds which fail to see, in the sudden discharge of 800,000 Negroes in the British West Indies, and two millions in the United States, dislocation of the frame of society in those countries, and ruin and misery to the very objects of their misplaced benevolence.

The managers of the impeachment are, a Mr. Charles Stuart, the author of a pamphlet published at Liverpool, and a Mr. Lloyd Garrison, a pamphleteer in America; and although the antislavery periodicals, the Reporter and Record, have, with little credit to their discernment, joined in the clamor, they have pinned their faith to Messrs. Stuart and Garrison, and produced nothing beyond extracts from their pamphlets; while a Mr. James Cropper, of Liverpool, writes a letter to Mr. Clarkson, in which, after several sweeping and unsupported averments, abusive epithets, and much matter of no application to the subject, he concludes with recommending Mr. Stuart's pamphlet, to which his letter is printed as a sort of preface. This pamphlet is called '*Prejudice Vincible, or the Practicability of conquering Prejudice by better means than by Slavery and Exile, in relation to the American Colonization Society.*' We have read it with all the attention and impartiality in our power, and have been unable to form any other opinion of it than this, — that while it manifests a marked spirit of special-pleading and unfairness, it fails to substantiate its averments in point of fact, and not less to establish their

relevancy to warrant the inferences drawn from them. In other words, it fails to prove the charges against the Society; and if it had succeeded, it would have left untouched the absolute good of the colony of Liberia.

The author quotes the two fundamental articles of the Society's constitution fairly enough.

'1st, The Society shall be called the American Society for colonizing the *Free* People of Color of the United States.

'2d, The object to which its attention is to be *exclusively* directed, is to promote and execute a plan for colonizing (with their consent) the free people of color residing in our country, to Africa, or such other place as Congress shall deem most expedient.' We regret the alternative as to place; for it tends to weaken the grand argument for the scheme, that it will give a beginning to the civilization of Africa. *De facto*, however, Africa has been chosen, and the reservation, we have reason to think, was a mere deference to Congress, as a matter of form.

Mr. Stuart, unwilling, it would appear, to trust himself with a moment's charitable reflection on these articles, at once puts the worst construction upon them. 'The broad facts of the case,' he says, 'are these: The whole population of the United States is about 13,000,000. Out of this, upwards of 2,000,000 are held in a most degrading and brutal state of personal slavery, under laws worse than even those of the wretched slave colonies of Great Britain.

'Out of the whole, 330,000, though *free*, are in most cases *only partially so*, and are exposed to exceedingly malignant and destructive persecution, merely because they have a skin differently colored from the remaining eleven and a half millions of their fellow-subjects.

'Both these two persecuted classes are rapidly increasing. Their increase terrifies the slave party, and fills them with anxious musings of danger.

'The glaring contradiction of a *free* people being a *slave-holding* people; of eleven or twelve millions of men, calling them-

selves the most free in the world, keeping upwards of 2,000,000 of their unoffending fellow-subjects in the most abject and degrading slavery, affects many, and urges them to seek a remedy. The word of God stands out before others, and bids them blush and tremble at the guilt and danger of their country; while the smothered cry of the oppressed and unoffending poor rises incessantly to God against her.

‘From this state of things it was that the American Colonization Society arose: by this state of things it is that the American Colonization Society subsists. It is agreeable to the slave-master, for it calms his fears. It offers a *remedy* to the man who mourns over the dishonor and inconsistency of his country; and to the man who fears God it commends itself, by pretending to do all that it can for the unoffending poor.’

Bold averment, and utter irrelevancy to the question, ‘are alike conspicuous in what we have quoted.’ The author proceeds: ‘The views of its advocates are frankly expressed in its own constitution, as above quoted, and in its own *reports*. I refer to them all, particularly to the three last, 13th, 14th and 15th, and submit from *them* the following quotations.’

Before giving the quotations, we beg to premise, that we have perused the 13th, 14th and 15th Reports alluded to, and we have not found the passages in these reports. On reading the matter published with the reports, we have found them forming parts of the speeches of members of the Society, which, as such, have been printed in the *res gesta* of their meetings, without being imputable to the Society. It became Mr. Stuart to have candidly stated, that he took his quotations from the speeches of individuals over which the Society had no control, and not from its reports, by which alone it should be judged of. This was due to his readers, that at least they might have so important a distinction before them; and its omission, which could not be accidental, is an example of that unfair partizanism with which we have charged the writer.

The passages are,—

‘1. 13th Report, page 44 :—The present number of this unfortunate, degraded, and anomalous class of inhabitants cannot be much short of half a million, and the number is fast increasing. They are emphatically a mildew upon our fields, a scourge to our backs, and a stain upon our escutcheon. To remove them is mercy to ourselves, and justice (!!!) to them.’ 15th Report, page 24 :—‘The race in question were known, as a class, to be destitute, depraved, the victims of all forms of social misery. The peculiarity of their fate was, that this was not their condition by accident or transiently, but inevitably and immutably, whilst they remained in their present place, by a law as infallible in its operation as any of a physical nature?’ In same 15th Report, page 25 :—‘What is the free black to the slave? A standing, perpetual excitement to discontent. The slave would have then little excitement to discontent, but for the free black: he would have as little to habits of depredation, his next strongest tendency, but from the same source of deterioration !!! In getting rid, then, of the free blacks, the slave will be saved from the chief occasions for suffering, and the owner from inflicting severity.’

‘2. 15th Report, page 26 :—If none were drained away, slaves became inevitably and speedily redundant, &c. &c. When this stage had been reached, what course or remedy remained? Was *open butchery* to be resorted to, as among the Spartans with the Helots; or *general emancipation and incorporation*, as in South America; or *abandonment of the country by the masters?*’* Either of these was a deplorable catastrophe;—could all of them be avoided? and if they could, how? ‘There was but one way, and it was to *provide and keep open a drain for the excess of increase*, beyond the occasion of profitable employment, &c. &c.

*‘In contemplating these alternatives, how can we sufficiently admire the goodness of God, in having provided that the increase of slaves shall *necessarily* lead to emancipation and incorporation! and how can we be sufficiently struck with horror at the deliberate and insolent cruelty of man, in *devising schemes* like this for the perpetuation of slavery! — J. C.’

This scrap of pure nonsense is a specimen of Mr. Cropper.

This drain was already opened.' The *African Repository*, vol. 7, page 246, says, 'Enough, under favorable circumstances, might be removed for a few successive years, *if young females were encouraged to go*, to keep the whole colored population in *check !!!*' How dreadful, thus coolly to rend asunder the sexes, which were made to be each other's mutual strength and solace through earth's dangerous pilgrimage!! And in page 232, anticipating within two generations a result of forty whites to one black, it declares that all uneasiness would then be at an end.

'3. In 14th Report, pages 12 and 13 : — And the slaveholder, so far from having just cause to complain of the Colonization Society, has reason to congratulate himself that in this institution a channel is opened up, in which the public feeling and public action can flow on, without doing violence to *his rights!* The closing of this channel might be calamitous to the slaveholder beyond his conception; for the stream of benevolence that now flows so innocently in it, might then break out in forms even far more disastrous than abolition societies and all their kindred and ill-judged measures.'

Report of Pennsylvania Colonization Society for 1830, page 44. — 'The Society proposes to send, not one or two pious members of Christianity into a foreign land, but to transport *annually, for an indefinite number of years*, in one view of its scheme, 6000; in another, 56,000 missionaries (!!!) of the descendants of Africa itself, to communicate the benefits of our religion, and of the arts. And *this colony of missionaries,*' &c. That is, *six or fifty-six thousand of the degraded and anomalous wretches* who are said to be a *mildew* upon the fields of America, and a scourge to the backs, and a stain upon the escutcheon of the white people of the United States, are to be transformed annually, by transportation to Africa, (*with their own consent,*) into an *army of missionaries*, communicating the *benefits* of religion and the *arts !!!*"

Now, suppose the very worst meaning to be given to the words

of the speakers, as *picked out* by Mr. Stuart, without giving us the benefit of context, we would ask, if it is to be endured, that a Society professing benevolence, and *acting* benevolently, shall be condemned because some of its members, in speeches at his meetings, discover and avow that the benevolent scheme may be made at the same time to answer a selfish interest? The notion is preposterous. But we have read the *whole* speeches, and are satisfied that their spirit was throughout benevolent both to the free Negroes, and also to the slaves, — slavery existing, — and the very reverse of that hard-hearted selfishness, which Mr. Stuart obviously intends to fasten upon the speakers, or rather on the Society, by culling and arranging for effect, isolated, and, as they stand alone, equivocal passages.

But the utter want in the Author's mind of the power of perceiving the relation of necessary consequence, is exposed by his drawing from anything he has quoted of these speeches, conclusions condemnatory of the Colonization Society. It is most true that the evils stated in them exist in America; and existed long before colonization was thought of; and equally true that that measure will do its own share of good without increasing those evils, — if it shall not, as we take it is demonstrable it will, materially alleviate, and, it may be, ultimately cure them. The utmost contemplated by the speakers, is the separation of the white and black population of the United States; and they welcome a means that shall tend to this beneficial end, and, moreover, improve the Negro's condition, physically and morally. Let us look this misrepresented policy of separation more narrowly in the face, and try it by the principles of a sound philosophy, which will ever be found in accordance with genuine rational religion.

Even Mr. Stuart will grant to us, that the actual existence of some millions of the blacks in the same community with the whites of the United States, is in itself an enormous political and moral evil. That the black population is, *de facto*, an inferior caste, which, with many individual exceptions, no doubt, is generally degraded, uneducated, and in many instances vicious and deprav-

ed ; and if it be a scourge to America, the punishment is the natural result of a daring violation by man of a marked appointment of God, — a just retribution for the avarice, rapacity and cruelty that for ages outraged nature, by tearing the African from the region and the climate for which the Creator had fitted his physical constitution, and mingling him with a race with which incorporation was not designed, if a strong natural repugnance to it is to be received as proof of the Divine intention.

It is wild fanaticism to call this repugnance unchristian, and to denounce a doubt of the power of religion to overcome it as infidelity ; — *because* God made all men of one flesh, and Christianity bids us open wide the arms of brotherly love, and take all our brethren of mankind to our bosom. It is a stupid perversion of this religious precept to maintain, that the fulfilment of this duty precludes all changes of the Negro's place of residence, and that the American does not in effect hold out to him the arms of brotherly love, by placing him in independence, comparative elevation, and abundance, in another country, instead of degradation and destitution where he is. God made all men of one flesh ; but he did not design them all to live in one country, and, however various and unsuitable their aspect and nature, to mix and incorporate. If we look at that well marked and vast peninsular called Africa, we find that equally marked race, the Negro, with slight modifications, forming its native population throughout all its regions. We find the temperature of his blood, the chemical action of his skin, the very texture of his wool-like hair, all fitting him for the vertical sun of Africa ; and if every surviving African of the present day who is living in degradation and destitution in other lands for which he was never intended, were actually restored to the peculiar land of his peculiar race, in independence and comfort, would even Mr. Stuart venture to affirm that Christianity had been lost sight of by all who had in any way contributed to such a consummation ? It matters not to brotherly love on which side of the Atlantic the Negro is made enlightened, virtuous and happy, if he is actually so far blessed ; but it does nat-

ter on which side of the ocean you place him, when there is only one where he will be as happy and respectable as benevolence would wish to see him; and certainly there a rightly applied morality and religion would sanction his being placed. The incurable evil of the present relation of the whites and the blacks in America is, that incorporation is almost morally impossible. The whites are too numerous, in both the sexes, to be driven to intermarriage with the Negroes. Mulattoes are a West Indian, greatly more than an American phenomenon. The distinction in the United States is white or black, with little of the intervening shades of color. The races do not and will not incorporate. Try the loudest advocate for the 'vincibility' of the prejudice, as it is most unphilosophically called, with this touchstone, — 'marry the Negroes to your sons, and give your daughters to Negroes,' — and we shall have a different answer from Nature than we receive from a misplaced religious profession.

If there be the barrier of natural repugnance to the actual incorporation of the blacks with the whites, it is equally hopeless to preach, as a religious duty, the conquest of prejudice to the effect of elevating the Negro to social equality with the white, — for this, too, is required by the anticolonizationists. The dominant relation of the white to the Negro has not varied during more than two centuries of intercourse. It was natural from this to infer constitutional inferiority in the Negro race, which, as an average character, was not generally elevated by the occasional appearance of an Ignatius Sancho, or other Negroes of superior talents and force of character. Phrenology confirms this decision. It demonstrates that brain is the visible title, the material charter of the ownership of mind. When it is of large volume, both in the intellect and the feelings, there is a moral force as inseparable from it as light from the sun, and minds manifested by smaller brains yield to it an homage which they have no power to withhold. The influence of the man over the boy, — of the schoolmaster over a numerous school, is not muscular but cerebral strength; for, in the last, he would be outdone by the united

force of his pupils. The large brain of Europe controls the small brain of India by an irresistible moral influence, while the total Indian muscle is to the British as three thousand to a unit. A native once asked an English gentleman how it came to pass that 30,000 Europeans could subject and keep in subjection 100,000,000 of natives, when, if each native only threw a slipper upon their master, they never would be heard of again? The moral force of large brain has mastered India, and is in the course of meliorating its condition. We had occasion, as already said, to compare the Negro with the European brain, in a former number,* and stated it as a phrenological fact, that the white is not only endowed with a larger volume, but with a better organization of brain than the Negro, so that the first has not only more power, but that power fitted for a superior intellectual and moral direction. Now, a fact in nature is another word for the Creator's will. When mixed, the white and Negro *must* stand to each other in the relation of a superior and inferior race, with all the injurious effects of such a relation on both. It is therefore in vain to make an ignorant appeal to Christianity, and denounce this fact as a sin in those who are sufficiently enlightened to observe it. Man must do his part, before he raises his voice to heaven. The Creator did not intend the two races to people the same country, where the one must rule, and the other submit, in their respective degrees of constitutional power. Man produced this anomalous condition, and, therefore, his first duty is to do his utmost to remedy the mighty mischief he has perpetrated, to remove the temptation to the sin of domination over a weaker brother, by restoring him to the condition for which he was created, instead of making vain efforts to do him justice in circumstances where it is morally impossible, and where it is, therefore, an inconsistency to make it a point of religious duty. It is here that we find well-meaning, but over-zealous religionists, erring most widely. They hold, practically, though they do not say so, that nature is not of God, and

* Vol. viii. p. 87.

thence they reject all aid from any manifestation of God but what *they* call his Word, which they are in constant danger, for that very reason, as is done in the question before us, to misinterpret and misapply.

We do not mean to affirm that this distinction is immutable, and that in the lapse of ages the African brain may not improve, as there are grounds for concluding the European has done in the most favorable circumstances for such melioration ; but it is impossible to conceive worse circumstances than those of a despised, neglected, and degraded caste, mingled yet unincorporated with a naturally dominant and greatly more numerous population.

Independent, therefore, of the indisputable abomination of slavery, — the real blot on America's escutcheon, — the existence of half a million of Negroes, and, were slavery abolished, of above two millions, whom nature destined to people Africa, and man has violently transported to America, is, we repeat, an enormous political and moral evil ; and it will be a scourge to the American's back, which will goad him and his children, and his children's children, long after he has laid down his own. Now, before, the American citizen resolves to break down a golden bridge for a retiring enemy, — to close a path, however narrow, by which the African may, *if he wills*, return to the country and climate of his race, — to re-consign to the desert jungle and its wild beasts, a fertile cultivated spot, inhabited by a civilized, religious, and moral community, ready to receive the African with the welcome of citizenship, and, for the rage of oppression, proscription, and persecution, to put on him the ring and the robe of a higher morality, and give him the elevated consciousness of independence and character, — before the American, we repeat, shall resolve to say no to all this, he must demonstrate that the Negro race *can*, in a reasonable course of generations, find in America, what they have never yet done, anything that deserves the name of country. This is to us the question, in comparison with which all the other points, so much dwelt upon, shrink into insignificance.

It is, to the high moral view which we take of the question,

matter of moonshine whether the American slave-owner is relieved or not of the incitement to insubordination in his slaves, which is dreaded from the spectacle of a wretched, despised, and destitute free-colored population, existing among them, — another of the evils which a speaker thought Liberia would cure, and which expectation Mr. Stuart calls a set-purpose to perpetuate slavery. Accustomed as we are to confide in the outward march of the supremacy of the Moral Sentiments and Intellect, the keystone of our Ethics, we expect the annihilation of slavery all over America, by the fiat of her legislatures, and the acclamations of her people, on far higher compulsion than the wretched fear of a redundant colored population. When we really come to the great question of slavery abolition, Liberia, *per se*, as it has hitherto operated, will be but a fly on the wheel of *that* mighty revolution. If it operates at all, we say it operates towards facilitating abolition, and not perpetuating slavery. But, alas! if two thousand settlers is the amount of colonization in eleven years, when would the ‘*drain*,’ as it is called, begin to be felt, which is to raise the slaves’ marketable value, — remove the slave-owner’s fears, — encourage him to perpetuate his tyrannies, — and harden his heart that he will not let the oppressed go. Confident that slavery will be abolished in the United States, whether the Liberian drain be great or small, through causes altogether unconnected with that drain, we grudge embarrassing that great question with one which has independent benefits in its train; and we hold the Liberian plan to be so excellent in its essence absolutely, that we would hail its enlargement to ten thousand times its present extent. But when we consider the difficulties which retard its enlargement, — when we view its present insignificant operation in any way, — the loud denunciation of it by Mr. Stuart and by his echoes seems to us utterly insane.

One of the speakers whose words are quoted, asks most unnecessarily, and, because of the atrocious alternative alluded to, in very bad taste, ‘Was open butchery to be resorted to?’ A child just beginning to read would see that the speaker was

assuming that such a course was morally impossible; yet Mr. Stuart gives the words the emphasis of italics, as if the speaker had recommended *that* mode of diminishing the free-colored population of the United States! This gross perversion has been eagerly seized by the enemies of Liberia, transferred in all its deformity into the Anti-Slavery Reporter, and the Anti-Slavery Record, and imputed not merely to the speaker, whose meaning has been purposely reversed, but to the whole American Colonization Society!

The speaker whose words are quoted from pages xii. and xiii.* of the Appendix of the Fourteenth Report, disclaims interference with the slave-owner's *rights*, while he would open a channel to his benevolence. Now, what person, endowed with a fair portion of intellect, can fail to see, and, with an average conscientiousness, to acknowledge, that the rights here spoken of are merely the conventional rights of two centuries' standing in America? And what grown man of practical sense will not say, that the Society did right to declare their non-interference with this question, when they could do all the good they contemplated without it. Nothing they do will obstruct, or even retard, the great measure which is destined to put the question of right on its proper moral footing. Yet their avoidance of that question is called acknowledgment of the slaveholder's right. If this is merely bad logic, we should not be disposed to visit it with the same measure of censure, as would be its due if it is deliberate perversion.

The 6000, or 56,000 missionaries, it matters not which number, is a mere hyperbole of over-zeal in the friends of the Colonization scheme. We rather look to the moral and religious improvement which the great majority of emigrants are to find in Liberia, than to take thither. Nevertheless, we would say, educate them as extensively as you can before sending them, and by all means send your most intelligent and moral individuals first, in order to lay that municipal foundation which will render it safe

* We refer to the passages by the proper Roman numerals of prefatory matter, which Mr. Stuart does not.

and beneficial to colonize more numerous and indiscriminately afterwards. But all that emigrate are missionaries to a certain extent, as they are more or less civilized and religiously instructed, and fitter for usefulness in the colony than the tribes which unite with it in Africa.

We had written some pages upon Mr. Stuart's yet farther amplifications of the few ideas which his meagre pamphlet contains, and on what he calls farther proofs, still consisting of isolated passages from the speeches of individuals, and from the African Repository. We showed what he calls his evidence, to be insufficient; and his statements, even if proved, to be irrelevant; but in consideration of our readers, and as we found that we only repeated the answers we have already made, we have not sent them to press.

Mr. Stuart tells us that the American black population itself is hostile to the colonization scheme. He says, p. 14, that the colored people are 'writhing under the colonization process.' This is the exaggeration of special-pleading. No one writhes under an invitation which he is perfectly free to refuse. Nevertheless, we have meetings of the free-colored people, passing resolutions, — far above Negro literature, and evidently all the work of one pen, — invoking their household gods, and obtesting the tremendous and atrocious scheme of *tearing* them from their native land and the homes of their fathers, &c. ! We have no manner of doubt that these absurd and uncalled for exhibitions are got up by the enemies of the colonization plan; and a weak invention they are. The reports of the Society are full of evidence of the popularity of the colony with the people of color, and record many instances of their eagerness to emigrate in greater numbers than the means of the society enable it to permit. The testimony of the settlers is daily spreading and increasing the attractions of the colony to the black population in every part of the United States.

With Mr. Lloyd Garrison we really need not trouble our readers. He is a type of Mr. Stuart, or Mr. Stuart of him, the chro-

nology of the pamphlets being of no moment, or the question which has saved the other original thinking. Mr. Garrison distorts meanings — fastens the speeches of individuals on the society — quotes partially — conceals explanations — exaggerates, clamors, and cants, exactly as Mr. Stuart does ; while the answer of irrelevancy, were every word they speak true, applies equally to both.

The Anti-Slavery Reporter, No. 102, has not only, as we formerly observed, copied the unfairness of Stuart and Garrison, but has made an addition of its own in the very worst spirit of these pamphleteers. It observed that a Mr. Broadnax had made an absurd and unfeeling speech in the Virginia House of Delegates, in proposing a bill for the forcible removal of the free Negroes from that State ; and although the bill was of course rejected, the Reporter holds out Mr. Broadnax's insane proposal, as serving 'to illustrate the spirit of the colonization leaders !' The next words in the Reporter, differently applied, we adopt, and apply to its conductors themselves : 'This is really too bad !'

Mr. Stuart thought proper to impugn an account given of Liberia in the organ of the Peace Society, called the Herald of Peace, and addressed a letter to the editor of that periodical, which has brought from him 'a Vindication' of the Society and their colony, itself sufficient to annihilate Mr. Stuart in the controversy. We allude to that paper for the sake of deriving from it an important aid to our own vindication. Mr. Stuart, in his letter to the editor of the Herald of Peace, makes admissions, by which, as the lawyers say, he admits himself out of court : He says, 'But is there nothing good, then, in the American Colonization Society ? Yes, there is, — 1st, For Africa it is good. It interrupts the African slave trade within its own limits ; and the least interruption to that nefarious traffic is an unspeakable good. 2d, For the few colored people who prefer leaving their native country and emigrating to Africa, it is unquestionably a great blessing. 3d, To the slaves, whose slavery it has been, or may be, the means of commuting into transportation, it is a blessing,

just in as far as transportation is a lesser evil than slavery; and this is by no means a trifling good. 4th, But its highest praise, and a praise which the writer cordially yields to it, is the fact, that it forms a new centre; whence, as from our Sierra Leone, and the Cape of Good Hope, civilization and Christianity are radiating through the adjoining darkness. In this respect, no praise can equal the worth of these settlements.' After this declaration in favor of all that he had denounced, we should think we *ought* to hear no more of Mr. Stuart.

For ample evidence of both the salubrity of the climate for Negroes, — though not for Whites, — and its growing prosperity, down to September last, we must refer to the Society's Reports, and other publications on Liberia.*

It will naturally occur to the reader to ask, How is this settlement countenanced, which is thus opposed? In America, the scheme has been hailed all over the Union, by the most eminent and patriotic statesmen, by the clergy of all denominations, by men of science and men of business; and the Society, which was formed 1st January, 1817, presents a most encouraging array of their names. We read among these the names of Monroe, Madison, Marshall, Jefferson, Bishops White and Meade, La Fayette, Carroll of Carrollton,† Bushrod Washington, Henry Clay, Webster, Mercer, Frelinghuysen, and many other names of statesmen, patriots, and philosophers. Auxiliary Societies have been formed in almost all the free states, and in several of those where slavery is yet unabolished. We have seen a letter from the Bishop of Virginia, Bishop Meade — a name which carries the greatest weight all over the Union — addressed to Mr. Elliott Cresson, the zealous agent of the colonization scheme, now engaged in enlisting British sympathies in its favor. We wish we

* There is an interesting account of Liberia, we hear, about to be in second edition, published by Waugh & Innes, Edinburgh; and Whittaker & Co. London.

† Lately deceased at the age of ninety-six, the last survivor of those who signed the declaration of independence in 1776.

had space for it, because it takes our own view of the evil of the mixture of a white and black population, and welcomes a benevolent plan for their separation. In England, the name of Wilberforce, who has decidedly approved the plan, is itself a tower of strength; and the venerable Clarkson, too, has lived to see and applaud it in the strongest terms. With every friend to Africa and the African, he wonders at the opposition, and (we have seen his words) imputes it to some demon's intervention.

Mr. Cresson has been eighteen months in England. He is a gentleman of independent fortune, and, actuated by the purest philanthropy, is zealously preaching the cause to the British people. He has been on the whole well received; and wherever opposed, it has been in the *very words* of Mr. Stuart's pamphlet, while his opponents had not read any thing on the other side. In Edinburgh, his reception has been most flattering. At a public meeting to hear his statement, held 8th January, 1833, Lord Moncrieff presided, and a number of the most eminent men were present, all of them well versed in the subject. Lord Moncrieff delivered a powerful address, in which he lamented the opposition to the enlightened plan. The Lord Advocate Jeffrey, M. P., concluded an eloquent address, by moving the first resolution, and was seconded by the Rev. Dr. Grant.*

'1. Resolved, That this meeting view with unmixed satisfaction the establishment of the free and independent settlement of Negroes on the West Coast of Africa, called Liberia, under the patronage of the American Colonization Society, — because they consider it as the most likely means to civilize and christianize the natives of Africa, — to diminish, and ultimately annihilate, the slave trade, by preventing its supply at its source, —

* Men of all shades of politics were present and concurring. A committee of correspondence was named, a collection made, and subscription papers lodged at all the banks, &c. Mr. Simpson, Advocate, undertook to act as Secretary; and Mr. Cresson has signified, that the funds, if sufficient, should be allotted to the establishment of an additional settlement at the mouth of one of the five rivers between Monrovia, the Liberian capital, and Sierra Leone, to which the name of *Edina* should be given. The rivers are the only slaving stations.

and to forward the cause of the abolition of slavery itself, by opening a channel in which benevolence may flow safely, in providing for the emancipated Negro an asylum and a country, in a region and climate for which his physical constitution is peculiarly fitted.' The second was moved by Mr. Simpson, advocate, in the unavoidable absence of the Solicitor-General Cockburn, who had zealously undertaken it, and seconded by Mr. Wardlow Ramsay: '2. That this meeting are disposed to welcome a plan, which, with due regard to the free-will, rights, and feelings of both the black and white population, tends to commence the cure of the evil of slavery itself, by re-establishing the African in possession of every social and political right in the land of his ancestors.' And the third was moved by Mr. J. A. Murray, M. P., and seconded by Mr. Farquhar Gordon: 'That this meeting highly approve of the principles and motives of the American Colonization Society, and applaud the judicious course which they have followed, in doing all the direct good in their power, while they carefully avoid in any way interfering with other existing institutions; and, in particular, in leaving Anti-Slavery and Negro Education Societies, and the American Legislatures themselves, to pursue their proper course in the great work of justice to the injured sons of Africa.' The motives of the American Societies — although held by all the speakers to be unexceptionable — were considered quite secondary to the actual merits of the plan, as standing out prominently in the real colony, with its free trade, its schools, and its churches, and even its newspapers. The sheet of a number, in quarto size, was, with great effect, held up to the meeting; and another, 'grown bigger,' as a Negro printer's boy said, 'as it grew older,' in folio.

With the sentiments of that meeting we cordially join. We heartily approve the American Colonization Society, on the one hand, in their motives, their principles, and their acts, and would cheer them on in their twofold behest of delivering Africa and America from the present diseased and unnatural condition of both, by a plan which tends to put asunder two races of men

which God did not join, and whose junction He does not bless, and to establish each, free and erect, the lords of their own continent ; while, on the other hand, and independently of all the possible mixture of motives with which it may be encouraged and supported, we hail the *existence* of Liberia, — a community of Africans, without a white to claim the white's ascendancy, to snatch from his colored brethren the prizes of life, and blight the freshness of his freedom by the chill of ancient associations and recollections, — a community whose basis is peace, or if war — and it has had its wars, in which it has borne itself nobly — defensive war alone ; — whose principle of commerce is a port without a custom-house, open to the whole world, — whose education is universal, — whose practical code is Christianity.

Last of all, we welcome Mr. Cresson to our country, and are glad of the encouraging reception which he has received. Such missions do incalculable good, both to the parent country, and her gigantic offspring in the New World. He comes in all the power of benevolence, before which unsocial feelings fly like the shades of night before the dawn. May his visit tend to enlarge better relations between the two lands than those of jealousies, and taunts, and calumnies, and wars ; and may Liberia itself be a new bond of union between them, in the very spirit of that infant community, — liberty, light, religion, free commerce, brotherly love, and peace.

ART. IV.—*Practical Utility of Phrenology. To the Editor of the Examiner.* [From the Edinburgh Phrenological Journal.]

SIR, — In your paper of 30th October, you gave a review of the 29th Number of our Journal. We return our best acknowledgments for the handsome terms in which you spoke of it; but we observe that, while you do justice to the conclusions at which we arrive, you experience much difficulty in discovering in what manner Phrenology is calculated either to retard or promote their accomplishment. We are not surprised at this state of mind, but consider the opportunity a favorable one for offering a few remarks on the manner in which Phrenology will accelerate the improvement of the human race.

We might ask what you understand by Phrenology? It is obvious that you have not studied the subject; and, in consequence, your notions of it are likely to be about as complete and accurate as those of a sensible gentleman would be concerning the science of chemistry, who knew no more of it than the explanation given in the dictionary of the meaning of the name. We make this remark, because the study of Phrenology is impeded when men of enlarged minds speak of it without knowing it, and without being aware that they do not know it. They have some ideas in their minds connected with the word; and, when they use the term Phrenology, they mean these ideas; but phrenologists lament that these notions are in general so defective and incorrect. It may be quite true that the particular notions which A or B attaches to the word Phrenology, may be of no value to society at large; but it may not be equally true that the facts in nature, the principles in physiology, and the inductions founded on these, which are recorded in the institutional works on Phrenology, and

which really constitute the science, are equally worthless. A sensible man, saying that he does not see the use of Phrenology, ought to ask himself whether, by that word, he means a few vague conceptions existing in his own mind, and picked up at random, or the contents of the best phrenological works. We mean no disrespect to you by these remarks, and intend only to illustrate a general proposition.

Phrenology does not pretend to the invention of a new element in human nature ; it merely gives a scientific basis to some truths which formerly existed in an empirical form, and brings to light many others of great practical importance, which were previously unknown. The notion is perfectly just, that many of the views and practices which we have developed in this Journal for the improvement of human beings, might be supported on the generally known principles of human nature, because Phrenology is a scientific exposition of these principles ; but the advantages which we claim may be thus elucidated : An old woman, by the empirical application of natural substances, could bleach, and dye, and spin, and weave, before the inventions of mechanical philosophy, and the discoveries of scientific chemistry took place ; but with far less productiveness in proportion to the labor bestowed, and with inferior success as to the quality of the workmanship. In like manner, old women could teach children the alphabet, and fox-hunting squires could make laws, and pious persons could preach about the means of securing eternal felicity in heaven, each using the stock of notions about human nature which happened to constitute the mental furniture of his or her mind ; but we deny that the value of the education bestowed, and of the laws enacted, and of the principles of piety inculcated, would be equal to what they would have been, if these several individuals had possessed a scientific and practical view of the physiology of the brain and philosophy of the mind, which are to be found in the phrenological works. We shall endeavor to render this proposition more obvious by a few illustrations.

1st, Phrenology shows that the power and direction of thinking

and of feeling in each individual is modified by the size, quality, and combination of the cerebral organs occurring in his particular case; and important practical consequences follow from this principle. For example, No. 29 of this Journal was handed into the offices of the *Literary Gazette and Examiner*, and read by the respective editors of these works, both personally unknown to, and entirely unconnected with us; but the effects produced on them by the self-same words and sentences were very different. On the editor of the *Gazette* the work appears to have produced the following effects: 1st, To prompt him to pen a high panegyric on himself; 2dly, To fall into a rage with us, and write scurrilous abuse against us; 3dly, To commit a gross misrepresentation; and, 4thly, To copy into his own pages the full narrative of certain cruel experiments, performed in Paris, which he had denounced us as atrocious monsters for copying and translating from a French journal. The whole moral and intellectual disquisitions of our publication failed to attract his notice; and he never touched on any point connected with the great interests of the human race, although several such were brought before him in our work. His views were all individual and personal; they regarded himself, us, and the demerits of the experimenter. On you, the editor of the *Examiner*, the effects appear to have been different. You seem not to have thought of yourself at all. You thought of us, not in a rage, but with respect and kindness; and, while you could not see the merits of Phrenology, you did justice to the fruits which it produced. The grand distinction between you and the editor of the *Literary Gazette* was, that there was nothing individual in your criticism; the points that attracted your notice were those which bore the closest and deepest relationship to the general welfare of mankind. You appreciated the ideas which we had thrown out, and perceived their consequences in relation to that great end. Now, Phrenology proves that one fundamental cause of the different impressions made on different minds by the same object, is the different degrees in which they possess the several mental organs. The manifestations of the editor of

the Gazette denote a brain in which the organs related to individual objects and personal interests predominate ; and your manifestations indicate a brain in which the organs of reflection and of the moral affections are more largely developed, in proportion to the organs of individual perceptions and personal feelings. While this fact is unknown, each individual assumes that his particular mode of thinking and feeling is in accordance with the best standard of human nature, because he knows no other than that furnished by his own mind. If he desired to bring over another person to the same views, he would use the arguments and illustrations which would weigh most forcibly with himself ; but owing to the difference of brain, these might feebly impress him to whom they were addressed. The advantages of Phrenology, in such a case, would be various. First, It would make known his own deficiencies to the individual in whom the inferior combination occurred ; render him aware of the existence of a higher standard than his own mind ; and induce him to avoid aberrations into the regions of his own weakness. Secondly, By giving to the public a clear and intelligible standard by which to estimate mental capacity, it would prevent them from being led away by beings who ought themselves to be directed. You conceive that many of our observations on human improvement are demonstrable independently of Phrenology ; but we assure you that a particular development of the moral and intellectual organs is indispensable to the perception of the facts on which such a demonstration must be founded ; so much so, that if the upper part of the forehead and the coronal region of the brain be deficient, the individual may be perfectly sane, and may possess much acuteness, and many excellent qualities, and yet be mentally blind to the existence of the facts, and utterly incapable of comprehending the induction on which the demonstration alluded to must rest. There are many individuals constituted in this manner, who are by nature utter sceptics as to the possibility of rendering mankind moral and intelligent by natural means ; and they form a grand mass of resistance to the march of improvement, which the higher minds

require to push or drag along, before the social body can advance a step. Individual interests, superstition, prejudices, and ignorance, present great impediments to moral improvement ; but all these are secondary when compared with the effects of a deficient development of the moral and intellectual organs. The individual is then passionately prone to animal gratification, and there is wanting in his nature a fulcrum, on which to fix the moral lever of direction and restraint.

2dly, Phrenology not only brings this fact before the eyes and the understanding as an institution of nature, and directs us to place such individuals in situations corresponding to their organization, but it furnishes valuable hints for diminishing the number and extent of deficient brains in subsequent generations. Form and quality of brain descend like features and general bodily constitution ; but powerful modifying effects result from the condition of the parents at particular times, and from training the young according to the laws of physiology. We have never seen inert and lymphatic children descend from a father and mother both possessing the nervous and sanguine temperaments. We do not know an instance of children prone to the pleasures of the table, whose parents were habitually temperate, while we could cite opposite examples. We could furnish cases in which mental depression, or excitement of violent passions in the parents, was followed by similar dispositions, as constitutional qualities, in offspring dating from that condition. In short, it is impossible to become acquainted with, and attend to, temperament and form of brain, and to the mental condition of parents, without having the conclusion forced upon the understanding, that all radical improvement of the dispositions and capacities of the race must spring from physiological causes. These causes operate in harmony with moral and religious principles : in other words, a man cannot obey the laws of physiology without at the same time observing the laws of morality and religion : hence there is no atheism or irreligion in this announcement ; but, on the contrary, the moral government of the world is supported by these laws. The sub-

ject is more fully elucidated in Combe's *Constitution of Man*, to which we refer. We humbly maintain, that no principles recognized in the current philosophy of Europe give the same importance to the laws of physiology, as means of improving the mental qualities of man, which is presented by Phrenology; and that, if this science be founded in nature, it is of immense value to mankind.

3dly, Phrenology exhibits the elementary qualities of mind as positive entities, connected with, and influenced by, perceptible organs: it enables us to point out the proper sphere of activity, or the uses and abuses of each, and the consequences of their due exercise, in a manner unattainable by means of the metaphysical philosophy of mind. After studying the mental powers in connexion with organs, it becomes possible for individuals to form a conception of a standard of human nature superior to themselves, and to compare themselves with it, to discover the points in which they are deficient, and those in which they excel, and to modify their practical conduct by this knowledge. It enables them to comprehend the characters and powers of other men, in a manner which they could never reach without this key to their qualities. It is a powerful engine for destroying superstition; because, when the faculties and their mode of action become familiarly known, it is easy to trace many impressions, doctrines and ideas, which have done unspeakable injury to mankind, to excessive and irregular action of particular organs, occasioned by natural causes, which many persons have mistaken for supernatural communications. We refer to false prophets, and fanatical professors of all ages. A practical phrenologist, who knows the functions of the organs of Wonder, and has seen or read the effects of their exaltation, will not readily become a proselyte to the Reverend Edward Irving's miracles; nor will one who knows that there is an organ of Language, whose function is to invent and learn artificial signs, and is aware of the effect of excitement on all the organs, be surprised at articulate sounds, destitute of all meaning, being uttered by certain individuals, believed by the ignorant to be inspired.

4thly, When a man of ordinary capacity has become familiarly acquainted with the mental organs and their functions, he arrives at an irresistible conviction of the existence of moral and intellectual qualities of a high order in the human race, which require only to be developed and directed, to lead to results far superior to any exhibited during the past ages, when the qualities and their relations have been scientifically unknown. He thereby gains a confidence in the stability of religion, morality, and social order, which renders his mind tranquil, and frees it from a thousand vague apprehensions about the possible triumph of vice.

5thly, When the mental organs and their functions are compared with the objects of external nature, the true position on earth of man, as a moral and intellectual being, is discoverable; and it becomes practicable to form a philosophical judgment concerning the adaptation of his institutions and pursuits to his nature. With all deference to philosophers of the old school, we maintain that it is impossible to do this while the elements of mind, and the influence of organization on them, are unknown. In a century hence the didactic literature, religious opinions, political and industrial institutions of the present age, will appear in a state of Gothic aberration from the dictates of reason, when enlightened by a correct knowledge of human nature.

Our observations are not half exhausted; but we fear that we have already extended them too far for the degree of development which we have been able to give them on this occasion. Our past pages are full of detailed elucidations of many of the points now touched on, and we refer you to them, as also to the works of Drs. Gall and Spurzheim, of Dr. Andrew Combe, and Mr. George Combe, for further information. And remain, with respect, Sir, your most obedient servants,

THE CONDUCTORS OF THE PHRENOLOGICAL JOURNAL.

ART. V.— *Cases by Mr. J. L. Levison, of London.** [From the Edinburgh Phrenological Journal.]

To the Editor of the Phrenological Journal.

SIR : With all the declamation of would-be philosophers against Phrenology, it is curious to notice the frequent blindness of medical men who are without its aid, in the treatment of nervous diseases, and the great professional advantages which others possess, whose nosological arrangement of cerebral affections is based on a knowledge of the noble science so much scoffed at. Mrs. ——, a lady of a nervo-sanguineous temperament, had for some time a violent attack of *waking visions* ; that is, she was continually annoyed by various spectres, some flitting before her, others staring wildly in her face, while some would occasionally grin over her shoulder. This produced a very unpleasant excitement, and might have terminated in mental alienation. Her medical attendant (no phrenologist,) after treating her for some time without any benefit, sent her to London to have the advice of one of the *great men* ; but she returned without any mitigation of the disease. Fortunately she was recommended to my esteemed friend Robert Craden, Esq. of Hull, who, besides being a skilful surgeon and able anatomist, possesses that *rare knowledge, an acquaintance with the true anatomy and physiology of the brain* ; or, in other words, he is a phrenologist ! and the sequel proved the sound professional advantage this knowledge gave him. The case was put under his care, and as he knew it to be a derangement of the perceptive faculties, his treatment was local, and a cure was effected.

*This letter was inadvertently omitted in our last Number. We shall be glad to hear from Mr. Levison respecting the casts to which he alludes.

The second case which I shall detail, is one of an affection of *Combativeness*, under the care of my very esteemed and scientific friend, Richard Casson, Esq. surgeon of Hull, at his establishment for the insane.

Mrs. A——, of a nervo-lymphatic temperament, with an excellent moral development, became insane under the following circumstances. Her husband was a sailor, and was wrecked at sea. Her *Adhesiveness* and *Philoprogenitiveness* are both large; and after this event, she brooded over it with all the energy that a strong attachment, lacerated by such a painful circumstance, naturally induced; but she seemed to concentrate all her affection in her only child, and for some time her melancholy could be pacified only by the presence of her daughter. This state continued for some months, but the havoc was going on — the shock to *Adhesiveness* was too great, and she ultimately lost her moral liberty. The manner in which the disease first manifested itself is strikingly corroborative of our views, whilst it must be inexplicable to the anti-phrenologist. She became extremely pugnacious, and exercised her *Combativeness* even upon the dear child she had so recently doated upon; — so slight are the shades between health and disease! To those who are acquainted with the true physiology of the brain, the case is replete with instruction, — *the convolutions of Adhesiveness are connected with those of Philoprogenitiveness, and laterally with the convolutions of Combativeness*. The latter fact explains why offended love excites hatred or anger. In Mrs. A——'s case there was nothing of guess-work — nothing fanciful; neither did it require the aid of the imagination; for, during her most violent paroxysms, she complained of pain over the outer and lateral portions of the posterior lobes. My friend treated her locally, and attended to her general health. She was conscious of her own affection, and sometimes requested to be confined; for, during an *exacerbation*, if she could not beat others, she used to endeavor to beat herself, and break everything within her reach. It was a decided case of diseased *Combativeness*, although the organ of *Destructiveness* also was somewhat

implicated in the unhealthy excitement. I may add that a cure was made. I cannot help remarking, that among animals we may observe, that when Philoprogenitiveness or Adhesiveness is pained, it rouses Combativeness; and the latter feeling continues more or less time under excitement, in proportion to the strength of the attachment. The male swan marches to and fro during the sitting of the female; and if any one approaches the nest, he darts at him with an astonishing fury, and his *pugnacity* is really frightful *if his mate is in danger*. I have observed a similar excitement of Combativeness in the goose, when the offspring have been approached. Even tame and harmless sheep evince something like a *savage courage*, if their young are attacked.

Having some paper to spare, I shall finish the communication with an interesting fact concerning the organ of *Imitation*, which is the more valuable in a philosophical point of view, as it demonstrates *synthetically*, that the remarks on the cerebral part, we call Imitation, are not fanciful. One day, going into the shop of a Mr. Meyer, a Polish furrier, and a very intelligent man, he particularly requested me to examine the head of his errand boy, saying, 'I believe in Phrenology, *although not acquainted with it practically*; but there is a case your explanation of which will put its truth in my mind beyond the shadow of a doubt, *as I am sure you never saw the boy before, and therefore cannot know anything about him.*' The lad made his appearance, and the group of intelligent foreigners looked on with deep interest as I passed my hand over the boy's head. His intellectual faculties were *mediocre*, and the moral sentiments above the average: Benevolence stood like an *ancient tunulus*, having a deep ravine on each of its sides. With this information before me, I did not hesitate to state my opinion thus briefly: 'He does not lack intelligence, and he is very willing to oblige, and do what you wish him to do, *but he does not know how to go about it.*' The latter remark, I thought myself authorized to state by the deficient Imitation.* There was a simultaneous German exclamation from the party, 'Wonderlich !

* We would have said by the *mediocre* intellect. —Ed.

Gott's wonder ! Och Gott vie var ist das !' &c. But, after a short pause, Mr. Meyer came and shook me by the hand, declaring that my remarks were ' God's truth ;' by which he meant that Phrenology must be founded in nature. If I can get a cast of the boy's head, I shall send it for the Society ; and by the next opportunity will send a list of some highly interesting casts I have lately collected, with the particulars.

I must now conclude, with warmest wishes for the extensive circulation of the truths of the science, through the medium of your valuable publication, because I feel, that in Phrenology there is that which will place happiness and moral good within the reach of all, and make the earth, instead of a scene of vice and bloodshed, comparatively a terrestrial paradise. I am, Sir, yours, &c.

J. L. LEVISON.

62 Gower Street, Bedford Square, London.

PHRENOLOGY IN THE UNITED STATES. Phrenology is likely to become a leading subject in this country. It has been well received by the candid of all classes. In some places it is adopted as a regular branch of education. Besides single lectures on the subject before Lyceums and other literary institutions in various parts of the United States, — during the past year, complete courses of lectures on the science have been delivered in Salem, New Haven, Providence, and other places, by Dr. Barber and Mr. Dunkin, of Harvard University, and in Boston, by W. B. Fowle. The audiences have been of a most respectable character, and have evinced a deep interest in the subject.

Owing to unavoidable circumstances, this number of the *Annals* has been delayed beyond its proper time. The next number will be published soon.

Original communications are respectfully requested of those who are engaged in investigating the science of Phrenology.

Boston, January, 1834.

MARSH, CAPEN & LYON,

NO. 133 WASHINGTON STREET, BOSTON, AND CONCORD, N. H.

PUBLISH THE FOLLOWING

VALUABLE BOOKS.

PHRENOLOGY, OR THE DOCTRINE OF THE MENTAL PHENOMENA, in two volumes, 8vo. Vol. I. Physiological Part. Vol. II. Philosophical Part, with Plates. 3d American Ed. By J. G. Spurzheim, M. D.

This work gives a full view of the Science of Phrenology, and furnishes numerous facts illustrative of the principles of human nature.

PHRENOLOGY in connexion with Physiognomy. Illustration of Characters, with thirty-five plates. One vol. royal 8vo. By J. G. Spurzheim, M. D. To which is prefixed a Biography of the Author. By Nahum Capen.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE DERANGED MANIFESTATIONS OF THE MIND, OR INSANITY. One vol. 8vo. By J. G. Spurzheim, M. D. With an Appendix. By A. Brigham, M. D.

'An invaluable treatise, from the pen of one who, probably, was more intimately acquainted with the nature and diseases of the brain than any man living. It is full of interest.' *N. Y. Mirror.*

A VIEW OF THE ELEMENTARY PRINCIPLES OF EDUCATION FOUNDED ON THE STUDY OF THE NATURE OF MAN. One vol. 12mo. By J. G. Spurzheim, M. D. 3d Am. Edition.

PHILOSOPHICAL CATECHISM OF THE NATURAL LAWS OF MAN. One vol. 18mo. 3d Am. Ed. By J. G. Spurzheim, M. D.

'Men have long been treated as children; they have been taught that ignorance and incredulity are virtues, and that fear is wisdom; and that they may glorify God by flattery, rather than by moral excellency.' *Extract from Preface.*

OUTLINES OF PHRENOLOGY. Being also a manual of Reference for the Marked Bust. One vol. 18mo. 3d Am. Ed. By J. G. Spurzheim, M. D.

EXAMINATION OF THE OBJECTIONS made in Britain against the doctrines of Gall and Spurzheim. By J. G. Spurzheim, M. D. And, **ARTICLE OF THE FOREIGN QUARTERLY REVIEW.** By Rich. Chenevix, Esq. F. R. S. &c. With Notes by Dr. Spurzheim. One vol. 12mo.

PROF. FOLLEN'S ORATION, delivered at the Funeral of Spurzheim, Nov. 17, 1832.

SPURZHEIM'S ANATOMY OF THE BRAIN, with a general view of the Nervous System. With an Appendix—with 18 plates, improved.

REMARKS ON THE INFLUENCE OF MENTAL CULTIVATION AND MENTAL EXCITEMENT UPON HEALTH. One vol. 12mo. By Amariah Brigham, M. D. 2d Ed.

OBSERVATIONS ON MENTAL DERANGEMENT. Being an application of the Principles of Phrenology to the elucidation of the causes, symptoms, nature, and treatment of Insanity. By Andrew Combe, M. D.

COMBE'S PHRENOLOGY. A System of Phrenology by Geo. Combe, late President of the Phrenological Society, Edinburgh—4th edition.

COMBE'S ELEMENTS OF PHRENOLOGY. Elements of Phrenology, by George Combe, late President of the Phrenological Society, Edinburgh. 4th edit. improved and enlarged, with plates.

A few sets of the **EDINBURGH PHRENOLOGICAL JOURNAL**, for sale.

C A S T S.

MARSH, CAPEN & LYON keep constantly for sale a variety of **CASTS**, illustrating **PHRENOLOGY**—approved by **DR. SPURZHEIM.**

James B. Dow, Printer.