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.

No. 2.

SEPTEMBER, 1834.

BOSTON:
MARSH, CAPEN & LYON.
1834.

CONTENTS.

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.

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. II.—SEPTEMBER,—1834.

Art. VI.—*Phrenological Sketch of* F. J. Gall.

[We have received the first vol. of the *Journal de la Société Phrenologique de Paris*, and are glad to see that Phrenology, so long proscribed in France, has at last awakened attention, and no doubt it will be diligently cultivated. In the list of members, (over 100 in number, two years ago,) we see the names of Andral, Broussais, Falret, Rostan, Sanson, Voisin, Cloquet, J. Appert, Lacoste, Duke of Montebello, Julien. An article on Gall, read to the Society, by M. Fosati, M. D. has furnished the following paragraphs which, we trust, will prove as interesting to our readers as they did to us. It will be observed that he uses the nomenclature and system of Gall, as well as some phrases and modes of expression, hardly allowable in the present condition of the science; still, with a few exceptions, we have thought it better to translate them literally.]

Gall was born in the Grand Duchy of Baden, in 1758, and died in Paris, 1828, aged 70 years. His body was well developed; he was five feet three inches two lines in height, with a large chest and strong muscles; his step was firm, and his look vivid and penetrating. His features, though not handsome, possessed a mild and pleasing expression, and in the latter years of his life his complexion had assumed a yellowish tint. Every part of his head was strikingly developed, measuring, above the eye brows and at the top of the ears, twenty-two inches two lines in

circumference, and fourteen inches nine lines, from the root of the nose to the occiput.

Taking Gall as a model of a phrenological portrait, it is proper that I should speak of all the cerebral organs, belonging to our species.

[After a few remarks on the organs of Amativeness, Philoprogenitiveness, Adhesiveness, Combativeness, and Destructiveness, which were all very well developed in Gall, he speaks of his Secretiveness, which was also tolerably large.] But he never made a bad use of it. He was too conscious of his intellectual powers to obtain his ends by cunning or fraud. He was frank and honest, but acute and penetrating. I come now to another quality on which I should like to dwell, were I not obliged to confine myself to the limits assigned me—I mean the sentiment of property. Many people in Paris have reproached Gall with being selfish. It cannot be denied that he was amply paid for his public lectures; that he was unfortunate in soliciting the sale of his work; and that he prosecuted some of his patients who refused to pay their bills. But do you know his own remarks on this point? 'Do you see, my friend, how these wealthy people treat us and other physicians? They spend a hundred times more for their pleasures than for the health we give them, and expend enormous sums on balls and dinners, while they leave their physicians unpaid. Indeed, while they largely remunerate the lawyer who gains their cause, they give nothing to the physician who saves their lives.' Gall was not generous, in the common understanding of the term; but it must be considered that in his domestic economy he failed in method, and consequently was always pressed by unforeseen and urgent wants. If he was selfish, let me ask what kind of selfishness it was? He educated and supported his nephews, and young people of talents, and his table was free for every body. It is true he was not generous to all who surrounded him, but he was so towards his domestics, and people of low condition, whose services he had received. We may say he had a love of property, but that his intellectual powers placed him above its control.

Another faculty which Gall possessed in a remarkable degree, as his organization shows, was that of Elevation, Pride, or a high opinion of oneself. I will here quote a remarkable passage, where, in speaking of that organ, he has delineated himself. 'There are certain men,' says he, 'with minds sufficiently strong, who are so deeply impressed with a sense of their own value, and so independent withal, that they know how to repel every external influence which tends to subject them. As far as practicable, they choose the freest countries to live in, and devote themselves to an employment that renders them independent, and exempts them from the caprices and favor of the great. That domination over their inferiors, which becomes slavery under an absolute master, would be insupportable to them. The honors and distinctions that are withheld from merit, while they are lavished on insignificant men, are but humiliations in their eyes. If they prosper, it is only by their own efforts; like the oak, they are sustained by their own strength, and it is to their own resources that they would be indebted for all they possess.' He was, in fact, proud and independent. He never was anxious for titles, and cheerfully practised the profession of medicine. As a political man, he loved liberty and good laws.

There is another innate sentiment, Vanity, Ambition, Love of Glory, approaching the preceding in its nature, but still quite distinct from it, which was feeble in Gall. I always observed him to be indifferent to the praise and approbation of the multitude, as he was also to their blame and ridicule. He labored for the love of science, and under the conviction that his ideas would triumph in the end. I could recall a thousand anecdotes, to prove that his vanity was not very susceptible. How many times have I seen him laugh at the squibs of the little journals, and unaffectedly despise the gross abuse which they heaped upon him. Let me cite one fact which will answer for many others. Gall had lived for some time at Berlin, with the celebrated poet Kotzebue, who profited by the occasion to learn of him the technical terms of his science, and such ideas and principles as he could best turn to ridicule. He composed his play, Craniomania, which was im-

mediately performed at the theatre in Berlin, and Gall attended the first representation, and laughed as heartily as any of them.

Caution, by means of which the effects of our actions are referred to the future, which sometimes renders us distrustful of the world and indecisive in forming our resolutions, was very strong in Gall. Observe what a fulness the head presents in its superior posterior lateral region. Gall proceeded with extreme prudence in every step; he was distrustful, and much disposed to give credit to bad insinuations against his friends and acquaintances, and would rather break with any one than live in the disquietude of doubt. He often said that it is more difficult to sustain a reputation than to create one, and that we must always act as if making the first efforts to render ourselves known.

Let us now pass to the faculties whose organs are situated in the anterior part of the head, beginning, with the sense of the memory of things, (Individuality.) This sense is the source of educatibility in man and other animals. Gall possessed it in a moderate degree, but it was not one of his most remarkable faculties.

He easily forgot whatever had no connexion with his doctrines, or with any of his predominant faculties.

It was the same with the faculty of local memory, (Locality). I will once more leave him to speak for himself. 'My taste for natural history,' said he, 'often led me into the woods, for the purpose of ensnaring birds or taking them in their nests. In the latter object I was very fortunate, because I had often observed, towards which of the cardinal points, each species were accustomed to build their nests. I should have succeeded equally well by disposing my nets properly, because I was in the habit of ascertaining the district the bird frequented, by his song, and his movements; but when, after a week or fortnight, I went to find what birds had been taken, or to carry off a nest, it was often impossible for me to find the tree I had marked, or the nets I had placed.' He also forgot the residence of his patients whom he had frequently visited in his carriage, and had considerable difficulty in remembering in what story of the building they lived.

He was ignorant of geography, and whenever he looked upon a map he found something new, though he had observed it a thousand times before. So you may be sure that if he travelled, it was not from taste, but with the sole object of propagating his doctrines.

If it be true, as I believe it is, that there is an organ of Order, Gall was absolutely destitute of it. The arrangement of his house was a curiosity. He said it was order to him. Imagine to yourselves, huddled together in his bureau-drawers, for instance, old journals, quittances, quack advertisements, letters from distinguished men, pamphlets, nuts, pieces of gold, silver, and copper, and packets of seeds. I have seen him take up a bundle of these papers and shake out from them the money he happened to need. In this manner he kept his records and his desk.

Weaker still was his *memory of persons*. 'This faculty,' said he, 'is too feeble in me, and the defect of it, has, all my life-time, caused me a thousand troubles. When I rise from the table, I cannot distinguish either man or woman who sat by my side during the meal. In *verbal memory*, Gall was also deficient. At school he never could learn his lessons, and when the task was one that exercised the memory, he was always surpassed by his school-fellows, whom he excelled in original composition.

The organ of *the sense of language*, which gives the talent of philology, was a little better developed. He knew besides his own, the Latin, and French language, which he wrote and spoke with facility, though defective in pronunciation, and had some knowledge of English and Italian. He had a strong dislike, however, for questions about mere words, grammatical discussions, compilations, and works of that kind. (*Pour les compilations, et autres travaux du même geure.*)

The sense of the relations of colors, which is one of the fundamental qualities indispensable to the painter, was absolutely wanting in Gall. He was obliged to depend upon the opinions of his friends whenever he treated of painters or painting, and by that means was sometimes led to pronounce an erroneous judgment which the critics never failed to remind him of. As for his taste,

he was fond of those brilliant porcelain-like pictures of modern times; and when in a gallery, he bestowed his attention on portraits, and especially on those of women when painted in a classical style.

As he was a poor judge of painting, so was he as poor an amateur in music. He generally got wearied at the Opera or Concert; but a woman's voice in conversation, he said was very agreeable

He was no more apt in the science of numbers; every kind of numerical calculation fatigued him, and I believe, I never saw him go through a process in simple multiplication or division that was at all complicated. He knew nothing of geometry, nor the problems of mathematics. What a contrast to those philosophers who make this same science the basis of all positive knowledge.

In mechanics, architecture, and the arts, he was no happier than in calculation, music, and painting. I will only remark that the execution of the plates for his great work, after Spurzheim ceased to overlook them, was detestable, which would not have been the case if Gall had possessed the slightest knowledge of design, or of the arts in general.

Having thus finished our notice of the organs situated in the lower part of the forehead, it remains for me to examine those higher faculties whose organs are placed in the upper part of that region. It is these that gave Gall his eminence over the generality of men.

That *comparative* sagacity, by means of which we promptly discern the relations of agreement and disagreement between the objects of our examination, and are led to search for affinities, comparisons, and similes, was very strong in Gall. Accordingly, you will observe that not only were all his researches but a continual comparison of organization with faculties, and of the faculties of man, with those of other animals, but that he also employed this method in his familiar conversations and public lectures, whenever, he was particularly anxious to impress his ideas on the minds of others.

To that other form of human intelligence, viz. the *metaphysical*,

Gall was strongly opposed, when it soars into the spiritual world, and pushes its inquiries into general principles and general truths, slighting, however, the material world and the relations of cause and effect. This way of thinking, and directing one's efforts in the search after truth, was none of his; he was for the positive, not the abstract.

Another remarkable manifestation of mind, *wit*, which gives a kind of relief to its possessor, Gall was endowed with in no small degree. Though he never engaged in the polemics of the Journals, yet in his works, he replied to his opponents with a keenness of satire truly astonishing. To be convinced of this, one has only to read the sixth volume of his work. Observe his piquant observations on the Editors of the *Dictionary of Medical Sciences*, in answer to the wish expressed by them, that somebody would, at last, devote himself to the physiology of the brain. He exclaims: 'Behold, an instance of lethargy, in M. M. Fournier and Begin, which has lasted from the time of my arrival in Paris, 1807, to the year 1819!' While deriding the principles of the transcendentalists, and at the same time answering his opponents, he observes, 'It may be certainly said with truth that the dead kill the living. Some time or other, when I shall take it into my head to be admired, cried up, and to have even my follies sanctioned, I mean to drown, hang and burn myself, till I am well dead; and if, notwithstanding these means of getting a reputation, my *moi* is still doomed to be concerned with the *non moi*, with the vanities of the world in *space*, I hope at least to have some titles and places to spare in *time*. *Moi*, *space* and *time*, you know, are the pivots on which the metaphysicians turn much of their reasoning.'

While pointing out the piracies many *savans* had made upon his works, he reasons with them in the following style: 'When nations are at war, pillage becomes a right. Now, savans who are engaged in making discoveries, are constantly at war with one another; therefore, they are allowed to pillage; therefore, the little malice of M. Boisseau is eminently rational.'

The result of another manifestation of the intellect, is the *poetical talent*. This is not enough to make one a poet, (in the ordi-

nary acceptation of the word;) for versification depends upon another faculty. Gall could never make verses. He even detested poetry, because he had no ear for harmony; but he possessed, in a high degree, the poetical power of invention.

A fundamental quality inherent in our nature, and which constitutes the strongest bond of our species, is the sentiment of *benevolence*, *compassion*, *moral sense*. Gall was exceedingly benevolent; he succored the unfortunate, and procured them the assistance of his rich patients; he encouraged talents, and rendered them all the aid in his power. If a kind of abruptness, or, more properly speaking, nonchalance, was sometimes observed in his manners, all thought of it was effaced by his benevolence. In his conversation, he was not too careful to observe those conventional forms and verbal disguises, which civilization has introduced to cover, as with a fine mantle, the bad dispositions of the soul, but the more intimately he was known, the more he was loved.

The faculty of *Imitation*, that which makes the actor and mimic, and is also of great use to the orator, inasmuch as it excites him to express by external signs what is passing within, existed in a very high degree in Gall. We had but imperfect means of judging of him as an orator, in his public lectures, where, however, notwithstanding the disadvantage of speaking in a foreign tongue, he left a deep impression on the minds of his hearers.

Let us now see what were Gall's opinions respecting God and religion. 'Everywhere,' he says, 'and in all times, man, pressed by the feeling of dependence, by which he is completely surrounded, is forced to recognize at every instant, the limits of his power, and avow to himself that his fate is in the hands of a superior power. Hence, the unanimous consent of all people to adore a Supreme Being; hence, the ever-felt necessity of recurring to him, of honoring him, and rendering homage to his superiority.' Thus Gall recognized God like a philosopher. He was indignant only against the abuses that men practised upon the credulity of the people; against those who make of religion a refinement of power, of ignorance, of slavery and corruption. He was indignant against the persecutions which sectarians, of different faiths,

carry on against their fellow-men in the name of God and religion. He was indignant against all these abuses, because he loved the human race, and desired its happiness.

It was to his *firmness*, that Gall owes the success of his researches. Without this constancy, or rather obstinacy with which he pursued the same ideas, the same observations, and the same researches, it would have been impossible for him to carry his new science to the point where he left it.

ART. VI. — *Objections of* DR. KIDD *to Phrenology. — Remarks by Dr.* ELLIOTSON. *From the Lancet.* [London Phrenological Society. Session 1833—34. *Dr.* ELLIOTSON, President.]

THE President, the other evening, on taking the chair, drew the attention of the members to some remarks on the doctrines of phrenology, which had been made public by opponents of the science. He remarked to the Society, that it was their duty not only to cultivate their science and watch its progress, but to consider whatever was advanced against it. During the recess, he had met with two works in which phrenology was opposed, although in one of them the admissions made at the same time in its favor were such in number and weight as would not have been made a few years ago, and such as proved the steady progress of 'their success.' This was a 'Bridgewater Treatise,' the production of a highly informed and excellent man, an Oxford professor, Dr. Kidd. The author admitted that 'it might be affirmed with truth, that, considered as an abstract philosophical speculation, phrenology is highly ingenious, and founded upon *unobjectionable principles*; and tha twhile the general conclusion is *inevitable* with respect to the collective functions of the brain, there is *nothing unreasonable* in supposing that *specific parts serve specific purposes*.' Dr. Kidd declares that it 'cannot be doubted, indeed that it is a matter of fact which is constantly open to our observa-

tion, that the degree of approximation in the structure of the brain of *other* animals to that of man, bears a very obvious relation to the degree of intelligence manifested by the various classes of animals.'—'Nor does there appear,' he says, 'on the ground either of reason or of religion, anything objectionable or absurd, in the assumption antecedently made, that the intellectual and moral tendencies of the one may, in a qualified sense, be determined, or at least modified, by the peculiar structure of the body. That they are frequently coincident with certain peculiarities of corporal structure, is a matter of actual observation.' He asks, 'Is it absurd to suppose that the brain, being a very complicated organ, made up of distinctly different parts, those parts are subservient to the exercise of different functions? Or, since it is evident that in every other individual organ of the body, where there is an identity of structure, there is also an identity of function in all the parts, may we not fairly presume that, were the integral parts different, the effects produced would be different; and, consequently, that as the integral parts of the brain differ from each other, the offices of those parts may be different? Or, again, will it be denied as a matter of fact, that different faculties and propensities manifest themselves in different individuals; and is it unreasonable on the ground of analogy, one only ground in this case, to suppose that they manifest themselves through the agency of different instruments? And since the visceral nerves are appropriated to the mere vital function of nutrition, and the spinal nerves to general muscular motion and common sensation, and the nerves of the special senses occupy but a very small portion of the brain,—to what assignable purpose can the great mass of the brain be applied, if not to the operations of that intellectual and moral principle, which, after the obstruction of the organs of nutrition, motion, and sensation, is the only imaginable part of our present nature?' Dr. Kidd lastly remarks, '1st, That just as the young of other animals have a comparatively higher degree of intellect at birth than the human infant, and no gradual development of faculties takes place, while the human faculties are slowly unfolded, so in the inferior animals, all the parts of the brain are in as per-

fect a state at the moment of birth, as they are in the adult animal of the same species; while in the human species, even according to Wenzel, although the brain makes continual and rapid advances to its ultimate magnitude and perfect state, from the period of conception to the seventh year after birth, yet all the parts have not obtained their full size till the age of seven, and, during the evolution of the parts peculiar to the human brain, the peculiar faculties of the human intellect are proportionably developed: and, finally, that until *those parts* are developed, *those faculties* are not clearly perceptible.'

The President here congratulated the Society on the circumstance, that while the truth of phrenology had really been admitted by the writer in the *Journal Hebdomadaire*, whose article was examined by Mr. Drew at a previous meeting, a professor of Oxford, — the university of all that is established and orthodox, — should admit the soundness of every one of its principles; but he lamented that Dr. Kidd, having shown so much soundness of judgment and freedom from intellectual and moral prejudice, should all at once have deviated from his philosophical and manly course. 'The rock on which Dr. Gall and his implicit advocates have split,' says he, 'is the attempt to fix the local boundaries of the several faculties of the soul. Had he satisfied himself with developing the structure of the brain in the various classes of animals; and had he been content to show, that in tracing its structure from those animals which manifest the least indication of intelligence to those which exhibit it still stronger and stronger, as it proportionably advances to the structure of the human body; and, lastly, had he only drawn from the premises the probable conclusions, that specific parts had specific uses with respect to the manifestations of the immaterial principle of animal existence, — and assuredly brutes are endowed with such a principle (though as being devoid of moral sense, they are not fitted for a future state, and, consequently, perish when their bodies die,) — had Dr. Gall been content to stop at this point, without wanting to define the local habitations of the supposed specific organs, he would have acquired the unalloyed fame of having developed a beautiful

train of inductive reasoning in one of the most interesting provinces of speculative philosophy, whereas in the extent to which he has carried his views, his doctrine has become ridiculous as a system.'

Now, observed the President, one would imagine that Dr. Kidd had ascertained by observation that Gall's almost endless facts in proof of the existence of each organ were no facts at all. Yet, on the contrary, without offering a single disproof of a single organ, Dr. Kidd barely and boldly asserts, that all Gall's facts amount to no facts; for such is the assertion that Gall has split upon the attempt to fix the local boundaries of the faculties. Phrenologists who have perseveringly examined not only Gall's illustrations and proofs, but head after head that Gall never saw, and found his assertions and observations true to nature, must laugh at such a professorial sweep.

Besides, this doctrine of particular portions of the brain serving for particular faculties, said by Dr. Kidd to be 'highly ingenious, and founded upon unobjectionable principles,' and to have 'nothing unreasonable' in it, was suggested to Gall by the observation that persons mentally and morally remarkable in a certain way, had a striking size of a particular part of the head. So far from splitting on this rock, Gall built his house upon it, while most metaphysicians build their's upon sand; and when the floods of objection came, and the rain of abuse fell, it remained stable! Not only the whole system sprung from this observation of relation, but even the beautiful grouping of the organs was its result, and not anticipated by Gall. The situation of the organs of the lower propensities, and the inferior mental faculties, common to us and brutes, at the lower part of the head, and the superposition of those of the higher, one above another, according to their excellence; the situation of the intellectual, in front of the head — the propensities at the posterior and lateral parts, — and of the moral sentiments at the superior and middle parts, — facts assented to now by most persons who once would not admit the doctrines of phrenology at all — not even that the brain was the organ of the mind — was a discovery which resulted from the successive and detached discovery of particular organs. When Gall had discov-

ered organ after organ, he found them arranged in this beautiful manner; and when we survey this, and the various developments of those respective regions in the different tribes of animals up to man, and in different races and individuals of the human kind, our admiration and wonder at the plan and beautiful order of the Creator is unbounded. No human ingenuity could have invented so beautiful a system.

To show how carelessly Dr. Kidd had studied the science, the foundations of which he attacks, while he admires the structure, the President read the following passage:—

'But there is an occasional absurdity in the application of his theory, which, though obvious, does not seem to have been noticed. Let us suppose the case of a *murderer*, and that a disciple of Gall were to maintain, that as the crime of murder proceeds from the operation of the organ of *destructiveness*, that organ would be found highly developed in such an individual; and yet, upon actual inspection, this was found not to be the case! Here, although the disciple of Gall might be disappointed in finding no such development, a plain reasoner would not be so disappointed; for, is it not obvious that avarice, or shame, or jealousy, might, in a moment, operate so powerfully as to lead an individual to the crime of murder, whose nature and habits were as far as possible removed from the propensity to that crime, and who, consequently, according to Dr. Gall's own principles, would be devoid of any undue development of the organ of *murder*?'

Now, (observed Dr. Elliotson,) this proves Dr. Kidd, (and I say it most respectfully,) to be unacquainted with the writings of phrenologists. He should have known, that though the faculty of *destructiveness*, occasioning violence and fierceness of disposition, is generally pronounced to be large in murderers, yet that phrenologists equally maintain that the heads of all murderers are not alike—that in some, the organ of *destructiveness* is of but ordinary development, and the murder is to be accounted for by insanity, by a deficient development of the organ of *benevolence* and the high moral feelings, and an excess of the organ of *self-esteem*, love of notoriety, love of property, &c. Some murders are committed

by poison, some by stratagem, some with ferocity. Phrenologists know all this, and speak of these matters like plain reasoners; and whenever they have asserted that the organ of *destructiveness*, in a particular instance, was not of an inordinate size, have acted as Dr. Kidd conceives plain reasoners ought, they have been exclaimed against and ridiculed, and told that they made heads to square with their doctrines, to get out of their difficulties.

Dr. Kidd candidly acknowledges that with respect to ourselves, the study of the system may be attended with the happiest consequences; for if, from the contemplation of it, we can be strengthened in our conviction of the fact which both reason and revelation teach us, — that each individual is liable to particular temptations, depending on his specific temperament,—we shall then have an additional memento of our frailty, an additional incentive to watch over and combat the 'sin which doth so easily beset us.' The President observed that there was more advantage in it than this, as he had pointed out in his notes to Blumenbach's physiology; that when a person was receiving praises for his talents or his virtues, he must from phrenology have an additional motive for humility. He must see that they depend upon this happy organization, and not upon himself; for the Creator has made us, and not we ourselves.

Dr. Kidd, at the same time that he is so candid, falls into the inconsistency, and even contradiction, of saying, that phrenology, 'in its individual applications, is not only useless, but of a positively mischievous tendency, for it is evidently more safe to judge of others by their words and actions and the general tenor of their conduct, than to run the risk of condemning an individual from the indication of some organ, the activity of which, for a moment, allowing its existence, may have been subdued by the operation of moral and religious motives.' Now, replied Dr. Elliotson, if it were useful to ourselves to observe our own natural organization, it would be almost impious to fancy that the work of the Creator in the organization of heads which are not on our own shoulders, must lead to mischief. It is irreligious to believe that the knowledge of any natural fact can be otherwise than useful. He

begged to quote his own words from page 214 of his Physiology. 'If we detect the sign of great talents and virtues in the heads of others, we may love them the more, as superior and highly favored beings; whereas, if we detect the signs of great virtues and talents in our own heads, we may learn to take no praise to ourselves, but be thankful for the gift; and if we detect the signs of intellectual deficiency and vice in others, we may learn to pity rather than to censure. We may learn not to judge others, not even our own selves, but to leave judgment to Him who only knows exactly what strength of evil inclination, what weakness of good, and what unhappy external circumstances, we have had to contend with. In truth, phrenologists never judge of actions. They know that character depends on two things, — internal and external circumstances, — that the stronger the peculiar internal organization, the weaker will be the effect of external circumstances; and the less decided the organization, the more powerful will be the effect of external circumstances.' A very decided organization acts much, and forces on the person, in spite of external circumstances.

The other work to which the President called the attention of the Society, was one written by a curate of the name of Taylor, and which, he said, he should never have heard of, but for the advertisement, in which he saw that young persons were to be put on their guard *against the wicked doctrines of phrenologists as well as those of geologists!*

The work is a sort of catechism, and thus modestly and tenderly begins: —'Are you aware that there is a certain set of men calling themselves "philosophers," who maintain that the superiority of men over brutes is owing to a better organization of his brain?' 'Yes, I know that well, and am fully prepared to refute it as the offspring of *dishonest presumption.* No man can believe it for a moment, much less *dare to venture his eternal all upon it.* Neither have any maintained such opinions, who have not, *by their pride of heart and intellect,* hardened themselves *in daring impiety* against the all-seeing providence of God, and who, like a

stag at bay, set themselves, even against hope, in stern defiance of his retributive justice.'

This excited a general burst of laughter amongst the members, which gradually subsided into disgust. The President afterwards remarked that if it appeared to any one that the Almighty had been pleased to connect superiority of mind in this present world with superiority of brain, there could be nothing presumptuous, dishonest, proud, or impious in thinking so. On the contrary, the examination of the various excellences of the brain in the various orders of brutes, and the various orders of human beings, fills the mind with wonder, admiration, awe, and reverence of the Supreme Being.

The next question and answer were, — 'But what can you say of the organization of the brain?' — *Ans.* 'With respect to the substance of the brain, it consists of a pound or two of a pulpy watery matter, which fills the upper part of the head, and sends off strings of the same material to different parts of the body.' [*Loud laughter at this philosophical statement.*] The President remarked, that to speak contemptuously of the most wonderful organ among the works of God, was impious in the extreme in the eyes of all persons who make no boast or profit of their religion. 'This substance,' the writer goes on to say, 'from its consistency, its composition, its organization, and its appearance, in whatever light viewed, is as unlikely to produce thought, as any other kind of matter.' The comment of the President on this paragraph was, that he had enumerated enough well-known facts in his note B to section 8 of Blumenbach's Physiology, to prove, what no one in his senses could doubt, — that the brain is the indispensable organ of the mind in the beings of this world, the mind being varied according to its physiological, and perverted according to its pathological, state. However strange it may be that the brain can execute this function, such is the fact, and to believe it does so by the physical powers given to its peculiar structure and composition by God, or whether, by a hypothetical something pervading it, and called a soul, the difficulty is the same; for that something must be as far past our comprehension, as a mere physical power be-

stowed upon the brain by the Almighty; and to suppose that he could not endow it with the power of mind, if it seemed good to him, would be impious. Some phrenologists believe in the existence of a soul; others do not. The question is unconnected with phrenology, and never discussed by Gall or his pupils, who write expressly on phrenology. A great writer upon divinity — Locke — in his reply to the Bishop of Worcester, says, 'All the difficulties that are raised against the thinking of matter, from our ignorance or narrow conceptions, stand not in the way of the power of God, if he pleases to ordain it so. The faculties of brutes prove, either that God can and doth give to some parcels of matter a power of perception and thinking, or that all animals have immaterial, and, consequently, immortal souls, as well as men; and to say that fleas and mites have immortal souls as well as men, will possibly be looked on as going a great way to serve an *hypothesis*.'

'But,' says Mr. Taylor, 'do not phrenologists maintain that the brain is divided into a number of compartments called "organs?" What say you upon this subject?'—*Ans.* 'Phrenology I consider in two lights. First, Hume, the sceptic, or infidel, affirmed man to be a bundle of ideas, — that there is no such thing as an immortal spirit. His followers eagerly seized upon the supposed fact of there being those organic compartments in the brain, and maintained that the mind of man was a compound of a certain number of organs, the seat of different faculties. As, first, in the forehead, the intellectual faculties; secondly, in the upper and middle part of the head, the sentiments; and, thirdly, in the hinder and lower part, the animal propensities. All these somehow, like David Hume's bundle of ideas, are jumbled or combined together, to make that rational, feeling, and world-enjoying creature, called "man."'

Now, (remarked Dr. Elliotson) phrenologists are not the followers of Hume. As phrenologists they never speak of him. Gall knew nothing of him. So far from Hume having led the way for those who believe that the brain has compartments for various faculties, he led the way for the Berkleyans, who denied all proof

that matter of any kind existed at all. Long before Hume was born, the various faculties of the mind were supposed to reside in distinct portions of the brain, as may be seen in old quotations in Burton's 'Anatomy of Melancholy.' The use of the words 'jumbled or combined,' as though those words were synonymous, shows the dogmatism, the unfairness, of this pious writer's mind.

'Then you reject phrenology *in toto?*' *Ans.* 'By no means, as I shall afterwards show. There are various instincts or attributes of the soul. In different individuals certain of these are more active than in others; which is equivalent to saying that the soul of one man is more on the alert to one individual enjoyment than the soul of another is to that enjoyment. But it is well known that mechanics have stronger or more sinewy arms than the mere student, — the washerwoman larger hands than the lady. Such being the case, there seems to be no reason why the soul, which throws, the weight of its will into the balance of intellectual enjoyments, and another which is ever indulging in mere feelings, while a third is all for animal enjoyments, should not exercise almost exclusively different portions of the brain. And if so, undoubtedly the part of the brain the most used will be the largest; for it is always found, that the more intense or active the thought, the more rapidly the blood flows through the head.'

'But have you not in this granted all that phrenologists ask?'— *Ans.* 'Perhaps all that some of them ask, but certainly not what those of the Hume school ask; for *they*, placing the power in matter, say that the large organ gives the superior ability, more intense feeling, or headlong propensities; *I*, on the contrary, say, that the soul enlarges its instrument; for the greater the rush of blood is to any part, the more is that part enlarged, at least during the earlier part of a man's life; and thus the brain, as a lobster enlarges its shell, elaborates the extent of the cranium, according to its own bulk. In this case, the shape of the head may be an indication of the bent of the soul, and thus far all anatomists and phrenologists agree.'

The comment of Dr. Elliotson upon this was, that if there be two parties in phrenology, one of which is rational, it is unfair and

irrational to charge upon the science of phrenology the absurdities of the other, because phrenology, it is allowed, does not necessarily participate in these, which, therefore, can afford no objection to it. Then as to size being the mere effect of use, every one knows that a muscle, or any other part, grows the more it is used, and probably the brain, or distinct parts of it, will do the same. But use does not explain the different size originally of the bodies, or particular members of different individuals. One is little, — another big; one by nature has large,— another small hands; and no use will alter them but within a certain limit. No exercise will make a dwarf a giant. Some are all muscle, if we may so speak, others are spindle-shanked in spite of their exertions. Parts of the body not exercised voluntarily, differ. Some are born with large noses, — some are snubs, — the former not from great use, and the latter not from want of use. So it is with the brain and head. In children all placed under the same circumstances from the first, these differences are observed; and if we examine through the series of animals, we find the same variety, each species having its distinct size and form. The influence of exercise no phrenologist denies; but, besides its effects, each has by nature a certain development of brain, as of all other parts, and exercise and want of exercise produce only limited effects upon the natural development which is bestowed in original diversity upon each individual. Nothing, the President observed, could be more injurious to religion than attempts to support it by assailing well-established facts and just reasonings upon nature. Nature and a true revelation cannot be in opposition. The facts of nature are, indeed, a revelation of the attributes of God, and as dearly and reverently to be prized as any other, and an attempt to render the declaration of what is properly termed revelation, probable, by dogmas and hypotheses, is not only unnecessary but unbecoming. The doctrine of soul is admitted by some, and denied by others. But those who deny it do not thereby deny revelation. They consider revelation to be the declaration of things beyond human observation or reasoning. We never could prove that there will be a life hereafter. The Scripture declares it. There-

fore, and for that reason simply, without any other consideration, those who believe in revelation are bound implicitly to believe it. Bishop Watson, the great defender of revelation, says, — 'This notion of a soul was, without doubt, the offspring of prejudice and ignorance. Believing as I do, in the truth of the Christian religion, which teaches that men are accountable for their actions, I trouble not myself with dark disquisitions concerning liberty and necessity, — matter and spirit. Hoping, as I do, for eternal life through Jesus Christ, I am not disturbed at my inability clearly to convince myself that the soul is not a substance distinct from the body.'

The President here closed the volume before him, and the meeting was adjourned.

Art. VIII. — *State of Phrenology in Great Britain.*

Dr. J. W. Crane read before the London Phrenological Society, a series of questions addressed by the French minister of commerce to the French consul in England, respecting the progress of phrenology in Great Britain.

It appeared from the statements of Dr. Crane, that the French Consul, not having it in his power to arrive readily at a solution of the questions, and knowing that Dr. Crane was a member of this society, placed them in the doctor's hands, for his assistance. They were accordingly laid before the Council, at a meeting of which it was proposed by Mr. Wheatstone, and seconded, that the correspondents of the Society should be written to for information. The results were not sufficiently ample, and Dr. Crane, therefore, aided by Mr. New, appended answers to most of the questions, which he proposed to the members generally, for their additions, suggestions, and corrections. The replies, he trusted, would afford the French Government opportunity of seeing (if they had ever before made inquiry into the state of phrenology in

this country) that the science had considerably progressed of late in public opinion in Great Britain, and had every chance of becoming better appreciated. The French Government had, probably, in view, an object which ought to be alluded to, namely, that of collecting materials for a great practical application of the principles of phrenology to the education of youth and the reformation of criminals,—an end to which every phrenologist, as a philanthropist, must desire to see the science approach, — and which, if accomplished, would add another laurel to the accumulated wreath which the French Government had for years been earning by its remarkable patronage of science. The following were the questions, and the answers appended to them : —

Question. How many phrenological societies, or societies occupying themselves with phrenological subjects, are there in England, Ireland, and Scotland ? — *Answer.* In England about twenty-three. One of which is in London ; and one in each of the following places :— Hull, Bath, Plymouth, Manchester, Birmingham, Bristol, Liverpool, Wakefield, Derby, &c. &c. In Scotland, there is one in Edinburgh, one in Glasgow, and one at the Mechanic's Institution of that place, and one in Dundee. In Ireland, there is one in Dublin, and one in Belfast.

[The repliers might also have added, that some of the medical societies of London occasionally occupy their evenings with discussions on phrenology, which always finds many, if not a majority, of advocates; and that there are very few philosophical societies in England in which the science is not, amongst other topics, at times very largely discussed. This is particularly the case, for instance, at Portsmouth and Chichester. — *Rep. Lanc.*]

Ques. How many members are attached to the principal societies? (No answer.)

Ques. Are there among them any persons distinguished for their rank or scientific acquirements ? — *Ans.* In the London Society I may select Drs. Elliotson and Billing, and Mr. Wheatstone. — In Plymouth, Dr. Butter, F. R. S. — In Manchester, Dr. Holland. — In Dublin, Mr. Carmichael and the Hon. Mr. Halliburton. — In Edinburgh, Mr. and Dr. Combe, and Sir J. Makenzie. — In Glasgow, all the Professors but one.

Ques. What phrenological collections are there in the three kingdoms, and what is the number of skulls or casts in the principal museums? *Ans.* In the London Society, there are from 300 to 400. In the late Dr. Spurzheim's, from 800 to 900. In Mr. Deville's, 2200, and 5000 birds and brute animals. In Mr. Holm's, from 300 to 400. In Messrs. Child's, of Bungay, about 300 casts. Mr. Stark of Norwich has also a collection; and a collection is also forming at Haslar and Chatham, by sanction of Government.

Ques. Are there any biographical notices or remarks appended to the collections? — *Ans.* There are, I believe, none which are at the command of the public.

Ques. How many of the collections belong to government? — *Ans.* None, unless those at Haslar and Chatham may be so described.

Ques. If the Government has none, what are the supposed causes of that? — *Ans.* The Government, as a general rule, patronizes no societies for the promotion of knowledge, nor any sciences, except perhaps such as have reference to navigation, *ex. gr.* astronomy. It is by the medical board at Somerset House, that the Haslar and Chatham collections are sanctioned.

Ques. Does the Government encourage the collections generally? — *Ans.* It neither encourages nor discourages them.

Ques. Is there any phrenology class at the Mechanic's Institution of London? (The 'Royal Institution' is written in the original, but from what follows it is clear that the Mechanics' Institution is meant.) *Ans.* There is such a class as the Mechanics' Institution; none at the Royal Institution. The members at the former are allowed a room for the meetings and museums by the governors. They meet weekly for mutual instruction and the reading of papers; they pay a small sum for entrance, and have a cast of the head taken on admission.

Ques. What are the details of the organization of the Mechanics' Institution? (The reply need not be given here. — *Rep. L.*)

Ques. May it be inferred, from the establishment of a class of phrenology there, that instruction in that science now forms a part of public instruction in England? — *Ans.* Not fairly, though I be-

lieve that in time it must become one of the courses delivered in the universities.

Ques. When was the class established?

—*Ans.* In July, 1831.

Ques. To what class in France would this class correspond? To a chair in a college of France, or to a chair in the Faculty of Medicine? — *Ans.* It is analogous to neither.

Ques. Have the classes at the Mechanics' Institution any concourse (examinations, probably) at the end of the year, and what is their nature? — *Ans.* Small prizes are contended for there.

Ques. Do the students who obtain prizes, thereby acquire rights of any kind, or are they simply gifts of benevolence? And what becomes of the students there in general? — *Ans.* Nothing is acquired but the honor of success. Their subsequent destinations in life depend on themselves or their parents, and are various.

Ques. At what other public or private establishments of education is phrenology inculcated? — *Ans.* It it recognized as a science at the London Hospital, the London Institution, and Grainger's Theatre of Anatomy and Medicine, and the professor of the principles and practice of physic at the London University teaches the treatment of insanity on phrenological principles.

Ques. What progress is phrenology making amongst individuals in England? — *Ans.* It is daily becoming more cultivated, and better understood.

Ques. What remarkable works, and what periodicals devoted to the science, are published in Great Britain? — *Ans.* Information on the subject may be obtained from the *Edinburgh Phrenological Journal.* There are various works of Spurzheim in English, and of Dr. and Mr. Combe; a work on National Character, by Mr. Chenevix, which is based on phrenology, and possess a very high character; with some others of less note. There is also a cheap weekly publication in London, called *The Phrenologist.**

Ques. State with great care and precision whether the men of science, who are phrenologists, have applied phrenology to the discipline of any prison, penitentiary, or junior school, and if the

* Since dead, and deservedly so. It was distinguished by 'cheapness and ignorance.' The conductor was clearly unequal to his task. — Rep. L.

founders are satisfied with the results? — *Ans.* In the two former nothing has been done by any person. Education has been privately conducted on its principles by individuals in some instances. Schools based thereon have been established at Aberdeen by Sir G. Makenzie; at Enfield, by Mr. Rondeau, and at Ongar by Mr. Stokes. The founders are satisfied with the results, and the pupils at those schools have increased in numbers.

The document thus supplied with answers, having received the approbation of the Society, was afterwards forwarded to its destination.

Art. IX. — *Essay on the Phrenological Causes of the different Degrees of Liberty enjoyed by different Nations.** [Part I.]

I OFFER no apology for submitting to the consideration of the Phrenological Society this first attempt to subject the doctrines of political science to the test of phrenological principles. I am well aware of the difficulties, and which have hitherto been deemed insuperable, of uniting men in similar views on a subject, when the differences of opinion are so great as almost to have become proverbial. But when the doctrines of Phrenology shall have been generally understood and received, and political creeds have been subjected to the tests of its principles, I do not despair of the arrival of a period when unanimity in political sentiment, now rather wished for than expected, shall universally prevail. Phrenologists themselves have not yet arrived at this unanimity. Our science, in regard to the extent of its application, is comparatively in its infancy, — we have not had time to bring it to bear on this important subject, — we have prejudice to overcome, — and it is not in a day or a year, that we can be expected to renounce the

* We have been favored, by George Lyon, Esq. with this interesting communication. It forms the substance of part 1st of a series of essays, on the same subject, read by him to the Phrenological Society during its last session. In future numbers we probably may give the substance to his other papers. [Ed. of the Edin. Journal.]

preconceived, and, as we may think, the well-founded opinions of a lifetime, till we can see more clearly than I apprehend we can yet do, the bearing of phrenological principles on the intricate and perplexing subject of politics.

Nothing is so essential to right and correct views on this, as well as every other subject of inquiry, as an accurate definition of the terms we employ. The first definition of liberty which occurred to me was, *the free exercise of the propensities and lower sentiments* in so far, but in so far only, as these are regulated and controlled by the higher sentiments, and guided and directed by the intellect.* And when we consider that the propensities and lower sentiments are the great springs of human actions, — that their excesses have produced almost all the crimes of which history is little else than the record, — and that their due regulation by preventing these excesses, would thus seem to place liberty on a sure and firm foundation, the definition now given might be thought sufficiently comprehensive and correct. Still, however, as a perfect definition it appears to be defective; — 1*st*, Because it does not explicitly recognize man in his social condition and relations; and, 2*dly*, Because it does not embrace the direct gratification of the higher sentiments and intellect, while these, equally with the propensities, have their appropriate desires, and seek their appropriate indulgence. On this account the following definition may be preferred, and we may state liberty to be *the exercise, at will, of the whole propensities, sentiments, and intellectual faculties, in so far as this exercise is not prejudicial to, nor inconsistent with, the legitimate exercise of all or any of these faculties in others.* Where the propensities, sentiments, and intellectual faculties, are all amply developed either in an individual or a nation, such an individual or nation is susceptible of liberty, because the excesses or abuses of the lower propensities are restrained by the possession and internal activity of the higher sentiments. Those, on the other hand, in whom the propensities greatly predominate, must have

* To prevent misconception, I beg leave to state, that whenever the term 'lower sentiments' is used, I understand by it chiefly, if not exclusively, the faculties of *Self-esteem* and *Love of Approbation.*

their excesses restrained from without, because the internal restraint is extremely deficient, and in exact proportion to that deficiency on the one hand, and to the power and strength of their propensities on the other, must be the degree and measure of the external restraint; or, in other words, the severity of the laws by which they must be governed. In short, the first are a 'law unto themselves.'—'Knowing this,' if we may accommodate the words of St. Paul, 'knowing this, that the law is not made for righteous men, but for the lawless and disobedient; for the ungodly, and for sinners; for murderers of fathers, and murderers of mothers; for man-slayers,' &c. It is for these last that our statute-book groans under such an accumulation of penal laws, and whose liberty is thereby abridged, because the unrestrained enjoyment of it would be equally destructive to themselves and to others. Perfect liberty, on the other hand, where there is a capacity of enjoying it, is not merely exemption from tyranny or inordinate government, — nor is it even rational submission to rational rule;— it is freedom from all external law or government whatsoever, because external law or government is, in the case supposed, unnecessary. When the sentiments and intellect decidedly predominate over the propensities, as in the case with the Rev. Mr. M.,* such an individual would not require to be subjected to law or restraint of any kind. He would, as already said, be a law unto himself; he would, abstain from every crime, and practise every virtue, though penal laws were unknown; his abstinence from crime being dependent on a far higher authority than that of an enactment of his Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords and Commons in Parliament assembled. What is thus applicable to individuals is applicable to nations in their corporate capacity, and the sole object of the following remarks is to illustrate and apply the proposition already substantially laid down, viz. that those nations only who possess the requisite endowment of all the three orders of faculties can acquire and enjoy the blessings of freedom; while those, on the other hand, in whom they are deficient, are not susceptible of these blessings.

* See Transactions of the Phrenological Society, p. 311.

Before, however, proceeding to the illustration of this proposition, it may not be improper shortly to state the nature of those restraints on the activity of the primitive faculties which are inconsistent with freedom, and in regard to which those nations who submit to them cannot be said to be free, or at least completely so.

If then, a law should exist in any country restraining the intermarriage of one class of its citizens with another, such as obtained in ancient Rome in regard to the plebeians and patricians, such a law would outrage *Amativeness*, *Adhesiveness*, *Self-esteem*, *Love of Approbation*, *Conscientiousness*, &c.; and to this extent such a people would not be free.

If the armies of any country should be commanded by one privileged class to the exclusion of all others, however meritorious, as obtained under the old regime in France, in favor of the *Noblesse d'Epee*, who alone could aspire to military rank, such a law or custom would impose a direct restraint on *Combativeness*, *Destructiveness*, *Self-esteem*, *and Love of Approbation*, and indeed on the whole higher sentiments and intellectual faculties; and therefore the people would not be free.

If all places of trust, power, and influence were confined to a few, as in Rome, where a plebeian could never aspire to the honors of the consulship, such an order of things would be a restraint on *Self-esteem*, *Love of Approbation*, &c; and here also the people would not be free.

Again, if a law should exist interfering with, or prohibiting the free accumulation of wealth, such as the Agrarian law of Rome, this would impose an arbitrary restraint on *Acquisitiveness*, *Love of Approbation*, &c.; and would of consequence be inconsistent with liberty.

And, not to multiply examples unnecessarily, if a law should exist, as obtains in Hindoostan, and more or less in all Roman Catholic countries, where the great mass of the people are interdicted from perusing their Sacred Writings, such a law would be a restraint on the knowing and reflecting faculties and higher sentiments, and those nations who should submit to it could not be considered free, or at least completely so.

These examples are sufficient, and more than sufficient, to convey, in phrenological language, and according to phrenological principles, the meaning of the term liberty, and of those restraints which are inconsistent with its enjoyment.* — We proceed, therefore, to remark that, in investigating the causes of the liberty of nations, no error is more common, nor any attended with more serious consequences, than the supposition that free institutions will necessarily confer liberty; and to regard these institutions less as the result of the propensities, sentiments, and intellectual faculties of the nations who enjoy them, than as the creatures of circumstances, springing from fortuitous causes, and dependent on these for their existence and their continuance. This theory regards nations as the mere passive recipients of all or any of the various forms of government which chance or the caprice of their rulers may impose upon them, and either virtually denies every thing like national character, or ascribes that character chiefly, if not solely, to the reflective influence of those institutions under which they have happened to be placed.†

There is, in truth, no difference between nations and the individuals who compose them, and what may be predicated of the

* The common definitions of liberty, such as, 'exemption from tyranny,' or 'inordinate government,' &c. appear to me to be vague and indefinite. I particularly object to that given by Delolme, at p. 245 of his work, as extremely defective. Mere absence of personal restraint, together with the free gratification of *Acquisitiveness*, seem, in the opinion of this author, to be the sum and substance of liberty.

† The doctrine of circumstances is maintained by all our standard writers, and in particular by Hume, Robertson, Ferguson, Miller, Delolme, Tytler, &c. I am not indeed aware of any author who explicitly recognizes natural dispositions and talents as essential elements in the composition of national character, apart from the circumstances which do unquestionably modify them. The only exception I have met with is contained in the 12th article of the 25th volume of the Quarterly Review. The observations of the reviewer are so strictly phrenological as almost to tempt me to believe that he is a phrenologist in disguise.

I may be permitted to take this opportunity of observing, that the article on the Cerebral Development of Nations, in the 5th Number of the Journal, and the present essay, were written by their respective authors in equal ignorance of the existence of the other paper.

one may safely be predicated of the other. If then we take one class of a people who have received from nature a highly-favorable development, and compare them with another class who are equally remarkable for an opposite development, we can infer, with the greatest confidence, what will be their respective manifestations in private life. The one will be wise, virtuous and intelligent; the other will exhibit a conduct the very reverse. Nor will the result be different if we now transfer them to a wider and more public field of action, and suppose them to become the legislators of their country. It is, I think, self-evident, that the laws framed and promulgated by the one, will bear the characteristic marks of the minds who devised them; and they will be distinguished by all those qualities which enter into the composition of wise, salutary, and excellent laws; while those of the other will be no less distinguished by rashness, precipitancy, and injustice. If the institutions of a country are to do every thing, — if it is a matter of minor consideration what are the qualities of mind which are to guide and direct them, then it should make comparatively little difference whether the House of Commons should be constituted as it now is, — embracing, as it does, a large proportion of the wisdom, virtue, and intelligence of the nation, — or that it should be composed of those who inherit the deficient organization of a Haggart, Thurtell, or a Bellingham. I am quite aware that this inference will be zealously disputed by those who advocate the expediency of free institutions, and who conceive that they may safely be intrusted to every nation and people without exception. They will be ready to maintain, that the precise effect of such institutions, and that on account of which they wish them to be universal, is, that they will invariably exclude such individuals as those I have now mentioned, and will, on the contrary, call forth, for the public weal, the whole virtue and intelligence of the community. Whether this result will invariably take place, I shall presently inquire; but I think it must, at all events, be conceded that, *cæteris paribus*, the wisest laws and the freest institutions will naturally spring from the best development; and *vice versa*.

The truth of this remark is capable of a very wide and extended illustration. The Society has now in its possession the skulls or casts of the skulls of individuals of a variety of nations, and in all of them it would not be difficult to show, that their respective laws and modes of government are in strict accordance with their phrenological development. In particular, we are now well acquainted with the Hindoo development; and though this is not the place to enter into an extended comparison of their laws and institutions with their cerebral organization, but which, I have reason to believe, will soon be done by an abler hand,* I may be permitted to assert, that they are in perfect accordance with each other. It is well known that an attempt was made to introduce the English system of jurisprudence into that country, and to supercede their own barbarous and absurd code of laws; but not only was the attempt utterly abortive, — so uncongenial were the laws of a free people to the low and degraded Hindoos, that it excited universal alarm and discontent, and, had it been persisted in, might have lost to us forever the dominion of India. It was found impossible to govern them as a free people; in other words, we were obliged to continue as much of their own laws and usages as was not incompatible with our prerogatives as sovereigns.

We are in possession of the casts of another race, the Charibs, and we know how strictly their development accords with their characters and habits. I wish to put this as an extreme case. It is a development, without all exception, the most unfavorable which it is almost possible to conceive, indicating an almost complete deficiency in the region of the intellect and sentiments, and presenting a fearful preponderance of the lower propensities. Can such a people as this be free? True, they were, and if any of them still exist, they are free. But what is the nature of their freedom? It is a freedom which bears the closest resemblance to that which they shared in common with the wild beasts of the field, which it was their business or their pastime to hunt and to

* The paper here alluded to afterwards appeared in the Journal, No. VI. Art. XIV.

destroy. They were themselves but a very few degrees raised above the brute creation; so far only as to render them the most terrible of the tenants of the forest, and whom the European settlers, after making every attempt to reclaim and civilize, were at last compelled, from the imperious law of self-preservation, almost completely to exterminate. I can conceive nothing more preposterous than to give to such a people the free institution of civilized man. But let us make the impossible supposition. Let us imagine the British Constitution planted in the Charibbean Islands. Let us suppose that their inhabitants, instead of treating it with unutterable contempt as an infringement on that only species of liberty which they could appreciate, were to receive it as a boon, and with the gratitude with which such a boon ought to be received, and then inquire, (their development remaining the same,) how the machinery would work? We shall concede that their representatives were chosen on the moderate supposition that only a few lives were lost, and only a few maimed for life during the struggles of a contested election; and let us now suppose the Charibbean House of Commons, in Parliament assembled, met, for the first time, to debate on the affairs of the nation. And can we entertain a doubt of the result? Let us look again to their fearful development, and only one inference can be drawn from it, — that when the doors of the House were opened, after the termination of their first and last debate, we should find but one solitary Charib, who, after relating the horrible catastrophe, that, from a confusion of tongues worse than ever Babel witnessed, from scenes of tumult and disorder, they proceeded at last to the work of destruction, till, like another messenger of Job he might conclude, — 'Yea, they are all slain with the edge of the sword, and I only am escaped to tell thee.' If it is true that the same causes invariably produce the same effects, then I shall presently endeavor to show, that the case I have now put is not merely a hypothetical one, but is strictly analogous to one which has actually taken place in our own day, and within the precincts of our own quarter of the globe. The case of the Charibs is, I acknowledge, an extreme one; but it is for this very reason that I have

selected it in illustration of the maxim, *extremis probatis, media presumantur*. For, if such would be the use or the abuse of liberty which would be made by a nation possessing the development of the Charibs, then, in the exact proportion which the development of any other nation bears to theirs would be, *cæteris paribus*, their susceptibility, or rather their non-susceptibility, of the enjoyment of the blessings of freedom. I do not see how it is possible to arrive at any other conclusion, without denying the first principles of Phrenology, and the whole experience of mankind. — 'Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them.' If a large development of *Tune* is necessary to constitute a genius for music; if it is necessary to metaphysical acumen that the organs of *Comparison* and *Causality* should be amply developed; if virtue and intelligence are necessary to the possession and enjoyment of rational liberty, then I cannot conceive how a nation can be free, in whom the faculties of *Benevolence*, *Veneration*, and *Conscientiousness*, and the intellect are greatly deficient, while the lower propensities are largely developed. 'Either make the tree good and his fruit good, or else make the tree corrupt and his fruit corrupt.'

I have said that the hypothetical case of the Charibs is not without its parallel even in the history of our times, and within the limits of the European commonwealth. Of course I do not mean that they are precisely similar. They resemble each other, however, in their leading features, and with a similarity quite sufficient for the present argument; and I earnestly recommend the lesson which it affords to the consideration of those who still believe in the omnipotence of free institutions, apart from the characters of those on whom they have been bestowed.

It is well known that, during the course of the late war, the island of Sicily was taken possession of by Great Britain; and, with a magnanimity peculiarly her own, she resolved to bestow on her new ally that form of government and those laws, under which she

herself had attained to such a pitch of prosperity and glory. Whether the zeal, thus manifested to the Sicilians, was a zeal according to knowledge, will immediately appear; but there can be no doubt that the gift was generously, freely and honestly bestowed. The Sicilian government was therefore formed exactly after the model of the British. The legislative, executive, and judicial powers were separated; vesting the first in a parliament, composed of lords and commons; the second in the king and his ministers; the last in independent judges. Due limits were set to the prerogative, by not permitting the sovereign to take cognizance of bills in progress, or to interfere in any way with the freedom of debate or the purity of election; the peerage was rendered respectable by making titles unalienable and strictly hereditary, and by forbidding the elevation to the peerage of such as were not already in possession of a fief to which a title had belonged, and whose annual income was not 6000 ounces* of silver. Due weight was assigned to the commons, by fixing the qualifications of members for districts at 300 ounces per annum, and of members for towns at half that sum, — an exception being made in favor of professors of universities, whose learning was accepted in lieu of house and land; and, lastly, that the electors should be possessed of property to the amount of 18 ounces, and (which was most important of all,) the right of originating every tax was reserved to the commons alone.

Such is the outline of the constitution given to Sicily by the British; and the result of this experiment is contained in the following quotation from Travels in Sicily, Greece, and Albania, by the Rev. Mr. Hughes: —

'*No words can describe the scenes which daily occurred upon the introduction of the representative system in Sicily.* The House of Parliament, neither moderated by discretion, nor conducted with dignity, bore the resemblance of *a receptacle for lunatics*, instead of a council-room for legislators; and the disgraceful scenes, so often enacted at the hustings in England, was here transferred *to the very floor of the senate.* As soon as the president had proposed

* The Sicilian ounce is equal to 12s. 6d. English.

the subject for debate, and restored some degree of order from the confusion of tongues which followed, a system of crimination and recrimination invariably commenced by several speakers, accompanied with such furious gesticulations and hideous contortions of countenance, such bitter taunts, and personal invectives, *that blows generally ensued.* This was the signal for universal uproar. The president's voice was unheeded and unheard; the whole house arose, — partisans of different antagonists mingled in the affray, *when the ground was literally covered with combatants, kicking, biting, scratching, and exhibiting all the evolutions of the old Pancratic contests.* Such a state of things could not be expected to last a long time; indeed *this constitutional synod was dissolved in the very first year of its creation, and martial law established.*' Mr. Hughes thus concludes: — 'That constitution, so beautiful in theory, which rose at once like a fairy-palace, vanished also like that baseless fabric, without having left a trace of its existence.' Vol. I. pp. 5, 6, and 7.

After adverting to the utter profligacy of all ranks of the people, Mr. Hughes observes, that

'No one will wonder that difficulties environed those who endeavored to resuscitate the embers of a *patriotism already extinct,* and break the fetters of a nation *who rather chose to hug them;* that civil liberty was received with an hypocrisy more injurious to its cause than open enmity, and that, *returning without any efforts of the people,* it returned without vigor, and *excited neither talent or enthusiasm;* that those amongst the higher classes who received it at all, received it like a toy, which they played with for a time, and then broke it to pieces; and that the populace, having penetration sufficient to discover the weakness of their rulers, *were clamorous for the English authorities to dissolve the whole constitution,* and take the power into their own hands.' — Vol. I. p. 13.

In this instance, the institution of a representative assembly, in which unlimited freedom of debate was permitted, instead of giving rise to those calm, temperate, and dignified discussions which characterize the British House of Commons, was only the signal and the scene for confusion and uproar, where *Combativeness, Destructiveness* and *Self-esteem* reigned supreme, uncontrolled by *Benevolence, Veneration* or *Conscientiousness;* and, like wayward children, whom an indulgent father has for a time left to their own government, to convince them, perhaps, of their utter inability to guide and direct themselves, and who, finding at

length the misery of unrestrained freedom, are glad to return to his firm but parental authority, and to surrender that liberty which they had only the power to abuse; so the Sicilians not only voluntarily, but even clamorously required that their liberty should be taken from them, and begged for the establishment of martial law as a boon.*

With these observations, I pass on to the consideration of another example, where, as in Sicily, free institutions were conferred *de plano* on the people, — an example to which I refer the more readily, that it is of a still later date, and the transactions of which are fresh in the recollection of every one of us. I allude to the independent states of Chili, Peru, &c., which have recently sprung up in Spanish South America. Captain Hall, as he is the decided advocate of the new government, and of, at least, one of their leaders, and the equally decided opponent of the old system, so his interesting and amusing journal is the text-book of those who applaud the wisdom and excellence of the one, and unsparingly censure the abuses of the other. Far be it from me to defend the mode by which Spain governed her distant colonies; but, when she is reproached for adopting and acting on the principles, that the colonies only existed for the benefit of the mother-country, it is a reproach which she must share in common with every other government of Europe; and, though in many respects her government was worse, in others, particularly in her leniency to the Indians and negroes, it was better than any of them. Be this, however, as it may, the question is, Are her late colonies free, in virtue of those institutions which they themselves or their leaders have erected on the ruins of the ancient government? Those who maintain the affirmative of this question refer us to Captain Hall's journal, — a work, it would seem, of such high authority as to be deemed worthy of an eulogium even within the walls of the British House of Commons, and to be appealed to, not merely for the

* Mr. Hughes refers the degeneracy of the Sicilian character, and their inaptitude for liberty, chiefly to the influence of climate. In the essay as read to the Phrenological Society, of which the present is only the substance, I have shortly considered and combated this theory.

accuracy of its statements, but for the soundness of its doctrines. Whenever Captain Hall *narrates*, and does not *speculate*, he is worthy of implicit credence; and, though he can scarcely be considered to have even seen the interior of a country, of whose ultimate destinies his hopes are so sanguine, employed as he was in skirting along a coast extending from Mexico to Cape Horn, I shall confine myself exclusively to his own statements, and from them deduce the inference, that the Spanish Americans are neither free, nor susceptible of freedom.

Let us attend then to the susceptibility of the Peruvians for liberty. Captain Hall observes, that San Martin,* after retaining the supreme authority for more than a year, resigned it into the hands of the Sovereign Constituent Congress, which assembled in September, 1822. He immediately sailed for Chili, 'leaving the Peruvians,'—I now quote from Captain Hall,—'as they had wished, to the management of the Congress they had themselves elected.'—'The Sovereign Congress, thus left to themselves, appointed a governing junta of three experienced men: they also passed an immense number of decrees to little or no purpose; and every thing very soon went into utter confusion, under their guidance. Indeed the greater number of the deputies were uninformed men, who knew little of the science of legislation. In November, 1822, an expedition sailed from Lima for the south coast; but in January, 1823, shortly after landing, they were completely beaten. This disaster was followed by general discontent, and in February the sittings of the Congress were suspended by Rivaaguero, the president, who subsequently dissolved them in a summary, and, as it was said, a most unconstitutional manner.'

The royalist troops took advantage of these disorders, and recovered Lima. Bolivar was obliged to march with a Colombian

* Though Lord Cochrane has bestowed on San Martin the gentle epithets of 'liar, cheat, robber, hypocrite, and murderer,' there will be found in his addresses and proclamations to the Peruvians some of the soundest views of political science. See Capt. Hall's Journal, vol. i. pp. 253, 254. 267, 268. San Martin clearly perceived and predicted the incapacity of the Peruvians, for liberty.

army to their assistance; but, up to the moment at which I am now writing,* it is uncertain whether their independence has been recovered; and, at all events, if it has, it is not to themselves, but to a foreign army, that they will owe their very existence as a state.

I had marked some other passages in Captain Hall's Journal, with the view of demonstrating the utter want of *Benevolence*, and *Conscientiousness* of the revolutionary governments, in their treatment of the old Spaniards, whom Captain Hall describes as by far the best informed, the most industrious, and the most honorable of the inhabitants of South America, — but who, nevertheless, were stripped of their wealth, — in many instances either secretly or openly put to death, without even the shadow of a trial, — were subjected to long imprisonments, and every one of them literally reduced to beggary. If such are the effects of revolutions, and such the nature of the freedom which they bring along with them, we are at least entitled to pause before we join in the loud ac claim of those who point to South America, as the land of liberty and independence.†

Since I commenced these remarks, a small volume on the present state of Colombia, has appeared from the pen of Colonel Francis Hall, who styles himself 'Hydrographer in the service of Colombia,' and who is already known to the public as the author of a 'Tour in British North America and the United States,' &c. Though Colonel Hall, equally with his namesake, Captain Hall, is the decided advocate of the new above the ancient order of things; though, from the dedication of his book to Mr. Jeremy Bentham, and, from the style of that dedication, it is clear to what

* It will be recollected that this essay was read, during the last winter session. — (1825.)

† I am sensible that the extracts I have given from Captain Hall's Journal do not so fully warrant the assertion of the incapacity of the South Americans for liberty, as I could have wished. I have been obliged to omit several pages of this part of the original essay, and I must content myself with referring to Captain Hall's own book, and in particular, to San Martin's addresses, already mentioned.

political party he belongs; yet I could desire no stronger proof of the utter inadequacy of free institutions to produce freedom, than is every where to be found in Colonel Hall's pages. His love of truth is too strong for his political prejudices; and, though his hopes are sanguine as to the future, the present exhibits the most melancholy aspects.

Let it be observed, then, that the constitution of Colombia is almost, if not altogether, theoretically perfect. We have a declaration of 'the perpetual independence of the nation, the sovereignty of the people, responsibility of magistrates, equality of rights,' and so forth. To accomplish these objects, there is a senate and house of representatives, the members of which are elected every four years, and with all imaginable regulations for ensuring the purity of election. Then follows a president, also elected for four years, with secretaries of state for the home and foreign departments, &c. The freedom of the press is not forgotten, — all illegal arrests and imprisonments, &c. are prohibited, — every man's house, as in England, is his castle. Trial by jury, though not yet adopted, is recommended, — monopolies are abolished, and every species of hereditary rank or emolument forbidden. Nothing, in short, is left to be wished for, but that the practice were equal to the theory. What that practice is, I shall leave Colonel Hall himself to state; and it will be almost altogether unnecessary for me to add a single comment to the quotations I shall make.

In the very next page to that which contains the outline of the Colombian constitution, Colonel Hall observes, that 'it will be long ere individuals can be found, who, with no other support than the laws, and the sympathy of their fellow-citizens, will dare to brave the indignation of the government, and insist upon justice as a right too obvious to be denied; such an effort would, I fear, under existing circumstances, *be rather deemed an act of madness* than of political duty; and yet, until such a spirit not only exists, but becomes prevalent, — is not only tolerated, but cherished and applauded, — *there can be no such thing as practical liberty.*'

At page 22, we are informed that the constitution had scarcely begun to take effect in some of the provinces, when it was over-

thrown, and has since ceased to exist. 'The invasion of Morales,' says Colonel Hall, 'of the province of Maracaybo, caused the suspension of the constitution in the provinces adjacent to, or *which might become** the seat of war. Insurrections in Quito produced similar measures in the south; and military, which is always synonymous with arbitrary government, *has been since almost every where established.* This evil would have been trifling in a country already accustomed to the enjoyment of its freedom under a tried constitution, but here it has unsettled men's minds as to the value and efficiency of a system, which either fails to produce the expected advantages, or disappears when its influence should be most triumphantly asserted.'

Colonel Hall pathetically deplores the evils attending the administration of justice in Colombia, and justly condemns its civil and criminal codes; — 'The great evil, however,' he observes, 'which is likely to cling long round the government of the country in all its branches, finds its origin in those habits of dissimulation, indolence, and corruption, which mark the character of enslaved nations. *Momentary bursts of feeling, or even correct ideas, and general good intentions, are insufficient to unlink the dark chain of vices with which ages of ignorance, superstition, and oppression, have entwined every social institution, and contracted or distorted every moral feeling.*'

These are the true causes of the failure of the free institutions of Colombia. Detested be that government and that oppression which produced such demoralizing effects, if these are indeed the causes to which they must be attributed. But, whether they were superinduced or inbred in the character of the people, is not *hujus loci;* we revert to our original proposition, and contend that a people can be free only when the sentiments and the intellect bear the sway over the lower propensities.

But what, according to Colonel Hall, is the cause of the degradation of the Colombian character? He thus exclaims, — 'It is indeed a truth worth a thousand homilies in defence of liberty,

* The words are printed in italics, and they are abundantly significant.

that without it there can be no virtue.' Rather let us reverse this proposition, and say,—'It is indeed a truth worth a "thousand homilies" in defence of *virtue*, that without it there can be no *liberty*.' Free institutions, we must repeat, are the effects, but never the causes of liberty; and liberty itself is, in like manner, the effect, but never the cause of virtue, for without virtue there can be no freedom.

We shall now be inclined to look a little deeper, and to refer to a remoter cause than the introduction of the feudal system by William, that pre-eminence in freedom which has so long characterized the people of England.* There is, in truth, no great manifestation of *Causality*, displayed in M. De Lolme's reasoning; and, if any dependence can be placed on the accuracy of the portrait which accompanies his work, the organ of that faculty is only moderately developed in his head. For, even if we were to adopt the doctrine of circumstances, and ascribe the liberty of England to the exorbitant power of the sovereign, and the loss or the want of liberty in France to the weakness of the sovereign, and who, in virtue of that weakness, gradually subdued his nobles, —for this is the ratiocination,—how did it come to pass that, under the feudal system, which we have seen to prevail over the whole of Europe at the same period, the German nobles resisted the effects of those circumstances which enslaved the nobles of France, and, notwithstanding the greater power of their emperor, mantained, and maintain to this day, their independence, and now take their rank amongst the sovereign princes of Europe? Similar causes, we have been instructed, produce similar effects; and when these effects do not invariably follow, we are entitled to question and to deny the efficacy of the causes to which they

* In an early part of the essay, as read to the Society, I had noticed De Lolme's theory of the liberty of England, which he ascribes to the *single* circumstance of William the Conqueror's having, *all at once*, and not by slow degrees, as on the continent, established the feudal system in England.—See book i. chap. i. Without this explanation, the transition to a new subject might seem somewhat abrupt.

have been ascribed. It would not be difficult, on phrenological principles, to solve the problem, as we have only to recollect the superiority of the German development, both in intellect and sentiment, to that of the French. At present, I can do nothing more than allude to the difference of national character; and I proceed to remark, that it would be easy to show, that of all the known forms of government, the feudal system was one among the least favorable to liberty. It resembled a great military camp; and whatever privileges its chief officers, the king and his nobles, might arrogate or assume, the great mass of the people were left almost without the shadow of liberty. The word 'vilain,' to which we now attach the opprobrious idea of 'villain,' but too impressively reminds us of the low and degraded state of the people wherever the feudal system prevailed. If, then, the English could and did erect on this system those laws and institutions for which they are now so distinguished; if, out of this chaos, *rudis indigestaque moles*, they framed their present admirable system of government, can we ask for a stronger proof of that wisdom and intelligence, which, from first to last, have presided over all their destinies? Intellect is manifested by the adaptation of the best means for the best ends. It avails itself of every circumstance, however unpropitious, and directs every occurrence, however adverse, and, step by step, slowly but securely, advances onwards till the superstructure of liberty is completed and perfected. Hence, though the English, instead of being subdued by William of Normandy, with the aid of his Norman retainers, had been conquered by Solyman the Magnificent at the head of his Saracens, and who had introduced a Turkish, as William had a feudal government, still they would have extracted liberty even from this; they would have availed themselves (so to speak) of every loop-hole and every crevice into which liberty might have found an entrance, till the cry of freedom was resounded even in a Turkish divan, and which was finally converted into a British house of parliament.

I am far from ascribing the same measure of virtue and intelligence to the English in the eleventh and the succeeding centuries,

which is now possessed by their descendants; and, though I deny he omnipotence, I am far from disputing the powerful influence of circumstances; but I maintain that the love of liberty, and the power and the wisdom to acquire and enjoy it, is marked in every line of the history of England. It might at first be a 'sapling' but not 'chance sown by the fountain.' It had a living principle of existence, which no combination of circumstances could materially injure, and far less completely extinguish. Every blast, as it swept over it, might seem to the superficial eye as if it would destroy it forever; but, watered with the dew of heaven, it only struck its roots the deeper, till now it takes its rank as the monarch of the woods.

The peculiar glory of the British constitution is the establishment of the representative system of government; but this formed no part of the feudal system, from which that government is said to owe its origin. It is well known, that the vassal was bound to the performance of personal service in the field, and personal attendance in the court, of his superior; and nothing, in truth, was so alien to strict feudal usages as to serve either in the one or the other by deputy. If I am told that, in the progress of time, from the increasing greatness and population of the kingdom, the personal attendance of the tenants, *in capite*, of the crown, came to be accounted a grievance, or was altogether impracticable, and if, in consequence of this, they fell on the device to send one in the name of, and as the representative of the rest, what is this but a manifestation of that intelligence for which I have been all along contending? It was strictly the adaptation of means to an end, which is the purest evidence and exercise of intellect. Why did the English steer clear, on the one hand, of the errors of the ancient republics, oppressed as they were with the multitudes which swelled their legislative assemblies — or avoid, on the other hand, the equally serious error of the neighboring kingdoms of Europe, where all power was usurped by the sovereign, and national conventions were almost, if not altogether, discontinued? If we are to refer all the beautiful adaptation of means to an end which characterize the British constitution, — if we are to ascribe

the noblest form of government which the world has ever witnessed, to the operation of chance, or fate, or fortune, and not to the intelligent mind, which, though unseen, was ever at work in creating it, then I conceive we must blot out *Causality* from the mind, and believe that a work bearing the very impress of wisdom, was not the result of skill and design in the contrivers, but was the gift of that blind goddess, to whom her equally blinded votaries ascribe whatever, either of good or evil, is mingled in the lot of individuals or nations.

Nor is it even in virtue of these institutions, though they are the result both of power and intelligence, that the people of England are free. They are free, not because the barons of England extorted Magna Charta from King John at Runnemede, — not because of the Habeas Corpus Act, or the petition of Rights or the Bill of Rights, — they are free — because they have inherited from their ancestors those qualities of mind which enabled them to wrest from their rulers those memorable concessions to liberty. Wo to that nation, whose liberties have no better foundation than musty charters, or old and obsolete acts of parliament! When King Robert Bruce summoned his barons to appear, and show by what rights they held their lands, they assembled accordingly, and the question being put, they started up at once and drew their swords, — 'By these,' said they, 'we acquired our lands, and with these we will defend them.' This is a title to liberty worth a thousand charters, a thousand times sworn to be respected. It is the birthright of such a people to be free; because, having acquired liberty, they are prepared to maintain and defend it; because they who should dare to injure her, know, to use the language of Mr. Burke, that a thousand swords would leap from their scabbards to avenge even the look which should threaten her with insult. Liberty is the birthright of those only who are capable of enjoying it; for he cannot justly be said to be deprived of any thing, which, if he possessed, he could not enjoy, and could only abuse. We should laugh at a deliberative assembly of imprisoned convicts who should gravely assert their unalienable right to be free; and complain that the rights of man were invaded,

because they were shut up in a prison. And such, and as absurd would be the language of a people whose whole history should indicate a deficiency of sentiment and intellect, but who should yet idly prate about the rights of man, as if political liberty was necessarily one of these rights, was merely the gift of fortune, and not the dear-bought purchase of intelligence and virtue. Liberty is not exalted but degraded by those who consider it as one of those common and valueless things, which all may instantly possess by pronouncing the words — 'Let us be free,' and who think that 'freedom must follow, as light was elicited by Divine command.' When, after the fall, the curse or the blessing was pronounced on man, that he should earn his bread by the sweat of his face, that order of things was introduced by which labor was made to precede the acquisition of every blessing, — even the most indispensable. Hence it is that the hand of the *diligent* alone maketh rich, while 'the desire of the slothful killeth him; for his hands refuse to labor.' Can wealth, which is so little conducive to our real happiness, be only purchased by labor? And is liberty, that first of human blessings, to be obtained without a sacrifice? 'Homer may slumber,' it has been well observed, 'but not the people who would be free. Perpetual watchfulness is their doom; not the broken vigilance of those who one day are deaf to all its rational demands, and the next suppose they can compensate their negligence by fretfulness, intemperance, and outrage.'

ART. X. — *On the Organ and Faculty of Constructiveness.*

The facts on which Phrenology is founded, are so numerous and varied, that it is difficult to give even an abstract of them; but we shall from time to time treat of the faculties and organs separately and give a sketch of the evidence on which they are admitted.

We shall in the present number, speak of Constructiveness; and give first Dr. Gall's account of the discovery of the organ, and of some of the facts on which he founds his belief in it; secondly, we shall state part of the evidence on which we ourselves are disposed to admit such a propensity and organ; and, lastly, notice some facts in human nature, altogether independent of phrenology, which may enable the reader to judge of the probability of their existence. Dr. Gall's account of Constructiveness occupies sixteen quarto pages, so that we are necessarily compelled greatly to abridge his statements. He gives the following account of the discovery:—

When he first turned his attention to the talent for construction, manifested by some individuals, he had not discovered the fact, that every primitive faculty is connected with a particular part of the brain as its organ; and on this account, he directed his observations towards the whole head of great mechanicians. He was frequently struck with the circumstance, that the head of these artists was as large in the temporal regions as at the cheek-bones. This, however, although occurring frequently, was not a certain and infallible characteristic; and hence, he was led by degrees to believe that the talent depended on a particular power. To discover a particular indication of it in the head, he made acquaintance with men of distinguished mechanical genius, wherever he found them: he studied the forms of their heads and moulded them. He soon met some in whom the diameter from temple to

temple was greater than that from the one zigomatic bone to the other; and at last found two celebrated mechanicians, in whom there appeared two swellings, round and distinct at the temples. These heads convinced him, that it is not the circumstance of equality in the zigomatic and temporal diameters, which indicated a genius for mechanical construction, but a round protuberance in the temporal region, situated in some individuals a little behind, and in others a little behind and above the eye. This protuberance is always found in concomitance with great constructive talent, and when the zigomatic diameter is equal to it, there is then a parallelism of the face; but, as the zigomatic bone is not connected with the organ, and projects more or less in different individuals, this form of countenance is not an invariable concomitant of constructive talent, and ought not to be taken as the measure of the development of the organ.*

Having thus obtained some idea of the seat and external appearance of the organ, Dr. Gall assiduously multiplied observations. At Vienna, some gentlemen of distinction brought to him a person, concerning whose talents they solicited his opinion. He stated that he ought to have a great tendency towards mechanics. The gentlemen imagined that he was mistaken, but the subject of the experiment was greatly struck with this observation: He was the famous painter Unterberger. To show that Dr. Gall had judged with perfect accuracy, he declared that he had always had a passion for the mechanical arts, and that he painted only for a livelihood. He carried the party to his house, where he showed them a multitude of machines and instruments, some of which he had invented, and others improved. Besides, Dr. Gall remarks, that the talent for design, so essential to a painter, is connected with the organ of Constructiveness, so that the art which he practised publicly was a manifestation of the faculty.

Dr. Scheel, of Copenhagen, had attended a course of Dr. Gall's

* In the plates and busts published in this country, the organ is placed too low, and too far forward. In a great variety of instances, we have found it very distinctly marked, a little upwards and backwards from the situation in the busts.

lectures at Vienna, from which he went to Rome. One day he entered abruptly, when Dr. G. was surrounded by his pupils, and presenting to him the cast of a skull, asked his opinion of it. Dr. G. instantly said, that he 'had never seen the organ of Constructiveness so largely developed as in the head in question.' Scheel continued his interrogatories. Dr. Gall then pointed out also a large development of the organs of Amativeness and Imitation.' How do you find the organ of Coloring?' 'I had not previously adverted to it,' said Gall, 'for it is only moderately developed.' Scheel replied, with much satisfaction, 'that it was a cast of the skull of Raphael.' Every reader, acquainted with the history of this celebrated genius, will perceive that Dr. Gall's indications were exceedingly characteristic. Casts of this skull may be seen in the Phrenological Society's collection, and also in De Ville's in London, and O'Niell's in Edinburgh, and the organs mentioned as large will be found very conspicuously indicated. That of Constructiveness in particular presents the round elevated appearance above described, as the surest indication of its presence in a high degree.

Several of Dr. Gall's auditors spoke to him of a man who was gifted with an extraordinary talent for mechanics, and he described to them beforehand what form of a head he ought to have, and they went to visit him: it was the ingenious mathematical instrument-maker, Lindner, at Vienna; and his temples rose out in two little rounded irregular prominences. Dr. Gall had previously found the same form of head in the celebrated mechanician and astronomer David, frere Augustin, and in the famous Voigtlænder, mathematical instrument-maker. At Paris, Prince Schwartzenberg, then minister of Austria, wished to put Drs. Gall and Spurzheim to the test. When they arose from table, he conducted Dr. Gall into an adjoining apartment, and showed him a young man: without speaking a word, he and the Prince rejoined the company, and he requested Dr. Spurzheim to go and examine the young man's head. During his absence, Dr. Gall told the company what he thought of the youth. Dr. S. immediately returned, and said, that he believed him to be a great mechanician,

or an eminent artist in some collateral branch. The Prince, in fact, had brought him to Paris on account of his great mechanical talents, and supplied him with the means of following out his studies.

Dr. Gall adds, that at Vienna, and in the whole course of his travels, he had found this organ developed in mechanicians, architects, designers, and sculptors, in proportion to their talent: for example, in Messrs. Fischer and Zauner, sculptors at Vienna; Grosch, engraver at Copenhagen; Plotz, painter; Hause, architect; Block, at Wurzbourg; Canova; Muller, engraver; Danecker, sculptor, at Stuttgardt; Baumann, engineer for mathematical and astronomical instruments; in a young man, whose instruction the late King of Wurtemberg intrusted to M. Danecker, because he had remarked in him a great talent for mechanics: in M. Hösslein, of Augsbourg, who, in in 1807, had constructed, from simple description, a hydraulic bélier, which, with a descent of two feet, raised water more than four feet; in Ottony and Pfug, at Jena; Hueber, designer of insects, at Augsboug; in Baader and Reichenbacher, at Munich; in Baron Drais, inventor of the velociped, and of a new system of calculation. In Bréguet and Regnier, at Paris, &c. &c.

Dr. Spurzheim mentions the case of a milliner of Vienna, who was remarkable for constructive talent in her art, and in whom the organ is very large. A cast of her skull is in the Phrenological Society's collection, and it presents an appearance, in this par ticular part, resembling Raphael's.

Dr. Gall mentions, that it is difficult to discover the position of this organ in some of the lower animals, on account of the different disposition of the convolutions, their small size, and the total absence of several of them which are found in man. The organ of Music in the lower creatures is situated toward the middle of the arch of the eyebrow, and that of Constructiveness lies a little behind it. In the hamster, marmot, and castor, of which he gives plates, it is easily recognized; and at the part in question, the skulls of these animals bear a close resemblance to each other. In the 'rongeurs,' the organ will be found immediately above and

before the base of the zigomatic arch, and the greater the talent for construction, the more this region of their head is projecting. The rabbit burrows under ground, and the hare lies upon the surface, and yet their external members are the same. On comparing their skulls, this region will be found more developed in the rabbit than in the hare. The same difference is perceptible between the crania of birds which build nests, and of those which do not build. Indeed, the best way to become acquainted with the appearance of the organ in the lower animals, is to compare the heads of the same species of animals which build, with those which do not manifest this instinct; the hare, for example, with the rabbit, or birds which make nests with those which do not.

Thus far Dr. Gall. Our own belief in this faculty and organ is founded on the following, among other observations: The organ is very largely developed in Mr. Brunell, the celebrated inventor of machinery for making blocks, for the rigging of ships, by means of steam; and who has, besides, shown a great talent for mechanics in numerous departments of art. His mask is in the Phrenological Society's collection. It is large in Edwards, an eminent engraver, Wilkie, Haydon, and J. F. Williams, celebrated painters; in Sir W. Herschell, whose great discoveries in astronomy arose from the excellence of his telescopes made by his own hands; and in Mr. Samuel Joseph, an eminent sculptor. In the late Sir Henry Raeburn, who was bred a goldsmith, but became a painter by the mere impulse of nature, without teaching, and without opportunities of study, we observed it large. We have found it large, also in Mr. Scoular, a very promising young sculptor, who displayed this talent at a very early age. We have noticed it large in all the eminent operative surgeons of this city, in our distinguished engravers, such as Mr. James Stewart, Mr. Lizars, and Mr. C. Thomson; and also in the most celebrated cabinet-makers, who have displayed invention in their art. We have observed it and Form large in a great number of children, who were fond of clipping and drawing figures. A member of the Medical Society, some years ago, read an essay against phrenology in that body.

He asked a phrenologist to take tea with him, and thereafter to go and hear the paper. During tea his son entered the room, and his lady, pointing to the child, said to the phrenologist, 'Well, what do you perceive in this head?' The phrenologist replied, 'Form and Constructiveness are large, and he ought to clip or draw figures with some taste.' — 'Very correct,' answered the lady, and produced several beautiful specimens of his ingenuity in this respect. Her husband observed, that 'it was a curious coincidence,' and proceeded to read his paper, and remains, we believe, an opponent, but a courteous one, to this day. One fact is no evidence on which to found belief, but it ought to lead to observation, while the author of the essay condemned phrenology on argument alone. The writer of this article, many years ago, and before he knew phrenology, employed a tailor, who spoiled every suit of clothes he attempted to make; and he was obliged to leave him for another, who was much more successful. Both are still alive, and he has often remarked, that in the former the organ in question is very defective, while in the latter it is amply developed. On the other hand, we possess a cast of the head of a very ingenious friend, distinguished for his talents as an author, who has often complained to us of so great a want of constructive ability, that he found it difficult even to learn to write; and in his head, although large in other dimensions, there is a conspicuous deficiency in the region of Constructiveness. To these negative instances fall to be added the casts and skulls of the New Hollanders in the Phrenological Society's collection. These are all remarkably narrow in the situation of this organ; and travellers have reported, that the constructive arts are in a lower condition with them than with almost any other variety of the human race. Contrasted with them, are the Italians and French. An accurate and intelligent phrenologist authorizes us to state, that, during his travels in Italy, he observed a full development of Constructiveness to be a general feature in the Italian head; and we have observed the same to hold, but in a less degree, in the French. Both of these nations possess this organ in a higher degree than the English in general. Individuals, among the latter,

are greatly gifted with it, and the nation in general possesses high intellectual organs, so that great discoveries in art are made in this country by particular persons, and speedily adopted and carried forward by those whom they benefit; but the natural tastes for works of art, and the enjoyment derived from them, are here less in degree, and less general than in France, and especially than in Italy. The busts of eminent artists of former ages display also a great development of this organ; in particular, in the bust of Michael Angelo, in the church Santa Croce at Florence, the breadth from temple to temple is enormous. The reflecting organs, also, situated in the forehead, and likewise Ideality in him are very large; and these add understanding and taste to the instinctive talent for works of art, conferred by Constructiveness.

When Dr. Spurzheim was in Edinburgh, in 1817, he visited the work-shop of Mr. James Mylne, brass-founder, a gentleman who himself displays no small inventive genius in his trade, and in whom Constructiveness is largely developed, and examined the heads of his apprentices. The following is Mr. Mylne's account of what took place upon the occasion: —

'On the first boy presented to Dr. Spurzheim, after his entering the shop, he observed, that he would excel in any thing he was put to. In this he was perfectly correct, as he was one of the cleverest boys I ever had. On proceeding farther, Dr. S. remarked of another boy, that he would make a good workman. In this instance, also, his observation was well founded. An elder brother of his was working next him, who, he said, would also turn out a good workman, but not equal to the other. I mentioned, that in point of fact the former was the best, although both were good. In the course of further observation, Dr. S. remarked of others, that they ought to be ordinary tradesmen, and they were so. At last he pointed out one, who, he said, ought to be of a different cast, and of whom I would never be able to make any thing as a workman, and this turned out to be too correct; for the boy served an apprenticeship of seven years, and when done, he was not able to do one-third of the work performed by other individuals, to whose instruction no greater attention had been paid. So much was I struck with Dr. Spurzheim's observations, and so correct have I found the indications presented by the organization to be, that when workmen or boys to serve as apprentices, apply to me, I at once give the preference to those possessing a large Constructiveness; and if the deficiency is very great, I would be disposed

to decline receiving them, being convinced of their inability to succeed.'

Dr. Gall mentions, that at Mulhausen, in Switzerland, the manufacturers do not receive into their employment any children except those who, from an early age, have displayed a talent for the arts in drawing and clipping figures, because they know, from experience, that such subjects alone become expert and intelligent workmen.

These are positive facts in regard to this organ. We shall now notice a few circumstances, illustrative of the existence of a talent for construction, as a distinct power of the mind apart from the general faculties of the understanding, from which the reader may form an opinion of the extent to which the phrenological views agree or disagree with the common phenomena of human nature.

Among the lower animals, it is clear that the ability to construct is not in proportion to the endowment of understanding. The dog, horse, and elephant, who in sagacity approach very closely to the more imperfect specimens of the human race, never, in any circumstances, attempt a work of art. The bee, the beaver, the swallow, on the contrary, with far less general intellect rival the productions of man. Turning our attention to man, we observe, that while among the children of the same family, or the same school, some are fond of a variety of amusements unconnected with art, others constantly devote themselves, at their leisure hours, to designing with chalk various objects on the boards of books, walls, paper, &c. or occupy themselves with fashioning in wax or clay, or clipping in paper, the figures of animals, trees, or men. Children of a very tender age have sometimes made models of a ship of war, which the greatest philosopher would in vain strive to imitate. The young Vaucanson had only seen a clock through the window of its case, when he constructed one in wood, with no other utensils than a bad knife. A gentleman, with whom we were intimately acquainted, invented and constructed, at six years of age, a mill for making pot-barley, and actually set it in operation by a small jet from the main stream of the Water of Leith. Lebrun drew designs with chalk at three years of age, and at twelve

he made a portrait of his grandfather. Sir Christopher Wren, at thirteen, constructed an ingenious machine for representing the course of the planets. Michael Angelo, at sixteen, executed works which were compared with those of antiquity.

The greater number of eminent artists have received no education capable of accounting for their talents; but, on the contrary, have frequently been compelled to struggle against the greatest obstacles, and to endure the most distressing privations, in following out their natural inclinations. Other individuals, again, educated for the arts, on whom every advantage has been lavished, when destitute of genius, have never surpassed mediocrity. Frequently, too, men, whom external circumstances have prevented from devoting themselves to occupations to which they were naturally inclined, have occupied themselves with mechanics as a pastime and amusement. An eminent advocate at the Scottish bar, on whom Constructiveness is very largely developed, informed us, that occasionally, in the very act of composing a written pleading on the most abstract questions of law, vivid conceptions of particular pieces of mechanism, or of new applications of some mechanical principle, dart into his mind, and keep their place so as to interrupt the current of his voluntary thoughts until he had embodied them in a diagram or description, after which he is able to dismiss them and proceed with his professional duties. Leopold I. Peter the Great, and Louis XVI. constructed locks. The organs of Constructiveness were largely developed in the late Lord President Blair, of the Court of Session, as appears from a cast of his head and statue, and also from his portraits; and we have been informed that he had a private workshop at Avondale, in Linlithgowshire, in which he spent many hours during the vacations of the Court constructing pieces of mechanism with his own hands. The predilection of such individuals for the practice of mechanical arts cannot reasonably be ascribed to want, or to their great intellectual faculties; for innumerable objects more directly fitted to gratify or relieve the understanding must have presented themselves to their notice had they not been led by a special liking to the course they followed, and felt themselves in-

spired by a particular talent for such avocations. Not only so, but we see examples of an opposite description; namely, of men of great depth and comprehensiveness of intellect who are wholly destitute of manual dexterity. Lucien and Socrates renounced sculpture, because they felt that they possessed no genius for it. M. Schurer, formerly professor of natural philosophy at Strasburg, broke every article he touched. There are persons who can never learn to make a pen, or sharp a razor; and Dr. Gall mentions, that two of his friends, the one an excellent teacher, the other 'grand ministre,' were passionately fond of gardening, but he could never teach them to engraft a tree. As a contrast to these, men of considerable mechanical dexterity are frequently found to be remarkably destitute of talent for every other pursuit, and to possess very limited understandings.

Cases of disease also tend to prove that Constructiveness depends on a special faculty, and is not the result merely of general intellect. Dr. Rush mentions two cases, in which a talent of design had unfolded itself during a fit of insanity; and he adds, that there is no insane hospital in which examples are not found of individuals, who, although they never showed the least trace of mechanical talent previously to their loss of understanding, have constructed the most curious machines, and even ships completely equipped. These cases are at utter variance with the notion that the intellectual faculties produce this talent; for in them they were deranged, while they accord with the phrenological doctrine of this power depending on a separate faculty and organ which may remain sound when the others are diseased. Fodere, in his Traité du Goitre et de la Cretinisme, p. 133, remarks, 'That by an inexplicable singularity, some of these individuals (Cretins,) endowed with so weak minds, are born with a particular talent for copying paintings, for rhyming, or for music. I have known several who taught themselves to play passably, on the organ and harpsichord; others, who understood, without ever having had a master, the repairing of watches, and the construction of some pieces of mechanism.

He adds, that these powers could not be attributed to the intel-

lect, 'for these individuals not only could not read books which treated of the principles of mechanism, mais ils etaient deroutés lorsqu'on en partait *et ne se perfectionaient jamais.*'

Constructiveness confers only the power of constructing in general, and the results which it is capable of producing are influenced by other faculties. For example, intellect alone, with extreme deficiency of Constructiveness, will never enable an individual to become an expert mechanician; but, if the development of Constructiveness be equal in two individuals, and the intellectual organs be large in the one and small in the other, the former will accomplish much higher designs than the latter; and the reason is obvious. The primitive talent for construction is the same in both; but the one, by means of reflection, is endowed with the perception of the relation of means to an end, and hence is able to select from the wide circle of nature and of art every object and appliance that may extend and elevate his conceptions and their execution, while the latter is limited to a mere mechanical talent, like that displayed by the beaver, the spider, or the bee, admirable in itself as far as it goes, but never stretching beyond imitation of objects previously existing.

The DIRECTION of Constructiveness depends also upon the other faculties with which it is combined. The greatest development of this organ would not be sufficient to constitute a musical instrument-maker without Tune to judge of tones. Constructiveness, with Number and Size large, would constitute a good mathematical instrument-maker. Constructiveness, Ideality, and Veneration, would prompt the possessor to design places of religious worship. Join Constructiveness with much Combativeness and Destructiveness, and delight would be experienced in making ships of war, cannons, mortars, or bomb-shells. Constructiveness combined with Secretiveness, Imitation and Form large, give a talent for sculpture; add Coloring, and a genius for portrait-painting is produced; add Locality, and a talent for landscape painting is the result. The organs of Size, Lower Individuality, and Locality, all large (indicated by a general fulness of the head at the top of the nose,) combined with Constructiveness, are essential to a genius for *operating* machinery in contradistinction to still-

life mechanism. We have observed, that, where the former organs were large, the individual was fond of every thing connected with weight, momentum and motion, and delighted in machines in which *active powers* and *principles* were displayed. If Constructiveness was also larger, he could embody his conceptions in models made by his own hands; but if this organ was small, he was obliged to resort to other individuals to execute his inventions. On the other hand, where Constructiveness was large and these organs small, we have observed the tendency to be towards drawing or architecture, or some other form of still-life mechanism, with little interest in machinery in motion. In Mr. James Milne's son, this combination occurs; and, while we have seen specimens of his talents in drawing, without teaching, we have been informed that he has yet displayed no partiality for the kind of mechanism connected with motion.

Art. XI. — *Application of Phrenology to Criticism.*

It is one of the marks of true science, by which it may without difficulty be distinguished from what is false, that the instant it is discovered, by whatever means the discovery is made, it becomes available for purposes of utility. None of the metaphysical systems regarding the mind has ever been converted to any useful purpose; nor are they capable of being so converted: for though they have been by the great but misapplied ingenuity of their authors, devised with the express intent of explaining some of the phenomena of mind, they all of them leave untouched a greater number of phenomena than they attempt to explain; and of many of the most ordinary and striking facts they do not pretend to give any explanation. The investigations of phrenology, as is well known, were not begun with any view of forming a system, and were merely the result of following out a train of observations

(to which the first discoverer was led more by accident than design), with regard to the functions and uses of different parts of the brain. But no sooner had these investigations been carried to a certain length, and the conclusions to which these led, been placed in their due order, than a system unfolded spontaneously, more perfect by far than any which human ingenuity could devise, and more perfect merely for this reason, because it proceeded from an observation of nature, and was not the product of human ingenuity. No sooner was this system evolved, than it was found to be capable of being applied to, and of explaining with ease, those differences in the characters and talents of men which had baffled the ingenuity of the most acute metaphysicians. They who have studied the subject, and who have consequently accustomed themselves to *think* phrenologically, are able, in all cases of real character, even the most anomalous, to discern the combination of powers and feelings (according to the phrenological system), which produce the manifestations perceived; and whenever a character is well or naturally described, either in real or fictitious writing, have no difficulty in applying to the delineation the same mode of analysis. We, who have experienced this in numberless instances, feel, in the occurrence of every new case, a confident expectation that it is capable of being explained satisfactorily on phrenological principles, and we are never disappointed. We can assure our readers, that if they will only be persuaded to try the efficacy of this system as a medium of thought, they will find it to furnish a key to human character, and to afford an insight into human nature, of which, antecedently to actual experience, they could not have formed the remotest conception.

It is our intention occasionally to give examples of this mode of applying the science, by analysing a few of the characters which occur in the writings of some of our best dramatists and novelists; and we trust we shall be able to show, that those writers who, in their delineation of character, have shown the deepest and most accurate knowledge of human nature, are throughout the most strictly phrenological; that characters drawn with a due attention to nature, may with ease, and in every case, admit of being trans-

lated, as it were, into phrenological language; and that the writers alluded to have in fact accurately described the manifestations of those faculties which have been more distinctly revealed to us by phrenology only, without giving them the phrenological names. We trust that we shall not have proceeded far in this sort of analysis without proving, to the satisfaction of our unprejudiced readers, that phrenology is no other than a systematic view of human nature, and that whatever is natural, is just to the same extent and in the same degree, phrenological.

In our present Number, we mean to give an example of the manner in which this science may thus be made subservient to criticism; and in doing so we meditate 'no middle flight.' We mean not to expend our time, in the first instance, by flying at inferior game; we shall not hesitate at once to grapple with the very highest, and shall choose our first example from Shakspeare himself. We do this for two reasons; first, Because the characters of that incomparable master are invariably drawn with such a force and breadth, that it is impossible to mistake the lines by which they are portrayed; and, secondly, Because it is admitted, on all hands that he possessed a knowledge of human nature the most profound and accurate of any man who ever wrote, insomuch that it has been often observed, that studying Shakspeare is studying nature.

The Character of Macbeth.

This character has been alleged by some critics to be out of nature. They have thought, that no man, who possessed in any degree the good, nay, the great qualities with which he is described at the beginning of the play, or who was capable of the noble actions there attributed to him, could have suddenly become so wicked as to murder his kinsman and his king, when under the protection of his roof, without provocation, and without any other motive than that of inordinate ambition. Others have with more reason vindicated Shakspeare from any departure from nature in this particular, observing, that nothing is more inconsistent than

the human character, and that many times men, who are far from being destitute of good qualities, and who are even capable of performing great and noble actions, may be drawn on by strong temptation to commit the most atrocious crimes, of which antecedently they would have conceived themselves altogether incapable. When the Prophet declared to Hazael, yet uninfluenced by the desire of a crown, the various atrocities he should commit to obtain one, he exclaimed with horror, — 'Is thy servant a dog, that he should do this great thing?'— and yet Hazael did as had been foretold. Though aware, however, of these inconsistencies in the characters of mankind, previously to the discovery of that system of the human mind which has been revealed to us by phrenology, we were not before this able to trace the sources from whence these inconsistencies arose; nor were we able to see to what lengths they might be carried, nor whether all men were equally liable to such aberrations from the known path of right and duty.* We have thought it might be interesting to examine the character of Macbeth, as portrayed by our great dramatic poet, by the principles of our new science, and we think we shall be able to show that it is strictly conformable, not only to nature, but also to phrenology.

In the third scene of the first act, after the prophetic addresses of the witches (which in one event had been almost in the instant verified,) the bare thought of the murder, just suggested to him, throws him into a state of the greatest mental agitation. His ambition and his conscientious feelings are immediately placed in violent opposition: —

> Two truths are told,
> As happy prologues to the swelling act
> Of the imperial theme. — I thank you, gentlemen. —
> This supernatural soliciting
> Cannot be ill; cannot be good: — If ill,
> Why hath it given me earnest of success,

* The combination of the lower propensities with the higher sentiments, in different degrees of relative strength, in the same individual, accounts for an immense number of actions apparently anomalous.

Commencing in a truth ? I am thane of Cawdor:
If good, why do I yield to that suggestion
Whose horrid image doth unfix my hair,
And make my seated heart knock at my ribs,
Against the use of nature? Present fears
Are less than horrible imaginings:
My thought, whose murder yet is but fantastical,
Shakes so my single state of man, that function
Is smothered in surmise; and nothing is,
But what is not.

It appears from this opening, that the ambition of Macbeth, depending on his *self-esteem*, *acquisitiveness*, and *love of approbation*, is strong. His soul dilates at the swelling thought 'of the imperial theme.' On the other hand, it appears that he is not without *conscientiousness*, and *veneration;* but that these are moderate in degree, and not sufficient, — or not sufficiently active to keep down the evil thoughts that begin to rise in his mind. Had these been sufficiently strong, such evil thoughts, if they had risen at all, would have risen only to be instantly repressed. It occurs to him, however, in his desire to avoid crime, that it may not be necessary for his purpose:

If chance will have me king, — why chance may crown me,
Without my stir.

And at last he resolves to leave things to their course, and to be guided by circumstances:

Come what come may,
Time and the hour runs through the roughest day.

In the next scene, temptations gather round Macbeth, when the king declares his purpose of visiting his castle; and, at the same time, invests his son Malcolm with the title of 'Prince of Cumberland,' thereby openly designating him as heir to the crown:

The Prince of Cumberland! That is a step
On which I must fall down or else o'erleap,
For in my way it lies. Stars, hide your fires!
Let not light see my black and deep desires;
The eye wink at the hand! Yet let that be,
Which the eye fears, when it is done, to see.

Here it is evident he is becoming more familiar with the thoughts of murder. *Destructiveness*, *secretiveness* and *cautiousness*, seem all to have a share in dictating this speech, while *conscientiousness* and *love of approbation* seem only so far awake as to show him the evil nature of the deeds he is meditating, without making him resolve to avoid them. His desire seems to be, 'not to leave undone, but keep unknown.'

In the next scene, Lady Macbeth, by a few expressive touches portrays his character to the life:

> Glamis thou art, and Cawdor; and shalt be
> What thou art promised: — Yet do I fear thy nature;
> It is too full o' the milk of human kindness,
> To catch the nearest way! Thou wouldst be great;
> Art not without ambition; but without
> The illness should attend it. What thou wouldst highly,
> That wouldst thou holily; wouldst not play false,
> And yet wouldst wrongly win.

In perusing this, which would almost appear to be the character of a man of average good dispositions, we must consider the character of the person who draws it. It is Lady Macbeth, who is throughout represented as a bold bad woman, selfish, cruel, remorseless, of unbounded ambition, without principle, and without any benevolent or virtuous feeling. She says that Macbeth is 'too full o' the milk of human kindness,' (a most expressive term for *benevolence*,) not that we are to understand this to have been very predominant in his character, but that he is not, as she is, utterly destitute of that sentiment. His benevolence, and all his higher sentiments, seem to be moderate, while the propensities leading to ambition are too strong to be resisted by them effectually; and if there is any hesitation in his own mind, it is afterwards overborne by the influence of the lady, who seems, for all that is ill, a much more determined character. In saying 'what thou wouldst highly, that thou wouldst holily,' she does not mean that her husband's feelings of right were so strong as to reject any elevation to which he was not justly entitled — for she immediately qualifies it by adding, — 'Wouldst not *play false*, but yet wouldst *wrongly win*;' that he would scruple at doing a very

bold and wicked act himself, though he would have no objection to profit by a wicked act done by another. She explains this still farther in what follows: —

> Thou'd'st have, great Glamis,
> That, which cries, *Thus thou must do, if thou have it;*
> *And that which rather thou dost fear to do,*
> *Than wishest should be undone.*

But she is aware of his want of decision. His dispositions are not, as her's are, entirely on the side of evil. Though she knows it is *love of approbation* and *cautiousness*, not *conscientiousness*, that would restrain him, yet she fears, that without her influence these may prevail so far as to make him lose the glorious opportunity that now offers itself. Conscious of her own power, and of the influence which a determined spirit possesses over one that is balanced between opposite motives, she exclaims,

> Hie thee hither,
> That I may pour my spirits in thine ear;
> And chastise with the *valor of my tongue*,
> All that impedes thee from the golden round,
> Which fate and metaphysical aid would seem
> To have thee crowned withal.

The soliloquy in the seventh scene opens to us the character of Macbeth still farther. From the first part of it, it will appear, that his *veneration* and *hope* are not sufficiently strong to be felt as religious sentiments, or that not having been turned into the channel of true religion, they are dormant and useless for any moral purpose.

He is willing to 'jump the life to come,' were he only sure of immediate success 'here upon this bank and shoal of time;' but his caution seems to have been great, and fully alive to all the dangers of the attempt, so far as regarded this world. He recollects, that 'whoso sheds man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed;' a maxim perhaps more religiously acted upon in *former* days than it is at present; as the death even of a common clansman was sure to excite a determined purpose of revenge in the breasts of a whole clan, and seldom passed without ample retribution. Hence the following reflections arise:

But in these cases,
We still have judgment here; that we but teach
Bloody instructions, which, being taught, return
To plague the inventor. This even-handed Justice
Commends th' ingredients of our poisoned chalice
To our own lips.

What follows would almost appear to be dictated by *conscientiousness*; but that feeling, as we said before, seems to have been only so strong as to point out what is right, not strong enough to induce a resolution to do it:

He's here in double trust:
First, as I am his kinsman and his subject;
Strong both against the deed — then as his host
Who should against his murderer shut the door,
Nor bear the knife myself.

To a mind well constituted, the bare mention of these motives would have been sufficient to supercede every other. Had *conscientiousness* been strong, it would have presented these as excluding every thought of such a deed; — there could, after this, have been no hesitation upon the subject. No temptation could, in this case, have induced the individual to do a deed so abhorrent to every good feeling. But Macbeth requires *other* motives to persuade him against it; and he brings to his aid the *love of approbation*, which, in him, seems to be a far stronger feeling than the sense of moral obligation:

Besides, this Duncan
Hath borne his faculties so meek, hath been
So clear in his great office, that his virtues
Will plead like angels, trumpet-tongued against
The deep damnation of his taking-off!
And pity, like a naked new-born babe,
Striding the blast, or heaven's cherubin, hors'd
Upon the sightless couriers of the air,
Shall blow the horrid deed in every eye,
That tears shall drown the wind. I have no spur
To prick the sides of my intent, but only
Vaulting ambition, which o'erleaps itself
And falls on the other.—

It would appear, that without any great share of moral feeling,

Macbeth's *caution* and *love of approbation* have now almost persuaded him to lay aside the murderous designs which he had once entertained. But to prevent this, the lady now comes in, and, with her wiles and persuasions, turns the beam which was only slightly swayed toward virtue, and cast the balance to the opposite side. It will be seen, that, probably knowing her temper, and his contempt for every thing that savored of goodness, he does not hint any conscientious motive *to her*, but only dwells on what *might* have some effect with her — *love of approbation:*

> We will proceed no farther in this business:
> *He hath honor'd me of late;* and I have bought
> *Golden opinions* from all sorts of people,
> Which would be worn now in their newest gloss,
> Not cast aside so soon.

The manner in which this is met by Lady Macbeth is worthy of notice. There are three things which a man cannot bear without uneasiness, and least of all from a woman he loves; the appearance of contempt — the imputation of indifference, — and the suspicion of cowardice. To a man of Macbeth's temper, in whom the *love of approbation* and its inseparable concomitants, the dislike and the fear of *disapprobation*, seem to have been predominant feelings, these would be all highly grating; and it will be observed, that Lady Macbeth contrives to combine them all in her reply, which is at once scornful, sarcastic, and bitterly taunting:—

> Was the hope drunk,
> Wherein you dress'd yourself? hath it slept since?
> And wakes it now, to look so green and pale
> At what it did so freely? From this time,
> *Such I account thy love.* Art thou *afeard*
> *To be the same in thine own act and valor,*
> *As thou art in desire?* Would'st thou have that,
> Which thou esteem'st the ornament of life,
> And live *a coward* in thine own esteem;
> Letting *I dare not* wait upon *I would,*
> Like the poor cat i'the adage?

Macbeth, however, does not yield immediately, but rouses at these taunts. He answers in a noble and spirited manner —

Pr'ythee, peace:
I dare do all that may *become* a man;
Who dares do more is none.

Dr. Johnson says, that 'these lines ought to bestow immortality on the author, though all his other productions had been lost.' We cannot entirely concur in this unqualified praise, in a moral point of view. We do not deny that the sentiment is noble, but it is not the highest moral sentiment. It is dictated by *love of approbation*, and not by *conscientiousness*, and hence it is the more conformable to the character of Macbeth. He does not say that he dares do all that is just and right and virtuous, but all that is *becoming*, all that is great, and noble, and glorious: not that which is approved by his own conscience, but that which is applauded and admired by men. We beg of our readers to observe this distinction — a distinction which passed unobserved by the acute mind of Johnson, but which is perfectly apparent to every one who is acquainted with phrenology.

But Lady Macbeth, as she has no compunctious visitings of conscience to restrain her evil intents, so neither is she turned aside from her purposes by any desire of vain-glory. She proceeds to turn this desire in him against itself. She attacks him on the point of consistency, and endeavors to impress him with the idea of the imbecility and utter silliness of a wavering and unsettled mind, and the disgrace of retracting from a resolution to which he had sworn by all the sacred vows of heaven: —

What beast was it then,
That made you break this enterprize to me?
When you durst do it, then you were a man;
And, to be more than what you were, you would
Be so much more than man. Nor time, nor place,
Did then adhere, and yet you would make both:
They've made themselves, and that their fitness now
Does unmake you.

This last taunt must have been felt by Macbeth with peculiar acuteness, because it just touches the weak point of his character. There are many who are exceedingly bold when the time for action is at a distance, but fall away when it approaches. Opportu-

nity, which invigorates others, takes away from them the desire and almost the power of acting; and their courage requires the aid of example and the persuasion of spirits more determined than their own. These incentives the lady supplies as she can, and as could only be done by the boldest and most unfeeling of her sex. Provoked to the uttermost by her husband's want of resolution, she exclaims, —

> I have given suck; and know
> How tender 'tis to love the babe that milks me:
> I would, while it was smiling in my face,
> Have pluck'd my nipple from his boneless gums,
> And dash'd the brains out, had I so sworn, as you
> Have done to this.

Overcome by the superior energy of his wife's character, and ashamed to be outdone in courage by a woman, Macbeth has but one resource more. He wishes to show the reasonableness of his hesitation, by adverting to the dangers attending the enterprize, and the ruin that would follow an unsuccessful attempt. These he but hints at in the few expressive words —

> If *we should fail,*

to which she contemptuously and impatiently replies —

> *We fail!*
> But screw your courage to the sticking-place,
> And we'll not fail.

She has now brought him to the point she wishes — *Conscientiousness*, or the sense of right, has been long out of the question. The *love of approbation* has been neutralized by opposing the glory of courage, firmness, and consistency, and the shame of their opposites, to the simple reprobation due to crime; and all that now remains is a lurking portion of *cautiousness*, giving rise to the fear of discovery and failure. This she proceeds to remove, by showing him a plan by which their enterprize may be easily and safely accomplished, while, at the same time, their guilt may be concealed, and the blame of it transferred to the guards of the unfortunate and fated monarch:—

When Duncan is asleep,
(Whereto the rather shall his day's hard journey
Soundly invite him,) his two chamberlains
Will I with wine and wassel so convince,
That memory, the warder of the brain,
Shall be a fume, and the receipt of reason
A limbeck only: When in swinish sleep
Their drenched natures lie, as in a death,
What cannot you and I perform upon
The unguarded Duncan? what not put upon
His spongy officers; who shall bear the guilt
Of our great quell?

This plan, proceeding from the superior readiness and invention of his wife, seems to delight Macbeth. It removes his only remaining scruple; and he yields thenceforth entirely to her wishes. He even seems to express admiration of her thorough, going and intrepid spirit in this apostrophe: —

Bring forth men-children only!
For thy undaunted mettle should conceive
Nothing but males.

But even to the last, his *love of approbation* and *cautiousness*, acting on defective *conscientiousness*, prompt the desire of avoiding the shame and danger of the crime, at the expense of ruin to others.

Will it not be received,
When we have mark'd with blood those sleepy two
Of his own chamber, and used their very daggers,
That they have done 't?

Impatient to fix this idea, she exclaims eagerly,—

Who dare receive it other,
As we shall make our griefs and clamor roar
Upon his death?

She here almost seems to scorn his slowness of apprehension; but concealing this scorn, if she felt it, from him, she encourages him as a mother would do a fearful child, until she brings him entirely into that state that is fit for her purpose. He then declares his resolution to be fixed; but still we see that it is a forced resolution to do something which he conceives was formidable —

I'm settled, and *bend up*
Each corporal agent *to this terrible feat.*

He has not yielded without a struggle; and there are still some remains of the conflicting feelings in his mind, of which he seems conscious, even in the desire he expresses of concealing them:

Away, and mock the time with fairest show;
False face must hide what the false heart doth know.

There are but two descriptions of persons who are uniformly at peace with themselves: they whose moral sentiments and controlling powers so far predominate over the lower propensities, that they never experience any temptation strong enough to induce them to commit crime, and they in whom the lower and selfish propensities are paramount, and whose moral feelings, if they have any, are too feeble ever to thwart or interfere with them. Between these two extremes lie many degrees of moral strength and weakness, in some of which the tendency, upon the whole, may lie towards virtue, and in others there may be a preponderance to vice, but in all of them (and this, it must be owned, is the general condition of humanity,) there is a balancing of opposite and conflicting principles, — and it depends upon the predominance or the deficiency of the superior sentiments, whether any particular temptation addressing itself to the lower propensities shall be successfully resisted. Macbeth seems to have been in the condition here described, and altogether so constituted, that, had he been placed in favorable circumstances, he might have passed through life without falling into any very grievous error, and might have left behind him a fair, or even a high reputation. Unfortunately, his moral and restraining sentiments are much too weak to resist the lower and more selfish propensities, which are excited by the prospect of a crown. And in place of a monitor to bring him back to his duty, he finds in his wife but an additional tempter to second all his worse, and to suppress his better emotions. By her persuasion he does that which, without it, it seems evident, he would

not have done. He murders the good, the unoffending Duncan, and bids adieu to peace of mind forever.

It is proper here that we spare a word or two for the 'dagger-scene.' Notwithstanding the resolution to which he has been worked up, the better feelings are not so entirely suppressed in Macbeth as to leave him quite at his ease. Though determined to commit the crime, he still feels that it is a grievous crime he is about to commit; accordingly, when Banquo leaves him for the night, and he is left in solitude to his own reflections, — and what is the most awful state to a mind not at ease with itself, — waiting the signal for the dreadful act, fancy, aided by the highly-excited state of his powers, presents to his mind's eye an 'air-drawn dagger,' seeming distinctly visible, yet eluding his grasp. This, though a highly poetical incident, and well adapted to produce a powerful effect in the theatre, is not without example in real life. It is perfectly well established, that a high degree of excitement in some of the organs has, in numerous cases, given rise to the curious phenomenon of things and persons, not present, being so distinctly apprehended by the mind as to be mistaken for objects really visible. Macbeth may easily be conceived to have undergone this delusion at a moment of such awe and agitation; and that this is the cause of the apparition he seems quite aware when he declares it in as distinct language as could have been used by a phrenologist,

> A dagger of the mind, a false creation,
> Proceeding from the heat-oppressed brain.

And afterwards he observes,—

> There's no such thing, —
> It is the bloody business that informs
> Thus to my eyes, —

thus rejecting the idea of the appearance being supernatural and accounting for it, quite philosophically, from ordinary causes. The remainder of this soliloquy is inimitably fine, showing him to be so much alive to the horror of the crime he is about to

commit, that he invokes even inanimate matter not to inform against him :

> Thou sound and firm set earth,
> Hear not my steps which way they walk, for fear
> Thy very stones prate of my whereabout,
> And take the present horror from the time
> Which now suits with it.

This horror, it may be thought, might have led him to pause; but he has now gone too far to retract. The guilt of the crime is in fact already incurred, and to draw back now would not be virtue, but cowardice, the shame of which he is anxious to avoid, almost as much as he is to gratify his ambition. In short, he runs into the guilt, in the full sense of all its magnitude and horror, and, like Baalam, falls, having his eyes open.

The scenes that take place after the murder are no less characteristic than those before it. Lady Macbeth has no struggles before the crime. She has no immediate remorse after it. But Macbeth, who is represented with so much more feeling of a good tendency than she possesses, with some *benevolence*, some *conscientiousness*, large *love of approbation*, and considerable *cautiousness*, has no sooner committed the act to which he was goaded on by his own and his wife's ambition, than he is seized with the utmost horror at what he has done. Conscience, in such minds as his, is said to be a treacherous monitor, inasmuch as, before the commission of crime it warns us only in the gentlest whispers, but afterwards raises its accusing voice like thunder. This is easily and beautifully explained by the phrenological doctrine, that the organs of the different faculties are not always in an equally active state, but come into activity *seriatim*, either from internal causes, or as they may be effected by external circumstances. The doctrine is, that previously to the commission of crime, the propensities leading to that crime are in a highly active state ; but no sooner are these gratified than a reaction takes place; the propensities, wearied with long exertion, become dormant, and the moral powers coming into activity, show us the enormity we have been guilty of, in all its horror. It is not merely *consci-*

entiousness, that being roused is offended by the commission of the crime. *Veneration*, where it exists, is offended, by our seeing that we have transgressed the laws, and done outrage to the commands of our Maker. *Love of approbation* is offended, in that we have incurred the reprobation, the scorn, and the hatred of all the wise and the good. *Cautiousness* is alarmed at the evil consequences which may attend our guilt in this world, and the punishment which awaits it in the next. This, joined with *secretiveness*, alarms us with the fear of detection —and we start at every sound, and mistake every bush for a minister of vengeance. In the case of murder (which outrages a greater number of the higher sentiments than almost any other crime) *benevolence* is highly offended, and through that all the social affections. All these feelings being roused in the mind of the murderer, after the passions that led to the murder have subsided, are sufficient to convert his mind into a nest of scorpions. The whole mixed state of feeling constitutes what is called *remorse*, —and which, probably, when these feelings are naturally possessed in any considerable degree, continues to haunt the culprit during life, and to render him his own tormentor, even when he is not overtaken by public justice.

The scene which follows the murder of Duncan illustrates these reflections in the most striking manner. The lady comes in, bold and determined, pluming herself on her skilful arrangements, and her success in intoxicating the grooms — yet even she is not without her fears; but these have only one object, the possible failure of their enterprize. The agitation of Macbeth is indicated by his calling within, —

Who's there? —What, ho!

She is startled with this, and exclaims —

Alack! I am afraid they have awaked,
And 'tis not done: — th' attempt, and not the deed,
Confounds us — Hark! — I laid the daggers ready,
He could not miss them.

Here a most striking circumstance is mentioned :—

Had he not resembled
My father as he slept—I had done't.

This, as Warburton observes, is very artful. For, as the poet has drawn the lady and her husband, it might be thought the act should have been done by her. 'It is likewise, (says he,) highly just; for though ambition had subdued in her all the sentiments of nature towards *present* objects, yet the likeness of *one past*, which she had been accustomed to regard with reverence, made her unnatural passions for a moment give way to the sentiments of instinct and humanity.' This is the explanation of the circumstance given by one of the ablest critics of our great bard, but it is rather an obscure one, and is not founded on any known principle in human nature. Phrenology furnishes an explanation which is not liable to these objections. Lady Macbeth is represented as almost totally void of *benevolent* feeling, or of any of the higher moral sentiments; but she is nowhere represented as incapable of *attachment* or domestic affection. On the contrary, she seems, throughout the play, to be devotedly attached to her husband. It is *his* greatness, *his* advancement she desires, more than her own. She every where speaks to him in the language of kindness and affection; and, destitute as she is of the higher moral qualities, we can easily conceive her to have been a dutiful and loving daughter. Shakspeare, who seems to have known human nature by an intuitive power, was aware of a fact, which phrenology, founded on careful observation, has since taught its disciples — *that these two species of feelings are totally distinct, and not at all dependent on each other.* There are many men and women who are ardently attached to their near relations, or others who are nearly connected with them, from possessing a strong *adhesiveness*, and who yet have no feelings of love or charity to any others of the human race, because they are destitute of the sentiment of *benevolence.* This seems to have been exactly the case with Lady Macbeth. Duncan, merely as her guest, her kinsman, and her king, she could have murdered in his sleep, had

not his accidental resemblance to an object of her strong affection, her father, stayed her hand. But for this trait, the character of Lady Macbeth would have been too horrible and fiend-like; but this single instance, in which she seems accessible to a touch of natural affection, allows us to feel, that, though unfeeling and cruel in her disposition, she still partakes of human nature, which is never so depraved as to be totally void of every good quality.

Macbeth then appears, environed with all the horrors of guilt, self-condemnation, and despair. The scene needs no comment. It is impossible to delineate all the characters of remorse, more strongly, more accurately, or more beautifully, than is here done by a few expressive touches.

Macb. I have done the deed:—Did'st thou not hear a noise?
* * * * * * *
Hark! Who lies i' the second chamber?
Lady M. Donalbain.
Macb. (*Looking at his hands.*) This is a sorry sight.
Lady M. A foolish thought, to say a sorry sight.
Macb. There's one did laugh in his sleep, and one cried *murder!*
That they did wake each other; I stood and heard them;
But they did say their prayers, and addressed them
Again to sleep.
Lady M. There are two lodged together.
Macb. One cried, God bless us! and Amen, the other;
As they had seen me, with these hangman's hands,
Listening their fear. I could not say, Amen,
When they did say, God bless us.
Lady M. Consider it not so deeply.
Macb. But wherefore could not I pronounce amen?
I had most need of blessing, but amen
Stuck in my throat.
Lady M. These deeds must not be thought
After these ways; so, it will make us mad.

There is hitherto nothing more shown than the natural operation of those good feelings, which we have seen Macbeth possessed in some degree, awakened to activity, after the strong excitement under which he proceeded to commit the act had subsided. The lady is under no such agitation — not from possessing a stronger mind, but because the good feelings in her were weaker or altogether wanting.

What follows is bolder. Macbeth has previously seen what was the mere product of his fancy. He is now represented as hearing a voice, which is equally the result of highly-wrought feelings, and expressive of the deep horror with which his crime now appears invested:

> Methought I heard a voice cry, *Sleep no more!*
> *Macbeth doth murder sleep.—The innocent sleep:—*
> *Sleep, that knits up the ravelled sleeve of care—*
> *The death of each day's life, sore labor's bath,—*
> *Chief nourisher in life's feast,—**

The lady is quite astonished at this emotion. She feels none, and can see no reason for it in him, and asks impatiently —

> What do you mean?

In his answer, it appears that this internal monitor had made so deep an impression upon him, that it appeared to address not himself merely, but the whole household:

> Still it cried, *Sleep no more*, to all the house. —
> *Glammis hath murdered sleep; and therefore Cawdor*
> *Shall sleep no more — Macbeth shall sleep no more!*
> *Lady M.* Who was it that thus cried? Why, worthy thane,
> You do unbend your noble strength, to think
> So brain-sickly of things. —

His emotion has totally deprived him of the power of thinking or acting, but she retains both:

> Go, get some water,
> And wash this filthy witness from your hand. —
> Why did you bring these daggers from the place?
> They must lie there: go, carry them; and smear
> The sleepy grooms with blood.
> *Macb.* I'll go no more:
> I am afraid to *think* what I have done;

* It has been observed by Mr. Combe, that this faculty, when powerful, is attended with a sentiment of its own paramount authority over every other, and gives its impulses with a tone which appears like the voice of Heaven. The same will hold when the sentiment, though moderate in itself, is powerfully excited.

Look on't again, I dare not.
Lady M. Infirm of purpose!
Give me the daggers: the sleeping and the dead
Are but as pictures: 'tis the eye of childhood
That fears a painted devil. If he do bleed,
I'll gild the faces of the grooms withal,
For it must seem their guilt. [*Exit. Knocking within.*
Macb. Whence is that knocking?
How is't with me, when every noise appals me?
What hands are here? — *Ha!* they pluck out mine eyes, &c.
Re-enter LADY.
Lady M. My hands are of your color; but I shame
To wear a heart so white.
Retire we to our chamber:
A little water clears us of this deed:
How easy is it, then? your constancy
Hath left you unattended. — [*Knocking.*] Hark! more knocking:
Get on your night-gown, lest occasion call us,
And show us to be watchers: — Be not lost
So poorly in your thoughts.
Macb. To know my deed — 'twere best not know myself.
Wake Duncan with thy knocking! Ay, 'would thou couldst!

We have seen Macbeth under the influence of the first feelings of an awakened conscience; but these feelings are often not lasting. — They weaken with time, and when not strong enough to lead to repentance and reformation, the individual continues to harden himself against them, and recovers, if not inward ease, at least outward composure. Secretiveness here assists to conceal what is passing within, though still some indications may make it visible to an accurate observer that all is not perfectly quiet. When Macbeth comes to show Macduff the king's chamber, though more composed apparently, yet his short constrained answers give some note of the uneasiness he is suffering:

Macd. Is the king stirring, worthy Thane?
Macb. Not yet.
Macd. He did command me to call timely on him;
I have almost slipp'd the hour.
Macb. I'll bring you to him.
Macd. I know, this is a joyful trouble to you;
But yet 'tis one.
Macb. The labor we delight in physics pain.
This is the door.

Len. Goes the king
Hence to-day?
Macb. He does:—He did appoint it so.

Macbeth is now embarked in a course of deceit, hypocrisy, and farther bloody deeds. One crime leads to more,—and the least of these is a feigned grief for the effect of his first guilt; but yet his expressions are at first equivocal,—and his feelings altogether such, that he may almost be supposed to speak the truth, when he says,

> Had I but died an hour before this chance,
> I had lived a blessed time; for, from this instant
> There's nothing serious in mortality;
> All is but toys: renown and grace is dead;
> The wine of life is drawn, and the mere lees
> Is left this vault to brag of.

When questioned by Malcolm, his evading to speak of the murder, or to say who were the murderers, are circumstances which show the attention of Shakspeare to the minutest shades and accidents in his painting. His anxiety too to prevent discovery, by killing the guards, under pretence of uncontrollable fury at their imputed crime, is in the highest degree natural and artful.

It is a trite remark, '*c'est ne que le premier pas qui coute.*' Macbeth having once imbrued his hands in blood, needs not his lady's instructions to incite him to any other murder. Having obtained the crown by means of this kind, he goes on to commit fresh crimes to secure himself in it. As he himself says,

> I am in blood so far stept in,
> Returning were as tedious as go o'er.

Till now he has been chiefly under the guidance of *love of approbation;* but his elevation to the crown renders this feeling less effective, and fear (cautiousness) is now the master passion of his heart. It is this which incites him to to the removal of Banquo.

> Our fears in Banquo
> Stick deep; and in his royalty of nature
> Reigns that, which would be fear'd: 'Tis much he dares;
> And, to that dauntless temper of his mind,

He hath a wisdom, that doth guide his valor
To act in safety. There is none, but he,
Whose being I do fear.

The prophecy of the sisters, who said that Banquo's issue should be kings, confirms his bloody purpose. But even while the act is on the eve of being accomplished, he confesses to his wife how much his mind is torn by fears and disquietudes, insomuch, that, even on the throne itself, he almost envies the condition of that victim whom he has immolated in order to obtain it:

We have scotch'd the snake, not killed it;
She'll close and be herself; whilst our poor malice
Remains in danger of her former tooth.
But let
The frame of things disjoint, both the worlds suffer,
Ere we will eat our meal in fear, and sleep
In the affliction of these terrible dreams,
That shake us nightly! Better be with the dead,
Whom we, to gain our place, have sent to peace,
Than on the torture of the mind to lie
In restless ecstacy. Duncan is in his grave;
After life's fitful fever, he sleeps well;
Treason has done his worst; nor steel, nor poison,
Malice domestic, foreign levy, nothing,
Can touch him further.

The Lady, who is always represented as coaxing and encouraging her husband, soothing his agitations, and endeavoring to calm his terrors, answers,

Come on;
Gentle my lord, sleek o'er your rugged looks;
Be bright and jovial 'mong your guests to-night.

His reply shows his desire to conceal his inward feelings, while at the same time he betrays the consciousness of his guilty and degraded state:

So shall I, love; and so, I pray, be you:
Let your remembrance apply to Banquo;
Present him eminence, both with eye and tongue:
Unsafe the while, that we
Must leave our honors in these flattering streams;
And make our faces vizards to our hearts,

Disguising what they are.
Lady M. You must leave this.
Macb. O, full of scorpions is my mind, dear wife.

We need not follow him through the farther scenes of blood,—only to observe, that even to the last, though grown more inured to evil deeds, he nowhere shows that callousness and utter disregard of crime, that is exhibited in Richard III. and some other wicked characters pourtrayed by the same masterly hand. To the end he is subject to the horrors of remorse, and these seem even partly to realize the sentence, which his conscience in its first exasperation denounced upon him, that he should sleep no more in peace. — The lady tells him,

You lack the season of all natures, sleep.

And afterwards, in her state of sleep-walking, when she shows in her own person that conscience will, in its own way, assault even the most callous, she intimates the state of terror in which he seems to have constantly lived:

'Hell is murky! — Fye, my lord, fye! a soldier, and afear'd? What need we fear who knows it, when none can call our power to account?'—'No more of that, my lord,—no more of that,—you mar all with this starting.'

We do not think it necessary to carry the analysis farther. We think it is evident, from this examination, both on the principles of phrenology, and on the acknowledged facts in the history of man, which are known to us independently of that science, that the character of Macbeth, as drawn by our immortal bard, so far from being out of nature, shows the deepest knowledge of the human heart, and is throughout perfectly natural. We have seen that it is not otherwise inconsistent than the nature of man is itself inconsistent, — and that the apparent inconsistencies are all reconcilable to a few plain and easily-understood principles, operated upon in certain obvious and intelligible ways, by the circumstances in which he is placed. The only feelings which seem to be possessed strongly, are *love of approbation* and *cautiousness*, —the rest both of the lower propensities and higher sentiments,

seem either so moderate in degree, or so equally balanced, that the character might have been turned either towards good or towards evil, according to the situation in which the individual was placed, or the example and persuasions of those who happened to be near him. Unfortunately such is the character of his lady, that the example and persuasions coming from her, and to which even some of his good propensities lend an additional force, all tend towards evil. This affords a key to the whole wavering in Macbeth's mind, his fall into irremediable crime, his consequent remorse, and final ruin.

ART. XII. — *Practical Application of Phrenology on a Voyage.*

25th January, 1824.

MR. EDITOR, — One of the most instructive and delightful occupations which a phrenologist can have, and one which can never fail him, at home or abroad, in the society of friends or of strangers, of the learned or of the illiterate, is that of observing peculiarities of development, and of tracing the varied natural language and outward manifestations of the predominant faculties in the looks, gestures, speech, and conduct of those with whom he may come in contact. Indeed, I have ever since I became acquainted with the science, found it to be the most desirable travelling companion a man can have. By its means the phrenologist derives both profit and pleasure, where another man finds only dulness and ennui. Place him, for instance, in a stage-coach, or in a steam-boat, among strangers, he has no difficulty in passing his time to his satisfaction. He sets about ascertaining what his companions are, not by asking their names, places of abode, and professions, as is the custom in France, but by inspecting their development, the indications afforded by which he knows to be the best and truest certificate of their intellectual talents, and moral

qualities; and he regulates his conduct accordingly. If he finds a youth with an enormous endowment of Self-esteem and Love of Approbation, who seems to demand the homage of all about him, and to think himself the most important person present, the phrenologist, knowing from what his airs proceed, instead of taking offence, treats him according to his real merits, and probably amuses himself with studying the peculiar combination of faculties which mark his character. If he finds another man, who contradicts every word that is said, and shows himself obstinate in maintaining a disputed point, the phrenologist regards this as springing from a large endowment of Combativeness and Firmness; and, aware that argument only serves to inflame these already too active propensities, he mildly states his opinion, and leaves his friend to keep that which he believes to be right. If, again, he meets with a person in whom Acquisitiveness, Secretiveness, and Self-esteem are large in proportion to Conscientiousness and Intellect, he can see no harm, in these degenerate days, in guarding against such trifling accidents as the disappearance of his purse or watch. Or if he finds a man with small Comparison and Causality and a small head, he will not try to talk with him on metaphysics or political economy; at least, with the view of acquiring new ideas. But I must stop my illustrations, to come to the proper business of this letter, which is simply to give you an account of the cerebral development and manifestations of an individual, whose character I had leisure to study, during a pretty long voyage in a ship in which he was captain and I a passenger.* The configuration of his head was calculated to strike, but by no means to delight, the observer. He soon saw the worst, however, and he could act accordingly. Subjoined is a note of the development, which, from actual examination, I know to be correct:

No. 1. Amativeness, small.
2. Philoprogenitiveness, large.
3. Concentrativeness, rather full.
4. Adhesiveness, rather small.
5. Combativeness, rather large.
6. Destructiveness, very large.
7. Constructiveness, large.
8. Acquisitiveness, do.
9. Secretiveness, full.
10. Self-esteem, very large.

* The facts stated in this letter, are not fictitious.—*Editor.*

No. 11. Love of Approbation, rather large.
12. Cautiousness, very large.
13. Benevolence, large.
14. Veneration, not large.
15. Hope, full.
16. Ideality, small.
17. Conscientiousness, do.
18. Firmness, very large.
19. Individuality, large.
20. Form, } rather large.
21. Size, } rather large.
22. Weight, } rather large.

No. 23. Color, full.
24. Locality, large.
25. Order, } moderate.
26. Time, } moderate.
27. Number, } moderate.
28. Tune, } moderate.
29. Language, large.
30. Comparison, rather full.
31. Causality, } small.
32. Wit. } small.
33. Imitation, full.
34. Wonder, large.

I shall add a few remarks on the manifestations of his predominant faculties.

Amativeness is marked rather small, and it is a curious feature in a sailor's life, that, notwithstanding the license allowed on board of ship, and the little delicacy displayed in the choice of terms or modes of speech by sailors in general, our captain scarcely ever, in the whole course of the voyage, spoke a word under the impulse of this organ which could offend the most delicate ear. In him this refinement was the more remarkable, as, from his rudeness and coarseness of character, it was less expected.

Adhesiveness was rather small, and the only manifestation referable to this faculty was immoderate laughter at his brother having been seized by the press-gang, and carried on board the tender as a deserter, when he himself was the person they wanted. He reckoned this a capital joke, and delighted to tell it.

Combativeness rather large. The fibre was long, but there was little breadth in this region. Its manifestations were not remarkable.

Destructiveness and Self-esteem were both very large, and the former was used as an instrument for gratifying the thirst for power, arising from a large development of the latter. When Self-esteem is large, the claim to superiority is generally founded on those qualities which the individual possesses in largest proportion. Thus, when combined with intellect and moral sentiments, the person values himself on intellectual and moral excellence. When the animal propensities predominate, the individual seeks the gratification of his large Self-esteem by the infliction of misery upon others, as the only means by which he can impress them

with a due sense of his power over them. In this way the captain's Self-esteem and Destructiveness acted together in great harmony, and vented themselves in ebullitions of passion and rage, and a total disregard to the feelings of others. The cloven foot appeared the very day we sailed, although he was anxious to appear all smoothness and civility. Having been hurried in his preparations, the ship presented at this time a scene of turmoil and confusion far surpassing any thing I ever saw, or had an idea of. The deck was covered with every sort of lumber, in the midst of which, pigs, dogs, hens, ducks, and geese, were joining the chorus, and increasing the chaotic din of a crew in the last stage of drunkenness, every member of which attributed all the uproar to the intoxication of the others, and gave loose to his wrath; and the noise caused by the explosion of which was augmented tenfold by that of some unfortunate biped, or quadruped, who had the misfortune to be trampled upon at every turn. The cabin was covered with trunks, baskets, barrels, cooking utensils, bedding, &c. so almost as to prevent locomotion. In the midst of this, our steward left us, on account of his brother having been killed by a fall from the yard of an Indiaman alongside, and we got an Irishman in his place, who had never been in the ship till that moment, and who of course could not know the geography of the lockers, &c. even had every thing been in the most perfect order. Two or three visiters remained on board, and the captain wished to show off a little. Our new steward exerted himself amazingly, but could not avoid a little delay and occasional mistakes, which Solomon himself would have committed in similar circumstances. Our captain, however, finding his Self-esteem hurt at the want of instant fulfilment of his orders, exhausted his Combativeness and Destructiveness upon poor Pat in curses and blows. The latter, conscious of having exerted himself to the utmost, and done well too, very naturally felt all his better feelings lacerated, and waxed a little hot, and threatened to leave us, (as we still lay on the tail of the sand bank off the harbor.) At dark he did leave us, but was pursued by the captain, caught, and hauled through the water from one boat to the other, and again

brought on board with desperate threats against farther misconduct. In the course of the voyage the captain told us of many feats in which he had wounded some and killed others; but these we did not believe. He told us, for instance, that he slew two bravadoes at Oporto, and *unslung* a Yankee's arm with a pistol-ball at New Orleans; and he told us in a fewdays after we landed at —— that he wished to get out of the town one evening after the gates were shut. The sentinel refused. The captain wrenched his musket from him in the most gallant style, threw it into the canal, and pummelled him to a jelly, and upon this was apprehended, lodged in the guard-house all night, where he scratched his breast with a penknife, swore next morning it was a bayonet-wound, and got off as having acted in self-defence. We afterwards ascertained, that there was not one word of truth in this story, as he was on board of his own vessel at the time alluded to; but it illustrates his character. But on one occasion, during the voyage, he fired a musket at a Dutch vessel to make her lie-to, that he might get ahead of her.

Constructiveness was large, as were Form, Size, Locality, and Imitation: these give a liking for mechanics. I once questioned him about his tendencies that way. His answer was, 'See here what I am working at just now,' at the same time producing from his pocket a handsome wooden foot, which he had carved with his knife, to form part of a female figure, from which the ship derived its name. I saw some other specimens beside this.

His large Acquisitiveness, and enormous Self-esteem, gave him the most complete Selfishness, which, as Conscientiousness was small, he gratified at any expense within the limits of the law, which he said was his only rule. The first specimen was an attempt to make me pay one-third more passage money than the others, because, as I lived at a distance from a seaport, he thought I would not be able to detect the imposition. In this, however, he was mistaken. Having a friend who lived in that part of the country, I desired him to make inquiry about the fare, &c., and the captain, not knowing that I was the person for whom he was acting, demanded one-third less from him than from me, so that,

on comparing notes, the trick came out. His rapacity was evident in all his conduct, and on one occasion it showed itself remarkably. The first day of moderate weather, after a succession of storms for upwards of three weeks, while a very high sea was still running, we discovered the wreck of a brig which had suffered more than ourselves, and thinking we could descry the crew clinging to the broken masts and rigging, we bore down to relieve them; but all were gone, and the bulwarks and every thing on deck swept clear away. Having a buoyant cargo, the hull still floated, and was turned over now on this side, and now on that, by every succeeding wave, and altogether presented a spectacle which saddened every mind except that of the captain. He alone was bent upon plunder, and spoke of visiting and breaking up the wreck, but the risk was so great, that none of the crew would go, and he himself was sore afraid; but it was the subject of keen regret for many days after: 'Had the weather been more moderate, he would have gained so much, and so forth.'

His Secretiveness was full, but not predominant. Had it been larger he would have been ten times worse; but he generally betrayed his purpose before he could execute it. He was full of contradiction, and did not show the tact which Secretiveness gives in concocting a story. Self-esteem was enormous, and his whole life was passed under its influence. I am not aware that he uttered a single word in the whole voyage which had not a near reference to himself or his interest. The love of power was a marked feature in his character, and every means by which he could make it be felt were considered lawful. If any of the crew seemed not to feel a sufficiently strong sense of his importance, blows and abuse were bestowed to deepen the impression. If any of the passengers showed an insensibility to his magnificence, he was assailed with what was intended to be the most cutting satire, with occasional threats of sending us to the forecastle among the crew, as he assured us that every thing was arbitrary on shipboard, and subject to his control. He could command, he said, the speech, *thoughts*, and behavior of every man on board, sailor or passenger. His satire was generally a failure, as he had the small-

est possible portion of wit; and it consisted of pure emanations of Self-esteem and Destructiveness, the snarl without the bite. If he did succeed in exciting pain, or a feeling of anger, he felt intense delight: it was an involuntary acknowledgment of his power, the more precious that it was generally denied. He could not bear contempt. Coarse and ignorant as he was, he seriously assured us, that he was fit company for the highest and best society in Britain, and that few were his equals in point of knowledge; yet in general he preferred the company of those he counted his inferiors, because his Self-esteem was gratified by the deference which they paid to him. If he had once uttered an opinion, the plainest and strongest facts failed to make him avow his conviction that it was wrong. He felt exceedingly when we put questions to his mate in his presence. The latter was an intelligent, worthy, and modest man, who generally gave us much more satisfactory answers.

Cautiousness was so very prominent, that I from the first doubted much the truth of a supposed resemblance which he had discovered in himself to Nelson, in never knowing fear. Indeed he soon manifested a very intimate acquaintance with the sentiment, although necessity sometimes forced him to withstand danger. He avowed, one day, that in the only battle he ever was in, he felt a degree of trepidation which was far from pleasant; and afterwards owned, that a sow having crossed his path in a narrow road, and in a dark night, he beat a retreat rather than venture to pass it. His 'Wonder,' however, aided his Cautiousness on this occasion; for as it was large, it always mystified what he did not see clearly. I saw him once, at least, pale and fluttering with a sudden fright. It was at supper-time, only two nights before we met with the wreck. He went on deck to look about him for a moment, and in an instant returned, and with a tremulous voice called up the mates. They hastened up, a good deal alarmed, and were saluted with 'breakers on all sides,' not 300 yards off; and at the rate we were moving, five minutes more seemed to him sufficient to seal our doom. The first mate, however, with more self-possession, thought that before we could be *surrounded* with breakers, we

must have got into the middle of them, some way or other, without damage, and therefore we might also get out again in safety; and suspected that the foamy appearance was caused by phosphorescent animalculi in the water, and it proved to be so. On coming down again, the captain still looked ghastly pale, and the first words he uttered were, '*I never got such a damnable fright in my life.*' Upon being reminded of his never having felt fear, he would not take with the joke. His whole seamanship was marked by Cautiousness, and to this we were partly indebted for our own safety. This was an example of the practical effects of a mere feeling, when strong in the mind, even with little intellect.

His Benevolence, with all his Selfishness, was by no means a nonentity. During the stormy weather, when we invalids were all sick, and unable to look after ourselves, he showed considerable sympathy and kindness of feeling, and gave us many little things to which we had no claim. After we were so far restored as to look to ourselves, he was less scrupulous, but occasionally showed touches of feeling. Even here, however, he showed his nature in a curious manner. He had two kinds of wine on board, one much better than the other. The best was reserved for our use, and at table he refused to taste it, and got his Love of Approbation gratified by our praises for his kindness. Our bottle was set apart to distinguish it, and on several occasions quantities disappeared, nobody knew how. One day, however, upon entering the cabin unexpectedly, it was discovered to be the captain himself who absorbed it, and he thus had the manifold luxury of drinking the wine, of being praised for his generosity in not taking it, and of experiencing a kind of pleasant feeling, arising from the gratificatiou of Secretiveness, Acquisitiveness, and Self-esteem.

His Conscientiousness was small, and the absence of the sentiment was very remarkable. Kill, steal, or destroy, but keep to windward of the law, was his text; and his creed and actions completely corresponded. He took great delight in narrating instances of successful trick and deceit practised upon others.

Firmness very large, with his Self-esteem, made him rude,

overbearing, and in a high degree obstinate and self-willed. He never could bring himself to yield a disputed point, till a day or two afterwards, when he sometimes would own that he had been wrong.

His intellect was that of a knowing kind. Individuality and Language were large, with small Causality; and it was truly amazing to hear what scraps of Latin and Greek, anecdotes and history, he had collected together in endless confusion, without regard to probability, utility, or common sense.

Satisfied, from the enormous Self-esteem and Acquisitiveness, with deficient Conscientiousness, that Self-interest would ever be a ruling passion in this man's mind, and that it would not be regulated by moral principle, however much it might be smoothed down and masked under the influence of Love of Approbation, Secretiveness, and Cautiousness, which so often give an exterior deportment calculated to hide what is going on within, I was on my guard against it. His Self-esteem, Firmness, and Destructiveness, gave him an innate love of power, and disposition to tyrannize, which was extremely unpleasant; and he would go almost any length to provoke an acknowledgment of superiority, which, if once accorded, was instantly again demanded. With this view he often tried to provoke those about him. I knew well the impulses under which he was acting, and therefore was enabled to keep my temper almost invariably; and knowing, that, to a large Self-esteem, contempt is the most intolerable of all things, I often looked as if I did not hear his sharpest hits. At first he took this highly amiss; but afterwards, finding his efforts fruitless, and that we would not acknowledge his importance, he became more quiet, social, and forbearing.

One great benefit arising from an acquaintance with the new doctrine is, that it cherishes a spirit of toleration and good-will towards all mankind. Had I met with such a character before I became acquainted with phrenology, I would have had no patience with him; whereas, knowing that nature had endowed him with such propensities, and that unfortunately they had been lost sight of in his education, as in that of most others, I never suffer-

ed myself o be angry or hasty with him, but rather pitied him. It enabled me, also, to see the propriety of never yielding to him in any of his absurd notions, when practically applied, and of leaving him in quiet possession of them while they remained merely matter of opinion. Yielding only increased his obstinacy and importance. He and I soon carried on our intercourse very amicably, from understanding each other. He was extremely fond of drawing a dreadfully long bow, and was in every case the hero of his own story. From observing his large Wonder, Secretiveness, Language, and Individuality, with small Consciousness and Causality, I was from the first inclined to receive his stories with liberal abatement, and had no reason to fear offending the feelings of an honest mind by doing so; and in fact he never showed any uneasiness at the truth of his statements being questioned. Want of space has prevented me entering into longer details and illustrations; but should the above be of any service, you are at liberty to do with it as you see proper.

Art. XIII. — *On the Combinations in Phrenology, with Specimens of the Combinations of Self-esteem.*

The opponents of Phrenology have objected to it, that there can be no truth or certainty in its doctrines, because we are told by its professors that the primitive faculties do not always manifest themselves in the same way, but vary their manifestations according to the other predominant faculties with which they are combined. Thus, say they, we are shown a large organ of Destructiveness in the head of a murderer — that is very well; but in another head, of a person who has never committed murder, the same organ is equally large. O but, say the phrenologists, this man has a large Conscientiousness, which prevents him from murdering. But here is another with a large Destructiveness, and not much Conscientiousness, and who yet is not only no murderer, but rather considered a good-natured man. O then, say the phrenologists, this third man has a large Benevolence and Veneration, and therefore he won't murder. In short, say they, the phrenologists are never without a loop-hole to escape, whatever be the person's character or actions. The system is so constructed, that they are always sure to find what answers their purpose; and in any given development, let the character be what it will, there are always found qualities which will sufficiently account for the manifestations.

The fact is certainly as these opponents of the system have said, — the phrenologists *do* in every case find elemental qualities which, in their combination, account for the character; but there is one small circumstance which these gentlemen overlook, namely, that the phrenologists find the organs which suit their purpose, *because they are there.* The opponents wish it to be believed, that they find them because they imagine or feign them. Certainly, with some persons, imagination may go a great way; but will imagination alter the stubborn facts of measurements made

by a pair of calliper compasses? Will imagination reduce the distance from ear to ear, which in one individual is six inches and a half, to a little more than five inches, as it is found in another? Will imagination stretch the Ideality of Haggart the murderer, which is 4¼ inches, to be equal to that of Dr. Chalmers, which is upwards of six? There are facts which imagination can neither add to nor diminish: —

> ——— 'Chiels that winna ding,
> And downa be disputed.'—

And by an experienced phrenologist all the other principal organs may be ascertained with equal certainty, many of them being capable of being so by actual measurement. So much with regard to single organs. With regard again to combinations, the effect of these is not in each individual case invented by phrenologists, *for the nonce.* Many hundreds of these combinations, and the effect of them, and the principle upon which these effects depend, are recorded in the books, circulated every where, and in the hands of every one who chooses to examine. When therefore a phrenologist predicates a certain effect to be the result of a certain combination — if he is inventing for the purpose, he must be a prodigiously clever inventor to do so consistently with all that has been stated and recorded of similar combinations previously; and in making such statements, the phrenologists could not have proceeded three steps without miring themselves irrecoverably, unless they really had proceeded upon principles which are founded on truth and nature. If it be supposed that these combinations and their multiplied effects are the sole *invention* of the founders of Phrenology, such is the simplicity of the elements, the consistency of the principles on wnich they are combined, and the certainty in their application, that we must conclude the inventors to be possessed of talents nothing short of miraculous. If, on the other hand, we adopt the very simple supposition that the principles are true, then Gall and Spurzheim are reduced to the rank of ordinary men, and are entitled only to the merit, (a very great one, certainly,) of being exceedingly acute and accurate observers of nature.

The principle, that the faculties vary the *mode* of their manifestation, according to the combinations with which they are united, in place of affording an objection to Phrenology, forms the chief beauty and excellence of the science. It is this which makes it applicable to explaining the varieties of human character. To those who look upon the mind and its manifestations, *en masse*, they appear to be made up of contradictions and inconsistencies: the varieties of human nature are endless, and we are inclined to resign in despair the task of explaining and reconciling them. But when we find that by the few simple elemental qualities, disclosed to us by the aid of Phrenology, all these contradictions are explained, and all the anomalies and apparent inconsistencies are reconciled to reason and to one another: this surely affords one of the most convincing proof sthat could be offered, that the system is true; and we cannot sufficiently admire, though we may be able in some degree to account for, that obliquity of mental perception which converts it into an objection.

It would doubtless afford an objection, a formidable one to Phrenology, if the faculties therein assumed as elementary were stated to be so fixed as always to manifest themselves in the same way. It would then be impossible to reconcile the system with nature. The modifying influence of circumstances and combinations is admitted in regard to every thing else, and why not here? In astronomy the planets are observed to perform their motions in orbits, approaching more or less nearly to circles or ellipses; but they all exercise on one another certain *disturbing forces*, which modify, more or less, the direction and velocity with which they move. In chemistry, the gaseous and earthy constituents into which different portions of matter have been resolved, are known to assume very different forms, (without any alteration in their substance,) according to the different substances or the different proportions of these substances to which they may be united. In these cases, instead of any objection being founded on the admission of the modifying influence of *circumstances and combination* to account for the production of any given effect, it is perfectly

understood that it is the study of these combinations which constitutes the science itself. It is the calculation and resolution of opposing, modifying, and disturbing forces, which constitutes the science of astronomy. It is the observation of the effect of different combinations of matter which constitutes the science of chemistry. So it is here, in the observation and explanation of the effect of different combinations of the simple powers, that the science of *Phrenology* properly consists. The *organology*, or the discovery and observation of the simple powers themselves, as connected with and indicated by the presence of their organs, is no doubt highly important, as forming the foundation upon which the whole rests; but this is rather allied to the department of natural history. The study of the combinations is the *philosophy* of the mind; and without this the mere knowledge of the facts is of comparatively little interest, and can hardly be applied to any practically useful purpose.

The effect of the combinations will be best illustrated by examples; and in order to afford a specimen of this species of study, we shall select a single organ and power, and endeavor to show what will be its effect in its combination with all the other powers and faculties, taking these separately and *seriatim*. In one respect, all the combinations exist in every sane individual, as every such individual possesses all the organs and their correspondent faculties more or less developed. In what follows, however, it is to be understood that we are considering what will be the effect when such and such faculties are not merely *present*, but when they are greatly predominant in the character, as they will be when the organs of them are found to be *large* or *very large*, and the others which might control or modify their influence to be small or moderate. We think it sufficient to mention this once for all, and that we need not in each individual instance repeat that the faculties we are describing are predominant in the character. As our present example, we shall select for consideration the different combinations of *Self-esteem*, which in itself merely leads to magnify the importance of self and all that belongs to it, but varies in the manner of its manifestation, according to the de-

velopment with which it is found to be combined. Some of the most remarkable of these variations are now to be stated:—

A great Self-esteem, when combined with a considerable amative propensity, will show itself in a selfishness with regard to sensual gratification. An individual so constituted, (unless Conscientiousness, Benevolence, and Adhesiveness be also large,) will regard woman as the mere instrument of his pleasures, and as a plaything for the amusement of his idle hours. Her feelings, her happiness, will not be the object of his care; but as soon as his own selfish appetite is sated, he will turn away and leave her, perhaps to pine in want and misery. While the appetite continues, however, he will be desirous of engrossing this toy to himself; and though he feels no love for her independently of his own selfish gratification, he will be jealous of any encroachment upon what he considers his own peculiar property. He will take no delight in a common creature, whose favors are open to all; but if he can succeed in overcoming the resistance of one who has not yielded but to him, the exploit will be gloried in as a high victory; though the conquest, after it is made, may soon be despised and forsaken.

Great Self-esteem, joined to Philoprogenitiveness, and not modified by the superior sentiments, render the individual fond of his children because they are his, and for no other reason. He feels towards them as if they were a part of himself, and it makes little difference that this part is extended beyond the limits of his own body. To use a common expression, 'all his geese are swans.' He is proud of them, and considers them superior to all other children: they are infinitely handsomer, and cleverer, and wittier, than the children of any other person. He loves to descant on this superiority; and if they are tractable and obedient, he conceives that it is all owing to his wonderful management, and to the superior excellence of his plan of education. He tells you it is people's own fault if their children do not behave as they would have them; that it just requires steadiness and a proper method of management, which method he never doubts that he possesses, though he cannot very well explain in what it consists. If you

tell him that children differ in their natural tempers, and that his children are perhaps naturally more manageable than yours, he smiles upon you with the most ineffable disdain. The idea, that their easy government is owing to any thing except his own merit, never enters his mind. If, on the other hand, when you go to his house, you find the children waspish, petulant, and troublesome, he prides himself in their spirit, wit, cleverness, and independence. He never checks them in their amusements, their sweet innocent gambols. But when, in the course of these innocent gambols, they interfere with some of his selfish propensities, as by breaking a china vase, or throwing down an ink-stand on a handsome carpet, his Self-esteem takes another direction, and brings his Combativeness and Destructiveness into play. He drives them out of the room in a fury, swears they are the torment of his life, and there never was such a set of ill-tempered, disobedient, awkward, stupid, intolerable brats; that all children are a pest, and those persons are happy who have none. You need not remind him of the account formerly given of the admirable order and management in which they are kept. You will receive no thanks for it, nor will it alter his mode of thinking and acting towards them on any future occasion.

When great Self-esteem is combined with Adhesiveness, it begets Selfishness in friendship. Friendship will indeed be probably confined either entirely to near relations, or those who are in some way or another connected with self. There are individuals who never form an attachment without some selfish end. The attachment, when once formed, may perhaps be sincere; but it is not founded on any regard to merit, or to the intellectual or moral qualities of the object, but to the connexion of that object to self. It is also accompanied with the same engrossing spirit, which we formerly noticed in regard to another propensity. The self-esteeming person cannot endure that his friend should love another better than, or even equally, with himself. When the parties are of opposite sex, this unfortunate feeling becomes peculiarly irritable and tormenting, and forms the disposition to *jealousy*, which is the cause of so much misery in the world.

When *Self-esteem* and Combativeness are predominant in the character, we find an irritability added to the love of contention, which is sometimes as amusing as it is troublesome. The self-esteeming combative man is a perfect spitfire; the smallest appearance of opposition puts him in a fume, and yet he can as little endure that you should agree with him; for he will, on no account, agree with you. You cannot annoy him more, than by saying that you are entirely of his opinion: he will endeavor to prove the contrary. He is snappish and worrying, and is 'nothing if not critical.' His element is the gale and the tempest, and he gets sick in a calm. A person of this stamp once boasted that he never took any one's advice, and that no one could pretend to say he was able to manage him. When he, to whom he addressed himself, told him that he was quite mistaken, for that he had always found him perfectly manageable. 'How?' cries his combative friend, in a fury. 'I am sure I never did any thing you advised me.' 'I grant you,' replied the other; 'but then I knew you too well ever to advise you to do what I wished. When I had any object to be served with you, I always desired you to do the direct contrary of what I wanted, and thus I was sure that you would act exactly agreeably to my wishes.' This is a genuine anecdote. The individual is now dead, but he was well known to many who would bear testimony to this trait in his disposition. This *spirit of contradiction*, has not escaped the comic poets and writers of farces, and nothing can be more laughable than some of its examples. As an instance, I may refer to this scene in 'Love in a Village:'

'*Mrs. Deb.* I wish, brother, you would let me examine him a little. *Justice Woodcock.* You shan't say a word to him. You shan't say a word to him. *Mrs. Deb.* She says he was recommended here, brother. Ask him by whom. *Justice Woodcock.* No, I won't now, because you desire it.'

'Whenever I am in doubt about any thing,' says Mr. Bundle, in 'The Waterman,' 'I always ask my wife; and then whatever she advises I do the direct contrary.' There are in real life many Mr. and Mrs. Bundles.

Self-esteem large, with Destructiveness predominating, is a fearful combination, unless balanced by a large proportion of benevolent and conscientious sentiment. The individual, in whom this combination is found predominant, (always supposing Benevolence and Conscientiousness deficient,) will be cruel as a boy, and ferocious as a man. Hogarth's Progress of Cruelty is as just and melancholy picture of what would be the result of this combination in its worst form. The individual will be prone to take offence, furious when offended, and never forgetting it, or forgiving the party offending. When offences are of a trifling description, and do not rise to such importance as to appear to deserve a heavier infliction, they will beget the feeling of hatred; that inward aversion and loathing which extends itself from the offending party himself to all that belongs to, or is connected with him. But when the offence is of a more serious nature, and touches sufficiently near any of the other predominant propensities, it gives rise to the passion of revenge, and nothing can or will satisfy its deadly rancor, except the blood of the offender. It is necessary to the full gratification of this feeling, not merely that the offender be punished, but that he be punished by him who has been injured or offended. We desire to inflict the mortal blow; and if *we* do not inflict it, we do not care, or rather we do not desire that it should be inflicted by another. Thus Macduff, in the first eagerness of his revenge against Macbeth, prays to Heaven to

> 'Cut short all intermission. Front to front
> Set thou this fiend of Scotland and myself.
> Within my sword's length set him; *if he 'scape me,*
> Heav'n forgive him too.'

Afterwards, when seeking him in battle, he exclaims:

> 'Tyrant, show thy face: —
> *If thou be'st slain, and with no stroke of mine,*
> *My wife and children's ghosts are unappeased.*'

Many instances of a similar kind might be produced from the tragic poets. In the 'Maid's Tragedy,' in the scene where Ev-

adne murders the king, (a scene infinitely exceeding in horror, any thing that Shakspeare ever introduced upon the stage,) after she has, by a stratagem, fastened him to his chair, and has begun her bloody work by inflicting one wound, she seems to glory in her crime, by repeating at every stab the grievous wrongs which had led her to such a dreadful excess of vengeance. In answer to his cries for mercy, she replies,

> 'Hell take me then, *this* for my Lord Amyntor; (*stabbing him*)
> *This* for my noble brother; and *this* stroke
> For the most wronged of women.'

When, however, to the combination, now considered, is added an ample endowment of the better sentiments, the individual will be irascible, and subject to starts of sudden rage; but when these are over (and their very fury will soon work itself out) the better sentiments will regain the ascendant, and he will repent what he has said or done when under their influence. It may even be, that, in order to make up for the injustice which his anger has made him commit, he will go as far to the opposite extreme of kindness and generosity. There are persons of this character who are reputed to be very passionate, but very good-hearted; and whom you will find striking their children for trifling faults in one minute, and the next overwhelming them with caresses. We have been told of a lady who was extremely apt to get into a rage with her woman, but as soon as the fit of passion was over, she endeavored to make up for the hard words, or perhaps blows, she had given her, by bestowing on her some gown, or other article of apparel; and so common had this become, and so completely had the maid got into her mistress's cue, that when she had set her heart on any new piece of dress, she generally contrived to irritate her mistress by some petty fault, when she was sure afterwards to be repaid with what she wanted.

Self-esteem large, joined with predominating Constructiveness, is a harmless combination. It will probably show itself in a minute attention to all the little niceties of personal accommodation

in house, furniture, dress, &c. While Love of Approbation and Ideality in ample proportion, joined with Constructiveness, would lead to a showy splendid taste in all these particulars; Self-esteem, on the contrary, will, in all its constructive operations, have an eye exclusively to personal convenience, and give rise to that truly English feeling, for which there is no adequate word in any other European language, *comfort*. This corresponds exactly with what we know of the English character, in which observation shows Self-esteem to be a predominant ingredient. Thus, we conceive that Ideality and Love of Approbation, joined with Constructiveness, have, in dress, given rise to the French invention of *ruffles*. But these, it has been wittily observed, are very much improved by the English addition of *shirts:* which last certainly have proceeded from the constructive faculty, aided by Self-esteem. This last combination does not regard outward show, but substantial convenience. John Bull evinces this in all his appointments. He wears, perhaps, a snuff-brown coat, but its texture is the best West of England broadcloth. He goes abroad with a slouched hat and gray galligaskins, but his linen is of 'Holland, at eight shillings an ell.' He cannot bear that his toes shall be pinched, in order to give a handsome shape to his shoe, but insists that his feet shall have full room to expatiate in receptacles, well lined with warm flannel socks, and protected from the damp by soles of half an inch thick. He never thinks of subjecting his viscera to the confinement of stays, but protects the protuberance by the folds of his ample doublet. The same regard to comfort, and disdain of appearance, is seen in his house, which, in the outside, has little attraction, and is built in defiance of all the rules of architecture; but enter it, and behold its numerous conveniences; its huge kitchen-chimney capacious of a fire, fit for the roasting of two oxen; its hall-table of solid oak, three inches thick, and shining like a looking-glass; its ample store-rooms and cellars; its bed-chambers, where heaps of down and sheets of unrivalled whiteness might induce a monarch to repose in them — and you will be ready to exclaim, 'What wants this knave that a king should have!' Within proper bounds this feeling is a highly de-

sirable one, when it leads us no farther than to a just degree of self-respect shown in our attention to personal cleanliness and accommodations. But it is often carried to an excess which is perfectly preposterous and unworthy of a rational creature. The extreme fastidiousness and selfishness, in this particular, of those whose Self-esteem, originally great, has been fostered by wealth, ease, and the want of any necessity for exertion, can hardly be conceived by those whose minds are differently constituted, or who have been placed in different circumstances. The English, with many good qualities, are, perhaps, more liable to this fault than any other people, and more instances of its excess occur among them than elsewhere. The superior wealth of the country, as well as the national peculiarity, before adverted to, sufficiently account for this.

Self-esteem large, joined to much Acquisitiveness, makes the acquisitive person more keenly acquisitive. When Acquisitiveness alone is large, the individual may have all the desire to acquire, but he will not be so intent on the selfish application of his riches. With a small Self-esteem, he will hardly have that grasping and insatiable desire of wealth, which constitutes the real miser. When these two propensities are combined, the individual will not only be indefatigable in amassing wealth, but he will be possessed of an engrossing and monopolizing spirit, as if he were desirous of possessing all the wealth in the world. He will be solely tempted to 'covet his neighbor's goods,' and to envy those who are possessed of any thing he esteems valuable, particularly if he has it not; and if Conscientiousness, or the dread of the law, do not interfere to prevent him, he will be apt to use all means, fair or foul, to possess himself of that which he esteems the ornament of life. When Conscientiousness is in such a proportion as to prevent any unfair means being used to acquire, the self-esteeming acquisitive man will probably show his disposition by an over-anxiety to keep what he has, and rather to accumulate by saving than by wresting property from others. The fortunes that are made in this way, from very slender gains, are such as to surpass all calculation. Some carry this so far as to desire to ac-

cumulate money after their death. Mr. Thellusson bequeathed L. 700,000 to be accumulated until all the male children of his sons and grandsons should be dead. The world has been puzzled to understand the motive which could have led to such a bequest; but a Phrenologist will at once see that it proceeded from an enormous Self-esteem and Acquisitiveness.

Self-esteem and Secretiveness large, the superior sentiments not being in proportion, will be extremely apt to degenerate into knavery. A man with this combination predominant, (Love of Approbation, Conscientiousness, &c. being deficient,) will never reveal any thing, unless he thinks it for his interest to do so. He will have no regard for truth or honesty, and look upon those who use them as fools. If brought to trial and convicted, he will never confess, but will die, making solemn protestation of innocence. Elizabeth Canning, who was tried for perjury, in giving a false account of what happened to her during a fortnight's absence from her mother's house, and on whose evidence, (afterwards proved to be false,) an unfortunate gipsy (Mary Squires) had nearly been executed, and who afterwards herself underwent a long imprisonment, and died at an advanced age, without ever revealing where she had really been during the time of her disappearance before mentioned, must have possessed great Self-esteem and Secretiveness. But what must these have been in the man who is recorded to have withdrawn himself, without any known cause, from the society of his wife and family, and continued absent from them for many years, during which time he was reputed to be dead, and his property and effects were administered by his relations; when it afterwards turned out that he had never moved from the street in which his family resided, but had concealed himself in a lodging opposite to them, from whence he had the satisfaction of seeing them every day, without being discovered himself? This is perhaps the most extraordinary instance that ever occurred of a man, without any positive evil or malevolent purpose, enjoying the pure selfish gratification of mere concealment.

If Self-esteem and Love of Approbation be both large, and are not accompanied with a proportional share of Cautiousness, Con-

scientiousness, and Veneration, (which three last-mentioned powers are necessary ingredients in a modest character,) the individual will be arrogant, boastful, and assuming. He cannot endure rivalship, and will not merely be desirous of praise, but he will be desirous of engrossing all praise to himself. The praises bestowed on another will be to him gall and wormwood. There are persons of this disposition, who cannot endure that any one should be commended but themselves. This jealousy of praise shows itself sometimes in the most ridiculous manner, and when all idea of rivalship is entirely out of the question; as when Goldsmith was impatient at the praises bestowed upon a puppet, which was made to perform some curious tricks with great apparent dexterity, and answered to one who was expressing his admiration, 'I could have done it better myself.'

Self-esteem, joined to Cautiousness, and both predominating, show themselves in an excessive solicitude about the future, in all matters where our own interest is concerned. Such persons are not only sensible of fear, in circumstances of present danger, but are ingenious in inventing probable and possible dangers, with which they torment themselves and others. Such are your everlasting croakers, who, not satisfied with the maxim, 'sufficient for the day is the evil thereof,' are always busying themselves with horrible pictures of evils to come. If they are removed by their situation from the fear of present want, and though in fact they are wallowing in riches, and have more of the world's goods than they know what to do with, they are constantly talking of ruin from the fall of stocks, — or the fall of rents, — the intolerable burden of new taxes, — or the horrors of a new war. With them the nation is always on the brink of ruin; and they have constantly before their eyes the terrors of a universal bankruptcy. England, the greatest and incomparably the richest country in the world, possesses a greater degree of this spirit of grumbling than any other; and the public journals furnish this spirit with its daily allowance of appropriate food. The motto of such persons is, that 'whatever is, is wrong,' — that matters are constantly going on from bad to worse, — that the present times are worse than

the past, and the future will be worse still. This is a feeling peculiarly English, and proceeds from a constitutional Cautiousness, joined to a full Self-esteem, which last appears in various ways a national characteristic. In other countries, where the people are really oppressed, discontent is not nearly so prevalent. The Frenchman, lean, withered, and half-starved, sings and fiddles and laughs under circumstances which would be sufficient to make an Englishman cut his throat; and if he has not a good dinner to-day, expects a better to-morrow; while John Bull, swollen up with good feeding to the size of one of his own hogsheads, sitting in his elbow-chair, with a smoking surloin and a foaming tankard of ale before him, thinks himself the most unfortunate of the human race; and in the intervals of mastication, groans out his fears of all manner of calamities. If markets are low, our agriculture and trade will be ruined; if high, our manufactures; so that he has 'a quarrel to be unhappy,' under all possible circumstances. The great prevalence of suicide in England is probably owing to the same cause, the great Self-esteem and Cautiousness of the English, joined to the Destructive propensity, which is also rather prevalent in the character of that nation.

Self-esteem, joined with Benevolence, is rather a discordant sort of combination. In the case of the lower, the selfish and animal propensities, we have seen Self-esteem to harmonize with them and increase their activity; but it is not so with Benevolence, nor with the other higher sentiments. The benevolence of a self-esteeming man will be very much confined to the members of his own family. His charity, wherever it may end, is sure to begin at home. We hear sometimes of such a person being extremely generous to a *sister*, or of his making handsome presents to his own wife. When he steps out of this circle to relieve an object of distress, he does it with such an air of condescension, and so complete a consciousness of the merit of his own liberality, as to take away in a great measure the value of the donation, and to forestal the gratitude of the donee. If, however, the benevolence of selfish men is seldom exerted, when once it is truly excited, it sometimes flows with a vehemence and with an exclusive

devotedness to one object which is quite peculiar to them. When the man of great Self-esteem is generous, he is selfish even in his generosity. His bounty is not dispersed abroad so as to do the greatest sum of good; it flows all in one channel, so as to depart as little as possible from that self which is his idol. When he makes his will, he does not fritter away his estate in legacies to poor relations, but chooses his heir; and this heir being the next thing to himself, he gives him all, and grudges every thing which is to diminish his lordly inheritance. In the choice of his heir too he is not guided by the consideration of desert or of need: he thinks who will be the representative that will do him most honor; and he generally chooses to bestow it on one who is already rich.

'Giving his sum of more
To that which hath too much.'

Another selfish way of exercising benevolence, is when a man disinherits all his relations, and leaves his fortune to build an hospital. The magnificent endowments of this kind which England possesses, and which are more numerous there than in any other country, are proofs of the great prevalence of Self-esteem, not less than of Benevolence, among the natives of that country. Sometimes the self-esteeming benevolent man chooses in his caprice to draw humble merit from obscurity; and having done so, he is generally a zealous and an efficient patron. 'We put a twig in the ground,' says Sterne, 'and then we water it because we have planted it.' But woe be to the unfortunate youth if he dares to owe obligations to any other! The same jealousy of disposition which shows itself in love and in friendship, will here display itself in regard to benefits. The man of great Self-esteem cannot brook a rival even in those; and if another interferes with his *protégé* he will abandon him, or become his enemy.

When Self-esteem is joined with great Veneration, it will show itself in a hankering after rank and greatness, and a desire to associate with those above us, while, at the same time, there will be a natural aversion to that sort of humility and obsequiousness,

which the great are often fond of in those whom they admit to their presence. Persons of most thorough Self-esteem, however, will learn to stomach this dislike to serve their own ends, and to 'crook the pregnant hinges of the knee, where *thrift* may follow fawning.' They will generally, however, endeavor, if they can, to revenge themselves for this on their own inferiors, and to force upon them a double portion of the bitter bolus they have themselves been compelled to swallow. Hence it is observed, that they who are the greatest sycophants to those above them, (and the selfish ever will be so, in order to serve their own selfish purposes,) are often the greatest tyrants to those beneath them. The cause of both is the same. — *Self-esteem* and *Veneration*, both great, exerting their energies alternately. With superiors the latter prevails, with inferiors the former. When his Veneration takes the direction of religion, the man of great Self-esteem, if Benevolence and Conscientiousness are not in equal proportion, shows his Selfishness even in this. His very devotion is selfish, and is tinctured by a too exclusive regard to his own spiritual interests. If it takes the direction of loyalty, or a regard for the royal dignity and state, it will probably show itself in a certain nationality of feeling, not in a devotion to kings in general, but to his own king in particular; and rather in a respect to *the Crown*, as an emblem of national greatness, than in an attachment to the individual who happens to wear it. This seems to be a characteristic in the loyalty of Englishmen.

Self-esteem, combined with Hope, sees every thing in the future that suits its own selfish wishes. When Hope is very strong, and Intellect moderate, the man of great Self-esteem has a confidence in his own good fortune which no disasters can abate. His thoughts are fixed upon some object of desire, which he still continues to expect, after a thousand disappointments; and he ever confidently believes, that he shall obtain the object hoped for. This was the case with Robert Bruce, who, in the greatest depth of his distress, ever confidently expected to regain the Crown, and to recover the liberties of his country; and continued to do so, under circumstances which, to a man of deep reflection,

must have appeared perfectly desperate. This was the case with Mary M'Innes, who, when she earnestly desired any thing, said that it was often 'borne in on her mind' that she should obtain it; and whatever strong emotions impelled her, whether they were expressed in prayers or imprecations, believed that these had the power to procure her what she desired, as the Sagas of the north, who believed they possessed the power, by their prayers, to procure a wind or to dispel a tempest. A similar trait is related by the late Mr. Nugent Bell, in his very interesting account of the Huntingdon peerage case. He mentions, that when Captain Hastings, now Lord Huntingdon, was quite depressed by the difficulties that were thrown in his way, and expressed his fears, that that young man (meaning Mr. Bell) had been deceived by his too great eagerness to serve him, his wife, Mrs. Hastings, used to say, 'Leave that young man alone, and my life on it he will succeed.' Strong Self-esteem and Hope, dazzled with the prospect of a title, and with a more limited intellect, which rendered her blind to the difficulties, would produce exactly such a manifestation.

Self-esteem, combined with Ideality, will produce a strong desire to enjoy objects which are remarkable for beauty. The ingredient of Self-esteem will here show itself in the same engrossing and exclusive spirit which we have seen accompanies it in some of the other combinations. It will not only lead the individual to desire the enjoyment of what is beautiful; but he will not be satified without the exclusive enjoyment of it. This combination leads to the enormous prices which are sometimes given for pictures and other objects of art, particularly if to any real or supposed beauty in them there be added the enhancing quality of rarity. It is Self-esteem, in addition to Ideality, which makes us put such a value upon what is extremely rare; for that which is beautiful in itself never can beeome less so because another person has the same. To the man of great Self-esteem, however, this makes all the difference in the world. In pictures, it is the pride of the collector to possess so many 'undoubted originals.' And to the biblio-maniac the possession of an *unique* copy of a

work is a treasure above all price. The same combination leads to the enclosing of large tracts of beautiful scenery, to form a park or pleasure-ground; and although, perhaps, the proprietor does not see it twice a year, the sacred precincts are nevertheless guarded with scrupulous care, and 'men-traps and spring-guns' are set to keep the *profanam vulgus* aloof. It must have been a prodigious Self-esteem, joined to great Ideality, which gave existence to Fonthill.

That Self-esteem, which is so prevalent a feature in the English character, may, perhaps, account for what seems almost peculiar to this country, — the many splendid country residences and parks of our nobility, the care with which they are kept, and, we may add, guarded from profane intrusion. In France and Italy, the chateaux and palazzos of the nobility are almost every where falling to ruin, and the gardens that once surrounded them, and which still exhibit some remains of the taste and wealth of their former owners, are become perfectly neglected, and reduced to the state of wildernesses. In these countries, Self-esteem is not so prevalent as in England. The Love of Approbation, which, probably, with them, gave rise to such structures, has now yielded to unfavorabie circumstances, or has taken a different direction. To the same cause may be owing the greater ease with which you get admittance abroad to collections of paintings and works of art of all kinds. Privacy and retirement, even in private dwellings, does not seem to be there regarded as a matter of comfort; and you may at any time see the palace of a Roman noble, and walk through every room, from the cellar to the garret, by paying half-a-crown to a domestic. Love of Approbation thus induces them to show what an Englishman, from his greater Self-esteem engrosses to himself. In this, Self-esteem, within due bounds, is necessary to respectability.

Self-esteem, joined to a large Conscientiousness, makes a man to be very tenacious and stickling in regard to the rights and privileges of himself and his fellows, and feelingly alive to any supposed invasion of them. Hence arises, as we imagine, the prodigious irritability of the English nation on the subject of liberty,

or what they are pleased to consider as such. The speeches of mob-orators, and the declamations in the radical prints, are perfect marrow to the bones of John Bull, and are exactly calculated to tickle his Self-esteem through the medium of his Cautiousness and Conscientiousness. The same combination will account for the well-known aristocratical tendencies of the great Whig families of England, and for the apparent inconsistency of their constantly ringing the changes upon the common topics of declamation, as to the rights and liberties of the people, while they are themselves the greatest contemners of that very 'people' whose rights they are so fond of talking about. While among the lower orders, Self-esteem, in the combination just mentioned, excites their indignation against any thing like oppression,—among the higher, it excites that horror of a vagrant or a poacher which besets so many worthy and patriotic noblemen.

But of all the combinations of Self-esteem, the most thoroughly untractable is, when it is joined to a great Firmness. With this combination, it would require the most enlarged intellect, and the best constitution of the moral powers, to preserve the individual from the imputation of obstinacy. But as these seldom meet in entire perfection in one development, the tendency of the Combination certainly is to produce this impracticable quality. Cautiousness would be a desirable addition to this combination, in order to prevent the possessor from too rashly committing himself; for when he has once done so, he cannot endure the thought of retracting, and he will die, rather than acknowledge his error. It is reported of a great literary character, that the first time he saw asparagus he began to eat the white part, and when told that he should eat the green and not the white, he replied that he 'always ate the white part of asparagus.' He, however, did not eat any more; and he was never afterwards observed to eat asparagus.

Self-esteem, combined with Wonder, will produce a desire to excite this sentiment in others, and to astonish them by some display of our own powers or performances. A man with large Self-esteem, Love of Approbation, and Wonder, with a defective Conscientiousness and limited intellect, is peculiarly fitted for

drawing a long bow. He will always be the hero of his own tale; and if you listen to him, he will give you an account of the most incredible exploits and adventures he has gone through. If he has been abroad, there will be no bounds to the wonders he will relate of what he has seen in his travels. He will be a perfect Munchausen—a liar of the first magnitude. Ferdinand Mindez Pinto was but a type of him. He will tell you

> 'Of antres vast, and deserts idle,
> Rough quarries, rocks and hills, whose heads touch heaven;
> And of the cannibals that each other eat—
> The anthropophagi, and men whose heads
> Do grow beneath their shoulders.

If he has been in action, Hannibal and Alexander were fools to him. He is fit to stand by 'Cæsar and give direction;' and for deeds of desperate valor, his are of such a kind that those of Robert Bruce, Wallace, or Amadis de Gaul, are not to be mentioned on the same day. If a battle is lost, he will tell you, had he commanded on the occasion, how he would have avoided the faults of the leader, and converted the defeat into a victory. He would 'challenge twenty of the enemy, and kill 'em — twenty more, kill 'em — twenty more, kill them.' The man is, perhaps, otherwise good-natured, quiet, and inoffensive, and if you take his stories with some grains of allowance, may be really a sensible and an amusing companion.

In reference to the intellectual powers, Self-esteem produces this effect, that however deficient those powers may be that are joined with it, the individual will confidently believe that his abilities are the measure of those of the whole human race, and that no man possesses any powers that are superior to his. If he possesses good knowing powers, with a deficient reflection, he will believe that nothing is certain, or worthy of observation or attention, except facts; and he will treasure up these in endless variety. He will have no confidence in any knowledge which is the result of inference or reasoning. What you can place before him, or make obvious to his senses, he will believe, but beyond that all will to him be darkness; and because he does not possess powers

which enable him to penetrate it, he will not believe that any other can see farther or more clearly than he does. We have observed that persons with such a combination never become thorough converts to phrenology. If they admit any part of it to be true, it is merely the coincidence between a certain development of brain, and a certain faculty of mind. This they may admit in the case shown, but these they regard as no proof of what will be in other cases; and they are constantly calling for more facts, conceiving that the science is never to be any thing but an endless observation of these. With regard to its furnishing a rational account of the diversities of human character, and a consistent and harmonious system of mental philosophy, this is perfectly beyond the scope of their intellectual faculties, and they do not possess the power of discerning or even of imagining it. When you talk to them of this, they cannot form a conception of what you mean. The relations among things which are clearly perceived by one who possesses a good Causality, appear to him to be vague and imaginative, and he laughs at one who perceives them, as an absurd visionary. You might as well speak to a blind man on the subject of colors: nay, there is more hope of the blind man understanding you than of him, for he feels and knows that you have a sense and a power which the other does not possess; but the man in whom Causality is deficient can never be convinced of this, and the very deficiency itself deprives him of the capacity of feeling and knowing that such deficiency exists. You talk to him in an unknown tongue, which he does not and never can by any possibility understand.

It is the same with every other description of intellect; and indeed when Self-esteem is great, the *conceit* of abilities seems generally to exist in the precisely inverse ratio of the possession of them. When the talents are naturally great, then the individual does not seem to arrogate to himself more than his just degree of ability or merit, nor more than every one is willing to allow him. Self-esteem, then, seems to take the direction of undervaluing the talents of others, rather than of overrating our own; but, in case of limited intellect, nothing can be more ridiculous than

the airs of consequence which we see put on in conjunction with the total want of every thing that can command our respect. The novelists and writers of comedy have drawn largely from this source of the ludicrous. The absurdity seems to arise from the prodigious incongruity between the solemn dignity of the outward demeanor, and the pitiful inanity within. Of this the following may be given as an instance: —

'Attached to the King's printing office, there was for many years a singular character, of the name of John Smith, in the capacity of messenger, who died in 1819, at the advanced age of ninety-nine years. During a period of eighty years did this honest creature fill the humble station of errand carrier at his Majesty's printing-office. But what was accounted humble became in his hands important; and the "King's messenger," as he always styled himself, yielded to none of his Majesty's ministers in the conception of the dignity of his office, when intrusted with King's speeches, addresses, bills, and other papers of state. At the offices of the Secretaries of State, when loaded with parcels of this description, he would throw open every chamber without ceremony. The Treasury and Exchequer doors could not oppose him, and even the study of Archbishops has often been invaded by this important messenger of the press. His antiquated and greasy garb corresponded with his wizard-like shape, and his immense cocked hat was continually in motion to assist him in the bows of the old school. The recognition and nods of great men in office were his delight. But he imagined that this courtesy was due to his character, as being identified with the State; and the Chancellor and the Speaker were considered by him in no other view, than persons filling departments in common with himself; for the seals of the one, and the mace of the other, did not in his estimation, distinguish them more than the bag used by himself in the transmission of the despatches intrusted to his care. *The imperfect intellect* given to him seemed only to fit him for the situation he filled. Take him out of it, he was as helpless as a child, and easily became a dupe to those who were disposed to impose upon him.'*

The sense of Self-importance, which is conferred by this faculty upon persons in the meanest situations, and with the humblest acquirements, seems to be a wise provision of nature. It renders its possessor happy and contented with that 'modicum of sense'

* Percy Anecdotes.

which has been conferred upon him, who otherwise would be miserable, if aware of his own deficiencies. Some amusing instances of its influence are given in the 'Memoirs of P. P. Clerk of this Parish,' by the members of the Scriblerus Club.

We shall add but one circumstance more in regard to the feeling of Self-esteem, namely, that it seems to be an essential ingredient in eccentricity of character. It leads the possessor in all his pursuits, and in his habits of living and acting, to please himself, in the first instance, without regard to the opinions of others, or to what they may say concerning him. While Love of Approbation would incline us to accommodate our conduct, as far as possible, to the opinions of those around us, Self-esteem, if predominant in the character, will lead us to set them at defiance, and to follow the bent of our own inclinations without regard to others. It coincides remarkably with this, that England, where Self-esteem is a prevailing feature in the national development, is the very hotbed of eccentricity and originality of character; while in France, where Love of Approbation is more prevalent than Self-esteem, there is much less apparent diversity of character and manners: there is not, as some acute observers have informed us, that kind of angularity and singularity so frequently observed in the minds and manners of our countrymen, but all are worn and rubbed down to one common standard.

We may, perhaps, at a future period give our readers a similar statement in regard to the effects of Love of Approbation in combination with other predominant qualities. In the mean time we hope that they have received some pleasure and instruction from our present speculation; and in saying this, we trust we do not exhibit too large an endowment of the propensity which has been the subject of it.

Art. XIV. — *On the Statement of Cerebral Development in Words and Numerals.*

On 9th December, 1824, Mr. Lyon submitted the following statement and motion to the Phrenological Society, which was unanimously approved of.

The terms at present in use to denote the relative size of the different organs of the brain, increase from 'very small,' which is the lowest, to 'very large,' which is the highest. These terms, it is acknowledged, are indefinite, it being difficult, as Mr. Combe remarks, 'to apprehend precisely the degrees of magnitude indicated by small, full, large, &c. except we have seen them applied by the individual who uses them.' To obviate this objection, Captain Ross makes use of numerals — 1000 being, according to his numeration, the middle term, corresponding to our term 'moderate.' Mr. Combe objects to decimals, as unnecessarily minute, and proposes to substitute the following scale, in which the terms 'very small,' &c. are retained, but are combined with numerals; thus —

1.	11.
2. Idiocy	12. Rather full
3.	13.
4. Very small	14. Full
5.	15.
6. Small	16. Rather Large
7.	17.
8. Rather small	18. Large
9.	19.
10. Moderate	20. Very large

Mr. Combe, as I understand, very properly proposes still to continue the use of the terms, and only to combine them with the numerals. There could be no doubt that the use of numerals alone would be preferable, if their values were completely understood; but this would be too great an innovation at once. To the uninitiated they would be completely unintelligible. An indi-

vidual who should take up, for the first time, any future publication on Phrenology, and observe the organ of *Self-esteem*, with the numeral 18 attached to it, would be wholly unable to understand its relative size, while he could form a pretty accurate conception of the term 'large.' In stating the development of candidates for admission as ordinary members, numerals alone would be unobjectionable, because the Society would very soon come to understand their value. But this is not the only, nor the chief, object, on account of which it is desirable to improve the present mode of stating development. Phrenologists are in the constant practice of taking developments, as it is called, and, in remarkable cases, these appear in the papers read in the Society, or are inserted in the Phrenological Journal, &c. It is obvious, that any mode which, while it would combine the use of the present popular and intelligible terms of full, large, &c. would, at the same time, mark those minuter shades for which we have no name, would, I apprehend, be an improvement. According to the present practice, when an organ is considered more than 'full,' but less than 'rather large,' we are obliged to make use of the clumsy expression, 'full, or rather large,' meaning thereby something between the two. Again, it sometimes happens in extreme cases, that we require a term beyond 'very large;' and then, as in the organ of *Combativeness* in the head of Mary M'Innes, we are obliged to use the term 'enormously large.' In Mr. Scott's paper on music, read at the last meeting of the Society, he states, in regard to the organ of *Imitation* in Signior de Begnie's head, 'If I could have got a term above 'very large to designate it by, I would have adopted it.'

To obviate these difficulties, I would propose, for the adoption of the Society, the mode suggested by Mr. Combe, and to employ along with our present terms the numerals of one, two, &c., to twenty. Thus, if an organ was more than 'full,' but less than 'rather large,' it would be stated 'full 15,' the numeral 14 being the value of the term 'full,' when neither in excess nor otherwise. —Or the size of the organ might be stated 'rather large 15;' the one being a shade less, and the other a shade higher. For the

sake of uniformity, however, it would be proper in every case to take the ascending series, and never to add the numeral below, but always the one above that which corresponds to the term which we wish to modify ; in other words, we should never say, 'rather large 15,' but always 'full 15.'

To provide for such extreme cases as those already mentioned, we might add to the term 'very large,' the ascending numeral 21, and beyond that, the term 'uncommonly large' with the numeral 22, or even 23, or 24, if such cases should ever occur.

I forbear to point out all the advantages which would result from the adoption of the plan now suggested. I may only mention, that it would introduce a degree of accuracy in the use of our present terms, which at present is certainly a *desideratum.* One Phrenologist, perhaps, uses the term 'moderate,' where another would employ the words 'rather small ;' — but when we start from a fixed point, like that of Idiocy, which all may understand, and ascend step by step, we are much more likely to arrive at the same conclusion, and to attach in every case the same ideas to the same terms.

I subjoin a note of the development indicated by the cast of the head of the New Zealand chief, presented to the Society by Dr. J. C. Williams, as illustrative of the mode now suggested.

Mr. Lyon's motion was unanimously adopted; and the development of candidates for admission as ordinary members was ordered to be stated in terms of it.

NEW ZEALAND CHIEF.*

Measurements.

From spine to lower Individuality.....7¼ inches.
.... Concentrativeness to comparison.....7⅞

* This cast is not accurately taken from nature, and no Phrenological conclusions are founded on it ; but, as the artist has given great variety to the size of its different parts, it serves as a striking illustration of the mode of stating development recommended in Mr. Lyon's motion. The cast was sold as correct ; but several aberrations from nature were detected by the Society ; and, on inquiry, the artist admitted that he had filled up several depressions, and otherwise altered the forms of nature, with the view, he added, of improving its appearance, and giving greater symmetry to its shape. — Editor.

From Meatus to spine..... 4
..... to lower Individuality..... 5½
..... to Firmness..... 6½
..... to Self-esteem..... 6½
.... Destructiveness to Destructiveness..... 6½
.... Secretiveness to Secretiveness..... 6½
.... Cautiousness to Cautiousness..... 5
.... Ideality to Ideality..... 5
.... Acquisitiveness to Acquisitiveness..... 5½
.... Constructiveness to Constructiveness..... 5

1. Amativeness, large.....18
2. Philoprogenitiveness, rather full.....12
3. Concentrativeness, full.....14
4. Adhesiveness, large.....18
5. Combativeness, large.....18
6. Destructiveness, very large..21
7. Constructiveness, moderate.10
8. Acquisitiveness, full.....15
9. Secretiveness, uncommonly... large.....22
10. Self-esteem, large.....19
11. Love of Approbation, very large.....20
12. Cautiousness, rather small...8
13. Benevolence, small.....7
14. Veneration, very large.....20
15. Hope, full..... 15
16. Ideality, moderate.....10
17. Conscientiousness, full.....15
18. Firmness, very large.....21
19. Lower Individuality, rather large.....16
— Upper Individuality, full....14
20. Form, moderate.....11
21. Size, full.....15
22. Weight, rather large.....17
23. Color, full... 15
24. Locality, rather large.....17
25. Order, rather large.....16
26. Time, rather full.....12
27. Number, moderate.....10
28. Tune, rather small.....9
29. Language, rather full.....12
30. Comparison, moderate.....10
31. Causality, moderate.....10
32. Wit, rather small... 8
33. Imitation, rather small.....8
34. Wonder, full.....15

Art. XV. — *On the Frontal Sinus.*

The external and internal smooth surfaces of the bones of the skull are called their external and internal *tables*, or *plates*, to distinguish them from the intermediate part called the *diploe*, which is of a looser and somewhat cellular texture, resembling the internal structure of the bones. As the diploe is nearly equally thick in every part, it follows that the two tables of the skull are nearly parallell to each other. The internal, indeed, receives some slight impressions from blood-vessels, glands, &c., which do not appear externally but these are so small as not to interfere with phrenological observations. The sutures which connect the bones with each other also interrupt the absolute parallelism; but their situation is known, and only one of them, called the Lambdoidal, where it passes over the organ of Concentrativeness, presents any difficulty to the student. The sagittal suture, which runs longitudinally from the middle of the crown of the head forwards and downwards, sometimes so low as the top of the nose, occasionally presents a narrow prominent ridge, which is mistaken for a development of the organs of Firmness, Veneration, Benevolence, and Self-esteem. It may, however, be easily distinguished by its narrowness and isolation from the full broad swell of cerebral development. The mastoid process of the temporal bone, which is a small knob immediately behind the ear, serving for the attachment of a muscle, is sometimes mistaken for the indication of large Combativeness. It is, however, merely a bony prominence, and is to be found in every head, and does not indicate development of brain at all.

These peculiarities being easily recognized, are never stated as obstacles to the ascertaining of the cerebral development; but

there is one part of the skull where the external configuration does not always indicate exactly the size of the subjacent parts of the brain, and upon which objections have been raised. At that part of the frontal bone, immediately above the top of the nose, a divergence from parallelism is sometimes produced by the existence of a small cavity called the *frontal sinus*; which is formed between the two *plates* or *tables* of the bone, either by the external table swelling out a little without being followed by the internal, and presenting an appearance like that of a blister on a biscuit, or by the internal table sinking in without being followed by the external; and hence, as the outer surface does not indicate the precise degree of development of brain beneath, it is argued that the existence of a frontal sinus must be an insuperable objection to our science, because it throws so much uncertainty on our observations as completely to destroy their value; other opponents, however, more rationally confine their objection to those organs only over which the sinus extends.

The first objection is manifestly untenable. Even granting the sinus to be an insuperable obstacle in the way of ascertaining the development of the organs over which it is situated, we state, *first*, That in ordinary cases it extends only over three, viz. Size, (21), Lower Individuality, (19), and Locality, (24); and, *2dly*, We ask in what possible manner it can interfere with the other thirty or thirty-one organs, the whole external appearances of which it leaves as unaltered as if it were a sinus in the moon? It would, we think, be quite as logical to talk of a snow-storm in Norway obstructing the high-road from Edinburgh to London, as of a small sinus at the top of the nose concealing the developments of Benevolence, Firmness, or Veneration on the crown of the head.

To enable the reader to form a correct estimate of the value of the objection as applicable to the two or three individual organs particularly referred to, we subjoin a few observations. In the *first* place, Below the age of twelve or fourteen, the sinus almost never exists; *2dly*, In adult age, it frequently occurs to the ex-

tent above admitted;* and, 3*dly*, In old age and in disease, as in chronic idiocy and insanity, it is often of very great extent, owing to the brain diminishing in size, and the inner table of the skull following it while the outer remains stationary. Now the first cases present no objection, for in them the sinus does not exist; and the third are instances of diseases, which are uniformly excluded in phrenological observations; and thus our attention is limited solely to the cases forming the second class. In regard to them, the objection is, that large development of brain, and large frontal sinus, present so nearly the same appearance, that we cannot be sure which is which, and, therefore, that our observations must be inconclusive.

To this we answer as follows: — 1*st*, We must distinguish between the possibility of discovering the *functions* of an organ and of applying this discovery practically in all cases, so as to be able in every instance to predicate the exact degrees in which each particular mental power is present in each individual. The sinus does not in general exist before the age of twelve or fourteen, below which is precisely the period when Individuality is most conspicuously active in the mind. If then in children, in whom no sinus exists, the mental power is observed to be strong when the part of the head is large, and weak when it is small, we make certain of the function whatever may subsequently happen. If in after-life the sinus comes to exist, this throws a certain degree of difficulty in the way of the practical application of our knowledge; and accordingly phrenologists state this to be the case, and admit

* This may seem at variance with a statement given in Mr. Combe's Essays, on the authority of a friend in Paris, who in the course of many months, dissections, had never found a frontal sinus except in old age and in disease. In sawing open the skull for anatomical purposes, the section is almost always made horizontally through the middle of the forehead, or *over* the organs of *Tune*, *Time*, and *Upper Individuality*; and in all the cases alluded to by the gentleman in Paris, this line was followed, and as the sinus rarely extends so high up, he could not, and did not, meet with it. On examining vertical sections, however, for the purpose of seeing the sinus, he has since frequently found it to the extent mentioned in the text.

a difficulty in determining the exact degree of this mental power, which, in adult age, may be expected to accompany any particular development of this organ, unless in extreme cases of development and deficiency, in which even the sinus itself can form but a small fraction of the difference. In the next place, the objection applies only to one set of cases. If there be a hollow or depression in the external surface of the skull at the situation of the organs in question, and the sinus be absent, then the organ must necessarily be deficient in proportion to the depression. If, with such an external appearance, the sinus be present, which it is not, but which we shall allow the opponents to maintain it to be, then it must be formed by the inner table receding still more than the outer table, and hence a still greater deficiency of organ will actually exist than is externally indicated, and of course the mental power will be at least *equally* deficient with the external indication of deficiency in the organ. In cases of deficiency, therefore, the sinus forms no objection. Thus the only cases in which it can occasion embarrassment are those in which it causes a swelling of the parts of the skull in question outward, to which there is no corresponding development of the brain within. Now, if in all cases in youth, when no sinus exists, and in all cases in mature age in which a depression is found, the mental power is ascertained to correspond exactly with the external development, and, if, in certain cases, in adult age, an external indication is found to which the mental power does not correspond, what conclusion falls to be drawn according to the rules of a correct logic? Not that the functions are uncertain, because they have been ascertained in cases not liable to impediment or objection, but only that in the particular case in mature age, in which the external development is large, and the power absent, *there must be a frontal sinus.*

Having now shown that this objection, viewed even in its strongest light, only renders it difficult to infer from the development alone the degree of endowment of these three faculties, in an *occasional individual* case, and does not in the least interfere with the possibility of discovering the *function*, we have now to state,

that there are few cases, indeed, perhaps not five in a hundred, in which the phrenologist cannot say distinctly, whether a sinus exists or not to such an extent as to diminish the accuracy of his observations; and we refer those who wish to have a correct idea of the general size and appearance of this cavity to about a dozen specimens in the collection of the Phrenological Society.

Art. XVI. — *Fatalism and Phrenology.*

The objection brought against Phrenology, on the ground of materialism, may now be said to have disappeared; and the other objection of fatalism will, I have no doubt, speedily take the same flight; still it is an objection which is often brought forward,* and to which, therefore, it is proper to give an answer.

I am quite satisfied that, in general, the authors of this objection have the most crude and imperfect conceptions of the subject on which the objection is rested, and would be exceedingly startled if they were told, that on no other system, save that of fatalism or necessity, can the doctrine of human responsibility be established. This is a position, however, which I have no intention at present to illustrate; and I would only farther observe, generally, that it could easily be shown that every objection brought against Phrenology, on the ground of fatalism, is equally applicable to many other systems, — Calvinism, for instance, though it forms the confession of faith of the whole church of Scotland.

We shall not suppose, that by fatalism the objectors mean 'predestination, or a predetermined order, or series of things and events,' because this is substantially the doctrine of the established religion of our country: we rather suppose they understood by it the second part of Dr. Johnson's definition, 'preordination of

* It is stated, for example, in the June number of 'The Congregational Magazine.'

evitable causes acting invincibly in perpetual succession;' or, more shortly, a 'decree of fate.' Phrenology is supposed to lead to fatalism, inasmuch as a man *must*, it is said, act according to his development; if he has the *bump* of murder, he murders by invincible necessity, — if he has the organs of cursing and theft, he is, in like manner, an invincible liar and thief. Now, in the first place, if it is true, as the objectors maintain, that our conduct is *necessarily* regulated according to our cerebral organization, they ought, in common fairness, to have stated the good as well as the evil which results from this doctrine. If large *Destructiveness must* produce a murderer, it follows that large *Benevolence must* produce a philanthropist; and as a large proportion of the inhabitants of this country, at least, have a superior endowment of *Benevolence*, *Veneration*, and *Conscientiousness*, it follows, on the showing of the objectors themselves, that, by *invincible necessity*, a great majority of the people of Scotland are, and must be, benevolent, pious, and conscientious. If some of the outcasts of society, must, it seems, be given up to reprobation, still, on the common principles of arithmetic, we should, on the profit and loss folio, carry a large balance of *necessarily* virtuous men and virtuous acting to the profit side of the account; and therefore, on a mere arithmetical view of the question, the advantage is all on the side of Phrenology.

But to repeat the objection, a man commits a murder in virtue of two large bumps situated behind his ears, — he has *no Benevolence*, and *no Conscientiousness*, (for this is the phraseology,) — he, therefore, cannot help murdering: it is no fault of his; Phrenology has revealed the existence of the bumps and their function, and Phrenology and Phrenologists must bear the blame of all the crimes, and the existence of all the criminals who infest society. Now, did it never occur to these sapient objectors to ask, How it comes to pass that several of the *phrenological murderers* did not, in point of fact, commit their crimes till they had arrived at an advanced period of life? Let it be recollected, that it was the *Phrenologists* who brought forward the cases of Bellingham, Pallet, and Thurtell, as illustrative of their science, and

who have said, or are represented to have said, that these criminals committed the offences which brought them to the scaffold, in virtue of their large organs of *Destructiveness*. But if Phrenology is a system of fatalism, why did Robert Scott, for instance, delay the commission of his crime to the mature age of half a century? If the organ of murder leads to murder by invincible necessity, why did he not murder long before? why delay, or rather, how *could* he delay, for more than fifty years, the commission of a crime, to which he was irresistibly impelled, and not have murdered every year, or even every day?

But let us examine the objection a little more closely, and it will be found to rest upon a total misconception of what Phrenology truly is. The invariable language of the objectors is, 'O! such a man has large *Destructiveness* or *Acquisitiveness*, or *Secretiveness*, and has *no Benevolence* and *no Conscientiousness*;' and, though it has been repeated, even to satiety, that we never met with and never heard of a human being who was totally destitute of these last-mentioned organs, or of any of the phrenological organs, save only in the case of idiots, the assertion is still repeated, and still believed, just as if the counter-assertion never once had been made or established. If it could be shown that Phrenology was a system destitute of motives, that man was like the lower animals, and deprived, like them, of the faculty or sentiment of *Conscientiousness*, then indeed he must be absolved from all moral responsibility, — he must, so far as morality is concerned, be a necessary agent in the sense in which this term is employed by the objectors. We kill a fox which preys upon our poultry, — we hang a thief who breaks into our house; — but we attach no *moral blame* to the former, though we destroy him as a nuisance, while we do attach moral turpitude to the latter, just because the one has no natural sentiment of justice, while the other has. Phrenology, at the same time that it reveals the existence of the lower propensities of *Destructiveness*, &c. demonstrates also the existence of the higher and controlling sentiments of *Benevolence*, *Conscientiousness*, &c. which, from their very constitution, are designed to regulate and control the manifestations of the former.

Their very situation, if there were nothing else, plainly indicates their superior functions, and points them out, presiding, as it were, in high authority over the lower propensities. They are like the ring which the Genius Syndarac gave to the Sultan Amurath, with this declaration of its virtues, — 'It shall mark out to thee the boundaries of good and evil, that, without weighing remote consequences, thou mayest know the nature and tendency of every action; when the circle of gold shall by a sudden contraction press thy finger, and the ruby shall grow pale, desist immediately from what thou shalt be doing, and mark down that action in thy memory as a transgression of the rule of right.'* If nature has given to every man what the Genius gave to Amurath, if *Conscientiousness* and *Veneration* are ever ready to interpose their high authority, 'Thou shalt not kill, — Thou shalt not steal,' when *Destructiveness* and *Acquisitiveness* would prompt to the violation of these commands, where is the pretence for maintaining that we must *necessarily* yield to the suggestions of the latter, but never to those of the former? I know of no system of human nature, which, compared with Phrenology, demonstrates, with equal clearness, that man is a free agent; or rather, to speak more correctly, one which reveals a greater number of motives to right acting. While some metaphysical writers admit, for example, a sentiment of justice, others as strenuously deny it. Phrenology *proves* its existence, together with the other higher sentiments of *Veneration*, &c. It has given them a 'locality habitation and a name,' a certainty and a stability, which no other system ever did or ever can; and while some philosophers trace all our perception of justice to the mere inferences of the understanding alone, this system like the ring of Amurath, instinctively marks out the boundaries of good and evil, and, without the necessity of weighing remote consequences, informs us of the nature and tendency of every action. That man, therefore, who should plead the doctrines of Phrenology, as a vindication of his crimes, would equal or exceed the folly of him who should obstinately persevere in the use of

* Adventurer, vol. i. No. 20.

some deleterious food, which was destroying his health, after he had been plainly and seriously informed and warned of its poisonous quality. It has generally been supposed, that the knowledge of a disease is half its cure; and though I do not say that if the Thurtells and the Haggarts had been Phrenologists they would have abstained from the crimes which brought them to the scaffold, yet I do maintain, that a belief in the doctrines of Phrenology would undoubtedly have had this *tendency*. It would surely have been something gained to the cause of virtue, if we could have proved to such individuals, by ocular demonstration that they carried an enemy in their bosoms, or, if the objectors will have it, in their *heads*, which required their never-ceasing watchfulness, rather than that they should remain totally or partially ignorant of his existence. If we are told, that they would have perverted this knowledge, and plead their deficient organization as an excuse for their crimes, then they must adopt one or the other of the following alternatives. If they say that having large *Destructiveness*, and *no Benevolence* or *Conscientiousness*, they cannot, therefore, abstain from crime, then, on their own showing, they class themselves with the wild beasts of the field, which raven and destroy by invincible necessity; they voluntarily place themselves beyond the pale of society, 'and every one who findeth them may slay' them as a nuisance. If they refuse this alternative, and still persist in their criminal courses, then they must expiate their crimes on the scaffold, *after* they have been tried by the laws of their country, and have been convicted on evidence sufficient to satisfy a judge and a jury.

If it is still objected, that it is *very difficult* for an individual like Pallet, for example, to abstain from crime. This is admitted; but the moment the question is reduced to one of mere *difficulty*, the whole objection raised on the allegation of fatalism falls to the ground. *Difficulty* is not *impossibility;* and it is *invincible necessity* alone which can be characterized as fatalism. And is Phrenology the only system of mind or morals which teaches the arduousness of virtue, *et facilis est descensus Averni?* If this is a sufficient reason for the rejection of Phrenology, we must not stop

here. Christianity itself must also be rejected; for there never was a system which described in more glowing or explicit terms our proneness to evil, or our aversion to good, than this revelation from heaven. 'Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may ye also do good, who are accustomed to do evil.' There is indeed, and there must be, a line where responsibility ends, and irresponsibility begins; but where that line is, is known only to HIM, by whom we have been fearfully and wonderfully made. I might hesitate whether some of the very lowest class of our criminals are or are not the proper objects of *human* punishment, or whether, after the State has wholly neglected to employ any means for their reformation, we are entitled to deprive them of life for crimes which it was *exceedingly difficult* for them not to commit. It is a fair subject of inquiry, whether it would not be better, not merely for themselves, but for society, were they to be shut up in a penitentiary for life, and treated rather as patients than as criminals? But whatever opinion may be formed on this question, — whatever it may be proper for *human* legislators to enact, — it is another and a very difficult question whether such unhappy beings are moral and responsible agents in the sight of the great Governor of the universe; and, in many cases, this is a point which He only who knows what is in man, can determine. *We* may *guess;* HE only can *know.* Though, perhaps, *human* laws might rather have regarded Pallet as a patient than a criminal, and treated him as such; — though, from his enormous development of all the lower propensities, joined to an exceedingly deficient endowment both of intellect and sentiment, and an utter destitution of moral and religious instruction, we might be disposed to regard him more as an object of sorrow than of anger; yet even *his* heart repeatedly misgave him before he committed the murder which brought him to the scaffold; and, after it was committed, he retired to an adjoining field, and reflecting on what had passed, he put his hands upon his face, and exclaimed, 'Good God! what have I been doing?' clearly indicating wounded *Benevolence*, *Veneration* and *Conscientiousness;* and yet this is one of the cases in regard to which we are told,

that he 'could not help it,' and on which the charge of fatalism is brought against Phrenology, as if the science which explains the *causes*, were also the *occasion* of the crimes which it records as illustrative of its doctrines.

Pallet committed an atrocious murder: why did he do so? On the Christian system, a Christian would answer, 'Out of the *heart* proceed evil thoughts, *murders*, blasphemies,' &c. 'The *heart* is deceitful above all things, and *desperately wicked*.' The corruption of his nature, therefore, was the source of his crime. On the phrenological system, the reply would be, Pallet possessed an enormous *Self-esteem*, *Combativeness*, and *Destructiveness*, with deficient intellect and moral sentiments. I do not stop to inquire whether the Christian and phrenological answers are not substantially the same; but I maintain, that if the objection of fatalism is brought against the latter, it is equally applicable to the former. There is not, indeed, a single argument which can be supposed to lie against Phrenology, as an alleged system of invincible necessity, which might not be demonstrated also to lie against Christianity, on the same ground; and when it is shown that Christianity is unfavorable to virtue, or that it encourages vice, it will be time enough to enter upon the vindication of Phrenology from similar charges.

This is a part of the subject, therefore, on which I have no disposition at present to enter. It opens up the whole controversy of Liberty and Necessity, of Calvinism and Arminianism, the doctrine of a self-determining power in the will, and the opposite doctrine of the necessary influence of motives. I have no doubt that Phrenology is able to shed its light even on these abstruse questions, and that it will be found to illustrate and confirm the profound and philosophical arguments of President Edwards, in his most masterly 'Inquiry into the Freedom of the Will,' — a work which has never been surpassed, or has never been equalled, either for the soundness or profundity of its reasonings.* My

* I may be permitted to observe, that the portrait of this eminent man, which is prefixed to his works, indicates the largest development of the reflecting organs, which I ever remember to have seen.

object has been rather to give a popular answer to a popular objection, than to enter into the metaphysical disquisition of fatalism,—a subject so difficult in itself, and with which Phrenology has in reality no more intimate connexion than with the Calvinistic system, which it is the professed object of President Edwards to explain and defend from the same charge of fatalism and invincible necessity brought against it by the Arminians.

NOTICES.

Mr. Editor: Being an inquirer into the truths of Phrenology, it gives me much pleasure to read all recent publications which offer new light on that theory of mental philosophy. It was therefore with joy that I hailed a duodecimo volume, of 252 pages, lately published at Albany, N. Y. purporting to be 'Lectures on Phrenology.' In general, the work is written in a very easy lecture-like style, a style in which the dryest subjects are rendered agreeable, and the agreeable doubly charming. The author has assumed the title of 'Elements of Phrenology,' for his new work, and has assured us that 'an elementary work on this science was much wanted.' With all the skill, taste and elegance which the lecturer has used, and he has employed much, it does not appear that the work was needed, when the works of Spurzheim and the Combes have been published in this country in various forms, and when he (the author) professes and confesses that these have been his sources of information, and that he has had 'but four year's experience in comparing cerebral development with mental manifestations.'

It must be granted that some men may obtain more experience and information in four years, than others can and do acquire in *thirty*. But this, it is feared, has not been the case with Mr. D., as is indicated by passages in his lectures. For instance, in treating of the temperaments in his last lecture, he uses whole paragraphs in decided opposition to the truths of phrenology as stated in his preceeding lectures, assigning to temperaments certain innate powers. In speaking of the sanguine temperament, he says, 'The individual possessing this temperament is ever of a *disposition* the most *happy, gay, lively and mirthful*; he possesses much *buoyancy of temper*, and an *elasticity of spirit* that reverses may bend but may not break. He is ever a *welcome companion*, and *enlivens the circle in which he moves*. He is *inclined to the softer passions, and the net woven by* Love, *finds him an easy victim*.' Again, 'If the sanguine temperament *inclines to love*, this (the bilious) inclines not less to *ambition*,' &c.

Among the faults of the work must be enumerated the *negligent* and *unpardonable* error on the frontispiece. We can pardon the author for using in the plate the old classification and marking, which Spurzheim finding incorrect, rejected for what he deemed more correct; but for locating the organ of calcu-

lation in the middle of the arch of the eye-brow, and coloring at the external angle of the eye, when the text says differently, are errors that cannot be overlooked. It is some apology, however, for the author that they are not original, as those of a similar nature occur in a small work by Dewhurst, published three or four years ago in London. QUÆSITOR.

Boston. The Boston Phrenological Society has held its regular meetings thro' the summer — and we are happy to state that they have been attended with unabated interest. The cabinet of the Society still remains incomplete. Some months ago a remittance of 100*l.* was made to London, for the purchase of casts — but as yet the order has not been answered. They are daily expected. A course of public Lectures will be delivered at the Masonic Temple, under the direction of the Society, to commence Oct. 3d, at 7, P. M.

Hingham. A Social Phrenological Society has been formed in this place — composed of ladies and gentlemen. Its members are of the most respectable families in the town — and their display of ability and zeal in the study of the science is highly creditable. Their example is worthy of imitation.

Nantucket. A Phrenological Society has been organized here, on a similar plan to that in Hingham. Its members are able and active. Mr. Dunkin has just closed a course of Lectures on Phrenology at this place, which was exceedingly popular.

Brunswick, Me. A Society has been formed here, in which the best students of the College take an active part. Its success is certain.

At Andover, Amherst, and Hanover, N. H. Phrenological clubs have been formed by the students, and the science receives no small share of their attention. We say to all, — persevere.

Phrenological Societies have also been formed in South Reading, Leicester, Worcester, Hanover, Mass., Providence, R. I., Hartford, Con. — We shall be happy to hear from them all.

Europe. We have received letters from London, Edinburgh, Dublin, and Paris. Phrenology is steadily advancing in Europe, and the science that was so much the object of ridicule in 1815 — is now quite generally adopted by the learned, and respected by the people.

The Opposition. It is quite amusing to hear grave inquiries respecting the *tendencies* of Phrenology, by persons who are totally ignorant of the subject. Some ridicule the science — some wonder at it, and think it *too strange* for credence — while there are others, noble fellows! who believe that its doctrines are true, but wait to hear them confirmed *as fashionable.* To all opponents our advice is—observe nature, and be honest. Read the works of Phrenologists, and then, according to common principles of justice, judge them.

The Annals. The remaining numbers of the first volume will be published before January. The causes of delay, heretofore, have been unavoidable, but they are now entirely removed.

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.

LECTURES ON POPULAR EDUCATION, by George Combe.

DR. CALDWELL, ON PHYSICAL EDUCATION.

MEMOIRS OF SPURZHEIM, by Andrew Carmichael, M. D.

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

CASTS.

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

James B. Dow, Printer.