

THE
PHRENOLOGICAL
JOURNAL AND MISCELLANY.

VOL. I.

DECEMBER 1823—AUGUST 1824.

*Isabella Millicent
of Perth*

EDINBURGH:

PRINTED FOR THE PROPRIETORS;

AND SOLD BY

**OLIVER & BOYD, TWEEDDALE-COURT, AND JOHN ANDERSON, JUN.,
EDINBURGH;**

**G. & W. B. WHITTAKER, AND TAYLOR & HESSEY, LONDON;
AND ROBERTSON AND ATKINSON, GLASGOW.**

1824.



2
2
—
A P
—

THE

**PHRENOLOGICAL
JOURNAL AND MISCELLANY.**

VOL. I

DECEMBER 1852—JANUARY 1853

*Published for the
Proprietors
of the Phrenological
Journal*

EDINBURGH

PRINTED FOR THE PROPRIETORS.

AND SOLD BY

OLIVER & BOYD, TWEEDELL-COURT, AND JOHN MACKENZIE'S, 217-

ROBINSON-RUE:

G. & W. E. WHITTAKER, AND TAYLOR & HENRY, LEIPZIG -

AND ROBERTSON AND ANDERSON, GLASGOW.

1853

BF
866
P57

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT,.....	i
ARTICLE I.—Suppression of Phrenology,.....	1
II.—Recent Attacks on Phrenology,.....	20
III.—Correspondence betwixt Mr George Combe and Dr Barclay,.....	46
IV.—Phrenology and Professor Jameson,.....	55
V.—Mr Charles Bell on the Functions of the Nerves,.....	58
VI.—Dialogue between a Philosopher of the Old School and a Phrenologist,.....	65
VII.—Alleged Claim of Reil to Dr Gall's Discoveries in the Anatomy of the Brain,.....	72
VIII.—The Spider and the Bee,.....	74
• IX.—The Enemies of Phrenology,.....	80
X.—Letter from Miss Cordelia Heartless,.....	86
XI.—Application of Phrenology to Criticism—Character of Macbeth,.....	92
XII.—On the Skulls of Three Murderers in the Museum of the Royal College of Surgeons, Dublin,.....	116
XIII.—Materialism and Scepticism,.....	120
XIV.—Transactions of the Phrenological Society,.....	146
XV.—Anti-phrenological Lectures, Demonstrations, and Exhibitions. By the Sieur Donnerblitzenhausen, &c. &c. &c. &c.....	155

NOTICES.

Mr GEORGE COMBE of this City intends to deliver a Course of Lectures on Phrenology in London, in April 1834.

Prepared or preparing, *inter alia*, for our next Number,—

Phrenological Review of Quentin Durward.

————— of the Trials of Margaret Lindsay.

————— of Mr Owen's New Views of Society.

————— of Parliamentary Report on Millbank Penitentiary.

————— Dugald Stewart, Esq. on Milton's Garden of Eden.

A Phrenological Tour.

CONTENTS

	Page
ARTICLE I.—Cranioscopy,	165
II.—Louis XI. and Charles the Bold, as delineated in Quentin Durward,	176
III.—Dugald Stewart, Esq. on Milton's Garden of Eden, ...	195
IV.—Second Dialogue between a Philosopher of the Old School and a Phrenologist,	200
V.—Phrenological Analysis of Mr Owen's New Views of Society,	218
VI.—Burke, Fox, and Pitt,	238
VII.—On the Organ and Faculty of Constructiveness,	247
VIII.—Practical Application of Phrenology on a Voyage,	259
IX.—Biblical Fragments,	269
X.—Captain Franklin's Journey,	274
XI.—Shakspeare's Character of Iago,	287
XII.—On the Frontal Sinus,	292
XIII.—Effects of Size and Activity in the Organs,	297
XIV.—General Directions for observing Development,	305
XV.—Phrenology and the Medical Society,	307
XVI.—Signs of the Times,	316
XVII.—Our First Number,	319
XVIII.—Proceedings of the Phrenological Society,	321
XIX.—Remarks on the Cerebral Development and Disposi- tions of John Thurtell,	326

NOTICES.

THE PHRENOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF LONDON.—This Society has received a great increase of numbers in the present session, and decidedly flourishes. In our next Number we shall give a report of its proceedings.

Dr ROBERT WILLIS, member of the Phrenological Society of London, having, since the publication of our first Number, commenced a course of lectures on phrenology in London, and intimated his intention of giving lectures regularly in future; Mr G. Combe considers the leading object of his intended visit to the metropolis as thereby accomplished, and will not deliver a course there in April, as formerly announced.

Mr G. COMBE is preparing a second edition of his *Essays on Phrenology*. They will be corrected and greatly enlarged, and are intended to present a condensed but comprehensive view of phrenology at the date of publication.

A report is in circulation that Mr G. Combe means to leave Edinburgh, and settle in London permanently as a lecturer; but we are authorised to state, that it is altogether unfounded, no such intention having at any time been entertained.

OUR FIFESHIRE CORRESPONDENT is respectfully informed, that his communication has been received, and that, with his consent, it shall be published, provided he entrust his name and address to the Editor. He is farther informed, that a cast or written development of the head of "My Landlord" would be reckoned a valuable acquisition. Phrenology rests on facts, and these cannot be too carefully authenticated.

THE HORRORS OF PHRENOLOGY will hardly be believed; but we shall try.

VERACITY is stupid. We say the *Sieur Donnerblitzenhausen* was in town at the time we mentioned. Did V. ever visit the Fives Court to inquire?

When SKYLARK soars a little higher, he will see more clearly. It is essential to clear vision, to get out of the dust.

PERTINAX is too short of temper for us; and TANDEM too long in harness. Are we at liberty to sweeten and shorten?

The price of our Journal has been complained of as too high. We may mention, that the quantity of letter-press, 10 sheets given in each Number, is in the same ratio to the price as the size of other periodicals is to the price of them. The paper is equally good, and the matter will speak for itself. Our first Number contained two extra sheets, comprising the Introductory Statement, which was paged separately from the Journal.

We have just heard, that in a debate in a Literary Society, (*not the Medical*.) a person boasted of being an apostate from Phrenology, that is, of his having once believed, and subsequently seen cause to abandon it. This story is obtaining a wide circulation, as evidence that the science is unfounded. Now, Phrenology professes to be a system founded on observations in nature; either, then, the gentleman in question believed at first, through weak credulity, without the authority of facts and philosophical reflection, or NATURE has *changed* since his first investigation. We leave him and his admirers to choose that horn of the dilemma which is most inviting.

In our First Number we intimated our intention to reserve a corner of our Work as a pillory, for the exposure and punishment of all who, under the guise of attacking phrenology, should henceforth be guilty of certain enormities inadmissible in fair discussion or philosophical argu-

ment. And we mentioned various descriptions and gradations of offence, which, we conceive, would be justly visited by such an infliction. Since the publishing of this, our proclamation, we have the satisfaction to say, that the offences so denounced by us have visibly diminished both in number and importance, though the enemies of our science may still indulge in the secret pleasure of uttering their *sottises* and *betises* on the subject in private society, but it would appear that the majority of them have lost all appetite for figuring in print. A few stray impertinences did, indeed, reach us, but these were either so insignificant in themselves, or so utterly unknown and unnoticed by the public, that we conceived it would be doing them by far too much honour to drag them into light; and, upon the whole, it occurred to us, that we should more effectually consult our own dignity by proclaiming a *maiden session*. Just as our last sheet was going to press, we happened to cast our eyes on a late number of the "MORNING HERALD," containing an article which, for sheer stupidity, is perhaps not to be equalled by any thing the public has yet seen. After perusing the statement we have given of the case of Thurtell, our readers will know how to appreciate the following exquisite *morceau*, of which our friend, the Sieur Donnerblitzmannen, if he wrote it, would, we should imagine, be, by this time, heartily ashamed—"Some months ago, a most desperate and concerted murder was executed, and the criminal, on the clearest evidence, was convicted, and underwent the last penalty of the law. The craniologists were all agog to get a feel at his skull; and when the body arrived at one of our public hospitals, about seventy learned men were assembled to feel the head; it was a sort of touching for the skull-evil; the wisest man in the room approached the corpse at a grave pace, and insinuated his finger and thumb behind the left ear, the usual place for murder to occupy; but the devil a bump was there to be found. The professor would not believe his finger: he slooped down and stared with all his eyes, but no mark was there, save that of

"Edge of penny cord, and vile reproach!"

"The professor shook his head, and a universal groan pervaded the assembly; the professor shut his eyes in thought—the whole assembly was blind: the professor again took heart, and opened his fist—the whole assembly cried 'courage; but, misfortune on misfortune! not only was the big bump of murder minus, but the bumps of caution and benevolence were big to conviction. The professor turned on his heel, and departed in peace—the whole assembly made their exit."

"He, ha, ha, ha!"

"Nay, prithee, laugh not; for a noble science perishes at the sound. Why, what a superseding of nature would it have been, had the professor, with his wisdom at his fingers' ends, been able to say, 'This man was a murderer; but the devil take the bumps, he was only left the choice to exclaim, 'This man was a philanthropist and a prudent fellow,' or to say nothing at all.

The following, which, we imagine, is also intended for wit, is so execrably bad, that we shall not make a single remark upon it.

"Another late instance of failure, was a gentleman waiting upon one of the learned in the art, and requesting him to feel a young lady's skull: 'but,' said the gentleman, 'as she has some doubt of the infallibility of the system, she has instructed me to bargain for your feeling her head through a veil, that you may not be guided by her countenance.' The professor agreed, and his fee was to be (the professor was an honourable man)—a kiss. A hackney coach was called, and in ten minutes the doctor and his disciple were landed at a hand-

‘ some house in Cavendish-square.—The gentleman ushered the philo-
 ‘ sopher into the drawing-room, where the young lady was sitting in
 ‘ anxious expectancy on an ottoman, in a long black veil, which covered
 ‘ her from head to foot. The doctor looked with all his eyes, but the
 ‘ long black veil defied his keenest researches; he thought he could
 ‘ make out the tip of her nose, and he was sure she had a pretty figure;
 ‘ she had her muff too in her hand: the professor made his bow and
 ‘ commenced his search: the first lump he hit upon was genius-devel-
 ‘ oped in an extraordinary degree: then there was bashfulness—quite
 ‘ enough, and a moderate proportion of the tender passion: her music
 ‘ was not quite made out, but that, quoth the doctor, dwells in the
 ‘ spheres, and he laid his hand on his bosom. How gallant of the doc-
 ‘ tor! He could not think of any thing prettier to say, so he demand-
 ‘ ed his fee with another bow. ‘ Certainly,’ said his conductor, ‘ and
 ‘ you have fairly earned it.’ The veil was snatched away; the doctor
 ‘ put his best foot forward for his prize, and extending his arms, found
 ‘ in them—a stuffed monkey, holding above its head a barber’s block,
 ‘ with—genius-developed in an extraordinary degree! The professor
 ‘ forgot to make his third bow, but shot out of the house like an arrow.”
 ‘ Ha! ha! ha!—Barber’s blocks are made of wood; and so I think
 ‘ was the doctor’s.”

These are specimens of antiphrenological wit; and this is the way in
 which the enemies of the subject think to put down and extinguish an
 inductive science!

N. B.—Authors and Publishers are respectfully invited to avail them-
 selves of the circulation of our Journal, to advertise any work in which
 they are engaged. Their Notices, which may be printed either on our
 covers or in a separate form, require to be sent in at least a fortnight
 before the times of our appearance.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE I.—Phrenological Essay,	337
II.—On the Combinations in Phrenology,	378
III.—Shakspeare's Iago,	402
IV.—Letter from an Observer of Nature,	423
V.—Report on the Cast of John Pallet,	425
VI.—Master James Hubard,	436
VII.—St Ronan's Well,	442
VIII.—Flourens on the Nervous System,	455
IX.—Phrenology and Mr Ówen,	463
X.—Phrenological Explanation of the Vocal Illusions commonly called Ventriloquism,	466
XI.—Proceedings of the Phrenological Society,	487
XII.—Dr Milligan s. Phrenology,	490



NOTICES.

THURTELL'S HEAD.—TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,—In the bust of Thurtell, published by De Ville, I could not but observe the position of the ear; in the common run of heads, a line drawn from the eyebrow, or, as you Phrenologists would say, from Lower Individuality horizontally along the head, would touch the tip of the ear, but in Thurtell's head this line will pass nearly half an inch above the usual course. Now, as we know the depth of brain is as the position of the ear, it follows that Thurtell's brain must have been in this part deeper than is usual, and as you have placed the organ of Destructiveness in that part of the brain, which is in this case most evidently developed, I own I have become, from viewing this cast, a decided favourer of your doctrine. If you find, on examination, that my observations are correct, their publication perhaps may have more weight with the sceptics, even than the decided explanation given in your last number.—Yours,
OBSERVER.

Hull General Infirmary.

MR MACRABY'S HEAD AND PHRENOLOGY.—In answer to our London correspondent, we beg to mention, that we have not been able to learn any thing concerning either the Phrenological Society to which he alludes, or the publication which he cites. We shall be happy to hear from him again with more minute information.

A CASE IN POINT is reserved for a future number.

In a note by the Committee to Dr Murray Patterson's Phrenology of Hindustan, published in the Phrenological Transactions, it is stated that Dr Patterson's knowledge of the science was derived solely from Dr Spurzheim's works. We are requested to mention, that Dr P. enjoyed the advantage of hearing a course of lectures on Phrenology, by Dr Matthew Allen of York, previously to his visiting India.

THE ELEMENTS OF PHRENOLOGY, containing a brief but comprehensive View of the Science, by Mr G. Combe, will be published in July. The second edition of the "Essays on Phrenology" will not appear before 1825.

"We understand that a number of gentlemen in Wakefield have formed themselves into a Society, for the purpose of cultivating a knowledge of Phrenology, on the system of Drs Gall and Spurzheim. They have taken a spacious room in Northgate to meet in, and have got together an interesting collection of masks, heads, &c. exhibiting very extraordinary development of human character, from its lowest to its highest state; and as we find that the Society intend to admit papers to be read on any subject connected with general literature and philosophy, we sincerely hope that it will meet with encouragement, and prove a source of knowledge to our townsmen, both useful and entertaining."—*Wakefield and Halifax Journal.*

NOTICES.

EDINBURGH MAGAZINE versus PHRENOLOGY.—During the last two years no subject has excited so great and abiding an interest in this city as Phrenology. It has been written about in the newspapers, discussed in literary societies, and afforded a ceaseless topic of conversation in private circles. Nevertheless the Edinburgh Magazine, which pretenses to be a chronicle of the times, has not, during this period, favoured its readers with the slightest hints of the existence of such a system, except by some awful sillinesses, intended for jokes, occasionally inserted among its notices. At length, however, Phrenology has appeared in its columns; and, when the other *accommodated Journals* are evidently leaning towards the science,^o this work has taken up the cue that other reviewers have laid down as stale, and made its debut by a clumsy imitation of Blackwood, in an article, "PHRENOLOGY AS OLD AS THE CREATION," in which grossness and indelicacy are substituted for reason, and profanity for wit. Its second article, "PHRENOLOGICAL CRITICISM ON BALLADS OF THE OLDER TIME," is far less exceptionable in point of taste, but equally unfortunate in regard to wit.

The author clearly intended it for a most tremendous quiz on the Phrenological criticisms of Shakspeare lately given in our Journal. His simplicity in this notion has greatly amused us. As the steam-engine serves to forge anchors, or to make needles, so Phrenology, if it be the true science of mind, (which is our position), must be equally available for the analysis of every variety of *mental manifestations*, from the sublime conceptions of a Shakspeare and a Bacon to the simple sentiment of a popular ballad. There is, therefore, no wit in the idea of applying Phrenology to the criticism of ballads; for this is just what a disciple himself would do, and what some of them have done. And then as to the execution of the article in question, it is bad Phrenology; and in no other respect is it good. We beg to set the author right on another point. "The proselytes," says he, "in this quarter, anxious, we presume, to do away the charge of novelty from their system, have, by some elaborate criticisms on the dramas of Shakspeare, attempted to prove that he was a Phrenologist." Not quite so,—their proposition is this: Phrenology contains an exposition of the primitive powers of the human mind and of the effects of their combinations, drawn from observations in nature. If this be the case, all *natural* representations of character must harmonize with the phrenological doctrines, both being derived from the same source. Shakspeare's characters are admitted to be *highly natural*, and we apply our principles to their analysis, and point out the most perfect accordance. Shakspeare acquires an additional lustre from standing the test of this examination, and Phrenology is shown to be in accordance with nature, by its harmony with nature's portraits drawn by this masterly hand.

Finally.—The writer of the article in question is a "*Bumpist*;" that is, one of a class of opponents who please themselves by representing, contrary to fact and to the statements of all phrenological writers, that the absence of bumps is the absence of size in the organs,—a joke so often shown to consist in a blunder on the part of the "*bumpist*," that one could not have expected it to reappear, even in the Edinburgh Magazine.

BLACKWOOD, having resorted to personal libel, in place of his usual ridicule and abuse, against Phrenology, is no longer in the lists of literary controversy, and must be consigned over to another tribunal.

^o The Christian Instructor in Edinburgh, and the Gentlemen's Magazine, the London Magazine, London Medical Chirurgial Review, the Lancet, &c. have lately given articles on Phrenology of a very favourable complexion.

CONTENTS.

	Page
ARTICLE I.—Ideality,.....	493
II.—Phrenology applied in the Education of a Youth.....	505
III.—Case of a Mechanical Genius,	509
IV.—Shakspeare's Othello,	512
V.—Redgauntlet,	532
VI.—New Monthly Magazine <i>versus</i> Phrenology,.....	534
VII.—Dr Hibbert on the Philosophy of Apparitions,.....	541
VIII.—On the Accordance which subsists between Phrenology and the Scripture Doctrine of Regeneration, ..	555
IX.—Ambrosian Manuscript,	571
X.—Spurzheim on Education,	578
XI.—On Size,	590
XII.—Professor Rudolphi and Phrenology,.....	592
XIII.—Dr Nares and Phrenology,	599
XIV.—Captain Ross on Decimal Notation of the Organs,....	600
XV.—Fielding's Miss Matthews,.....	602
XVI.—Observations on Secretiveness,	611
XVII.—Elements of Phrenology, by George Combe,	615
XVIII.—Outlines of Phrenology, by J. De Ville,	625
XIX.—Lord Byron,	629
XX.—Mr Rolph and the Philadelphia Journal on Phrenology,	631
XXI.—Phrenology illustrated by Quotations from the Poets,	636
XXII.—The Encyclopædia Edinensis and Phrenology,	641
ANALYTICAL INDEX,.....	645



NOTICES.

WE have received a full and accurate report of an ANTI-PHRENOLOGICAL LECTURE delivered at the INN of CAIRDOW, in September, 1823, by a celebrated LECTURER ON ANATOMY. It is under consideration.

PHRENOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF PHILADELPHIA.—We have been favoured with the following extracts of a letter, dated 11th June, 1824, from a member of that Society to a Gentleman in Edinburgh:—"Our Society has not increased in numbers; but more of its members have been strengthened in their conviction of the importance of the pursuit, and are more strenuous in its support than formerly. The prejudice so long prevailing, that the study of Phrenology, and the benefits accruing from it, could be pursued and appreciated only by the medical profession, is now subsiding; and we can boast of receiving zeal and talent for our cause from some gentlemen of the bar. One of these latter (Joseph Hopkinson, Esq. counsellor at law,) is a Vice-President of our Society; the other Vice-President is Dr Horner, Adjunct Professor of Anatomy in our Medical College. Among our lecturers for the year are several who teach Physiology, and who are attached to the public institutions for the Medical and Surgical Relief of the Poor." The letter proceeds to mention, that Mr Combe's Essays on Phrenology have been reprinted in that city; that 'Elements of Phrenology' have been published by Charles Caldwell, M. D., Professor of the Institutes of Medicine and Clinical Practice in Transylvania University, Lexington; that "the Philadelphia Journal of the Medical and Physical Sciences, edited by Dr Chapman," the most extensively circulated periodical of that class in the Union, has strenuously espoused the cause of Phrenology as a true and important science; that several lecturers on Physiology and Pathology teach Phrenology to their students, and that the Professor of Anatomy in the Academy of Fine Arts is a zealous phrenologist, and impresses his students with its value and importance. The letter proceeds,—“I have just learned that it is contemplated to have an Athenæum in New-York, and a lecturership on Phrenology attached to it. It may be well to remark, that the proposal of one of the young gentlemen of that city to lecture on the science gave rise to the idea of forming an Athenæum. Within the last year there has been an increasing interest evidenced for the study and knowledge of Phrenology in that city, and I have little doubt but that we shall soon hear of a society having been organized there." It is added, that Dr Gall, Dr Spurzheim, Sir G. S. M'Kenzie, Mr G. Combe, Mr Andrew Combe, Mr William Scott, Dr Butter, and Mr Alexander Hood, had been elected honorary members of the Philadelphia Phrenological Society.

We have to return our best thanks to our correspondent at HERTFORD for his obliging communication about Pallet, and also to apologize for not having sooner acknowledged receipt of it. The fact is, that, by some unaccountable neglect, his letter did not reach us till the middle of July,—five weeks after the appearance of our last Number, in which we had already given as full an account of the same case as we were able to collect. Had his letter arrived in time we should have made use of it. As it is, he will perceive, by referring to p. 425, in what respect we differ from him.

* See Extracts from this Journal in the present Number, p. 637.

NOTICES.

We are happy to be able to announce the safe arrival of the very valuable donation from Monsieur Royer of the Jardin du Roi, Paris, to the Phrenological Society, of which we gave a list in our last. Many of the specimens are extremely valuable, and will prove of great use to the Society, and they already attract many visitors. The skulls in Comparative Anatomy which Monsieur Royer has sent will lay the foundation for a series of observations in Comparative Phrenology, which are, in some measure, new in this country. And it is somewhat curious to notice, that at the very time these skulls were on their way from the continent of *Europe*, a paper on Comparative Phrenology by Dr. B. H. Coates of Philadelphia, and explanatory of them, was on its way from the continent of *America*, and that both met at Edinburgh at the same time. This interesting paper was read before the Phrenological Society of Philadelphia, and afterwards printed in the Medical Journal of that city. In a future Number we shall notice it more fully. In the meantime, we hope Monsieur Royer's example will not be without its effect in inducing others to forward the cause of truth, by sending such donations as they may be able to command.

The Phrenological Society has also been indebted to the kind zeal of Mr De Ville of London, for a very extensive donation of casts of eminent and remarkable characters; thus forming another very valuable addition to the Society's Museum since our last Number appeared.

Our readers will perceive, that, in addition to the usual quantity of letter-press, we have, in this Number, and at a considerable expense, given a Plate, with five portraits of celebrated characters, in illustration of the article on Ideality. We beg to add, that, if our success continues to increase as it has hitherto done, we propose to give, from time to time, similar illustrations of other organs.

Some of our medical readers have lately asked us if we did not mean to notice Dr Pritchard's remarks on Phrenology, contained in his valuable work on Nervous Diseases. Want of room precludes us from doing so in this Number, but we may in the next. They scarcely bear upon Phrenology.

A very interesting memoir, containing an account of an extraordinary female character, and accompanied by a cast of the head, has just been received by the Phrenological Society from Richard Carmichael, Esq. the justly celebrated surgeon of Dublin. Mr C. states, that it may be published in the Society's Transactions; but the case is so very curious and instructive, that we should be sorry to see it so long delayed. Mr W. Bewick, who made the copy of Haydon's Lazarus, exhibited here some months ago, has taken a very accurate drawing of this woman, and also presented it to the Society.

We have to solicit indulgence and a favourable construction from several correspondents, to whose communications and inquiries it has been impossible for us, from the pressure of matter, to do justice. We hope they will accept our sincere thanks for the interest they have taken in our welfare, and give entire credit to our promise to pay them due attention hereafter. The truth is, the evidences of the relation and bearing of our science crowd so fast upon us, that we find it exceedingly difficult either to take them in order, or to allow proper space for their exhibition. Have the advocates of any system of metaphysics ever had reason to make a similar acknowledgment?

Dr Majendie offers to exchange his "*Journal de Physiologie*," with ours. We may say that we accept of his offer, and will do the same with other journals that choose it.

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT.

IN submitting to the public the First Number of the first periodical work devoted to Phrenology, we deem it proper, as conductors of that work, to make our motives and our objects perfectly understood. When we say that of the educated public,—as well those who perform as those who delegate the labour of thought,—very few individuals indeed have *yet* formed an adequate conception of the real nature, the cogent evidence, and the vast importance of phrenology, we neither reproach the public with its ignorance, nor compliment the phrenologists on their knowledge. We merely affirm the fact, that the public *have not*, and the phrenologists *have* informed themselves on the subject. It is more than time that the indifferent but impartial world should know, that they are not only uninformed, but grossly and scandalously misled, in regard to this new department of knowledge. Although the proofs are so simple, that any person of average education is perfectly competent to understand and apply them, the path of evidence is not that in which they have been conducted. The ENEMIES of phrenology have hitherto been their favourite guides, and these have most scrupulously avoided that course. This influence had the more easy operation, inasmuch as it built upon a foundation of not unnatural prejudice against a doctrine in itself certainly very new, very bold, very startling to preconceived notions, and coming, withal, from a very suspicious quarter. Germany, it must be admitted, was in doubtful repute in this country. because of some alleged fantastical speculation, not a little moral heresy, much literary extravagance, and a great deal of quackery,—not confined to *mining*,—all the produce and export of that country, when yet another German started yet another spe-

ulation, which, at its first declaration, seemed to leave all the known extravagances of his country immeasurably behind. The doctrine thus appearing, *prima facie*, absurd, it is not matter of wonder that its terms,—a few of them, *as compounds*, being new to our language,—were themselves scorned and ridiculed; and that by a sort of reaction they rendered the doctrine itself apparently still more monstrous.*

It will be farther remembered, that at the time the doctrine reached this country, the Edinburgh Review was the Koran of the reading public. The reception of the new doctrine, accordingly, depended on the *fiat* of that literary dictatorship, whom it pleased, in a manifesto unmatched, as has been demonstrated elsewhere, by all the presumption and quackery of Germany itself, to annihilate “craniology” and “craniologists” at one decisive blow. The public were *thoroughly convinced*, and there was an end of the matter. Now, although it be humiliating, it is true, that this *first* denouncement continues the measure of the public knowledge, and the rule of the public opinion at this moment. Let any one, either anti-phrenologist or neutral, ask himself, what are the grounds upon which phrenology,

* A few words, once for all, on the terms of phrenology, cannot have a more suitable place than this. They have been laughed at, until they have become the very stalest pleasantry, we take it, in present currency. It would seem, therefore, not an unfit time to examine them *seriously*. Of these THIRTY-FOUR laughter-moving terms, will it be credited, by those who have laughed at them till they can laugh no more, that TWENTY-FIVE,—compounded in the same manner, and with precisely the same sense and meaning,—are peaceful occupants of Dr Samuel Johnson's Dictionary, where they have never occasioned a smile!—NINE, then, remain to be justified; 1st, These were, like other new technical terms, *necessary* to express a meaning for which there were no words in Johnson's Dictionary; 2d, They are, with one Greek exception, compounded of English words, either in Johnson's Dictionary, or in very current usage, and of the termination *ness* or *ty*, the value of which is known to every school-boy. The eight words are, *adhesive*, *acquisitive*, *constructive*, *ideal*,—all four in Johnson;—*amative*, *concentrative*, *combative*, and *secretive*,—the four last in use, though not in Johnson's Dictionary. The Greek derivative is *philoprogenitiveness* (or the animal propensity to cherish offspring), as legitimate, at least, as many terms in mineralogy, and still more in botany, or any other new Greek terms for any other new science, art, matter, or thing, which is best expressed by a Greek word,—and, above all, which there is no determination to hunt down. It is time the public should know, that not one of these terms has been shewn, by the most bitter enemy of phrenology, to be either illogically compounded, or unphilosophically employed. They have merely been laughed at—as *very long names*!—(*Edinburgh Review*, No xlix.)—This is not the only instance of sheer babyism which we shall bring home to our manly opponents.

or *craniology*, as he will probably call it, is, by himself, according to the scale of his sympathies, disbelieved, or rejected, or contemned, or detested? He *must* acknowledge, that he has not examined its facts at all, and very slightly and contemptuously skimmed its "absurd" doctrines; and he *must* refer his first decision back to the Edinburgh Review.* It is amusing to observe the result, on the public mind, of the abuse heaped by that journal on the "cunning craniologers,"—namely, a sort of partizanship, or general array against the subject, with a kind of feeling of duty, or point of honour, to take the side *against* phrenology, whenever it is alluded to, and resent all arguments, and especially all *staggering* facts, as personalities, and so many most obtrusive attempts "to force the matter down the public throat." In such a state of matters, although nothing *for* phrenology will go down "the public throat," *any thing* against it finds facile descent. It was easy to mislead the public yet farther; and the public has been misled in a manner quite unprecedented in an enlightened age.

For two or three years, notwithstanding Dr Spurzheim's lectures, in London and Edinburgh, the subject was either forgotten in this country, or resorted to as a sort of gossip and badinage; but its philosophical converts were few. The respect now paid to it is the result of A REVIVAL,—a revival by men of philosophical habits, many of whom readily acknowledge that they once joined in the general mirth;—and because a revival, carrying the weight of second thoughts and deliberate reflection. Very striking facts began to force themselves on the notice of inquiring men both in England and Scotland. A systematic examination of the doctrine followed, and, by the force of evidence, converts were made, who put Germany and the Edinburgh Review alike out of the question;—converts of calm and candid reconsideration,

* The Quarterly Review, about the same time, bore a testimony of uncommon feebleness against "*craniology*," which, we are not aware, told either one way or the other. The circumstance is forgotten; the conductors of that otherwise able work have a deep interest that it should.

with whom a once-refuted *quackery* had no chance of coming to life again ; and who, be it well marked, have, without even the most visionary interest, adopted the system, in the face of almost universal unmitigated ridicule.

The Essays by Mr George Combe of Edinburgh were published in 1819, and by the facts they detailed, the reasonings founded on these facts, and their complete refutation of the too long-triumphant article in the Edinburgh Review, most materially advanced phrenology in this country. Sir George Mackenzie next published on the subject ; and a small anonymous work, of much eloquence, as well as ingenious reasoning, lately appeared in Edinburgh, entitled, " Observations on Phrenology, as affording a Systematic View of Human Nature." Mr Combe began in May 1822 to lecture on the subject in Edinburgh, and continues to give a winter and summer course every year. In England, Dr Parry of Bath, in his Elements of Pathology, speaks favourably of the doctrine ; and Mr Abernethy, of high medical renown, has, in a tract on the subject, in 1821, borne his testimony to the beauty and certainty of the *philosophy* of mind, to which the phrenologists have been led.

Of periodical works, the first which had the honour, since the subject was revived, to scorn the general laugh, was the *New Edinburgh Review*, which for more than two years powerfully, yet candidly and temperately, advocated the doctrine. The *London Magazine* was the next to discard the unworthy prejudice which prevails against phrenology, and has set the subject in a very strong and attractive light ; and the *London Medico-chirurgical Review*,—a work of the very highest estimation in the medical world,—in an article which appeared in March last, characterized by much good sense as well as talent, declared phrenology well worthy of the most serious attention of men of science.

Of associations for the cultivation of Phrenology the first was instituted in Edinburgh in 1820 ; which place, as it produced the most inveterate enemies, has, by a sort of redeeming compensation, furnished some of the most zealous

friends of the philosophy of Gall and Spurzheim. The Phrenological Society, the first volume of whose transactions was lately published, consisted, at first, of a very few members, who have been the objects of more bad wit than any of their fellow-citizens. The members of the institution have since increased to above eighty in number, among whom are many professional and scientific gentlemen, and several eminent artists. This example has been followed by the formation of a phrenological society in Philadelphia, to which a complete set of casts was sent from Edinburgh; and last winter a phrenological society was formed in London.

In France many men of science and letters have yielded to the evidence, and adopted the principles. Among the most celebrated is Blainville, professor of comparative anatomy in the College du Plessis, who, in his lectures, states the evidence of the principles of phrenology as not subject to doubt; and Geoffry St Hilaire, also a name well known to the scientific world, as an author, a member of the Institute, and one of the most distinguished professors at the Jardin des Plantes, goes nearly as far. The necessary consequence is, that the French public have ceased to make merry with the subject, and phrenology is respectfully treated by them as a science; the only satirists being English, who, at Blainville's lectures, distinguish themselves by a sneer when the professor comes to that part of his course.

No *endowed* philosopher in this country has yet avowed his patronage of the new doctrine, or ventured even to allude to it, as a science, within college walls;* but some men, not so trammelled, held in public estimation at least as high as any that are, have given the science their candid investigation, and, it follows, their enlightened and zealous support. It is a little too much, after all this, for any man, be his talents and acquirements what they may, who has

* Some of our own professors bestow occasional *hits* upon the subject, which only prove how much it is in their way. Their good sense is beginning to whisper them that it is as well to drop this practice. It will soon become very amusing to their own students.

not studied the subject, to reject it, but yet more to endeavour to run it down. We would simply ask him, whether he can furnish an instance of any quackery, such as he ignorantly believes phrenology to be, which has been so revived and so supported?*

This vigorous career of phrenology being too much for its enemies to bear with equanimity, the hostility is revived of all who had committed themselves by scorning or railing at that system. It touches pride, but it touches still more nearly some other sensibilities. If phrenology be true, all other systems of the philosophy of mind are false. Philosophical reputations are at stake, and, yet more, patrimonial interests; and it were indeed an outrageous demand on human nature, a grand miscalculation of the state of the balance between the *amour de la vérité* and the *amour propre*, to expect that great established philosophers should have the candour—the heroism, for the sake of mere truth, to throw down their own pedestals, and shut their own chequers. From contempt, phrenology has accordingly risen to be the object of fierce opposition and intense hatred with some persons who pass for scientific men. This is particularly manifested in their hatred of the *phrenologists*,—a certain sign that their opposition to the doctrine is candid, fair, and philosophical. But truly there is much indulgence due to these eminent persons. They are like fishes which the water is evidently leaving dry, and, to their last gasp, they must retain a cordial hatred of the exhausters of their atmosphere.

The *formal* attempts at refutation have been fewer than, from the prevalent disposition on the subject, might have

* It is edifying now to look back on some of the conceited predictions of the short life of "craniology." Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, (under its first and inoffensive management,) in its very *first* number, (April 1817,) thus concludes one of the most perfectly inane papers which has perhaps yet been penned against the new science. After proposing a system of *cardiology*, or the mind in the *heart*, as "the brain has had its day," it says, "Such patch-work systems of conjecture and speculation are fortunately destined, by the immutable and eternal laws of truth, to last but for a season. Craniology has almost lived its little hour. In this city, we are certain that, with the absence of Dr Spurzheim, and the introduction of some other novelty, as a French dance or a new beauty, it will be very soon forgotten."

been looked for; but the reason lies in that uniform and signal defeat which has overtaken, and will ever await the imbecility of speculative reasoning when opposed to an extensive and well-established induction. The best proof of this is the far-from-enviable situation in which the reputations of the *regular* anti-phrenologists have been left by their success hitherto, in the controversy. With an insignificant exception or two, therefore, public disputation has been scrupulously shunned.* The war, however, has not come to an end. While the phrenologists have kept the field, they have been annoyed with sundry small attacks, which, although utterly despised by them, have told upon the public ignorance, and had the effect of fostering the public prejudice. Much of this very safe warfare is maintained on convivial occasions. Most dinner parties have long had the matter all their own way, and, the same jokes serving again and again, the "grand nonsense" has been refuted, and refuted to the perfect satisfaction of the harmonious disputants. We have seen some variation in the fortune of the afternoon, when a person who had informed himself on the subject has chanced to be present. So long as the whole company, as is the custom, attacked him at once, little progress is made, and he appears stunned by the very noise of the assault; but when his replies shew the ineffable worthlessness of some of the most prominent of the attacks,—especially when each gentleman has answered the preliminary question, "Have you studied the subject?" with the well-known indignant formula, "Not I! God forbid!"—we have seen a number of the enemy fall off, and become spectators of the fight which is kept up between the sturdy phrenologist and his assailants. It is then lamentable, in a company of men, often, who are leaders and lights where they are informed, to hear each after each propound his own jejune preconception,

* It behoves the world to know that, notwithstanding all the noise made by the opponents of phrenology, they have not yet pointed out one single fallacy in one single fact published by the phrenologists. Of this statement we challenge contradiction, with better proof than a *priori* argument.

and succeed only in establishing that he is utterly ignorant of the doctrine which he attacks. The task of the phrenologist is, nevertheless, a hard one. His arguments go for nothing because of his opponents' want of ideas. He must furnish ground on which his arguments will take hold—like the mariner who should be tasked first to *make* his anchorage and then to cast his anchor. This want of ideas is secretly not a little painful to the anti-phrenological disputant himself, and not the less so, that it is generally perfectly apparent to the rest of the company. We have seen some salutary warnings on this head. While the phrenologist is armed at all points,—not only master of his own science, but able, as he ought to be, readily to compare it with any of the numerous systems of mind and morals which have neutralized each other from Plato's downwards,—while he knows more of the anatomy of the brain than ninety-nine in every hundred of the medical profession itself, his antagonist, with a smile of contempt, for the poor *égare*, founded in the same sort of superiority which the Chinese possesses over the European, commences his extinguishment of the “craniologist.” Let any such extinguisher recall his far-from-comfortable experiences on the occasion; how severely he was tasked to call up all that would come of that valuable practical store his metaphysics; or of the few meaningless names which *he* has been accustomed to consider the anatomy of the brain;* let him recollect his feelings when he found himself mired after a few steps, and angrily persevering in the debate, when deserted by every definite idea; let him remember how he then left an argument which had first left him, and began to charge the phrenologists with presumption for believing, they being few, what the rest of the human race, being many, reject; and especially in pretending to demonstrate *thirty-three* primary mental faculties in man, when no other philosopher of mind has

* We have witnessed some amusing instances of the retreat of a medical man, after a very confident attack upon a phrenologist, on this presumed his weak quarter.

succeeded in demonstrating *one*. His antagonist's defence, on this head, he may likewise remember, namely,—that there is neither pride nor presumption in assenting to *facts* which are evident to his senses and his reason; and may be equally so to others who may choose to exercise them; whereas there are both pride and passion, in abundance, in the committed philosophers of preconception, the theorists, and *inventors* of metaphysics. So simple are the elements of our creed, and so easy the beautiful system of human nature to which it leads, that the *necessity* of its perfect comprehension by any educated man who gives it his attention, denies any thing like merit to the mere learners from the first observer, and allots even to him the praise of merely following out an accidental discovery. A dull joke may finally have come to our disputant's succour;—one of the beridden hackneys which have done much good service in expediting a retreat from the field, and which are known and numbered in their stalls by the phrenologists.

The public are likewise misled by hits at phrenology, as certain question-begging insinuations are called, in the works of eminent authors, whose eminence in other matters has not made them acquainted with phrenology; and likewise, as before noticed, in the lectures even within the walls of our universities.

But the most persevering of the public deluders are the writers in certain periodical journals; who, although their ridicule be a tissue of solecisms, and their arguments unredeemed drivelling, seem to the uninformed public to triumph, merely because they have hitherto been unnoticed. One important object of this Journal will be to disabuse the world of such false impressions, by watching the movements, hitherto so vapouring, of these less dignified foes, and visiting them with that exposure, which is itself ample vengeance on their offences.

Another department will be allotted to furnishing the public with the means of forming a just estimate of that venerable delusion, the science of metaphysics, or philosophy of

mind, as hitherto *established*;—to learn and forget which so much time is wasted at our universities,—and with the simple and satisfactory explanation which phrenology affords of many curious phenomena, given up in despair by the metaphysicians.

In another department we propose to institute a course of critical analysis on phrenological principles, of our best and most popular authors, in almost every branch of writing which has man for its subject, in which we shall endeavour to shew that the best writers are the most strictly phrenological; and that, like the Bourgeois Gentilhomme of Moliere, who had spoken prose for forty years without knowing it, these writers owe their popularity to their being phrenological, which is another word for natural. The poets will afford us a noble field, and none more than that “priest of nature”—Shakspeare.*

We shall occasionally review new publications, when we can thereby illustrate phrenology—try the soundness of the author’s views, by what has never yet failed us, a phrenological test, or in any way bring phrenology to bear upon the subject.

* Wishing to vary the matter of our First Number, we have given but one example of the application of phrenology to criticism, and we have taken that example from Shakspeare himself. In his character of Macbeth, he not only *never* departs from the view of human nature which phrenology has pointed out to be the true one, but often absolutely uses the phrenological language. We have other writers in our eye who owe their fame to their truth to nature. To the author of Waverley we shall, in our next Number, apply the infallible phrenological touchstone. *He* will not differ from us in opinion, that the characters which he has delineated in Quentin Durward are so many types of nature. We rather think we have the whole European public committed this length. We pledge ourselves to demonstrate, that that nature is the nature which phrenology, and no other philosophy, is fitted to analyze and explain. We will use the chief excellencies of his work as an exposition of our science; and when we have adduced him as one of our most powerful witnesses, we will remind him, that even he, in ignorance, compared our science to the palmistry of the Egyptian wanderers! and when we have done so, our revenge will be complete.

Of the universal application of this powerful analysis, which, like some of the agents of chemistry, reduces the most complicated moral compounds to their first elements, the reader will find some examples in the *Transactions of the Phrenological Society*, lately published,—among others, a historical application to the case of King Robert Bruce, and a histrionic to that of Clara Fisher and Kean. We understand, too, that an exposition of the peculiarities of the genius of Raphael, as explained by his cerebral development, known from a cast in the Society’s possession, will hereafter be given to the public.

We will omit no opportunity of removing those grounds of unjust dislike to our science, arising from an erroneous belief that it leads to materialism, fatalism, immorality, or irreligion; by shewing that, while it is perfectly consistent with, and most favourable to the doctrine of the *immortality* of the soul, it leaves the question of its essence just where it was, beyond human view—that it is perfectly consistent with the freedom of human actions—that it tends to a very highly-improved moral economy—and that it is beautifully in harmony with the precepts of our Holy Faith. Our readers may rest assured, that they will not only never find this Journal inculcating or countenancing principles at variance with sound morality and pure religion, but, on the contrary, they will find it bringing to speedy justice any pseudo-phrenological writers, who may attempt to pervert the science by a contrary course.

We shall find room for treatises tending to throw light on our important science, and for all new phrenological facts, information, and intelligence, which may be worth publication. Many curious facts have been communicated to the phrenologists, in the whole range of human nature, which those in possession of them never dreamed of transmitting to the metaphysicians, who would only have pronounced them “unexplainable in the *present* state of human knowledge.” A Phrenological Journal will attract such information in the whole extent of its circulation.

We have mentioned some of the intended allotments of our work, without meaning thereby to limit its range, or to exclude a variety of matter, instructive or amusing, having always a tendency, directly or indirectly, to illustrate or defend the science of phrenology.

We scarcely deem it necessary to apologize for the occasional introduction of lighter matter, more suitable to our subsidiary title of a Miscellany; when by means of it we can indirectly support phrenology, by pointing out amusing absurdities in the tenets and conduct of its opponents. It is they, not we, who tumble into the incongruities on which

the ludicrous is founded. The incongruities which they impute to phrenology appear so only to ignorance, and move laughter, just as the doctrine of the rotation of the earth, quicker than a cannon bullet, did in the wittings of the sixteenth century.

One department, at present much called for, will be reserved for the exclusive benefit of the ENEMIES of our subject and ourselves, who may in future distinguish themselves, as they have hitherto done, by one or more of the following laudable modes of refuting an inductive science. RAILING and ABUSE—FALSEHOODS and MALIGNITIES—IMPERTINENCIES and INSOLENCIES—DULL JOKES—INDECENCIES—NASTINESSES and BRUTALITIES—the three last sometimes separate, and sometimes combined. To this choice catalogue we engage faithfully to add any newly-emerging species. While we pledge ourselves to honour and respect all candid, fair, and philosophical opponents, whose object, like our own, is scientific truth, and not mere victory—above all, that most worthy opponent who has never yet blessed our sight, *an inductive* adversary, who shall scrutinize our facts—while we shall ever approve in others the utmost caution in assenting to our observations and propositions, and leave to their own self-satisfaction all who do us no possible harm, by merely *resolving not to believe*—we mean to repel all OFFENSIVE OPERATIONS of those we designate eminently our ENEMIES, and to brand their attacks as disgraceful to the age in which we live, and its certain reproach in the next; and we trust that no instance of our *retaliation*, for retaliation every iota of it will be, of attacks made with perfect impunity for several years past, shall lack the entire sympathy, nay, the hearty approbation of our impartial readers, who, in their love of justice, do not object to witness punishment condign.

That we have not exaggerated the sum of “many a wrong” suffered by the phrenologists, we deem a few specimens of *the treatment* imperatively called for.

I.—RAILING AND ABUSE.

Examples from the Edinburgh Review, No 49, June 1815.

“ We look upon the whole doctrines taught by these two modern peripatetics, (Drs Gall and Spurzheim), anatomical, physiological, and physiognomical, as a piece of thorough quackery from beginning to end.”

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

“ Well has the learned and most witty historian of Mrs John Bull’s indisposition remarked, ‘ there is nothing so impossible in nature, but mountebanks will undertake ; nothing so incredible, but they will affirm.’ ”

“ Were they (Drs Gall and Spurzheim) even to succeed in shaking off the suspicion of *mala fides*, which we apprehend is inseparably attached to their character, we should not hesitate to say,” &c.

“ We have two objects in view in a formal *exposé* and exposure of the contents of the volume before us. The first is to contradict directly various *statements*, in point of fact, made by Drs Gall and Spurzheim with unparalleled boldness and effrontery, which persons, perfectly satisfied of the general absurdity(!) of their opinions, may not have the same opportunity of refuting as ourselves: The second, and by far the most important, to save the purses of our readers, if possible, before it be too late, by *satisfying* that curiosity which might otherwise lead them to purchase the books themselves, or attend the lectures of these cunning *craniologers*.”

“ Such are the opinions of Drs Gall and Spurzheim on the *Functions in general* of man, and on his *Intellectual Faculties* in particular. We have been the more minute in our sketch of them, that their absurdity might be the more apparent. To enter on a *particular* refutation of them, would be to insult the understandings of our readers. Indeed, we will flatter the authors so far as to say, that their observations are of a nature to set criticism entirely at defiance. (This has two meanings). They are a collection of mere absurdities, without truth, connexion, or consistency; an incoherent rhapsody, which nothing could have induced any man to have presented to the

“ public, under a pretence of instructing them, but absolute insanity, gross ignorance, or the most matchless assurance.”

* * * * *

“ Such is the trash, the despicable trumpery, which two men, calling themselves scientific inquirers, have the impudence gravely to present to the physiologists of the nineteenth century, as specimens of reasoning and induction.”

* * * * *

“ We are so heartily tired of the mass of nonsense we have been obliged to wade through, that we could now most willingly have done. But the anatomical discoveries of Drs Gall and Spurzheim yet remain to be considered, and these are on no account to be passed over in silence. It appears to us, that in this department they have displayed more quackery than in any other ; and their bad faith is here the more unpardonable, that it was much more likely to escape detection. *These gentlemen are too knowing not to have perceived that the science of anatomy is in general cultivated with most zeal by those who have the least leisure to devote to it ; that is, by persons who are toiling with weariness through medical practice, and that those whose PROFESSION it is to improve this department of human knowledge, are usually content to bequeath it to their sons, JUST AS IT WAS HANDED DOWN TO THEM BY THEIR FATHERS AND GRANDFATHERS. They calculated, no doubt, that as the number of individuals is INCONSIDERABLE, who are not only zealous in anatomical pursuits, but, by a fortunate combination of circumstances, are enabled to bestow their whole time on them, the chance that a few bold affirmations respecting the structure of a delicate and complicated organ would be put to the test of experiment was proportionally small. Perhaps it would occur to them, too, that as UNPROFESSIONAL PEOPLE ARE IN NO RESPECT AWARE HOW VERY LITTLE FAMILIAR EVEN PHYSICIANS OF THE FIRST EMINENCE ARE WITH THE STRUCTURE OF THE BRAIN, it might contribute materially towards their reputation with the public to DELUDE A FEW OF THE MEDICAL TRIBE, WHO ARE NATURALLY LOOKED UP TO AS JUDGES IN QUESTIONS OF THIS SORT.*” *

* Although the above passage in italics contains but a moderate portion of insulting and abusive matter, we could not withhold it, and beg our readers to peruse, re-peruse, and never forget it. It contains, *Primo*, a declaration, that the medical profession, with a very few exceptions, are all but ignorant even of the structure of the brain : *Secundo*, That the anatomical professors are, *quoad* the brain, old women ; and, *Tertio*, That it was the easiest thing for Gall and Spurzheim to cheat them all, from their *not being able* to detect the imposture. Now our readers will please to observe, that all *soberly-thinking families* believe or reject phrenology according to the creed on the subject of the family doctor, who, they affirm, and even *argue*, must be the best judge ; and that that gentleman is generally a very decided anti-phrenologist, without knowing what phrenology is. Indeed, from the nature of medical education, which almost excludes any attention to the philosophy of mind, this result is by no means wonderful. They will farther keep in view, that thousands attempt to dispute on phrenology who

This never-to-be-forgotten review thus concludes :

“ The writings of Drs Gall and Spurzheim HAVE NOT ADDED ONE FACT to the stock of our knowledge, respecting either the structure or the functions of man ; but consist of such a mixture of gross errors, extravagant absurdities, downright mis-statements, and unmeaning quotations from Scripture, as can leave no doubt, we apprehend, in the minds of honest and intelligent men, as to the real ignorance, the real hypocrisy, and the real empiricism of the authors.”

We have not a shadow of doubt that, if the editor of the *Edinburgh Review* could, he would gladly recall this most imprudent manifesto. Our belief is, that he will not again meddle with the subject, although he will thereby be placed in an awkward predicament, if phrenology becomes, as it cannot fail to do, a subject of general interest. The old *refutation* will not suit the present state of the science. A new attempt by the *Edinburgh Review* would be good fortune quite beyond our hopes.

We deem a short notice enough for the *Quarterly Review*, which has dealt in more measured abuse than the *Edinburgh*. In concluding *their* manifesto, in which, as in duty bound, they reject the new science as “ sheer nonsense,” they take merit in softening their appellation of Dr Spurzheim to “ Fool.”—No XXV. p. 128. They had expressed their opinion of Dr Gall, more than a year before, when reviewing Madame de Staël’s *L’Allemagne*.

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

2. *Examples from other Publications.*

Blackwood’s *Edinburgh Magazine* has distinguished itself as the most persevering, and, of course, the most ab-

never saw the brain in their lives ; and, lastly, they will please to be informed, that, so far from trusting to escape “ detection,” Dr Spurzheim did actually, as is perfectly notorious, court and obtain a public demonstration of the brain, with the late Dr Gordon, one of the most eminent anatomists of the *Edinburgh* school of medicine.

surd of the assailants of phrenology, and enemies of phrenologists. It would indeed be matter for wonder if *such* a work had abstained from abuse.

"We have already said, that, in *our* opinion, fool and phrenologist are terms as nearly synonymous as can be found in any language. One writer in this work demolished the Edinburgh Phrenological Society by one article, equal to *any thing* in Arbutnot or *Swift*. (In nastiness we presume.) The phrenologist called out against *wit*, and clamoured for *pure* argument. Here they have it, and with a vengeance!"—BLACKWOOD'S *Magazine*, No lxxii. p. 100.

"These infernal idiots, the phrenologists," &c.—BLACKWOOD'S *Magazine*, No lxxvi. p. 593.

"It is not by extreme cases only, but by much more common facts, that the flimsy theories of these German illuminati are to be demolished."—RENNELL on *Scepticism*.

"A tribe of crazy sciolists, denominating themselves craniologists"—"these visionary abortions."—this crew."—*London Literary Gazette*, 13th September 1823. p. 587.

More of *this* flatterer in the sequel.

II.—FALSEHOODS AND MALIGNITIES.*

1. On the authority of Blackwood's *Magazine* for May 1823, the following dialogue took place among certain *gentlemen*, declared enemies of phrenology and phrenologists, assembled in a pot-house:—

Odoherly. What did your *friend* Brodie† die of, Mr Tickler?

Tickler. Apoplexy, I suppose. His face was as black as my hat.

Hogg. Lucky Mackinnon's bonny face was black too, they were saying.

Dr Mullion. Yes; "black, but comely."‡ I saw her a day or two afterwards,—very like the print.

* It was necessary to class these offences together, for it was always found that the falsehoods were malignities, and the malignities falsehoods. Indeed, some attacks, as the reader will perceive in the sequel, have a *pancratic* character, and exhaust the whole catalogue.

† Brodie was a notorious criminal, executed for systematic and long-continued theft and housebreaking.

‡ Proh pudor!

Tickler. These infernal idiots, the phrenologists, have been kicking up a dust about her skull, too, it appears. Will those fellows take no hint?

Odoherly. They take a hint! Why, you might as well preach to the Jumpers, or the Harmonists, or any other set of stupid fanatics. Don't let me hear them mentioned again.

Dr Mullion. They have survived the turnip. What more can be said?

Hogg. The turnip, doctor?

Dr Mullion. You haven't heard of it, then?—I thought all the world had. You must know, however, that a certain ingenious person of this town lately met with a turnip of more than common foziness in his field; he made a cast of it, clapped it to the cast of somebody's face, and sent the composition to the Phrenological, with his compliments, as a *fac-simile* of the head of a celebrated *Swede*, by name Professor Tornhippson. They bit,—a committee was appointed,—a report was drawn up,—and the whole character of the professor was soon made out as completely *secundum artem*, as Haggart's had been under the same happy auspices a little before. In a word, they found out that the illustrious Dr Tornhippson had been distinguished for his inhabitiveness, constructiveness, philoprogenitiveness, &c.—nay, even for "tune," "ideality," and "veneration."

Odoherly. I fear they have heard of the hoax, and cancelled that sheet of their Transactions. What a pity!

Hogg. Hoh, hoh, hoh! The organization of a fozey turnip! Hoh, hoh, hoh, hoh! the like o' that! The Swedish turnip,—the celebrated *Swede*!—P. 593.

This ignoble discourse was published, by the respectable interloquitors, in the knowledge that the *true* tale of that "weak invention of the enemy," the turnip, was as follows:

In April 1821, a medical gentleman in Edinburgh, aided by a landscape painter, fashioned a turnip into the *nearest resemblance* to a human skull which their combined skill and ingenuity could produce. They had a cast made from it, and sent it to Mr G. Combe, requesting his observations on the mental talents and dispositions which it indicated; adding, that it was a cast from the skull of a person of an uncommon character. Mr C. instantly detected the trick, and returned the cast, with the following parody of "The Man of Theassaly" pasted on the coronal surface:—

THERE was a man in Edinburg,
And he was wond'rous wise;
He went into a turnip-field,
And cast about his eyes.

And when he cast his eyes about,
 He saw the turnips fine ;
 " How many heads are there," says he,
 " That likeness bear to mine ?

" *So very like* they are, indeed,
 No sage, I'm sure, could know
 This turnip-head that I have on
 From those that there do grow."

He pull'd a turnip from the ground ;
 A cast from it was thrown :
 He sent it to a Spurzheimite,
 And pass'd it for his own.

And so, indeed, it truly was
 His own in every sense ;
 For CAST and JOKE alike were made
 All at his own expense.

The medical gentleman called on Mr Combe next day, and assured him that he meant no offence, and intended only a joke. Mr C. replied, that he treated the matter entirely as such ; and that if the author of it was satisfied with his share of the wit, no feeling of uneasiness remained on the other side. The story got into the Caledonian Mercury, at the time, so that the above misrepresentation must have proceeded on the faith that the real facts were by this time forgotten. For nearly six months past, the opponents of phrenology have been chuckling over this story, as a delightful specimen of the accuracy of our science ; and we have been equally amused with the proof it affords of their own gullibility. A human skull is an object which it is *possible* to imitate ; and if, in the instance in question, or in any other instance, the imitation had been *perfect*, a cast from the *fac-simile* would have been just as completely indicative of natural talents and dispositions as a cast from the original skull itself, supposing phrenology to have a foundation in nature. There was a lack, therefore, not only of wit but of judgment, in the very conception of the trick. If the imitation was complete, no difference could exist betwixt a cast from a turnip, and a cast from the skull which it was made exactly to resemble ; if

it was imperfect, the author of the joke, by his very departure from nature, encountered an evident risk of his design being detected, and becoming, himself, the butt of the very ridicule which he meant to direct against the phrenologist. This has actually been the result. The imitation was execrably bad, and the cast smelt so strongly of turnip, that a cow could have discovered its origin. We do not mean to say, that the pot-house wits themselves would have been equally acute: far otherwise; for there cannot be even the shadow of doubt, that, had a cast, taken from a turnip as it grew, without any attempt to make it resemble a human head, been submitted to them, granting to them the unusual advantage of perfect sobriety, *they* would not have discovered the trick. An experienced phrenologist was the last person on whom the deception could pass; but all heads are alike—all turnips are heads, and all heads turnips, on the very shewing of the anti-phrenologists.

2. An enemy of phrenology is known to have deliberately avowed, that he heard an eminent phrenologist say, that he had *cut the acquaintance* of several persons upon their unfavourable cerebral development alone;—while the truth was, that he really heard the phrenologist say, that it was of the essence of the science to teach us to bear with our neighbour's peculiarities, knowing these to be the natural result of his cerebral development.

3. It is boldly stated by some enemies of phrenology, and with amazing effect on the credulity of the public, that Dr Spurzheim himself,—Dr Spurzheim who has for nearly twenty years devoted every faculty of his mind to the new science, and who continues to teach it with indefatigable zeal,—that Dr Spurzheim ACKNOWLEDGES that he has been all along trying experiments on the “gullibility” of mankind, and laughing in his sleeve at his success!!!

What must be the extent of that “gullibility” on which *such* a story can take effect!

4. “The author of ‘The Gathering of the West,’ politely refused to allow his head to be *manupilized* by the same hands that so successfully *developed* the cerebral organization of “Haggart the murderer.”—*Blackwood's Fables*, No lxxii. p. 130.

The truth.—The author of “The Gathering of the

“ West” was in the company of the phrenologist who *ascertained* the cerebral organization of David Haggart, (nature having previously *developed* the said cerebral organization), and who published the result of his observations, which, in spite of the contemptible ribaldry to which it has given rise, all who *understand* phrenology, and do not misapply even its most elementary terms, held, and do still hold as affording a demonstration of the truth of the science. This phrenologist authorizes us to counter-state, that the author of “ The Gathering of the West” *requested* him to examine his cranium. He declined, and remained firm, although much urged by that gentleman. The falsehood is not imputed to the said author, to whom *we* should not have alluded, had he not been first dragged forward by coarser hands; and thereby insulted as the subject of a malevolent falsehood, and had that falsehood not been directed against a phrenologist.

III.—IMPERTINENCIES AND INSOLENCIES.

Under this head we class all empty petulances, which merely indicate their author’s over-respect for himself, and under-respect for his opponents, when he has not established, by his facts or arguments, even the shadow of a right to assume such a style;—all pertnesses, flippancies, and insulting jeers, in short, which require no other quality than effrontery, and which are always found in close connexion with disgraceful ignorance.

Exempli gratia.

1. “ *Scotch Nonsense*” was the suitable title which the doubtless philosophic editor of a well-known London newspaper had (of course by patient investigation of phrenology) qualified himself to give to an extract he was pleased to copy from the Caledonian Mercury, describing the cerebral development of Mrs M’Kinnon, lately executed in Edinburgh for murder, which so irresistibly illustrated the science.

If phrenology be nonsense, it is assuredly not *Scotch* nonsense, having originated in Germany, and being counte-

nanced in England by men of the pitch *at least* of that editor. A Scotch phrenologist prepared, but did not send to the Caledonian Mercury, the following paragraph, for the eye of this enlightened anti-phrenologist. We are happy to supply the defect :—

“ *English Sense.*—Many persons, no doubt, regard the doctrines as too ridiculous to merit a serious refutation, but we cannot subscribe to this opinion. The writings of Drs Gall and Spurzheim *themselves* are worthy of a calm and philosophical refutation, if they contain erroneous views; but when other men of judgment, and not destitute of talent, come forward as supporters of their opinions, and not only so, but when societies are formed for their cultivation, we suspect that the tide of ridicule will soon begin to flow in an opposite direction, if those who patronise the established system persevere in this supercilious treatment of their opponents. The contempt of the Chinese for the science and literature of Europe does not arise from a more enlarged and comprehensive understanding in that nation, but it marks the extent to which ignorance and prejudice possess the mastery over their minds.”—LONDON *Medico-Chirurgical Review*, March 1823.

Blackwood again.

2. “ *Cranioscopy* means the inspection of the cranium, and *craniology* a discourse on the cranium. Phrenology is derived from the Greek noun *φρενας*, *mind*,* or rather, perhaps, from *φρενις*, *mentis delirium*, the same root from which our common English word *phrensy* takes its rise, and which signifies, according to Dr Johnson, on the authority of Milton, *madness, frantickness*. The Scottish writers, on this subject, with the characteristic good sense of their countrymen, prefer the appropriate term *phrenology* (first applied, nevertheless, by Dr Spurzheim,) to the less significant terms employed by the *cranial* philosophers of the south, or the fathers of *skull-science* on the continent. *Phrenitis*, in the nosological systems of Sauvages and Cullen, I need scarcely remark, is a cognate word.”—*Blackwood's Magazine*, No liv. p. 73, note.

3. “ The most inveterate *enemies* (we thank thee, Jew!) of Gall and Spurzheim must now be convinced—convicted of the blind folly of their opposition to the doctrines of those great discoverers in the philosophy of the human mind. Fortunately for mankind, David Haggart murdered the jailor of the Dumfries prison, and that distinguished craniologist, Mr George Combe, having, according to the method of induction

* Sed potius, φρενις. We notice this, as that classical journal is particular in such matters.

“prescribed by his predecessor Lord Bacon, and explained by his contemporary Mr Macvey Napier, studied the natural character of the murderer, as indicated by his cerebral organization, has been enabled to place phrenology among the number of the exact sciences. Looking upon this achievement as by far the greatest that has been performed in our day, we shall endeavour to present our readers with a short sketch of Mr Combe’s discoveries, which have thus formed an era in the history of human knowledge.

“Mr George Combe, who possesses a tenderness of sensibility rarely found united with great intellectual power, made his experiments,” &c. &c.—*Blackwood’s Magazine*, No lix. p. 682.

4. “From the slight and *imperfect* sketch which we have now given of the conduct of this interesting young man, (Haggart), as furnished to us by Mr Combe. the world will perceive the high character of that philosophy of which he is the ablest expounder. For our own parts, we think that Gall and Spurzheim, and Combe, have thrown greater light on the nature of man than all the other philosophers put together since the world began. Indeed, there is now little or nothing to discover. The moral and intellectual geography of the head of man, and, *we understand*, of all other animals, is laid down with a minuteness of accuracy that must be very galling to the feelings of an Arrowsmith or a Morrison. Aristotle, Lord Bacon, and Locke, are mere impotent ninnies in comparison with Gall, Spurzheim, and Combe; and, indeed, any one page of Combe’s great work on Phrenology, is worth ‘all that Bactrian, Samian sage e’er writ.’ We propose that a colossal and equestrian statue be erected to him on the Calton-hill, instead of that absurd national monument the Parthenon; and that a subscription be forthwith set a-going, under the auspices of Sir John Sinclair, who will soon make Michael Linning hide his diminished head.”—*Blackwood’s Magazine*, No lix. p. 690.

What immediately follows is little short of intuition. It is our friend the Literary Gazette once more, as promised.

5. “Poor Dr Stukely never dreamed that a future age would produce a tribe of crazy *sciolists*, denominating themselves *craniologists*, (which they do not); that these visionary abortions would establish in modern Athens, formerly known by the name of Edinburgh, a *Phrenological Society*, (why not *Cranilogical*?) and open a toy-shop in the Strand for the sale of casts from the heads of those worthies who have been executed for murder, rape, and larceny; or, to employ the technical phraseology of this crew, who have been martyrs to excessive destructiveness, amativeness, and secretiveness. How would

“ the good sense of that philosopher have revolted on seeing M. De Ville point out to his customers an *imperceptible* eminence or *invisible* depression, as the *only* reason for the fatal sentence of the law ! And what would he have said on learning that it was the height of the fashion for every fool to have a cast of “ his own head ! ”—LONDON *Literary Gazette*, 13th Sept. 1823.

The classification of the above notable extract rather perplexed us. We first thought it merited a place among the witticisms, where its author, we doubt not, would, if consulted, have placed it. Its preponderating impertinence, however, removed the difficulty.

IV.—WRETCHED JOKES.

1. “ We cannot hope not to raise upon ourselves ‘ a pitiless ‘ storm’—all Gall’s bitterness, and all Spurzheim’s spleen.”—*Edinburgh Review*, No xlix. p. 229.

2. “ By a proper gauging of the head without, they can tell to a trifle how much it contains within. They have always found, that the larger the cranial part of the head measured upon the outside, skin and all, the greater the quantity of brain lodged in the cranial cavity. So it is the simplest process in the world. Shave a man’s head, and you have the measure of his mind in a moment. Multiply the length by the breadth, and the product by the thickness, and his philosophy and feeling will come out to the fraction of an inch. The remark is as old as it is said to be true, that no real hero is a hero to his *valet de chambre*. Let all those whom it may concern now remember, that no man can be a *pretended* philosopher to his barber.”—*Edinburgh Review*, No xlix. p. 246.

3. “ In the course of our own experience, we have observed that persons who have a lurking affection for port-wine have uniformly a certain redness of nose ; and yet we are far from conceiving ourselves warranted to infer from this, that the nasal hue is the *cause* of the vinous partiality. Some, on the contrary, are disposed to maintain that it is rather the *effect* ; but this we hold to be quite wicked and calumnious. Again, it is a remark, which we have never found to fail, that all great lawyers have long and very mobile fingers, ‘ *digiti pre-hensiles*,’ as Linnæus would have called them, with a remarkably smooth cuticle or epidermis on the palms of their hands. Shall we therefore conclude that this length and flexibility of finger, and this exceeding smoothness of palm, are the cause of eminence in the law ? No ; this may be a

“ case of mere coincidence ; nay, the professional eminence may indirectly be the cause of some of these phenomena ; but this is dangerous ground.”—*Edinburgh Review*, No xlix. p. 247.

4. “ Whether the organ of *hope* goes upwards or downwards, backwards or forwards ; whether the organ of *order* stands quite clear of that of *tune* ; whether the organ of *combative-ness* does not intertwine with the organ of *destructiveness* ; whether the organ of *wit* does not run the organ of *imitation* through the body ; whether one might not scoop out the organ of *covetiveness*, from end to end, as a cheesemonger with his wimble does a bit of Stilton, and yet not interfere in the least with the organ either of *benevolence* or of *veneration* ;—these, and many other questions of equal importance, would be in vain determined by an inspection of the engravings alone.”—*Edinburgh Review*, No xlix. p. 250.

5. “ Then, in point of extravagance, we do think, that since the integuments of every sort covering the skull seem to present so little impediment to the exercise of their acute vision, and their erudite touch, in the discovery of the bumps, it would have made very little difference to them, and been vastly more convenient for their customers, if they had affirmed that they could discover a man’s character through his night-cap, or his hat, or a wig of four stories, or even through both hat and wig, at the distance of twenty miles, provided they had a good telescope and the weather were clear.”—*Edinburgh Review*, No xlix. p. 253.

6. Why do the phrenologists restrict themselves to *thirty-three* cerebral organs ?—Why *have* they not found more ?—An organ of *angling* for instance ;—of *hunting*,—(of *cobbling*,—or of *punch-drinking* ?)—*Blackwood’s Magazine*.

7. As craniology is a science of bumps, some of them good, and some of them bad, it follows, that a character may be made perfect, by planing off, or “ scooping out ” the bad bumps.—*Q. E. D.*

8. *Converse*.—A proper application of steel-caps or helmets, so constructed as to restrain the growth of the bad bumps, and favour the growth of the good, would make the whole human race perfectly virtuous and intellectual,—nothing but Socratees, Newtons, and Howards in the world. For a full detail of this plan, *vide Blackwood’s Magazine*, No liv. p. 74.

9. “ In the education of youth, the phenomenon is quite familiar, that both the intellectual and moral powers are stimulated and improved by scholastic castigation. Therefore these powers are not situated in the head.”—*Blackwood’s Magazine*, No liv. p. 74.

10. Why is phrenology like a parrot?—*Ans.* Because it is far-fetched and full of nonsense.

11. Why is the saying, "As the bell clinks the fool thinks," applicable to a phrenologist?—*Ans.* Because the phrenologist sees in the brain, as the fool hears in the clink of the bell, the disordered fancies of his own imagination.

The last two overpowering arguments formed part of a lecture on anatomy and physiology delivered in this city.

V.—INDECENCIES, NASTINESSES, AND BRUTALITIES.

The published examples of these modes of refuting phrenology, we think it just to all other of our publishing enemies to say, distinguish the classic page of Blackwood alone.

1. In the Note on page 74 of the *liv.* Number, is an indecent allusion to an anecdote *invented* against the late Dr Webster of Edinburgh, which every debauched dotard will instantly tell you, if you give him the association. The indelicacy is also a wretched joke. It is meant to establish by possibility the organ of benevolence elsewhere than in the brain. We content ourselves with referring to the foul passage, to make good our charge;—we will not quote it.

2. The whole discussion is grossly indecent, where these moral philosophers comment on Dr Spurzheim's observations on hereditary excellencies and faults. They entitle it, "Improvement of Intellect from Cross-breeds of Genius."—No *liv.* p. 75.

3. "*Dr Clyster's*" theory, as propounded on page 74 of No *liv.* and the pretended misprint for *covetiveness*, with the witty remarks thence arising, all as contained in a Note to page 76, are specimens alike beastly. The comparison contained in the paragraph at the foot of the 2d column on page 690 of No *liv.* is too sickening even to be described. If we were asked whence it came, we should say from a carouse of jolly beggars.

4. Jests on human suffering, in its most horrible visitations, are well and truly called brutalities. In attempting to ridicule that most demonstrable doctrine of phrenology, the pathognomy, or manner, expression, and attitude corresponding to several of the faculties, Blackwood's Magazine says,—

“ We believe also that Haggart’s general appearance corresponded very nearly with the above description. *We* never but once had the *pleasure* of seeing him, and then we particularly remarked ‘ the stiffened approach of the shoulders to the head.’ But candour forces us to remark, that appearances may have been temporary and deceitful, for he had just been *turned off*: and in that predicament it is possible that the shoulders of any gentleman might make a stiffened approach to his head,” &c.—No lix. p. 686.

“ Mr Combe still observed the same laudable delicacy and refined humanity towards him (Haggart) who was the subject of his queries, and soon about likewise to be *the subject* of the still more searching-home thrusts of Dr Monro, that had marked the whole of his behaviour during their interview.”—No lix. p. 683.

“ Even on the scaffold, where he conducted himself in a manner deserving the highest approbation, he did not, we are told (for we were a minute or two behind *our time*”), &c.—No lix.

“ *We* saw him dissected.”—*Ibid.*

As *amateurs*, we would ask, or as students ?

We should not have been entitled to adduce as a specimen of brutality, *quoad phrenologia*, the dialogue which led to the one already given, relative to the story of the turnip, unless it was evidently meant to introduce that notable falsehood. It is of great consequence that our opponents should be properly branded.

See the disgusting conversation about executions in No lxxvi. p. 592.

THESE are the ignoble means by which men, who yet style themselves philosophers, and are pleased to hold at nought the power of observation, and the reasonings of all other intelligent creatures, have deemed it philosophical to treat one of the most important inductive inquiries which science has yet been called upon to prosecute ;—these are the weapons with which they have endeavoured to annoy and obstruct those who have given that inquiry their serious attention. To answer *such* reasonings were degradation only less profound than to employ them ; but it were of the worst

example to allow them to pass unnoticed. In future, therefore, we will record them. We will insure them their fitting meed of unsparing exhibition; for there is severe retribution for such malignity and fatuity in simple exposure. The transgressor who attracts no notice, when one of the multitude, becomes an object of immensely-increased *regard*, when sole occupant of an elevation created expressly to shew him; and the same critique on his character which goes for nothing as he moves in the world below, tells a thousand-fold when *looked up to* on a label affixed to his breast,—

PILLORY SHALL BE OUR ENGINE OF PUNISHMENT.

In our subsequent numbers, and for future offences*, we pledge ourselves to have in constant readiness a very efficient machinery for conferring the sort of distinction to which we have alluded. The promoted shall be seen in every point of view, in their genuine weakness and ugliness; and there shall not be wanting rings and bolts, of every size, for securing heads, hands, and hoofs, and a post for ears, in all their variety of length and hirsuteness.

Let us be perfectly understood. We force our doctrine on no one; but we are well entitled to say, “attack it fairly—attack *us* fairly, or let both alone.” We cannot too often repeat, that all candid inductive opponents, who love truth better than a paltry hollow reputation, shall meet with our most perfect respect and consideration; nay, even speculative *a priori* reasoners, who are at once sincere and civil, shall have no reason to complain of our manner to them, when we perform the easy task of pointing out their errors. But all falsehood, unfairness, malevolence, impertinence, and folly, we shall drive back from ourselves, and brush away from our science.†

* We beg the authors of the various enormities we have enumerated as mere specimens, to consider themselves as not having *yet* actually stood in our pillory.

† Names shall on no account be pinned to outrages, unless surrendered by the delinquents themselves, in any mode of clear and unequivocal voluntary publicity.

Before any impartial person joins our enemies in bestowing upon us the epithets of presumptuous, severe, merciless, cruel, or any other of the list which delinquents always have in readiness for a well-deserved retribution, let him call to mind, the long and heavy account of *aggression* which we have to settle, and he will not only not grudge us our *revenge*, but cheer us, if we bear us well in the contest. It is likely, that our punitive establishment will deter incipient delinquents; but old offenders we do not expect to reform. The philosophers of the punch-school especially are committed, and bound to proceed with their refutation of our induction—with their “arguments with a vengeance,” and their personalities, till their fabric of folly is completed; and “fool and *anti-phrenologist*” shall be held by universal consent to be convertible terms.*

But we must not conclude without a word of expostulation with men of real scientific habits, who know what induction is, and can appreciate a system built upon that basis. The sooner *they* cease to scorn, and begin to learn, the better for themselves. We tell them that they do neither well nor wisely to neglect phrenology—that they act absurdly to prejudge it. We tell them—disdain us as they may—that it is to be disgracefully behind the science of the age, to live in Chinese-like contempt of an inquiry which deeply engages a number of men in no way their inferiors, either in philosophical acuteness, or powers or habits of just reasoning. The inquiry is too far advanced to make this insolence of office longer safe. The system is greatly too near its certain destination of being deemed the most important discovery of modern times, to leave it prudent for even the greatest philosopher to entrench himself against it in his imagined strong-hold, where, if he remain, he must soon make a very ridiculous figure, and run the risk of being a by-word to every school-boy, as one of those who, in

* Drunkenness, as an excuse, will on no account be listened to.

the nineteenth century, opposed the progress of the true science of mind.

One sign of the times is worth the regard of the most securely established philosopher. The doctrine, which he unwisely despises, is rapidly taking hold of the reason, and delighting the imaginations of the rising generation. *They* have no exclusive theories which they love better than truth ; no philosophic dignities and reputations in jeopardy ; no pride to be offended by the success of a system which they have not committed themselves by contemning. Phrenology is rife among the young men. They discuss it in their friendships, study it practically in themselves and in each other, debate it in their societies, and evince their opinion of the truth of its principles by their votes. Let their philosophical instructors remember, that these youths will soon be men, who will look back on *Alma Mater* with a contempt for her doting metaphysics, which will turn *their* sons from *her* gates to the schools of the phrenologists.



THE

PHRENOLOGICAL JOURNAL.

No I.

ARTICLE I.

SUPPRESSION OF PHRENOLOGY.

“ In eldest times, ere mortals writ or read,
“ Ere Pallas issued from the Thunderer’s head,
“ DULNESS o’er all possessed her antient right,
“ Daughter of CHAOS, and Eternal NIGHT.
“ Fate in their dotage this fair Idiot gave,
“ Gross as her sire, and as her mother grave;
“ Laborious, heavy, busy, bold, and blind,
“ She ruled in native anarchy the MIND,
“ STILL HER OLD EMPIRE TO RESTORE SHE TRIES,
“ For, born a goddess, Dulness never dies.”—DUNCIAD.

SOME time ago, we heard an eminent philosopher give it as his decided opinion, “ that the pestiferous nonsense *PHRENOLOGY* ought to be *put down* by the hand of power.” This opinion made the greater impression upon our minds, that it came from one who had an important interest in maintaining his title to the philosophic character, by a strict adherence to the rule, neither to adopt any matter of knowledge upon trust, nor to reject it without examination. We therefore presumed that he had, with suitable patience and care, with due fairness and candour, investigated the numerous facts on which Phrenology is said to be founded,

and had either proved them to be fallacious, or overturned them by the force of his own counter-observations. Although we did, for a moment, hesitate to think that the Magistrate's interference would, in *such* circumstances, be necessary, it was plain to us that the authoritative would give signal vigour to the scientific refutation ; and we therefore applauded the opinion as the result of absolute philosophic wisdom.

So laudable a proposition could not long remain a mere opinion. Some serious measures have lately been taken by the regularly endowed and official guardians of truth, whose duty it is to obviate or extirpate error ; and we are happy to have it in our power to make our readers acquainted with the progress of an undertaking so suitable to the light and liberality of the nineteenth century. The result, we doubt not, will be as complete as the means have been wise and energetic.

As it naturally occurred to the projectors of this great measure, that any local, or even national authority was of too limited jurisdiction to interfere, with effect, in a matter which concerned scientific truth in general, they concluded that a power ought to be sought for of more extended sway, to pronounce and execute judgment. The Society for the Suppression of Liberty, then met at Verona, was sounded ; but the members of that august body gave no encouragement, not only because they had other heresies to put down, but because to them there appeared no difference between the nonsense called phrenology and the nonsense called metaphysics. This was the decided opinion of the Emperor of all the Russias, and, as he could answer, of the whole Russian population. The other potentates concurred, for themselves, in that opinion, without giving the same assurance of the assent of all their subjects. No other society, or body corporate possessing sufficient power, presented itself ; and thus some painful delay was experienced. At last, it was determined by those more immediately concerned in the early and effectual extinction of a sedition which threatened to involve al-

tars and CHAIRS in one common ruin, to invite to a convocation metaphysicians from all the universities of Europe, for the purpose of deliberating on the subject. This learned, wise, and impartial body, accordingly met; and, after solemn discussion, and much anxious communing, resolved to claim the interposition of a tribunal whose friendly influence and regard they had repeatedly felt in former emergencies, and whose supremacy extends unquestioned over all the regions of transcendentalism and abstraction. Their enlightened appeal was in terms as follows:—

UNTO the most Profound, Impenetrable, and Mysterious Powers, CHAOS, NIGHT, and DULNESS:

The Petition of the PROFESSORS, TEACHERS, and ADMIRERS of the sublime Science of Metaphysics in all the Universities of Europe,

Confidently Sheweth;

THAT, for two thousand years, your petitioners and their predecessors have been engaged in inventing, explicating, and perfecting the philosophy of mind; and their labours have been crowned with distinguished success. They have, severally and successively, elaborated, erected, and established the most splendid and beautiful systems of metaphysical science, systems exhibiting every diversity of principle and form, and curiously adapted to every variety of the human understanding. Your petitioners, and their predecessors, have dedicated themselves to this highly important and practically useful pursuit,* in virtue of “the natural superiority which men of general views possess over the

* “It is not, however, merely as a subject of speculative curiosity, that the principles of the human mind deserve a careful examination. The advantages to be expected from a successful analysis of it are various; and some of them of such importance, as to render it astonishing, that, amidst all the success with which the subordinate sciences have been cultivated, this, which comprehends the principles of all of them, should be still suffered to remain in its infancy.”—*Stewart's Elements*, part 2d. sect. 1. Of the Utility of the Philosophy of the Human Mind.

“ common drudges of business ;”^{*} and each of your said petitioners and their said predecessors, being necessarily in himself a quintessence, prototype, and representative of human nature in the abstract, has, by “ attentive and patient reflection on the subjects of his own consciousness,”[†] given birth to a theory, in which he himself clearly perceives the profoundest truths, combined with the most transcendent beauties ;—the whole appearing, in the eyes of the inventor, characterized by the most perfect consistency and philosophical harmony.

In this manner the said science has been, during the whole period aforesaid, amplified, improved, decorated, and enriched, until it has attained an extent and a magnificence, utterly unappreciable by the ignorant vulgar ; and it has latterly been advancing towards the acmé of sublimity, with a rapidity and force which can only be compared to that of a comet, in approaching its perihelion :—The said science is at this moment actually making the most prodigious progress, under the auspices of your Profundities, and by and through the infinite pains and labour bestowed thereon by your petitioners :—And when the said science shall, by these means, and the continuance of your august influences, be brought to a state of *absolute perfection*, and shall have “ acquired that ascendant in human affairs” to which its superior importance entitles it,—a consummation which your pe-

* Stewart's Elements of the Philosophy of the Human Mind, chap. 4. sect. 7.

Schiller appears in the following lines to have justly appreciated their superiority.

DER METAPHYSIKER,

“ Wie tief liegt unter mir die Welt,
 “ Kaum seh' ich noch die Menschlein unten wallen !
 “ Wie trägt mich meine Kunst, die HÖCHSTE unter allen,
 “ So nahe an des Himmels Zelt !”
 So ruft von seines Thurmes Dache
 Der Schieferdecker,—so der kleine grosse Mann
 HANS METAPHYSIKUS in seinem Schreibgemache.
 Sag an, du kleiner grosser Mann,
 Der Thurm, von dem dein Blick so vornehm niederschaut,
 Wovon ist er—worauf ist er erbauet ?
 Wie kamst du selbst hinauf,—und seine kahlen Höh'n,
 Wozu sind sie dir nützlich, als in das Thal zu seh'n ?

Schiller's Gedichte.

† Stewart's Elements, Introduction, part 1.

tioners calculate with the utmost confidence will be realized within the very reasonable period of two thousand years from this time, your petitioners anticipate, as they are well warranted to do, the greatest benefits as its results: *Then* the sublimity and practical utility of this noble science will be seen in all their lustre; then the whole human race will reap its fruits in unmeasured abundance, and have their “intellectual and moral natures” polished, refined, humanized, strengthened, and adorned, and raised to the most exalted pitch of excellence;* men will then be instructed in the true arts of making laws and governing kingdoms,†—a knowledge of which they are at present most lamentably destitute; even the vulgar, though utterly incapable, themselves, of rising to the heights and sublimities of the science, will experience the many great and practical advantages which the various clear and harmonious theories and systems of your petitioners, and their successors, will afford to them,—in training and educating their children;‡—in dedicating them to the several professions and pursuits for which they are respectively fitted;—in selecting fit persons for public and official situations;—in discriminating the talents and dispositions of all persons with whom the said vulgar must necessarily be connected, in friendship, family alliance, or business, which

* “To how great a perfection the intellectual and moral nature of man is capable of being raised by cultivation, it is difficult to conceive. The effects of early, continued, and systematical education, in the care of those children who are trained, for the sake of gain, to feats of strength and agility, justify, perhaps, the most sanguine views which it is possible for a philosopher to form with respect to the improvement of the species.”—*Stewart's Elements*, p. ii. § 1.

† “There is, nevertheless, a science of legislation which the details of office, and the intrigues of popular assemblies, will never communicate,—a science of which the principles must be sought for in the constitution of human nature, and in the general laws which regulate the course of human affairs; and which, if ever, in consequence of the progress of reason, philosophy should be enabled to assume that ascendant in the government of the world which has hitherto been maintained by accident, combined with the passions and caprices of a few leading individuals, may, perhaps, produce more perfect and happy forms of society than have yet been realized in the history of mankind.”—*Stewart's Elements*, p. ii. § 2. On the Utility of the Philosophy of the Human Mind.

‡ “Education never can be systematically directed to its proper objects till we have obtained, not only an accurate analysis of the general principles of our nature, and an account of the most important laws which regulate their operation, but an explanation of the various modifications and combinations of these principles which produce that diversity of talents, genius, and character, we observe among men.”—*Stewart's Elements*, p. ii. § 1.

mental qualifications it much concerns the said vulgar to know before forming such connexions and alliances;—in the treatment and cure of fatuous and insane persons;—in the reclaiming, illuminating, informing, and convincing of their errors, all wrong-headed sceptics, enthusiasts, and fanatics:—ALL which, and various other advantages, which must ultimately result from a true philosophy of mind, when it shall have acquired the ascendant, as aforesaid, the said vulgar may confidently expect will be reaped by their posterity in the hundredth generation, arising entirely from the labours and discoveries of your petitioners, made and to be made. In the meantime, until the said science is so perfected, as aforesaid, the said vulgar, not being capable of appreciating our said transcendental discoveries, must be contented to go on as heretofore in their own stupid, unsystematic, blundering way,—that is to say, appointing persons to fill offices from family connexion and political interest; marrying on account of beauty, wealth, or outward accomplishments, without regard to the abstract qualities of their minds, or the structure of their intellectual faculties; entrusting their children in infancy to the care of nurses and chambermaids, and, in more advanced years, to pragmatistical pedants, both equally ignorant of metaphysics; consigning the insane to the care of physicians, by whom the said science of metaphysics is also utterly neglected; and committing the enacting of laws, and governing of kingdoms, to statesmen and politicians, all equally ignorant, or at least neglectful, of the said sublime science of metaphysics;—the which disorders, however deplorable, must be submitted to for the present as what cannot be helped; but all of which will be duly remedied and amended, so soon as your petitioners and

“ The long reign of error in the world, and the influence it maintains, even in an age of liberal inquiry, far from being favourable to the supposition, that human reason is destined to be for ever the sport of prejudices and absurdity, demonstrates the tendency which there is to permanence in established opinions, and in established institutions; and promises an eternal stability to true philosophy, when it shall once have acquired the ascendant; and when proper means shall be employed to support it by a more perfect system of education.”—*Stewart's Elements*, p. 2. § 1. *ut supra*.

ought their said transcendent theories
reasonable period aforesaid.

prosecuting their said tran
satisfied, that "among
natural history of the
the "mind and
one another,"
"engaged the
ly necessary in the
;"* nevertheless, your
philosophical, and expe-
to the body in their said tran-
to leave the subject in that pro-
ture, doubtless for the most salutary
ously wrapped around it,—a mystery
initely to the true dignity of the science
ill be evident to your Profundities from the
lar and concise statement :—

ough your petitioners admit that the mind is con-
ted with the body, yet this connexion is general, philoso-
phical, and platonic, and by no means of such a real, obvi-
ous, and palpable kind, as might be, in any degree, appre-
hended or understood by the vulgar; and accordingly, in a
great variety of instances, the mind and the body are known
to manifest their respective faculties and powers, altogether
independently of each other. And first, in regard to the
body, this is proved, not merely by the phenomena of sleep-
walking, but by the familiar and every-day occurrence of the
bodies of men and women which are every where met with,
going through all the functions of eating and sleeping, rising
at certain hours and putting on clothes, walking and talk-
ing, attending dinner parties, and frequenting routes, plays,
balls, churches, and other places of public amusement and in-
struction, without ever manifesting, in the whole course of this
their varied existence, any mental faculty whatever. The other

* Stewart's Preliminary Dissertation, part II. p. 199, 200.

part of the proposition is equally well proved, not merely by the well-known phenomena of ghosts and apparitions, accounts of which have been handed down to us from the earliest times, and respecting which many learned and scientific treatises have been given to the world by your petitioners, their predecessors and allies; but by the not less incontestable fact, that your petitioners, as well as their brethren the poets, and other men of general views and exalted genius, so far from being chained and bound down to a piece of vile earth, like the "common drudges of business," are capable of sending forth their souls, on voyages of discovery, through the boundless regions of space and time, pervading and permeating all actual and possible existence, and darting in a moment "from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven," altogether unshackled by material organs, and not only without assistance from the body, but without any aid from experience, or the observation of dull and uninteresting matters of fact. This power is of eminent service to your petitioners, particularly when engaged in their said transcendent speculations, as, by this mode of proceeding, your petitioners have been enabled to advance their science in the most dignified and mysterious manner, infinitely beyond the range of the present every-day world, or what is by the vulgar called "*nature*,"—and this independence on fact and observation has been the true cause of all that extraordinary symmetry, beauty, and perfection, perceivable in the several theories of your petitioners, and of the wonderful harmony and agreement which, amidst all their variety, subsist among them. Hence, in the science of mind invented by your petitioners, and their predecessors aforesaid, the body is either necessary or not necessary to the mental manifestations, as best suits the special argument of your petitioners for the time; the philosophy of mind being, in this manner, rendered extremely convertible, and admirably fitted for supporting or subverting, as may be required, all imaginable and conceivable views, systems, hypotheses, opinions, creeds, and theories whatsoever,—to the great benefit and advantage

of the whole human race, and the infinite convenience, accommodation, and satisfaction of your petitioners.

In contemplating the final result of their labours, your petitioners cannot regard without some emotion of envy, the brilliant lot which awaits the sages of future times, by whom this sublime science is to be at last perfected, and their fortunate cotemporaries, on whom the full light and splendour of their ultimate discoveries are destined to fall.

BUT, notwithstanding the brilliant prospects thus held out to mankind by and through the labours of your petitioners' predecessors, your petitioners themselves, and their successors, and IN SPITE of your petitioners' exclusive right, as inventors, discoverers, elaborators, custodiers, and venders, of all facts, doctrines, theories, hypotheses, systems, creeds, notions, dogmas, first lines, and outlines, of and concerning mind and its powers, intellectual and moral, and as the only persons capable, from understanding the said several facts, doctrines, theories, hypotheses, systems, creeds, notions, dogmas, first lines, and outlines, of applying the same to the practical business of life, from which the beneficial results before mentioned will assuredly follow, as aforesaid, to the great delectation, high honour, and immortal renown of your petitioners;—YET TRUE IT IS, that two wicked and evil-disposed persons, F. J. Gall and J. G. Spurzheim, styled doctors of medicine, but held in utter abhorrence by all who exercise power or hold office in our schools, colleges, and universities,* not having the fear of your Profundities before their eyes, and in manifest contempt of your undoubted lawful authority in all matters connected with the said philosophy of mind, aided and abetted by two most seditious, schismatic, troublesome, and disorderly persons, called REASON and EXPERIENCE, and pretending to act under their sole direction and guidance, but without the license, permission, grant, or endowment of your petitioners, the only legal inventors, discoverers, elaborators, custodiers, and ven-

* "Is there no Arbuthnot now, to chastise the follies of our Craniologists?"—*Stewart's Dissertation, Part II. Note H. H.*

ders, as aforesaid, have not only presumed to take upon them to dispute with your petitioners, their said exclusive and undoubted rights and privileges, as inventors, proprietors, and venders of the said philosophy of mind in all its branches, degrees, stages, and relations, but have farther introduced, or attempted to introduce, into the said philosophy, the most abominable, flagrant, and mischievous innovations, to the great and lasting injury of the whole human race, and to the incredible grief, disturbance, vexation, loss, and detriment of your petitioners.

More particularly, *first*, the said F. J. Gall and J. G. Spurzheim, aided and abetted as aforesaid, despising the authority of your petitioners, questioning the unquestionable fact that the consciousness of each of your petitioners is an exact and essential type of the minds of the whole human race,—a fact, the benefit of which, notwithstanding all the differences in their creeds, systems, and doctrines, your petitioners have always considered to belong to each other as a legitimate patrimony, heir-loom, and property,—and neglecting and vilifying the grand, simple, and transcendental methods of speculation used by your petitioners and their predecessors, time out of mind,—have adopted in its place the poor, low, creeping, pitiful, beggarly method of investigating the subject by the observation of facts, which they are pleased to call “following nature;” thereby, so far as in them lies, degrading the philosophy of mind from its original, grand, lofty, and mysterious character, bringing it down to the conceptions, and levelling it to the capacities of the “common drudges of business,” and voluntarily, and with open eyes, rejecting “all the knowledge which has been accumulated “concerning the mind”* by your petitioners and their predecessors, and resorting, in order to obtain information, to a state of “total ignorance,”†—a mode of proceeding which argues either the most consummate folly and stupidity, or else a degree of wickedness and malignity which it is quite

* Blackwood's Magazine, No LXXII. p. 101.

† Ibid.

appalling to your petitioners to think of, and which all the true and loyal subjects of your Profundities regard, or ought to regard, with the utmost horror, detestation, and loathing.

Secondly. The said F. J. Gall and J. G. Spurzheim, aided and abetted as aforesaid, and proceeding by the aforesaid paltry, dilatory, and empirical method of observing facts, have attempted to degrade and vulgarize the mind, by representing it as constantly, and in all circumstances in this life, influenced by the condition of the body, and even dependent on it for the power of manifesting its faculties,—a heresy of the most dangerous nature, leading to materialism, fatalism, the subversion of religion and morality, and even to atheism itself, in defiance and contempt of the aforesaid mysterious doctrine taught by your petitioners, namely, that although there is a sort of general and philosophical intercourse between the mind and the body, they are by no means joined together, for better for worse, but may be considered either as joined or as disjoined in any particular case, as may happen to be most convenient for your petitioners at the time, to the end of rendering all the actual phenomena of mind explicable on any particular theory that is advanced, or that may be hereafter advanced, by any of your petitioners or their successors, to the great increase of the dignity and mystery of the said science of metaphysics,—to the infinite satisfaction, delectation, and edification of the said human race,—and to the unspeakable convenience, comfort, and repose of your petitioners.

Thirdly. The said F. J. Gall and J. G. Spurzheim, aided and abetted as aforesaid, in farther prosecution of their said wicked and felonious design to vilify and degrade the mind, for the purposes aforesaid, have dared to affirm, that the *brain*, a mass of pulpy matter, evidently intended indeed to fill up the cavity of the head, and spare nature the horror of a vacuum, but in regard to the sublime science, the interests of which we now advocate, of a use, if any, by your petitioners, and all regular and legitimate philosophers, utterly inexplicable, and into which they have no wish to inquire,—

have dared to affirm, we say, that the brain is neither more nor less than the *organ of the mind*, by means of which, the said mind manifests its faculties during life,—a most obviously absurd supposition, inasmuch as it is easy to be perceived, that the said brain is “of a clammy consistence, “and can no more retain motion than a quagmire,”* and so cannot possibly be the organ of any thing;—and, besides other foolish facts and authorities in support of said doctrine, reference has absurdly been made, in evidence thereof, to the writings of one William Shakspeare, a person to your Profundities utterly unknown, ignorant of the sublime mysteries of metaphysics,—destitute of all general views,—and a mere drudge, attached to, and deriving his sole merit from, the observation of nature,—who has somewhere asserted, that “when the brains were out the man would die,”—a most false, unfounded, and wicked assertion, as is clearly proved by the facts before referred to, and by divers authentic and well-attested cases known to your Profundities, where various individuals were known not merely to live, but to manifest, in vigour and perfection, all the powers, faculties, and sentiments of the mind, they ever possessed, after every atom of their brains had oozed out, been shot away, utterly wasted, and altogether obliterated;† and which wicked assertion of the said William Shakspeare is not only false, but leads directly to materialism, fatalism, atheism, and the subversion of religion and morality, as aforesaid.

Fourthly. The said F. J. Gall and J. G. Spurzheim, not content with affirming generally a constant and invariable connexion, in this life, between the mind and the brain, have, with an unheard-of perseverance in their aforesaid folly, wickedness, and malignity, collected, or pretended to collect

* Glanvill.

† “If it is meant to be affirmed that *total* destruction of the brain is uniformly followed by loss of *intellect*, we demand where the cases are by which that point has been established? Is there a single instance on record in which *complete* destruction of this organ had been observed, and in which a total cessation of intellect followed *as the effect* of that destruction? We will not pretend to affirm that there are no such cases recorded, but if there be any, we are altogether ignorant of them.”—*Edinburgh Review*, Vol. XXV. p. 244.

together, a prodigious number of skulls of deceased persons, —disturbing the repositories of the dead, to the great scandal, alarm, and horror, of all the peaceable, well-disposed subjects of your most profound reverences; and have also made, or pretended to make, a prodigious number of observations on living subjects, by a process partly resembling that of pawing, kneading, or nibbling, as practised by graziers when feeling and estimating the carcasses of sheep; from which they have proceeded, still more outrageously, to actual measurement, and have “gauged all the prominent craniums in Germany, and ascertained the solid contents of every celebrated head in France;”^{*} and, for the more extensive dissemination of their said wicked doctrines, they have farther engaged in making and collecting casts of various heads in plaster: ALL most disgusting, vulgar, and mechanical operations, utterly unworthy any man of enlarged and general views, and unbecoming the dignity of a philosopher. And they pretend to have discovered, as the result of numberless such observations, that, wherever certain bumps, lumps, elevations, or protuberances, are found in the head, indicating, as they foolishly affirm, that certain part or portions of the included brain are largely developed, the same are always found connected with certain powers, sentiments, or propensities of mind; and, this connexion being found invariable in all observed cases, they hence absurdly and wickedly conclude the said portions of brain to be the organs of the said several powers, sentiments, or propensities; and they have farther pretended and stated, that the result of this examination and observation has been to establish a certain, and they have the impudence to say, an *intelligible* analysis of the primary faculties of the mind, of which they affirm no less than thirty-three to be already distinctly discovered and ascertained: ALL WHICH STATEMENTS are mere shallow and quackish pretences, wickedly-devised and malignantly-intended contrivances, in as much as, *First*, All the

^{*} Edinburgh Review, Vol. XXV. p. 237.

said pretended facts and observations of the said F. J. Gall and J. G. Spurzheim, and their followers, calling themselves phrenologists, are utterly false, feigned, forged, fabricated, and unfounded, the skulls produced by them not being the real skulls of human beings, but those of horses, sheep, cows, apes, baboons, and other unseemly animals, or else artificially contrived and fabricated by them out of the bones of such animals, and the casts referred to being modelled upon turnips and other bulbous roots.* *Secondly*, Even if all the said alleged observations as to the apparent diversities of form in the human head were true, they would afford no proof whatever of the aforesaid theory, in as much as the greatest difference stated to be observed between different individuals in the development even of the largest organs does not exceed one inch and a half,—a space which, as your Profundities well know, is nothing when compared with the thickness of the skulls of many of your petitioners, and of others of the truly loyal and most devotedly-attached subjects of your Profundities; and such a difference occurring on such a head arguing nothing respecting the form or size of the included brain, it being manifest to us, “that human heads are rather like unto hazel nuts, whereof many that be equally large to look upon do yet possess, some a thicker, some a thinner shell; some a smaller, some a larger kernel,”† and it being notorious with your said petitioners and lieges, that many, indeed the majority of them, are not *conscious* of their possessing any brains at all.—*Thirdly*, That setting all this aside, the foresaid facts and observations are utterly irrelevant and superfluous, seeing that your petitioners have already discovered all the faculties of the mind, without their assistance; and what is more, that, as some of your petitioners have discovered the mind to require ten or twelve intellectual faculties, and some of them have discovered that one or two faculties are perfectly competent to perform all the intel-

* Vide Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, No LXXVI. p. 593, for a full, true, and particular account of a very remarkable case to this purpose.

† Edinburgh Review, Vol. XXV. p. 246.

le ctual labour, each votary of the science may fit himself with a theory to his liking, and such as will suit his own particular case, a matter of infinite advantage and convenience in so important and extensive a subject, and shewing, in the strongest light, the wickedness, absurdity, and folly of the said F. J. Gall and J. G. Spurzheim, and their deluded followers,—seeing, that since your petitioners had already supplied the market with such a beautiful variety of systems, ready made, and fit for use, the attempt to bring in a new one could only arise from a wicked desire to delude the public, and to interfere with the lawful profits and exclusive privileges of your petitioners, all as aforesaid. But, *lastly*, and what will completely, and for ever, set this absurd system to rest,—notwithstanding your petitioners, and some of their friends and well-wishers, have used the utmost care and diligence in dissecting and anatomizing the brain in all possible ways, cutting it in slices, horizontally, vertically, crosswise, and obliquely, from top to bottom, and from bottom to top, they have been utterly unable, even with the aid of the most powerful glasses and microscopes, to discover in it any thing in the least resembling a faculty of the mind, either intellectual power, propensity, or sentiment;* and not only is there no outward label, or other mark or indication set upon the different pretended organs, or any distinct and visible boundaries of separation between them, either by march-stones, pits, or other more regular, mural, or fossiform divisions; but nothing can be found or discovered by your petitioners, in any one of the said pretended organs characterizing the functions of the same. Thus, for instance, in what is called the organ of *destructiveness*, your petitioners are utterly unable to see any thing like cannon-balls, duck-shot, lancets, knives, or other cutting, destructive, and lethal weapons; in the organ of *constructiveness*, there appears nothing like clock-work, spinning-wheels, levers, screws, or any kind of machinery; not a

* This was demonstrated in the clearest manner by one of the most eminent anatomists and physiologists in this city, during his course of lectures delivered in the summer of this present year, 1823.

vestige of the impression of any coin or bank-note can be detected in the organ of *acquisitiveness*; nor any thing like the keys of a piano-forte, the stops of a flute, flageolet, or haut-boy, or the strings of a violin, in the organ appropriated by these pretenders to *music*,—and so of the rest; from all which incontrovertible facts, it is perfectly manifest to your petitioners, and must be so to your Profundities, and all your liege subjects, that the whole is a mere absurd theory, resting on no solid foundation, utterly unworthy of any serious or attentive consideration, and one which, if it were to gain ground, would “throw disgrace upon the philosophy of this “enlightened age.”*

AGAINST ALL which monstrous errors, perverse machinations, very detestable and felonious innovations, and highly-injurious and terribly-threatening consequences, your petitioners confidently apply to your Profundities for REMEDY and REDRESS.

MAY IT THEREFORE PLEASE your Profundities to take into your most solemn consideration what is above set forth, and having commanded the said F. J. Gall and J. G. Spurzheim to appear at your bar, refused them any opportunity of defending their said indefensible system, according to the well-established and very venerable form of your High Court:

Primo, To adjudge and declare, that the said F. J. Gall and J. G. Spurzheim, are Germans, and therefore incapable of making any discovery in science, or in any manner of way adding to the fund of human knowledge.†

Secundo, To adjudge and declare, that the whole doctrines, facts, observations, and reasonings of the afore-

* Blackwood's Magazine, No. LXXII. p. 102.

† It is quite beneath the petitioners to take notice of the trifling inventions of gunpowder and printing, and latterly of lithography, to which Germany claims to have given birth, as these inventions are entirely of a low and mechanical nature, undeserving the attention of men of enlarged and general views, and indeed affording a complete proof that the genius of Germany is utterly mean and grovelling.

said F. J. Gall and J. G. Spurzheim, are and shall be (without any examination, of which they are utterly unworthy) held to be unfounded, false, ridiculous, and absurd, and altogether such as, were they to gain ground, would be a disgrace, offence, insult, and scandal to this enlightened age;* and that this the adjudication and declaration of your Profundities shall be received and respected, throughout the whole of your extensive dominions, as a logically conclusive, and never-to-be-questioned refutation, of the said wicked, abominable, and malignant doctrines, now and in all time coming; and, for the more effectual extinction of the said unqualified piece of empiricism, may it please your Profundities to authorize your petitioners, and their successors, to raise the *posse comitatus*, and to require the aid and assistance of all your Profundities' peaceable, loyal, and able-bodied subjects, to lend the whole force of their lungs towards the utterly overwhelming and extinguishing the said wicked, abominable, and malignant doctrines, by laughing, hooting, bellowing, cursing, and roaring down any feeble attempts that may be made to support the same,—and to make it imperative on them to lay aside all peculiar and unnecessary delicacy, and on the contrary, to apply to the said F. J. Gall and J. G. Spurzheim, and their abominable empiricism, all the vituperative, contemptuous, opprobrious, and abusive epithets which can be found in their respective vocabularies: and in the meantime to adjudge and declare, that the said F. J. Gall and J. G. Spurzheim, and all their coadjutors, admirers, and followers, are Quacks, Empirics, Impositors, Hypocrites, German Illuminati, Crazy Sciolists, Abortions, Fools, Frenzied, and Infernal Idiots.†

* Blackwood's Magazine.

† Edinburgh Review, No. XLIX. Renzel on Scepticism, Blackwood's Magazine, *passim*, Quarterly Review, No XXV. and Literary Gazette.

Tertio, To adjudge and declare the mind and body to be either connected or unconnected, as may best suit any particular theory advanced, or to be hereafter advanced, by any of your petitioners.

Quarto, To adjudge and declare the brain to be a worthless pulp, utterly unnecessary, and even unfavourable to the perfect exercise of all the powers and faculties of the mind; and to ordain the said brain to desist and cease from all connexion with the said powers of the mind, now, and in all time coming.

Quinto, To ordain each hemisphere of the said brain, which the said F. J. Gall and J. G. Spurzheim have presumed, most arbitrarily and unwarrantably, to divide into thirty-three portions, each portion being the organ of a particular faculty, instantly to resolve itself into one homogeneous and unorganized mass, as heretofore, and in that entire state, to hold itself in readiness to execute any office or function which may be required of it by any of your petitioners.

Sexto, To abolish the whole propensities, sentiments, and intellectual powers, proposed and discovered, or pretended to be discovered by the said F. J. Gall and J. G. Spurzheim, and to ordain and declare the same to have been from the beginning, to be now, and in all time coming, utterly *null* and *void*.

Septimo, To adjudge and declare that the sole and exclusive right of inventing, making, and vending all manner of theories, systems, creeds, notions, dogmas, first lines, and outlines, concerning mind in general, and the human mind in particular, belongs, by prescription, and under the letters patent to that effect granted by your Profundities, to your present petitioners, as it formerly belonged to their predecessors, and will belong to their metaphysical posterity, so long as your Profundities shall continue to reign over a willing, an obedient, and a happy people.

Octavo, To confirm and revive all, and whatsoever systems,

theories, creeds, notions, and dogmas, of all regular, leal, and trust-worthy philosophers in the said science of metaphysics, that have ever existed, restoring them all to good odour and fame :—In particular, to adjudge that the Ideas of Plato, the Intentional Species of the Peripatetics, the Forms, Modes, and Phantasms of other Ancients, the Entities, Identities, Formalities, Materialities, Virtualities, Ecceities, Petreities, and Polycarpeities, of Dun Scotus, the Substantial Forms of the Realists, the Empty Names of the Nominalists, the Monads and Harmonies of Leibnitz, the Vibrations, Vibratiuncles, and Associations of Hartley, the Animal Spirits and Pores of Descartes, the Perceptive Motions and Imaginative Reactions of Hobbes, the Material Images of Sir Kenelm Digby, the Feelings and Impressions of Hume, the Sympathies of Smith, the Common Sense of Reid, the Tastes, Habits, and Intellectual Faculties of Stewart, the Ideas of Emotion of Alison, the Feelings of Relation and the Simple and Relative Suggestions of Brown, the Transcendental Qualities of Kant, the Flexible Spherule and Sensible Surface of John Fearn, the Symbolical Sentiments of William Howison, and the Harmonic Intervals or Seven-fold Mystery of Francis Maximus Macnab, with all other powers, faculties, sympathies, feelings, and states of mind whatsoever, invented, made, and vended by your petitioners, and their said predecessors, shall be received, understood, comprehended, and believed in, “ as the knowledge “ which has been accumulated concerning the human mind,” and as such shall be revered, taught, expounded, and illustrated, in all schools, colleges, and universities within the dominions of your Profundities, as the only legitimate science of mind, leaving it to your petitioners to reconcile the same to one another as they best can, with full power to

them and their successors to add thereto their own several and respective new theories, creeds, and systems, yet to be invented and made,—the said additions to be incorporated with the said previous systems, and harmonized therewith, and the whole together to form, and be considered, admitted, and acknowledged to be, the science of metaphysics, or the true philosophy of the human mind, in all time coming.

Postremo, To inflict such punishment upon the said F. J. Gall, and J. G. Spurzheim, as may serve as a warning to all their deluded followers, and to all the true and loyal subjects of your extended empire;—and, thereafter, to banish forever the said F. J. Gall and J. G. Spurzheim, and their said abettors, Reason and Experience, beyond the bounds of your said extended Empire, and to do otherwise as to your deep Profundities in your great wisdom shall seem meet :

And Your Petitioners, &c. &c.

The Procedure and Judgment of the Court are still
IN NUBIBUS.

ARTICLE II.

RECENT ATTACKS ON PHRENOLOGY.

“ *Pedro*. What ! a feast, a feast ?

“ *Claudio*. I’faith, I thank him, he hath bid me to a calf’s-head
and capon, the which if I do not carve most curiously, say my
“ knife’s naught.”

DURING twenty years, the opponents of Phrenology have been ceaselessly labouring to “ put it down.” In the *Edinburgh Review*, vol. ii. (1803), an article appears, pretending to refute

“The Man of Skulls;” and, strange to tell, in 1815, the task of refutation remained still to be performed, and was again attempted in the 49th number of that Journal. So far as we know, the former made little impression, and we believe it was soon forgotten. The last article was a signal, at which the floodgates of sarcasm, slander, and wretched reasoning, were opened, and, from almost every review, magazine, and newspaper in the empire, torrents of abuse and ridicule were poured out against Phrenology and its founders, and it was then imagined to be “put down” for ever. Once more, however, it arose, not like the phoenix from its ashes, for it had never been consumed, but, like the strong-ribbed vessel, which, sound and secure in all its timbers, survives the storm, rises above the waves, and defies the utmost rage of the tempest. In spite of the prejudices of the public, and the *interests* of individuals, arrayed against Phrenology, (as public prejudice and private interest ever have been ranged in opposition to all discoveries subversive of established systems), the doctrine has gained ground, and is daily rising in general respect and estimation. This progress is manifested, not only in the daily accession of converts, but more amusingly in the various gradations of concession which yielding scepticism is making in favour of the science. Some admit that they “really begin to think” there *is* something in it, but that it is carried *greatly* too far; others “must confess,” that it is past being laughed at, and that at least it deserves, what it has not yet received, fair play; while many absolute converts coquet with their belief, as if ashamed of it, wanting perhaps the moral courage to brave “the dread laugh,” with which the “*nonsense*,” as it is termed, is yet greeted by many a jovial, and, *quoad hoc*, profoundly ignorant company. The avowal of conversion, no doubt, will be more boldly made, when it becomes *safer*:—in the mean time, the doctrine *is* advancing, and that rapidly.

This circumstance, however, has only increased the rancour of the opponents of the new philosophy; and, while its disciples have been peacefully employed in adding to the general stock of knowledge of the mental and moral condition of man, by many

thousand observations, they **have** been assailed by every weapon which ignorance, actuated by malevolence, could muster against them.

We shall state, in the plainest manner, some of the reasons which the phrenologists have had for not noticing these writers sooner. Controversy is, at all times, rather an idle occupation ; but metaphysical controversy is peculiarly barren and unprofitable. It has also the property of being altogether endless, and Milton makes it one of the occupations of the fallen angels " to reason high " on matters of metaphysical import,

" And find no end in wandering mazes lost."

This is the case where the opposing parties are on an equal footing, and where both of them contend with weapons purely metaphysical : but where, on the one hand, we have a strong and consistent statement of facts and observations, and on the other side nothing but speculative reasoning, it is impossible, in the nature of things, that the parties can ever fairly join issue. It is a battle between a living man and a ghost.

There are three things to be attended to in considering an inductive science. First, The *facts* and *observations* on which it is founded. Secondly, The *reasonings* on these facts and observations ; and, thirdly, The *general theory* or *system* to which these reasonings lead. These three points, which ought ever to be kept distinct, have been confounded and jumbled together by our opponents ; or rather, leaping boldly over the first, and avoiding to grapple fairly with the second, they have directed their arguments almost exclusively against the third, namely, the *system* to which the phrenologists have been led, not by an effort of invention, but by the results of numberless observations of nature : and, because our opponents imagine that this system is imperfect, or because some points of it do not correspond with their preconceived ideas of our mental constitution, they take it upon them to denounce the whole as false and absurd.

This is exactly of a piece with the attempts made in the sixteenth century, and even later, to ridicule and reason down the Copernican System. The wits and reasoners of those days,

when they set themselves in array against the observers of nature, disdained to proceed by the slow methods of observation and induction. They at once denounced the notion of the Earth's motion round its axis as contrary to *common sense*. But we do not now consider the doctrine of the earth's rotation to be *contrary* to common sense, although common sense alone could never have discovered it.

When we survey the solid foundation of facts,—innumerable, incontestible, well observed facts,—upon which the conclusions of phrenology rest, we who have studied these, and who know what it is we trust in, can regard, with a degree of calm contempt, of which our adversaries can hardly form a notion, the prodigiously imbecile attempts which have been made to put the system down, either by what is considered Reasoning, or what has very erroneously been designated Wit. We certainly are not so unreasonable as to expect, that, on the first announcement of a new science such as this, founded on an extensive observation of facts, our assertions shall be admitted without examination. But we certainly have a right to complain of those who will neither believe us, nor examine for themselves.

The facts observed by the phrenologists are got rid of in a very summary way. "Who knows, *for example*," asks one, "whether, for every case brought forward by them, there may not be one of an opposite kind *kept* in the "back ground?" To say nothing of the delicacy, the candour, or the justice of such a supposition, or rather such a charge (for it infers the utmost disingenuousness and even moral depravity in the phrenologists), we shall merely remark, that it is utterly inadmissible in fair argument. We are not here in an Ossianic or a Rowleian controversy, respecting the authenticity of manuscripts which nobody ever saw, or the genuineness of traditionary poetry which nobody ever heard. The facts are as patent to all as the light of heaven, and within the reach of every, even the meanest, capacity. Nay farther, so very open have the phrenologists laid themselves to detection, that they have published to the world their methods of observation, and furnished every one with the means of making observations for himself, whereby he may be

enabled to detect their errors, if they are in error, and to expose their quackery, if they are really quacks. It is certainly incumbent on those who deny the universality of the coincidences asserted, to prove the exceptions, and to produce instances to the contrary. They have been challenged to do so for at least ten years; and they have been challenged in vain. What is the legitimate inference to be drawn from this?—Plainly, *that they have no facts to produce*; and, considering the numbers, the weight, the abilities, and the zeal, of the opponents of phrenology,—the rank which they hold in science, and the interest they have to maintain their supremacy,—it is not too much to say, that, *had any such contradictory facts existed, they would have been produced before now*. To this we cannot imagine the shadow of an answer.

It will readily be allowed, that it would be perfectly vain and fruitless to enter upon a formal and detailed refutation of reasonings which are nothing more than mere cavils founded on misrepresentation, and, what is worse, a misrepresentation of the most elementary parts of the phrenological system. In order to do this with proper effect, it would be necessary to state the principles of the whole science from the foundation. It is, in some respects, an impediment to phrenologists, that the facts on which they found their doctrines, though abundantly simple and most easy to be comprehended, are so exceedingly numerous and varied, that it is difficult to give even an abstract of them. It is the easiest of all easy things to start some little objections, suited to make an impression on those to whom the subject is utterly unknown, and for a moment the objector “claps his wings and crows like chanticleer.” But the objections are the objections of ignorance, whilst the answers can be perceived and appreciated by those only who possess a knowledge of the subject. Besides, these answers, and the proofs of them, are a thousand; and their irresistible weight depends not upon their single, but their united effect. The phrenologists are absolutely oppressed with the multitude of proofs which crowd upon them; and the same circumstance which forms the amazing strength of this evidence, gives rise to the difficulty, nay the

impossibility, of making it seen by others in any short or easily remembered statement.

Lest, however, it should be imagined that this is all *bravado*, and an apology for not meeting these writers in the field of controversy, we shall select a single faculty and organ, and present the reader with an abstract of the evidence on which they are admitted.

We shall commence by giving an abstract of the evidence on which Dr Gall founds his own belief in the existence of the organ and propensity, which he named "*Instinct carnassier*," but which we shall designate "Destructiveness,"—a term not very elegant, indeed, but expressive and familiar to the English public. We shall next state part of the evidence on which we ourselves are disposed to admit such a propensity and organ; and, lastly, We shall notice some facts in human nature, altogether unconnected with phrenology, which may enable any ordinary inquirer to judge of the *probability* of our conclusions being well or ill founded. Dr Gall's observations and statement of cases on this single propensity occupy sixty pages of the third volume, 4to edition, of his "*Anatomie et Physiologie du Système nerveux en generale, et du Cerveau en particulier*;" but our abstract must necessarily be very brief and imperfect.

He gives in substance the following account of the discovery of the organ. In comparing attentively the skulls of several of the lower animals, he observed a characteristic difference betwixt those of the carnivorous and the granivorous species. On placing the skulls of granivorous animals horizontally on a table, and raising a perpendicular line from the exterior opening of the ear, he found that only a small portion of the posterior lobes of the brain and cerebellum was situate behind this line. Following the same course in regard to the skulls of carnivorous animals, he observed, that, in the greater number of them, this perpendicular rose about the middle of the head, or, at least, that a considerable portion of the cerebral mass was situate behind it. Farther, he discovered, that, in carnivorous animals in general, the greatest prominence of the brain occurs precisely above the external

opening of the ear. To prove these statements, he exhibits plates of a variety of skulls, and contrasts that of the marmot with that of the marten,—the skull of the squirrel with that of the mole,—skulls of roebucks with those of monkeys,—the badger, otter, fox, dog, pongo, papion, &c.

Dr Gall thus perceived, that certain cerebral parts, lying above and behind the petrous portion of the temporal bone, exist in carnivorous animals, which are not found in granivorous animals. This distinction prevails also among birds. In birds of prey, the part of the brain in question is largely developed; whereas in the other tribes of birds, it is small, and the great mass of the brain is placed before the external opening of the ear. In illustration of this fact, he gives a plate of the skull of the falcon contrasted with that of the stork.

For a long time he merely communicated these observations to his hearers, without making the least application of them to phrenology. He merely pointed out that, by inspecting the cranium, even when the teeth are wanting, it is possible to distinguish whether the animals belong to the granivorous or carnivorous genera. It happened, at length, that some one sent him the skull of a parricide; but he put it aside, without ever imagining that the skulls of murderers could be of any use to him in his researches. Shortly afterwards he received also the cranium of a highwayman, who, not satisfied with robbing, had murdered several of his victims. He placed these two crania side by side, and frequently examined them. Every time that he did so, he was struck with this circumstance, that although they differed in almost every other point, each of them presented a distinct and corresponding prominence immediately above the external opening of the ear. Having observed, however, the same prominence in some other crania in his collection, he thought that it might be by mere accident that these two parts were so much developed in the skulls of the murderers. It was only, therefore, after a considerable time, that he began to reflect upon the different conformation of the brain in carnivorous and granivorous animals; and then observing that the part which was large in carnivorous animals, was precisely that which

was so much developed in the murderers, the question occurred to him, Is it possible that there can be any connection betwixt the conformation of brain thus indicated and the propensity to kill? "At first," says Dr Gall, "I revolted from this idea; but when my only business was to observe, and to state the result of my observations, I acknowledged no other law than that of truth. Let us not, therefore," says he, "fear to unfold the mysteries of nature, for it is only when we shall have discovered the hidden springs of human actions, that we shall know how to guide the conduct of men."

"Naturalists," continues Dr Gall, "are in the practice of distinguishing carnivorous animals by the teeth, claws, and the form of the stomach and intestines. According to them, the structure of these parts sufficiently explains the instinct which prompts these creatures to kill other animals. In consequence of this idea, they treat with contempt the notion that there exists in the brain an organ of this propensity. They ought to consider, however, that although all these instruments are formed in perfect harmony with such an instinct, they could never produce it. Give to the sheep the teeth and the claws of the tiger, *without changing its inward dispositions*, and it would never be impelled by these external appendages to attack and kill other animals. The tiger, on the other hand, placed in a meadow of the richest pasture, would die with hunger, before he would be prompted to graze. The idiot and the insane, however perfect the mechanism of their hands, can neither paint nor build, unless the influence of a higher power be given to direct these external appendages. Naturalists, therefore, ought not to confound the *instruments* by which an instinct acts upon its objects with the internal propensity which directs their application. One phenomenon, at least," continues the Doctor, "they will find it difficult to explain by means of teeth, claws, the stomach and intestines, viz. every carnivorous animal has a manner of killing its prey peculiar to itself. Some strangle their victims, others with their teeth cut their throat, while others strike them on the back of the neck, &c. Who, then,"

says he, "has instructed these animals to follow such different methods, and always so perfectly appropriate to the nature of the animal to be slain? Could the teeth, or the claws do so?"

Hitherto we have spoken only of the difference betwixt the *crania* of carnivorous and herbivorous animals. The same difference is found to exist betwixt the *brains* of these different classes. Dr Gall exhibits a plate of the brain of the lion and tiger, and of the calf and kangaroo, and the convolutions which are marked as the organs of Destructiveness exist in the former, while in the latter, they are absolutely wanting.

"At the same time," says Dr Gall, "it is proper to observe, that the organ is not, in all carnivorous animals, situated with rigorous exactness, above the external opening of the ear. Among some species of birds, for example, in the stork, the cormorant, the heron, the gull, &c., the external opening of the ear is considerably drawn back, and the organ of the propensity to kill is placed immediately behind the orbits, forming a large prominence upon each side, the size of which is found to bear an uniform proportion to the degree in which the animal manifests the propensity to kill. In comparing the *crania* of carnivorous birds with the skulls of those that can live indifferently either upon animals or vegetables, this prominence is found to be less conspicuous in the latter; in the duck, for example, and in the different species of thrushes; and it becomes less and less prominent in proportion as the birds exhibit a more distinct preference for vegetables, such as the swan, the goose," &c. The differences are illustrated by plates in Dr Gall's work.

These distinguishing characteristics of development vary not only in different *species*, but in different *individuals*, exactly in proportion to the greater or less predominance of the carnivorous instinct. For example, the portion of brain, above alluded to, is perceptibly larger in the eagle and the falcon, than in the crow and the magpie, larger in the wolf than in the dog, and in the tiger than in the lion. In illustration of the difference among individuals, Dr Gall mentions, that he possesses a considerable collection of the heads of cats and dogs,

in forming which, he paid particular attention to the degree in which the carnivorous instinct had manifested itself in each individual; and he states it as a fact, that in those cats which were ardent hunters, this region of the cranium is decidedly more developed than in those which were contented to receive their food in kitchens and parlours. The same circumstance holds in regard to dogs: those which had a large development of this part of the head were known to pursue and kill with avidity mice, rats, hares, and foxes, while those which were not naturally given to such pursuits, had a smaller development of the same part. He mentions, that it is impossible for any one to make a collection of the skulls of cats and dogs, paying attention to this difference of their dispositions, without being convinced, beyond the possibility of doubt, of the truth of these remarks.

So much for the lower animals: The following are a few of the facts stated by Dr Gall, in proof of the existence of the propensity and organ in Man. The organ is situate, in the human head, at the temporal and lower part of the parietal bone, and is about two inches and a half in length, and an inch and a quarter in breadth. This organ is very apparent in the crania of two of the accomplices of Schinderhannes, who had committed more than twenty murders. It was large in a soldier of Berlin, who experienced an irresistible propensity to commit murder, and who, upon the approach of paroxysm, of which he was sensible, before it attained its height, caused himself to be pinnioned, to prevent deeds of violence. It was found large in a young woman who had assisted her mother to murder her father.—In a young man, nearly an idiot, who had killed a child without any rational motive, under the impulse of a blind propensity:—It was large in the skull of a man named *Homme-Dieu*, exhibited by M. Brüggmanns at Leyden. This wretch had precipitated a number of persons from the banks of the canals into the water, to enjoy their dying struggles.—It was also large in a man of Brunswick, who, without any other motive than the pleasure of killing, had committed two murders, the second on a child; also in twenty-five women, whom Drs Gall and Spurzheim found confined in different prisons, for infanti-

cide:—It was large in a criminal of Frankfort, who was executed, after having committed a second murder; in Bouhours, who felled his victims with a mallet, to rob them of their money; in the crania of all the murderers in the collections of Messieurs Haberl, Sax, Weigel. In Lepelrey-des-Longchamps, the organ was largely developed, and the organ of Combativeness very little; and this person conceived the project of a murder, which he bribed Héluin, who was more courageous than himself, to execute. In the latter, the organ of Acquisitiveness was large. A man named Valet murdered his grandmother and three aunts; and Mercier, under promise of a sum of money, assisted him, by preventing the women from escaping, but without inflicting a single blow. In the cranium of Valet, the organ of Destructiveness is well developed; in that of Mercier it is not so. In the latter, the organs of Combativeness, Cautiousness, and Benevolence are very small, while the organ of Acquisitiveness is, on the contrary, very prominent. These skulls are preserved in the Museum at the Jardin du Roi*, and Dr Gall possesses casts of them. The cranium of a man named Voirin, a hatter, guillotined in Paris about the year 1808, for having committed two murders, is exceedingly remarkable. The organ is much developed, and prominent. Dr Gall gives an extract from the act of accusation, which indicates exceeding barbarity in his conduct. The organs of Benevolence and Reflection were also small. The head of Doutun, who had murdered his brother, presents almost the same appearance. The skull of a criminal of Tarn, condemned to death on 21st January 1809, for having assassinated his brother-in-law, presents a very large development of the organ. Dr Contèle narrates the circumstances, and certifies the development to be such as is now described: *Observations sur la Constitution Médicale de l'Année 1808, à Albi, second partie*, p. 163. and 165. In the head of Madelaine Albert de Moulins, the organ is prodigiously developed, and this woman murdered,

* We are informed by a gentleman, to whom casts of these skulls were shewn by Mr Royer of the Jardin du Roi, that he pointed out the characteristic indications of each precisely as here stated, without knowing that such a crime had been committed, much less the share which each had had in its commission.

with a hatchet, her mother, brothers and sisters. A cast of this skull is in the Phrenological Society's possession.

Dr Gall mentions also, that in the busts and portraits of *Caligula*, *Nero*, *Sylla*, *Septimius Severus*, and *Charles the Ninth*, this part of the head is represented as largely developed. Besides these, Dr Gall mentions several other cases, but the foregoing must suffice as an example of the kind of evidence on which he proceeded.

In the *second* place, we shall state part of the evidence on which our own belief in this propensity and organ is founded. The following facts may be verified by any person who has a mind to inquire. The organ of *Destructiveness* is very large, and that of *Benevolence* small, in the skull of *Bellingham*, who murdered *Mr Percival*. The temporal bones protrude at least half an inch in the situation of the organ of *Destructiveness*, on each side, and the frontal bone presents a receding surface at the organ of *Benevolence*, where the skulls of individuals remarkable for *benevolence* generally rise into an elevation of half an inch or more. A cast of *Bellingham's* skull may be inspected in the *Phrenological Society's* Collection, No 33. The organ of *Destructiveness* is also largely developed in the skull of *Gordon*, who accompanied a poor half-fatuous pedlar boy, and, in the middle of a muir, beat out his brains with the heel of his clog, and robbed him of his pack, not worth twenty shillings. The skull itself is No 59 of the *Society's* Collection, and the bones protrude nearly half an inch on each side at the region in question. It is large in *Charles Rotherham* (cast No 36), who pulled a stake from a hedge, and beat out the brains of a poor woman on the highway, and robbed her of some very trifling articles. It is large also in the skulls of *Hussey* (No 30), *Nisbet* (No 31), and *Lockey* (No 34), who were executed for murder. It, and the organ of *Acquisitiveness*, appear to have been very largely developed in the head of *Heaman* (No 15, busts), executed at *Edinburgh* for piracy and murder; also in the head of *Robert Dean* (No 18, busts), executed for murdering a child, without any rational motive; and in the head of *Mitchell* (No 21, busts), executed for murdering a young wo-

man, whom he had seduced. In the heads of David Haggart (No 32, skulls, and No 17, busts) and Mary Mackinnon (No 31, busts), executed at Edinburgh, and of Booth (No 75, skulls), a poacher, executed at York, all for murders committed on the impulse of the moment, it appears considerably developed; while in them Combativeness is also very large.

In the whole of these skulls and heads now enumerated, the distance in a direct line, measured by means of callipers, from the external opening of the ear to the middle of the surface of Philoprogenitiveness on the skull, *i. e.* about half an inch above the spinous process of the occipital bone, is equal to the distance from the external opening of the ear to the external surface of the head at lower Individuality, corresponding to the top of the nose; and *the coronal surface is narrow*. This indicates a great preponderance of the animal organs situate in the lower and back part of the brain, over the organs of the moral sentiments, and of intellect, situate in the coronal and frontal regions of the head. On the other hand, in several hundred individuals of gentle dispositions and good intellects, whose heads we have examined, we found, with few exceptions, the distance before the ear, according to the above measurement, to exceed the distance behind it to a considerable extent, in many cases amounting to an inch, and, *in every instance*, the coronal surface was large and ample in proportion to the base and posterior part of the brain. Any person who wishes to put this fact to the test, may try the experiment upon the casts of the criminals before alluded to, and upon the busts Nos 3, 11, 12, 26, 27, 29, 32, 36, 37, 38, and 39, of the Society's collection, the latter being casts of virtuous individuals. We may state, that the whole are open to public scrutiny every Saturday from one to three o'clock, in Clyde Street Hall.

The Society possesses casts of the skulls of five Caribs (Nos 12, 13, 14, 15, 16), who are well known to have been a ferocious tribe, and in all of them the organ of Destructiveness is decidedly large. On the other hand, Dr George Murray Paterson, surgeon in the Honourable East India Company's Service, mentions, as the result of three thousand actual exami-

nations, that the organ is small in the heads of the Hindoos in general, who are known to be extremely tender in regard to animal life. In the skulls of fourteen Hindoos (Nos 60 to 73), twelve of which were presented to the Society by this gentleman, and two by Dr Combe of Leith, the development of the organ will be found to be decidedly less than in the skulls of Europeans in general.

Several years ago, Peter Somners was tried before the High Court of Justiciary, and found guilty of wantonly murdering, in a fit of intoxication, an old man with whom he was amusing himself on the road. We were informed by a gentleman, who had an opportunity to know the fact, that this young man had manifested great cruelty to animals at previous periods of his life. We saw him in prison, and his organs of Destructiveness were very large. In the country, we saw a boy, who had watched the progress of a brood of swallows, and when they were fully fledged, delivered them alive, one by one, into the mouth of a sow, without any other motive than the barbarous pleasure of seeing them devoured; and in him the organ was very large. We have read a full account of this case in the Society's MS. Book of Reports, which we found open to public inspection in the Society's Hall. In the collection of Dr Barclay, there is the skull of a Negro who committed several murders, and in it Destructiveness is very large.

Hitherto, however, we have contemplated Destructiveness only when acting with excessive and uncontrolled energy, and producing abuses of its legitimate function. We have seen it raging, in brutes and in man, "without check or limitation, "without either pity or remorse." It is quite obvious that it was precisely in such cases that the organ and the propensity were most likely to force themselves upon the notice of the observer, because they were present in that high degree of development and activity, which produced a predominance of this feeling over the other faculties of the mind. Destructiveness, however, when directed by the higher sentiments, serves a valuable purpose in the mental economy. The form in which it manifests itself when opposed by obstacles from with-

out, is the passion of anger. When combined with Benevolence, or a strong sense of justice, it gives rise to a virtuous indignation, some degree of which is absolutely necessary to the true dignity of man. Nothing is more necessary or more becoming a perfectly virtuous character, than a just degree of severity and anger against every species of vice, fraud, deceit, and cruelty. When we witness any signal instance of these, not to be angry is a proof of a mean and contemptible spirit. It is this faculty which gives to the character its greatest energy and power. It lends a peculiar force to the accents of command. Every command so enforced implies in it a threat: "Do thus, or thus, as ye shall answer." It is an intimation of the will of the speaker, coupled with the farther intimation, expressed or implied, that disobedience will be attended with fatal or inconvenient consequences. This power, accordingly, is highly necessary to the chiefs of savage or uncivilized nations, and even among a more refined people to all in situations of command. Robert Bruce in former days, and Buonaparte in our own, had this organ largely developed. The cast of the skull of Bruce is in the collection of the Phrenological Society (No 1), and may be inspected by those who wish to verify the statement. Destructiveness also gives edge to sarcasm and satire, and prompts the fancy to the conception of all those images of terror, which become sublime or horrible, according as they are clothed with ideality, or presented in naked deformity. Now, we state as a positive fact, that we have measured with callipers, and noted in inches and tenths, the development of this organ in a great variety of individuals, and that we have found the presence of the peculiar kind of energy now mentioned, to bear a regular proportion to its size. In several eminent public characters in particular, whose heads we have examined, but whose names, for obvious reasons, we forbear to mention, who manifest, in a striking manner, this mental quality, we found the organ large, and we never found a single individual who manifested this power, in whom the organ was small. When, on the other hand, the organ of Destructiveness is small, and the higher sentiments are powerful, there is want of fire in the character: there is a softness

which is little fitted to awe or control a fiery spirit in others,—an effeminacy which does not make itself felt in the contests of life,—and a tendency to listless insipidity, from the want of a spur within ; and those characteristics are greatly aggravated if Combativeness also be small. In private life, we have met with individuals who were noted for this undue softness and effeminacy of disposition, who, with fair talents, were unable to make themselves felt in the circles in which they moved, and whose own exertions were never able to carry them through the difficulties of life ; and in them we found the organ in question small. These differences amounted to at least half an inch on each organ of Destructiveness, or a whole inch on the general breadth of the head across the temporal bones.

The facts now adverted to may be viewed as positive proofs of the existence of this organ and faculty ; but, in the *third* place, we proceed to advert to some phenomena in human nature, recorded without any view to phrenology, from which some inferences may be drawn concerning the existence of this propensity. We may premise, that metaphysicians and ordinary observers of human nature, admit the existence of instinctive tendencies in the human mind, quite distinguishable from mere intellect or reason. Thus, for example, no one confounds the feeling of love with mere intellectual ideas. The intellect perceives the objects which excite this passion, but the feeling itself is not intellectual. The same observation applies to the sentiments of Hope, Benevolence, Fear, and many others, which are generally admitted to be different from, and not immediately dependent upon, the intellectual powers. Now, these feelings are known to become diseased ; and the effect of the diseased excitement on the feelings of Love, for example, is to produce ungovernable desires,—on the sentiment of Hope to give rise to extravagant joy, without any adequate external cause. But in these cases, a sane feeling is admitted to exist which disease excites into inordinate activity, but does not create. Now, if we find patients under mental alienation displaying the most irresistible impulse to destroy, we are entitled to argue, upon

every principle of analogy, that some propensity of a similar character must exist also in the sane state, of which these manifestations are only abuses caused by the disturbing influence of disease;—in short, that disease can no more produce, as a first cause, a violent tendency to destroy, than it can create a sixth sense, a new sentiment, or an intellectual power. Is there, then, such a tendency manifested in derangement or not?

The following cases are published in Dr Gall's *Physiologie du Cerveau*. M. Mayer of Berlin, surgeon of a regiment, shewed Drs Gall and Spurzheim, in presence of Messrs Heim, Formey, Gæricke, and others, a soldier, who, from distress at the loss of his wife, had suffered a wasting of the body, accompanied with excessive irritability. At last he was seized every month with convulsions. He perceived their approach, and as he felt an immoderate propensity to kill increasing upon him, in proportion as the paroxysm approached, he begged his attendants to bind him with chains. At the end of a few days the fit and propensity diminished, and he himself indicated the time he might with propriety be set at liberty. At Haina they saw a man, who, at certain periods, felt an irresistible desire to commit violence upon others. He also was aware of his unhappy tendency, and made himself be confined till such time as he felt that he would not abuse his liberty. A man, subject to melancholy, assisted at the execution of a criminal, and the spectacle excited in him such a vivid emotion, that he was instantly seized with a vehement desire to kill, and at the same time preserved the greatest abhorrence of such a crime. He spoke of his unhappy condition with tears and extreme confusion, begged of his friends to save themselves from his hands, and thanked them when they strenuously resisted his attempts. Pinel, also, a celebrated writer on insanity, who is not a phrenologist, remarked that patients are frequently furious without derangement of the intellectual faculties, and he therefore testifies dissatisfaction with the definition which Locke has given of insanity. He speaks of an individual who was subject to periodical attacks of mania, and whose fits regularly returned after intervals of calm of several months duration. "Their ap-

"proach," says he, "was preceded by the sensation of a burning heat in the interior of the abdomen, then in the breast, and latterly in the face; next redness *des joues*, sparkling eyes, great distention of the veins and arteries of the head, and at last an uncontrollable fury, which inspired him with an irresistible propensity to seize an instrument or offensive weapon to knock on the head the first person who presented himself to his view. He experienced a sort of internal combat between this ferocious impulse to destroy, and the profound horror which rose in his mind at the very idea of such a crime. There was no mark of wandering of memory, imagination, or judgment. He avowed to me, during his strict seclusion, that his propensity to commit a murder was absolutely forced and involuntary,—that his wife, whom he tenderly loved, had nearly become his victim, he having scarcely had time to bid her fly to avoid his fury. All his lucid intervals were marked by melancholy reflections and expressions of remorse; and so great did his disgust of life become, that he had several times attempted, by an act of suicide," (this is common in the excess of Destructiveness) "to bring it to a close. What reason have I (said he) to cut the throat of the superintendant of the hospital, who treats us with so much kindness? and yet in my moments of fury I am tempted to rush upon him, as well as others, and plunge a dagger in his bosom. It is this unhappy and irresistible propensity which reduces me to despair, and makes me attempt my own life." (Sur l'Alienation Mentale, deuxième édition, p. 102 et 103. § 117.) "Another alienated patient," says Pinel, "experienced attacks of fury, which recurred periodically during six months of the year. He was sensible himself of the decline of the symptoms towards the end of the fits, and indicated precisely the time when he might be set at liberty in the interior of the hospital. He requested the attendants to defer his liberation, if he felt doubts of controlling the blind impulse which prompted him to commit acts of the greatest violence. During his intervals of calm, he avowed that while the fit lasted, it was impossible for him to repress his fury; that if any one presented himself before

“ him, he experienced, believing that he saw the blood flowing in the veins of the man, an irresistible desire to suck it, and to tear his limbs to pieces with his teeth.” (*Ibidem*, p. 293, 284. § 239.

The following case is given on the authority of Dr Zimmerman of Krumbach. “ A peasant, born at Krumbach in Suabia, aged twenty-seven, and unmarried, and of parents who did not enjoy the best health, was subject, from the age of eight years, to frequent attacks of epilepsy. About two years ago his malady changed its character, without it being possible to assign any reason for the alteration ;—instead of the attack of epilepsy, the man, since this period, felt himself seized with a violent propensity to commit a murder. He felt the approach of the attack sometimes several hours, sometimes a whole day, before its actual invasion. From the moment in which he felt the presentiment, he earnestly entreated to be chained, to prevent him from committing so fearful a crime. ‘ When the propensity seizes me, (said he), I am absolutely forced to kill or strangle, were it even an infant.’ His father and mother, for whom he felt a sincere attachment, would have been, during the attack, the first victims of his propensity. ‘ Mother,’ cried he, in a tone of voice truly terrible, ‘ fly, or I shall be absolutely forced to strangle you.’ ”

M. Fodéré, also, who is rather an opponent than a convert to phrenology, cites several examples of the great activity of the destructive propensity in mania ; among others, that of a young man, of twenty-five years of age, who had several times lifted his hand against his father, and who was shut up on this account in a lunatic asylum. He was always very neat in his person, and appeared sensible, “ which induced me,” says Fodéré, “ to endeavour to excite in him a feeling of remorse ; but he would never admit the enormity of his crime, and he frequently eyed me to give me a blow,—his manners all the time being extremely polite.” (*Traité du Délire appliqué à la Médecine*, par M. Fodéré, tome premier, p. 401. § 196.) Other cases are recited by Pinel, p. 119, 120, and 165, which it is unnecessary to detail.

These cases might be multiplied to a great extent, by mere reference to the public newspapers. We shall cite only one, which appeared in them in May 1822. "MURDER OF A CHILD BY ITS MOTHER.—On Sunday morning, about half-past ten o'clock, a most sanguinary and horrid murder of unparalleled inhumanity, was perpetrated on the body of a fine female infant, about eight months old, named Sarah Mountford, by her own mother, wife of Mr Mountford, weaver, No 1, Virginia Row, Bethnal Green. The husband, who is a Methodist, had gone to chapel, leaving his wife to clean, and send to the Sunday school, her young family. Having done this, it appeared she cleaned herself and her infant, when, overcome by some extraordinary aberration of intellect, she cut off the head of the child with a razor, and, besmeared with the blood, immediately told the persons in the house of the bloody deed, desiring to be given into custody, as she wanted to be hanged. From the conduct of the wretched woman after the transaction, no doubt can be entertained of her insanity. Mrs Mountford underwent a short examination on Monday, and was committed for trial. A coroner's inquest has since been held, which returned a verdict of wilful murder against the wretched woman. The distress of the family is extreme. The unhappy husband and two of the eldest daughters are seen running about the streets in a state of distraction. One of the latter has been deprived of utterance since the horrid transaction." This woman is said to have been "overcome by some extraordinary aberration of intellect;" which mode of expression may be forgiven in the writer of a newspaper paragraph, but, viewed philosophically, it is absurd. The intellectual powers enumerated by the metaphysicians, such as Perception, Conception, Memory, Imagination, and Judgment, furnish no propensities to action, which, being deranged, could produce such a piece of barbarity. Derangement of intellect causes the patient to reason incorrectly, and speak incoherently; but, if his *feelings* be sound, he is not mischievous. Here, however, the unhappy woman seems to have been inspired with a blind and irresistible impulse to kill.

These, then, are phenomena actually occurring in human

nature, and to some principle of the mind they must of necessity be referred; and we should like to know to what faculty admitted by the metaphysician, they can with propriety be ascribed, or whether they indicate any such propensity in man as that now under discussion?

But, farther, we may inquire, whether such a tendency as that of Destructiveness has ever manifested itself in the history of the world. Tacitus, after narrating a battle in the City of Rome, between the partizans of Vitellius and Vespasian, continues, "About the combatants the people were gathered as spectators; and, as if they had been only attending the representation of a fight exhibited for public amusement and sport, they favoured and espoused now these, anon those, with theatrical shouts and clappings: Nay, as often as either side recoiled, and particular individuals had fled into houses, or lay hid in shops, they insisted upon their being dragged out and slain, and thus came to enjoy themselves the largest part of the prey." History, b. iii. "Upon the slaying of Vitellius, war was rather seen to cease than peace to commence. The vanquishers continuing in arms, hunted all over the city after the vanquished with eagerness and implacable hate. The temples and places of public resort were filled with carnage and mangled corpses, as in them were butchered all whom chance presented to the destroying sword. Nay, this lawless violence increasing, they searched private houses, and dragged forth such as lay hid. When they beheld any one remarkably tall, and in the prime of years, him they murdered without exception, whether he were soldier or citizen. This cruelty, which, during the fresh impulse of animosity and rancour, glutted itself with blood and killing, was afterwards transformed into rapaciousness." We forbear to describe the sack of Cremona, described also by Tacitus, or to give a picture of the barbarities practised at the siege of Jerusalem. We cannot mention the names of Sylla, Tiberius, Domitian, Marcus Caius, Aurelian, Caracalla, Septimus Severus, or, coming nearer to modern times, recall the scenes which were enacted by the Spaniards at Cuba, Mexico, and Peru; or the Sicilian Vespers,

the carnage of St Bartholomew's, or the massacres of the French Revolution, without the mind being overwhelmed by images of the most wanton and abominable cruelties. Following the steps of Caligula, we find him cutting out the tongues of his victims, delivering them to be devoured by wild beasts, forcing individuals to assist in executing their relations, torturing or putting to the rack unhappy wretches as an amusement to his own ferocious mind ; and, finally, expressing a wish that the Roman people had but one head, that he might cut it off by one blow. Turning our eyes to Nero, we discover him indulging in equal atrocities, causing Britannia to be poisoned, murdering his own mother, setting fire to Rome in four quarters at once, and ascending a tower to enjoy the spectacle of the conflagration. If these acts do not indicate such a propensity as that of Destructiveness in man, we cannot imagine what deeds could do so.

But it will perhaps be said, that the devastations of war are the results of excitement of highly inflamed passion, and do not prove a cool, deliberate desire of destruction to hold a place in the human mind, when not provoked by aggression. The phrenologist asks, From what source does "highly inflamed passion" proceed? Mere aggression cannot create a feeling in the mind; it can only rouse some propensity which previously existed. But, to proceed, we may ask, are there no instances of Destructiveness being manifested coolly and wantonly in the absence of all aggression? A gentleman (whose name and address we are ready to furnish to any reader who wishes to verify the correctness of our statement) told us, that he had two nephews, brothers, both children, brought up precisely alike, yet of very opposite dispositions: one of them used to rise early in the morning, before the family were abroad, and go to a little wooden cage, in which a breeding duck was kept, and lifting up the middle bar, allowed a young one to thrust through its head, then dropped the bar, and chopped it off, to his great entertainment and delight. He used also to seize young animals wherever he could find them, clasp his little hand round their neck, and enjoy their agonies in suffocation. His brother had dispositions completely the reverse. He could not endure the

sight of these cruelties, and used to come bathed in tears, and tell the family what he had witnessed. Delight in cruelty characterizes even whole tribes of people, just as softness and gentleness of disposition do others, such as the Hindoos. In Fraser's Tour through part of the Himalaya Mountains, it is stated, that the inhabitants of Nawur and Teekur, (valleys in the Province of Bischur), "are notorious for infamy of character, even in "this country, where all are bad. They are revengeful and "treacherous, deficient in all good qualities, abandoned in morals, and vicious in their habits. As a proof of *the savage indifference with which they look on the life of another,* "and on the act of *shedding human blood,* it is said, that mere "wantonness, or a joke, will induce the crime of putting a fellow creature to death, *merely for the satisfaction of seeing the blood flow, and of marking the last struggles of their victim;* and some facts that came under our observation of a "tantamount nature, give too much reason for believing the "assertion to be founded in truth. Female chastity is here "quite unknown; and *murder, robbery, and outrage* of every "kind are here regarded with indifference."—P. 267. It is curious to observe the Author of Waverley, with his characteristic sagacity, seizing upon this tendency in human nature to cruelty, and marking the different degrees of it in different nations. "Other nations," says he, "are like the tamed tiger, "which, when once its native appetite for slaughter is indulged "in one instance, rushes on in promiscuous carnage. But the "English public have always rather resembled what is told of the "sleuth-dog, which, eager, fierce, and clamorous in pursuit of "his prey, desists from it as soon as blood is sprinkled upon his "path." There is poetry, no doubt, in this passage, but it is the poetry of illustration, not of fiction. Indeed, every one acquainted with history and books of travels, knows that such descriptions might be multiplied to an unlimited extent, as real and undeniable features of human character. We proceed, therefore, to exhibit "Destructiveness" operating in a less offensive but equally characteristic form.

A recent Reviewer of a work on Architecture, says, not in jest, but quite seriously, and viewing the matter as a feature of national character, that "the word *canaille* might be most justly extended, as far as the present question is concerned, to a considerable height in society; we are sorry to say, too often to its very capital. It is to this division of society, high and low, that we owe the injuries committed on our works of art; and not only on our works of art, but on every object of utility where destruction can be inflicted. *The people destroy our mile-posts, our bridges, our statues, and our public buildings, whenever they can get access to them; no object of art, or even of utility, is safe from their depredations; nor dare we admit them into our museums and collections without guards; though they are injuring the objects of their own admiration as well as ours.*" (*New Edinburgh Review*, No 8, p. 556.) The Reviewer continues: "It may be, that the spirit of pure mischief leads to this practice; that spirit which is esteemed a laudable proof of liberty; it may be ignorance; it is probably the consequence of both united." No one will attempt to deny the practices here alluded to; and when the Reviewer speaks of "the spirit of pure mischief" as an exciting cause of them, we do not feel that he is writing nonsense: we understand him perfectly, and recognise his description, and theory of its cause, as accordant with human nature. We would ask our opponents, then, what more forcible description could be given of the nature of Destructiveness, when undirected by intelligence, than that of "the spirit of pure mischief?" They will perhaps say, that such acts proceed from the spirit of fun; but we reply, As an individual who is destitute of "Tune" can find no amusement in a concert; or as one who is greatly deficient in Veneration, experiences small pleasure in acts of devotion; so, unless a propensity to destroy existed in human nature, it would be impossible to extract "fun" or pleasure from such irrational acts as the wanton destruction of mile-stones, road-posts, bridges, railings, and, in short, of every object that can, with impunity, be made food for such an appetite.

Dr Spurzheim, in treating of Destructiveness, observes, that in man it "presents different degrees of activity, from a mere indifference to the pain of animals, to the pleasure of seeing them killed." And he adds, that "some persons feel a pleasure in tormenting animals, and in seeing them tortured;" which pleasure he refers to the propensity in question. We are able to adduce no less an authority than that of the King, Lords, and Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, in confirmation of the doctrine, that such a tendency to torment animals actually exists in human nature; for, by the statute, 8d Geo. IV. ch. 71., it is enacted and ordained, "That, if any person or persons shall *wantonly and cruelly* BEAT, ABUSE, OR ILL-TREAT any horse, mare, gelding, mule, ass," &c., "he, on being convicted thereof, shall forfeit and pay any sum not exceeding L. 5, nor less than 10s., to his Majesty, his heirs and successors;"—a provision which would be a mere absurdity, if no propensity, "*wantonly and cruelly*" to commit such offences, lurked in the mind of man.

A recent author, however, is pleased to "*deny that there exists in the human mind ANY natural propensity, or any desire, INDEPENDENT OF INTELLECT, to build, or destroy, or inhabit,*" &c. Pinel, then, was mistaken in supposing that the *intellect* of his patient was sound, in whom there was no wandering of memory, imagination, or judgment, but in whom a propensity to destroy raged with ungovernable fury; for this last, it seems, was itself an *intellectual* operation! Nay, the barbarities of the inhabitants of Nawur and Teekur were also manifestations of *intellectual* powers! The devastations, too, committed on our mile-stones, bridges, and road-posts, all proceed from exuberant activity of the *intellects* of the people! Of course, also, the adjectives, *cruel, fierce, ferocious, savage, brutal, barbarous, atrocious*, do not indicate states of mind referable to excited feelings or propensities, but designate only pure intellectual operations! This is "argument with a vengeance."

The foregoing are a few of the facts which may be brought forward in favour of *one* of the thirty-three faculties admitted

by the phrenologists; and we ask every person of common sense, and common candour, if any opponent is to be listened to otherwise than with contempt, who merely laughs at the supposition of there being such a native propensity in man, connected with that portion of the brain which we have pointed out. The facts we have mentioned are not the tenth part of those we could have brought forward in support of this single propensity, and on twenty of the other powers we could lay before our readers a still more ample store of proofs and illustrations. What has been now stated, however, may serve as a specimen (though a very small specimen,) of the phrenological mode of inquiry, and of the kind of evidence on which phrenologists venture to found their opinions. All the cases we have quoted from Dr Gall, have been for years before the public in his French work; the casts to which we have referred, have long been exposed to public inspection, in the Hall of the Phrenological Society, accompanied with a Catalogue, and a Book of Reports, stating the characters of many of the individuals, and the development of their heads. It is also to be recollected, that the same pains in collecting facts and evidence has been taken in regard to the other faculties, no one of which is stated as *ascertained* without the sanction of thousands of observations; and, lastly, that it is open to every one to satisfy himself, and either to confirm these observations or to refute them, by appealing to nature, and observing for himself,—and that a *single fact to the contrary has never been shewn*. When we consider all this, shall we attribute to ignorance, presumption, or folly, what has been said by some of our opponents, namely, “that the assertions” (of the phrenologists) “are in general as purely dogmatical, as “if Drs Gall and Spurzheim were entitled to sway men’s belief in matters of philosophy, with an authority as absolute “and universal as ever was exercised by the Pope in the affairs “of religion?” We repeat it, that such an observation could only proceed from the grossest and most culpable ignorance of facts in these writers,—presumption in the highest degree, in writing upon a subject of which they know nothing, or such an utter want of ordinary reflection, as incapacitates them from

drawing the plainest inference from facts before their eyes. We denounce such writers "ignorant and vain,"—and let them, as Sir Archy says, "mak their maist o't."*

ARTICLE III.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWIXT MR GEORGE COMBE AND DR BARCLAY.

Mr GEORGE COMBE to Dr BARCLAY.

Edinburgh, 5th July 1823.

DEAR SIR,—My nephew, Mr John Cox, who resides with me, has attended your present course of comparative anatomy, and I have observed, in his notes of your lectures, many representations of phrenology very much at variance with what I understand these doctrines to be; but, as a lecturer ought never to be judged from notes taken by his students, I merely explained to him the correct doctrine, and abstained from troubling you. In his notes, however, of your lecture of yesterday, there are errors regarding this subject of so palpable a nature, that I think it an act of justice to you, to let you know what has been taken down as your sentiments. I enclose the passages, and advert particularly to the statement that Drs Gall and Spurzheim "*put the different faculties of the soul into the convolutions;*" and the insinuation that they derived their physiology of the brain *from the anatomy*, and that they pretend to have *seen* the faculties of the mind in the brain. These representations are so completely at variance with the doctrines of phrenology, as stated by Drs Gall and Spurzheim themselves, and as laid down in pages 8, 9, 10, 59, 60, 69, 78, 84, and 85, of the

* *Love à la Mode.*

Essays on Phrenology, and are so much calculated to avert inquiry into the subject, that I really feel an anxiety to know how far Mr Cox has correctly apprehended your meaning.— I remain, &c.

Notes of Dr BARCLAY'S Lecture referred to in the preceding Letter.

“ I HAVE here the head of a horse,—and as we cannot procure
 “ that article when we please, I shall take the opportunity of
 “ shewing you the brain. You perceive that it presents a con-
 “ voluted surface. These convolutions are almost, though not
 “ altogether, analogous to those of the human brain. In these
 “ convolutions, Gall and Spurzheim have placed the different
 “ faculties of the mind. Gall, however, differs in some points
 “ from Spurzheim, as he has found some faculties which the latter
 “ has not yet been able to see. But, gentlemen, I am not in the
 “ least surprised at this, for no person ever saw the faculties of
 “ the mind. The mind no more exists in the brain than the
 “ skill of the carpenter exists in his tools. I must say, that to
 “ me the cause of the faculties is inconceivable. Are we to
 “ expect that the faculties can be seen? certainly not. No
 “ animating principle has, or ever can be, seen by us; at least,
 “ no animating principle can be seen in this brain just now.
 “ In the human brain, the convolutions may be separated by
 “ the blow-pipe or water, as they are like the foldings or doub-
 “ lings of a towel. Drs Gall and Spurzheim were the first who
 “ suggested this. *These individuals put the different faculties of*
 “ *the soul into these convolutions*, and these take it into their
 “ head to shew themselves through the skull. Dr Spurzheim
 “ said that these convolutions were separable by water in the
 “ head. A person who died of water in the head had a num-
 “ ber of these convolutions expanded by the water, which was
 “ seen on dissection, at which operation I was present, thus
 “ confirming Dr Spurzheim's assertion. We are certainly much
 “ indebted to Dr Spurzheim for the reviving of discoveries
 “ which were forgotten; and, as he has revived ancient dis-
 “ coveries, he has also made one or two new and useful ones.
 “ This gentleman, however, has been much abused by the
 “ Edinburgh Review, which states him to be a quack; but he
 “ is as far from being a quack intentionally as any gentleman
 “ alive, and is an intelligent and learned man. When he was in
 “ this country I respected him as a man, and as a man of can-
 “ dour, though I could not agree with his conclusions. One
 “ morning he breakfasted with me, and I told him I was to
 “ lecture that day upon the brain, and that I wished him to
 “ come to the class to hear if I coincided with him in the man-
 “ ner of dissection, which, if I did not, he was to tell me at
 “ the end of the hour. I told the gentlemen that Dr Spurzheim

“ was present, and that if my mode of dissection did not agree with his, I would inform them to-morrow. After the hour, therefore, I asked the doctor if my ideas of the anatomy of the brain coincided with his, when he told me that they did so precisely. But when he spoke of the physiology of the brain, he and I differed. Both of us *had the same facts*, upon which we agreed, but we drew different conclusions from them. He said, however, that we would not quarrel upon the subject, and so Dr Spurzheim still remains one of my best friends.”

Dr BARCLAY to Mr GEORGE COMBE.

Edinburgh, July 10, 1823.

MY DEAR SIR,—I was duly favoured with your letter and the enclosure ; but being under the necessity of leaving town immediately, or almost immediately, after the lecture, I was prevented from acknowledging the receipt of it so soon as I could have wished. In looking over the notes taken down by Mr Cox, I see nothing that deviates materially from the language that I used, so far as my recollection serves me, except the last sentence, where I am reported to have asserted that Dr Spurzheim still continues one of my best friends. I think this expression is stronger than what I made use of, although I hope we are still friends, as we once were friends, and never had a quarrel,—yet he never gave me any reason to conclude that he was one of my best friends. To the best of my recollection, the other language in the notes expresses my ideas, or at least was employed to express them, though I acknowledge that, like most other expressions, it may admit of different interpretations. Thinking that I understood Dr Spurzheim’s meaning, and that my language, considered in connection with the language which I used before and after, and having rather a friendly than a hostile feeling to Dr Spurzheim, I did not imagine that I could intentionally or inadvertently misrepresent him. However, in talking of the subject again, which I mean to do, after examining the structure of some more brains, I shall warn my students of the ambiguity of language, explain more fully the language which I have hitherto used, on Spur-

zheim's theory, and, with permission, shall read your letter and Mr Cox's notes, as a proof of the necessity of such a caution. With much respect and many thanks for the friendly candour of your communication, I am, &c.

Mr COMBE to Dr BARCLAY.

Edinburgh, July 11, 1823.

MY DEAR SIR,—I am much obliged by your very friendly and candid letter of yesterday's date, which confirms my previous conviction, that any error in your statements regarding phrenology, must have proceeded altogether from misapprehension. As you are to mention the matter to your class, perhaps you will not feel displeas'd at my requesting you, to permit me, in this letter, to furnish what I understand to be a correct enunciation of the principles on which phrenology is founded, and which, if you see proper, I have no objections that you read, after the other communication.

First, Then, the phrenologists maintain, that the mind is not conscious of the functions of the different parts of the brain, and that hence we cannot tell by merely reflecting on what passes within ourselves, whether the whole brain is employed by the mind, in performing every act of thought, or whether different parts of it serve for the manifestation of different faculties.

Secondly, That dissection alone does not reveal the functions of any organ of the body: For example, although anatomists have long dissected the nerves, they never discovered from the structure alone, that one set of them constitutes the organs of voluntary motion, and another the organs of feeling; facts, which, I understand, the recent experiments of Majendie and Mr Charles Bell have established beyond doubt. In like manner, no anatomist, by merely dissecting the brain, can discover any fact or circumstance which authorises him to assign functions to it, either as a whole, or to its different parts.

Thirdly, Drs Gall and Spurzheim, therefore, not only dis-

avow the possibility of discovering the physiology of the brain from its anatomy, but state this impossibility, as an insuperable reason why some other mode of investigation must be adopted, before the functions of this organ can be at all found out; and they add, that they have compared the size of different parts of the brain, as indicated by the skull, with the power of manifesting different faculties of the mind, and have found that where the size of a particular part is large, (the brain being healthy), the mental power is invariably strong, and *vice versa*; and they disclaim, most explicitly, any merit, except that of observing the concomitance.

The objection to this mode of ascertaining the functions of the brain, which is generally stated, is, that the two tables of the skull are not parallel, and that only *fancy* can perceive the differences of development spoken of. The answer to this objection is, that the differences of development extend to inches, and the differences of thickness in the different parts of healthy skulls in the prime of life, do not exceed an eighth or a tenth of an inch, so that the want of parallelism is a verbal, more than a practical objection. For example, the space across the head, at the top of the temporal bone, where the organ of ideality is marked out, is, in the mask of Dr Chalmers, taken from nature, $6\frac{1}{4}$ inches.
 In Mr Joseph, the celebrated sculptor, $6\frac{1}{4}$
 In Mr Haydon, the eminent historical painter, $5\frac{1}{4}$
 In Wordsworth the poet, 6
 And all these are men distinguished for ideality in their mental manifestations.

Whereas, In Mr Joseph Hume, M. P.,* the same distance is only $5\frac{1}{8}$ inches, and he is equally distinguished for plainness of manner, and deficiency in ideality.

These *include the integuments*. The same differences appear in skulls. In the cast of the skull of Raphael, for example, the great painter, the above distance, *without the in-*

* A cast of Mr Hume's head is sold in London.

teguments, is $5\frac{1}{2}$ inches. In the skull of Gordon, a very brutal wretch, who murdered a pedlar boy in Eskdale muir, it is $4\frac{1}{2}$ inches.

All these masks and skulls lie in the hall of the Phrenological Society, open every Saturday from 1 to 4 o'clock, for public inspection, so that the statements of the phrenologists as to them can be easily verified or refuted. Now, we say, that these differences being measurable with callipers, can be perceived by the eye and the understanding unaided by fancy, and that the departures from perfect parallelism between the two tables of the skulls, do not amount to inches, so as to make up the difference between Mr Joseph Hume's development and Dr Chalmers', or between Gordon's and Raphael's, the former amounting to an inch and one-eighth, and the latter to an inch. We say, therefore, that if all men, having a development like Dr Chalmers, in this particular part, manifest great ideality, and all men having a development like Mr Hume, manifest comparatively little of that mental quality, this is better evidence, that the part of the brain lying under the part of the skull in question, is the instrument for manifesting that sentiment, than any other evidence that has hitherto been produced, to determine the functions of that part of the brain.

In Mr Cox's notes it is said, that Drs Gall and Spurzbeim place the faculties in the *convolutions*. These gentlemen, on the other hand, state, that each organ extends from the surface of the convolutions to the *medulla oblongata*, but that the parts of each organ are proportionate to each other; so that if the peripheral surface is large, the whole organ will be large, and *vice versa*. In evidence of this assertion, they mention, that the size of the *corpora pyramidalia*, which they shew to be the origin of the anterior lobes of the brain, bears an uniform proportion to the size of the convolutions of these lobes; that the same rule holds with the *corpora olivaria*, and the middle lobes, and with the *corpora restiformia*, and the posterior lobes. I have attended to these proportions in several brains which I have dissected, or seen dis-

sected, and observe that this statement is borne out by facts, so far as my means of verifying it go. The Society possess a cast of the brain of an idiot girl, in whom the anterior lobes are extremely small, and the middle lobes pretty full, and a corresponding difference is very distinguishable in the relative proportions of the *corpora pyramidalia* and *corpora olivaria*. I state these circumstances only to shew, that Drs Gall and Spurzheim conscientiously seek for evidence, and wish to rely as little on imagination as possible in stating their doctrines.

In the *last* place, Drs Gall and Spurzheim differ, as you say, on some points, but not quite in the way you appear to suppose. Where both have seen evidence, both agree; and out of the 33 organs they are at one on about 30 of them. In regard to the other 3 on which the difference exists, Dr Gall says, that cases have not fallen in his way sufficient to authorize him to draw the same conclusions as Dr Spurzheim; and this is quite intelligible; for he and Dr Spurzheim have not studied together, nor travelled together, for nearly ten years, so that cases may have come under the notice of the one which the other had no opportunity of observing; and hence the one may really know more than the other of nature's constitution. Dr Gall, be it remarked, does not state *opposite* functions to these parts; he only says, that he has not discovered them.

Trusting that you will oblige me by reading this letter, which will correct all misunderstandings, I remain, with much regard, &c.

NOTE.—On 16th July 1823, Mr Geo. Combe, accompanied by his brother, Mr Andrew Combe, accidentally met Dr Barclay in an evening walk, when he, of his own accord, said, that he would read the above letter to his class.

Mr COMBE to Dr BARCLAY.

Edinburgh, 28th July 1823.

MY DEAR SIR,—Mr COX tells me, that you read my letter to you, of 11th July, on Saturday, to your class, when only eleven persons were present, exclusive of your two assistants, while the students who heard the erroneous statements complained of exceeded forty in number. I sincerely regret troubling you again on this subject; but the cause of my first writing you still remains unremoved, and I feel an anxiety that it should be done away with. My complaint was not, that you made observations on phrenology displeasing to me, for you have clearly a right to make any comments on this, or any other subject of public discussion, you see proper; but that you stated mere fictions of your imagination as phrenology, and ascribed these to phrenologists as *their* doctrines, thus unavoidably representing Dr Spurzheim, Dr Gall, and myself, not only in an unfavourable, but a false light; and my object was to obtain the simple act of justice of having the doctrines, with which my name and reputation are now inseparably connected, stated such as I actually have delivered them in my printed work on the subject, and of which I had the honour of presenting you with a copy. Had you given a correct statement of phrenology, as it is really laid down in the printed works, the freest and severest comments on its doctrines would not have offended me; but, to speak candidly, I do feel not quite pleased at the very different manner in which you have treated it. To go no farther than the notes, of which I sent you a copy, and which you acknowledged to be correct, there is such a complete mis-statement of the doctrines in them, that a fair and full correction of it was called for, and this could have been accomplished only by reading my letter of 11th July, as soon after it was received as possible, and while all who heard the first statement were still in attendance, and not by delaying all notice of the letter till the class was reduced to so small a

number as that above-mentioned. To remove, therefore, all occasion of mistake, with your permission, I shall publish Mr Cox's notes, and our correspondence, and add to it any reply with which you may see cause to honour me. Of course, I am quite satisfied that the mistake on your part was unintentional. I know that you will excuse the freedom of this request, as it is the surest mark of real esteem to state candidly what I feel; and, with a repetition of the assurance, that it is only with your erroneous statements of the doctrines of phrenology, and not with your comments upon them, that I conceive myself at liberty to find fault in this manner, I remain, &c.

Dr BARCLAY to Mr COMBE.

Edinburgh, July 30, 1823.

MY DEAR SIR,—It was always my intention to read your letter to my class, after exhibiting a specimen or two of the brains of quadrupeds, birds, and fishes. Your friend Mr Cox will tell you that I had not finished that subject till Friday, and the very next day I read your letter—but without, I confess, any previous advertisement either to the class or to the public. If the class was thin upon that occasion it was not my fault, it was not even my wish. Most of the summer classes had risen the day before. To that circumstance I had not adverted, and on telling one of my assistants that I meant not to finish till some day this week, he told me that the other classes had risen, that a number of the students had left town, and many, probably for reasons similar to his, that they might not be compelled to pay for a week's boarding and lodging for a single class and a lecture or two. This unfortunate circumstance, a circumstance which you think so unfortunate for your letter, I did not foresee, though, to remedy the evil as much as possible, I left it on the table to be transcribed, and it actually was transcribed by one gentleman. I never believed that a system of phrenology could be founded upon the structure of the brain; and

confess that I laboured under a mistake when I thought that phrenologists entertained that opinion, especially the sect of phrenologists in Edinburgh. Perhaps casts, with a number of figures indicating the situation of organs, are sufficient for their ordinary purposes; and that if these organs can be seen through the skull, it is not necessary to proceed farther. Dr Spurzheim, however, did not always know that an accurate examination of the structure, even of various brains, could regularly be dispensed with. I considered it, indeed, as a great improvement, to mark the situation and magnitude of the organs upon the outside of the skull, for the benefit of the ladies, who might be shocked at the disgusting and bloody sight of the inside, if the brains were present. I consider it as a still greater improvement for them and their beaux, who wish to display their talents at table and in mixed companies, that you now can measure the capacity of a man by a pair of callipers, which, I am told, you occasionally make use of for that very purpose.—I have no objection to your publication of this, and my former letter, but I am determined not to enter any farther into the controversy, particularly as my controversial organs are not in repair just now, and I really suspect that some of them are lost, particularly that pride-inspiring organ, which, according to phrenologists, tempts goats to climb precipices, and black rats to live in garrets, or in the upper-stories of granaries.—But, my dear sir, notwithstanding these remarks, I still am, with much respect, your's truly, &c.

ARTICLE IV.

PHRENOLOGY AND PROFESSOR JAMESON.

It is generally known that many of the objects of natural history now exhibited in the museum of Edinburgh College were brought from Paris a few years ago. When preparations were making in that city for sending them here, Mr

Royer of the Jardin des Plantes, who is a decided phrenologist, selected from the catacombs about seventy skulls illustrative of the development of the different cerebral organs ; and, embracing the opportunity of the conveyance of the other articles, transmitted them to this city to a gentleman who delivered them to Professor Jameson, *for the museum*. This fact was mentioned in the newspapers at the time ;— nevertheless the skulls have not yet appeared in any patent apartment of that establishment. By a law of the college, the students attending Professor Jameson's lectures have the privilege of free access to the museum ; and, accordingly, one of them, who, notwithstanding of an opinion delivered by that gentleman, *ex cathedra*, that phrenology is not warranted by experience, ventured to think differently, expressed a wish to inspect the skulls. The reply of the professor was, " The skulls are in the garret, and you will see them afterwards, as they are difficult to be got out." Now, we happen to know perfectly, that at the time alluded to, (July 1823), the skulls in question were not in the garret, but in presses in Professor Jameson's lecture-room, within the distance of three feet from the seats occupied by his hearers, and that he required only to turn a key to gratify the young gentleman's curiosity.

It is not in the least surprising, that, amidst the immense variety of objects connected with the museum under his charge, Professor Jameson should have forgotten where these skulls were deposited, and supposed them to be in the garret when they were in the presses fronting him. - Besides, we understand that there is not yet room in the buildings for the public exhibition of many interesting specimens. These circumstances do, in our opinion, satisfactorily account for the professor's mistake, and for the skulls not being more prominently brought forward ; but we reckon it an act of justice to him to add, that his condemnation of phrenology in his lectures, joined with the non-appearance of the skulls, has given rise among phrenologists to an impression, that he is unwilling that their science should derive support from any specimens

in the museum. While we entirely acquit the professor of any such feeling, we would seriously recommend to him to put an effectual stop to this notion by freely exposing the skulls in the press to the inspection of all who desire to see them, not doubting but that close investigation is the best means of exploding phrenology, if, as he says, it is not warranted by experience.

We are able to state farther, that the skulls are really very interesting to the student of phrenology. The question is often asked on what principle did Drs Gall and Spurzheim *map out the skull*, and assign different shapes to the different organs as appearing on the cranium? This collection presents a most satisfactory answer to the inquiry. In cases of extreme development of any particular organ, the bone situate above it protrudes in the very form and dimensions delineated by the founders of the science; and these skulls were selected with the view of illustrating this point, and do illustrate it in the most decided manner. In one skull, for example, *cautiousness* is the predominating organ, and the projection is seen to be exactly of the shape and size marked in the phrenological busts. In another, *benevolence* is the leading feature, in a third *veneration* predominates, and so on; and in each, the skull is seen presenting a distinct elevation of a form corresponding to that assigned to the external indication of the organ by Drs Gall and Spurzheim. The history of the individuals to whom the skulls belonged is not known, and the collection was sent as evidence merely of the fact, that elevations of the cranium, corresponding in figure and dimensions to those delineated on the phrenological busts, actually exist in nature, and that the lines of demarcation are not fanciful, as is generally reported and believed. After the real existence of the differences in development is established, the next step is to attend to the mental manifestations which accompany each particular form, and by this means, the phrenological student will obtain evidence of the functions of the parts of the brain, the form and size of which only are indicated by the skulls in question.

In the Transactions of the Phrenological Society, there is an interesting communication on the phrenology of Hindostan, by Dr George M. Patterson, the result of several thousand observations; and in illustration of which, he has presented the society with twelve Hindoo crania. We are happy to mention, that a collection of Hindoo skulls, to a similar or greater extent, has been received from India for the College Museum, and they are now in one of the apartments of the college.— They completely coincide in type and appearance with those presented to the Phrenological Society, are particularly indicative of Hindoo talents and dispositions, and form an interesting contrast with the skulls of the other nations in the society's collection whose characters differ from that of the inhabitants of Hindostan.

ARTICLE V.

MR CHARLES BELL ON THE FUNCTIONS OF THE NERVES.

Philosophical Transactions, 1821—12th July.

WE have to congratulate our readers on the new light which is breaking in upon us on every hand, in regard to the functions of the different parts of the nervous system. The amazing progress made by Drs Gall and Spurzheim, in the discovery of the physiology of the brain, and that made by Mr Charles Bell in the physiology of the nerves, form a beautiful and valuable illustration of the importance of having a mode of investigation founded upon correct principles. So long as we acknowledged with one breath the intimate union and mutual influence of the mind and body, and yet studied the phenomena as if the mind were a disembodied spirit, our labour was almost entirely lost, although a stray fact might appear here and there amidst a mass of jarring

and unprofitable materials. But when Drs Gall and Spurzheim first put in practice the only successful mode of inquiry, of never separating the study of mind from that of the organ by which it is incessantly influenced, the results became simple, consistent, and useful in an eminent degree.

In like manner, (p. 399,) "whilst the doctrines hitherto received prevail," and "whilst the nerves are supposed to proceed from one great centre, to have the same structure and functions, and to be all sensible, and all of them to convey what is vaguely called nervous power, the discoveries of new nerves and ganglia are worse than useless: they increase the intricacy, and repel inquiry. The endless confusion of the subject induces the physician, instead of taking the nervous system as the secure ground of his practice, to dismiss it from his course of study as a subject presenting too great irregularity for legitimate investigation or reliance."

But suppose it demonstrated that each set of nerves, however similar in structure and appearance to others, does yet perform a distinct function which no other nerves can perform in its place, and that "no organ which possesses only one property or endowment has more than one nerve, *however exquisite the sense or action may be;*" and that "if two nerves coming from different sources are directed to one part, this is the sign of a double function performed by it." (p. 402.) So that "if a part, or organ, have many distinct nerves, we may be certain, that instead of having a mere accumulation of nervous power, it possesses distinct powers, or enters into different combinations in proportion to the number of its nerves," with what different interest will the anatomist proceed to the investigation of this part of his science? He then has an important and tangible object clearly in view. He can no longer wander on the way and fatigue himself to death unrewarded. He has principle to guide him, and the certain prospect of success as his recompense. Instead, therefore, "of resigning his inquiry in despair," Mr Bell tells us, that with the principle in view, "even the youngest stu-

“dents are brought to comprehend so much of the subject, that the idea of chance or accident, or real confusion among these numerous branches, is entirely dismissed; and what remains unexplained has, by the success of our past inquiries, become a subject of peculiar interest.” From this single step made by Mr Bell, we are fully warranted in saying, that the physiology of the nerves will, in all probability, make a greater progress in the course of ten years than it has made since the world began. Such is the importance of the “right road” in the discovery of truth.

Mr B. begins his inquiry with the “nerves of respiration, comprehending all the nerves which serve to combine the muscles employed in the acts of breathing, speaking, &c.”

The respiratory muscles are many in number, and are situated far apart. They belong to the face, neck, thorax, and abdomen. If a man be excited by exercise or passion, the respiratory action is extended and increased, the shoulders rise at each inspiration, the muscles of the throat and neck are in violent and simultaneous action, and the lips and nostrils move in time as regularly as the levator and depressor muscles of the ribs. It is obvious, that so many and so distant muscles cannot be combined in such regular action without some cords of connexion or affinity; these cords Mr B. calls the respiratory nerves, and he proceeds to shew that these have no other function than to combine these muscles in action.

In those animals which do not breathe, and whose mouth or throat has only one function to perform, these parts have only one nerve, and wherever a function is added, another nerve is also to be found. After the anatomist has employed weeks to disentangle and dissect all the nerves of the tongue, throat, and palate, in the human subject, he finds, at length, five different trunks of nerves, which only confused and perplexed, so long as he believed, that because nerves resemble each other they must necessarily perform the same function; but on the new principle he has no difficulty in extricating himself, when he considers the multiplied offices of the mouth in man,—“that it is a pneumatic as much as a manducatory

“organ,—that it is the organ of voice and of speech as much
 “as of taste and exquisite feeling. It would, indeed, be
 “matter of surprise if the same nerve served for the action
 “of gnawing and feeding in the lower animals of simple
 “structure, and also for the governance of those complicated
 “operations which serve to interpret the wants and senti-
 “ments of men.”—403.

This, it will be readily admitted, is the purely phrenologi-
 cal doctrine applied to other parts of the nervous system.
 All the parts of the brain, from the similarity of appearance,
 have, like all the nerves, been supposed to have only one
 function, and as no physiological fact could ever be reconciled
 to this supposition, all inquiry into the nervous system was
 deemed idle and unprofitable.

But when we admit that one part of the brain, like one
 nerve, can only execute one function, and that for every new
 mental faculty added as we rise in the scale of creation, there
 must be an addition of another part of the brain, then our
 inquiry becomes interesting, for we instantly find an explana-
 tion of the phenomena. There is a nerve of respiration, a
 nerve of manducation, of the voice, and of feeling, and of
 taste in the mouth. In like manner we must admit an organ of
 benevolence, of veneration, of self-esteem, of amativeness, and
 of love of offspring, because each of these is distinct from and
 added to the other. If the whole brain served for all these,
 then it is impossible that man could have mental faculties
 different in kind from those of the lower animals, or that one
 of the latter could possess faculties which another does not,
 although all have brains, and in all the brain is avowedly the
 organ of mind.

Mr B., taking comparative anatomy for a guide, divides
 the nerves, by an easy and natural method, into two parts or
 systems,—the one simple and uniform, the other irregular
 and complex. Wherever an animal is endowed with mere
 sensation and locomotion, and has no central organ of circu-
 lation, and no organ of respiration but what is generally dif-
 fused over the surface, the nerves are extremely simple, and

consist of two cords running, in the length of the body, with branches going laterally. Wherever organs are superadded to these, as the animal advances in the scale of existence, the nerves of the irregular or complex system are superadded to the other in exact proportion to the additional functions performed. Thus, the simple and uniform system is to be observed in the human body as well as in the leech or worm, only it is obscured by the variety of superadded nerves proportioned to the additional functions performed.

The nerves of the spine, the tenth or sub-occipital, and the fifth pair, constitute this original, uniform, and symmetrical system. All these arise in the same way,—all go out laterally,—all are exquisitely sensible,—so much so, that nerves of the irregular class are easily distinguished by their greatly less degree of sensibility. Besides, the latter do not arise by double roots, and have no ganglia on their origins,—they come off from the medulla oblongata, and upper part of the spinal marrow, and these are they which give the appearance of confusion to the dissection, because they cross the others.

The respiratory nerves in man are, *1st*, the eighth pair, or par vagum, which serves to associate the larynx, heart, lungs, and stomach. That the stomach is so associated is evident from what takes place during vomiting and hiccough. These organs are supplied with other nerves for their other functions.

2d, The portio dura, which connects the motions of the lips, nostrils, and face, with the respiratory motion of the chest. By the division of this nerve this connexion is lost.

3d, Spinal accessory, which associates the muscles of the neck and shoulder in respiration, and which, when cut, leaves these muscles incapable of acting harmoniously with those of the chest, although, from being plentifully supplied with other nerves, they are still capable of voluntary motion. Thus, shewing the plan of nature.

4th, Phrenic, which associates the diaphragm, and which is the only one previously known as a respiratory nerve.

5th, What Mr B. calls the “ external respiratory nerve,”

in opposition to the former as the "internal," to which it has a remarkable resemblance, which has been overlooked. It has a similar origin, and is connected with the phrenic, and goes on the outside of the ribs to muscles, which are already plentifully supplied with nerves for their other functions.

Mr Bell then examines in detail the nerves of the face, and clearly proves, "that the two sets of nerves, hitherto supposed to be similar, differ in structure, sensibility, and function." He begins by those of the face, because, "happily for our present object, the nerves which, in other parts of the frame, are bound together for the convenience of distribution to remote parts, are here *distinct*, and run apart from each other until they meet at their extremities," and are "exposed in a manner which courts inquiry." So that the organs of the brain are not the only ones in the body which are so much "bound together" as to make it impossible to point out their exact limits. The nerves going to the extremities have now been proved to consist of two sets of fibres, one for sensation, and another for motion, although they are undistinguishably blended and enclosed in a common sheath.

In following the distribution of the two nerves which supply the face, viz., the portio dura and the fifth pair, says Mr B., "unbiassed by theory or opinion, we should be forced to conclude, that the portio dura alone is not sufficient to supply any one part with nervous power, for every one of its branches is joined by divisions of the fifth. The questions then naturally arise, Whether these nerves perform the same functions? Whether they furnish a double supply of the same property or endowment, or whether they do not perform different offices?" To settle these points, he instituted many conclusive experiments upon the lower animals.

On dividing the portio dura alone on one side, when the animal was panting and forcibly dilating its nostrils, the motion of the nostril of the same side instantly ceased, and the side of the face remained at rest, and perfectly placid, during

the highest excitement of the other parts of the respiratory organs, while the opposite side and nostril still acted in unison with the chest. Cutting the nerve caused no sign of pain, and the animal was able to eat without the slightest impediment, so that voluntary motion was not lost; on dividing the superior maxillary branch of the fifth pair, when the animal was in the same state of hurried respiration, acute pain was occasioned; the *nostril continued to expand regularly* in time with other respiratory parts, but the side of the lip was observed to hang low, and towards the other side. The same branch of the opposite side was then cut, but the animal had lost the power of elevating and projecting the lip, as in gathering food, and opened his lips only by pressing the mouth against the ground.

When the portio dura of one side was cut, and ammonia presented to the nose, the same side remained quite relaxed, but the other was curled up with the peculiar expression of sneezing. In the same way, smiling, laughing, &c., evidently depend on this nerve. The slightest touch on the portio dura convulsed the muscles of the face, but caused no pain. The reverse was the case with the fifth; touching it gave great pain, but there was more difficulty in exciting the muscles. The former is proved to be the nerve of expression.

It was suggested to Mr Bell, as an objection to his principles, that the trunk of the elephant being hollow, and connected with respiration as well as sensation, it should have two nerves, whereas Cuvier states it to have only one. But having been favoured by Mr H. Mayo with an opportunity of dissecting the trunk of a young elephant, Mr B. had no difficulty in finding two nerves, "both of great size," being continuations from the fifth and seventh pairs.

These experiments of Mr Bell are of great interest to the phrenologist, and to the physician, and their accuracy has been nearly established by those of Majendie in Paris, and Mr Schaw in London. We cannot at present proceed to the examination of Mr B.'s second paper, but we shall take oc-

cession to recur to it. He has the merit of having first demonstrated the difference of function performed by different sets of nerves, in opposition to the opinions of some eminent physiologists, who tell us that the different nerves resemble the different parts of a broken magnet, so exactly, that any one could easily supply the place of another. He has also the merit of having applied a principle, which is likely soon to lead to results of the greatest importance, and to place the physiology of the nerves on a level with that of the best known organs of the body. He has the merit, in short, of having done for the physiology of the nerves, what Dr Gall has the merit of having done for the physiology of the brain. Neither was the first to conceive that different nerves or different parts of the brain must have peculiar functions, but both were the first to *demonstrate* the facts.

To Majendie we are also much indebted for the zeal with which he continues to prosecute his physiological inquiries, and to unfold new views. He, as well as Mr Bell, is entitled to the merit of having *discovered* the existence of two sets of fibres in the spinal nerves, for he was not aware of Mr Bell's experiments when he published his own.

ARTICLE VI.

DIALOGUE BETWEEN A PHILOSOPHER OF THE OLD SCHOOL AND A PHRENOLOGIST.

Phil. Do you believe in Phrenology?

Phren. Yes, I do! Do you not believe in it?

Phil. No indeed. It is most ridiculous nonsense.

Phren. How do you know? Have you studied it?

Phil. Not I. It is too absurd to merit a moment's attention.

Phren. In saying so, do you not resemble a person ignorant of geometry, declaring that he does not believe in Euclid's demonstrations?

Phil. This is quite in the usual strain of dogmatic absurdity, in which the phrenologists are so fond of indulging.

Phren. I beg pardon,—the absurdity is all on the other side.

Phil. So you are pleased to say ; but you never shew us that it is so. Have not the anatomists dissected the brain these two thousand years, and discovered no such organs as you speak of ; and have not the most eminent metaphysicians carefully analysed every thought and sentiment of the mind, and never discovered such absurd propensities as destructiveness, acquisitiveness, secretiveness ? A person cannot know what Euclid's Elements contain who has not studied them, and any declaration that he did not believe in the demonstrations would be a piece of gratuitous absurdity on his part, at which we might smile, but with which we could not be angry ; but certainly the brain and the mind have been subjected to examination ere the days of Gall and Spurzheim, and there is nothing ridiculous in saying, on the faith of these investigations, that their doctrines are mere extravagancies, unworthy of the least consideration.

Phren. It is quite true that the brain has been dissected, and the mental phenomena have been analysed by very acute minds, for a very long period of time ; but, were the phrenologists to point out fundamental errors in the methods of investigation, followed by all previous philosophers, and to shew that they themselves proceed by a surer path to truth, they would reduce all the opinions on which you found to absolute insignificance, while they would be entitled to challenge a becoming attention to their own discoveries.

Phil. I grant you this, but these are mere general declamations in which your sect habitually indulges, without condescending to lay before us tangible and intelligible principles of philosophy.

Phren. “Tangible, and intelligible principles of philosophy,” as you term them, have been repeated in every work on phrenology, from Gall's first publication to the present day ; but you and those on your side of the question have either deli-

berately shut your eyes against them, or, if you have seen them, you have never met them fairly in argument. You have neither refuted nor admitted them, but kept them back in all the discussions, and concealed them from the world, as if they had never been announced.

Phil. with warmth. Sir, I am not aware of any such statements as those you now allude to.

Phren. I beg pardon for any degree of temper appearing in these remarks. They were made more in sorrow than in anger;—but, to return to the point, Did you ever hear the principle announced, that “dissection alone is not sufficient to reveal the functions of any corporeal part?” For example, that although anatomists have dissected the human body for ages, they never discovered in its structure the least indication of the fact, that of two sets of nervous fibres running undistinguishably in the same sheath, one is the organ of motion, and the other the organ of feeling, and that one may be injured, and feeling be impaired, while, if the other continue sound, motion will remain, or *vice versa*; or are you aware, that although the mesenteric glands have been often dissected, their functions are still a mystery in physiology?

Phil. Yes, I am aware of the principle, and admit the facts.

Phren. Do you not perceive then, that it was absolutely impossible for anatomists, by mere dissection, to discover the functions of the brain?

Phil. Well,—suppose, for the sake of argument, that I do so,—this does not shew that you can discover these functions any more than they.

Phren. Certainly not,—if we pursued no other method than that of dissection. It is a vulgar error to suppose, that Dr Gall assigned different faculties to different parts of the brain, *in consequence of dissecting that organ*. This notion has been industriously propagated in the public mind, and yet phrenologists uniformly state it as a fundamental principle of their science, that the function of no organic part can be discovered by means of dissection alone: But to proceed.

They farther maintain, that by reflecting on consciousness, or on what passes within our own minds, we could never discover the nature of the substance which lies in the interior of the head, and of course, that although different parts of the brain were *de facto* the organs of different mental powers, we could never find out that they were so by this mode of exclusively reflecting on consciousness.

Phil. Well, but what then ?

Phren. These are two philosophical facts, which the phrenologists found upon as fundamental principles. I have never seen them contested ; but their application is not attended to. If they be sound, the inference from them is irresistible, that those philosophers who have hitherto sought to discover the functions of the brain, by dissection alone, or by reflection on consciousness alone, or even by both together, must be as ignorant of these functions as the clown is of Euclid. When, therefore, without pursuing any other mode of inquiry, they are pleased to say, that phrenology is perfectly absurd, they approach much nearer to the supposed conduct of this person than they imagine.

Phil. This may do all very well to shew that philosophers in general know nothing of the functions of the brain ; but it does not shew, that the phrenologists are farther advanced.

Phren. True, but they go a step farther. Majendie discovered that motion is attached to one set of nervous fibres, and feeling to another, by cutting these at their origin, and observing that the respective power was instantly lost : Now, nature has to a certain extent performed this operation to our hand, in regard to different portions of the brain. One man has an inch and a half more of brain lying under the middle of the parietal bone than another ; and the phrenologists observe (and that observation has been confirmed by many thousand instances, and falsified in none), that he who has the larger portion manifests a strong natural sentiment of cautiousness, and that he who possesses the smaller portion, manifests very little of this feeling. The same observation may be made in regard to ideality, and all the other organs. In the mask of

François of Paris, who was bred a shoemaker, and is author of *Zenobia*, a tragedy of considerable reputation, the distance from ideality to ideality is $6\frac{3}{8}$ inches. In the mask of Henri Quatre of France, it is $5\frac{6}{7}$ inches. In that of D. Wilkie, painter, $5\frac{1}{4}$ inches; while in D. Haggart it is only $4\frac{1}{4}$ inches; and in many individuals who manifest little of this sentiment, it does not exceed that amount. These casts are all in the Phrenological Society's collection.

Phil. It is easy to represent these as observations of vast importance, but you forget that the two tables of the skull are not parallel; and hence, that whatever the external measurements may indicate, you can draw no conclusion as to the size of the brain beneath.

Phren. This is one of the bold assertions made by the opponents, but it is utterly unfounded. Does not the bark indicate the shape of the tree? Does not the shell correspond to the size of the crab? Does not the brain increase in dimensions betwixt infancy and manhood? and does not the skull, in all its varying changes, accommodate itself to its figure? Some persons have averred, that the brain attains its full growth at three, and others at seven years of age; but every hatter's apprentice will tell you that this is a very absurd mistake. It is true, that in cases of disease the skull becomes irregular. In its structure it is then sometimes thicker, sometimes thinner, than in health; but such cases are not those by which phrenology is to be confirmed or refuted. Take a healthy man in the vigour of life, and I affirm, without fear of refutation, that the skull takes its form from, and indicates the real shape of the brain.

Phil. But many anatomists prove the reverse; they exhibit a great variety of skulls presenting the most irregular surfaces.

Phren. I know they do; but they never venture on the assertion, that these form a fair specimen of the skulls of healthy individuals in the prime of manhood. They say nothing on this point, but leave it to their hearers to take it for granted, which they generally do. The phrenologists,

on the other hand, assert, that the skulls thus paraded are selections of diseased and extraordinary cases,—exceptions to the general rule,—and that they no more afford fair specimens of the structure of the healthy skull than the diseased tibia and femora exhibited by the same anatomists afford specimens of the appearance of these bones in a state of health.

Phil. But in every skull which I ever saw, there are differences in the parallelism of the outer and inner tables.

Phren. True; and this objection is generally stated in a sophistical manner, without specification, to make it tell beyond its real force against phrenology. Variations from perfect parallelism betwixt the two tables of the skull, to the extent of an eighth or a tenth of an inch, are not unfrequently observed in the skulls even of healthy individuals; but then the difference betwixt the development of a large organ and a small organ amounts to a full inch, and frequently to more. Now, to give this objection force, it ought to be asserted, that the bone in a sound skull in middle life is generally found varying from an inch in thickness in one part, to only an eighth of an inch in another, and this so irregularly, that in no instance where a prominence appears can we tell whether we must penetrate through an inch of bone before arriving at the brain, or whether we may not meet with it at an eighth of an inch below the surface. Do you make such an assertion as this?

Phil. No, I do not; but in your smaller organs this eighth of an inch may be fatal to all your observations.

Phren. This is evading the question, as our opponents always do. If you wish to find the truth, seek for it where it is most palpable in the first place, and afterwards proceed to points of greater difficulty. If you really wish to put phrenology to the test, take a pair of callipers, and measure the dimensions of the larger organs in persons whose characters you know to differ extremely in one point, and if the difference of size does not run from half an inch to an inch and a half, I shall give up the cause. You may then be

entitled to talk against it, but not till then. Even as to the smaller organ there is one-fourth of an inch of difference betwixt the development of the organ of colouring in the head of Mr James Milne, who cannot distinguish shades of colour, and in the heads of Mr Douglas and Mr Gibson, who are professional painters. Masks of the three lie on the Society's table, and you may ascertain the fact by examination. I could cite many other instances.

Phil. But this practice of poking at heads is absurd and ridiculous, and no gentleman can practise it without being laughed at as a fool.

Phren. They who sit enthroned in antiquated and erroneous opinions find it easier to laugh at methods which threaten to hurl them from their high estate, than to offer a valid objection to them by argument. They have been successful in maintaining the laugh for a time, because the real state of the matter in dispute was not generally known. As soon as this is the case, the tables will be turned. An individual is never truly absurd in seeking important knowledge in the only way in which it is to be found, and when the phrenologists have demonstrated, *first*, The utter ignorance of their opponents; and, *secondly*, The adequacy of their own method of investigation to arrive at truth,—the ridicule will attach altogether to the other side. The opponents must stoop to be schooled by those whom they affect to despise, or act upon the maxim,—

“ Ne voyons goutte, cherissons l'erreur.”

Phil. But you deceive yourselves; your imaginations are heated, and you see facts just because you wish to see them.

Phren. Then it is your duty to observe better, and contradict us. You are not entitled to assume our incapacity to observe, without a shadow of evidence of the real existence of this incapacity. We court inquiry; we exhibit our casts; put callipers, with a graduated scale, into your hands, and request you to examine, and measure, and refute us, if you can. Besides, it is a truly ludicrous manifestation of one o

our demonstrated organs, *self-esteem*, for an opponent to assume that *he himself*, without one moment's attention to the subject, is a better judge of the real nature and merits of phrenology than other individuals who have devoted much time and labour to its investigation. Such a piece of conceit might have passed without severe animadversion while the phrenologists were few in number and obscure; but when societies are formed in various places for its cultivation, professing it to be a well-founded, experimental science, and when full courses of lectures on it are delivered and attended, day after day, with patient attention by gentlemen arrived at maturity of judgment and of acknowledged talents and reputation, such a system of contemptuous condemnation exposes him who uses it to just ridicule.

Phil. It may be so; but I have too much to engage my attention at present to listen to such animadversions. Good morning!

ARTICLE VII.

ALLEGED CLAIM OF REIL TO DR GALL'S DISCOVERIES IN THE ANATOMY OF THE BRAIN.

IN a future number of this Journal, it is our intention to treat of the anatomy of the brain, and to point out as clearly as possible the advantages of the mode of dissection adopted by Drs Gall and Spurzheim, as compared with those generally in use. On the continent, ample justice is now done to the anatomical labours of these two gentlemen, and it is much to the credit of our present professor Monro, that so early as 1818, when the prejudice against them was very strong, he should have been the first to admit and to give them praise for the improvements which they had made in the anatomy of the nervous system.* In this country, their anatomical

* *Outlines of Anatomy*, vol. III. p. 135.

merit is still far from being generally acknowledged, and it has been much the fashion to affirm that they had borrowed largely, without acknowledgment, from Reil, the celebrated German anatomist. This charge was first made by Dr Gordon, and although triumphantly refuted by Dr S., in a pamphlet published in 1817, is still frequently brought forward by those who look to one side only of a question. All that we mean to do at present is to refute the charge, from the authority of —— Reil himself,—who would have been astonished at such a charge, if he had read it.

In the 4th volume of Dr Gall's large work, "Sur l'Anatomie et la Physiologie du Cerveau, et du Systeme Nerveux," at p. 378, is an extract from a publication by Professor Bischoff, who was acquainted with Reil and Loder, both of Halle, and both eminent as anatomists, and before all of whom Drs G. and S. dissected several brains. "Le digne Reil," says Bischoff, "qui comme anatomiste profond et physiologiste judicieux, n' a pas besoin de mes éloges, a déclaré en s'élevant au dessus de toutes les petites tesses de l'égoïsme ' *qu'il avait plus trouvé dans les dissections du cerveau faites par Gall, qu'il n' aurait cru qu'un homme put jamais y decouvrir-de toute sa vie.*' Loder, (continues Bischoff,) *qui ne le cede sans contredit à aucun des anatomistes vivans a jugé les decouvertes de Gall de la maniere suivante.*" After giving a favourable opinion of the physiological and anatomical discoveries, Loder says, "Je suis honteux et indigné contre moimeme, d'avoir comme les autres depuis près de trente ans, decoupé des centaines de cerveaux comme on tranchè dans un fromage et de n'avoir pas aperçu la forêt par le trop d'arbres qu'il y avait. Mais a quoi bon se facher et rougir ? Le meilleur parti est de preter l'oreille à la verité et d'apprendre ce que l'on ne sait pas. Je dis comme Reil que j'ai trouvé plus que je ne croyais qu' un homme put faire dans le cours de sa vie."

ARTICLE VIII.

THE SPIDER AND THE BEE.

To the Editor of the Phrenological Journal.

SIR,—I am a phrenologist, and as I do not, like some half-converts to the system, coquet with my belief in it, but, on the contrary, openly avow it wherever I go, I am of course prepared to encounter all that kind of civil persecution, with which the followers of Drs Gall and Spurzheim have been visited by the patrons of the old philosophy. This, however, makes no sort of impression on me; on the contrary, I am frequently amused, when, at the first mention of the subject in a company, I perceive a sneer beginning to mantle on the face of some grave professor, or pert young advocate.—Burns has somewhere asked, “where is the shield from the darts “of contempt?” I could have told him, that one effectual shield is afforded by the conviction, that the contempt is founded in ignorance. The savage views with supreme contempt the arts and the improvements of civilized life;—but what civilized man cares for the contempt of a savage? Now the grave professors, and advocates learned in the law, however knowing they may be in matters within their own sphere, are perfect Yahoos when they begin to talk about phrenology, of which we have generally found they know as little as the Canadian or Esquimaux does about the solar system.

I happened to dine the other day with a party of literary men, among whom the subject was started, as it sometimes is, for the sole purpose of running it down. I soon found that so far as votes went I was rather in the minority, as indeed I was the only decided phrenologist in the room. Some there were who, I knew, had wavered, but these being deterred by the dread laugh of a redoubted doctor, drew their forces aside, and left me to wage the combat alone. The contest which followed somewhat resembled what I have seen take

place between the small fry of a school and some unfortunate dominie, who has happened to incur their displeasure. Whenever the dominie turns and faces the enemy, they scamper off in all directions,—so that he never can get a blow at any of them; but no sooner has he turned his back than they are down upon him in scores, while at the same time he is assaulted from a distance with showers of light missiles, more irritating to the temper than weapons of a heavier construction. I attempted several times to fix them down to fair argument, but this I found was in vain. When, as I thought, I had aimed a blow that was to fell one of them to the earth, he shifted his ground, or one of his friends took his place, and bestrode the fallen, spreading over him as a shield a stray leaf of Blackwood's Magazine; or, if nothing else would do, sometimes my most conclusive hits were parried by a pun, or a conundrum. However, I was determined not to yield one inch of ground, and continued to the end to show a bold front to the enemy.

Being rather tired by this unprofitable sort of wrangling, on reaching home I took up a book to compose my mind with something intelligible, after the nonsense I had been listening to, and I lighted upon that volume of Swift which contains his account of the battle of the books in St James's library. I there read, with great satisfaction, the following apologue:—*Upon the highest corner of a large window, there dwelt a certain Spider, sworn up to the first magnitude by the destruction of infinite numbers of flies, whose spoils lay scattered before the gates of his palace, like human bones before the cave of some giant. The avenues to his castle were guarded with turnpikes and palleadoes.—In this mansion he had, for some time, dwelt in peace and plenty, without danger to his person, by swallows from above, or to his palace, by brooms from below: when it was the pleasure of fortune to conduct thither a wandering Bee, to whose curiosity a broken pane in the glass had discovered itself, and in he went; where, expatiating a while, he at last happened to alight upon one of the outward walls of the Spider's cita-*

del, which, yielding to the unequal weight, sunk down to the very foundation. Thrice he endeavoured to force his passage, and thrice the centre shook. The Spider within, feeling the terrible convulsion, supposed at first, that nature was approaching her final dissolution,—or else, that Beelzebub, with all his legions, was come to revenge the death of many thousands of his subjects, whom his enemy had slain and devoured. However, he at length valiantly resolved to issue forth, and meet his fate. Meanwhile, the Bee had acquitted himself of his toils,—and, posted securely at some distance, was employed in cleansing his wings, and disengaging them from the ragged remnants of the cobweb. By this time the Spider was adventured out, when, beholding the chasms, the ruins, and dilapidations of his fortress, he was very near at his wif's end; he stormed and swore like a madman, and swelled till he was ready to burst. At length, casting his eye upon the Bee, and wisely gathering causes from events, (for they knew each other by sight)”— — —

As it was now approaching the “witching time of night,” and I had been somewhat jaded during the day, I here gave a nod in my chair and fell asleep; and the subject of which I was reading having impressed itself on my organ of individuality, produced the following dream:—

Metthought I was seated in the venerable library of our own renowned *Alma Mater*,—and upon the corner of one of the windows, I perceived the individual Spider of which I had been reading, peering out of the recesses of his cell, swelling with venom, his eyes fixed with fury upon the offending Bee, who continued, with great *sang froid*, to brush his wings without minding him. At last the Spider called out to him in a voice of thunder,—“What miscreant is this who presumes to trespass upon my premises? Do you not know, sirrah, that these are my undoubted lawful dominions, where no one is allowed to come without my permission? but you shall find, sirrah, that there are here traps and spring-guns which shall soon make you repent your temerity.”

The Bee, upon this, made a very proper and modest apo-

logy ; said he was sorry he had given offence,—that he had no intention of trespassing on other people's grounds,—and that he would forthwith return to his more congenial haunts and occupations ; but withal he desired to be acquainted with the name and quality of the owner of the castle.

“ Sir,” replied the Spider, “ I am a metaphysician ; these “ webs which you see stretched around in such beautiful “ order are my systems and theories, which are to me as the “ apple of my eye, or as the children of my loins. If you “ dare, insect as you are, to touch one of them, or so much “ as to approach them with your unhallowed breath, you “ shall learn what it is to incur the anger of a philosopher.”

“ Sir,” replied the Bee, who, by this time, I evidently perceived to be a phrenologist, “ I am sorry that I have offended “ you. Your systems do indeed appear to be rather too tender “ to be breathed upon, much less touched by so rude a hand as “ mine. From their venerable and dusty appearance, I presume that they are very old. Your castle seems to have “ been built at very distant periods, and by various hands ; “ additions make a house convenient within, but are somewhat “ clumsy without ; but yours is such a thing of shreds and “ patches, that I would hardly discover it to be a house at “ all, without very narrow inspection. Doubtless this august “ fabric has been the work of many generations, and has descended to you from a long line of illustrious ancestors.”

On this the Spider assumed a look of ineffable disdain. “ Heaven help your foolish head !” he exclaimed, “ is that “ all you know about metaphysics ? No, sir ; every thread of “ this beautiful structure (which you do not possess skill to “ comprehend, or taste to appreciate), is my own work ; it is “ altogether spun out of my own bowels. Twenty systems, “ every one of them larger, and fairer, and more beautiful “ than another, have been demolished to make way for it ; “ twenty successive monarchs have, for two hundred years, occupied this corner, and every one of them erected a castle “ of his own, and, in order to make room for it, cleared “ away all that had been left by the labours of his predeces-

“soft; but my system is infinitely finer and handsomer, and more elegant and substantial, than any that has preceded it. I have fixed its foundations upon such firm ground, and connected the parts of my fabric in such a strong and indissoluble manner, that it must of necessity last as long as the world endures.”

“Great sir,” replied the Bee, “with submission, may I not ask, if a misgiving does not sometimes come over you, that this fabric of yours, though it looks so fair and handsome at present, may not some time share the fate of those which have gone before it? Were they not also spun from the bowels of their respective authors?”

“Every one of them,” answered the Spider; “it is beneath the dignity of a true philosopher to draw any of his materials from without. We metaphysicians can say with the ancient sage,—*Omnia mecum gero.*”

“But are you not afraid,” said the Bee, “that your successors may happen to treat your labours with as little ceremony as you have treated that which preceded you? How can the material, which has proved itself so fragile and unsubstantial in their hands, become at once strong as iron or adamant, when moulded and fashioned by you? May not some young spider, after you are gone, fix himself on this very spot, and begin a new work, and rear a still more splendid palace in the site which is now occupied by yours?”

“You impudent, audacious scoundrel,” cried the Spider in a rage, “how dare you make such a supposition? I shall teach you to repent of such insolence to me.—But—stay, give an account of yourself,—What is your employment, and who are you? Have you been able to construct such an assemblage of beautifully complicated workmanship as that which adorns my castle? Where are your works? What is their nature? Are they any way to be compared with mine?”

“Sir,” said the Bee, “I shall not venture to make any comparison between my works and yours. I am a phrenologist,—you are a metaphysician. I meddle not with

“ any fine-spun theories and complicated hypotheses ; I go
 “ on in my own way, which is entirely different from yours.
 “ If you will come with me you shall see my works, and not
 “ mine only, but those of the colony to which I belong.
 “ We do not sit, as you do, in solitude ; we labour in com-
 “ pany. Each brings his contribution to the general stock.
 “ We do not live in dark and dirty corners ; we go abroad
 “ into the world, and observe nature in all her variety and
 “ in all her greatness.—No object is too high, and none is
 “ too lowly for us.—We light upon the heath-bell that crowns
 “ the summit of the mountain, or on the daisy which blossoms
 “ in the vale. We do not, like you, draw our materials from
 “ our own bowels ; we visit every flower that sips the dew,
 “ and extract something from the greatest and from the
 “ fairest objects in nature.—But come with me and see the
 “ cells we have constructed, and taste the honey with which
 “ they are stored,—it affords a food no less delicious than
 “ healthful,—at once gratifying the palate and nourishing
 “ the body.”

“ I,” cried the Spider, swelling into tenfold rage,—“ I
 “ go to your waspish hive and taste your trash !—No ! de-
 “ pend upon it, not a particle of the vulgar compound shall
 “ ever cross my lips.—Begone !—Fly, like an idler as thou
 “ art, to thy fields and mountains, and there loiter away thy
 “ time in skipping to every flower thou meetest, and leave
 “ me here to enjoy undisturbed my sage and profitable con-
 “ templations.”

“ Farewell then,” replied the Bee ; “ live in your dismal
 “ corner, and increase and spread your webs till they cover the
 “ whole roof of this spacious hall ; you will only take a few more
 “ miserable flies who may perish in their labyrinths. But the
 “ sun will continue to rise and set, and to illuminate hill and
 “ dale, though you wilfully shut your eyes upon their beauties ;
 “ flowers will bloom, and honey will be gathered, without
 “ your assistance.—*You boast, indeed, of being obliged to no
 “ other creature, but of drawing and spinning out all from
 “ yourself ; that is to say, if we may judge of the liquor in*

“ the vessel, by what issues out, you possess a good plentiful
 “ store of dirt and poison in your breast; and, though
 “ I would by no means lessen or disparage your genuine
 “ stock of either, yet, I doubt you are somewhat obliged, for
 “ an increase of both, to a little foreign assistance. Your in-
 “ herent portion of dirt does not fail of acquisitions, by sweep-
 “ ings exhaled from below.—So that, in short, the question
 “ comes all to this; Whether is the nobler being of the two,
 “ that which, by a lazy contemplation of four inches round,
 “ by an overweening pride, feeding and engendering on itself,
 “ turns all into excrement and venom, producing nothing at
 “ all, but fly-bane and a cobweb; or that which, by an universal
 “ range, with long search, much study, true judgment, and dis-
 “ tinction of things, brings home honey and wax? ”*—I here
 found that my sleep had left me, and that I was sitting with
 the book in my hand, so that the last words pronounced by
 the Bee seemed to be written in legible characters on the
 page. I immediately took up my candle and went to bed,
 pondering deeply the moral of my dream, which, I doubt
 not, is sufficiently obvious to all who have any interest in
 finding it out.—I am, sir, your obedient servant, M.

Edinburgh, October, 1823.

ARTICLE IX.

THE ENEMIES OF PHRENOLOGY.

WE are informed by the ancient poet Simonides, that “ the
 “ gods formed the souls of women out of those seeds and prin-
 “ ciples which compose several kinds of animals and ele-
 “ ments, and that their good and bad dispositions arise in
 “ them according as such and such seeds and principles pre-
 “ dominate in their constitutions.” We are much pleased
 with this idea, and, applying it to the various characters of

* Swift's Works, Scott's Edition, Vol. XI. p. p. 231—234.

those who think to elevate themselves by endeavouring to vilify and degrade phrenology, we have thought that we could trace, by some very obvious marks, those of the inferior tribes from which they derive their most distinguishing qualities. Our correspondent's apologue (The Spider and the Bee), has come to us quite *apropos*, and furnishes a very pleasing illustration of this train of thinking. The bees are in every respect a fit emblem of the phrenologists, both as regards the nature and extent of their labours; their cheerful co-operation in work; the regularity and beauty of their structures; the agreeable nature of the manufacture they produce; and, lastly, (which hitherto they have allowed to remain latent, but which their enemies will now feel they possess in full vigour,) the stings which enable them to defend themselves when attacked, and to afflict with grievous pains those who would attack them. Their enemies, on the other hand, may be distinguished into the following classes:—

First, the WASPS,—who possess an ample store of venom, and sting most unmercifully, but make no honey, and collect nothing in their cells but filth and trash unfit for the use of man or beast.

A second sort are the BUTTERFLIES,—who, although they frequent the same meadows as the bees, and visit the same flowery paths, are incapable of gathering any thing that is either useful or agreeable to themselves or to others. Their lives are entirely useless; they spend their time in fluttering about in the sunshine, but make no provision for winter; and when the sun withdraws his beams from them they perish. These are the *dandies*, the *beau monde* of creation, and are more the objects of compassion than of dislike, nature seeming to have formed them on purpose to shew how useless are all the fairest and shewiest gifts when not accompanied by industry, prudence, and foresight.

A third class are the ANTS,—who are industrious enough, and, within their own sphere, are exceedingly commendable and meritorious, but, being incapable of rising above the earth, or extending their view over remote regions, are al-

together unfit to form a judgment of a subject which comprehends the whole of nature.

In the fourth class are the **GEESE**,—who rail at phrenology merely because they do not understand it. These animals generally affect a solemn gait and carriage, holding up their heads in such a way as to indicate a large endowment of *self-esteem*; but when they wish to express their hatred or contempt, they stretch out their necks, and make a kind of hissing noise quite different from their ordinary gabbling. They are also remarkable for this property, that when they hide their heads, so that they can see nothing themselves, they suppose others to be equally blind, and think that no one can see them, while all the time they are completely exposed to observation. They frequent the rich, low-lying grounds, and delight in ponds and the banks of rivers, never rising to any height, and attack all passengers who trespass upon their domains; but their attacks are the reverse of formidable, and are generally regarded with profound contempt.

The fifth class are the **DUCKS**,—who imitate the manners of the geese, and are upon the whole extremely like them, only inferior. Their mode of attack, however, is different; for, in place of the hissing noise before-mentioned, they content themselves on all occasions with crying, “*Quack, quack.*” They are a much dirtier and fouler feeding species than the geese, delighting to dabble in the mires and puddles, where they pick up and devour with greediness the foulest and most loathsome garbage. The only annoyance they give is in getting among people’s feet, when it is sometimes difficult to avoid treading upon them.

The sixth class are the **OWLS**. The vision of these birds is of such a peculiar kind, that they can only see in the dark or twilight, and are perfectly blinded by the light of the sun, who is consequently to them a tenebriferous planet. The more plain and demonstrable any subject is, these worthies are the more incapable of perceiving its truth; and when the sun rises, such is its effect on them, that they

retire to their holes, exclaiming,—“ Dear me, how dark it grows !”

The seventh class are the PARROTS,—who have learned a few words by rote, which they repeat constantly, and with great satisfaction. One of them is at present exhibited in a large cage at a window in a certain obscure alley in this city, “ as thou goest up by the road of Gabriel, even unto Am-brose,” where he keeps saying to himself,—“ Phrenology, phrenzy ;—phrenology, phrenzy ;—fools, fools, phrenzied fools, infernal idiots ;—phrenzy, phrenzy ;—phrenology, phrenzy.”

The eighth class are the MONKEYS,—who keep grinning and chattering at a great rate, and in such a way, that you would at first believe they were uttering a very voluble discourse in an unknown tongue ; but on more attentive notice you find, that it is no language at all,—mere sound without meaning. These are a very mischievous race, and fond of playing unlucky tricks, but are extremely apt to injure themselves by their absurd attempts to imitate human actions.

The ninth class are the BEARS. These are a very rough, uncultivated class, inhabiting naturally the most barren wastes, or icy regions, where nothing of the vegetable kind can grow. Hence they despise all the beauties of nature ; and though their own form is one of the most homely, they imagine their shapeless cubs to be the very perfection of elegance and beauty ; and there are even found among them who pique themselves on the grace and dignity of their movements in dancing. Although their hug is rather formidable, it is very possible to catch and muzzle them, when, after proper discipline, they form a natural alliance with the monkey, and afford pretty sport for children.

A tenth class are the SWINE,—who delight to wallow in the mud, and hate nothing so much as cleanliness and decency. Whoever enters their sty, would do well to stop his nose, if his olfactory nerves are not of the dullest.

The eleventh class are the ASSES,—who, though a very respectable, patient, grave, and sedate set of creatures, pos-

sess the quality of obstinacy in such illimitable perfection, that neither blows nor kindness have the smallest effect in turning them from the path they think proper to go in. They stand, as the poet informs us,

“ Cudgel-proof,
 “ And steadfast as the unchisell'd rock of flint,
 “ Regardless though the heavens' high marble roof
 “ Should fall upon their skulls, with mortal dint.”

Upon them, both on account of their amazing *vis inertiae*, and the limited range of their intellect, we have ever despaired of making any impression, and sooth to say, we do not desire it. We may add, that their dialect is extremely confined, and that they have only one mode of expressing their sentiments on all occasions, namely, by *braying*.

The twelfth and last class we shall at present mention are the *curs*,—who, although fawning enough upon occasion, are perpetually snarling and yelping at the heels of some animal nobler than themselves. The pertinacity and apparent fury with which they attack a trooper's charger, or a blood mare, or even that formidable machine, a mail-coach drawn by four swift steeds, and rattling in all the panoply of chains and traces through some country town, would seem to entitle them to the attribute of courage, were not the comparative *safety* of the operation demonstrated by the thousands of instances in which their apparent boldness escapes with impunity. It will, however, sometimes happen, that one of the steeds aforesaid, irritated by a more than ordinary tone of impertinence in his canine foe, will lend the yelper such a salute as may lay him sprawling in the kennel,—and, changing his yelp into a howl, send him home limping and lamed for life.

After this enumeration, we must with sorrow allow, that the ranks of the enemy do not entirely consist of such animals as we have mentioned, of whose hostility no one takes any account, or cares whether it is bestowed upon him or not. These ranks are sometimes “ forced with those that

“ should be ours,”—names qualified to adorn a good cause, and almost, if that were possible, to uphold a bad one. But the number of these, we have the satisfaction to see, is diminishing daily ; and we entertain no doubt, that at no very distant period, all will declare themselves for us whose accession is any way desirable. Were it otherwise, we know that we have truth on our side, “ a tower of strength, which they upon the adverse faction want ;” and whatever may be the appearance of the contest at the present, we are assured the time will come when they, who now oppose themselves to an inductive science, would give “ all the shoes in “ their shop” that they had kept themselves quiet ; and when they will be left without any alternative but to consider in which of the above-designated classes they shall choose to place themselves.

Though, for the present, we know that there are in society many worthy and *bona fide* opponents, towards whom we profess no hostility, but whom, on the contrary, if they allowed us, we would convert into friends ; we shall shew no mercy to those vulgar adversaries who contend with us for victory without caring for truth. One den of such there does exist, who, we know, are among the list of incorrigibles, and against whom we proclaim “ war to the knife.” In this contest we have hoisted the black flag, and will neither give nor receive quarter. They formerly, in a very celebrated manifesto, the boasted charter of their corporation,* announced themselves to the world as a set of *beasts*, and truly the nature of their demeanour since has been such as not to belie the appellation ; but they there assumed to themselves characters of some of the nobler tribes, to which we are sure they have no just claims,—as a lion, a tiger, or a panther, however ferocious, would disdain to herd among the rabble rout. We know the whole kennel well, and have listened sometimes to their midnight howlings ; in which, for the most part, it is impossible to distinguish any thing better than the gabbling of

* Chaldec Manuscript.

geese—the screeching of owls—the chattering of monkeys and parrots—the roaring of bears—the grunting of hogs—the braying of asses—and the yelping of curs.* Such are the components of *Blackwood's Menagerie*.—The appearance of our First Number will be the signal for a general yell from the whole pack; but, knowing this, we are prepared for it, and shall not be startled, though it should be both loud and long. Be it observed, we have provided a quantity of *long poles*, to prevent them from doing us any personal damage; and we promise we shall not be chary in our manner of using them.

ARTICLE X.

LETTER FROM MISS CORDELIA HEARTLESS.

Royal Circus, 29th October 1823.

MR JOURNALIST,—Having learned from my brother William, who is a phrenologist, that a book to be called the Phrenological Journal is soon to appear, I hope you will excuse my applying to you thus early, in a matter extremely interesting to me, and which seems to be quite in your way.

For a long time past, my brother has been telling me a great deal about bumps and skulls, and brains, and characters,—all which I at first thought was positive nonsense, being so assured by Dr Egomet, who attends our family, and who, I thought, should know best about the skull and the brain, in spite of my brother's very decided belief that our

* We have long been of opinion that the writers in Blackwood's Magazine are legitimate descendants of the great and never-to-be-forgotten Martinus Scriblerus; and we are confirmed in this opinion by the wonderful similarity in many respects, between them and that great philosopher. We are told, that as soon as he was born he uttered the voice of nine different animals,—“he cried like a calf—bleated like a sheep—chattered like a magpie—grunted like a hog—neighed like a foal—croaked like a raven—mewed like a cat—gabbled like a goose—and brayed like an ass;” so that it appears this great man united in his own person almost as many qualities as, in our degenerate days, are sufficient to furnish out contributors to a whole magazine.

doctor knows no more about the matter than his own carriage-horses. The subject too is always laughed at by dinner-parties where I have been, (for I am just come out), and I have heard it called trash by a professor of the college whom I have met,—dangerous quackery by four physicians,—contemptible nonsense by eleven advocates,—and d—d nonsense by a good many captains, some colonels, and two generals; all of whom speak very decidedly, and declare that they have treated the subject with the contempt it deserves, by avoiding all examination of it, and always flying into a passion when its name is mentioned. That was all too strong with me for brother William's opinion, so I long thought phrenology, not only a very foolish but a very bad and dangerous thing.

But on hearing that Dr Chalmers and some other learned divines were of a different opinion, besides a good many others, as clever men as any of them, I began to think it must be true after all, and begged my brother to lend me Mr Combe's book, which I read with great attention and delight; though, I must own, there were some parts of it too deep for me. My brother took me, after this, to see a collection of skulls and casts of heads, which were explained and lectured upon, for it was a little lecture, by a friend of his, who is a very clever phrenologist. I was much pleased with hearing him describe all the bumps; and, though I did not like to hear about destructiveness and combativeness, I was enchanted with others of the faculties, particularly that delightful one of adhesiveness, which gives, he told us, attachment in friendship and love, all that is meant by constancy, and that sweet *philopro*—(what is its name?) but it means the love of children, and I am sure I have that, for I love children dearly. I was frightened a little at the horrid heads of the murderers, with the great ugly bumps behind the ears, and at the heads of the idiots; but the more I was frightened the more I was convinced, which my brother says is perfectly philosophical. In short, I came away quite a convert. But in my eagerness I totally forgot

a circumstance which has since occurred to me, and which caused me for a time considerable uneasiness. You must know, Mr Journalist, that I am just seventeen, and, like most young ladies of my age, I have been not a little interested in certain feelings which have hitherto been supposed to belong to the *heart*. I have been often warned, more particularly of late, by my aunt Sophy, to take especial care of my heart, and I set about watching very carefully, for some time past, all its flutterings, or, as I have heard them called, pit-a-patations; William calls these ~~sorts~~ phenomena. Thus I took great pleasure at my leisure hours in reading a delightful volume of sonnets that lies in aunt Sophy's dressing-room, all about hearts and darts,—and the hearts of lovers being consumed in the flames of love; and last year, when my father brought me a gold watch for my Christmas gift, my aunt presented me with a seal to hang to it, with the device of Cupid trundling a wheelbarrow loaded with hearts, (which, you will allow, is very pretty and classical,) and the motto “*Choisissez.*” I have indeed been sometimes flatteringly told of my beauty, and that my charms would one day make some young fellow's heart ache. Now, sir, there is a very handsome and interesting young gentleman who visits us, on whose heart I once imagined I had made a very evident impression. Indeed there is a sort of family understanding about that young man and me. When I thought of him I was sometimes inclined to believe that our hearts were designed for each other; but, alas! what avails all this, since it turns out that our feelings and loves, and all the rest of it, have nothing to do with the heart after all. You know, Mr Journalist, that pretty duet by Sir John Stevenson,

“Tell me where is fancy bred,
“In the heart or in the head?”

My brother says that “fancy” here means “love,” and that Sir John did not know, (what I know now,) that it belongs to the head,—otherwise he would never have asked the question. But it did for a little while distress me to think, that instead of having a heart, as I had imagined, with all the

hopes and fears, and delicious feelings of love belonging to it, there is nothing in my bosom better than an ugly muscular bundle of fibres, (so at least William says,) thumping away with no more feeling than the pendulum of our house-clock. Then all my aunt Sophy's book of sonnets is nonsense from beginning to end, and my beautiful seal, with the motto and device, quite without meaning. "Must I throw it away?" thought I, "or, what is worse, get a skull engraved upon it with '*memento mori*'?" But what disappointed me most was, that all the care and watchfulness I had bestowed for the last two years over the flutterer in my bosom was quite thrown away, as I now found I should have directed my whole attention to the bump of adhesiveness on the back of my head.

When in the midst of these contemplations, I received a letter from my lover, who knows nothing about phrenology, and still goes on with the old notion of hearts; and the letter was all about hearts,—and our hearts and hands being united, "and all that sort of thing, and every "thing in the world," as Mathews says. And next day he called upon me, and pressed his suit with great ardour, praying me to let him know if my heart was engaged; I told him it was not. Then he asked if he might hope that my heart felt an interest in his favour. To which I replied, quite gravely, that it was impossible it ever could feel an interest in him or any one, for I had just discovered that my heart was utterly callous and insensible, totally void of either sentiment or feeling, and nothing more than a piece of fibrous flesh. Upon this, my lover opened his eyes so wide, and eyed my countenance at the same time with such a glance, that I evidently saw he apprehended that all was not right in my upper story; so, as I like a little fun, I thought I would keep up the joke, and try its effect on my swain for some time longer. I therefore continued to maintain the most serious countenance while he sidled a little away from me, considering what he should say next. When he had recovered somewhat from his surprise, he said I surely

could not be serious. I assured him I never was more serious in my life. "That your heart is callous and insensible," said he, "I will never believe, when I have myself been so often witness to its sensibility, and know the tenderness and sweetness of your disposition, so that if your heart is not susceptible of the most delicate and ardent emotions, there is not, I am persuaded, a susceptible heart in the world." "My dear friend," said I,— "I know it; there *is* no such thing in nature as a susceptible heart, at least there is none in woman. I know ~~that~~ my own heart has no more tenderness nor susceptibility than that of a tiger, a bear, a hyena, or a crocodile." Here my auditor gradually pushed his chair farther from mine,—but I continued without appearing to observe him. "You will find it so, believe me,—and I am well assured that those of my whole sex are in no better condition. No," exclaimed I, "don't talk to me of hearts. It is all a deception, with which the artful and designing of my sex have deluded the ignorant and unwary of yours. I will no longer be guilty of continuing so gross a delusion; but know," said I, rising and assuming a tragedy air, "if you really wish to discover the seat of true affection, and of all those sentiments and sensibilities you so much admire,—here,"—said I, turning majestically, and placing my hand on the back of my head, just upon the bump of adhesiveness,— "*It is all here.*" And at the same time taking out my comb, and letting my tresses, which are very long and luxuriant, flow down my back, I threw just such a portion of wildness and enthusiasm into my eyes and countenance as might give me the look of a very pretty maniac.

Words cannot express the astonishment of my lover at this last sally, which he doubtless considered the effect of sheer madness. His eyes stared,—his lips quivered,—his countenance became deadly pale, and he evinced all the marks of terror and distress; so that, unless I had been anxious to see the success of my experiment, I should certainly have betrayed myself and laughed outright. At last he muttered

something about being sorry he had an appointment elsewhere, and made a very awkward retreat from the room, and a speedy one from the house. I could only contain myself till he was out of hearing, when, although it was very cruel, I laughed till my sides ached!—No, I never enjoyed a game at cross-purposes half so much.

On the breakfast table, next morning, I saw a letter, in my lover's well-known hand, waiting the coming down of—*my father*. I left the parlour that I might not appear to have seen it. At breakfast I observed my father look unusually grave, and two or three times direct a scrutinizing glance to my side of the table. I was, however, entirely on my guard, and behaved with the most perfect decorum. After breakfast, I rose and took my work, and sat down quietly at the other end of the room, while my father and aunt Sophy conversed in a low voice about something which I could not distinctly hear,—but I am pretty sure, from the looks they directed towards me, that I was the principal subject. I heard aunt Sophy say repeatedly, “Poor thing!” My father once or twice said, rather peevishly,—“Nonsense! I'll not believe it;” and once, I think, I heard him use the word “villain.” I understood all this better than I chose to let them know; and to give them more freedom, I sat down to the piano-forte, and played some of the most noisy pieces I could think of. At dinner, and all the evening, my father and aunt were more than usually kind and attentive to me. Thinks I to myself, “I see the reason of all this, but I will die before I betray myself.” For a day or two I thought the matter would surely be explained: first, I thought my lover would call, then I thought he would write.—“Surely,” thought I, “he will not give me up without another trial.” But a whole week has elapsed, and I have neither seen nor heard from him,—and my brother told me yesterday, that he had gone for a few days to the country. I then began to think that I had carried the matter too far; and though he cannot fail in time to discover his

mistake, and see that "I am not mad," I cannot bear that he should think so even for another week. I therefore have deemed it the best way, dear Mr Journalist, to address this letter to you, and to beg you will assure my swain, that, notwithstanding all that has passed, I am as perfectly in my senses as he is ; and although I cannot offer him my *heart*, the bump of adhesiveness on the back of my head will do every bit as well ; and as it is very large, it will, when I give him my hand, attach me to him for life. I remain, dear Mr Journalist, ~~your~~ very obedient humble servant,

CORDELIA HEARTLESS.

ARTICLE 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 analyzing 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 shew, that those writers who, in their delineation of character, have shewn 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 translated 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 pourtrayed; 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, in-somuch 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 Shak-

speare 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 shew 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

* 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.

Cannot be ill ; cannot be good :—If ill,
 Why hath it given me earnest of success,
 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 smother'd 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 around 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 now 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 shew 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 un-
 "known."

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 holly," 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 *valour 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,
Not bear the knife myself.

To a mind well constituted, the bare mention of these motives would have been sufficient to supersede 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 casts the balance to the opposite side. It will be seen, that, probably knowing her temper, and his contempt for every thing that savoured 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 further in this business :
He hath honour'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,
Suck I account thy love. Art thou *afraid*
To be the same in thine own act and valour,
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 endeavours 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 enterprise 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. Opportunity, 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 shew the reasonableness of his hesitation, by adverting to the dangers attending the enterprise, 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 shewing him a plan by which their enterprise 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 clamour 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 favourable 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 for ever.

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 apprehend-

ed 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, shewing 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 whereabouts,
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 Balsam, 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 affected 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, shew us the enormity we have been guilty of in all its horror. It is not merely *conscientiousness* 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 con-

stitutes 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 enterprise. 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 ex-

planation 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 fiendlike; 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 shewn 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 labour's bath,—
*Chief nourisher in life's feast,—**

* 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.

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.—

Glamis hath murder'd sleep ; and therefore Cowdor

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 ;

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 colour ; 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 could'st!

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 shew 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 labour 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 circum-

stances which shew 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 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 valour
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, in so much, 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 kill'd 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 ecstasy. 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 endeavouring 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 shews 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 lave our honours 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 ! &c.

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 no where shews that callousness and utter disregard of crime that is exhibited in Richard III. and some other wicked characters portrayed 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 shews 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 afraid? 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, shews 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.

ARTICLE XII.

ON THE SKULLS OF THREE MURDERERS

In the Museum of the Royal College of Surgeons, Dublin.

A SWISS gentleman lately visited the Surgeons' Hall of Dublin, and was shewn into the Museum, where a number of skulls of persons who had been executed for murder was kept. The keeper of the Museum begged him to observe that the organs of destructiveness and of some other faculties were not more prominent in their skulls than in the skulls of the generality of men. The Swiss gentleman came afterwards to Edinburgh, where, having heard phrenology spoken of, he reported this observation. He chanced to repeat it to a phrenologist of this city, who immediately requested him to visit a collection, consisting of skulls of murderers and of virtuous individuals, and to point out those to which the Dublin skulls bore the nearest resemblance. The Swiss gentleman, after looking at several skulls, professed ignorance of the subject, and stated his inability to tell from recollection the precise appearance of the skulls in question. The phrenologist then shewed him the difference betwixt the skulls of murderers and of persons of mild dispositions, namely, that in the former the inferior and posterior parts were large in proportion to the anterior and superior, while in the latter these proportions were reversed;—but he could not say whether this rule held or not in the skulls in the Museum. Meantime the report which we have now mentioned got abroad, and the opponents of phrenology were already rejoicing over it as establishing a fact which the phrenologists would not dare to expiscate, and which would shew at once the unfounded nature of their science, and the *mala fides* of their proceedings in concealing all circumstances which militated against them.

The phrenologists, however, pursued a different course.

The gentleman alluded to immediately wrote to a friend in Dublin detailing the report, and adding, "I am certain the statement does not correspond to the fact, otherwise nature's laws are different in Ireland from what they are in England, Scotland, and France. Would you, therefore, be so good as see the skulls, and write me such an account of them as I may publish in the *Phrenological Journal*." The letter farther mentioned, that "Mr —— (the Swiss gentleman) did not in the least impute to Mr S. the keeper of the museum, any hostile feeling towards phrenology, but said that the remark about the development was made in answer to a question, and that if it was not correct, the error arose entirely from the circumstance of the keeper not being aware of the development which characterizes murderers."

A speedy reply was obtained, to the following effect:—

Dublin, 29th Sept. 1823.

"Immediately after receiving your last favour I procured the measurements of the skulls in the college of Surgeon's Museum, according to your wishes; as also the briefs used on the trials of the individuals, whose history you desired to be informed of, but postponed writing from day to day, in hopes of being able to send you a paper fit to lay before the *Phrenological Society*. I am, however, compelled, through mere want of leisure, to abandon my intention.

"There are but three skulls of executed murderers in the Museum; but perhaps Mr —— included in the number he mentioned to you the casts (masks) of the same individuals taken immediately after their execution. The first is the skull of Matthew Osborne, who was executed in February 1821, for the murder of his wife, by trampling on her, and striking her on the head with a piece of timber. Six of her ribs were broken, and crushed into her lungs. He fled, after locking up the body in his room, but was found concealed in a house in the neighbourhood, with the key in his pocket. He was upwards of fifty; and, though his wife does not appear to have been young, he was jealous of her; to excite his compassion, she asked him if he was going to kill the mother of his children, but he cursed her for a whore, and completed the murder.

"The two others are the skulls of Bridget Butterly and Bridget Ennis, who were tried in April 1821 for the murder of Mary Thompson. The deceased lived with a gentleman of this city, by whom she had two or three children. Bridget

"Butterly had previously lived with him as a servant, and it
 "appeared that he had also a criminal connexion with her.
 "The prisoners watched the house in the forenoon of the day,
 "till they saw the gentleman leave it followed by his man-
 "servant. After an interval Bridget Ennis knocked, and
 "stated to the maid-servant that her master had just met with
 "an accident in Henry-street, and desired her to bring him his
 "great-coat. She set off with the coat, and immediately af-
 "terwards the two women knocked at the door; it was opened
 "by Mrs Thompson. There was but a short parley until they
 "threw a handkerchief over her head, and dragged her down
 "the kitchen stairs, where they beat out her brains with the
 "kitchen poker. A knife and iron tongs were found in a bed
 "in an adjoining room, both bloody. They carried off a
 "writing-desk and trunk, in which were bank-notes and pro-
 "perty to a considerable amount. The same evening they
 "were both seen dancing at a public-house. One of them
 "(Ennis) was apprehended there. The other was detected
 "putting off a bank-note, of which she did not know the value.
 "The peace-officers, on searching her, found her gown clotted
 "with blood, particularly the sleeves, which were tucked up.
 "To account for the circumstance, she stated that her nose had
 "been bleeding. She was young, and rather handsome. Her
 "companion was ordinary, and seemed elder; yet she stated
 "her age to be but twenty. Their unfortunate victim was
 "about the same age, and was described by the witnesses as a
 "beautiful creature. Her child, about three years old, was
 "found in the house covered with blood.

"I believe I have detailed all the circumstances that it is now
 "possible to learn, which can throw any light upon the charac-
 "ter of these individuals. I made an effort to procure casts of
 "their skulls, but was disappointed. Nothing, however,
 "could exceed the obliging attentions which I received from
 "Mr S——, who assisted me in taking the measurements.
 "Had he sufficient leisure himself to make the casts I should
 "have had the satisfaction of sending them for your own ex-
 "amination. I have a very deficient eye in judging of the
 "comparative size of the organs, and would not venture on the
 "attempt, as the chances are, I should mislead you. You may
 "depend, however, on the correctness of the following measure-
 "ments."

Our correspondent gives a tabular view of the measure-
 ments, which we shall copy *verbatim*; but to enable the
 reader to understand its import, we shall add the measure-
 ments of the skulls of Gordon, who murdered the pedlar
 boy in Eskdale muir, and of Bellingham, who assassinated
 Mr Perceval, in both of which destructiveness and the ani-

mal organs in general greatly preponderate in size over those of intellect and the moral sentiments. The latter skulls we have seen in the collection of the Phrenological Society, and the measurements are taken from that Society's transactions.

	In Matthew Osborne.	In Bridget Butterfly.	In Bridget Eines.	In James Gordon.	In John Bellingham.
	Inches.	Inches.	Inches.	Inches.	Inches.
From the centre of the surface of philoprogenitiveness to meatus auditorius externus, - -	5	4½	4½	4½	4½
From the meatus to lower individuality,	4	4	4½	4½	4½
From destructiveness to destructiveness,	5½	5½	5½	5½	5½
From cautiousness to cautiousness,	5½	5½	5½	5½	5½
From ideality to ideality, - -	4	4½	4½	4½	4½

We can certify, without fear of contradiction, that the skulls of Gordon and Bellingham are very different in form from those of individuals who possess amiable natural dispositions; and as these Dublin skulls present a development *inferior to them*, we regard this as another, added to many previous examples, that the reports generally circulated concerning facts said to be inconsistent with phrenology have no foundation in nature, and originate entirely in want of knowledge of the subject in those on whose authority they rest. If any person wishes to learn the names of the gentlemen here referred to, with the view of verifying our report, we are ready to communicate them on application to the Editor.

ARTICLE XIII.

MATERIALISM AND SCEPTICISM.

REMARKS on SCEPTICISM, especially as it is connected with the Subjects of Organization and Life. By the Rev. THOMAS RENNELL, Christian Advocate in the University of Cambridge.—London, 1821.

SOMATOPSYCHONOLOGIA, shewing that the Proofs of Body, Life, and Mind, considered as distinct Essences, cannot be deduced from Physiology. By Philostratus. London, 1823.

THE objection, that phrenology leads to materialism, has been frequently urged against the science; and we embrace this early opportunity of discussing its merits. It appears singularly unphilosophical, even upon the most superficial consideration. Phrenology, viewed as the assertion of certain physical facts, cannot, if unfounded, logically lead to any result, except the disgrace and mortification of its supporters. On such a supposition, it cannot overturn religion, or any other *truth*; because, by the constitution of the human intellect, error constantly tends to resolve itself into nothing, and to sink into oblivion; while truth, having a real existence, remains permanent and impregnable. In this view, then, the objection, that phrenology leads to materialism, is absurd. If, on the other hand, the science is held to be a *true interpretation of nature*, and if it is urged, that, nevertheless, it leads fairly and logically to materialism, then the folly of the objection is equally glaring; for it resolves itself into this,—that materialism is the constitution of nature, and that phrenology is dangerous, because it makes this constitution known.

The charge assumes a still more awkward appearance in one shape in which it is frequently brought forward. The objector admits that the mind uses the body as an instru-

ment of communication with external nature, and maintains that this fact does not necessarily lead to materialism. In this we agree with him; but we cannot perceive how it should lead nearer to this result, to hold that each faculty manifests itself by a peculiar organ, than to believe that the whole mind acts on external objects by means of the whole body or the whole brain. In short, in whatever point of view the system is regarded, whether as true or false, the objection of materialism is futile and unphilosophical; and we are grieved that it should have been brought forward in the name of religion, because every imbecile and unfounded attack against philosophy, made in this sacred name, tends to diminish the respect with which we desire to see it always invested.

The question of materialism itself, however, as a point of abstract discussion, has of late excited considerable attention; and we shall offer a few remarks upon its general merits. In entering on the subject, it is proper to take a view of the nature and extent of the point in dispute, and of the real effect of our decision upon it. The question then is, Whether the *substance* of which the thinking principle is composed be matter or spirit? And the effect of our decision, let it be observed, is not to *alter the nature of that substance*, whatever it is, but merely to adopt an opinion consonant with, or adverse to, a fact in nature over which we have no control. Mind, with all its faculties and functions, has existed since the creation, and will exist till the human race becomes extinct, and no opinion of man concerning the cause of its phenomena can have the least influence over that cause itself. The mind is invested by nature with all its properties and essences, and these it will possess, and manifest, and maintain, let men think, and speak, and write what they will concerning its substance. If the Author of nature has invested the mind with the quality of endless existence, it will, to a certainty, flourish in immortal youth, in spite of every appearance of premature decay. If, on the other hand, nature has limited its existence to this pass-

ing scene, and decreed that it shall perish for ever when the animating principle passes from the body, then all our conjectures, arguments, discussions, and assertions respecting its immortality, will not add one day to its existence. The opinions of man, therefore, concerning the substance of the mind, can have no influence whatever in changing or modifying that substance itself; and if so, as little can these opinions undermine the constitution of the mind, or its relations to time and eternity, on which, as their foundations, morality and religion must and do rest as on an immutable basis. According to our view, morality and natural religion originate in and emanate from the primitive constitution of the mental powers themselves. Innumerable observations have proved, that faculties and organs of Benevolence, Hope, Veneration, Justice, and Reflection exist. Now, our believing that the mind will die with the body will not pluck these sentiments and powers from the soul; nor will our believing the mind to be immortal implant a single one more of them in our constitution. They would all remain the same in functions and constitution, and render virtue amiable and vice odious, although we should believe the mind to be made of dust, just as they would do were we to believe it to be a more immediate emanation from the Deity himself.

In short, therefore, this question of materialism has appeared to us one of the most vain, trivial, and uninteresting that ever engaged the human intellect; and nothing, in our opinion, can be more unphilosophical and more truly detrimental to the interests of morality and religion, than the unfounded clamour, or cant, shall we call it, which has been poured forth from the periodical journals about the dangers attending it. A manly intellect, instead of bowing before prejudice, would dissipate it by shewing that the question is altogether an illusion, and that, adopt what opinion we will concerning the substance of the mind, every attribute belonging to it must remain unaltered and unimpeached.

But not to stop in our investigation till we have reached the goal, we may inquire, whether it be possible to discover

the substance of which the mind is composed, whether it be material or immaterial? Previous to doing so, however, we ought to endeavour to ascertain what means we possess of arriving at a knowledge of the essence of the mind. All our knowledge must be derived either from consciousness or observation. Now, by reflecting on what we feel, we discover nothing concerning the nature or essence of the thinking being. We do not feel a spiritual substance stirring about within us, and elaborating sentiment and thought; and neither do we feel a *material substance* producing those effects. We are conscious only of feelings and emotions, of friendships and attachments, of high conceptions and glorious thoughts; but whether these originate from matter or from spirit; whether the first embryo substance of reflection dwelt lowly in the dust, or soared a pure ethereal essence amid the regions of boundless space, before it was constituted a part of us; whether God, in creating man, was pleased to invest his material organs with the property of thought, or to infuse into him a portion of immaterial fire;—on all these points consciousness gives us no information. A great deal of popular delusion, indeed, has been kept alive on this point, by the fact being overlooked, that we are not conscious of the operations of the brain. Men in general, because they are sensible only of thought and feeling, and not of the movements of any material organ performing these acts of the mind, imagine that it is necessarily an immaterial substance which is thinking and feeling within them; but they are equally unconscious of the contraction and relaxation of the muscles, and they might as well imagine that their arms and legs are moved, not by material organs, but by the direct impulse of spirit, as entertain the supposition in question. In short, the truly philosophical conclusion is, that by means of consciousness we are unable to discover of what substance the thinking principle is composed.

Does observation, then, throw a stronger and a steadier light upon this long-agitated question? The mental organs, while in health, and in the natural state in which their func-

tions are most perfectly performed, are completely hid from inspection. No eye can penetrate the integuments of the head, and the tables of the skull, and the *dura mater*, and the *pia mater*, to obtain a view of the operations performed in the brain, while the thoughts run high, and the sentiments swell with emotion ; and when external injury or disease removes these coverings, the mind does not then disport in all the vigour of its healthy action ; besides, even when all these external obstacles to inspection are removed, still it is only the surface of the convolutions which is perceived, and the soul may be enthroned in the long fibres which extend from the surface to the *medulla oblongata*, or thought may be elaborated there, and still evade detection. It will be said, however, that death will solve the question, and allow the whole secrets of the soul to be disclosed ; but, alas ! when the pulse has ceased to beat, and the lungs have ceased to play, the brain presents nothing to our contemplation, but an inert mass, of a soft and fibrous texture, in which no thought can be discerned, and no sentiment can be perceived, and in which also no spirit or immaterial substance can be traced ; so that from inspecting it imagination receives no food for conjecture as to the presence or absence of an immaterial guest when life and health animated its folds.

Observation, therefore, reveals as little in regard to the substance of the mind as does reflection on consciousness ; and as no other modes of arriving at certain knowledge are open to man, the solution of the question appears to be placed completely beyond his reach. In short, to use an observation of Dr Spurzheim, nature has given man faculties fitted to observe phenomena as they at present exist, and the relations subsisting between them, but has denied to him powers fitted to discover, as a matter of direct perception, either the beginning or the end, or the essence of any thing under the sun ; and we may amuse our imaginations with conjectures, but will never arrive at truth when we stray into these interdicted regions.

The solution of this question, therefore, is not only unim-

portant, but it is impossible; and this leads us to observe, that no idea can be more erroneous than that which supposes the dignity and future destiny of man as an immortal being to depend, of necessity, on the substance of which he is made. The great Creator has formed man such as he exists, and endowed him with all his powers; and what intellect is so grovelling as to suppose that the Omnipotent cannot, if such be his will, restore consciousness to the scattered atoms of the human body, or call up from the dust, and invest with the splendours of a blessed immortality, a frame which His power first called into being, and which His arm sustains and preserves every moment while it lives? Matter and spirit are alike to Him; and equally plastic to His will; and we may rest assured, that be the thinking principle matter, or be it spirit, it is of that substance, and endowed with those attributes which most perfectly fit it to fulfil the destinies which await it by His eternal decrees. We agree, therefore, with Philostratus, that "the only genuine result of metaphysical speculation is to convince us of our inability to penetrate, by the light of human science, beyond the objects of our senses, in their various relations;" only we would to senses add "the understanding," as an additional source of legitimate information.

It may be asked, however, since all access is thus denied to the discovery of the substance of which the mind is made, whether all light is withheld *by nature*, independently of revelation, respecting the mortality or immortality of man? By no means. From contemplating the powers of the mind itself, and the relations which they bear to this world and to hereafter, we may draw conclusions possessing a high degree of probability concerning the object of man's creation. When we find phrenology demonstrating the existence in the human mind of a faculty of Veneration, which longs to know intimately a God whom it may worship; a faculty of Hope soaring beyond the boundaries of time, and expatiating in the fields of an eternity to come, as its dwelling place; a faculty of Conscientiousness, desiring to see virtue crowned with its just

reward; a faculty of Benevolence longing to contemplate happiness diffused as widely as space extends, and as endless in duration as eternity; and Intellectual Powers insatiable in their desires to discover and to contemplate the wonders of creation; in short, faculties all pointing to a future and a higher state of being, as the aim and the object of their existence, we may infer that this world is not the scene in which are to close for ever the destinies of man. Aside from revelation, it is from sources such as these, from the constitution of the mind itself, and its relations to objects present and to come, that its ultimate destiny must be inferred, by the *understanding*, although not as an object of sense; and if we regard these with an enlightened desire of arriving at sound conclusions, we shall find much presumptive evidence that man is destined for immortality.

We are led to entertain these views, not only from believing them to be well-founded, but by perceiving the absurd embarrassments into which those persons have brought themselves and the cause of religion, who imagined that they could shew by fact and argument, that the substance of the mind is immaterial, and who founded on this supposed demonstration the chief philosophical reason for holding it to be immortal. Mr Rennell, while he admits that immateriality does not necessarily imply immortality, attempts to shew that the mind in this world manifests its powers independently of organization, and undertakes this task in defence of religion! But so far from being successful, he, and those who aid him, have been visited with the most signal failures in their endeavours. The plainest dictates of common sense stand opposed to such a notion as theirs. If the eye has been designed by the Creator to serve as the organ of vision, we may rest assured that no man, in a natural state, ever saw without such an apparatus; and, in like manner, if by the fiat of God, the brain has been made necessary to the mind as an organ by which it may carry on its daily intercourse with the world, we may safely infer that it can no more dispense with this instrument on particular occasions,

(when no miracle is present), and act directly as an immaterial substance on external matter, than it can see independently of optic nerves. If, then, it be sound philosophy to conclude, that as nature has rendered organs necessary to the mind in this life, no mental acts can be performed here without them, what are we to think of an attempt to prove that the mind does act in this life independently of organs, and to found on the issue of this attempt, the main philosophical argument in favour of its immortality? It must necessarily be sophistical and unsuccessful; and the enemies of religion, seeing the fallacy of the argument, proclaim the weakness of the cause which it was adduced to support, when, in fact, the cause was independent of its aid, which was offered only by an indiscreet ally. The propriety of these remarks will become apparent, by observing the result of Mr Rennell's attempt to prove the immateriality of the mind by facts and reasonings. This gentleman is writing in opposition to Mr Lawrence, Sir C. Morgan, and others, advocates of the doctrines of materialism; he displays great talent and sincere earnestness in his endeavours to refute them, and wherever his premises are sound he is successful; but when he enters upon the line of argument to shew that the mind sometimes acts in this world independently of organs, his whole conclusions are puerile and unsatisfactory.

To give the reader a clear idea of the real nature and value of his arguments, we may mention, that Mr Lawrence, whom Mr Rennell is combating, had said that "medullary matter thinks;" or, in other words, that the brain is the mind. Now, according to the principles which have been laid down here, two answers to this assertion naturally suggest themselves: First, Mr Lawrence might have been called upon to *prove* his assertion, or shew by evidence, that, *de facto*, there is not and cannot be any principle, which we call mind, added to, or in connexion with the brain, which may really be the being which thinks, and which uses the brain only as an instrument for communicating with the material world. If he had been called upon to prove this

point, how could he have done so? Dissection, as we have said, does not shew that it is the brain which thinks, and reflection on consciousness does not reveal this fact either, and no other mode of proof remains. Philostratus, for Mr Lawrence, has answered, that he can shew an affection of the brain taking place in correspondence with every mental act, and that every disturbance of the organ affects the mental manifestations, and argues that, from the concomitance of these circumstances, he is entitled to conclude that the brain is the *cause* of the *mental* phenomena. His own words are, "to particular organisms we invariably see particular functions connected, during a certain progress which the animal machine makes through growth, maturity, and decay, to eventual dissolution. The vital energies, as well as the intellectual, keep pace with the progress of the organic machine, and are, to all appearance, destroyed with it. As we have never become acquainted with either the living or the intelligent principle unconnected with organization, so we have no philosophical reason to regard them as separate existences. They may be properties of peculiarly constructed matter." This conclusion, however, does not necessarily follow. The notes of a violin cannot be produced without an instrument, and every note may be proved to be accompanied by a corresponding affection of the violin, but this does not prove that the instrument itself produces them. The musician cannot produce the note without the intervention of the violin, but he is altogether distinct from *it*. In like manner, it may be impossible for the mind to manifest a single feeling or thought without a corresponding affection of the brain, and still the mind may, like the musician, only use the brain as its medium of communication with the world. Philostratus's conclusion, therefore, does not *necessarily* follow from his premises; and by demonstrating that he cannot possibly possess any other, we shew that neither he nor any one can prove that, *de facto*, medullary matter thinks. He may *infer* this to be the case, but the inference is only a conjecture concerning a point which he is incapable

of proving, and the opposite conjecture, that medullary matter does *not think*, but is only the instrument of thought, is at least as *sound* and as *well supported* as his.

The second answer that might be given to him on the principles now laid down is this. Allow to him, for the sake of argument, that medullary matter *does think*, what then? Here, in our opinion, the great error of the friends of religion lies, in admitting, as they generally do, that if the mind be material, man must *necessarily* be neither immortal nor responsible, consequences which appear to us to be altogether illogical, and not deducible from the premises. Let us allow to the materialist, for the sake of argument, that the brain does think, what then? If in fact it does so, it must be the best possible substance for thinking, just because the Creator selected it for the purpose, and endowed it with this property. In this argument the religious constantly forget that the same Omnipotent hand made the brain that created the mind, and the universe itself, and that in the dedication of every cerebral convolution to its objects, be they thinking or any other process, the divine wisdom is as certainly exercised, as in impressing motion on the planets, or infusing light and heat into the sun. If, therefore, *de facto*, God has made the brain to think, we may rest assured that it is exquisitely and perfectly adapted for this purpose, and that His objects in creating man will not be defeated on account of His having chosen a *wrong substance* out of which to constitute the thinking principle. But what *are* His objects in creating man? This brings us to the jet of the question at once. Mr Lawrence, it is said, founds no moral doctrine on his opinions regarding the substance of the mind; but other materialists, who make these opinions the foundation of atheism, wish us to believe that the best evidence of the Divine intention in creating the human soul is to be found in discovering the *substance* of which it is made; and they insinuate, that if it is constituted of a very refined and dignified substance, the conclusion necessarily follows, that it is intended for magnificent destinies, while, if it

is composed of a rude and vulgar material, it must be intended only to crawl on this filthy world. Here, however, sense and logic equally fail them; for no principle in philosophy is more certain than that *we cannot infer* from a knowledge of the mere substance of any thing for what ends it is fitted. Exhibit to a human being every variety of imaginable essence, and if you allow him to know no more of its properties than he can discover from examining its constituent parts, he will be utterly incapable of telling whether it is calculated to endure for a day or to last to eternity. The materialist, therefore, is not entitled, even from the supposed admission that medullary matter thinks, to conclude that man is not immortal and responsible. The true way of discovering for what end man has been created, is to look to the *qualities* with which he has been endowed, trusting that the substance of which he is composed is perfectly suited to the objects of his creation. Now, when we look to the qualities with which man is endowed, we find the thinking principle in him to differ not only in *degree* but in *kind* from that of the lower animals. The latter have no faculty of Justice to indicate to them that the unrestrained manifestation of destructiveness or acquisitiveness is wrong; they have no sentiment of Veneration to prompt them to seek a God whom they may adore; they have no faculty of Hope, pointing out futurity as an object of ceaseless anxiety and contemplation, and leading them to desire a life beyond the grave; and we affirm it as an undeniable fact, that the convolutions of the brain, which in man form the organs of these sentiments, do not exist in the lower animals. Those organs also, which in man serve to manifest the faculties of Reflection, are, in the lower animals, eminently deficient, and their understanding, in exact correspondence with this fact, is so limited as to be satisfied with little knowledge, and to be insensible to the comprehensive design and glories of creation. Man, then, being endowed with qualities which are denied to the lower creatures, we are entitled, by a legitimate exercise of *reflection*, the subject being beyond the region of the external

senses, to conclude, on principles truly philosophical, that he is destined for other and higher objects than they are, whatever be the *substance* of which his mind is constituted, just as we infer from perceiving weights, wheels, and a pendulum combined, that a clock is intended to measure time, whether the structure be of wood, brass, or any other metal. The properties of things indicate the objects for which they are intended, better than the substance employed in producing them. Man may err in choosing a substance not calculated to answer his designs, and he may construct a piece of mechanism of timber which would have been more appropriately constituted of iron; but God cannot commit such mistakes; and when we see His purposes in creating man clearly indicated in the faculties with which we are endowed, it appears to us to be downright absurdity, and even profanity, to dispute whether the Creator has chosen a fit essence of which to create us, and to fear that His objects may be defeated by His having selected too frail and perishable a material for constituting our thinking principle.

While then we agree with Philostratus, that no legitimate inference concerning the ultimate destiny of man can be drawn from inquiries into the substance of which his mind is composed, we dissent explicitly from the conclusion that the discoveries of revelation in regard to the immortality of the soul are not capable of receiving any support by correct inductions from natural phenomena. They do not indeed *require* such aid; but as revelation proceeds from the Divine mind, it must harmonize with all His other works; and it is at once logical and useful to point out, as phrenology truly does, the existence of such *natural* principles in the mind of man, as coincide with the doctrines of revelation, and render his revealed destiny in itself a matter of high probability.

But to proceed; let us compare the foregoing answers, which might be given to the materialist, who pushes his conclusions to the extreme above alluded to, with those furnished by Mr Rennell. This gentleman endeavours to prove that the mind is independent of matter in this life, and ad-

duces, as evidence of his proposition, the following circumstances, which, it will be observed, all relate to the *present state of existence*, and are intended to shew that the mind in this world may, and occasionally does, act independently of organs.

“Let us take,” says he, “a healthy man in sound sleep. He lies without sense or feeling, yet no part of his frame is diseased, nor is a single power of his life of vegetation suspended. *All within his body is as active as ever.* The blood circulates as regularly, and almost as rapidly, in the sleeping as in the waking subject. Digestion, secretion, nutrition, and all the functions of the life of vegetation proceed, and yet the understanding is absent. *Sleep, therefore, is an affection of the mind rather than of the body,* and the refreshment which the latter receives from it is from the suspension of its active and agitating principle. Now, if thought was identified with the brain, when the former was suspended, the latter would undergo a proportionate change. Memory, imagination, perception, and all the stupendous powers of the human intellect, *are absent, and yet the brain is precisely the same,—the same in every particle of matter—the same in every animal function.* *Of not a single organ is the action suspended.* When again the man awakens, and his senses return, *no change* is produced by the recovery,—the brain, the organs of sense, and all the material parts of his frame, remain *precisely in the same condition.*” P. 92.

Before proceeding to analyze this passage, we beg to state, that what we condemn in Mr Rennell is the impolicy of first holding out the essence of thought as a matter ascertainable at all by our faculties, and representing it as of importance to religion, and thereafter endeavouring to arrive at this knowledge by a line of argument altogether unfounded. In the selection of his arguments there is the greatest want of judgment; for if the opponents succeed in exposing their absurdity, they immediately proclaim a triumph over the whole doctrine which they were adduced to support; and yet nothing is more easy than to prove the puerility of the statements here founded on in support of the mind's independence of matter in this life. “Sleep,” says Mr Rennell, “is an affection of the mind rather than of the body.” If this be so, we may ask, in the first place, what notion are we to form of an immortal and immaterial essence, which

requires to lay aside its powers for a great part of the time of its existence, and to pass into a state of utter oblivion for many hours out of every day? If it be so frail, and liable to such long suspensions, we may reasonably fear its utter extinction, amid the wreck of matter and the crash of worlds. But, in the second place, if sleep be an affection of the mind rather than of the body, how should it happen that the physician, by administering opium, should be able to produce it? or why should the stimulus of green tea, or the high delirium of a fever, drive it far from the eyelids? The assertion again, that when the man awakes, *no change in the condition of the brain* takes place, is also unfounded. In passing from the state of sleep to that of watching, we feel such sensations in the head as lead us, after we know the purposes of the brain, irresistibly to infer that a new condition—that of activity, is induced upon it in waking. To remove the drowsiness and confusion which succeed recovery from inebriation, some men wrap a cloth wet with cold water round the head, and it is known to restore and invigorate the activity of their mental powers; and does this fact correspond with the notion that sleep and drowsiness are affections of the mind rather than of the body? Who ever heard of an immaterial spirit having its suspended energies restored by being wrapt in a wet towel! and yet such must be the case, unless sleep is merely an affection of the organs. On this last supposition the action of the cloth is easily accounted for. The organs, being merely a material substance, obey an universal law of animated nature, in receiving an invigorating influence from the application of cold, after relaxation from excessive excitement and too much heat. Mr Rennell, however, proceeds,—

“ In a child of eight years old, the limbs and all other parts
 “ of the body are considerably smaller than in a man arrived
 “ at maturity; hence they are not endowed with the same
 “ strength, nor capable of the same action, as at a more ad-
 “ vanced period. But the weight of the whole brain com-
 “ monly arrives at its maximum at the age of three years,
 “ and all parts of the organ acquire their full dimensions at
 “ the seventh year, after which no alteration takes place du-

“ring the whole life. Such is the result of the investigations of Wenzel, and of others who have given their attention to the anatomy of that organ. Now, if the understanding originated in the brain, why should it not be as perfect at the age of seven years as it is at the age of twenty? The organ in which it resides is equally perfect at both ages. We can account for the difference of bodily strength, at different periods of life, from the organs not having arrived at their full size and maturity, but we cannot account for the distinctions in mental power.” P. 99.

From the clearness and downright honesty of purpose with which Mr Rennell utters these absurdities, we have a very high opinion at least of his conscientiousness. He does not sophisticate, or shew a diffidence of his cause by entrenching himself in the ambiguity of words. He indicates no secretiveness, or concealed consciousness of writing nonsense; so that one is led to treat his errors with indulgence. We merely regret, therefore, that he should have oppressed a good cause by so foolish a defence. He affirms, that “the whole brain commonly arrives at its maximum at the age of three years;” and, in support of this and his other physiological statements, he refers to authorities; but where nature was within his reach, he was not entitled to venture on erroneous assertions, even although they were to be found in some obscure corner of some weak and unknown author. He required only to look at the first child he saw to learn the very erroneous nature of such a statement as the foregoing; or, if he could not depend on his own observation, he required only to go to a hat-shop, and ask whether hats and caps for children of three years of age are made of the same size as those for full-grown men? On the same authority he asserts, that the brain attains its maximum of weight at three years of age. This also is positively incorrect. Again, he states, that “the brain is equally perfect at the age of seven as it is at the age of twenty.” This also is an error which he can scarcely be excused for falling into, in a grave dissertation. He had only to compare the heads of children of the one age with those of men of the other, to see that the brain is far less in size in the former than in the

latter; and every anatomist will tell him, that at seven years the convolutions are not only less in size, but that they are also less in depth than at maturity, and that the anterior lobes of the brain, connected with the intellect, are not so large in proportion to the other parts of this organ at seven years as at twenty-one. Mr Rennell continues,—

“ Every one accustomed to train the youthful mind is well aware that there are certain periods when its intellectual powers, the comprehension, the imagination, the judgment, develop themselves in a manner, and to a degree, which cannot be accounted for upon any external principle.” — “ With the same external advantages of education, and with the same readiness in imbibing knowledge, two different minds will experience this development of power at two different periods of their existence. Yet that there is the slightest possible change in the appearance, the consistency, or any other quality of the brain, at these or any other similar periods, no physiologist will choose to assert.”

So says Mr Rennell. We, on the other hand, do not choose to *assert* any thing on the subject; but we are ready to produce positive evidence, that at this period of mental excitement, the cerebellum, for example, has attained a much larger size in proportion to the brain than it exhibited ten years before, and at this period it is known that the sexual feelings come into activity: in like manner, to shew by positive facts, that, at the age in question, the anterior convolutions of the brain, connected with the intellectual powers, have also attained a much larger development, in point of size, than they possessed before the period of mental excitement commenced; and, on dissection, we are able to shew, that the whole texture of the brain is firmer and more completely organized than in the early years of infancy, when the substance is pulpy, and the convolutions are very imperfectly unfolded. If, therefore, the doctrine of immortality were to rest on such arguments as these, it would stand upon a frail foundation indeed.

To prevent misapprehension on this very important subject, we beg to repeat, in a few words, the substance of the doctrine now delivered.

1st, It appears to us that we know nothing whatever concerning the *substance* of the mind, that our faculties are not fitted to find it out, and, therefore, that it is mere self-delusion to pretend, either by observation or reasoning, to determine its essence. All discussion on this subject is, in our opinion, equally idle and vain, as that between the nominalists and realists, which now appears to the world as a piece of childish absurdity, altogether unworthy of full-grown men. In like manner we anticipate that posterity will regard the angry dissensions of the present generation, about the substance of the mind, as equally ridiculous; and that they will form the reproach of our day, as the other disputes now alluded to, adhere as a stigma to a preceding generation.

2dly, That this ignorance is fraught with no evil consequence to the interests of individuals or of society; because, on the principles of a sound philosophy, there is no perceptible connexion betwixt the *substance* of the mind and its future destiny.

3dly, That while the interests of individuals and society are not in the least concerned in the *substance* of the mind, they are deeply involved in the question of its *immortality*; but that the real evidence of its being destined for a future existence, so far as this can be derived from philosophy, is to be found in the aim of the faculties with which it is endowed, and in the relations which they bear to time and to eternity, and not in the discovery of the essence of which it is composed.

Before concluding, we have still a few words to address to each of the authors before us, on other points than the question of materialism. The great object of Mr Rennell's publication was scepticism, connected with the subjects of organization and life. In a note on "the System of Gall and Spurzheim," he says, "*It must certainly be allowed, that this system does not, of logical necessity, terminate in materialism.*" So we also think; but if this was the case, phrenology clearly lay out of the path of Mr Rennell; and

when he proceeded, nevertheless, to state that this system, "however ingenious or amusing in theory it may be, is annihilated by the commonest references to fact;" when he talked of "the flimsy theories of these German illu-
 "minati," and of their "absurdities," and of "this master-
 "piece of empiricism," all without understanding one word of the subject, he acted very unlike a Christian, and very unlike a philosopher. If it was necessary to the success of his argument to attack phrenology, he was bound, by every consideration of common sense, as well as by a regard to his own reputation, before doing so, to study and endeavour to comprehend it; if, on the other hand, which he admits to be the case, it did not necessarily obtrude itself into his discussions, he was, if possible, more strongly called upon to understand it and treat it fairly; for, in assailing it without necessity and without provocation, he came forward as a knight errant to the combat; and a knight should be courteous and honourable as well as brave. Yet, so far from being acquainted with the science, he betrays the most palpable ignorance of its very elements. "Certainly," says he, "of the parts specified by Gall and Spurzheim, *every one has in its turn been found wanting*, without any deficiency in that *intellectual* faculty, which they would represent it either to produce or to sustain." In the phrenological system, not one-third part of the brain is represented as being in connexion with the *intellectual faculties*; and we defy Mr Rennell to point out a single authenticated case, in which the organs on both sides of the brain, which are really stated as related to these powers, have been found wanting, without any deficiency of the intellectual faculties occurring, and we shall at once yield to him the palm of victory. Two-thirds of the brain are stated in phrenology as constituting the organs of propensities and sentiments, and many cases are on record in which these parts were injured, without the organs of intellect being affected, and in which, in exact correspondence with the latter fact, the in-

intellectual faculties were not impaired. Mr Rennell appears not to have been aware that, in the system in question, this large portion of the brain is represented as appertaining to the propensities and sentiments; and, in consequence, when he read of an injury of *any part* of the brain having occurred without *intellectual* derangement, he imagined that phrenology was overthrown!—Such cases, on the contrary, indirectly support it, for they are explicable upon the principles of this science, while they are at variance with every hypothesis which considers the whole brain as the single organ of mind. The public have been egregiously misled in regard to the real bearing upon phrenology, of the recorded cases of injuries of the brain as affecting the mental powers; and we refer Mr Rennell to an inquiry into this subject, by Mr Andrew Combe, published in the Transactions of the Phrenological Society, to enable him to manage his next attack upon phrenology with greater success.

In the next place, if respect to philosophy and to his own reputation did not prompt Mr R. to study phrenology before attacking it, regard to the sacred cause of religion, of which he is the advocate, ought to have led him not only to do so, but to make himself *extremely certain* that it *was unfounded*, before he connected an assault upon it with the holiest and most sacred of causes. It has been the misfortune of religion, in all ages, to be used, by indiscreet votaries, as a weapon with which to assail the most brilliant and useful discoveries in philosophy; by which conduct the profane have been furnished with plausible, though unfair pretences for representing the two as naturally hostile. The founders of phrenology, and all its supporters, proclaimed from the beginning, that it is an *inductive science*; and Mr Rennell is too acute and too learned, not to know, that, if this character truly belong to it, an ultimate triumph as certainly awaits it, as if all the schools of Europe had already pronounced it to be founded in nature. It was indiscreet in him, therefore, so far to condemn the intellect and honesty of the phrenolo-

gists, as to give way to the popular clamour of the day, and *assume* the system to be absurd without inquiry, and upon this most flimsy and unstable foundation to enter religion on the field against it. Did it not occur to the reverend advocate, that if, peradventure, phrenology were true, he was subjecting his own cause to a most unnecessary embarrassment? Imagine phrenology to be admitted, which must speedily be the case, the enemies of religion may then turn round and maintain that the Christian Revelation must be a fable, because Mr Rennell, its advocate, has testified, that a science subsequently established on incontestable evidence, stands directly opposed to its doctrines! It will be impossible to demolish phrenology, if it rest, as it does, on physical facts; and as religion also is impregnable, some future advocate will be constrained to sacrifice Mr Rennell at the shrine of the two to reconcile them;—and this has always been the case. The indiscreet votary has uniformly been discovered to have been the only real enemy to the sacred cause; and the discredit which ultimately overtakes him, is nothing more than a just retribution for his retarding the progress of truth, and setting philosophy and religion, which God has conjoined, in hostile array against each other. We make these observations in the most serious and candid spirit; and if there be any Christian whom this controversy may excite to publish his sentiments, we warn him, as he values the progress of the faith to which he is attached, not slightly to represent it as standing in opposition to the system which we defend; for we assure him, (and *we*, at least, have experience and knowledge on our side,) that phrenology is an irresistible and impregnable body of truth, and that all opinions which really stand opposed to it *must*, in time, be levelled in the dust. The Christian religion, in our humble apprehension, is strongly supported by it, so far as philosophy is capable at all of bearing upon its doctrines; and we shall take a subsequent opportunity of shewing this; but, in the meantime, we repeat, that whoever shall indiscreetly attempt to represent the two as inconsistent, will do a temporary injury to both,

and ultimately bring lasting discredit upon himself. Phrenology, indeed, and we speak advisedly, will, in time, be perceived to be an instrument of analysis in morals, ethics, and political economy, of so vast a power, that the scoffing fribbles of the day are incapable of conceiving its magnitude; and after it is firmly established, there are few opinions against which it will not be directed as a mighty engine of expiscation, and while all which are true will come forth from the ordeal shining with redoubled brilliancy and beauty, those which are false will be melted away under its application.

To Philostratus we now address a few words. We perceive that he is a phrenologist, fairly initiated in the doctrine, and aware, at least, of its truth, if not of all its importance; but we regret to be obliged to add, that, in the present publication, he has acted uncandidly towards religion, and not quite fairly towards phrenology. We agree with him in holding, that physiology affords no proper basis on which to found the doctrines of Christianity, and that those who joined in the clamour against Mr Lawrence manifested more zeal for religion than knowledge of its true interests; but we reprobate as not only irrelevant and puerile, but as positively mischievous, the author's identification of the *dogmas*, as he calls them, of any *church*, more especially of the church of Rome, with the *truths* of Revelation. If he had avowed himself a Roman Catholic, he would have been more excusable, but clearly he is not of this persuasion, and therefore can be held only to sneer at the foundations of the Christian faith, when he places them emphatically within the pale of the Romish church. He blames the authors against whom he writes, theologians and physiologists, for trespassing on each other's department, *hinc inde*; and what does *he* do when he presumes to embody the Christian Revelation in the perversions of it by the church of Rome? Had he been wise, he would have seen that this very course impairs the *moral* effect of his whole argument. If he had confined himself to the simple and sublime truth of the Christian Revelation, that the soul is immortal, and argued that no physio-

logical facts either add to the evidence of Revelation on this point, or shake its validity, he would have been unanswerable. We have followed this course, putting churches, with all their peculiarities, out of the question, and we are not afraid of a refutation of our argument.

In the next place, the author travels quite out of his way to make a silly and irrelevant, and apparently spiteful attack upon Paley, who, for any thing physiology or phrenology shews to the contrary, might have been "a great eater," and "sound reasoner" at the same time. He says,

"The anatomical theologian, Paley, was another writer who tried to establish spiritual things on the basis of physical proof. I shall let his bad anatomy alone, and proceed to take a single instance of the character of his reasoning from his proof of a God. He says something to the following effect:—'If I find a watch, and examine its curious workmanship, I infer a watchmaker, and that he was an ingenious mechanic. In like manner, in contemplating the wonderful mechanism of the universe, I am led to believe in an Omnipotent Artificer.' To me this appears false reasoning,—for, when I infer the existence of a watchmaker from the appearance of a watch, it is because I have beforehand found by experience that such instruments were made by watchmakers. But by what previous experiment can I have discovered that the worlds were made by God?"

Paley's reasoning appears to us to be perfectly just, and this author's to be erroneous; and, as he is a phrenologist, we shall give him an example of the application of the science to this present question, both to maintain our own views and to illustrate the value of the system as an instrument of moral analysis and reasoning.

The author speaks of "our inability to penetrate, by the light of human science, *beyond the objects of our senses* in their various relations;" and maintains, that "in contemplating this constant order of appearances (in nature), as the links of the great chain pass before us, we lose sight of the great cause of the whole; and we should inevitably be lulled into a belief that the material atoms of the universe contained within themselves the necessary causes of their own phenomena, were it not for the doctrine taught

“ us from our infancy, that there existed a spiritual being “ who had caused and who maintained the whole.” The notion, that the human mind can form no ideas except what are referable to the external senses as their immediate origin, is of French extraction, and as Mr Stewart has shewn in the preliminary dissertation to the Encyclopedia, is generally founded on a misapprehension of the doctrine of Locke.— Phrenology demonstrates its untruth : for while it shews, that by the aid of the external senses, and the *knowing* faculties and organs, the mind perceives existing *objects and events*, it demonstrates farther, that by means of a higher order of powers, those of *Causality* and *Comparison*, it obtains ideas of *causation*, and *infers the existence of causes from contemplating their effects* ; acquiring, in this manner, an important class of notions, of which the senses are totally unfit to take cognizance, and of which they are not the immediate source. Phrenology farther reveals, that individuals who possess the former organs largely developed, and are deficient in the latter, perceive *sequence* in events, but do not at all, or at least very imperfectly, perceive *causation*. Hence such persons speak constantly of the *evidence of their senses*, as the ultimate source of all their knowledge ; and because they cannot *see* causes with their *eyes*, disbelieve in causation and a God ; and, taking their own minds as standards of those of the human race, they absurdly imagine that all the higher perceptions familiar to those who possess a greater development of *Causality* and *Comparison* are *pure imaginations*. They thus erect themselves into great philosophers on the strength of their natural deficiency in intellectual power, and imagine themselves to be profound when they are only silly. We make these remarks from observation ; for we have observed persons who are liable to scepticism in regard to the existence of a God to be commonly deficient in the organs of *Causality*, and equally incapable of tracing abstract relations in general, as in perceiving causation in this particular instance. If, then, a watch, or the stupendous operations of nature in the universe, were presented to *such*

persons, they would indeed see a succession of phenomena : but from the weakness of Causality they would be unable to infer any thing farther. Hence, *independently of experience*, such persons cannot mount a single step in the chain of causation. It is quite true, therefore, that it is only "because" *they* have beforehand found by experience that time-pieces "are made by watchmakers" that they infer, on seeing such an instrument, that an intelligent being made it. But their error consists in supposing, that no other minds could accomplish more. The faculty of Causality perceives *intuitively* the relation of cause and effect just as Individuality intuitively perceives existence ; and experience is no more requisite to enable the former to infer intelligence and design from the survey of contrivance, than to enable the latter to apprehend the presence of external objects from perceiving them. An individual possessing Causality in a high degree, could not fail, independently of all experience of the existence of watchmakers, to infer, after comprehending the object of a watch, and understanding the contrivances and adaptation of parts, by which it is fitted to accomplish its ends, that it was the production of an intelligent being. He could not indeed, without such experience, infer that it was made by the particular class of tradesmen named by society watchmakers, because this trade is artificial ; but he would unquestionably be led, by the intuitive operation of Causality, to conclude, that the machine was the product of a mind willing to attain the end in view, and possessing the power to accomplish it. In like manner, after comprehending the constitution of the universe, a mind sufficiently endowed with this faculty, by its natural instinct alone, would infer the existence of an intelligent cause, willing the production of the results, and possessing power to bring them about.

This is the doctrine also of that excellent metaphysician, Dr Thomas Brown. "Those," says he, "whom a single organized being, or even a single organ, such as the eye, the ear, the hand, does not convince of the being of a God,—who do not see him, not more in the social order of

“ human society, than in a single instinct of animals, producing unconsciously, a result that is necessary for their continued existence, and yet a result which they cannot have foreknown,—will not see him in all the innumerable instances that might be crowded together by philosophers and theologians.” (IV. p. 417.) That is to say, those individuals who possess a good endowment of Causality will intuitively perceive, in a single organized being, the traces of a God; while those who are greatly deficient in this faculty will not, by the spontaneous operations of their own minds, be led to infer the existence of a Creator, even from the most numerous exhibitions of his wisdom and power;—the latter see only *sequence* in events,—the former, in addition to *sequence*, perceive *the relation* of Cause and Effect. Of a person endowed with much Causality, compared with those greatly deficient, it may be truly said,—

“ He sees with other eyes than theirs.—Where they
Behold a *sun*, he views a Deity :
What makes them only *smile*, makes him *adore*.”

Atheism is more prevalent in France than in England, and the organs of Causality are decidedly smaller in the French head in general than in the English; and a corresponding deficiency in the moral and political sciences, to the successful prosecution of which Causality is indispensable, has long characterized the literature of France. The splendid development of the upper part of the forehead observable in the ancient busts of Socrates, Plato, Seneca, and Cicero, coincides with the explanation now given. Such an endowment of the reflecting organs enabled these illustrious men strongly to perceive the traces of a Divine Being in the works of creation, and in consequence there is a beautiful harmony in their conclusions on the subject. In the forehead of some tribes of American Indians and Africans, on the other hand, the upper part, where these organs are situated, is generally “villanously low;” and travellers have asserted, that some of them form no conceptions of the existence of a Supreme First Cause. In short, we have never met with an instance of a

person in whom the organs of the moral sentiments, and of Causality and Comparison were highly developed, who did not reckon the evidence of the existence of God, from mere intuitive induction, as irresistible as the perception that light emanates from the sun. On every principle of philosophy the perceptions of minds so endowed are of higher authority than those of other minds deficient in these powers, and hence it is more reasonable for men of limited understanding to believe in a God, on the authority of such individuals, than to deny his existence, because their own intellects are incapable of grasping the proofs. These views coincide also with the opinions of Mr Hume, an author who will not be suspected of too strong a tendency to credulity on matters of religion. "A purpose," says he, "an intention, a design is evident in every thing; and when *our comprehension is so far enlarged* as to contemplate the first rise of this visible system, we must adopt, *with the strongest conviction*, the idea of some intelligent cause or author."—"The universal propensity to believe in invisible—intelligent power, if not an original instinct, being at least *a general attendant of human nature*, may be considered as a kind of mark or stamp, which the Divine Workman has set upon his work; and nothing surely can more dignify mankind, than to be thus selected from all other parts of creation,* and to bear the image or impression of the Universal Creator."—"What a noble privilege is it of human reason to attain the knowledge of the Supreme Being; and, from the visible works of nature, be enabled to infer so sublime a principle as its Supreme Creator!"—(*The Natural History of Religion*, § 15.)

Finally, This author states, that he believes that the "very consciousness of a distinct being is itself dependent on the activity of some material and cerebral instrument; perhaps connected with the common centre of sensation. For,

* The observation in the text is literally correct. Those parts of the brain which in man constitute the organs of Veneration and Causality, are not to be found in the lower animals.

“ strange as it may appear to those who are unacquainted
 “ with forms of insanity, this belief of our individual exist-
 “ ence, this very power of discriminating between ourselves
 “ and the surrounding world, is weakened, and nearly de-
 “ stroyed in particular cases of hepatic irritation and cere-
 “ bral disorder, just as other powers of the mind are, of
 “ which I have given examples in the following inquiry :”
 A similar conclusion, namely, that consciousness of personal
 identity is connected with (we do not say dependent on) a
 particular portion of the brain, has forced itself upon our
 minds as matter of inference, from facts analogous to those
 here alluded to ; but at present we cannot hazard a conjecture
 concerning the situation of the organ.

ARTICLE XIV.

*TRANSACTIONS of the PHRENOLOGICAL SOCIETY, with five
 Plates, 8vo. pp. 448. JOHN ANDERSON, Jun. Edinburgh,
 and SIMPKIN & MARSHALL, London.*

THOSE persons who have contentedly remained in ignorance
 of the doctrines of phrenology, on the supposition that they
 are really as unfounded and absurd as they have been gener-
 ally represented, and who have trusted to their sinking into
 oblivion long before such ignorance could become discredit-
 able, will probably be somewhat surprised, and perhaps a
 little alarmed, at the appearance of the volume before us.—
 It contains a list of the names of eighty-seven individuals,
 who, by constituting themselves into a society for the culti-
 vation of phrenology, dare, after examination, to testify to its
 truth. Among the members we find gentlemen of independ-
 ent fortune, clergymen of the established church, lawyers,
 doctors in medicine, surgeons, &c. The volume contains a
 selection from the essays read to the society since its institu-
 tion in 1820, up to the end of the session terminating 1st May

1823, and it shews in what inquiries the phrenologists have been engaged, while the public have been idly laughing at their investigations as absurd.

The Transactions are introduced by a preliminary dissertation by Mr George Combe, in which he gives an historical account of the origin and progress of phrenology, and shews that it is truly the science of mind. He then compares the phrenological mode of investigation by observation with the metaphysical method previously in use, that of reflection on consciousness, and proves the decided superiority of the former. He points out the application of phrenology to the study of mind as a science, and to the business and relations of life, and concludes with a notice of the institution of the society.

“ Impressed with those views of the importance of phrenology,” says he, “ a few individuals of the city of Edinburgh resolved to form themselves into a private society, for the purpose of cultivating the science, and communicating freely to each other their experience and observations on the subject. The project originated with the Rev. David Welsh, minister of Crossmichael, and was carried into effect at a meeting” held at Edinburgh on 22d February 1820. The society was declared public on 28th November 1820, and now presents the world with a specimen of its labours.

Article I. consists of “ Outlines of Phrenology.” It gives a condensed but perspicuous view of the leading doctrines of the science, and an enumeration of the faculties and their organs, illustrated by a plate. The faculty which was formerly named Inhabitiveness is now termed Concentrativeness, and the organ is said to be “ found large in authors and orators who excel in concentration of thought.” A clear distinction is drawn between the effects of SIZE and ACTIVITY in the organs; the want of which has given rise to much difficulty in the study. “ STRENGTH, it is said, is one quality of mind, and ACTIVITY another. A mind may be very powerful, but slow,—or very active, but not remarkable for vigour, or both qualities may be combined. Strength depends on the SIZE of the organs;—ACTIVITY may result from constitution and exercise. Hence

“ phrenology affords a measure of strength alone. It indicates whether a man is by nature fitted to feel *strongly* or *feebly*, but does not reveal the *number* of thoughts or feelings which may pass through his mind in a given time.”

Article II. contains “ a View of some of Dr Spurzheim’s Lectures, as delivered at Edinburgh in the Winter of 1816, “ by Dr Poole,” and elucidates a number of elementary points requisite to be attended to in studying the system.— Speaking of Dr Spurzheim, the author says, “ His serene, “ probably because his conscientious reliance on the ultimate “ triumph of truth, supported him against the obstinacy of “ ignorance, and the malevolence of systematic error; and “ to these high endowments, so requisite to the character of “ a philosopher, especially when waging war with established “ creeds, he added a simplicity and a gentleness of manners “ which did not fail to conciliate regard where his reasoning “ and his extensive information were urged seemingly in “ vain.”

Article III. is “ on the Functions of Combativeness, Destructiveness, and Secretiveness, with Illustrations of the “ effects of different Degrees of their Endowment on the “ Characters of Individuals, by Mr William Scott.” This is an exceedingly amusing and interesting paper, and will go far to dissipate the unfounded prejudice that any of the phrenological faculties are necessarily evil. Mr Scott shews, by the most convincing examples, that both combativeness and destructiveness, when under proper control by the intellect and moral sentiments, are not only necessary, but highly useful faculties,—and that without them there could have been no achievements of any kind calculated to attract admiration. The account of SECRETIVENESS also is very interesting, and it is illustrated by selections and interesting quotations from Shakspeare, which admirably elucidate the nature of the faculty. The author also gives an analysis of humour, which is equally new and profound. SECRETIVENESS, in combination with WIT, produces it.

Secretiveness confers that natural archness which consti-

tutes the essence of humour ; by giving the tact of concealment it enables the possessor to exhibit a feigned exterior with all that gravity and apparent unconsciousness which highly gratifies the spectator who sees the deceit.

Article IV. is " on the Effect of Injuries of the Brain upon the Manifestations of the Mind, by Mr Andrew Combe." In this paper the whole cases of injuries of the brain which have been founded on by the opponents of phrenology are minutely analyzed, and the author arrives at the conclusion, that they rather confirm than militate against the science. The greater proportion of the cases, he shews, are so deficient in *precise statement* concerning the real condition of the mental powers, including the *feelings* among these as well as the intellect, and regarding the *particular portions* of the brain affected, that they do not at all bear on the question. The remainder of them are shewn to be easily explicable on, and perfectly consistent with the principle of the brain being a congeries of organs situated in two corresponding hemispheres, while they are absolutely subversive of the notion, that it is a single organ, and that every part of it is employed in manifesting every mental act.

Article IV. contains " Cases of Deficiency in the Power of perceiving Colours." The first is by Dr Butter, who states that Mr Robert Tucker, with eyes capable of perceiving all objects except colour, is yet deficient in this latter power to a remarkable degree, and that the structure of his *eyes* appears sound and complete, while he is very evidently defective in the part of the brain marked in phrenology as the organ of colour. The next case is reported by Mr G. Combe, and is that of Mr James Milne, whose powers of vision are also excellent in every respect, except in the perception of colour, and in whom the organ is also stated to be deficient. The case of Mr Sloane is next given exactly to the same effect ; while masks of David Wilkie, Haydon, and Williams, all eminent painters, are referred to as exhibited to the society, in all of which the organ of colouring is said to be large. Mr Combe also mentions the case of a gentleman, to whom

a painted landscape “ appeared to represent a group of objects on a plain surface, without any perceptible fore or back ground ;” in short, who was able to perceive colour, form, and relative position, but not *perspective* or distance. On contrasting a mask of his face and forehead with masks of Mr Douglas and Mt Gibson, two painters who excel in perspective, the organ of SIZE was discovered to be very deficient in the former gentleman, and very large in the two latter, the difference between the other organs not being remarkable.

Article V. contains “ Notice of a Case in which the Patient suddenly forgot the Use of spoken and written Languages,” by Mr Alexander Hood of Kilmarnock. In the phrenological system there is a faculty and organ of language distinct from the faculties and organs which take cognizance of *things*. In the patient in question, the knowledge of things remained entire, his feelings and understanding were vigorous and sound, and his organs of articulation were unimpaired, and yet he could not communicate his ideas by speech or writing, on account of the entire loss of command over the *words* which express them ; which power he previously possessed in an ordinary degree. The case is extremely interesting, and so minute and circumstantial as to leave no ambiguity concerning the extent of the patient’s loss, and of the powers which were retained ; and it goes far to shew that such a faculty and organ as those of language must exist. It does not prove *directly* where the organ is situated, because the patient recovered, and there was no operation ; but the loss of the mental power had been preceded by a pain in the part of the head above the eye, where the organ is placed in the phrenological busts ; and hence its position is indirectly confirmed. Cases similar to the foregoing, observed by Dr Spurzheim and Dr Gall, are also mentioned, and a notice of several affections of the same kind are quoted from notes of the late Dr Gregory’s lectures, all tending to shew that the power of using artificial signs must be in connexion with a particular part of the brain.

Article VI. is "Remarks on the Cerebral Development of King Robert Bruce, compared with his Character, as appearing from History," by Mr William Scott. It is known that the grave of King Robert Bruce was discovered in the church of Dunfermline, and on November 5, 1819, opened by the Barons of Exchequer, at whose sight a cast of the skull was taken before re-interring the skeleton. Its authenticity is thus beyond question. Mr Scott mentions that it is remarkably large, which circumstance indicates a large brain; and size in the brain corresponds with *power* in the mind, the *kind* of power coinciding with the *direction* in which the brain is largest. In Bruce the organs of the lower propensities are said to have been very large, those of several of the moral sentiments, and of the knowing faculties to have been large, while those of benevolence and justice, and reflection, are mentioned as only moderate in development. Mr Scott enters into a minute analysis of his character, as appearing from history, and shews that it coincides in the most satisfactory manner with his cerebral development, not only in the mental qualities which he possessed, but also in those in which he was deficient. The article throughout is exceedingly entertaining, and displays at once an accurate knowledge of historical details, and that penetration and comprehensiveness of understanding which characterize a philosophical mind. An excellent engraving of Bruce's skull is prefixed.

Article VII. contains a "Report upon the Cast of Miss Clara Fisher," by Mr George Combe. This wonderful child at nine years of age rivalled Kean in playing Richard III., Shylock, Falstaff, and a variety of other characters. Her head appears to be uncommonly large for her years, and the combination of powers which she possesses is analyzed, and shewn to correspond with the lines of acting in which she excels. A beautiful plate of Miss Fisher accompanies the report.

Article VIII. is the "Case of J. G., aged ten Years," by Mr D. Bridges, junior. The subject of this report is an ac-

accomplished rogue of eight years of age, whose evil tendencies were distinctly announced by Mr G. Combe, on an examination of his head, without any previous knowledge of his character. He has been successively under the charge of Mrs Baron Cockburn, Mr Buchanan, one of Dr Chalmers's elders, and Mr Andrew Reston, assistant librarian to the School of Arts in Edinburgh, and who attempted to educate him to virtue without success. Letters from Mr David Waddell, tutor in Mrs Cockburn's family, Dr Chalmers, and Mr Reston, are given in the report, and altogether it is an instructive page of that curious and perplexing volume, human nature. A cast of his head was presented to the Society, and the cerebral organization and dispositions are said completely to correspond. The organ of conscientiousness is remarkably deficient, while that of secretiveness is very large. This is the origin of his duplicity, in which he is a complete adept. The intellectual organs are said to be largely developed, and the most convincing proofs are afforded of his talents being equally powerful; but they have hitherto been directed only to vice. The boy eloped from Mr Reston's house in February last, and has not since been heard of.

Article IX. is "On inferring Natural Dispositions and Talents from Development of Brain." This article contains, *1st*, A case reported by Mr Brian Donkin, in which a cast of the Rev. Mr M. was sent to Mr G. Combe, with information of the education and rank of the original; and he drew out a sketch of his natural talents and dispositions founded on the development of the brain, which was shewn to the friends of the clergyman, and acknowledged as characteristic and correct. An analysis of the *principles* on which the inferences were founded is added by Mr Combe, in which he shews that there is nothing empirical, or of the nature of fortune-telling, in this application of the science, but that it follows as a natural and unavoidable result, if the fundamental propositions of phrenology are founded in nature. *2dly*, A report by Mr Robert Buchanan on the skull of Gordon, who murdered a pedlar boy on Eskdale Muir; *3dly*, A

report by Sir Geo. S. Mackenzie on the skull of Bellingham, the assassin of Mr Perceval; and, *4thly*, A report by Mr G. Combe on the head of Mary Mackinnon, lately executed for the murder of William Howat. The dispositions of these various individuals, which led to their several crimes, are analyzed and compared with the development of their brains, and shewn to correspond. Each of them possesses certain qualities common to the three, and certain other faculties which characterize him or her as an individual; and the development of the organs in each is said to harmonize with this circumstance: the same organ being large in all when all manifested strongly a particular faculty, and the other organs being large or small according as the corresponding mental power was strongly or weakly manifested by the individual. These reports are interesting to all who direct their attention to criminal legislation and the improvement of prison-discipline. They throw light upon that variety of mental constitution which is prone to crime, and elucidate the ultimate causes of vice; without a knowledge of which, measures cannot be adopted upon philosophical principles for the reformation of criminals. In the three heads the organs of the lower propensities bear the same overpowering proportion to those of the intellect and moral sentiments, which we have described, in the present number, as characterizing the heads of murderers in the collection of the Phrenological Society, and in the Museum of Dublin. The mass of brain behind the ear is immense. This article is illustrated by two plates, in one of which the head of the Rev. Mr M. is contrasted with the heads of Mary Mackinnon and David Haggart, and in the other of which representations are given of the skulls of Gordon and Bellingham.

Article X. contains a few brief Observations, by Mr Carmichael of Dublin, on the mode of studying the natural Dispositions and Instincts of the lower Animals in Relation to their Cerebral Development; an object of much interest, but in regard to which little has been yet accomplished.

Article XI. consists of a Phrenological Analysis of some of

the Maxims of Rochefoucault, and affords another instance of the varied and interesting applications of which the true philosophy of mind is susceptible ; and we dare say it is one to which few of our readers thought of seeing phrenology applied.

The XIIth article is an Answer, by Mr Andrew Combe, to Dr Barclay's Objections, contained in his Work on Life and Organization, and which have been referred to by some medical journals as an " admirable " refutation of phrenology, and, as such, recommended to persons who, like us, are so foolish as believe the science to have a foundation in nature. Each objection is treated in detail, and we use the freedom to refer these journalists to the answers, as a modest vindication of our faith, and leave to them, without envy, the whole honour and advantage which Dr Barclay's objections throw into the scale of the opponents. The author of the article proceeds to apply the principles of phrenology to the explanation of many of the phenomena of sound and diseased mind, *with all of which* he shews them to be consistent ; while, on the application of Dr Barclay's theory to the same phenomena, all is found to be contradiction and confusion.

The last article is a novelty in the philosophy of mind. It is an Essay, by Dr George Murray Paterson, on the Phrenology of Hindostan, and contains the result of the actual examination of upwards of 3000 Hindoo heads.

This volume of Transactions contains the first instance of the phenomena of mind, being referred by philosophers, in different parts of the world, to the same primitive faculties ; and it is highly interesting to observe the accordance, at once in principles and conclusions, of observers placed at half the diameter of the globe from each other, and having no means of communication. This fact furnishes a strong presumption of the truth of the principles of phrenology.

give dish notish to de nobilitè, gentrè, savans, artiste, and all de wise, de goot, de beautiful, and de grande of dish city, a city of so much merite, worth, dignitè, and true pretentionsh, —dat I shall intend dish winter to teekel dair imagination, and all in all ashtonish dair faible intellectualite by mine vunderful, novel, and shublime lecturesh, demonshtationsh, and exhibitionsh, in de transhendentale schience of **AKEPHALO-NOOLOGIE**, or vat you call de miud widout de brainsh.

ODER. I vill poblisch von grand programme, in ver well English; derfore I vill not now give no more as a little ex-emplaïre. of my grande capitals, witch deserf to be prent in lettre of goldsh and shilversh and all manner of preshioush shtonesh.

FORST. On mine honesh word, dat is I **BY MYSELF** I vill overturn, culbut, evaporate, and altogeder reduce to noting at all, widout de fatigue of examinationsh, of witch it is all in all unworthy, de doctrine of those execrab, abominab, quacksh, impostorsh, and madmansh, dat call demshelf **Docteur Gall** and **Docteur Spurzheim**. I vill demonshtat, dat de brain has had its day, as all may shee if dey do vill to shee; and dat all men vill not be better, dat is to shay, vill not be no wors, if de brainsh vash remove comfortable outshide, without cheremonish. When I shall fail to convinsh all mine auditeur dat de doctrine and de docteurs are one grande abshurditè, I ondertake to sacrificsh myshelf to de cause of trout; dat is all as one like I vill be broil on one gril, one gridiron, vat is dat you call. On mine honour, ladish and gentlemensh, dish vash not to be no great decept. Der vill be one fire huge for two ox, and one ver big gridiron on it; on witch, after I vash take de tendre congé of mine auditeurssh, I vill retire to reposhe, dat is, I vill lie on it at long length. **Oder.** I vill pairmit any one gentleman not convinshed to refreshe himshelf on de ver big gridiron wid me.

SHECOND. I will exhibit mine demonshtatif, exclusif, and confondatif expairment of de altogeder falshenese of de pretend organsh of phrenologie. I vill take van dozen poor

childsh, and pairmit any gentlemansh or ladi, in preshensh of all de compagnie, to shcope out of all de little childsh headsh, wid an intrument, ver commode witch I did invent for dish purpossh, as many of de pretend organsh of de [brain as dey shall pleash, all as van like de sheesemongair vid his vimble;* after dish operation, de dozen poor childsh vill retain all de facultesh of de mind in de vorld. Oder, I gif mine word to take shix gentlemensh of the compaignie, cleevair men of de metaphhysique, and shix ladish blue, and repeat dish beautiful expairment of shcope out deir organsh, vid de reshult all as like. For I did take van little boy in London, van little boy of much tricksh, who did live by his wits, and did turn him loosh among de compaignie, after I did shcope out de pretend organ of wit, and he did exhibit his talons by de pocket-pick of de whole compaignie. Dish expairment I vill pairform on mine own brainsh, and oder on de pocketsh of mine auditeursh, and gif mine honesh vord dat I did pairform de shame wid ver great shuccesh in all de metropolesh of de known vorld. After lecture, not to enterrompe de shame, all de shcope organsh of de poor childsh, de grande metaphhysiens, de blue ladish, and myneshelf, will be replash, and de headsh vash be all one as dey vash.

IN DE TIED PLASH. I will gif my grande demonsbra-tion of de superfluoushnesse of dat vere inutile pulp de brain.† I vill take tree yonk men, old as ten-seven years, dat did learn one altogeder coursh of logique, and philo-shophie morale, in one much great, regulier, old univershity, shuperannuate and ver celebre. I vill wid my brain-pomp, oder mine own inventionsh, exhaust de altogeder brain, trow de ear, of all de tree yonk men, leaving in eash all as much as one pigeon egg.‡ After wich operation, de shame yonk men vash pairform all de accomplishment of de learned pig, or de big dog Munito. One of the yonk-men vill prononce my lecture of de one two tree day before, all as it vash. An

* A very curious coincidence of illustration in the Edinburgh Review, No 49.

† Ibid, No 49.

‡ Ibid, No 49.

oder will composit a dishcoursh for refute de doctrine of de bompsh on de skull, as much conclusif wid any dat vash yet appear. De tird vill gif answer to all queshtionsh in de grande metaphyshique, dat any wishe gentleman or ver blue ladi vash pleash to try at him, and vill dispute for evermore in pre-shensh of all de compaignie, wid any cleevair gentleman or blue ladi, who shall exposs demshelf on dish transhendental and much diffishile queshtion of de ver learn metaphyshicien, mine own conterman Hermanz Van der Cloot, "if de man's "obshervation of his own consciounesh be de sole logique or "reason dat he conclude himshelf to be altogeder what he "must be, why shall he still be de same ting in de world, "and not anotter man, vhen he shleep, or is widout no con- "sciounesh at all?"*

ODER. FOURT. I vill exhibit mine *chef d'œuvre*, mine piece of de mashter, vat ish dat you call. I vill take von yonk ladi of distinctionsh—ver beautiful—out of dish compaignie, who shall gif hareshelf for de subject of dish expairment, and vill gif leave to any otter ladi to cut off here head wid mine akephalonological guillotine. De head vill be lock in van box, and remove to anotter apartment, well far from hearing,—de ladi vill return to hare seat, and wait de ciroustance. After mine lecture I vill replash de head on de ladish neck, wid muche improvement to hare beautè, and she vill gif accompte of all dat vash and vash not sbaid in myne lecture, and in all de world, for de time she vash absent from hare head. It is a ver shweet expairment.

ODER, FIVE TIME. I gif mine vord to demonshrate, dat de doctrine of de metaphysique is de true and sond doctrine, namely, dat de mind and de corpse have not de connection necessaire. I vill come out of mine corpse altogeder, and leave de shame in my chair total deprive of sensh and ondershtand. I ondertake to ashtonish much de compag-

* The Sieur alluded to the question of personal identity, which has given so much trouble to the metaphysicians. Hermanz Vander Cloot, who has discussed it fully in a work of three volumes folio, is not mentioned in Mr Dugaid Stewart's Preliminary Dissertation, and is less known in this country than even Fichte or Mendelsohn.—*Editor*.

me. All as you call de sond metaphysique alwaysh shall hold dat it is de mind dat shleep. I vill demonshtat dish great trout. I will go to shleep in my mind till de shleep shall be discovair by de shnorsh. Oder, as it follows by de logique, dat if it vash de mind only dat shall not shleep, de corpse shall be vida-vake when de mind shnorsh. So it vash. My corpse vill be restore, and vill shew my mind, dat it shall do widout it, and ondertake to perpetuate de lecture ontill it pleash my mind to vida-vake.* Mine corpse again sensh-lesse, my mind again vida-vake, I vill project de shame into one goosh bird, vat you call gandair, at de ver moment dat its head is shop off vid de cleavair as you call; and de goosh bird shall, upon my shoul, promenade de room, and gif all its motionsh and geshturesh natural, all as one like all otter goosh bird in de world. After dat I vill recall my mind, retorn wid mine own corpse, and wid all de graceousnesse and sensibilitate in de world make mine one bow and marsh out of de room.

SHIX. Corpse have had its day. I vash finish it, and thus I vill prove its wortleshness. I vill be all in all intoxicate, dat is, I vill drunk ver much of cognac l'eau de vie—wid all de compagnie; and wid my mind altogeder accurate I vill prononsh van grand phillipique, van manifeshto againsh de quack, and de quackerie en general, and de grande non-sensibilitate phrenologie en particulier, witch phillipique vash be two time as logical, tree time as hypercritical, shix time as eloquent, and van dozen time as sublime as de grande **FORTY-NINE** of de Revu of Edimbourg,—de **TWENTY-FIVE** de Revu de Quartier, and de celebre argument of de vengeance of de Sieur Blackwood.

ODER. SHEVEN. I vill pairmit any gentlemansh of de compagnie to blow out de brainsh of any otter gentlemansh of de compagnie wid van blonderbosse. I vill fill up de void, vat you call de vacuum dat de Nature abhorsh,—wid de horse hair as you call, or de plumage of de goosh-bird,

* What an enviable triumph to Mr Rennell!

and I vill repair de shatter skull wid my pseudocephalic plates of goldsh, shilversh, brash, or de belle-metal, and I vill plash above it van scratch vig, and undertake for de shame gentlemanshs, dat he shall conversh, take shnuff, fleert wid de ladish, talk de politique, abuse phrenologie, and total commit all de avocationsh in de world, all as vell like before he vash exhaust of de inutile encombransh of his brainsh. If der vash any gentlemansh in my preshensh who shall not chance neevair to go by ambassade to Peking, he shall go trow dish operationsh previoush to him shet shail. He vill find it gif him much diplomacie, and fit him all in all for de cherimonish of de Ko-tou.

ODER. EIGHT. I undertake to exhibit my grand expairment of de transhposhition. I vill take van bomkin—van clown, dat is dat you call, dat scarsh know his lettresh, and I vill take van learned professeure, ver full of much vishdom and schience, who is skill in all de tongs dat ever vash shpeak in de world, and who do swelle much vid true dignetè and great importansh. Oder, I vill gif deir headsh a little chop off wid mine guillotine, and by a proshesh total mine own invent, make desh two to change de headsh. Who vill den deny dat de mind is not any more in de brain for ever, when dey shall hear, vid dair ear, de corpse which shall, after de transhposhition, have de bomkin'sh head, gif forth van oration in shix differentsh langues, wid much of de theologie, logique, and grande metaphyshique? Dish I shall conshidair mine expairment of de cross. Dese headsh vill be retranshposhed after de lecture if deshire,—but it vash not be of nò consequensh.

LASHT OF ALL. Having gif my powerful demonshtationsh to confond de doctrine of dose shame quacksh, de Docteurs Gall and Spurzheim, and all dose ver large foolish dair followersh,—dat de mind is not at all in dat part of de corpse called de head, I vill lecture most beautifully for shome time to come, to demonshtate where de mind really livesh and dwellsh. It will be de true inductif philoshophiè. Look den at de ver little boy; considair his fondation, all as you call his later

end,—observe de result of de expairment vid de little twigsh, —vat you call de birch-tree, on its arrondissement,—you vill see all his facultè, and all his geniuse brisk and his vertu improve. It followsh, dat all de facultè, propenshitè, and shentiment, is loge in de little boy'sh vat-you-call. On dish induction I have fonded my ver great fame—my grande sisteme of morale schience, legishlation, education, inshanità. In van vord, I haf now plash de philoshophie of mind on its propre broad bashe.—Of dish expairment I vill gif pratique exemplaire, so dat all de little childsh dat read shall run.* Ladish and gentlemensh, dish is all as mine forst lecture.”

The Sieur concluded amid thunders of applause.—The following hand-bill was distributed to the audience as they dismissed :—

ADVERTISE.

“ The Sieur Donnerblitzenhausen, &c., &c., &c., &c., &c., have bring with him some bottle of his celebrate ELIXIR INGENII, wherefore person of the most dull capacity may be learn to write with the largest facility any quantity of poetry or prose, and on all subject whatever. For specimen, the public are refer to the page of the Sieur Blackwood, the Liberal, the Black Dwarf, and other very celebrate publication, the author of whom have made much use of the Elixir with large advantage. He can also give the public with any plenty quantity of his BLACKING, same size with ELIXIR INGENII. No character of respect cannot resist it, —a single one drop fall, that repute shall not be no more ;

* It is now evident where the Sieur Blackwood got this brilliant idea.—Vide his 54th Number.

† We hear the Sieur is very properly mysterious on the subject of his blacking, and wishes it to be supposed, that it is made from the juice of the famous upas tree of Java ; and he even gives out that he has a plant from that tree growing in his conservatory, which he obtained from a Dutch convict during his travels in the East : but the blacking has been analyzed by some very able chemists, who have pronounced that it derives its black colour from containing a considerable proportion of the “ Extract of Ebony ;” whence it derives its poisonous properties is not so confidently ascertained, ebony being an inert substance of itself, and not exhibiting, except in this combination, any deleterious qualities.—EDITOR.

and if the repute shall be previous fair, it shall not be only the more conspicuous. The Sieur have also travel with him some many bottle of his incomparable ANTI-ERU-RETORY LOTION, which, when apply to the face, give a much degree firmness to the skin, and remove all flush or ag-gravate of the complexion. For proof to the virtue of these much invaluable secret, reference shall be make to the testimonial of some of the grand eminent and all in all suc-cess writers of the age,—persons well notorious, and pretty much distinguished. The Sieur have select the hereafter of many hundred he have receive to the same kind.

“ *Edinburgh, January 1823.*

“ SIR,—I cannot sufficiently express the infinite debt of
 “ gratitude I lie under to you, on account of the prodigious
 “ benefit I have received from the use of your invaluable
 “ *Elixir Ingenii*. Truth obliges me to declare, that I was ori-
 “ ginally one of the most hopeless blockheads that ever was
 “ tormented or puzzled with the four and twenty letters. At
 “ school I was invariably the *booby* of all my classes, and was
 “ pronounced by my master to be an incorrigible dunce; and
 “ such I might have remained for life, had not a friend ad-
 “ vised me, in a happy hour, to try your *elixir*. The effect
 “ has surpassed my most sanguine expectations. I had not
 “ swallowed above half a bottle when I experienced a general
 “ effervescence throughout my whole frame, and such an itch-
 “ ing at the points of the fingers as could only be satisfied with
 “ an immediate evacuation by writing. I accordingly had re-
 “ course to pen and ink, and in eight and forty hours produced
 “ the famous article, which demolished the whole doctrines of
 “ Gall and Spurzheim at a blow. I am in raptures at my success.
 “ I am admired by the ladies, praised by Blackwood, and estab-
 “ lished as a philosopher and a man of genius. In short, I consi-
 “ der my fortune made; and, for all this, I have to thank you,
 “ Sir, and your incomparable elixir. I have only to request that
 “ you will send me twelve bottles by the most direct convey-
 “ ance, for which you will find the money enclosed. I remain,

“ With the most exalted respect,

“ Sir,

“ Your most obedient

“ grateful humble servant,

“ ANTIPHRENOLOGUS.

“ *Ambrose's Tavern. Saturday Night.*

“ DEAR DONNER,—You are a devilish fine fellow. Your
 “ *Elixir Ingenii* is quite the thing. It suits my case to a tittle.

" I have now written, under its influence, fifty cantos of the
 " ' Mad Banker ;' and, before I took the elixir, I never could
 " put a rhyme together in my life. I was constantly beaten at
 " crambo by the misses: now I could rhyme you so, eight
 " years together, or, if I were to live so long, eighty; dinners and
 " suppers and sleeping times always excepted. Yours,
 " WILLIAM WASTLE."

" *The Punchery, October 1, 1823.*

" DEAR SIR,—You have conferred upon me the greatest ob-
 " ligation that ever was conferred upon man. I was always a
 " lad of towardsly parts, but unfortunately laboured from my
 " youth upwards under a severe affliction of too great mo-
 " desty. I used every thing to combat this unlucky infir-
 " mity,—was immersed seven times in the Shannon without
 " effect. Often, when suffering under a paroxysm of my dis-
 " order, I have envied the happy unblushing equanimity of some
 " of my countrymen, who could maintain a command of counte-
 " nance under all circumstances. But now, thanks to your in-
 " valuable *Anti-erubetory*, I think I may venture to say—with-
 " out vanity, that I am now, my valued friend Tickler not ex-
 " cepted, the most imperturbable private gentleman in his Ma-
 " jesty's dominions. You need not send me any more of your
 " lotion, as I believe I sha'n't require it. Your most obedient,
 " MORGAN O'DOHERTY."

" *Ambrosian Tiplery, Three in the Morning.*

" SIR,—I have tried your three specifics, and find them all
 " superb,—particularly the blacking. My method is to mix all
 " three together, and take a wine-glass of the compound every
 " morning fasting, and tolerably sober, so that I am always in
 " trim for Ebony. Send me a supply per packet, as I mean
 " this winter to *make a clean sweep* of these vermin the Phrens.
 " Yours,
 " TIMOTHY TICKLER."

" 17, *Prince's Street, October 1, 1823.*

" I HEREBY certify, that I have, for these seven years past,
 " used the incomparable blacking of the Sieur Donnerblitzen-
 " hausen, and that, after the most ample experience, I can with
 " truth declare, that it is infinitely superior to any other black-
 " ing ever invented,—in so much, that I now never think of using
 " any other. For the admirable quality of its hue, equal to the
 " purest jet, or deepest ebony, its durability and exquisite polish,
 " it is not to be surpassed, nor, I may say, equalled. These
 " facts have all been distinctly ascertained upon oath; and for
 " their truth I have farther to refer to the verdicts of several
 " most respectable and intelligent juries, by whom the merits of
 " the said blacking were duly appreciated.

(Signed) " CHRISTOPHER NORTH."

FRAUD.

“None of the above medicaments shall be genuine that shall be not signed with the *Sieur Donnerblitzenhausen's* initials, H. F. A. D. B. and sealed with his seal, which have its motto—*TOHU vau BOHU*, and his crest—A THUNDERBOLT.

“The *Sieur* shall live in his lodgement at the summit of the three pair of step of stairs, round about the right through the lane which lead after the corner out of the passage to the left as you come away with the *Fife's Court* of *Rose Street*. Nevertheless, the *Sieur* shall continue always to be hear of at *Number ten-seven, Prince Street.*”

END OF NUMBER FIRST.

THE
PHRENOLOGICAL JOURNAL.

No II.

ARTICLE I.

CRANIOSCOPY, by DR ROGET.—Supplement to the Encyclopædia Britannica.

“ Io domando ciò che tutti desiderano e pochi ottengono, di esser giudicato dalla ragione, non dalla opinione. Non facciamo un dogma della stima di alcun autore. Vediamo co' nostri occhi. Gl' inconvenienti che possono nascere da questo liberissimo metodo non saranno mai tanti quanti sono quelli che derivano dal guidicare colla fama e colle prevenzioni.”—VERRI.

THE phrenologists have been often blamed for attributing too little weight to the numerous attempts which have been made to sap the foundations of their science. But where, in the whole course of phrenological warfare, is even an *opponent* to be found who has declared himself satisfied with the refutations and arguments of his coadjutors in the field? In what page of the grand attack in the 49th Number of the Edinburgh Review (1815), does the anti-phrenological champion of that day refer to, or quote the facts or arguments of the anti-phrenological champion of 1803? In what page of the “able and elegant article” of Dr Roget does *he* refer to any of the numerous death-blows given to our science before his time? In what page of “Life and Organization” can we gather any thing as to the existence of a

refutation of phrenology, prior to Dr Barclay's own? In what page of *Anti-phrenologia* does its illustrious author refer to those of Dr Barclay, or any other of *his* predecessors? Where, in short, is the magazine, journal, or review, which has not, by some strange mistake, deemed it necessary to be original in this particular alone, and to avoid scrupulously any reference to the assistance of predecessors or contemporaries? And yet our opponents ask *us* to swallow what *they* themselves cannot, and even to own ourselves vanquished, when they see us standing before them vigorous and unscathed.

But to satisfy those who may differ from us in opinion, and also to redeem the pledge given in our 1st Number, when we stated our readiness to meet any opponent whose object seemed to be truth, although he should not have displayed much philosophy in his mode of attack, we now take up Dr Roget's article,—CRANIOSCOPY, which is still regarded in the south as the most formidable attack phrenology ever had to sustain; and our doing so will afford us a good opportunity of undeceiving the public on the supposed credit due to the opinions of the members of the medical profession above that due to the opinions of other men.

Phrenology being a system of philosophy founded on the discovery of the functions of the different parts of the brain, there are only two circumstances which can entitle a professional man to dispense with the preliminary step of examining the nature and evidence of the doctrines, before giving an opinion for or against them. He must have previously ascertained, either that there is another function which is inconsistent with the phrenological one, or that the latter is incompatible with the anatomical structure. Now, even Dr Roget himself expressly declares, that "the brain *is still as incomprehensible in its functions as it is subtle and complex in its anatomy;*" and that "its structure is so void of apparent adaptation to any purpose we can understand, that it will suit any physiological system equally well,"—thus leaving the educated part of the public on a perfect footing of equality with himself as to the possession

of knowledge on those points. We state this explicitly, because, to use the words of our motto, "we wish to be judged by reason, and not by opinion;" and while, on the one hand, we are disposed to listen attentively to the opinions of those medical men who have really examined the evidence, and who know what phrenology is, we cannot, on the other hand, regard the decision of any one of them, who has not informed himself, as entitled to more consideration as evidence, than the opinion of an ignorant fisherman regarding the theory of the tide when placed in opposition to that of Sir Isaac Newton.

In entering upon his refutation, Dr Roget takes credit to himself for some very slender virtues. After representing phrenology as "admitting so easily of being held up to ridicule by PARTIAL OR EXAGGERATED statements," he claims merit "for refraining from employing the weapons of ridicule" against it, and for contenting himself "with the simple exposition of the sandy foundation" on which, and the "flimsy materials" of which the new system is constructed. We willingly leave to him all the praise of which forbearance from ridicule founded on "partial or exaggerated statement" is worthy.

The first, and what Dr Roget calls the most important of all his objections, is, that injuries of different parts of the brain have occurred without corresponding derangement of the function assigned to them; and Haller and Dr Ferrier are referred to as authorities. These cases, our readers are aware, have been already amply discussed in the Transactions of the Phrenological Society, and shewn to be not only perfectly consistent with and explicable by the phrenological view of a plurality of organs, but also to be at utter variance with Dr Roget's idea of unity of mental organ. We therefore pass on to what he denominates Gall and Spurzheim's "analogical arguments;" in the attempted refutation of which he displays much of that inconsistency into which a man unavoidably falls when writing on a subject with which he is unacquainted.

Dr Roget very judiciously objects to any theory of the functions of the brain founded on analogy alone, and stigmatizes, "as a gross violation of logic," the assumption "of any such analogy as equivalent to *positive proof*, which "can only result," he adds, "from the *evidence of direct observation*." Drs G. and S. take the same view of the matter, and, therefore, wherever they lay down any point as established, proceed solely upon the positive proof resulting from direct observation, and never upon analogy alone, which, like Dr R., they think calculated to afford "indications of what *may* possibly happen, and thus to direct "and stimulate our inquiries to the discovery of truth by "the legitimate road of observation and experiment." They therefore earnestly beg of their readers not to judge from analogy, and, to use Dr R.'s own words, they constantly "appeal to the evidence of induction, as the supreme authority in the court of philosophy." Can we admire, then, Dr R.'s consistency, when he turns round and says, "Although I am ignorant of the structure and functions of the brain, and have said that the former will suit G. and S.'s physiological views as well as any others, and although I object to the evidence of analogy, as proving any thing at all, yet *by analogy alone* I will refute Drs G. and S.'s statements, which they allege to be founded, not on analogy, but on *positive proofs and observations*?" and to shew that "these gentlemen have ventured to found "all the leading propositions of their doctrines" "upon "analogical assumptions and preposterous imaginations," quite forgetting what he has said elsewhere about the court of philosophy, and about G. and S. "making their last and "most resolute stand in experience, as in an impregnable "fortress," and about the mode of obtaining "*the facts*" "upon which *so much is made to depend*." If the phrenologists displayed half as much inconsistency, they would deservedly be laughed at as sorely deficient in "logical "acumen."

Even granting Dr Roget the privilege of refuting direct

inductive evidence by that drawn from analogy, we suspect he is only at the beginning of his task, for he has not yet advanced a single argument of this kind which is able to stand on its own foundation, much less fitted to be employed to beat down the arguments of others. Indeed he never attempts to combat the *principles* of phrenology, but merely magnifies the difficulties of putting them in practice; and in this he acts wisely, for it is only thus that the real febleness of his reasoning has any chance of escaping detection. With all his caution, however, he is not altogether safe. To prove that one organ may perform all the operations of the mind, he argues thus: "Does not the same stomach digest very different and even opposite kinds of aliments? yet we do not find that one portion of that organ is destined for the digestion of meat, and another for that of vegetables." Very true; but the *function* is the *same* in all, the *subject* only is different. Digesting is no more than digesting, whether it be performed on turtle or roast beef, animal food or vegetable. In like manner, no phrenologist ever asserted that one part of the organ of causality reasoned in political economy, another in metaphysics, and a third in medicine; or that one portion of the organ of tune was destined to produce soft and plaintive notes, and another bold and warlike music. We only maintain, that as the stomach cannot secrete bile, nor perform the office of kidneys, neither can the organ of causality produce a relish for music, nor that of tune a talent for logical reasoning. We have never said that causality cannot be exercised on all sorts of subjects, sacred or profane, important or trifling; but we have said, that no change of subject will ever change its specific function of reasoning, any more than any change of diet will change that of the stomach from digestion to the secretion of bile.

Dr Roget states, as strong analogical arguments against a plurality of mental organs, that "nerves perform the double office of volition and sensation; but no anatomist has yet separated the different bundles of fibres which convey

“ each impression ;” and that “ the same organ serves for “ the hearing of acute and of grave sounds,” and “ the “ whole retina, and not merely different portions of its sur- “ face, receives the impression of different kinds of colour : “ there is not one organ for the perception of blue, and an- “ other for the perception of red rays.” “ Guided by such “ analogies as these,” says he, “ might we not be equally “ justified in concluding that the same part of the brain may “ serve for the memory of words and for the memory of “ things, and that the same portion of that organ which “ enables us to conceive the idea of figure may also suggest “ to us that of size ?”

The first of these analogies is the only one that, if sound, would be applicable, because in it alone there is a real difference of function, or a manifestation of two distinct powers; volition and sensation. But, unfortunately for Dr Roget, it has been demonstrated since he wrote, that for each of these functions there is a *different bundle* of fibres, although they are enclosed in a common sheath, and seem to constitute only a single nerve. This analogy therefore falls completely to the ground as an argument against phrenology. Nay, it becomes a powerful support of its doctrines. Many years ago, Dr Spurzheim and some other physiologists inferred, from the fact of motion remaining in some cases where feeling was lost, and *vice versa*, that the nerve must really be double. Now, with this fact before us, when we observe that the memory of things frequently remains after that of words is lost, and *vice versa*, as in Mr Hood's and Dr Gregory's cases, mentioned in the Phrenological Transactions, does not the inference naturally follow, that there must be a distinct organ for each of these kinds of mental manifestations ? We refer our readers for particulars to an article in our last Number on the functions of the nerves.

The second and third analogies evidently arise from Dr Roget confounding a modification of the same function with two distinct functions. Hearing acute and hearing grave sounds amount to nothing more than *hearing* sounds.

Again, the perception of blue and that of red colours are nothing more than perception of colours. We maintain that there is one organ for hearing sounds of every kind, and another for perceiving colours of every hue, but not that one organ perceives one colour, and another another; so that the Doctor's analogy again totally fails him. We are only surprised that he never stumbled upon this plain fact in any of Dr Spurzheim's works, where it is repeatedly mentioned.

Dr Roget thinks the phenomenon of mental fatigue being relieved by passing from one kind of study to another, as from philosophy to music, equally explicable on the supposition of a single organ of mind as on that of a plurality; and he entertains the same opinion of the facility of explaining the phenomena of dreams, somnambulism, partial insanity, the very essence of which is the activity and healthy manifestation of one or more faculties co-existing with the inactivity and diseased manifestations of others; or, to use the analogy of the five senses, Dr Roget is able to conceive how sight and smell may be lost or diseased, while hearing, taste, and touch are in a different state, equally well, on the supposition of all being functions of a single organ, as on that of each having an organ to itself. This analogy is a palpable one, and we use it because there cannot be a greater difference between smell and taste than between destructiveness and veneration. We can offer no argument against Dr R.'s power of conception; but, to render the analogy effective, he ought to have referred to some created being in which all these different functions are performed by a single organ. This he has not done, and, therefore, we are not enlightened by his argument.

Such, then, our readers will be surprised to learn, are Dr Roget's refutations of the *analogical* arguments adduced by Drs G. and S.—not as proofs of their system, as Dr R. would have us to believe, but merely as facilitating its reception, by shewing its consistency with the ordinary laws of the animal economy.

Dr Roget proceeds to object to the anatomical evidence in favour of phrenology, because, says he, "the anatomy of the brain is so complex and so void of apparent adaptation to any purpose we can understand, that it will suit any physiological system equally well. The separation of the parts of the brain and their diversity of shape can no more be evidence of a diversity in their functions" than the lobules of the kidneys, &c. Those of our readers who recollect that it is a principle much and justly insisted upon by the phrenologists, that dissection alone is insufficient to reveal the function of any organ, will see at once that Dr R. is here combating an enemy of his own creation. G. and S. had for their object only to shew that the anatomy of the brain was *not inconsistent with* their physiological discoveries. They do not attempt to go farther than this; and the proof of it is, that the physiology was discovered long before they commenced their anatomical labours. We refer Dr R. to Dr Spurzheim's *Outlines*, p. 22.

Dr Roget, as if he were instructing Drs G. and S. in an important truth for the first time, states, that "comparative anatomy, upon which so much is made to hinge, is of all guides the most fallible in questions of this nature." No person reading this would imagine that Dr Spurzheim himself had previously said, that "Although it is of the highest importance to know the gradation observed by nature in perfecting the brains of animals, in order to multiply and ennoble their functions, we must allow that, notwithstanding the most assiduous labour, comparative anatomy has shown only the mechanical form of different brains, and that these anatomical notions do not at all determine the functions of the cerebral parts."—(*Outlines*, p. 24.)

The next objection of Dr R. was one much in vogue, but is now little noticed. It is, that the want of parallelism in the two tables of the skull, renders it impossible to ascertain the size and shape of the parts underneath. But this objection disappears, when we recollect that the function of every organ has been determined from *extreme cases of en-*

dowment and deficiency. The whole thickness of the skull varies, in different individuals, from one-tenth to one-fifth or one-sixth of an inch, and therefore when we measure across *both* sides of the head, the greatest possible inequality, within the limits of health, must be comprised within something less than the greatest aggregate thickness of both sides, viz. two-fifths of an inch; so that when we produce two skulls nearly equal in size, one of which presents one inch more in the region of cautiousness, for example, than the other, there must of necessity be at least three-fifths of an inch more brain at that part in the former, than in the latter; and when such differences are daily found, they are quite sufficient to enable us to determine the functions. But in point of fact, the divergence from the parallel, when it does exist, is seldom more than to the extent of a *line*, and rarely extends over a whole organ, so far as to affect the accuracy of our observations. In disease and old age, indeed, the difference is often very great; and for that reason the phrenologist never infers any thing whatever from the development in such cases.

Dr R. next attacks and denies the principle of size of cerebral organs being, *ceteris paribus*, a criterion of energy; and he again represents this principle as founded on a loose analogy, instead of resting on the firm basis of experience. "Let us examine," says Dr R., "the logic by which the above fundamental principle is deduced. 'A large muscle,' say G. and S., 'is stronger than a smaller one, and a large loadstone is more powerful than a smaller one; why should it not be the same with regard to the brain?' Thus again," says Dr R. 'confiding in a loose analogy,' &c. Now, Drs G. and S. founded this doctrine on positive observations, that large organs are actually accompanied with stronger manifestations than small ones, and *then* they pointed out that this fact is in harmony with the analogies of nature. Dr R. therefore does not meet them fairly. He next goes on to describe other conditions which must influence the functions as much as that of size, without ever seeming to

know that the phrenologists have attended to these as well as himself, and have said, that size, *ceteris paribus*, is a measure of energy of manifestations. Dr R. seems, indeed, not to be aware of the meaning of this proposition, as he adds, that "increase of size in the viscera of the body is more generally the indication of a diseased than of a healthy state;" thus evidently confounding *healthy existence* with *morbid growth*; and because Professor Hufeland has said that small eyes see better than large ones, he, (who never trusts to analogy,) asks if it may not be the same "with the organs of the brain?" Unfortunately for Dr R.'s views, however, physiologists and pathologists are agreed, that while too small a brain is constantly attended by idiocy, a healthy brain of a larger size is uniformly accompanied with a greater degree of mental power, as the result of its greater size; and Dr R. cannot indicate a point where size ceases to exert an influence upon the vigour of the manifestations. He therefore adds, "But really in our present state of ignorance as to the mode of operation by which these organs are subservient to the processes of intellect and sensation, all reasoning, *a priori*, on their functions as connected with their size, must be completely illusory." Here we have a specimen of reasoning far surpassing even the celebrated "argument with a vengeance." Dr Roget first avows his ignorance of the conditions which render the cerebral organs more or less subservient to the operations of the mental faculties, and justly objects to any *a priori* reasoning on the influence of size, as *completely illusory*, and trusts to observation alone for knowledge. But when Drs G. and S. say that they have made *innumerable observations*, which afford "positive proof" of size of cerebral organ exerting a great influence upon the power of manifesting the faculty, Dr R. does not attempt to disprove this by an opposite statement of observations affording different results, but, in avowed ignorance, and on the faith of *a priori reasoning alone*, to the validity of which he had just objected, he declares G. and S.'s statement to be "*preposterous and unfounded.*"

We add not a single remark; for nothing that we could say would make any impression upon those who admire this specimen of Dr R.'s reasoning, and to those who do not admire it, nothing farther is necessary. "Even were we to admit so preposterous a doctrine, as that the energies of the parts of the brain are proportional to their magnitude," and that it were possible to distinguish the size of each part, "is it an easy task to determine the real character of the individual, and to discriminate between real and affected sentiment?" &c. We have dwelt too long on Dr R.'s article to do more than refer to the Phrenological Transactions for a most satisfactory answer to this question; and shall only add, that we have not often had much difficulty in determining whether an individual had a talent for music, a great command of language, or much poetical or reasoning powers. Nor have we ever seen any one to whom nature had denied these reasoning powers, who was able to write a very logical treatise merely by affecting to be logical, or who could, by merely affecting to be poetical, manifest poetical power in such a degree as to deceive the world and pass for a genius.

Those who have not seen the article *Cranioscopy*, but whose fate it has been to hear it confidently talked of as a most satisfactory refutation of our science, will be surprised to learn that we have now stated *all the objections* which a professional gentleman of Dr Roget's talents and knowledge has been able to bring against phrenology. Since, with all the supposed advantages of a medical education, he has effected so little, we conceive that we are only doing justice to ourselves and readers, when we again beg of them not to be deterred from examining the subject by the mere dicta of any man, however high he may rank, in or out of the profession. The one is as little qualified to judge as the other, until he has put phrenology to the test of experience. Nor ought any one to refrain from putting it to this test, from a supposed disqualification arising from his ignorance of anatomy. For, in the first place, he has Dr Roget's assurance

that the *structure* of the brain, in as far as is known to the medical profession in general, will suit any physiological system equally well; and, *2dly*, He may feel doubly sure, when he knows that Dr Gall actually discovered the physiology before he began his researches into the anatomy of that organ; and we can safely assure him, that in so far as anatomy is concerned, or, indeed, any other species of general medical knowledge, any man of ordinary understanding may, in a single day, qualify himself as thoroughly for entering upon the study of phrenology as the profoundest physician that ever lived.

We have purposely avoided entering into Dr Roget's repeated misrepresentations of the doctrines, and of the evidence upon which they are founded, contained in what he calls the history of the science, and have confined ourselves entirely to his *objections*, for upon these alone his adverse opinion rests. The misrepresentations we believe to have been involuntary, and to have arisen from unacquaintance with the subject. The objections, however, are his own, and in their fate his other opinions must necessarily be involved.

ARTICLE II.

LOUIS XI. AND CHARLES THE BOLD, AS DELINEATED IN QUENTIN DURWARD.

AFTER describing the distracted state of the kingdom of France, at the period of the accession of Louis XI. the author of this novel mentions,—

“That his character, evil as it was in itself, met, combated, and in a great degree neutralized the mischiefs of the time, as poisons of opposing qualities are said, in ancient books of medicine, to have the powers of counteracting each other.

“Brave enough for every useful purpose, Louis had not a spark of that romantic valour, or of the pride connected with, and arising out of it, which fought on for the point of honour when the point of utility had been long gained.”

This part of the monarch's character indicates a *full*, but not a very strong propensity of *combativeness*, with a defective *love of approbation*, which last inspires the desire of fame.

"Calm, crafty, and profoundly attentive to his own interest, he made every sacrifice, both of pride and passion, which could interfere with it."

A great endowment of *self-esteem* and *acquisitiveness* would produce the manifestations here mentioned. *Combativeness* not being strong enough to induce a love of fighting for its own sake, and *love of approbation* not being energetic enough to give a desire of fighting for fame, the individual would not fight except to gain a favourite object, and when all other means of gaining it had failed.

"He was careful in disguising his real sentiments and purposes, from all who approached him, and frequently used the expression, that the King knew not how to reign who knew not how to dissemble; and that for himself, if he thought his very cap knew his secrets, he would throw it into the fire. No man of his own, or of any other time, better understood how to avail himself of the frailties of others, and when to avoid giving any advantage by the untimely indulgence of his own."

It is impossible to describe more graphically or accurately the feelings and manifestations accompanying that power which is named by the phrenologists *Secretiveness*, and which must have been possessed by this monarch in a more than ordinary degree.

The following passage seems to admit, what indeed is sufficiently obvious from the history, as given by Philip des Comines, that he was also largely endowed with that quality or propensity, called *Destructiveness*,—indeed, without admitting such a propensity to have been active in him, it is impossible to make sense of the passage, or to receive it as an accurate portrait of his character: "He was by nature vindictive and cruel, even to the extent of finding pleasure in the frequent executions which he commanded." This, it is proper to state, was long before noticed by Dr Gall himself; and he has in his larger work refer-

red to this bloodthirstiness of Louis XI. as one of the instances which go to prove the existence of the propensity of destructiveness. In this novel the propensity is distinctly admitted and described;—and this description is read and applauded, as shewing a profound knowledge of human nature;—while Dr Gall and his followers have been ridiculed and abused in the most unceremonious manner, for having admitted so monstrous a principle into their system.* The effects of this propensity, when combined with *secretiveness*, are again most accurately described thus:—

“ But as no touch of mercy ever induced him to spare when he could safely condemn, so no sentiment of vengeance ever stimulated him to a premature violence. *He seldom sprung upon his prey till it was fairly within his grasp*, and till all chance of rescue was in vain; and his movements were so *studiously disguised* that his success was generally what first announced to the world what object he had been manœuvring to attain.” †

Had the author been here writing for the purpose of illustrating the manifestations of *secretiveness*, *cautiousness*, and intellect, operating along with *destructiveness*, and in

* We like to draw illustrations of phrenology from writers not professedly phrenological. We have met with a passage in the last number of a periodical work, which has hitherto given no countenance to our system, (*Quarterly Review*, No 58, p. 450,) so completely descriptive of the propensity of destructiveness, when sublimed into a state of fury, that we shall give it entire for the edification of our readers. We shall be glad to know, on which of the metaphysical theories of mind the author of this passage founds his opinions of human nature. In speaking of the cruelties practised in former times, against persons suspected to be guilty of witchcraft, he says, “ Dreadful as the cruelties may have been, which were thus perpetrated under the name of the law, we are still compelled to acknowledge that superstition only assisted in producing them. It was only one of the influential causes; and other causes and pretences equally potent may exist even in an age of reason. When the contagion of fear and hatred is at its height, the mysterious love of destruction, which is always lurking in human nature, acquires fresh strength as it proceeds. Its effects have been exemplified within our recollection. The wide-wasting and insane persecutions, which, two hundred years ago, would have taken the shape of the proscription of witchcraft, have been renewed in our enlightened times with greater violence. The executions, the massacres, the noyades, the fusillades of the French Revolution were urged by the same moral madness, which, in the preceding age, had occasioned the persecution of so many alleged votaries of Satan. They differ in name, but they are precisely the same in kind. Bloodshed always causes bloodshed. There is a state of morbid excitement, during which the contagion of murder spreads with as much certainty as the plague; and the individuals composing a nation may be exalted into a paroxysm of moral phrenzy, possessing as little control over their actions as the raving maniac. The instruments of evil may occasionally share our pity with the victims.” &c. &c.

† It will be recollected, that combinations permitted to our novelist are called *lropholes*, when asserted by the phrenologist.

the absence of *benevolence*, he could not have done so with more perfect effect. We have here just the qualities of the cat, veiling its deadly intent under the appearance of gentleness and suavity, until it is able at one leap to pounce upon its hapless prey. But we shall go on to consider the other parts of the character, throughout the whole of which *secretiveness* appears a predominant ingredient.

“The avarice of Louis gave way to apparent profusion, when it was necessary to *bribe* the favourite or ministers of a rival prince for averting any impending attack, or to break up any alliance confederated against him.”

This is nothing more than his love of accumulating wealth, yielding to the stronger desire of acquiring or securing something else, which at the time he considered more valuable; of adding, perhaps, to his dominions, or of averting an attack upon those which he already possessed. The profusion here spoken of is merely a price paid for something else that is more desirable than the money expended, so that *acquisitiveness* is still operating even in the act of giving away.

“He was fond of license and pleasure; but neither beauty nor the chase, though both were ruling passions, ever withdrew him from the most regular attendance to public business and the affairs of his kingdom. *His knowledge of mankind was profound*, and he had sought it in the private walks of life, in which he often personally mingled; and, though personally proud and haughty, he hesitated not, with an inattention to the arbitrary divisions of society which was then thought something portentously unnatural, to raise from the lowest rank men whom he employed on the most important duties, and knew so well how to choose them that he was rarely disappointed in their qualities.”

The above corresponds admirably with what is stated in the books of phrenology with regard to the function of *secretiveness*; that, when united with a good development of the knowing organs (which this monarch undoubtedly possessed), it gives to its possessor a proportional share of the *savoir faire*, and is accompanied with a kind of instinctive tact of penetrating into the motives and characters of those around us. When the reasoning faculties and higher sentiments are not very fully developed, it also gives rise to *cur-*

ning, that crooked and short-sighted policy which seeks its ends by devious means, and which often in its refinements o'ershoots the mark it aims at, and in seeking to deceive others deceives itself. This is well illustrated by the following passage :

" Yet there were *contradictions* in the nature of this artful and " able monarch, for *humanity is never uniform.*"* Himself the most " false and insincere of mankind, some of the greatest errors of his " life arose from a too rash confidence in the honour and integrity " of others. When these errors took place they seem to have arisen " from an *over-refined system of policy*, which induced Louis to as- " sume the appearance of undoubting confidence in those whom it " was his object to o'erreach ; for in his general conduct he was as " jealous and suspicious a tyrant as ever lived."

We have noticed that his *self-esteem* appears to have been great ; and its manifestations are accurately described in the " pride and haughtiness" which is said to have been this king's general demeanour, and in the " jealousy and suspicion" which also are said to have characterized him ; both of which, however, *secretiveness* led him to conceal and to suppress, when he had a purpose to be served by their suppression. *Self-esteem* is that principle to which the phrenologists attribute both pride and jealousy. It also gives rise to the love of power, to which Louis seems to have been more strongly attached than even to pleasure or the chase ; and this, joined to his great acquisitiveness, sufficiently accounts for his regularity and attention to the business of the state. His being insensible to glory shews him to have been deficient in *love of approbation* and *ideality*, which give the desire of fame, applause, and worldly honour ; and his cruelty and inattention to the rights and sufferings of others shew him to have had a small endowment both of *benevolence* and

* This is also a tribute to phrenology which should not be passed over ; for the apparent contradictions and want of uniformity in human nature are all easily explained by the principles of this science ; but certainly cannot be unravelled by the speculations of metaphysics. Such accommodation to the *irregularities* of human nature is stated as one of the greatest objections against phrenology by superficial inquirers ; but to us it appears strong presumptive evidence of its truth and accuracy.

conscientiousness. *Veneration*, on the contrary, appears to have been large. This sentiment, when properly directed, particularly when joined to a good endowment of the reflective powers and moral sentiments, leads to genuine religion; but when it has not the assistance of these to direct it to its proper objects, particularly when joined to a great *cautiousness*, leads to superstition, as it appears to have done in Louis.

“ Two other points may be noticed to complete the sketch of this formidable character, who rose among the rude chivalrous sovereigns of the period to the rank of a keeper among wild beasts, who, by superior wisdom and policy, by distribution of food, and some discipline by blows, comes to predominate over those, who, if unsubjected by his arts, would by main strength have torn him to pieces.

“ The first of those attributes was Louis's *excessive superstition*,—a plague with which Heaven often afflicts those who refuse to listen to the dictates of religion. The remorse arising from his evil actions, Louis never endeavoured to appease by any relaxation in his Machiavellian stratagems, but laboured in vain to sooth and silence that painful feeling by superstitious observances, severe penance, and profuse gifts to the ecclesiastics.”

The other point alluded to, his disposition to low pleasures and “obscure debauchery,” is to be explained by reference to qualities already indicated. It arises from the animal propensities joined to *secretiveness*, which delights most in those gratifications which are indulged in a hidden and concealed manner. To the secretive man in particular, “stolen waters are sweet, and bread eaten in secret is pleasant.” What follows is no less indicative of the predominance of the same propensity.

“ The wisest, or, at least, the most crafty sovereign of his time, was fond of ordinary life; and, being himself a man of wit, enjoyed the jests and repartees of social conversation more than could have been expected from other points of his character. He even mingled in the comic adventures of obscure intrigue with freedom scarce consistent with the habitual and guarded jealousy of his character; and was so fond of this species of humble gallantry, that he caused a number of its gay and licentious anecdotes to be inserted in a collection well known to book-collectors, in whose

“ eyes (and the work is unfit for any other), the *right* edition is very “ precious.”

It is curious enough that the propensity of *secretiveness*, which, as we have seen, furnishes a key to so much of the character of Louis, should also account for this. The observations of phrenologists have determined that this power is an essential ingredient in *humour*, or that talent which enables its possessor to amuse himself, quietly and covertly, with the foibles and failings of others. That this was one of Louis's qualifications is undoubted, as well from many parts of his real history, as from what is attributed to him in the present work; the most memorable instance is where he teases the Cardinal Balue by practising upon his skill in horsemanship during a boar-hunt, and at the same time punishes his Reverence for a certain want of tact he had displayed in venturing to speak to his majesty at an unwelcome time upon a subject of state-policy. We give the scene, as it illustrates better than any thing we could say, this peculiar quality. After mentioning some other foibles of the cardinal, his awkward attempts at gallantry, and affected fondness for the martial amusement of the chase, it is mentioned that

“ the gallant horses, which he purchased at almost any price, were
 “ totally insensible to the dignity of carrying a cardinal, and paid
 “ no more respect to him than they would have done to his father
 “ the tailor, whom he rivalled in horsemanship. The king knew
 “ this, and by alternately exciting and checking his own horse, he
 “ brought that of the cardinal, whom he kept close by his side,
 “ into such a state of mutiny against his rider, that it became ap-
 “ parent they must soon part company; and then, in the midst of
 “ its starting, bolting, rearing, and lashing out alternately, the
 “ royal tormentor rendered the rider miserable by questioning him
 “ upon many affairs of importance, and hinting his purpose to
 “ take that opportunity of communicating to him some of those
 “ secrets of state, which the cardinal had but a little before seemed
 “ so anxious to learn.

“ A more awkward situation could hardly be imagined, than
 “ that of a privy counsellor forced to listen and reply to his sove-
 “ reign, while each fresh gambade of his unmanageable horse
 “ placed him in a new and more precarious attitude;—his violet
 “ robe flying loose in every direction, and nothing securing him

“ from an instant and perilous fall, save the depth of the saddle and its height before and behind. Dunois laughed outright ; while the king, who had a *private mode of enjoying his jest inwardly, without laughing aloud,*”—(what can more distinctly mark the perfection of that power which suppresses the outward indication of the feelings?)—“ mildly rebuked his minister in his eager passion for the chase, which would not permit him to dedicate a few moments to business. ‘ I will no longer be your hindrance,’ continued he, addressing the terrified cardinal, and giving his own horse the rein at the same time.

“ Before Balue could utter a word by way of answer or apology, his horse, seizing the bit with his teeth, went forth at an uncontrollable gallop, soon leaving the king and Dunois, who followed at a more regulated pace, enjoying the statesman’s distressed predicament.”

We have mentioned that the secretive propensity is found by the phrenologists to be accompanied by a tact which is essential for enabling its possessor to penetrate into the secret purposes of others. Other powers are doubtless required for giving this talent in perfection, but secretiveness powerfully aids the other faculties in this sort of penetration. It is also accompanied by a corresponding desire of discovering those purposes ; and indeed this is only one of the means by which the secretive are guided in knowing when and how to conceal what is passing in their own minds. This fact in the philosophy of mind is repeatedly referred to, and is indeed the very flower and essence of the quality of cunning to which the propensity is known to lead. It is mentioned,* that Dunois possessed a native openness and intrepidity of character, which “ made him from time to time a considerable favourite with Louis, who, like all astucious persons, *was as desirous of looking into the hearts of others as of concealing his own.*”

Phrenology has established that this power is an essential ingredient in the talent for *acting*, and to the perfection of the art of personation, both of a tragic and comic kind. Let any one read what follows, and consider whether the same powers which are shewn by the king in this instance might

* Vol. i. p. 225.

not, if differently directed, have rendered him an able and a natural actor.—Having occasion to hold a private interview with the Count of Crevecœur (ambassador from Charles of Burgundy) and his own minister, Balue, both of whom he suspected of treachery to his person, he thought fit, by way of precaution, to place Durward in the chamber, concealed behind a beaufet, with a lighted matchlock, and with orders, that when he should hear the king exclaim, *Ecosse, en avant!* he should instantly shoot Crevecœur through the head. Having planted this ambuscade, the king patiently waits the arrival of his visitors, and, we are told,

“welcomed them with a degree of cordiality which Quentin had
 “the utmost difficulty to reconcile with the directions which he
 “had previously received, and the purpose for which he stood
 “behind the beaufet with his deadly weapon in readiness. Not
 “only did Louis appear totally free from apprehension of any kind,
 “but one would have supposed that these guests whom he had
 “done the high honour to admit to his table *were the very persons*
 “*in whom he could most unreservedly confide, and whom he was*
 “*most willing to honour.* Nothing could be more dignified, and
 “at the same time more courteous, than his demeanour. While
 “all around him, including even his own dress, was far beneath
 “what the petty princes of the kingdom displayed in their festivi-
 “ties, his own language and manners were those of a mighty sove-
 “reign in his most condescending mood. Quentin was tempted to
 “suppose, either that the whole of his previous conversation with
 “Louis had been a dream, or that the dutiful demeanour of the
 “cardinal, and the frank, open, and gallant bearing of the Bur-
 “gundian noble, had entirely erased the king’s suspicions.

“But whilst the guests, in obedience to the king, were in the
 “act of placing themselves at the table, *his majesty darted one keen*
 “*glance on them, and then instantly directed his look to Quentin’s*
 “*post.* This was done in an instant, but the glance conveyed so
 “much doubt and hatred towards his guests, such a peremptory
 “injunction on Quentin to be watchful in attendance, and prompt
 “in execution, that no room was left for doubting that the senti-
 “ments of Louis continued unaltered, and his apprehensions un-
 “abated. He was therefore more than ever astonished *at the deep*
 “*veil under which that monarch was able to conceal the movements*
 “*of his jealous disposition.*——“So soon as all, even Oliver, had
 “retired, he called Quentin from his place of concealment, but
 “with a voice so faint, that the youth could scarce believe it to be
 “the same which had so lately given animation to the jest and zest
 “to the tale. As he approached, he saw an equal change in his
 “countenance. The light of assumed vivacity had left his eyes,

“ the smile had deserted his face, and he exhibited all the fatigue of
 “ a celebrated actor, when he has finished the exhausting repre-
 “ sentation of some favourite character.”

We shall next turn to the contrast afforded to the character of Louis by that of Charles the Bold, duke of Burgundy, at one time his potent rival, but whose dominions, latterly, Louis found means to annex to his own: so much does craft and policy prevail over inconsiderate violence.

“ The character of this duke,” the author observes, “ was in every respect a direct contrast to that of Louis XI. The latter was calm, deliberate, and crafty, never prosecuting a desperate enterprise, and never abandoning a probable one, however distant the prospect of success. The genius of the duke was entirely different. He rushed on danger because he loved it,* and difficulties because he despised them.† As Louis never sacrificed his interest to his passion, so Charles, on the other hand, never sacrificed his passion, or even his humour, to any other consideration.‡ Notwithstanding the near relationship that existed between them, and the support which the duke and his father had afforded to Louis in his exile while dauphin, there was mutual contempt and hatred betwixt them.§ The Duke of Burgundy despised the cautious policy of the king, and imputed to the faintness of his courage, that he sought by leagues, purchases, and other indirect means, those advantages which, in his place, he would have snatched with an armed hand; and he hated him, not only for the ingratitude he had manifested for former kindnesses, and for personal injuries and imputations which the ambassadors of Louis had cast upon him when his father was yet alive, but also and especially because of the support which he afforded in secret to the discontented citizens of Ghent, Liege, and other great towns in Flanders.

“ The contempt and hatred of the duke were retaliated by Louis with equal energy, though he used a thicker veil to conceal his sentiments. It was impossible for a man of his profound sagacity not to despise the stubborn obstinacy which never resigned its purpose, however fatal perseverance might prove, and the headlong impetuosity which commenced its career without allowing a moment’s consideration for the obstacles to be encountered. Yet the king hated Charles even more than he contemned him, and his scorn and hatred were the more intense that they were mingled with fear; for he knew that the onset of a mad bull, to whom he likened the Duke of Burgundy, must ever be formi-

* Combativeness, very large.

† Self-esteem, very large. Hope, large. Cautiousness, small.

‡ Self-esteem and combativeness.

§ Self-esteem, great in both, with a complete opposition in other qualities, would produce this mutual hatred.

“ dable, though the animal makes it with shut eyes. It was not alone the wealth of the Burgundian provinces, the discipline of the warlike inhabitants, and the mass of their crowded population, which the king dreaded, for the personal qualities of their leader had also much in them that was dangerous. The very soul of bravery, which he pushed to the verge of rashness and beyond it, profuse in his expenditure,* splendid in his court, his person, and his retinue,† in all which he displayed the hereditary magnificence of the House of Burgundy, Charles the Bold drew into his service almost all the fiery spirits of the age, whose temper was congenial; and Louis saw too clearly what might be attempted and executed by such a train of desperate resolute, following a leader of a character as ungovernable as their own.

“ There was yet another circumstance which increased the animosity of Louis towards his overgrown vassal; for he owed him favours which he never meant to repay, and was under the frequent necessity of temporizing with him, and even of enduring bursts of petulant insolence, injurious to the regal dignity, without being able to treat him as other than his ‘ fair cousin of Burgundy.’ ”

As this is a much more open character than that of Louis, and the elements of which it is composed much more obvious, we have not chosen to interrupt the author’s statement by a detailed phrenological exposition of the faculties and propensities which the sketch indicates. We prefer, for brevity’s sake, as well as for the more distinct exhibition of the contrast intended, to state what we conceive to have been the development of those two princes, as far as the sketches of their character here given afford materials.

	LOUIS.	CHARLES.
1. AMATIVENESS,	full,	no data.
2. PHILOPROGENITIVENESS,	moderate,	do.
3. CONCENTRATIVENESS,	full,	moderate.
4. ADHESIVENESS,	probably moderate,	full.
5. COMBATIVENESS,	full,	very large.
6. DESTRUCTIVENESS,	very large,	large.
7. CONSTRUCTIVENESS,	no data,	no data.
8. ACQUISITIVENESS,	large,	moderate.
9. SECRETIVENESS,	very large,	small or moderate.
10. SELF-ESTEEM,	large,	very large.
11. LOVE OF APPROBATION,	small,	large.

* Acquisitiveness, small or moderate.

† Ideality, full or large; and love of approbation, large.

	LOUIS.	CHARLES.
13. CAUTIOUSNESS,	large,	small.
13. BENEVOLENCE,	small,	full.
14. VENERATION.	very large,	moderate.
15. HOPE,	moderate,	full or rather large.
16. IDEALITY,	small,	full.
17. CONSCIENTIOUSNESS,	small,	rather full.
18. FIRMNESS,	large,	large.
19 to 29.		
KNOWING FACULTIES, }	upon the whole large,	no data.
30 to 32.		
REFLECTIVE FACULTIES, }	moderate or rather } small,	small.
33. IMITATION,	probably full,	no data.
34. WONDER,	do,	do.

After considering these two characters separately, it may be interesting to observe how they conduct themselves towards each other when brought into contact, and to see how this conduct agrees with the principles of the phrenological system. The visit which Louis made to Charles at Peronne in 1468, affords us an opportunity for this, as it does to our author, of displaying still farther his knowledge of human nature, as manifesting itself in the collisions of strong and contending passions. It is not easy to conjecture what could induce so prudent a prince as Louis to take a step by which he put himself so completely in the power of an exasperated rival; but it is probable that he did so, trusting to Charles's romantic honour, which he calculated would not allow him to violate the rites of hospitality; and also trusting not a little to his own superior sagacity, skill, and command of temper; and expecting that, in a personal conference, he could not fail to derive, by means of these, some notable advantages. He was disappointed, however, in these expectations; and soon discovered, that, notwithstanding an external appearance of respect and kindness with which he was treated by Charles, he was, in reality, looked upon by him with the greatest degree of jealousy. This repressed state of feeling on the part of Charles was blown into a flame on the arrival of news from Liege, by which it appeared that, in-

stigated by Louis's emissaries, the subjects of the Duke of Burgundy in that quarter had risen against their bishop, assaulted him in his castle at Tongres, and put a great part of his retinue to death; and it was even reported that the bishop himself was among the number of the slain.* This being believed by the duke, he fell into a violent passion against the king—charged him with a design of deluding him in coming thither—ordered the gates both of the town and castle to be shut; and caused Louis to be lodged near a certain tower where one of his predecessors had been put to death. All this, of course, threw Louis into the greatest anxiety and alarm, and it required all his courage, coolness, and address, to extricate him from so unpleasant a situation; nor did he accomplish this without making some important sacrifices, and disavowing all that had been done by his emissaries at Liege. The different scenes which are supposed to take place at this time between the rival princes, particularly upon the arrival of the news from Liege, and the first explosion of Charles's wrath on hearing it, are described with a graphic force and effect which few writers could have equalled.

We have first an interview between Louis and Charles, in which the king, in a half-serious half-bantering manner, endeavours to bring round the duke to his purposes, and in which we are told he performed the part of a prudent pilot, and "seemed to sound with the utmost address and precision the depths and shallows of his rival's mind and temper, and manifested neither doubt nor fear when the result of his experiments discovered much more of sunken rocks and of dangerous shoals than of safe anchorage." The rivals then retired, after a day wearisome and unsatisfactory to both—the king to ruminate on farther schemes—the duke to visit on his courtiers and attendants that repressed rage

* This account, which is given by Comines as a report merely, is assumed as true in the novel, where there is a detail of the actual slaughter of the bishop given in all its horror.

to which he durst not, or did not choose, to give vent in the presence of his superior. Next day, after a review and a boar-hunt, in the course of which Louis continued steadily to pursue the true objects of his visit, in conciliating and securing to his interest both the highest and the lowest advisers and adherents of the Burgundian chief;—an entertainment is given more splendid than any which had yet taken place, in which Charles displays at once his own wealth and the number of his retainers; and at the same time treats Louis with all the external observances and ceremony due to his master and liege lord. In the midst of the feast, Charles is informed of the arrival of Crevecoeur with intelligence of importance from the territory of Liege; but the nature of this intelligence, from the fear of his violent temper, is at first carefully concealed,—a concealment which has only the effect to drive the duke to the last degree of impatience. Several excuses are then made for the non-appearance of Crevecoeur in person; that he wished to change his dress; that he wished to communicate his news at a private audience.

“ ‘*Teste-dieu*, my lord king,’ said Charles, ‘this is ever the way our counsellors serve us—If they have got hold of aught which they consider as important for our ear, they look as grave upon the matter, and are as proud of their burthen as an ass of a new pack-saddle.—Some one bid Crevecoeur come to us directly!—He comes from the frontiers of Liege, and we, at least (he laid some emphasis on the pronoun), have no secrets in that quarter which we would shun to have proclaimed before the assembled world.’

“ All perceived that the duke had drunk so much wine as to increase the native obstinacy of his disposition; and, though many would willingly have suggested that the present was neither a time for hearing news, nor for taking counsel, yet all knew the impetuosity of his temper too well to venture on farther interference, and sat in anxious expectation of the tidings which the count might have to communicate.

“ A brief interval intervened, during which the duke remained looking eagerly to the door, as if in a transport of impatience, while the guests sat with their eyes bent on the table, as if to conceal their curiosity and anxiety. Louis alone maintaining perfect composure, continued his conversation alternately with the grand carver and with the jester.

“ At length Crevecoeur entered, and was presently saluted by the hurried question of his master, ‘What news from Liege and Brabant, Sir Count?—The report of your arrival has chased mirth

“ from our table ; we hope your actual presence will bring it back to us.”

“ ‘ My liege and master,’ answered the count, in a firm, but melancholy tone, ‘ the news which I bring you are fitter for the council-board than the feasting-table.’ ”

“ ‘ Out with them, man, if they were tidings from Antichrist,’ said the duke ; ‘ but I can guess them—the Liegeois are again in mutiny.’ ”

“ ‘ They are, my lord,’ said Creveceur, very gravely.’ ”

“ ‘ Look there, man,’ said the duke, ‘ I have hit at once on what you have been so much afraid to mention to me—the hare-brained burghers are again in arms. It could not be in a better time, for we may at present have the advice of our own Suzerain, bowing to King Louis, with eyes which spoke the most bitter, though suppressed, resentment, ‘ to teach us how such mutineers should be dealt with. Hast thou more news in thy packet? Out with them, and then answer for yourself why you went not forward to assist the bishop.’ ”

“ ‘ My lord, the farther tidings are heavy for me to tell, and will be afflicting to you to hear.—No aid of mine, or of living chivalry, could have availed the excellent prelate. William de la Marck, united with the insurgent Liegeois, has taken his castle of Schonwaldt, and murdered him in his own hall.’ ”

“ ‘ Murdered him !’ repeated the duke, in a deep and low tone, but which nevertheless was heard from the one end of the hall in which they were assembled to the other ; ‘ thou hast been imposed upon, Creveceur, by some wild report—it is impossible.’ ”

“ ‘ Alas ! my lord,’ said the count, ‘ I have it from an eye-witness, an archer of the King of France’s Scottish Guard, who was in the hall when the murder was committed by William de la Marck’s order.’ ”

“ ‘ And who was doubtless aiding and abetting in the horrible sacrilege,’ said the duke, starting up and stamping with his foot with such fury, that he dashed in pieces the footstool which was placed before him. ‘ Bar the doors of this hall, gentlemen—secure the windows—let no stranger stir from his seat, upon pain of instant death !—Gentlemen of my chamber, draw your swords.’ And, turning upon Louis, he advanced his own hand slowly and deliberately to the hilt of his weapon, while the king, without either shewing fear or assuming a defensive posture, only said,—”

“ ‘ These news, fair cousin, have staggered your reason.’ ”

“ ‘ No !’ replied the duke, in a terrible tone, ‘ but they have awakened a just resentment, which I have too long suffered to be stifled by trivial considerations of circumstance and place. Murderer of thy brother !—rebel against thy parent !—tyrant over thy subjects !—treacherous ally !—perjured king !—dishonoured gentleman !—thou art in my power, and I thank God for it.’ ”

“ ‘ Rather thank my folly,’ said the king ; ‘ for, when we met on equal terms at Montl’hery, methinks you wished yourself farther from we than we are now.’ ”

“ The duke still held his hand on the hilt of his sword, but refrained to draw his weapon, or to strike a foe who offered no sort of resistance which could in anywise provoke violence.

“ Meantime wild and general confusion spread itself through the hall. The doors were now fastened and guarded at the order of the duke; but several of the French nobles, few as they were in number, started from their seats, and prepared for the defence of their sovereign.”

It is needless to quote the rest of the scene, which is equally characteristic, and naturally described. Our readers know that it ends in the gentlemen of the French party yielding to superior force, and Louis himself being placed under arrest, and sent, under a strong guard, with only six attendants, to the confinement of a dungeon.

The behaviour of the king after he is put in confinement, the choice he made of persons to attend him, his resolution to hang the astrologer in his prison, his prayer to Our Lady of Clery to forgive him for this meditated offence, and the manner in which the consulter of the stars contrived to slip his neck out of the noose that was prepared for him, are among the most amusing and interesting parts of the book, and correspond exactly with what we already know of the monarch's character. But it is more to our purpose to attend to the behaviour of Charles, whom the circumstances that had taken place seem to have affected more strongly than even Louis himself.

“ He refused to throw off his clothes, or to make any preparation for sleep; but spent the night in a violent succession of the most strong passions. In some paroxysms he talked incessantly to his attendants so thick and rapidly, that they were really afraid his senses would give way; choosing for his theme the merits and the kindness of heart of the murdered Bishop of Liege, and recalling all the instances of mutual kindness, affection, and confidence which had passed between them, until he had worked himself into such a transport of grief, that he threw himself upon his face on the bed, and seemed ready to choke with the sobs and tears which he endeavoured to stifle. Then starting from the couch, he gave vent at once to another and more furious mood, and traversed the room hastily, uttering incoherent threats, and still more incoherent oaths of vengeance, while, stamping with his foot, according to his customary action, he invoked Saint George, Saint Andrew, and whomever else he held most holy, to bear witness, that he would take bloody vengeance on De la Marck,

of the character—*large combativeness, destructiveness, and self-esteem*, for the other. But it is not more contrary to phrenology, than to all the rules of just philosophizing, to conclude, that *the same mental quality* which gives rise to the one of these manifestations, also originates the other. Were that the case, the tiger would be the most loving as well as the most ferocious of animals, and the kindness and benevolence of Herman Pavillon must have yielded, by fifty degrees, to those of that warm-tempered gentleman William de la Marck.

We have no right to be angry with this author for his not being a phrenologist, and for his refusing to adopt the system which we advocate ; but we do think ourselves entitled to complain that this gifted writer, who possesses so much the talent (when he chooses to exert it) of giving to humble merit the deserved assistance of a little well-timed applause, the value of which is no doubt duly appreciated, should so far depart from his usual style of courtesy, in one instance, as to indulge, as he does, in certain little hits against us and our system, which do us no manner of harm, and only shew that he is utterly ignorant of what our system really is, what are the proofs upon which it is founded, and what are the objects and purposes to which it may be applied. In the work which we have been considering, he has thought fit to compare our science to the ancient and venerable art of palmistry ; and, in its more youthful successor, the sheets of which are yet hardly dry, he has chosen to refer to the consideration of the *craniologists** the well-known cases of “ those men of undoubted benevolence of character and disposition, whose principal delight was to see a miserable criminal degraded alike by his previous crimes and the sentence which he had incurred, conclude a vicious and

* It is proper that we say a word on the affectation of using this misnomer, which the *phrenologists* have so repeatedly disclaimed. It resembles the wretched vanity which induces people to forget the names of those they wish to treat as their inferiors :

“ *And if his name be George, I'll call him Peter.*”—KING JOHN.

“wretched life by an ignominious and cruel death.” If this is intended as a sarcasm, it is a sarcasm on human nature, and glances pointless from the *phrenologists*, who did not make the character which their system serves to explain; and is, indeed, a direct tribute to their system, while it admits that the anomaly in question seems “to defy all the researches of the “ethic philosopher.”

ARTICLE III.

DUGALD STEWART, ESQ. ON MILTON'S GARDEN OF EDEN.

THE application of phrenology, as an analytic instrument, has interested many of our readers; but the phrenologists cannot boast of the honour of originating this use of the philosophy of mind. Long before our science had raised its head, Mr Stewart had presented his readers with an analysis of the powers necessary to the conception of Milton's Garden of Eden.

In his “Outlines of Moral Philosophy, Part I.” he says,

“The most important of these (the intellectual powers of man) are comprehended in the following enumeration :

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| “ 1. Consciousness. | “ 6. Association of ideas. |
| “ 2. Powers of external perception. | “ 7. Memory. |
| “ 3. Attention. | “ 8. Imagination. |
| “ 4. Conception. | “ 9. Powers of judgment and reasoning. |
| “ 5. Abstraction. | |

“Besides these intellectual faculties,” continues Mr Stewart, “which in some degree are *common* to the whole species, there are *other* more complicated powers or capacities which are *gradually formed* by particular *habits* of study or of business. Such are the *POWER of TASTE, a GENIUS for POETRY, for PAINTING, for MUSIC, for MATHEMATICS*; with all the various intellectual *habits* acquired in the different professions of life.”

Here, then, IMAGINATION is mentioned as a “faculty in some degree common to the whole species;” and TASTE

as a "power gradually formed by particular habits of study
"or of business."

In the "Elements of the Philosophy of the Human
"Mind," chap. vi. sect. 1. Mr Stewart states, that

"what we call the power of imagination, is NOT the *gift of nature*,
"but the result of acquired habits, aided by favourable circum-
"stances. It is NOT *an original endowment* of the mind, but an
"ACCOMPLISHMENT formed by experience and situation, and which,
"in its different gradations, fills up all the interval between the
"first efforts of untutored genius and the sublime creations of
"Raphael or of Milton."

As this doctrine concerning imagination appears to differ
from that previously cited, we hold the last passage, which
is the most elaborately written, to contain Mr Stewart's pro-
foundest views on this part of our constitution. According
to him, therefore, neither TASTE nor IMAGINATION is the
gift of nature; but both are formed and acquired by
habits.

The following is his analysis of the faculties which con-
tributed to the formation of Milton's Garden of Eden :

"Let us consider," says he, "the steps by which Milton must
"have proceeded in creating his imaginary Garden of Eden. When
"he first proposed to himself that subject of description, it is rea-
"sonable to suppose, that a variety of the most striking scenes which
"he had seen crowded into his mind. The ASSOCIATION of ideas
"suggested them, and the power of CONCEPTION placed each of
"them before him with all its beauties and imperfections. In every
"natural scene, if we destine it for any particular purpose, there
"are defects and redundancies, which art may sometimes, but can-
"not always correct. But the power of IMAGINATION is unlimited.
"She can create and annihilate, and dispose, at pleasure, her woods,
"her rocks, her rivers. Milton, accordingly, would not copy his
"Eden from any one scene, but would select from each the features
"which were most eminently beautiful. The power of ABSTRACTION
"enabled him to make the separation, and TASTE directed him in
"the selection. Thus he was furnished with his materials; by a
"skillful combination of which he has created a landscape, more
"perfect, probably in all its parts, than was ever realized in nature;
"and certainly very different from any thing which this country
"exhibited at the period when he wrote." (*Elements of the Philo-
sophy of the Human Mind*, chap. vii. sect. 1.)

The Garden of Eden, then, was created by Milton by

the aid of the powers of ASSOCIATION, CONCEPTION, ABSTRACTION, IMAGINATION, and TASTE. Of these the first three are possessed by the whole human race; and Milton's superiority in the last two was the result of his "particular habits of study or of business." Hence it seems to us to follow, that any individual who possessed the three primitive faculties of association, conception, and abstraction, in the same degree as Milton, might have acquired his habits, and by these have formed powers of imagination and taste equally admirable, and then have written the Garden of Eden, or even Paradise Lost itself, if he had happened to turn his attention that way. Now, the phrenologist would form a different theory. He perceives in Paradise Lost manifestations of Ideality, of great reflecting faculties, and much Veneration, together with Language, Individuality, Locality, and other powers; and he would infer, that the poem itself, and even the description of the Garden of Eden in particular, was the result of the activity of these faculties, improved by exercise and education, and that without these natural gifts, Milton's habits could not have been acquired, nor similar manifestations of intellect produced.

To elucidate the value of Mr Stewart's theory and ours, we may compare with Milton an author in whom the primitive faculties of association, conception, and abstraction will be generally admitted to have been equal in vigour and cultivation, and see whether he could have been trained to write such a poem. Locke will serve as an example. In the three original powers in question, he appears to have been fully equal to Milton. In vigour of conception, scope of association, and intensity of abstraction, the Essay on the Human Understanding may be placed in the opposite scale with Paradise Lost, without danger of depreciation. Equal taste and imagination certainly are not displayed in it; but according to Mr Stewart, Locke, by possessing the primitive powers, could have acquired these secondary qualities,

and rivalled Milton in the very points in which he is reckoned almost inimitable !

In the portraits of Locke we perceive a great development of the organs of Comparison and Causality, with rather a deficiency of Ideality ; in those of Milton, on the other hand, we see the " fair large front " indicating Comparison and Causality equal to Locke's, with much larger organs of Ideality. To Locke we would ascribe, also, great Concentrativeness and Conscientiousness ; and in Milton's portraits we distinctly perceive Veneration, in addition to Ideality, largely developed.

We infer, that the heads of both were large ; for great size of brain would be necessary to that powerful *energy* by which they are equally distinguished. Locke must have been conscious of this quality, when he contemplated the overthrow of the philosophy of his age ; and Milton displayed it, in an eminent degree, when he characterized his song as one

" That with no *middle flight* INTENDS to soar
 " Above the *Æolian* mount, while it pursues
 " *Things unattempted yet* in prose or rhyme."

The combination of Concentrativeness with Causality and Comparison in Locke, would give him the great capacity for abstract and concentrated thinking, and that comprehensiveness and depth of understanding, for which he is so justly celebrated. Conscientiousness would inspire him with that ardent love of truth which constitutes a fundamental element in a philosophic mind, and shines conspicuously in all his works ; while a deficiency in Ideality would unfit him for extensive flights of imagination, and permit his intellect to follow, undistractedly, its natural bent towards solid and useful investigation, in preference to ornamental description or sublime invention. Education would furnish his faculties with ideas, which constitute the *material* of thought ; and exercise would educe their native vigour, and preserve it unimpaired until disease or the chills of age benumbed the

brain. The Essay on the Human Understanding would be the result of those faculties and circumstances combined.

Comparison and Causality would confer on Milton depth, scope, and vigour of intellect, not inferior to Locke's; while Ideality, largely developed, would carry him far as the wide diurnal space beyond and above the region of Locke's imaginings; and his powerful Veneration would prompt him to seek for gratification of his feelings amid the glories which surround the Almighty's throne. This combination, with much of the faculties of Language and Tune, would constitute the natural elements of Milton's genius; and to a capacity for improvement by education, exercise, and travel, equal to Locke's, it would add a susceptibility of elevated emotion, and a consequent power of forming vast, splendid, and lovely conceptions, altogether unattainable by the latter by any "habits of study or of business."* Thus endowed, Milton's mind would be adequate to the conception and execution of that stupendous poem, the melody, and taste, and beauty of which are surpassed only by its grandeur and magnificence. The Garden of Eden would owe its origin principally to Locality, Order, Colouring, and Ideality. Individuality and Comparison appear not only to have supplied particular illustrations of exquisite elegance and beauty, but also to have suggested some allusions to heathen mythology, and incidents of common life, neither dignified, appropriate, nor refined.

These remarks are offered not as a complete analysis of the genius of these two illustrious men, but merely as an elucidation of the difference between the metaphysical and phrenological modes of accounting for their productions. To us the latter appears, in the present instance, to make the nearer approach to nature and the common apprehen-

* The busts and portraits of Lord Bacon indicate a development of ideality closely resembling that of Milton, and over all his works this faculty sheds a brilliant and fervid illumination. Locke approaches him in some degree in vigour, scope, and profundity of thought; but he is immeasurably behind in that gorgeousness of fancy which abounds in Bacon almost to excess.

sions of mankind ; but Mr Stewart has said, “ Is there no “ Arbuthnot now to chastise the follies of our craniologists ? ” And he is a great philosopher ! The world must decide between us.

ARTICLE IV.

SECOND DIALOGUE BETWEEN A PHILOSOPHER OF THE OLD SCHOOL AND A PHRENOLOGIST.

Phren. In our last conversation we discussed the principles of Phrenology. Have you considered these, and are you prepared to admit their truth, or to overthrow them by philosophical objections ?

Phil. Indeed I have given them very little consideration. The world has gone on well enough with the philosophy of mind it already possesses, which, besides, is consecrated by great and venerable names, while your system has neither symmetry of structure, beauty of arrangement, nor the suffrages of the learned to recommend it. Its votaries are all third-rate men—persons without scientific or philosophical reputations. You are not entitled, therefore, to challenge the regard of those who have higher studies to occupy their attention. You complain that they only ridicule and abuse you, and do not venture to challenge your principles or refute your facts ; but you do not yet stand high enough in their esteem to give you a right to expect any other treatment. Since I last conversed with you, therefore, I have not thought at all of the subject, farther than taking an occasional laugh at it with the ladies in the drawing-room.

Phren. Ferdinand of Spain thinks the world goes on admirably without liberty, and the Grand Turk conceives his people to be blessed by ignorance ;—if you belong to their school, and imagine knowledge to be of no value, because men can eat, drink, and sleep, without it, I rejoice that the

old philosophy continues to be honoured by your support. The admirers of the new system reckon no moral or physical truth unimportant, just because it is necessarily of divine origin. Besides, you are deciding without examination, and consequently without knowledge, that there is no symmetry or beauty in phrenology. It possesses these attributes in the highest degree; for Nature is ever beautiful and harmonious. You smile at this assertion; but you have no *authority* for the opposite opinion. You are aware, moreover, that all great discoveries have been treated with derision at their first announcement. It is little more than ten years since I heard a celebrated poetical baronet play off more bad jokes against an ingenious gentleman, who asserted the possibility of lighting London with gas, than he has uttered even against phrenology itself; and yet London is now lighted in the way then ridiculed;—aye, and the baronet's house, too, shines in all the splendour of gas-illumination!

Phil. I grant that the ridicule with which phrenology has been treated argues nothing against it, and proves only its wide departure from preconceived ideas; but you have not answered my remark, that there are no distinguished names among the votaries of your doctrine, the weight of whose reputation might afford some reason for condescending to examine it.

Phren. You have admitted its novelty; and you are aware that men who possess reputation in physiology or mental philosophy would appear to lose rather than gain renown, were they to confess their present ignorance of the functions of the brain and the philosophy of mind, an almost necessary prelude to their adoption of phrenology; and the subject does not lie directly in the department of other scientific men. In this manner it happens, oddly enough, that those who are most directly called upon by their situation to examine the science, are precisely those to whom its triumph would prove most humiliating. Locke humorously observes on a similar occasion, "Would it not be an insufferable thing for a learned professor, or, and that which his scarlet would blush at, to have his

“ authority of forty years standing, wrought out of hard
 “ rock, Greek and Latin, with no small expense of time and
 “ candle, and confirmed by general tradition and a reverend
 “ beard, in an instant overturned by an upstart novelist?
 “ Can any one expect that he should be made to confess,
 “ that what he taught his scholars thirty years ago was all
 “ error and mistake, and that he sold them hard words at a
 “ very dear rate? What probabilities, I say, are sufficient to
 “ prevail in such a case? And who ever, by the most co-
 “ gent arguments, will be prevailed with to disrobe himself
 “ at once of all his old opinions and pretences to knowledge
 “ and learning, which with hard study he hath all his time
 “ been labouring for, and turn himself out stark-naked in
 “ quest of fresh notions? All the arguments that can be
 “ used will be as little able to prevail as the wind did with
 “ the traveller to part with his cloak, which he held only
 “ the faster.” * Human nature, sir, is the same now as in
 the days of Locke.

PM. Your allusions, sir, are impertinent. You will never convert mankind to phrenology by such means.

Phren. Pardon, sir; I made no individual application of these remarks. There is, however, another answer to your observations, to which I solicit your attention. Some individuals are born princes, dukes, or even field-marsals; but I am not aware that it has yet been announced that any lady was delivered of a child of genius, or of an infant of established reputation. These titles must be gained by the display of qualities which merit them; but if an individual quit the beaten track pursued by the philosophers of his day, and introduce any discovery, although equally stupendous and new, do you not perceive that his reputation is necessarily involved in its merits? Harvey was not a great man before he discovered the circulation of the blood, but became such in consequence of having done so.

* Book iv. c. 20, § 11.

What was Shakspeare before the magnificence of his genius was justly appreciated? The author of *Kenilworth* represents him attending as a humble and comparatively obscure suitor at the court of Queen Elizabeth, and receiving a mark of favour in an "Ah! Will Shakspeare, are you there?" And he most appropriately remarks, that here the immortal paid homage to the mortal. Who would now exchange the greatness of Shakspeare for the splendour of the proudest lord that bowed before the Maiden Queen? Or imagine to yourself Galileo, such as he was in reality, a feeble old man, humble in rank, destitute of political power, unprotected by the countenance or alliance of the great, poor, in short, in every thing except the splendid gifts of a profound, original, and comprehensive genius—and conceive him placed at the bar of the Roman pontiff and the seven cardinals, men terrible in power, invested with authority to torture and kill in this world, and, as was then believed, to damn through eternity; men magnificent in wealth, and arrogant in the imaginary possession of all the wisdom of their age—and say who was *then* great in reputation—Galileo or his judges? And who is *now* the idol of posterity—the old man or his persecutors? The case will be the same with Gall. If his discoveries of the functions of the brain, and of the philosophy of the mind, stand the test of examination, and prove to be a correct interpretation of nature, they will surpass, in substantial importance to mankind, the discoveries even of Harvey, Newton, or Galileo; and this age will in consequence be rendered more illustrious by the introduction of phrenology, than by the butcheries of Buonaparte, or the victories of Wellington. Finally, the assertion that no men of note have embraced phrenology, is not supported by fact. In the *New Monthly Magazine* for January 1823, it is said, "There are many men here (Paris) amongst the most eminent for their medical and physiological knowledge, who, though differing widely upon other scientific topics, yet agree in saying, that there is much not only of probability, but of truth, in the system of Dr Gall." It is

known, too, that several of the most eminent divines of the Scottish church make no secret of their attachment to the science. Besides, the writings of the phrenologists will bear a comparison in point of skill, extent of information, correctness of logic, and profundity of thought, with those of the most eminent of their opponents.

Phil. There may be some truth in these observations, but what I principally alluded to is the fact, that all the disciples of phrenology are persons ignorant of anatomy and physiology. You delude lawyers, divines, and merchants, who know nothing about the brain; but all medical men, and especially teachers of anatomy, are so well aware of the fallacy of your doctrines, that you make no impression on them. They laugh at your discoveries as dreams.

Phren. This objection, like many others, is remarkable more for boldness than truth. In our last conversation I demonstrated the unavoidable ignorance of medical gentlemen of the old school regarding the functions of the brain, and you may easily satisfy yourself by a little inquiry that this representation was correct. For my own part, before adopting phrenology, I saw Dr Monro, Dr Barclay, and other anatomical professors, dissect the brain repeatedly, and heard them declare its functions to be an enigma, and acknowledge that their whole information concerning it consisted of "names without meaning." This circumstance, therefore, puts the whole faculty, who have not studied phrenologically, completely out of the field as authorities. The *fact*, however, is the very reverse of what you state. Drs Gall and Spurzheim are now pretty generally admitted to be admirable anatomists of the brain, even by those who disavow their physiology; and in the list of the Phrenological Society, out of 86 members you will find 18 doctors in medicine, and 11 surgeons, a proportion considerably larger than that of the medical profession to society in general.

Phil. This is a vain discussion, and I do not desire to prosecute it farther. Seriously speaking, I would study

your system did I not see insuperable difficulties and objections.

Phren. Will you be pleased to state them; for I always learn something from conversation with a candid and intelligent opponent.

Phil. Your whole system of separate faculties appears to me unsound. The mind, so far as consciousness is concerned, is single, and the phrenological faculties are distinguished from one another only by the kinds of external objects with which they are conversant; your faculty of locality, for example, is only the mind attending to relative position; and your faculty of colouring is the mind attending to the rays of light. Now, you might as well say that there is one ear for sharp sounds and another for flat. The question between you and the metaphysicians is one of nomenclature merely.

Phren. You imagine, then, that Drs Gall and Spurzheim merely surveyed the different objects on which the mind is employed, and conceived the idea of forming them into classes; and by a kind of metaphysical fiction, adopted, for the sake of laying the basis of a theory, called the acts of the mind, when employed on these different classes, FACULTIES, and gave each faculty the name of the external objects on which it is supposed to be employed?

Phil. Certainly I do understand the matter so.—Have you any different view of it?

Phren. The basis of the theory would be gratuitous, and the whole system merely an emanation of human thought, if these views were correct. They are very wide of the truth. I shall explain what is meant in phrenology by a faculty; and the difference between the metaphysical and phrenological views of it. In popular language, FACULTY is nearly synonymous with POWER OR CAPACITY; but not with ACT OR STATE. Nevertheless Dr Thomas Brown has lately shewn, that the faculties of the metaphysicians are merely names for different states of the mind, and not different powers. The mind perceiving is in one state accord-

ing to him, the mind conceiving in another, and the mind judging or reasoning in a third. Accordingly, he says that the philosophy of mind consists in an analysis of all the states in which it is capable of existing, and of the causes of these states; and that the words Faculties and Powers designate only certain states in which the mind exists on particular occasions.

Phil. This is a correct and comprehensive statement of what every student understands to be the true principles of mental philosophy.

Phron. Favour me now with a few minutes' attention. The mind, considered as a general power existing in different states, may be likened to a wind-instrument with only one form of apparatus for emitting sound,—a trumpet for example. If excited with one degree of force it emits one kind of note, which is the result of the metal being in a certain state. If excited with another degree of force, it emits another kind of note, and this is the consequence of the metal being in another state. The number of notes that may be produced will be as great as the variety of states into which the metal may be excited by every possible impulse of wind. Now, suppose the first note to be Perception, the second Conception, and so on, the analogy betwixt the instrument and the mind may be carried to an indefinite length, each state of the trumpet, and each note resulting from it, corresponding to a state of the mind, and to the mental act which proceeds from it.

Phil. You illustrate well, and seem to comprehend the metaphysical theory perfectly. I am impatient to hear how you will elucidate and support your own.

Phron. I would liken the mind to another musical instrument—a piano-forte, having various strings. The first string is excited, and a certain note is produced; the second is excited, and another note swells upon the ear. Each note, it is true, results from the instrument being in a particular state, but it cannot exist in the state which produced the first note without the first string; nor in the state

which produced the second note without the second string; and so forth. The trumpet represents the mind as conceived by the metaphysicians; the piano-forte shadows it forth as apprehended by the phrenologists.

Phil. I conceive the distinction; but your supposition is a mere gratuitous hypothesis—the other is supported by the evidence of consciousness. You cannot shew that the mind really acts by distinct faculties, as the piano-forte emits different sounds through the excitement of different strings.

Phren. I think it possible to do so. Suppose that you had never seen either a trumpet or piano-forte, nor heard them described,—that they were played in your presence behind a screen, and you were required, from the mere notes emitted by each, to form a theory of its mechanism, could you be sanguine in your hopes of success in the attempt?

Phil. No! certainly I would not.—Imagine the performer on the piano-forte to sound every variety of note which the instrument was capable of producing, what a task would it be for an observer to attend to such fleeting entities as the notes, and analyse them—to arrange them into classes according to their resemblances or differences, and to give each class a name indicative of its distinctive qualities! Even after he had been successful in such an analysis, on what principle could he determine whether the sounds proceeded from a simple instrument in different states like the trumpet, or from different parts of a compound machine like the piano? Or allow that even the latter point was determined, what would be the chances in his favour that the divisions of his classes would correspond to the number of the strings, and that each note would be allotted to the string which produced it? In the present state of the human mind such an analysis is impossible.

Phren. Here again we are agreed; but this is precisely what the metaphysicians have been attempting, and their success has been what you describe.

Phil. I do not comprehend you. Be pleased to explain.

Phren. The mind is conscious of existing in various states, but it has no consciousness of the instruments by means of which it enters into them; and yet, until the classification of its states shall correspond with the divisions of its organs, the philosophy of mind will be equally wide of nature, as the description of a piano-forte drawn up from an analysis of its notes would be different from one founded on an examination of the instrument itself.

Phil. You are still enigmatical. I am interested in your observations, and desire to understand you.

Phren. If you were permitted to approach the piano-forte, and to try experimentally what notes could be produced from it by striking its various strings, or to see the performer touching its various keys, would you understand the theory of the production of its notes better?

Phil. Undoubtedly; but how does this bear upon the point under discussion?

Phren. A philosopher sitting in his closet, and reflecting on what passes in his own mind, is like a person studying the theory of a musical instrument by attending to its notes; the latter hears only notes succeeding notes, and has no palpable circumstance to inform him whether they are produced by a simple or a compound instrument. The former is conscious only of feelings and thoughts, but can discover no theory of their production. The inquirer, on the other hand, who studies man in society, resembles the person who approaches the instrument and examines narrowly its structure, and makes it sound while he observes it. By reflecting on the acts performed by the mind in perceiving relative position and colours, you say that you discover no circumstance to lead you to believe that the one is attributable to a faculty of locality, and the other to a faculty of colouring; but if you attend to the experience of Mr James Milne, whose case is recited in the Phrenological Transactions, p. 222, you will find that he is unable to distinguish shades, while he has an acute perception of relative position; and it

is added, that the organ of Colouring is small in his head, while that of Locality is fully developed : you are now as it were examining the instrument while you observe its performance.

Phil. I comprehend your illustration, and, as I desire only to find the truth, I may observe, that although I see no adequate ground, *a priori*, for assigning locality to one faculty and colouring to another, neither do I perceive any good reason in the nature of these mental acts to deny that the case *may be* as you state ;—the acts themselves are different, just as the feeling of benevolence is different from that of cruelty, and therefore they *may belong* to different organs ; but it lies with you to prove that they do so. Besides, what is your exact definition of a faculty ?

Phren. Your candour and love of truth I never doubted, whenever it was possible to surmount the prejudices with which your mind had been preoccupied. We admit that the burden of proving the truth of phrenology rests with us, and all we request is your attention to the evidence. You will find some of it in the Phrenological Transactions, part in the Phrenological Journal, but Nature herself is the grand record of which I would solicit your consideration. The best definition of a faculty which I am able to give is this, “ a particular mental power connected with a particular part of the brain as its organ.”

Phil. But this conveys no idea of what the particular power is ?

Phren. The works on phrenology specify them. Thus, Causality is one, and Tune is another.

Phil. But you call combativeness a faculty, and benevolence a faculty, and these are mere feelings or states of mind, and not powers.

Phren. This is one of the errors of the old philosophy. Do you ever meet in society with persons who oppose you at every step, contradict you in every argument, and maintain a systematic opposition to every proposal submitted to their consideration ?

Phil. Yes, I do, and this variety of character is admitted in scripture. The apostle speaks of men who through strife preached Christ crucified.

Phren. Whether, then, is it more correct to view those persons as possessing an *active* impulse or propensity prompting them to opposition in general, without requiring any hostile aggressions to call it into activity, or to consider their minds as only susceptible of entering into the state of opposition when external circumstances call for it?—Which opinion is best supported by facts,—that which regards combativeness as a disposition, a tendency, an instinct, in such minds, or merely a state which may be *induced* like any other state, but which exerts no *active* influence over their conduct?

Phil. I am disposed to admit there is some colour of plausibility in your remarks.

Phren. But I might go farther. One great evil produced by the metaphysical mode of philosophizing is, that too narrow a view is taken of the general constitution of the mind. If the metaphysician can discover any plausible explanation of a particular mental phenomenon, he never conceives himself called on to consider how his theory concerning it accords with other facts regarding the mental powers, or with human nature in general. For example, when he gravely tells you, “that he regards every intellectual operation as a general result of our spiritual nature; and that metaphysics draws no line of separation between intellect, faculty, and feeling,” he does not imagine himself called upon to reconcile with this statement the notorious facts, that some men have strong feelings and weak intellects, or, *vice versa*, that others possess particular feelings in a powerful degree, while they are almost insensible to others; or that one intellectual faculty is found deficient, and all the others eminently energetic, in the same individual. Or, again, when the metaphysical opponent adds, that “nothing can be more monstrous than to talk of the propagation of an intellectual power,” he does not think it necessary to grapple

with Dr Gregory's statement to the same effect, in the following words:—"Hujusmodi varietates non corporis modo, verum et animi quoque, plerumque congenitæ, nonnunquam hereditariæ, observantur. Hoc modo parentes sæpè in prole reviviscunt; certè parentibus liberi similes sunt, non vultum modo et corporis formam, sed animi indolem, et virtutes, et vitia. Imperiosa gens Claudia diu Romæ floruit, impigra, ferox, superba; eadem illachrymabilem Tiberium, tristissimum Tyrannum produxit; tandem in immanem Calligulam, et Claudium, et Agrippinam, ipsamque demum Neronem, post sexcentos annos desitura." In short, the metaphysical student has his faculties too much warped, and his field of vision too much limited to a point, to discover the bearing of the phenomena of nature on his theories, and hence is led into inextricable labyrinths and interminable errors. The phrenologist is in a different situation. He discovers that combativeness and destructiveness, for example, are *powers*, by attending to their effects; and he ascertains that they are connected with different organs by physical observation; and then he compares these conclusions with appearances presented to him by the human mind in every condition. One individual in society is remarkable for deficiency of the combative principle, and another is distinguished for its energy. These facts harmonize with the existence of a small and large development of the organ in different persons, which can be pointed out to the senses. The records of insanity describe cases of the most dreadful fury without derangement of intellect or even of the moral feelings. The connexion of these different powers with distinct organs, one of which may become diseased, and the others remain sound, coincides with this fact. The patient of Mr Hood at Kilmarnock* lost the power of recollecting words and their signification, while every other faculty of his mind remained entire; and the doctrine of a

* Phren. Trans. p. 236.

separate faculty and organ of language accords with this description; and all these cases shew, that the idea of a power which may become active by internal impulse being connected with particular organs, coincides better with the general phenomena of mind than the notion that there are no faculties, but only different states of mind.

Phil. I now comprehend what you mean by a faculty; but there is another preliminary obstacle to the study of phrenology, which appears to me nearly insurmountable; I mean the difficulty of discriminating the intellectual and moral character of individuals who are the subjects of observation. I do not mean to say that it is *impossible* to form an accurate estimate of a man's character from his conduct; but I do maintain, that to effect this purpose requires such an extensive acquaintance with conduct, and the motives which led to it, as may be obtained by any one person only in a comparatively small number of cases, and will furnish an induction much too limited to serve as the basis of any general rules.

Phren. It is a common mistake to suppose that all the organs and faculties were discovered, or are to be demonstrated to others, in a single individual. Were this the method followed by phrenologists, your objections would be insuperable; but nothing can be farther from the truth. They state, that each organ and its functions were discovered by observation of *extreme cases*, and are to be proved by such alone. Who can hesitate in deciding, for example, that Haydn had a great faculty for music, and Mr Sloane,* whose mask is to be found in the Phrenological Society's Collection, certifies that he scarcely knows one tune from another. The talents here are so different, that no deep skill is requisite to distinguish them; and therefore the masks of these individuals may be contrasted in regard to the organ of Tune. You will find the development as different as the

* Phren. Trans. p. 226.

mental manifestations. Again, it is impossible to read the literary productions, or to listen to the speeches of Dr Chalmers and Mr Joseph Hume respectively, and entertain a moment's doubt as to which of them manifests most of ideality; and masks of their foreheads are to be found, in which an equally palpable difference of the organs of ideality appears. No person can read the history of King Robert Bruce, and doubt that he possessed firmness and courage in an eminent degree; and in the cast of his skull the indications of the organs of these faculties stand prominently forth. The Rev. Mr M. mentioned in the Phrenological Transactions, p. 310, at a mature age, left a mechanical trade, to study divinity, and served as a clergyman for many years thereafter, with distinguished piety and zeal. The manifestations of veneration are extremely conspicuous; and it is a fact, that in his head the organ is largely developed. In the conduct of the boy J. G. mentioned in the Transactions, p. 289, the most striking indications of cunning and want of Conscientiousness were exhibited, and in his head Secretiveness is found large and Conscientiousness small. Now, if in every instance where a very decided character, animal, moral, or intellectual, comes under your notice, you observe the development of the brain, and contrast the organs with which the strong manifestations are connected, with a cast of an individual of opposite powers or dispositions, you will find the difficulties really far less than you imagine.

Phil. You phrenologists are very ready with your answers, and those of you who possess a little ingenuity, are really extremely plausible in your statements; but then your organs compensate one another, and by the help of this principle, and a little dexterous metaphysical analysis, I know not any character whatever which might not be reconciled to the tenement in which it is lodged, conformably to the rules of the system. Thus, if we observe an open expanded forehead, presenting the organs of the intellectual faculties very fully developed, we must not be surprised to find the owner of this enviable apparatus deficient in intel-

lectual improvement, if at the same time the principles of action at the back of the head, such as self-esteem, the love of approbation, &c. are comparatively weak. A man may have the organ of destructiveness very strong; but, if that of benevolence or veneration be also powerful, its influence will be counteracted. A distinguished professor of this new science was lately examining a head in my presence, and discovered a great deficiency in the organ of veneration; but this was compensated, he said, by the organs of benevolence and firmness, which were both very fully developed. Such is the strange reasoning which is to be dignified with the title of *Phrenology*, and in comparison of which all the speculations of the most eminent philosophers of ancient and modern times are "emptiness."

Phren. You state your objections fairly and forcibly, and I rejoice to meet with such an opponent. You will recollect that the *subject* of phrenology is *Man*, and that he is confessedly an assemblage of contradictions. The greatest of poets has said,

" O thou goddess,
 " Thou divine nature, how thyself thou blazon'st
 " In these two princely boys! They are *gentle*
 " As zephyrs blowing below the violet,
 " Not wagging his sweet head; and yet as *rough*,
 " Their royal blood enchafed, as the rudest wind,
 " That by the top doth take the mountain pine,
 " And make him stoop to the vale."

Now what does Shakspeare do here, but inform us that these boys possessed much combativeness and destructiveness, combined with great benevolence? and yet he receives the highest praise for his insight into nature, in drawing such a representation of the human mind, while the phrenologists, for doing the same thing, are supposed to be fools. Is not the sword carried before the King? and what is it but an emblem of destructiveness, ready to fall upon the heads of evil-doers, ministering thus in its very severity to purposes of benevolence and justice? Does not the soldier go forth to battle armed with the musket and

the sword, instruments fabricated for no purpose but to kill? and does not the surgeon follow in his rear, carrying succour and healing to those who have suffered under the inflictions of the soldier's ire? Were man all benevolence, would the weapons of war exist? Were he all fury and revenge, would he come as a ministering angel, with the tear of pity in his eye, to solace those whom his passions had rendered wretched? Instead of the co-existence of those faculties in the phrenological system being a proof of its departure from nature, it affords the strongest presumptive proof, that it is founded on observation. Shakspeare, as I have said, is the most phrenological of authors, because he is the most natural. Iago says, " 'Tis in *ourselves* that we are *thus*, or *thus*."—" If the balance of our lives had not *one scale* of REASON to *poise another* of SENSUALITY, the *blood* and *baseness* of our natures would conduct us to most *preposterous conclusions*. But we have REASON to cool our *ragging motions*, or carnal stings, our unbitted lusts; whereof " I take this, that you call love, to be a sect, a scion." This is just intellect and sentiment governing combativeness, destructiveness, and amativeness. Again, it is not part of the doctrines of phrenology, that one faculty compensates for the want of another. The system teaches, that the same action may be produced by various motives; for example, that one individual may go to church through piety, another through fear, and a third through love of approbation; but this is very different from the doctrine that the love of approbation may produce the feeling of piety, and the faculty of veneration the love of praise, which is the true meaning of one faculty compensating for the want of another.

Phil. But if the same action may be done from a variety of motives, do you not perceive that this renders it impossible to discover which is the true one, and thus may the difficulties multiply which you are endeavouring to remove?

Phren. I do not perceive the impossibility you allude to. Sir Walter Scott, in describing the battle of Bannockburn, uses the following words:

“ And O ! amid that waste of life,
What various motives fired the strife ?”

According to your theory, the poet should have proceeded to descant upon the impenetrable mystery of human motives, and candidly confessed that he could not answer the question ; but, instead of doing so, he proceeds—

“ The aspiring noble bled for fame,
“ The patriot for his country’s claim ;
“ This knight his youthful strength to prove,
“ And that to win his lady’s love ;
“ Some fought from ruffian thirst of blood,
“ From habit some, or hardihood.”

All this is acknowledged to be strictly natural, and why ? Because, on surveying attentively the conduct of an individual actuated by a strong passion, it is *not* difficult to discriminate the motive which urges him on ; and I have often said, that phrenology is proved by cases in which the various faculties manifest themselves, with the energy of passion on the one hand, and by others, on the other, in which the feeling or power does not appear, even in moderate vigour, although strongly elicited by external circumstances. Besides, do you not observe that Sir Walter has here enumerated, among the motives of the warriors, the impulses given by several of the phrenological faculties, in terms identical with those which we employ ? “ The aspiring noble bled for fame.” This is precisely that he was impelled by love of approbation. “ *Some fought from ruffian thirst of blood.*” This is pure destructiveness.

Phil. You have not answered my remark, that, according to your system, the most splendid intellectual organs may produce no corresponding results, if the organs of propensity and sentiment, situated behind, are deficient in size. This appears to me a very formidable objection.

Phren. The intellect serves the double purpose of directing the propensities and sentiments, and providing for their gratification. It guides our desires to proper objects ; but, at the same time, it is greatly stimulated to activity by them. This is the phrenological exposition of the maxim, “ *rege animum, quod nisi paret imperat ;*” *animum*, here meaning

the propensities and sentiments. Now, the objection, which seems to you so overwhelming, amounts only to this, that of two intellects, equal in native energy, that one will produce the greatest positive effects which is most steadfastly supported by confidence in its own powers (self-esteem), most forcibly stimulated by the desire of the esteem of others (love of approbation). Instead of such a view forming a valid objection to our science, it demonstrates its perfect accordance with nature. If phrenology had taught, that equal intellectual faculties will produce equally active manifestations, however differently supported and stimulated by sentiment, such doctrine would have stood in direct opposition to every day's experience. I may repeat, that other authors frequently obtain the highest praise for penetration in bringing forward views of the human mind, which, when stated as doctrine by the phrenologists, are instantly treated as absurdities, and charged as objections against their system. Are you aware, for example, that an acute critic has remarked, that "*courage* is at least *as necessary* " *as genius* to the success of a work of imagination; since, "*without this*, it is impossible to attain that *freedom* and "*self-possession*, without which, *no talents can ever have* "*fair play*, and, far less, that inward confidence and exultation of spirit which must accompany all the higher acts "of the understanding?" (*Edinburgh Review*, No 72, p. 418).—In phrenological language, this means, that the most powerful reflecting faculties are greatly aided in producing an impression on the world by a competent endowment of combativeness, firmness, and self-esteem.

Phil. Well, really I am so much pleased with your explanations, that I shall be induced to converse with you again. I admit, there may be things in the world more absurd than your boasted science, but at present I must bid you adieu.

ARTICLE V.

PHRENOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF MR OWEN'S NEW VIEWS
OF SOCIETY.*

MR OWEN denominates his doctrine, "The Science of the Influence of Circumstances in forming the Human Character;" and to arrive at an enlightened judgment of its merits, it is necessary to take a comprehensive view of the natural constitution of the human mind, and of the modifications of which it is susceptible. Before the discovery of phrenology, no adequate means existed of attaining sound and definite ideas on the former point, and until such information is possessed, all speculations concerning the latter must necessarily be defective; because, without knowledge of the natural qualities of the subject which we desire to modify, we are not in a condition to judge of the means best fitted to attain our ends, nor to discriminate between results attributable to natural constitution, and others springing from adventitious causes. Mr Owen, like many of his predecessors, proceeds to speculate on the modifying power of circumstances, without previously ascertaining the primitive attributes of the subject to be modified; at least, without *philosophically* doing so; for his table of the original powers of the human mind does not correspond with that contained in any admitted system of mental philosophy, and he offers no evidence, † on his own part, in support of its title to universal acceptance. This is a fundamental error, the effects of which may be easily explained. We, for example, humbly believe, that a natural propensity of "acquisitiveness"

* It is proper to mention, that we submitted these observations to a zealous and able advocate of the new views, and that he has favoured us with his corrections and remarks, which we print in the form of notes, signed O. To do him full justice, we offer no commentary on his statements, but leave the reader to decide, according to the dictates of his own judgment, after considering both sides of the question.

† Except the internal consciousness, which he supposes to exist in each individual.—O.

exists in the human mind, and Mr Owen does not admit such a feeling.* We are constrained to rank a tendency to destroy, and another to combat, among the primitive powers, while Mr Owen conceives these propensities to be adventitious. We hold secretiveness to be natural, while he maintains the disposition to conceal to be the result of irrational treatment in youth. Now, suppose, what is the truth, that both Owenites and phrenologists ardently desire to conduct mankind to the greatest possible happiness of which their nature is susceptible, how different will be the means that will appear adequate, according to the views entertained on the above points; while, at the same time, upon the judicious choice and employment of the means, will depend altogether the probabilities of success!

The primitive constitution of the mind is not a point to be taken for granted, or passed over as of no importance, but ought to form a fundamental element in all our reasonings, and in all our schemes, for the improvement of the race. If the phrenologists are well founded in believing, that *Combativeness*, *Destructiveness*, *Acquisitiveness*, and *Secretiveness* exist, it will be impossible, by the influence of circumstances, to eradicate them from the mind, and no scheme for the melioration of the species will succeed which does not admit their existence, and provide either for their gratification or adequate restraint. If we proceed on the notion that they are not natural, we shall be led to treat them with neglect, till they burst forth and overwhelm all our schemes. If, on the other hand, we allow their existence, but expect completely to subdue them, then our system must embrace means for inducing men to practise self-denial and restraint, and in this respect differ widely from institutions framed on the principles of unlimited indulgence.

Mr Owen's leading principle is, "that the character of

* No innate feeling of acquisitiveness, farther than is really necessary for supplying, in the best manner, all our natural wants and rational desires.—O.

“ man is, without a single exception, always formed for him; that it may be, and is chiefly, created by his predecessors; that they give him, or may give him, his *ideas* and *habits*, which are the **POWERS** that *govern* and *direct* his conduct.” (Essays on the Formation of Character, p. 83.) According to phrenology, the origin of human character is different. Nature has implanted certain animal propensities, moral sentiments, and knowing and reflecting faculties in the mind, and connected each with a particular organ. Each is susceptible of *spontaneous* activity, and it may be called into action also by *external excitement*. Desires and aversions take their origin from the activity of the propensities and sentiments, and intellectual ideas from that of the knowing and reflecting powers. Thus, if in any individual the organ of Acquisitiveness is adequately developed, it may become spontaneously active, and the faculty attached to it will then generate desires for wealth, or other objects capable of accumulation. The sentiment of Ideality may become active in a similar way, and then the mind will be spontaneously filled with brilliant and magnificent emotions; or if Combativeness be excited, the mind may be inspired with a passion for war.

According to phrenology, then, *ideas* and *habits* are not the “ **POWERS** which govern and direct the conduct;” their influence is this:—If a boy possess a strong natural Acquisitiveness, and his father be a merchant, and inculcate on him the advantages of wealth, the “ *ideas* and *habits*” thus communicated may direct the propensity to seek indulgence in commercial pursuits. If the youth, on the other hand, possess the same Acquisitiveness, with little self-love, and great love of approbation, and live among philosophers, who prize highly collections in natural history, the “ *ideas*” he receives from them may turn his Acquisitiveness towards the formation of a museum. If in another child Combativeness were very powerful, and he were placed within the influence of soldiers, he might be led by the “ *ideas*” received from them to indulge in the profession of arms: or, on the other hand,

if he heard only of the contentions of the bar, he might, his other faculties permitting, be induced, by this stock of ideas, to seek its gratification in forensic disputation. Mr Owen, however, appears to imagine, that by the simple communication of ideas,* the fathers could, in any of these cases, have created a desire in the children, to be merchants, soldiers, or lawyers, indifferently,—a notion contradicted by every day's experience of life. He, indeed, is not so inconsistent as to affirm, that a boy *naturally* combative may be made acquisitive, or *vice versa*; for he denies that such natural tendencies exist. Viewing the mind, however, as a very plastic instrument, he conceives it quite possible to make *any* boy a soldier, lawyer, or divine, by merely communicating to him habits and ideas. In D'Israeli's *Curiosities of Literature*, there is an anecdote of the "Fairfaxes," which forcibly illustrates how widely such views differ from actual nature. "The old Lord Thomas Fairfax, one day found the Archbishop (of York, in James the 1st's reign) very melancholy, and inquired the reason of his Grace's pensiveness. 'My Lord,' said the Archbishop, 'I have great reason of sorrow with respect to my sons; one of whom has wit and no grace, another grace but no wit.' 'Your case,' replied Lord Fairfax 'is not singular. I am also sadly disappointed in my sons. One I sent into the Netherlands to train him up a soldier, and he makes a tolerable country justice, but a mere coward at fighting. † My next I sent to Cambridge, and he proves a good lawyer, but a mere dunce at divinity; ‡ and my youngest

* By sound ideas, and good habits, the fathers might have so formed the judgment and inclinations of their sons, that these habits and ideas would have inclined them to prefer temperance, kindness, and industry in some useful employment, to the vices which are opposed to these virtues.—O.

† This disposition would spring from large cautiousness and conscientiousness, with a deficiency of combativeness, and probably of firmness and destructiveness.

‡ This indicates veneration deficient, and probably combativeness, which fits for disputation, along with intellect fully developed.

“ ‘ I sent to the Inns of Court, and he is good at divinity,
 “ ‘ but nobody at law.’ ”*

According to phrenological principles, then, the character of an individual is the result of his natural endowment of propensities, sentiments, and intellectual faculties, modified by education, and all external influences, which have operated upon them. This, we admit, is also Mr Owen's doctrine in *words*; for in his *first* letter explanatory of his views, he says, ‘ that human nature, like each distinct species of animal nature, is always composed of the same general propensities, faculties, and qualities, but that these differ in degree and combination, in every individual of the human race.’ But, in the first place, this is at variance with the doctrine above quoted from his *Essays*; and, secondly, as already observed, he does not think it necessary to ascertain what these primitive propensities are, in which he admits individuals to differ, and in his general argument, he proceeds as if they had no existence, or, at least, as if they were *entirely* plastic to his will.

As, however, we admit the influence of modifying causes, it is proper to explain to what extent we conceive them to operate. Our doctrine on this point may be embodied in three propositions, which appear so self-evident, that we forbear offering any argument in support of them. First, We cannot *eradicate* any propensity, sentiment, or intellectual faculty implanted by nature. Secondly, We cannot essentially *change the character* of any natural feeling,† so as to convert acquisitiveness into benevolence, or combativeness into veneration; and, thirdly, our efforts are limited to *restraining* the different faculties from *improper* manifestations, and to *directing* them to *legitimate* and *beneficial* indulgence.

* This character would result from veneration, hope, and benevolence largely developed, and probably combativeness, and firmness deficient.

† Unless changing the feeling of veneration from the governing power of the universe,—to what in the East is called “ Devil-Worship,” be changing its character.—O.

Phrenology shews, that man possesses animal propensities, moral sentiments and intellect, and that, *ceteris paribus*, these powers act with a degree of energy corresponding to the size of their respective organs. To use an illustration brought forward by the Rev. Mr Singer, in his reply to Mr Owen at Dublin, on March 18, 1823: "Adam had two sons, "one was Cain, and the other Abel." The phrenologist would account for the difference of character between these two individuals, by supposing Abel to have possessed a large development of the organs of intellect and moral sentiments, and a small or moderate endowment of the organs of the lower propensities; and Cain exactly the reverse. Both being exposed to the same external modifying causes, Abel would be led, by the spontaneous activity of his faculties, to religious and peaceful exercises; Cain, by the impulse of his animal feelings, to jealousy, hatred, revenge; and the catastrophe of the murder would ensue as a natural result. We use this as an illustration merely of our position, that moral evil springs from abuses of the animal propensities of human nature, when not regulated by moral sentiment and directed by intellect. Observation shews, that some individuals are born with so great a preponderance of the first over the two latter classes, that they are *constitutionally* prone to immoral and prejudicial conduct.

According to Mr Owen, however, moral evil seems to be without a cause. "Each human being," says he, "comes into the world a *passive* compound, and, in some respects, "unlike every other individual of his species." If the first human being was a *passive* compound at creation, when did he or the race become active? If each child is at birth a *passive* compound, why do parents experience such great difficulties in modifying their dispositions? In short, we are carried back to the question, which we represented as lying at the base of the argument, What is *human nature* IN ITSELF? Mr Owen represents it as a *passive*,* we, on the other

* A *passive* compound, which can move in no direction, till it be acted

hand, hold it to be an EMINENTLY ACTIVE compound, susceptible at the same time of some modification from external causes ; and how different will our methods for improving it be according as we conscientiously hold one or other of these views ? Mr Owen, we know, will tell us, that an infant an hour old is NOT *active*, and we grant him this position ; but our doctrine is, that at this age the mind contains principles which time alone will render active, and which cannot be eradicated, changed, or prevented from unfolding themselves, except by the death or physical restraint of the being. He, on the other hand, to be consistent, must deny the existence of all principles ever tending to action, because the moment he admits a *single active* disposition, his whole fabric, reared on the basis of man's *passive* nature, falls to the ground, and he must himself perceive the necessity of inquiring into the character and tendency of the active powers, before forming schemes for directing human conduct.

Vehement disputes have been maintained by philosophers about the influence of nature and education, as forming the character of individuals, one class maintaining that nature does all, and another that education, in this respect, is omnipotent. Mr Owen, although in words he disclaims alliance with the latter, appears to us, if he were consistent with himself, to belong to it. The phrenologist steers a middle course between the two ; man, as revealed to him by his science, is endowed with active powers, which in *some* individuals, such as Fairfax's sons, are so energetic as to form the leading features of the characters through life, but which in others are susceptible of control and direction, so as to render them liable to receive important modifications from without.

upon,—that is,—till a thought, or idea, come into the mind ; which thought, or idea, comes into his mind, independently of any power which man can command, and leads him along as 'decidedly as if he were drawn by force, and,—boasting of his freedom,—he is thus led, as it were "by the nose," from the cradle to the grave.—O.

The questions then naturally occur, first, to what extent is it possible to modify human nature by external influences? Shall we be able by any treatment to direct all the manifestations to legitimate objects alone? And, secondly, what means are best fitted to accomplish the greatest attainable improvement?

It is extremely difficult to answer the first of these questions, because human nature has never yet been philosophically understood; nor have *all* possible means of improving it been tried, and their effects ascertained. We shall therefore state only a few general remarks on this point. Human beings may be divided into three great classes. In individuals composing the first class, the animal propensities predominate so much over the moral sentiments and intellect, that naturally they are extremely prone to vicious indulgences hurtful to themselves and to society. Nero, Commodus, Caligula, among the ancients; Louis XI. Bellingham, Thurtell, and criminals in general, among the moderns, are examples of this division. In those of the second class, the animal propensities are nearly equally balanced by the moral sentiments and intellect, and the *habitual* preponderance of either depends on the influence of external causes. If they are placed among the virtuous, they will generally act under the guidance of their moral sentiments and understanding; if surrounded by the example, and stimulated by the temptations of abandoned associates, they will lapse into vice. The great mass of mankind, in our judgment, belongs to this class; but we beg the reader to attend to the condition which we annex to the influence of circumstances over them, namely, that their *general* or *habitual* conduct only will be thereby determined; for as the propensities exist in them in a state of considerable energy, they will by no training hitherto discovered reach *perfection* in moral conduct, but will present that chequered appearance of good and evil, so characteristic of the human race. To the third class belongs a small remnant, who may really be styled, in a worldly sense, the elect, namely, individuals in whom

the propensities are just so powerful as to serve their necessary purposes in life, and in whom the moral sentiments and intellect so greatly preponderate, that a perpetual serenity of temper and benignity of disposition reign within, and who seem already to have realized in themselves the *beau ideal* of a perfect human being.

So far as we have yet observed, the first class is the least susceptible of improvement; and to prevent them, by moral training, combined with physical restraint, from abusing their propensities, is almost all we can expect. To the improvement of the second class we are unwilling to set limits, and only observe, that we do not expect to see them rendered perfect. The third class is extremely small, and is obviously not greatly susceptible of melioration.

We proceed, therefore, to inquire into the *means* contemplated by Mr Owen for elevating the character of all these classes, and leading them to the highest degree of excellence of which their nature is susceptible. This end, according to our views, will be best attained by providing for the gratification of as many of the natural faculties as can be indulged, without injury to the individual or society, and by inducing each member of the community to restrain all other manifestations of his feelings. Now, if we contemplate the constitution of the mind phrenologically, we discover the following primitive animal propensities, *besides* the desire for food :

Amativeness.	Secretiveness.
Philoprogenitiveness.	Self-esteem, or self-love.
Adhesiveness.	Love of approbation.
Combativeness.	Cautiousness.
Destructiveness.	Benevolence.
Acquisitiveness.	

Mr Owen proposes to admit the earliest and most unlimited indulgence of the first of these propensities,* and

* Mr Owen supposes that much insincerity has been produced in the world by the unnatural restraints which the customs of society have put upon the ra-

holds the opinion, that although mankind should increase their numbers to an indefinite extent, the means of their subsistence and accommodation can be still more rapidly provided. We, on the other hand, conceive, that the first step towards meliorating the condition of the race, must consist in inducing them to put restraint upon this propensity, to suppress it till, by the exercise of their other faculties, they have provided, not only the means of animal existence, but that portion of moral, religious, and intellectual cultivation, that will fit them for adequately discharging their duties as parents and members of society. We are aware, indeed, that Mr Owen will reply, that in his system the latter requisites will be amply provided, and that the children in his new establishments will be greater philosophers at ten years of age than men in old society at fifty. If they are rendered really rational at this tender age, then, in our opinion, the first discovery they will make will be the indispensable necessity of curbing this appetite, of which their patron is disposed to permit to them unlimited indulgence. Regard to health, also, will dictate the same salutary restraint.

The next propensity is the love of offspring. In old society this is gratified to the greatest possible extent, consistent with the duties of individuals to the community. The mother* reaps her dearest enjoyments from those cares and watchings which to others appear so painful; and the

tional indulgence of this propensity. He supposes, that in this case, like all others, the right way may be distinguished from the wrong, by the natural consequences. The way which experience shall prove to be productive of most happiness, with least suffering, is the way which he supposes nature to have intended. He supposes it a species of degrading bondage, for one party to be held as the property of another, against the natural inclination of either; and thinks that "force" can never be useful, either to separate or to keep together the affections of mankind. And he supposes, moreover, that, regarding the necessaries and comforts of life, our powers of production are now so great, that they must keep always "a-head" of population, till the whole earth become a cultivated garden; and when a check becomes necessary, he supposes that reason will point out a mode more effectual than misery; but that many centuries must elapse before this check can be either necessary or beneficial.—O.

* When supplied with the necessaries of life.—O.

child* exercises the finest feelings of our nature (adhesiveness and veneration), in that return of mingled reverence and affection which he pours forth as a recompense for the anxieties of which he is the object. In the new system it is proposed† to limit this intercourse to a few hours a day; to assign to *the community* the duty of nursing, tending, and protecting the infants; and to train them to regard themselves as the children of the establishment rather than of individuals. In Mr Owen's picture of the advantages of this system, there is something fascinating to those in whom benevolence is stronger than philoprogenitiveness. He represents the little creatures sporting together; their minds already expanding with a diffusive benevolence, and finding their sole delight in receiving and communicating enjoyment. The parents, too, under the same combination of feelings, are supposed to experience the highest pleasures in contributing infant members to the community, and to be removed far above that grovelling selfishness which induces ordinary mortals to love their own children better than those of all the world besides, just because they are their own. However beautiful such views may appear to the eye of reason, it is obvious, that if nature has constituted man with the sentiment of self-love, and combined it with the love of offspring, he will be impelled by these in-

* When treated kindly.—O.

† It is proposed to apply the advantages of science to the rearing and training of children, in the idea that the unpleasant labour, which at present attends this department, may be greatly shortened. Mr Owen supposes; that the duty of tending, educating, feeding, and clothing a limited number of children, can be conducted, under scientific arrangements, in a superior way, which will be extremely agreeable to the children, and at less than a twentieth part of the toil and labour which is now required to accomplish the same purpose in a very inferior manner. He does not suppose that this method will have any tendency to destroy the natural affection on either side, because he believes that mankind are attached to that which gives them pleasure, and are averse to that which gives them pain, and that the proposed arrangements will only have the effect of lessening the latter. He proposes to set no limits to the intercourse between parents and children; and he does not think that the children will be much injured, even at the commencement, by this intercourse with their parents, because it is in those instances, in which the children are *troublesome* to their parents, that the latter are most apt to injure the dispositions of the former by harsh treatment.—O.

instinctive impulses to cherish his own offspring as part of himself; and every system which should attempt to limit or control such feelings, will be regarded as an intolerable restraint upon the best of our natural affections.

Mr Owen will no doubt reply, that he has no intention of diminishing this tender intercourse; that the children will be permitted, during night, and all their leisure hours, to live in the exclusive society of the parents, exactly as in old society at present; and that the public training will be limited to those portions of time, in which children, in ordinary circumstances, are committed to the care of ignorant nurses, or placed under the birches of tyrannical school-masters. In answer to this statement, we would remind Mr Owen, that, according to his own principles, all the adults of old society are vitiated and debased by ignorance; that the first members of his new establishment must necessarily be composed of these rude materials; that, according to him, the human character is formed by impressions received even at the age of two months; and that he thus undertakes to permit ignorant parents to enjoy unrestrained intercourse with their children, and to fill their minds with erroneous ideas, and nevertheless assures us, that he will rear them, by public training, into perfect men. If this does not imply contradiction and impossibility, our faculties of Comparison and Causality deceive us.

The next propensity is that of "Adhesiveness," which, combined with the sexual passion, leads to marriage; and Self-esteem, or Self-love, being added, the combination produces the desire for exclusive possession of the object of our tender affections. Mr Owen, we understand, does not object to this arrangement, so long as both parties find it agreeable. Adhesiveness and Benevolence give rise to friendship; and in the new system, it is expected that these two feelings will furnish the mainsprings of conduct, so that their gratification is amply provided for.

Combativeness and Destructiveness follow next. The legitimate effect of these, in ordinary life, is to produce a

bold, active, daring, and enterprising spirit, with as much fire as suits the motto of our country, "Nemo me impune lacesset." Their abuses produce hotness of temper, contentions, rage, cruelty, or bloodshed, according to the degree of their excitement, and the extent to which they are permitted to proceed unchecked. In the new system,* the daily routine of labour, rest, and pleasure, the removal of all objects of exclusive possession, the introduction of that equality which excludes ambition, and the total absence of all occasions for legitimate emulation, leave these propensities without the slightest prospect of gratification. If they exist, therefore, as phrenology proves that they do, and if they possess spontaneous activity, they will probably gather strength by forcible suppression, engender secret strifes, hatred, and discontent, and finally blow up the whole establishment in some mighty explosion.

Acquisitiveness gives the desire for property, and, combined with Self-esteem, produces the love of *exclusive possession*. In the new system, property is to belong to the community; and while we admit, that by this arrangement simple Acquisitiveness may find gratification, it is quite obvious, that all indulgence of the strong desire of personal aggrandizement produced by the combination now mentioned will be denied. If this desire exist, as all men, except the Owenites, believe,† and if it naturally demand to

* In the new system, it is thought, that when mankind shall know that the use of "force" and "violence" has a necessary tendency to defeat its own purposes, and that every human being is guided or governed, in all his actions, by a judgment and inclinations, over the formation of which he has no control, and that the worst part of his fellow-creatures are really and truly only the most unfortunate,—it is thought that these hurtful propensities shall be altogether overcome; especially if the means are found sufficient for the gratification of all the inclinations and desires which can be indulged in, without injuring the happiness of ourselves and others. The summit of human ambition is supposed to exist in securing the esteem and admiration of our fellow-creatures. This esteem or admiration can be justly bestowed only on the *benefactors* of mankind; and the new system opens the only legitimate door through which ambition and emulation can attain the object they have in view.—O.

† The followers of the new system believe, that the desire of aggrandizement is neither more nor less than the love of approbation and esteem; and

be gratified, nothing can be more preposterous than to erect a community founded on its utter exclusion.

Secretiveness, Mr Owen views as the growth of ignorance, and in his system all is to be open as the day. We recommend to him to keep a sharp look-out on those in whom the organs are very large, and the moral sentiments deficient, otherwise they will prove phrenology to be true, by duping, and perhaps plundering the whole community.

Self-esteem, or self-love, is recognised by Mr Owen as a principle of human nature; but he views it as an exceedingly rational feeling, ready to yield its pretensions to the calls of benevolence, and to reap its highest enjoyment in the happiness of others. Sincerely do we wish that we could regard it in this light; but, unfortunately, in our system it is a blind animal impulse, magnifying Self; and, when very energetic, tempting us to trample under feet benevolence, justice, and veneration, for the sake of its indulgence. Combined, as already mentioned, with Amativeness, Philoprogenitiveness, Adhesiveness, and Acquisitiveness, it is the origin of our desires for exclusive property in wife, family, and estate. To direct it to legitimate objects, and restrain its improper and excessive manifestations, is a duty at once arduous, painful, and imperative; and we have great apprehension that it will not, in all individuals, prove so accommodating and subservient to reason, as to ensure complete success to the views of Mr Owen.

The LOVE OF APPROBATION is intended to play a conspicuous part in the new establishment. It and BENEVOLENCE are expected to move the whole community, and to induce them to submit to every degree of self-denial that may be requisite for the general advantage. In men in general it is a powerful feeling, but it is only one of many natural desires; and Mr Owen appears to us to expect more

that when the good opinion of mankind shall be withdrawn from the possession of accumulated artificial wealth, that mankind will cease to desire more than their wants require.—O.

from it than it is capable of performing. In some individuals, also, it is extremely small; and such persons, if their Self-esteem, Combativeness, and Firmness, be large in proportion to its deficiency, will prove very troublesome members of the new communities.

Cautiousness or fear is regarded by Mr Owen as a factitious feeling, the sole offspring of ignorance and folly; and, accordingly, he contemplates its complete exclusion from the domains of the new community—"a consummation devoutly to be wished for."—In old society, in which human beings are surrounded by danger in every form, it is a bountiful gift of an all-wise Creator. It serves as an instinctive sentinel over our safety, prompting us continually to watch and to fly from, or prepare to meet whatever foe may assail us. Its excessive endowment produces fearfulness, timidity, anxiety, and melancholy. To us the very existence of such a faculty affords a proof that man is not intended to inhabit a paradise on earth; nevertheless, we cordially wish Mr Owen success in his endeavours, first, to dispense with the necessity of its exercise, and then to expunge it from the tablets of the mind. We are sorry to add, however, that, in the very act of doing so, the faculty in question inspires us with fears and "doubts" that the wish will never be fulfilled.

Having now adverted to the animal propensities *seriatim*, we shall briefly notice the moral and intellectual faculties proved by phrenology to exist in man. They are the following:

Faculties producing
Moral Sentiments.

Veneration.
Hope.
Ideality.
Wonder.
Conscientiousness.
Firmness.

Faculties of the Intellect.

Individuality.	Time.
Form.	Tune.
Size.	Language.
Colouring.	Comparison.
Locality.	Causality.
Order.	Imitation.

Mr Owen, we understand, does not admit an *intelligent*

First Cause; and, although he * intends to *tolerate* religion (which springs from Veneration) to those who remain so unenlightened as to desire to worship, yet it forms no part of his *system*. In old society the sentiment of Veneration is directed also to superiors in rank or power, and produces a spirit of willing obedience. In the new system, however, all are intended to be on a footing of equality, so that its exercise in this manner also is cut off. *Faith* is one result of Hope, and he prescribes it as the origin of nearly all the evils which afflict the world. In prohibiting also all means of personal aggrandizement,† he denies to Hope the more vulgar employment of building castles in the air, an exercise attended with no small delight to the care-beridden sons of old society. Hope, in short, in the new establishment, will be swallowed up in fruition. In all these views, phrenology stands opposed directly to Owenism. As Veneration exists, and Causality and Comparison are also implanted in the mind, and, as the latter lead us from nature up to nature's God, the adoration of the Creator is regarded not only as the most rational, but the most delightful exercise of the human

* Mr Owen conceives, that, for human beings to talk of "admitting," "rejecting," and "tolerating," &c. as *acts* of the mind which individuals can control, is an erroneous conception. He has the notion, that *surrounding circumstances* make impressions upon the mind, and, all that man can do, as a "passive agent," is to state what these impressions are, and to obey them. Regarding the "First Cause," the impressions which he has received lead him to believe that the human intellect, in its present imperfect state, is altogether incompetent to judge correctly on the subject. He sees around him marks of the sublimest wisdom and design; but, finding himself unable to attach "intelligence" to that which can neither have organic structure nor dimensions, he is compelled to remain in ignorance till the subject be more clearly revealed to him.—O.

† In the new system, the only possible way of securing "personal aggrandizement" will be by becoming conspicuous for the superiority of our *habits and attainments*. This superiority will secure respect and approbation in every state of society, but more particularly in that which refuses, as counterfeit, all titles which are unsupported by such means; and, besides, these qualifications carry a reward along with them of which no earthly power can deprive them. Those who suppose that, under the new system, it is intended to *view* all individuals as *exactly alike*, have formed a supposition which is opposed to every thing in nature; while the new system is respected by its followers only so far as it appears to be in accordance with nature and the welfare of mankind.—O.

soul ; and to found a system of society in which it has no place is to run counter to Nature, and to despise the lessons of experience contained in the history of the world. Hope and Veneration give a tendency to faith and obedience ; and, when Mr Owen commences his new establishment, he will probably discover that these faculties may be of essential service in carrying even his own plans into execution. If he should propose to the community the adoption of any arrangement attended with the sacrifice of a little temporary comfort or convenience, but calculated to produce distant benefits more than equivalent to the immediate evil, he may prove this probability of future good in the way of demonstration to those individuals who have large intellectual organs, and who, in consequence, are capable of tracing the links in a long chain of causation ; but to gain the acquiescence of the narrow-minded, short-sighted, and, at the same time, self-confident, among his people (and such will exist even in the new establishment), he will be compelled to call in the aid of much-derided faith, and ask them to believe on his word what they cannot see with their own eyes,* and to submit to his ordinations with respectful humility, trusting that the result will correspond to his anticipations, and amply repay them for the temporary sacrifice of their self-love to the public advantage.

IDEALITY has been amply exercised in devising the new system ; for it is intended to exhibit altogether the *beau idéal* of human associations. We proceed, therefore, to CONSCIENTIOUSNESS, or the faculty which gives the natural sentiment of justice. The use of this feeling is exceedingly obvious and important in human nature, as it appears to the phrenologist. Man is actuated by numerous animal propensities, all struggling for indulgence, and among them in particular are Self-esteem and Acquisitiveness, prompting individuals to prefer their private interests to those of the community. The faculty of justice curbs the excesses of all

* Until ocular demonstration be given.—O.

our desires, and enforces the dictates of Adhesiveness, Benevolence, and Veneration. Hence the very existence of a sentiment, whose office it is to hold the balance betwixt *meum et tuum*, indicates the intention of Nature that the human being should possess individual rights and private property, while it points out with equal clearness that he is destined to flourish in society. If his whole desires had centered in the public good, the only struggle would have been, who should accomplish most for the general advantage; if they had all been selfish, man would have lived in solitude and owed no duties to his fellows; and, in either case, justice would have been superfluous. Now, Mr Owen, in instituting community of property and equality of rank, contemplates the submerging of justice in benevolence, or placing man in circumstances in which this faculty will have no duties to perform. It appears to us, that, if Nature had intended the human race for such a condition, the sentiment would not have been planted in the mind.

In the new establishment, ample provision is intended to be made for the exercise of the whole Intellectual powers; and on this head we have nothing to object to Mr Owen.

We have seen Mr Owen, and been permitted to examine his head, and are assured that we give no offence in stating, that to us it affords a key to his whole views. The organ of Philoprogenitiveness, for example, is only moderately developed in his head, and inferior in size to Benevolence; and he in fact told us that he feels almost as much interest in the well-being and well-doing of the four hundred children attending his schools, as he does in that of his own. We know that he makes a kind and indulgent parent; but the feeling displayed on his part is that of friendship rather than that instinctive sympathy and ardent affection which spring from a powerful Philoprogenitiveness. He maintains that anger is not a natural emotion;* and his Destructiveness is not large. He conceives individual property to be an institution which retards the creation and diminishes the enjoyment of wealth,

* His own words are, that anger is "a feeling that will not be produced in man when children shall be trained from infancy without punishment, and

and is highly injurious to good morals; and his Acquisitiveness is moderate. He regards the tendency to Concealment (legitimately employed in suppressing improper thoughts and desires), and also Fear, as consequences of ignorant treatment of youth; and, in his own head, the organs of Secretiveness and Cautiousness are not largely developed. On the other hand, he relies on the Love of Approbation as a lever adequate to move the whole human race in any direction; and in himself the organ of this sentiment is decidedly large, as is also that of Benevolence. In the Intellectual region the Knowing organs are well developed; and in his present institution ample gratification for these faculties is provided in maps, pictures, objects of natural history, music, &c. Indeed, ideas of *things* which *exist* are represented as constituting the whole of certain knowledge. The organs of Causality, however, are decidedly deficient; and hence the small figure, that ideas of relation which have a real, although not a corporeal existence, make in all his views. Hence also, the blindness to Causation which is found in all his works, and that peculiarity of his written compositions of propounding statements and assertions without adequate connecting links, and nevertheless representing the whole as a chain of demonstrative reasoning. To us his writings appear as a collection of isolated and often contradictory propositions, when to himself they appear the closest logical deductions. He views the human mind through the Knowing faculties, and sees it as a "passive compound,"* while a person endowed with Causality in an adequate degree intuitively perceives it to consist of a combination of *active energies* which may be regulated, but not extirpated or fashioned entirely according to our will. The organs of Hope, Veneration, and Conscientiousness are well developed, and Firmness is decidedly large; and most sincerely do we acknowledge the purity, disinterestedness, and excellence of the motives by which he is actuat-

taught to understand the general principles and detail of the formation of the human character."

* Mr Owen now adds,—“ Formed by training and education to become active in one direction or another.”

ed, and bear testimony that he has done much good at New Lanark, and set a valuable example in education to society at large. He possesses the elements of a practical, although not of a speculative or philosophical understanding; and, under the direction of good feeling, acts right in a great many instances where he reasons wrong. His possession of a well-developed organ of Veneration has been objected to us, seeing that he is not greatly disposed in favour of religion.* Every phrenologist knows that this faculty gives the feeling of deference and respect in general, and that religion is only one of the ways in which it may be manifested. If his Causality had been large, it would more probably have taken that direction. We have not enjoyed sufficient opportunities of observing the private life of Mr Owen to be able to point out its influence on his habitual feelings, farther than that it shews itself in a respectful deference which characterizes his general deportment in society. Were this organ small in Mr Owen's head, the other organs remaining the same, there would be more vivid and less amiable manifestations of Self-esteem, Firmness, and Love of Approbation.

Having thus considered the new arrangements as they are calculated to affect the various primitive faculties of the mind, and accounted for their rise by the peculiar constitution of Mr Owen's mind, we should proceed to discuss the proof which he adduces in support of the paramount effect of circumstances in controlling, modifying, or extirpating these powers. The proof to which he refers, is the history of every tribe and nation, ancient and modern. But the discussion of these topics, together with the statement of our own views of the most eligible mode of improving the condition of the human race, must be postponed till our next Number.

* Mr Owen says,—“Of what he considers error in religion.”

The notes on the three last pages are from the pen of Mr Owen; the other pages he has not seen, but the notes on them are written by one of his most intelligent disciples.

ARTICLE VI.

BURKE, FOX, AND PITT.

To the Editor of the Phrenological Journal.

SIR,—I shall make no apology for offering to your notice the following brief, and, I doubt, imperfect sketch of the characters of three of the most eminent men which modern times have produced, explained according to the principles of phrenology. Although their names are necessarily connected with political recollections, I shall allude to them without a spark of feeling of a political tendency; having no reason for choosing them as the subjects of consideration, except that the conspicuous part they acted in public life has rendered the more prominent points in each universally known and understood. I mean those three unrivalled orators and distinguished statesmen, the glory of English eloquence, Burke, Fox, and Pitt.

I shall begin with Mr Burke,—and both from what we know of the talents he evinced, and from a mask of his forehead in the collection of the Phrenological Society, I should be inclined to say, that he probably possessed a greater variety of intellectual power; or, to speak phrenologically, that in him the intellectual organs were more equally developed than in either of the other two illustrious persons. The mask shews nearly an equal proportion both of the knowing and reflecting organs, and of those leading to a taste in the fine arts. *Comparison, Causality, Wit, and Ideality*, are all large, and nearly in equal proportion, and *Language* is particularly large. In a bust, of which the society also possesses a copy, there appears the same fine and equable development both of sentiments and propensities. We cannot, however, trust to this as being perfectly correct; as we know that statuaries, though they may give the general form of the head, seldom pay any attention to particular developments. From his writings, however, and various traits of character exhibited

in his life, we may be entitled to infer some part of his development with considerable certainty. He certainly possessed great *Self-esteem* and *Love of Approbation*. His ambition and desire to shine in eloquence and in discourse, proceeded from the latter;—his irritability of temper, when his opinions were questioned or disregarded, from the former. His *Firmness* does not appear to have been large, of which various instances may be given in his want of command and of feeling; and his whole writings shew a deficiency of *Concentrativeness*. He is eloquent and brilliant in the highest degree, and illustrations flow upon him with a copiousness that is equally delightful and surprising; but there is a want of precision and logical sequence in his argument, and an utter disregard of method. In perusing his speeches, we are often dazzled, sometimes instructed, but seldom entirely convinced. All this furnishes a probable explanation of the undeniable fact, that Mr Burke, with all the talents he possessed, did not produce that mighty effect which was to have been expected. He never rose to be a leader, even in the party to which he first belonged; he quarrelled with that party and left them, without ever obtaining the confidence of any other; and he was at last reduced to the humiliating necessity of accepting a pension from that government and that ministry, whose measures and whose influence it had been the business of his whole previous life to oppose and to subvert.

But I shall not trust in delineating his character, even to the knowledge of facts which are now matters of history. I shall take the characters drawn of him by two of his intimate friends and contemporaries, who will not be considered as any way wanting in perspicacity or candour. I allude to no less persons than Dr Johnson and Dr Goldsmith. The former is recorded to have said, that “no one could be five minutes in the company of Mr Burke, though a perfect stranger to him, and merely driven to take shelter under the same shed with him during a shower of rain, without discovering that he was the greatest genius in the world.” This exactly corresponds with what has been mentioned of

his equal and full development of all the intellectual faculties, so that no subject could come wrong to him, joined to a very large endowment of Language and Love of Approbation, prompting him to display on all occasions the whole stores of his mind. Goldsmith states this peculiarity in a single line, with his usual felicity, when he tells us, in his poem called "Retaliation," that "Burke shall be *tongue* with the garnish of *brains*." He afterwards, in the same *jeu d'esprit*, goes more minutely into his character, and points out, with almost phrenological precision, both its excellencies and defects :

Here lies our good Edmund, whose genius was such,
 We scarcely can praise it or blame it too much ;
 Who, born for the universe, narrowed his mind,
 And to party gave up what was meant for mankind.
 Though fraught with all learning, yet straining his throat
 To persuade Tommy Townsend to lend him a vote—
 Who, too deep for his hearers, still went on refining,
 And thought of convincing, when they thought of dining.
 Though equal to all things—for all things unfit,
 Too nice for a statesman—too proud for a wit ;
 For a patriot too cool—for a drudge disobedient,
 And too fond of the right to pursue the expedient.
 In short, 'twas his fate, unemployed or in place, sir,
 To eat mutton cold, and cut blocks with a razor.

I have said that this description is almost phrenological. It is, at any rate, such as will at once suggest to a phrenologist the combination of elemental qualities from which it proceeds; and it corresponds exactly with the development we have mentioned—with some peculiarities which we have no other means of ascertaining. The last six lines are peculiarly striking :

Though equal to all things—for all things unfit.

This corresponds with what has been stated, of his possessing every intellectual talent, without that endowment of *Concentrativeness* and *Firmness* which should determine his genius steadily to some particular object :

Too nice for a statesman—

His very refined taste, proceeding from great Ideality, and a great endowment of the superior sentiments, must have

disgusted him with the insignificant details and petty vexations and crosses which invariably attach themselves to the real business of life—of the highest no less than of the lowest kind, in this working-day world. Persons of plain intellect, (I mean no disparagement), like Joseph Hume or the late Mr Whitbread, who are not seduced from their path by any glittering conceits, and who are gifted with much Firmness and Concentrativeness, will be much better fitted for the tasks they respectively undertake, than a man of the varied talents and refined temperament of Burke:

Too proud for a wit.

Though pre-eminently fitted to shine in the ranks of literature, or any department to which he thought fit to direct his talents, his Self-esteem was too great to make him satisfied with this sort of distinction. He aspired at being a leader and a light in politics; and abandoned the secure haven of literature for the stormy sea of state-intrigue, in which he must frequently have been jostled by minds of less refined construction:

For a patriot too cool—

He possessed too little Combativeness and Destructiveness to fit him for being the orator of the mob. He could not, at least it would be quite foreign to his nature to roar at the hustings, to flatter the passions of the multitude at public meetings, or to rant about liberty, tyranny, and usurpation, at public dinners:

For a drudge disobedient.

His Self-esteem, which we have already seen, must have been large, would make it equally unpalatable to him to cringe to power, or to lend himself unreservedly as the tool of a party. In short, he would neither be led nor driven, either in the opinions he was to hold, or the conduct he was to pursue, without knowing the reason why:

And too fond of the right to pursue the expedient.

He possessed too great Conscientiousness to follow his party all lengths, when he thought them in the wrong. A remarkable instance of this occurred on the occasion of his quar-

relling with, and separation from, Mr Fox. I inquire not here which of them was absolutely in the right; but I believe no one will deny, that Mr Burke acted on this occasion from a conscientious regard to what he *thought* was right, though, perhaps, there was also in his conduct more irritation than can be justified, or than was called for, by this sentiment alone. This irritation I attribute to his Self-esteem and Love of Approbation; which were wounded by Mr Fox's contemptuous treatment of the principles and views contained in his famous "Reflections on the Revolution in France."

The whole character affords a remarkable example of the great importance of Firmness and Concentrativeness in enabling the intellectual powers to work with full effect; and, upon the whole, we may apply to it what was said by the dying Israel of his first-born,—“Reuben, thou art my might
“and the beginning of my strength, the excellency of dignity,
“ty, and the excellency of power. Unstable as water, thou
“shalt not excel.”

It is important to observe the contrast between the other two characters, for they were contrasted in a very remarkable degree. I never had the happiness of hearing Mr Pitt, but I once enjoyed the high gratification of hearing a speech from his great rival,—and never will the impression which it made be effaced from my mind. I can compare its effect to nothing more apt than to that of being in a storm at sea. It seemed to rouse and stir up every faculty and feeling of the mind to the most intense state of excitement, accompanied with that kind of glorying and sense of inward greatness characteristic of the true sublime,—as if there was a feeling of an increase of personal dignity, even in the being admitted to the privilege of hearing such a man. It is well known, that in his public speaking Mr Fox's ideas and words did not begin to flow readily until he had raised himself into a state of excitement almost resembling rage, and that then they came upon him with a rapidity nearly too great for utterance. This was said to form a striking contrast to the mildness, the suavity and urbanity of his manners in private

life, where he is known to have been as much beloved by his personal friends, as he was admired and idolized by his party as a public leader. These opposite qualities, which he thus displayed, are easily explained on the phrenological system, by supposing, what must have been the fact, that he possessed at once a great development of Combativeness and Destructiveness, and also of Benevolence. The one of these qualities does not, as has been said, neutralize the others, as an alkali and an acid: they remain both of them in high activity in one and the same character, either alternately, or at one and the same time. Destructiveness may often come in aid of Benevolence, or of Justice, or of the other superior sentiments resisting every species of fraud, oppression, and wrong. Thus, in the character given of himself by Job, he says, "I brake the jaws of the wicked, and plucked the spoil out of his teeth" It is evident from the busts of Mr Fox, and also from what is known of his life and character, that he had a considerable share of the lower propensities, as well as of those higher powers which add dignity to character;—and in him, at least in the latter parts of his life, these lower powers added a force and an overwhelming energy to his mind, which otherwise it could not have possessed. His speaking was also characterized by very considerable Ideality and Hope, and probably a great endowment of the Love of Approbation. The former quality, Ideality, cultivated by a classical education, conferred such a portion of refined taste, as would prevent him from offending, even in the midst of what appeared the uncontrolled bursts of passion, and to infuse into all his conceptions the glow of genius and the splendour of eloquence. To a great endowment of Hope, joined with Benevolence, it was probably owing, that this great man was led to form too flattering expectations of the advantages to be derived to the world and the cause of liberty, by what took place at the first breaking out of the French revolution, and to see, amidst all the horrors and the blood of that distracted period, symptoms of the commencement of a new and a better order of things, the downfall of tyranny, and the regeneration and ultimate happiness

of a mighty people. To his Benevolence we must certainly attribute the ultimate success of that great measure which formed the glory of his last short administration, the abolition of the slave trade, a measure which, had he never accomplished any thing else, was sufficient to entitle him to the gratitude of the world. But much of what he did is certainly also to be traced to the Love of Approbation, his affability, so contrary to the distance and *hauteur* of his great rival, and his descending on many occasions to gratify the humours of the lower orders, in a manner which would certainly have been considered derogatory to his dignity by the statelier and more reserved temper of the other.

With regard, again, to the peculiar character of Mr Pitt, as shewn both in his conduct and in his eloquence, a phrenologist would certainly attribute to him an intellect penetrating and acute, but not very philosophical or profound. He possessed, in an eminent degree, the tact of discrimination of character, and of suiting his arguments to the feelings and views of those to whom they were addressed. The mask taken from his forehead, after death, (in the Society's Collection,) shews a full *Individuality* and large *Comparison*, two powers which are essential for this sort of tact, and of the most eminent use to a public speaker. His *Causality* and *Wit* do not seem to be equally large, and *Ideality* does not appear to be developed in any remarkable degree. This corresponds exactly with the character of his eloquence, which was more distinguished for acute observation and copiousness of illustration, than for any profound or original views of political economy or of human nature. In his conduct as a minister, he was naturally averse from entertaining new views in the science of government, or from entering upon untried and untrodden paths; but preferred to follow in the tracks which had been pointed out by the wisdom of preceding ages, and rendered safe by many examples. His *Cautiousness* was probably considerably larger than that of Mr Fox, and his Hope smaller, which, joined to the constitution of his intellect as above explained, would render him more inclined to keep the beaten path, and to avoid experi-

ments in legislation. But what gave to his other powers, such as they are, the commanding influence which he so long retained over the councils of the nation, was his possessing (as I conclude that he must have possessed) together with a very large *Self-esteem*, a much superior endowment of *Self-esteem* and *Firmness*, than either of the other two great men. To the first of these qualities, is to be attributed the prodigious confidence which he possessed in the able sufficiency of his own talents, his taking upon himself all, or nearly all, the responsible duty of the public business, and, like an eastern monarch, not bearing a brother near the throne. To the last is to be ascribed that invincible spirit, which was neither to be shaken by adverse, nor cajoled by a prosperous state of the public fortunes, that immoveable fortitude which enabled him to hold on his course, and to maintain his plan, like "Teneriffe, or Atlas, unremoved," in the midst of a more formidable opposition at home, and a more appalling array of danger from abroad, than ever it had fallen to the lot of any minister of Britain to encounter. He seemed, in short, as little moved by the attacks upon himself and his administration as rocks are,

When angry billows split themselves against
Their fainty ribs, or as the moon is moved
When wolves, with hunger pined, howl at her brightness.

He must also have possessed a great *Concentrativeness*, a quality which is eminently conspicuous in his speeches, where he displayed the talent of keeping his attention, from the first to the last, steadily directed towards one point, never wandering from the path of strict logical sequence, and bringing arguments and illustrations from all possible sources to bear upon his original proposition, so that nothing was introduced extraneous to the subject, or which did not ultimately tell in the winding up of his peroration. The description which has been given us even of his gestures and the tones of his voice, his rising in his emphasis, and mouthing his syllables with the most distinct enunciation, is quite

correspondent with those qualities of mind which have been ascribed to him. We may add, that the bust which is in the Society's collection, coincides most remarkably with this supposed development, those parts of the head in the regions of Nos. 3, 10, and 18, being evidently very fully developed, while those of the animal propensities are very little so,—another circumstance which is also quite conformable to his character.

Now it may be asked, not whether any of the metaphysical systems of mind furnish a better account of the intellectual and moral differences, which appear in those three great men, but whether they furnish us with any account at all of those differences? Surely it will not be said, that this is a useless or an uninteresting study. "The proper study of mankind is man," and this is not merely acknowledged in words, but we see, by the interest which is felt in every thing that promises to give us an insight into the mind and the feelings of man, what a strong hold it takes upon our hearts and imaginations. We love to observe the progress from infancy to manhood, and to see the powers of an extraordinary mind gradually develop their great energies. To use the words of an eloquent writer, "we delight to watch, fold by fold, the buckling on of the celestial panoply, and to witness the leading forth of that chariot, which, borne on irresistible wheels, and drawn by steeds of immortal race, is to crush the necks of the mighty, and sweep away the serried strength of armies." Phrenology does this in a degree that never has been accomplished, or even attempted, by any other system. It lays open to us the mechanism of this celestial armour,—takes it to pieces, and shews us the wonderful adaptation of each part to its several end, and the admirable fitness of the whole for the work it has to accomplish; and hence arises one of the strongest presumptions that it is not the invention of man, but, in reality, the production of a divine Artificer.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

M. T.

ARTICLE VII.

ON THE ORGAN AND FACULTY OF CONSTRUCTIVENESS.

IN our first Number we stated, that the facts on which phrenology is founded, are so numerous and varied, that it is difficult to give even an abstract of them ; and we selected a single faculty and organ, that of Destructiveness, as an example of the truth of this remark, and gave a rapid sketch of the evidence on which it is admitted, as a primitive propensity of the mind. We shall now treat of CONSTRUCTIVENESS in the same manner ; 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 zygomatic bone to the other ; and at last found two celebrated mechanics, 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 zygomatic 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, in others a little behind and above the eye. This protuberance is always found in concomitance with great constructive talent, and when the zygomatic diameter is equal to it, there is then a parallelism of the face ; but, as the zygomatic 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 shew 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 shewed them a multitude of machines and instruments, some of which he had invented, and others improved. Besides, Dr

* 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.

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 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 Colouring?" 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'Neill'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 before hand 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 mechanic and astronomer David, frere Augustin, and in the famous Voigtlaender, mathematical instrument-maker. At Paris, Prince Schwartzberg, then minister of Austria, wished to put Drs Gall and

Spurzheim to the test. When they rose from table, he conducted Dr Gall into an adjoining apartment, and shewed 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. Höslein, of Augsburg, who, 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 Pflug, at Jena; Hueber, designer of insects, at Augsburg; 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, (skulls, No 5,) and it presents an appearance, in this particular 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 towards 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 recognised; 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 zygomatic 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, shewn a great talent for mechanics in numerous departments of art. His mask is No 10 of the Phrenological Society's collection. It is large in Edwards, an eminent engraver (mask No 11), in Wilkie (No 19), Haydon (20), and J. F. Williams (21), celebrated painters; in Sir W. Herschell (42), 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 (No 48). 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 to 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 authorises 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 taste 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, on 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 farther 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 or 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 pas-

time 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 the 1st., 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 inspired 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 for 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 shewed 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. 138, 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 intellect,

“ for these individuals not only could not read books which treated of the principles of mechanism, mais ils etaient deroutés lorsqu'on en parlait, et ne se perfectionnent 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 Colouring, 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 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.

ARTICLE VIII.

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, 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 shews 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 his 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.

- No 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, } 21. Size, } rather large. 22. Weight, }	No 23. Colour, full. 24. Locality, large. 25. Order, } 26. Time, } moderate 27. Number, } 28. Tune, } 29. Language, large. 30. Comparison, rather full. 31. Causality, } small. 32. Wit, } 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 propen-

sities 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 ten-fold 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 as almost 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 visitors remained on board, and the captain wished to shew 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 harbour.) At dark he did leave us, but was pursued by the captain, caught, and hauled through the water from the 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 *cutting* a Yankee's arm with a pistol-ball at New Orleans; and he told us in a few days 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 a head 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 shewed 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 shew 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 fea-

ture 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 shewed 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 fore-castle 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 behaviour of every man on board, sailor or passenger. His satire was generally a failure, as he had the smallest 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 shewed 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 shewed touches of feeling. Even here, however, he shewed 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 gratification 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 Cautionness, 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 suffered myself to 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 Conscientiousness 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 shewed 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.—W. E.

ARTICLE IX.

1. *BIBLICAL FRAGMENTS.* By MARY ANN SCHIMMELPENINCK. London, 1821.

2. *The HARMONY of PHRENOLOGY with the SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE of CONVERSION, (read before the PHRENOLOGICAL SOCIETY, 27th November 1823.) Published in the Christian Instructor for December 1823.* By GEORGE LYON, Esquire.

THE objections to phrenology are gradually giving way to the efforts of its defenders, and the force of truth. Many which appeared formidable at a distance, have proved, on a nearer approach, to be unsubstantial vapour. Those of Materialism and Fatalism have in this manner vanished away, and are not likely to be revived. Another had occurred, which threw a doubt upon the subject with many pious and excellent persons; namely, that the doctrines of phrenology were inconsistent with an important Scripture doctrine. Mr Lyon has brought this objection to the test of a close examination, and endeavoured to demonstrate that it is entirely unfounded. We do not mean to give any analysis of his paper, and notice it only to give us an opportunity of mentioning, that there are two principles admitted in all phrenological works, which, Mr Lyon states, are perfectly sufficient to explain that change of character and conduct which takes place under the influence of religious truth, without either resorting to a miracle, or supposing any change in the original faculties. The two principles are, first, the different states of relative *activity* in the organs of the different faculties, which may occur at different periods of life; and, secondly, the different *direction* which these faculties may receive, according as they are turned towards worldly or spiritual objects.

We may perhaps, at some future period, discuss this subject, which is of great extent and undeniable importance; but at present, we must content ourselves with quoting a very interesting passage from the other work referred to, in which phrenology is not merely asserted and maintained by Mrs S. to be not inconsistent with the doctrine, but used to explain, certainly in the most admirable and beautiful manner, many anomalies, of which previously no account could be given. It is not the least remarkable feature in this work, that, while phrenology has here been suffering under all manner of opposition and obloquy, this lady refers to it as a science in which she seems to believe with a confidence as unwavering as that she reposes on the system of divine truth, which she adduces it to illustrate.

“The Bible,” says Mrs Shimmelpenninck, “is the revelation of God, addressed emphatically to MAN. It must, then, as to its substance, contain all the truths of GOD; but, as to the mode of setting them forth, it must be calculated for their intended recipient, man. Now man is never happy unless all his faculties are called into alternate activity. It is, therefore, obvious that the revelation of God must be made in such a mode as to address itself to all the human faculties, and to afford scope to all the human propensities. Every branch of the human intelligence must there find its appropriate object; and every class of human impulses must there find an object, a motive, and a sphere for full exertion and activity.

“For, were this not the case, there would always remain some unevangelized, intellectual, or moral faculties, which would be perpetually disturbing and distracting the councils of the mind; or some refractory, unchristianized propensities, which would be perpetually snapping the reins of her control, and starting aside from that course which the mind could (in that case) possess no appropriate motives to urge them to maintain. In the first case, the man would resemble an equipage, the charioteers of which were in a perpetual contest as to which road to drive their steed. In the second case, he would be in the same trouble as the driver who should have two or three unbroken horses yoked in with an otherwise well-appointed team. Now, the human vehicle can never go on well, unless the moral and intellectual faculties (the drivers), and the inferior propensities (the steeds to be driven), are all in perfect accordance; that is, every faculty and every propensity has its own peculiar and distinctive object; consequently each one has its own appropriate class of motives, of which any other faculty and propensity is un susceptible. But every faculty and propensity have, like the limbs, their alternate

" necessity for exertion and activity, and for rest. But no motive
 " will influence it longer than its appropriate faculty or propensity
 " is in activity. Hence every character must be in a perpetual
 " state of alternation and inconsistency, as its various faculties and
 " propensities rest or exert themselves; unless it be possible to find
 " a round of motives and objects which though addressed to all the
 " faculties, shall yet all bear upon one and the same end, and thus
 " unite their different means and resources in labouring for one
 " common object. On having found, or not having found, such a
 " stock of motives, so connected, depends all consistency or incon-
 " sistency of character. It is owing to this necessity of alternate
 " exertion and rest in all the faculties, and owing to not having
 " found one common object for these motives to bear upon, that
 " we so often behold the most astonishing extremes in the same
 " character; that we see in the same person the most astonishing
 " and exalted talents often united with the most debasing proflig-
 " acy; nay, we often observe the very same thing in reading the
 " biographies of persons who have afterwards settled into truly and
 " exemplarily religious characters. There is often a period in the
 " history of such persons, when the good heaven, the grace and
 " word of God, has been received by some of their faculties, with-
 " out having yet spread itself, and furnished their appropriate sphere
 " of activity to all the faculties. During this period, in which the
 " heaven is hid in the meal, before it is thoroughly leavened, the
 " character often exhibits the most monstrous contradictory ex-
 " amples of devotion and of evils; and those who are inattentive to
 " the workings of the human mind, would often be tempted to im-
 " agine those hypocrites, whom a little patience would soon exhibit set-
 " tled Christians. The case is, that the grace of God, or Gospel truths,
 " are only as yet apprehended by some faculties. The recipient, in
 " his zeal, sets all the converted faculties to work together, and en-
 " deavours to still the activity of the rest as he may. After a time,
 " however, the evangelized faculties need rest, and the unevange-
 " lized ones, wearied of the duration in which they have been kept,
 " suddenly start up without control, and plunge in headlong disor-
 " der: and thus arise the alternations of zeal and lukewarmness, of
 " love and distaste for religion, to which new converts are subject,
 " till all their faculties and propensities have discovered their true
 " religious object and sphere. Hence it follows, that no affection,
 " or no taste, can be always and at all times influential, that does
 " not address all the faculties and propensities. But revelation is
 " intended to be always influential: it must, then, be addressed to
 " all the faculties and propensities, and furnish them all with full
 " scope for their activity; and this in an eminent manner the revela-
 " tion of God, and that alone, does.

" Again; some faculties and propensities are both much more
 " commonly met with, and much more early developed than others.
 " Now, it is remarkable, that the mode in which the truths of God
 " are revealed in Scripture, as well as its doctrines, are precisely
 " adapted to all these multiplied wants. Every faculty and pro-
 " pensity finds in scriptural truth its highest object: but those are

“ yet most abundantly provided, which are most early and most commonly developed.

“ God revealed in Christ, and set forth not only as Jehovah incarnate, but under the types of Husband, Father, Friend, and Brother, and Captain and Leader of his people, becomes an object within the grasp alike of every devotional and elevated feeling to which the mind can soar in the retirement of the closet, and of every endearing social and affectionate feeling which goes forth with us in the intercourse of life. Our veneration here turns from rank, from talent, and the debasing great things on earth, to receive its highest object in God himself. Our faith is established, not on the doubtful calculation of human probabilities, but on Him who is truth itself. Our conscience is not left to waver in the uncertain projects of expediency of causes in producing effects, beyond the powers of man to calculate; but its fluctuations are at once fixed by the unerring rule of right. Human caution and circumspection are not the sport of vain terrors; but to learn to fear alone the Lord of Hosts himself; and, He being the only fear and dread, all others vanish. Our determination is no longer the servant of idolatrous self-will; but is determined, like St Paul, henceforth to know nought else but Jesus Christ, and him crucified; and to live to him who died and rose for us. Our veneration is henceforth superlatively fixed on that Parent, who, though the mother may forget the sucking child, will not forget his children; and who, like a true and tender Father, bids the bow of peace smile again in beauty, even from the frown of the darkest cloud. Our heart adheres to that Brother who wished to appease our heavenly Father's wrath, even by the sacrifice of his own blood,—to that Friend who came to us in our need, who sticketh closer than a brother. Our heart is united to that heavenly Bridegroom, with whom the believer, being united, is one spirit. Our benevolence henceforth no more vacillates between the good and the pleasure of its objects. It henceforth knows its own true good, and the true good of others. Its self-love and benevolence both receive accession and amalgamation by that one heart-affecting consideration, *Christ died for sinners!* of which number they are and I am. One blood has been shed, the ransom for all; one Spirit is poured out, the teacher of all; one God is the Father, who accepts all in the one beloved.

“ The revelation which informs us that *we are citizens of Mount Zion, the city of the living God*, and which unfolds the wondrous mystery of the cross, and the astonishing Christian scheme, affords scope abundantly for the fullest exercise of all the highest reflecting faculties. What concatenation of cause and effect does it unfold! what a wondrous fund of comparison between things natural and things spiritual! what a mine of investigation does it discover! and every discovery of truth here brings with it an accession of love! All the resisting propensities of Destructiveness, of Combativeness, which formerly grovelled on earth, are now used to destroy that evil self they before defended; and become champions of the truth, instead of the instruments of hatred, error, and ill-

" will. The faculties of calculation, of order, &c. &c. which for-
 " merly moved in the service of self, are no longer set to work by an
 " ill-understood covetousness; but, by benevolence, and a thousand
 " well-understood institutions of philanthropic economy, succeed to
 " the sordid accumulations of selfish gain. The same faculties of
 " wandering, and ready perception and imitation, which, inspired by
 " self, led the wandering gipsy from clime to clime, under a thousand
 " characters of imposition, inspired by Benevolence and Veneration,
 " send the indefatigable missionary from clime to clime on errands
 " of love; and in his journeyings, from the Esquimaux to the fens
 " of Surinam, from the barbarous Indian to the civilized Persian,
 " enable him to become, like St Paul, *all things to all men, that he*
 " *may win some.* The same perceptive faculties of form, of colour,
 " of music, &c. which, inspired by human Ideality, so continually
 " chain the lovers of the fine arts down to earth, become, by the
 " parabolic style of writing, the very means of lifting the soul of the
 " believer to heaven. Every earthly object, which the natural man
 " desecrates, as the means of expressing and decorating human pas-
 " sions, the book of God consecrates, by rendering the vivid type of
 " heavenly truths. To the Christian, all the earth reflects heaven.
 " All which is visible is the type of that which is invisible; and tem-
 " poral things, touched by the alchemy of Scripture explanation,
 " become at once holy and spiritual. And the perceptive faculties
 " being the most early developed in children, so God has supplied
 " the earliest age with this vast magazine of living spiritual types,
 " and with a treasury of holy associations and instructions, which
 " no believing parent will fail to apply; knowing that feelings con-
 " nected with sensible associations are ever strongest. And last,
 " though not least, we add, that the parabolic style of Scripture is
 " eminently calculated not only to spiritualize the perceptive facul-
 " ties, but the ideality of man: and by thus doing, she converts into
 " the most powerful auxiliaries of holiness, the most dangerous in-
 " struments of human passion. The ideality, whilst the slave of
 " human perception and passion, is ever chaining man down to earth
 " with gilded cords, or presenting one vain phantom after another
 " to his ever-renewed, but disappointed chase. But when ideality
 " is once inspired by the Spirit of God, the case is altered: she then
 " starts up from earth, not a demon, but an angel, in her native
 " magnitude. She it is, who gives wings to the soul, to bid her
 " contemplation to soar from earth to heaven. She it is, whose
 " faithful and vivid mirror reflects back the invisible realities and
 " joys of heaven, to those yet groaning in misery on earth. How
 " often has she gladdened the heart and lighted up the eyes of the
 " wretch, pining in a dungeon on earth, with the bright (but no
 " more bright than true) vision of heavenly joy! How often has
 " she annihilated the pain of the martyr, by transporting his mind
 " from the rack on which he lay, to the glory in which he should soon
 " participate! How base is ideality, when she is the magic painter
 " of human passion! how exalted, when the vivid painter enlisted
 " in the service of divine truth! Then, indeed, does she resume the

"exalted post of giving permanence to spiritual joy, in defiance of
"temporal sorrow."

Let no one, after reading this fine passage, affect to think that phrenology is inconsistent with religion, or dare to assert that it threatens the smallest injury to the dearest interests of men.

ARTICLE X.

NARRATIVE of a JOURNEY from the SHORES of HUDSON'S BAY to the MOUTH of the COPPER-MINE RIVER, &c. By Captain JOHN FRANKLIN.

ONE of the greatest evils produced by the opposition which Phrenology has met with has been the deterring from the study of it many individuals to whom a knowledge of its principles would have been of the greatest utility, and by whom the most valuable contributions to the stock of human knowledge might have been made in return. This reflection was forcibly suggested to us by perusal of Captain Franklin's work, now on our table. He and Dr Richardson appear to have possessed that endowment of faculties which fitted them for observing character; and they were placed in an enviable situation for the exercise of their talents, had they enjoyed the advantages of a rational system of mental philosophy to direct them in their observations, and confer consistency on their conclusions. They possessed opportunities of observing tribes very little removed from the condition of primitive nature, and not as mere passengers through their territory, but as sojourners among them. They held intercourse with them in prosperity and adversity, in joy and sorrow, in situations where they could command, and in circumstances in which they were absolutely dependent on their bounty. Whatever native good sense, and a desire to communicate useful information could accomplish, they have pre-

sent to their readers in the Narrative before us; and our present duty, therefore, shall be limited to pointing out how much more might have been gained had they been initiated into the doctrines of our science; and we hope hereby to induce future travellers to avail themselves of its aids.

Captain Franklin mentions, that the Orkney seamen are extremely cautious, and English sailors the reverse. The former made many scruples, inquiries, and stipulations before they would engage in the expedition, while the latter, in general, dash thoughtlessly into any undertaking in which they are solicited to embark, (p. 6.) This difference may arise from one of two causes—either the English sailors move in a more varied and extensive field of service, and, in consequence, become more familiar with danger, and less alive to its terrors, or they possess naturally a smaller development of the organs of Cautiousness than the natives of Orkney. The first hypothesis would be received by readers in general as perfectly satisfactory, and yet, from many observations of the limited influence of external circumstances in producing striking peculiarities of mental character, we are led to suspect the latter to be the real origin of the difference. Whichever conjecture may prove correct, it would be interesting to ascertain the actual size of the organs of Cautiousness in both of these classes of seamen.

The ESQUIMAUX are represented by Captain Franklin as cunning in making bargains. The women brought to the expedition imitations of men, women, land-animals, and birds, carved with labour and ingenuity, out of sea-horse teeth. The dresses of the men, and the figures of the animals, were not badly executed, but there was no attempt at delineation of the countenances. They were fond of mimicking the speech and gestures of the Europeans, (pp. 17, 18, 19.)

This description indicates considerable endowment of Constructiveness, Secretiveness, and Imitation. In the works on Phrenology, it is mentioned, that Secretiveness is large in all eminent actors and artists; and Mr Scott gives an account

of its subserviency to the production of expression. In its more vulgar manifestations it leads to cunning. It is interesting to observe, that Captain Franklin represents the Esquimaux as possessed at once of cunning and some talent for expression in their works of art. Mr Scott farther remarks, that Secretiveness gives the power of calling up the natural language of the other faculties, and in this way contributes largely to the talent for acting; and one of his illustrations is, that "women can weep at will." Captain Franklin proceeds in his description of the Esquimaux thus:—"When the women had disposed of all their articles of trade, they resorted to entreaty; and the putting in practice of many enticing gestures was managed with so much address as to procure them presents of a variety of beads, needles, and other articles in great demand among females," (p. 19.) This coincides precisely with the power which Mr Scott supposes Secretiveness, especially when combined with Imitation, to confer; and certainly it would have been highly interesting to know how far the development of the organs coincided with the Phrenological theory.

The following account is given by our author of the CREE INDIANS: Their original character, says he, must have been modified by intercourse with Europeans. Food, soil, and access to spirits operate on the moral character of a hunter. They have not benefited much by European intercourse, but this is not their fault, no pains have been taken to inform them. "The Crees, at present, are a vain, fickle, improvident, and indolent race, and not very strict in their adherence to truth, being great boasters." Fickleness, improvidence, and indolence, are indicative of a brain, in the whole, rather small, and not much developed in the regions of Cautiousness and Reflection; Hope should be full, while Combativeness and Destructiveness, which inspire with energy, should not be predominant organs. Vanity and boasting are clearly referable to an excessive Love of Approbation. "On the other hand," continues the author, "they strictly regard the rights of property.—they enter a house

“and see articles of value, yet nothing is ever missed.” This is so very remarkable a feature in the dispositions of savages that we greatly regret our ignorance of the development which accompanies it. In several thieves whose heads we have examined in this country, we found Secretiveness and Self-esteem; the one the origin of cunning, the other of self-love, large, with Acquisitiveness well developed, and Conscientiousness deficient. Now, to produce a natural tendency to perfect honesty, in regard to property, we would infer a different combination, namely, moderate Acquisitiveness, Secretiveness, and Self-esteem, and considerable Conscientiousness; but here also no light is shed on our inquiries by Captain Franklin from his unacquaintance with phrenology.

He proceeds, “They are susceptible of the kinder affections, capable of friendship, very hospitable, tolerably kind to their women, and withal inclined to peace.” These traits are clearly referable to Benevolence and Adhesiveness, without much Combativeness and Destructiveness. “They are extremely superstitious.” The power of phrenology as an analytic instrument here comes into play. Improvidence and Indolence, we said, indicated much Hope and little Reflection. Extreme superstition flows from the same sources, with the addition of much Veneration, and it is still more aggravated by Wonder; and here we see a beautiful consistency in the delineation of which the narrator himself probably would not be aware. “They are fond of gaming.” We have observed in actual life, that persons who are addicted to this vice have generally considerable Acquisitiveness and Hope. The former of these qualities appears, from other parts of the description, not to be strongly marked in the Cree character, while the latter is evidently powerful. We are unable, in the present state of our information, to solve this difficulty.

“They are not deficient in the sexual propensity, and seduce each other's wives,” (p. 68.) This indicates Amativeness in full proportion. “Both sexes are extremely indulgent to their children,” (p. 69.) This is evidently refer-

able to Philoprogenitiveness. "They shew great fortitude in the endurance of hunger and the other evils incident to a hunter's life." This may be accounted for in two ways: *1st*, From frequent exposure to these evils they probably do not *feel* them so acutely as Europeans would do; and, *secondly*, It is the point of honour among savages to endure without complaining; and we have seen that Love of Approbation, from which this sentiment arises, is in them very powerful. At the same time it is proper to remark that, so far as we have observed in real life, Secretiveness and Firmness in considerable strength are necessary to the suppression of painful emotions; and from the Crees being described as open in their manners and fickle, we would doubt the largeness of these organs. Some additional information, therefore, is required to enable us to reconcile these to each other. "They seldom meet their enemies in open warfare," (p. 71.) This fact harmonizes with the preceding representations of their deficiency in Combativeness and Destructiveness, and in general force of character.

"Tattooing is almost universal with the Crees, and is very painful." A Cree tattooed, in the most exquisite pitch of the natural fashion, is animated by the same feelings as a European dandy, decorated according to the supreme ton of London or Paris; Love of Approbation is the main-spring of the conduct in both; and this faculty we have seen manifests itself strongly in Cree Indians in other respects; so that here we have an interesting harmony in the features of the picture indicative of its truth.

None of the doctrines of phrenology has been more ridiculed by the superficial than that which maintains the influence of the laws of propagation on the manifestations of the mind, and yet it is admitted equally by physiologists and by accurate observers of nature. In speaking of the HALF-BREED INDIANS, our author remarks, that "these métifs, or, as the Canadians term them, *bois-brûlés*, are upon the whole a good-looking people, and where the experiment has been made, have shewn much aptness in learning, and willing-

“ness to be taught ; they have, however, been sadly neglected, (p. 86.) It has been remarked,” he continues, “ I do not know with what truth, that half-breeds shew more personal courage than the pure Crees.” It is impossible to contrast the skulls of American Indians, Caraihs, New Zealanders, and other savage tribes, in the Phrenological Society’s collection, with those of Europeans, and not be struck with the great deficiency of the former in the regions of the moral and intellectual organs. As a general rule, the offspring inherits the development of brain, as well as the other bodily qualities of the parents, at least of the particular stock to which the parents belong ; and hence the children of European and Indian marriages ought to possess heads better developed than those of native Americans, but still inferior to those of average Europeans. In the present instance, the mental manifestations correspond to such an endowment ; for the half-breeds are distinctly described as superior in aptness of learning to the aboriginal Crees. We hope some future traveller will inform us concerning the modification of brain by which they are distinguished.

In treating of the organ of Cautiousness, Dr Gall mentions that, among the lower animals, he had found it generally larger in females than in males ; and as evidence of the former acting more habitually under its influence in avoiding danger, he states, that, in snaring cats and squirrels, he uniformly caught many more males than females ; and he cites also reports of the number of bears killed in a season in Virginia, and of the wolves destroyed in a department of France, by which the same result appears. Captain Franklin adds his testimony to the fact of the general cautiousness of females in avoiding danger. “ It is extraordinary,” says he, “ that although I made inquiries extensively amongst the Indians, I met with but one who said that he had killed a she-bear with young in the womb.” A female, when rearing young, becomes bolder than in ordinary circumstances, apparently owing to a sympathetic excitement of the organs of Combativeness, situated near to those of the

love of offspring ; and it is probable, from analogy, that the organs of Cautiousness, besides being generally larger in females, may, by some arrangement of nature yet undiscovered, be excited into more constant activity during utero-gestation than at other periods.

“ The looks of the **STONE INDIANS,**” says our author, “ would have prepossessed me in their favour, but “ from the assurances I had received from the gentlemen of “ the posts of their gross and habitual treachery,” (p. 104.) This indicates great Secretiveness and deficient Conscientiousness. “ They steal,” continues Captain F., “ whatever they “ can, particularly horses, which they maintain are common “ property,” (p. 105.) “ They usually strip defenceless persons whom they meet of all their garments, but particularly of those which have buttons, and leave them to travel “ home in that state, however severe the weather. If resistance is expected, they not unfrequently murder before “ they attempt to rob,” (p. 108.) They originally entered this part of the country under the protection of the Crees. They are still their allies, but have become more numerous than their former protectors. “ They exhibit all the bad “ qualities ascribed to the Mengive or Iroquois, the stock “ from whence they are sprung.” This character is so opposite to that of the Crees, that a more admirable opportunity of investigating the effects of different developments of brain could scarcely have occurred. If the description of the Stone Indians is correct, they ought to possess more of the organs of Destructiveness, Acquisitiveness, Secretiveness, and Self-esteem, and less of Benevolence, Love of Approbation, and Conscientiousness, than the Crees. As they appear to be also the more energetic tribe, they ought to have larger heads.

“ The **CHIPEWYANS** are by no means prepossessing “ in their appearance.” “ Their manner is reserved, and “ their habits selfish.” This indicates great Self-esteem and Firmness, with little Benevolence and Love of Approbation.

“ They beg with unceasing importunity for every thing they see. I never saw men who either received or bestowed a gift with such bad grace; they almost snatch the thing from you in the one instance, and throw it at you in the other. It could not be expected that such men should display in their tents the amiable hospitality which prevails generally amongst the Indians of this country. A stranger may go away hungry from their lodges, unless he possesses sufficient impudence to thrust, uninvited, his knife into the kettle and help himself. The owner indeed never deigns to take any notice of such an act of rudeness, except by a frown, it being beneath the dignity of a hunter to make disturbance about a piece of meat,” (p. 156.)

This description is the very portrait of the manners produced by a large Self-esteem and little Love of Approbation; and it contrasts strongly with the character of the Crees, who respect property, but are “ vain, great boasters,” and “ very hospitable;” all indicating Love of Approbation, much more powerfully possessed than Self-esteem. “ As some relief to the darker shades of their character, it should be stated, that instances of theft are extremely rare amongst them.” This would indicate moderate Acquisitiveness and Secretiveness, and some Conscientiousness. “ They profess strong affection for their children, and some regard for their relations, who are often numerous, as they trace very far the ties of consanguinity.” These observations indicate Philoprogenitiveness and Adhesiveness fully developed, and add another to the already numerous proofs of the feelings which are connected with these organs being distinct from the sentiment of general benevolence. “ They evince no little vanity, it is said, by assuming to themselves the comprehensive title of ‘ The People,’ whilst they designate all other nations by the name of the particular country,” (p. 159.) If this observation, that they display no little vanity in any respect, were well founded, it would be at variance with the characteristics of extreme selfishness, of extreme bad grace in bestowing or receiving favours, and their want of hospitality; because vanity can spring from no source but a powerful Love of Approbation, and such an endowment is incompatible with the manners ascribed to them. On a correct analysis, however, there is really no inconsistency

in the different features of the portrait. The assumption of the title of "The People" is not an indication of vanity, but of *Self-esteem*,—feelings extremely different in themselves, but frequently confounded by persons not addicted to minute discriminations. The Crees are *vain* and great *boasters*, and these are pure emanations of Love of Approbation. The Chipewyans are sullen and reserved in their manners, do not solicit the admiration of others, which all men do who boast, but assume to themselves a lofty epithet, indicating a proud consciousness of their own vast superiority, and their contempt for all other tribes of the human race, savage or civilized.

The ESQUIMAUX are said to manifest considerable Constructiveness, and the COPPER INDIANS are described as

"Essentially the same with the Chipewyans, but in personal character they have greatly the advantage of that people,—a circumstance which is to be attributed probably to local causes, perhaps to their procuring their food more easily and in greater abundance. The DOG-RIB INDIANS (sometimes called, after the Crees, *Slaves*) inhabit the country to the westward of the Copper Indians, as far as M'Kenzie's river. They are of a mild, hospitable, but rather indolent disposition. They spend much of their time in amusements, and are fond of singing and dancing. In this respect and another, they differ very widely from most of the other aborigines of North America. I allude to their kind treatment of the women. The men do the laborious work, whilst their wives employ themselves in ornamenting their dresses with quill-work, and in other occupations suited to their sex. Mr Wentzel has often known the young married men to bring specimens of their wives' needle-work to the forts, and exhibit them with much pride.* Kind treatment of the fair sex being usually considered as an indication of considerable progress in civilization, it might be worth while to inquire how it happens that these people have stepped so far beyond their neighbours. They have had, undoubtedly, the same origin with the Chipewyans, for their languages differ only in accent, and their mode of life is essentially the same. We have not sufficient data to prosecute the inquiry with any hope of success, but we may recall to the reader's

* A phrenologist would say "vanity;" for if they had been proud they would have been too highly satisfied with themselves to ask applause from others.

"memory what was formerly mentioned, that the Dog-ribs say "they come from the westward, whilst the Chipewyans say that "they emigrated from the eastward," p. 290.

This description leads us to believe that the Dog-ribs are really sprung from a tribe different from that of the Chipewyans; for mild and hospitable dispositions, fondness for singing and dancing, a taste for embroidery and finery, and so much elevated feeling as to treat their women with kindness and respect, indicate a much larger development of the organs of Intellect and of the moral sentiments than the Chipewyans seem to possess. In the present state of our knowledge, however, regarding the actual development of brain of these people, all is obscurity and conjecture.

The author mentions also the Hare Indians, Loucheux, Squint-Eyes, or Quarrellers, the Sheep Indians, and Strong-bow Indians, but the account of them is little interesting.

"The Strong-bows and Rocky-mountain Indians have a tradition in common with the Dog-ribs, that they came originally from the westward, from a level country, where there was no winter, which produced trees and large fruits rare to them. It was inhabited also by many strange animals, amongst which there was a small one whose visage bore a striking resemblance to the human countenance. During their residence in this land their ancestors were visited by a man who healed the sick, raised the dead, and performed many other miracles, enjoining them at the same time to lead good lives, &c. No one knew from whence this good man came, or whither he went," p. 293.

We cannot conclude this article without adverting to JOHN HEPBURN, an English sailor, who accompanied Captain Franklin and Dr Richardson in the expedition. In the preface to the work a tribute of gratitude is paid to this individual; and it is acknowledged, that, to his exertions in a considerable degree was owing the ultimate safety of the officers, who survived the perils and privations that overwhelmed many, and had nigh proved fatal to all. In returning from the sea to Fort Enterprise, the expedition was overtaken by winter in all its severity, and accompanied by more than its usual horrors. The distance they had to travel was about 300 miles, and the route lay over a barren wilderness, in which was neither road nor human habitation.

During summer the party had subsisted on deer and other game, and fish, which abounded as long as the ground and rivers were open; but winter froze the rivers, buried the vegetation under snow, and drove the game to more southern latitudes. While it thus deprived them of food, it added to their toils; for their march now lay over newly-driven snow, varying in depth from one to three or four feet. They were oppressed also by carrying clothes, books, philosophical instruments, cooking utensils, and a canoe, by which to cross the lakes and rivers which they encountered in their progress, there being no means of transport for any article except personal labour. These privations and toils were borne by all with admirable courage for many days; and while a stray partridge or lingering deer could be obtained to sustain their sinking strength, no murmurs or complaints were heard. But at last every article of food failed them, except a miserable weed named "Tripe de Roche," and painful efforts were required to obtain even it from beneath the snow, under which it lay deeply buried. The party boiled it in snow-water, and drank the infusion. Their shoes, and every piece of skin which had served them as dress, or as a cover for their baggage, were devoured, and still no relief appeared. The canoe was at length abandoned as a load altogether insupportable; books, instruments, and necessaries were dropt, as the strength of each individual failed under his burden; the temperature had long been below zero, and men of the stoutest hearts began to lose their courage, while several of those of weaker minds had sunk in despair, and died. In this condition John Hepburn was distinguished in a remarkable degree for devotion to his duty, and for long-enduring patience and even cheerfulness of mind. "We were much indebted, it is said, to Hepburn at this crisis. The officers were unable from weakness, to gather *tripe de roche* themselves, and Samandré, who had acted as our cook on the journey from the coast, sharing in the despair of the rest of the Canadians, refused to make the slightest exertion. Hepburn, on the contrary,

“ animated by a firm reliance on the beneficence of the Supreme Being, tempered with resignation to His will, was indefatigable in his exertions to serve us, and daily collected all the *tripe de roche* that was used in the officers’ mess.” Many other instances of Hepburn’s exertions are recorded, which it is unnecessary to state in detail; but to convey an adequate idea of the real condition of mind and body of the party, we quote the following passage.

“ I observed,” says the author, “ that in proportion as our strength decayed, our minds exhibited symptoms of weakness,* evinced by a kind of unreasonable pettishness with each other. Each thought the other weaker in intellect than himself, and more in need of advice and assistance. So trifling a circumstance as a change of place, recommended by one as being warmer and more comfortable, and refused by the other from a dread of motion, frequently called forth fretful expressions which were no sooner uttered than atoned for, to be repeated perhaps in the course of a few minutes. The same thing often occurred when we endeavoured to assist each other in carrying wood to the fire; none of us were willing to receive assistance, although the task was disproportionate to our strength. On one of these occasions, Hepburn was so convinced of his waywardness, that he exclaimed, “ Dear me! if we are spared to return to England, I wonder if we shall recover our understandings.”

It is interesting to inquire what combination of faculties will fit an individual for passing through such a scene, without being roused to malevolence by the mere extremity of his sufferings, or being overwhelmed by despair through the hopelessness of his condition.

John Hepburn is a man of middle stature, apparently about 40 years of age, strongly built, and in the enjoyment of excellent health. In the situation in question, these afforded advantages of no mean importance, independently of the natural dispositions of his mind; but while they must have been admirably subservient to the effective execution of benevolent and dutiful feelings, it is obvious that the latter could proceed only from the mind itself. We know by ob-

* We recommend this fact to the notice of those who still believe that the condition of the mind in this life is not affected by the state of the organization.

servations in common life, that agreeable external circumstances are most favourable to the exercise of the superior sentiments and intellect; and that extreme misery, on the other hand, has a natural tendency to produce, in some, peevish discontent, insubordination, absolute malevolence, or recklessness; in others, abject despair and total incapacity for exertion, indicative of excessive and uncontrolled manifestations of Self-esteem, Combativeness, Destructiveness, and Cautiousness. Now, as in John Hepburn, the higher sentiments preserved their sway over the lower feelings, in the utmost extremity of wretchedness, we should be led to expect, in the development of his brain, the organs of the moral sentiments and intellect decidedly to preponderate over those of the animal propensities. We should infer a large development of Benevolence and Firmness, faculties which supply the elementary feelings of kindness to others, and long-enduring patience in himself; also of Veneration, which inspires with resignation to the Divine Will, and of Hope, whose cheering influence would contribute largely towards supporting the mind, amid the dreary wastes of snow, and the melancholy scenes of suffering, in which he was tried. Cautiousness, which is the source of prudence in ordinary situations, and of fear, terror, or despair, in more appalling circumstances, we should expect to be very little more than moderate in size. The intellectual endowment we would anticipate to be respectable, sufficient to confer a good practical understanding, but not so great as to lead to any very extensive or remote views of the consequences of present events. To these endowments we would expect to be added so much of the animal organs as is necessary to give energy to the character, but not so much as to debase it. We have had an opportunity of examining the head of John Hepburn, and ascertaining that the actual development corresponds exactly with these inferences.

We have read this work with great interest, and form a very favourable opinion of the moral and intellectual qualities of the gentlemen who conducted it; and trust that if

they are again called on to engage in any similar service, they will add Phrenology to the stock of their other highly-respectable attainments.

ARTICLE XI.

SHAKSPEARE'S CHARACTER OF IAGO.

Two classes of persons are readers of our Journal, and it may perhaps be difficult to please both, when, as sometimes happens, they do not make sufficient allowances for each other, and for us. The one class consists of those who have never studied any phrenological publication except this. These call loudly for facts,—require us to teach the very elements of the science, and would criticize, as theoretical and speculative, every article that goes beyond the boundaries of their own limited knowledge of the subject. The other is composed of persons who are already skilled, more or less deeply, in phrenology. Some of these have verified its facts to satiety, and studied its principles till they have become familiar as the rules of arithmetic; and they, accordingly, would complain of our dwelling continually on the threshold of the science,—of our devoting sheet after sheet to details of cases, which to them appear like formal recitations, that Mr A. B. has a nose on his face, and Mr C. D. has a similar protuberance, and that both of them use the said protuberance in smelling; in short, they demand applications of the science calculated to interest persons who have already satisfied themselves not only of its physical truth, but of its being the true theory of mind. It is our inclination and interest to satisfy both of these classes. We respectfully solicit the first class then, to consider that Dr Gall began to teach phrenology so long ago as 1796, and that, during the 28 years that have since elapsed, many persons have been studying, while the great world has been laughing; and with their permission, therefore, we shall dedicate a few pages occasionally to the entertainment of advanced phrenologists, of which the present

article shall be an example. To the second class, we represent that allowances should be made for unenlightened brethren, and that every detail of facts which arrests for the first time the attention of one reflecting reader, adds strength to the cause. Even to the novice, too, we may add, that if he have good organs of Concentrativeness and Causality, the present article will prove not destitute of interest.

A phrenologist of this city, on the suggestion of a friend, studied and analyzed the character of IAGO as drawn by Shakespeare, and reduced it to what he conceived to be its phrenological elements. Iago exhibits many of the propensities, sentiments, and intellectual faculties, so powerfully and unequivocally, that no difficulty occurred in deciding on their energy; for example, Secretiveness is so powerfully manifested, that the organ, if the individual had existed, must have been large; Conscientiousness is so feebly shown, that its organ must, on such a supposition, have been small, and so on with others. Where no indication was found in the text to lead to a conjecture of the strength of particular faculties, such as Philoprogenitiveness, Constructiveness, Form, &c., the organs of these were set down as moderate, being the degree least calculated to affect the manifestations of the powers, the energy or deficiency of which was more precisely ascertainable. The note of organs thus prepared was the following:—

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

This note was delivered to a second phrenologist, who had not the least suspicion of its being fictitious, and he was requested to write out his opinion of the talents and dispositions which it indicated. The following dialogue took place on the occasion :—

2d Phren. This is a fearful combination ; but you have not told me in what sphere of life he moves.

1st Phren. He is an officer in the army, of inferior rank.

2d Phren. Of what rank ? A serjeant-major or a commissioned officer ?

1st Phren. Not exactly either ; but you may hold him to be an ensign.

2d Phren. Is he educated ?

1st Phren. Not much.

2d Phren. What is his age ?

1st Phren. About 40.

2d Phren. What is the size of his head ? the force of his character depends on this.

1st Phren. It is an average size.

At this conference, a third gentleman, also a phrenologist, was present, who shortly afterwards was intrusted with the secret, which he scrupulously preserved. A few days after this, the second phrenologist met him, and said, that it was a dreadful development he had got in hand, and proceeded thus :—

2d Phren. Do you know any thing about the individual ? Shall I be safe to write what I think of such a wretch ?

3d Phren. I know him as well as Mr —— (the 1st Phren.) ; you are perfectly safe, and may freely write your ideas without fear of his resentment.

2d Phren. Was he at the battle of Waterloo ?

3d Phren. No ; I don't think he was.

2d Phren. Was he in the Peninsular war ?

3d Phren. I am not quite certain ; but it is probable he may have been in Spain.

2d Phren. Well, I shall state exactly what his development indicates, whether it be agreeable to him or not.

3d Phren. Do so by all means ; and I again assure you that you are quite safe from his resentment.

The second phrenologist next day called on the gentleman who had given him the note of development, and put into his hands the following sketch :—

“ I can hardly imagine a case, where a firm belief in the truths of phrenology would be productive of more beneficial consequences than in the present ; for this is, without exception, the most unfavourable development I ever saw. Phrenology is eminently *practical*, and the present sketch is attempted not so much with a view to the illustration of the science, as from a real desire that it may be useful to the individual who is the subject of it, by laying open to him the hidden springs of his actions and conduct. He must, therefore, be prepared to hear the TRUTH, and with ‘ all plainness of speech.’

“ *Selfishness* will here reign with a predominating sway.—Totally indifferent to the rights and feelings of others, he will pursue his own selfish ends and gratifications without once being turned aside by the calls of benevolence, justice, or friendship ; he never gave a penny in charity in his life. He would ‘ pass by on the other side,’ and witness, with indifference, a case of distress or outrage, adding, perhaps, with a growl or a curse, ‘ Why did they not take better care and be d——d to them.’ He will utterly despise and condemn those who act from noble and disinterested motives. It will indeed be extremely difficult for him to conceive that this is possible, and hence he will be prone to regard them as hypocrites ; but if satisfied that this is not the case, he will assuredly turn round and esteem them fools and blockheads. He is not one of those who will seek reputation at the cannon’s mouth, —not he. The thought and the feeling will ever recur *cui bono* ? And such as do so will be added to the aforesaid catalogue of *fools*. In action (for I understand he is a military man) he would tremble at every joint before the battle commenced ; and though by no means a coward, he would take especial care not to run unnecessarily into danger. But wo ! to the hapless victim whom his sword should strike to the ground ! his cries and his tears for mercy would be heard and witnessed in vain,—he would be transfixed with multiplied wounds, and expire without exciting one emotion of pity. He would take intense delight in witnessing the destruction of his foes—every rank and battalion, swept by the cannon, would be viewed by him with ecstasy. And though capable of perceiving and appreciating the advantages and excellence of skilful manœuvres, these would give him comparatively little pleasure, if they did not lead the enemy into a situation where they might be destroyed and cut to pieces, and, if by the artillery, so much the better.

“ He will be remarkably distinguished by a talent for humour, or, I should rather say, satire, which will be characterized by its

“ being biting, severe, and sarcastic. He will spare neither friend
 “ nor foe ; but I am wrong, he never had a real friend in his life.
 “ He can veil himself and his doings in the most impenetrable se-
 “ crecy ;—no human being will ever be able to extract from him
 “ that which he has determined to conceal. He will be proud and
 “ revengeful, and will never forgive or forget an injury. He will
 “ be prone to amours, and an adept at seduction. It is in this lat-
 “ ter mode that he will most delight to gratify his passions.

“ He has no taste for poetry. He will wonder at the folly of
 “ mankind for taking delight in such trash ; and marvel ex-
 “ ceedingly, that men are to be found who would give two guineas
 “ for a copy of the *Lady of the Lake*. His anticipations of the fu-
 “ ture will never be delightful, but always full of apprehension.
 “ He cannot be happy.

“ This is a melancholy picture, and, as I am totally unacquainted
 “ with the individual who has sat for it, I have drawn it, not in
 “ anger, but in sorrow. There are scarcely any redeeming points.
 “ He will not, however, be deficient in respect for his parents, and
 “ he will be decidedly loyal ; and yet, alas ! even in this excellent
 “ feeling, Self-love will display itself. It is his own company, his
 “ own regiment, his own king, and his own country, as such, that
 “ will render them the objects of his respect and regard ; and will
 “ lead him to treat other nations, particularly the French, with
 “ sovereign contempt. The French ! Why, the very name of
 “ that, to him, detested race, will excite all that bitterness, hatred,
 “ and contempt, which the vehement, unrestrained, and combined
 “ activity of *Self-esteem*, *Combativeness*, and *Destructiveness*, can
 “ produce.—And the manifestations of these will be powerfully aid-
 “ ed by *Language*, *Wit*, and *Secretiveness*. Altogether they will
 “ generate a rancour and an abuse, which, if the head had been
 “ somewhat larger, would have been as uncontrollable as they would
 “ have been tremendous.

“ He will not be indifferent to music ; but he will take no delight
 “ in that which is of a gay, cheerful, soft, or melting kind. Mar-
 “ tial music, the national airs of God save the King, Rule Britan-
 “ nia, &c. will be felt and appreciated.

“ He will be an attentive observer of every thing that is passing
 “ around him. He will have an excellent memory for facts and
 “ occurrences ; but he will have great difficulty in recollecting faces
 “ and persons.

“ I am not certain how the very ample development of the reflec-
 “ tive powers will manifest themselves in such a combination of the
 “ sentiments. They will however discover themselves ; and I infer
 “ that he will be acute, penetrating, and even profound.

“ The large endowment of Cautiousness and of the Intellect are
 “ invaluable in such a character. Indeed, but for these, he must
 “ long since have committed crimes which the justice of his country
 “ would have avenged. But let him be on his guard—these may
 “ not always be sufficient to restrain him from evil. And let him
 “ not despond ; if he shall seek after virtue, and strive to maintain a

“ virtuous conduct, great indeed will be his praise. I would im-
 “ that can place his attainments beside and on a level with those
 “ of the greatest and best of mankind. Let him cultivate his
 “ faculty of *Veneration*, and direct it to its noblest ends; he may
 “ ultimately obtain strength from on high to cheer him in his
 “ arduous course.”

We add no comment on the complete reflection which this sketch exhibits of the character of Iago as drawn by Shakspeare. Every reader may find amusement in comparing the two; and the thoroughly-instructed phrenologist will reap much pleasure in tracing in his own mind the principles on which the author of the sketch proceeds in drawing his inferences of character from this combination of the primitive faculties. In a subsequent Number, we may perhaps unfold the principles, and point out their application, for the benefit of less advanced readers. In the meantime we may remark, that this application of the science is at once highly ingenious, amusing, and instructive. There is first an analysis of the character into its elements by one phrenologist; then these are handed to another, quite uninformed as to their source, and he, by synthesis, produces a portrait which turns out to be a *fac similé* of the original. To a reflecting mind, this constitutes a striking proof that we do not juggle with the combinations, but that phrenologists have made decided progress in ascertaining philosophically their effects in nature.

ARTICLE XII.

ON THE FRONTAL SINUS.

The external and internal smooth surfaces of the bones of the skull, are called their external and internal *tables*, or

~~We did some hesitation in printing this sentence, lest it should give occa-~~
~~sion to erroneous judgments on the part of the thoughtful and superficial; but~~
~~we considered an insensible piece of evidence, that the author believed that~~
~~the arrangement of the tables and dispositions of an actual living human being;~~
~~and, as it appeared, it is in itself so appropriate, that the reader, we hope,~~
~~will acquiesce in the course we have adopted, in giving the sketch entire as it~~

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 parallel 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 recognised, 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 ap-

pearance 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 extent above admitted;* and,

* 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 Time, Firm, 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 obtaining vertical sections, however, for the purpose of seeing the sinus, he frequently found it to the extent mentioned in the text.

Sdly, 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:—*1st*, 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 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 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 shewn 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.

ARTICLE XIII.

EFFECTS OF SIZE AND ACTIVITY IN THE ORGANŒ.

CONSIDERABLE obscurity pervades the minds of many persons regarding this branch of the Phrenological doctrine, and we shall endeavour to remove it.

In physics, power is quite distinguishable from activity. The balance-wheel of a watch moves with much rapidity, but so slight is its impetus that a hair would suffice to stop it; the beam of a steam-engine traverses slowly and ponderously through space, but its *power* is prodigiously great.

In muscular action these qualities are recognized as different with equal facility. The greyhound bounds over hill and dale with animated agility; but a slight obstacle would counterbalance his momentum and arrest his progress. The elephant, on the other hand, rolls slowly and heavily along; but the impetus of his motion would sweep away an impediment sufficient to resist fifty greyhounds at the summit of their speed.

In mental manifestations (considered apart from organization) the distinction between power and activity is equally palpable. On the stage, Mrs Siddons, senior, and Mr John Kemble, were remarkable for the solemn deliberation of their manner, both in declamation and action, and yet they were splendidly gifted in power. They carried captive at once the sympathies and understanding of the audience, and made every man feel his faculties expanding, and his whole mind becoming greater under the influence of their energies. This was a display of power. Other performers, again, are remarkable for vivacity of action and elocution, who nevertheless are felt to be feeble and ineffective in rousing an audience to emotion. *Activity* is their distinguishing attribute, with an absence of power. At the bar, in the pulpit, and in the senate, the same distinction prevails. Many members of the

learned professions display great felicity of illustration and fluency of elocution, surprising us with the quickness of their parts, who nevertheless are felt to be neither impressive nor profound. They possess intellect without passion, and ingenuity without comprehensiveness and depth of understanding. This also proceeds from activity, with little power. There are other public speakers again who open heavily in debate, their faculties acting slowly but deeply, like the first heave of a mountain-wave. Their words fall like minute-guns upon the ear, and to the superficial they appear about to terminate ere they have begun their efforts. But even their first accent is one of power; it rouses and arrests attention; their very pauses are expressive, and indicate gathering energy to be embodied in the sentence that is to come. When fairly animated, they are impetuous as the torrent, brilliant as the lightning's beam, and overwhelm and take possession of feebler minds, by impressing them irresistibly with a feeling of gigantic power.

Let us apply these observations to phrenology.

The proper subjects for observation are men in sound health, under the middle period of life, and free from external restraint upon their actions. Dr Gall discovered, by observation, that in such individuals the power of manifesting the mental faculties bears a proportion to the size of the cerebral organs; and on this fact the whole science is founded. Accordingly, if we take two brains, one very large, like that of King Robert Bruce, and another very small, like that of the least of the Hindoos in the Phrenological Society's collection, in no instance and in no circumstances, the above conditions being preserved in both, will the faculties attached to the small brain manifest themselves with the power and energy which characterize those connected with the large one. The small brain may be as active, and the large one as inactive as is consistent with the condition of sound health, and yet the manifestation of *power* will uniformly distinguish the latter, while comparative feebleness will attend the former, however numerous and vivacious its

manifestations may otherwise be. In this instance we do not refer to power of *intellect* alone, as most persons do when speaking of the mind, but of *mental character generally*, the brain being the organ of the propensities and sentiments, which are the main springs of character, as well as of the perceptive and reasoning powers.

In the next place, if we take two individuals in whom the conditions above specified are preserved, and in whom all the mental organs are, as nearly as possible, of an equal size, except one, Ideality for example, and if one of the individuals (Dr Chalmers) has a development of it equal to 6½ inches, and in the other (Mr Joseph Hume) the development is equal only to 5½ inches, then, according to Phrenology, no cultivation, excitement, or activity, which does not infringe the conditions before stated, will render Mr Hume's manifestations of Ideality equal in power and intensity to those of Dr Chalmers. The same proposition may be repeated in regard to all the other organs and faculties; and it is simply this, that, *ceteris paribus*, size in the organ is a correct indication of power in the mental manifestations.

As then size is an indispensable requisite to power, no instance ought to occur of an individual, who, with a small brain, manifested clearly and unequivocally great force of character, animal, moral, and intellectual, such as belonged to Bruce, Buonaparte, or Fox; and such accordingly we state broadly to be the fact. The Phrenological Society possesses casts of the skulls of Bruce, Raphael, and La Fontaine, and they are all large. The busts and portraits of Lord Bacon, Shakspeare, Buonaparte, indicate large heads; and among living characters no individual has occurred to our observation who leaves a vivid impression of his own greatness upon the public mind, and who yet presents to their eyes only a small head. In like manner, no orator, sculptor, painter, or poet, who manifests Ideality in the highest intensity of vigour, is to be found in whom the organ of this faculty is small.

It is proper, however, next to advert to certain conditions which may co-exist in the brain along with size, and to at-

tend to their effects. Size, we have said, is not the *only* requisite to the manifestations of great mental power; the brain must possess also a healthy constitution; and that degree of activity which is the usual accompaniment of health. Now, the brain, like other parts of the body, may be affected with certain diseases which do not diminish or increase its magnitude, and yet impair its functions; and in such cases great size may be present, and very imperfect manifestations appear; or it may be attacked with other diseases, such as inflammation, or any of those particular affections whose nature is unknown, but to which the name of mania is given in nosology, and which greatly exalt its action; and then very forcible manifestations may proceed from a brain comparatively small; but it is no less true, that when a larger brain is excited to the same degree by the same causes, the manifestations become increased in energy in proportion to the increase of size. These cases, therefore, form no valid objection to phrenology. The phrenologist ascertains, by previous inquiry, that the brain is in a state of health. If it is not, he makes the necessary limitations in drawing his conclusions.

In physiology, the function of any organ is ascertained by numerous and extensive observations; and, if exceptions to the common appearances present themselves, their causes are investigated. The fact, for example, that the eye and optic nerve are necessary for vision is ascertained thus. In *every* case in which sight is enjoyed, that nerve and the eye are possessed; and in every case in which the structure of both is destroyed, vision is lost; but we cannot add, that in *every* instance of *apparent* soundness of the nerve and eye, vision *must necessarily be present*; because both of those organs are liable to diseases which impair the function without producing any *perceptible* change of the structure. Cases, for example, of total or partial blindness, arising from amaurosis, occasionally occur, in which no distinguishable marks of disease can be found, either in the eye during life, or in the optic nerve after death; but no physiologist thence concludes that these parts are not ne-

cessary to vision. Having found them present in *all cases* where sight was enjoyed, and having observed vision to be lost in *all cases* of destruction of their structure, he founds his belief in the function of the parts on these facts, and feels it to rest on a firm basis; and as he knows that diseases may affect organs without rendering alteration of their structure visible to our eyes, he concludes, that in all instances in which the power is lost, the parts being possessed, the latter *must be diseased*; and no one questions the soundness of his logic. In like manner, from observing the power of motion to be intimately connected with muscular contraction, the physiologist calls the muscles the organs of motion. But, when by palsy they lose their contractile power, he infers, and is allowed to infer, although he may not be able to prove, that an important condition, that of health, is altered, and that some disease exists in the nervous system. All these observations are applicable to the brain. If we meet with powerful manifestations in 99 cases out of an hundred, large brains in the prime of life, and in the remaining one find them feeble, it is no stretch of principle to infer that in this instance disease *must be present*; and, on the other hand, if we observe comparatively weak manifestations to accompany 99 cases of small brains, and in one other case find them powerful, the conclusion is again legitimate, that here diseased excitement produces an unwonted exaltation of the function. The fairness of this reasoning is universally admitted when applied to other organs—to the muscles for instance. It is well known that muscular power is always, *ceteris paribus*, proportioned to the size of the muscle itself. It is also known that in insanity the muscular system often becomes excited so far as to act with triple energy, and to overbalance the efforts of two or three powerful men, who try to restrain the maniac. Thus a delicate female, apparently enfeebled by disease, has been known to have suddenly displayed more than masculine strength. No one, however, looks upon this fact as overturning the original proposition of size being, *ceteris paribus*, a measure of energy, because he knows that, if a

highly muscular man were subjected to an equal degree of excitement, he would require *five* or *six* instead of *two* or *three* men to restrain him. The true way to disprove our principle, then, is to bring a single unequivocal case of vigorous manifestation with manifest deficiency of organ and absence of disease. Such a case would overturn our science.

Another case, however, may be stated; suppose that in the skull of Gordon, the murderer of the pedlar boy, the measurement from Destructiveness to Destructiveness is $5\frac{1}{4}$ inches, and that in the skull of Raphael it is $5\frac{5}{8}$. Here the size is greatest in Raphael, and yet the former was an atrocious murderer, and the latter an amiable man of genius. This, therefore, it may be said, constitutes an objection to phrenology. But if the principle be applied, that size, *ceteris paribus*, indicates power, it will shew its fallacy. In Gordon the organs of the moral sentiments and intellect are small, and hence that of Destructiveness is the largest in the brain. In Raphael the moral and intellectual organs are very large; and hence, in conformity with the above principle, Destructiveness predominated in the one, and amiable feeling and understanding in the other. Still, the dispositions of Raphael would be characterized by this faculty. It would communicate that warmth and vehemence of temper which are found only when it is large, although he did not abuse them like Gordon.

Another case may still be supposed. If, in each two individuals, the organs of propensity, sentiment, and intellect, are equally balanced, the general conduct of one may be vicious and that of another moral and religious. This we admit, but it forms no objection to our science. The question here is not one of *power*, for as much *energy* may be displayed in vice as in virtue, but it is one of *direction* merely. Now, in cases where an equal development of all the organs exists, *direction* depends on *external* influences, and then no phrenologist pretends to tell to what objects the faculties have been directed, by merely observing the size of the organs. Before conversion St Paul manifested Combative-ness, Destructiveness, and Veneration, in persecuting Chris-

tians to death, for the supposed glory of God; after this change Veneration was still directed to the same object, but Combativeness and Destructiveness were then manifested in dauntless and energetic preaching of Christ crucified. In both instances Combativeness and Destructiveness performed their natural functions; for, without a large endowment of these propensities, St Paul could no more have displayed the moral courage and fervour of temperament, which characterized him after conversion, than he could have persecuted without them before it. In the one instance they were abused, in the other legitimately directed; but there was no change of radical function. On this subject we refer to an *Essay on Combativeness, Destructiveness, and Secretiveness*, by Mr W. Scott, in the *Phrenological Transactions*, and to an *Essay on the Harmony of Phrenology with the Scripture Doctrine of Conversion*, by Mr G. Lyon, in the *Christian Instructor*. To found a valid objection to phrenology, it would be necessary to shew an instance in which an individual, in whom certain organs were very small, became, in consequence of education, conversion, or any other natural cause, which does not infringe the conditions before laid down, precisely similar in character to another in whom the same organs were very large, and who was exposed to the same influence, or *vice versa*; in short, to shew that by these external influences any of the faculties can be supplied if wanting, or *eradicated* if possessed. If such instances exist, we have never seen them. The utmost extent to which the power or will of man extends, is to direct the manifestations of his faculties to certain objects in preference to others, or to restrain them from abuse, but not to change their natural constitution, or to rid himself of their existence. Man is beset by the frailties and evil-tendencies of human nature after conversion and education, as before them, which is just to say, that the lower propensities continue to exist and to perform their functions. After these influences have operated, abuses may be less habitually indulged in than in the previous state; but the ene-

my still lurks in secret, and requires our constant watchfulness to check him.

We have heard another case stated as an objection. Suppose that two individuals possess an organization exactly similar, but that one is highly educated and the other left entirely to the impulses of nature; the former will manifest his faculties with higher *power* than the latter; and hence it is argued that size is not in all cases a measure of energy.

Here, however, the *ceteris paribus* does not hold. An important condition is altered, and the phrenologist uniformly allows for the effects of education before drawing positive conclusions. See Phrenological Transactions, p. 308. The objector may perhaps push his argument farther, and maintain, that if exercise thus increases power, it is impossible to draw the line of distinction between energy derived from this cause and that which proceeds from size in the organs, and hence that the real effects of size can never be determined. In reply, we observe, that education may cause the faculties to manifest themselves with the highest degree of energy which the size of the organs will permit, but that size fixes a limit which education cannot surpass. Dennis, we may presume, received some improvement from education, but it did not render him equal to Pope, much less to Shakspeare or Milton: therefore, if we take two individuals whose brains are equally healthy, but whose organs differ in size, and educate them alike, the advantages in power and attainment will be greatest in the direct ratio of the size in favour of the largest brain. Thus the objection ends in this, that if we compare brains in opposite conditions, we may be led into error—which is granted; but this is not in opposition to the doctrine that, *ceteris paribus*, size determines power. Finally—extreme deficiency in size produces incapacity for education, as in idiots; while extreme development, if healthy, as in Shakspeare, Burns, Mozart, anticipates its effects in so far that the individuals educate themselves.

In saying then that, *ceteris paribus*, size is a measure of

power, phrenologists demand no concessions which are not made to physiologists in general, among whom, in this inquiry, they rank themselves.

ARTICLE XIV.

GENERAL DIRECTIONS FOR OBSERVING DEVELOPMENT.

THE fundamental principle of phrenology is, that the energy of the mental manifestations bears a constant and uniform relation, *ceteris paribus*, to the size of the brain as the organ of mind; and it is ascertained that the brains of different individuals, of the same age and stature, differ much from each other, both in their general size and in the proportions of their component parts. The differences in general size may easily be determined by a visit to a hatter's shop, or by the ocular inspection of a number of heads in any assembly or class-room; and the proportions of the parts of the head may be discovered, by ocular inspection, in the same way. In some, the greater mass of the brain, and consequently of the head, will be seen to lie between the ear and the forehead; in others, from the ear to the occiput or hindhead; and in others, again, it excels in perpendicular height. Great differences in breadth are also remarkable—some being narrow throughout, and others broad. Some are narrow before and broad behind, and *vice versa*. It is proper to begin with the observation of these generalities, both in order to become familiar with the general size and configuration of heads, and also in order to appreciate the proportion which the general mass of the three orders of organs bears to each other, in average heads. In estimating the development, we must of course have an idea of the breadth as well as length of the fibre, as breadth is an essential ingredient in size. The length is ascertained by the distance from the opening of the ear to the peripheral surface of the organ; the breadth, by the breadth of the region in which the organ is situated.

Thus the organs of intellect are situated in the forehead, and, in proportion to the length of the line from the ear to that region, is the length of these organs. If the forehead is narrow, then the organs situated there must also be narrow; and if broad, the reverse. If the line from the ear to the forehead is much longer than from the ear backwards, and the breadth is nearly the same, then we infer that the intellectual organs predominate. If the head rises high and broad to the coronal surface, then we infer that the mass of the moral sentiments is great.—These proportions should never be forgotten.

We judge of the length of the organ by the distance from the ear, because a line passing through the head, from one ear to the other, would nearly touch the *medulla oblongata*, whence all the organs proceed towards the surface. Those of the intellect run forwards; those of the moral sentiments upwards; and those of the propensities backwards and outwards, all nearly from the same centre.

Keeping these points in view, we next proceed to the observation of individual organs: and for this purpose, we should begin with a few of the largest, and select extreme cases. Thus, if we take the organ of Cautiousness, we should examine its development in those whom we know to be remarkable for timidity, doubts, and hesitation. We should contrast the appearance of the organ in such cases with that which it presents in those individuals who are remarkable for heedlessness and rashness, and into whose minds a doubt or a fear never enters. After we are familiar with the extremes of endowment and deficiency, we may proceed to those in the middle line, and follow the same course in studying the functions of all the organs, taking those of intellect last, as being smallest. After having observed individual organs and manifestations for some time, we may then attend to the effects of peculiar combinations. It must, from the first, be kept in mind, that no organ acts *alone*, and that the direction which each faculty takes is modified by the activity of others.

There are some sources of error in judging of development which it is proper to notice. These are, 1st, mistaken by a bony prominence, such as those sometimes formed by the sutures, or by the mastoid process behind the ear, for the indications of large cerebral organs. This can easily be avoided by a careful inspection of a skull, and learning the situations of those protuberances which occur in every head : 2d, When several neighbouring organs are equally and largely developed, no individual prominence is to be found ; and they who seek only for *bumps* affirm that there is no organ at all. In such cases, a general fulness is perceptible, and the distance from ear to ear, joined in the broad peripheral expansion, points out that the organs are large : 3d, When the organ is very largely developed, it sometimes pushes a neighbouring smaller organ a little out of its place. This may generally be easily distinguished by the greatest prominence being near the centre of the large organ, and the swelling extending over a portion only of the other : 4th, A protuberance is perceptible in those cases alone, in which any single organ is possessed in great vigour, as Self-esteem and Cautiousness, while those beside it are small.

ARTICLE XV.

PHRENOLOGY AND THE MEDICAL SOCIETY.

THE Medical Society of Edinburgh gave out the question, " Does phrenology afford a satisfactory explanation of the " moral and intellectual faculties of man ?" as the subject of an essay by one of its members. The duty to write upon it was transferred by arrangement to Mr Andrew Combe ; and the evening of Friday, 21st November 1823, was fixed for hearing the paper and discussing its merits. In conformity with the rules of the society, three copies were previously circulated

among the members for fourteen days, and one copy lay in their hall for nearly as long; and the nature of the essay was thus generally known before the evening of debate. It attracted an unusual attendance of members, and as the society admits visitors, the number of strangers was still greater. The society's hall was found inadequate to contain one half of the persons assembled for admission; but Dr Duncan, junior, having handsomely permitted the use of his class-room in the College, an adjournment to it was proposed and adopted. This apartment, we are informed, is seated for three hundred students; and, as on this occasion, not only the benches, but the passages and area were occupied, we presume that at least four hundred persons were present. Mr Andrew Combe being unable, through indisposition, to read the essay himself, this duty was performed by the president in the chair for the evening.

The essay being concluded, the president invited the members to deliver their sentiments, and added, that the society would be happy to hear visitors also; who might consider themselves as members for the night. The debate immediately commenced, and was supported with much animation till two o'clock in the morning. At this hour, a member moved an adjournment to Tuesday evening, 25th November, at seven o'clock, in the same place, which was unanimously agreed to. The discussion recommenced at the time appointed, and lasted without interruption till a quarter before four on the following morning.

We are at present restrained from reporting the debate, and, therefore, are obliged to be thus brief and general in our statement, which is given merely to introduce a few remarks on some subsequent occurrences.

The opposition to phrenology manifested on this occasion proceeded chiefly from members of the society, and the speeches in support of it from visitors. The gentlemen who spoke in opposition were not young men attending the medical classes, as has been represented, but gentlemen of mature years, decorated with literary, scientific, or professional titles.

The greater number held diplomas of doctors in medicine, or of surgeons. Nor did they, on this occasion, ruffle for the first time unfledged pinions; for many of them were gentlemen extensively travelled, and known, moreover, as debaters in different societies for a period of several years. Nevertheless, we are constrained to say, that they manifested throughout a profound ignorance of phrenology, with a deficiency either of ability or inclination to grapple fairly and manfully with its principles; they indulged in a spirit of cavilling on petty and isolated points, wandering through a maze of random assertion, founding on hearsay statements; and when they ventured to allege a fact in support of their own views, they coupled it with a positive declaration that its *accuracy* must be received on their report, and that *they had taken the most effectual means to prevent the phrenologists from finding out the individuals alluded to*, so as to verify the assertion by their observations. The Phrenological Transactions, on the other hand, replete with principles and facts, were published before the debate, and in the hands of the Medical Society; we likewise furnished one of their members with a copy of our First Number before publication, also containing many facts, and it was placed on the Medical Society's table for a week before the first night of discussion. These publications must have been diligently read; for members of the Medical Society not only visited the Phrenological Society's collection of casts on the regular days of exhibition, but solicited and obtained private inspection of them day after day, and were incessant in examining and measuring them.—Nevertheless, in the whole discussion no opponent once ventured to attack the *principles* stated and elucidated in Mr Combe's essay then read: only one called in question any part of the essay, and this was on a speculative point; and no member of the Medical Society, except one, (of whom we shall speak presently), denied the correctness of the facts stated in the Phrenological Transactions or Journal, which they had the means of verifying by an unrestrained inspection of the casts and skulls.

Our astonishment, therefore, was indescribable on hearing it reported all over the town, after the termination of the discussion, that the members of the Medical Society had completely refuted phrenology, and put it down for ever. There was no *vote* of the Society on the question, so that this assertion must have had reference exclusively to the supposed effect of the speeches. We traced the report, and found it to originate with the members of the Society themselves, who loudly proclaimed a victory at once brilliant and decisive. In anticipation of a discussion really interesting, we had requested a gentleman, who is much interested in phrenology, to take down the speeches in short hand, and three other friends to take notes; on comparing which, we found ourselves in possession of a very full and accurate report of the debate. On hearing of the boasted triumph of the opponents, we congratulated ourselves in possessing these materials, and resolved, in perfect candour and good faith, to give the public an opportunity of judging between us and our opponents. Aware, however, that we were liable to be viewed as partisans, and that if we reported the speeches exactly as they were delivered, many persons might suspect us of misrepresenting them; and anxious, at the same time, to do the speakers ample justice, we resolved to apply to themselves for notes of their speeches, and to print *whatever* they furnished us with. We accordingly sent the following circular to each of the speakers in the debate:—

“ THE Editor of the Phrenological Journal, intending to give an account of the recent debate on phrenology in the Medical Society, will be happy to receive from Mr ———, notes of the facts and arguments brought forward by him in his speech, so that the report may be as full, accurate, and complete as possible, and that the public may have an opportunity of judging of the real merits of the question at issue. The Editor has only to add, that no statements can be published that are not accompanied by the names of the individuals who made them, and that they will require to be in his hands within a fortnight from this date; the limits of the Journal require also, that brevity and condensation should be attended to as far as possible. Communications to be directed to the Editor, to the care of Messrs Oliver & Boyd, Tweeddale Court, Edinburgh.”

In addressing this circular to the members of the Medical Society, the Editor never for a moment imagined that he was proposing any thing to which they could be reluctant to agree; indeed it was reasonable to infer, that they would rather be pleased than offended with such a request. Understanding, however, that the members of the Medical Society believed that they were prohibited by their own laws from publishing any proceedings within its walls without permission (which, however, we know is not the case), and actuated by respect for that belief, he addressed the following note to their President:—

“Edinburgh, 28th November 1823.—The Editor of the Phrenological Journal presents respectful compliments to the President of the Medical Society, and solicits the favour of his reading the annexed circular to the Society, and also begs that the Society will be pleased to grant permission to their members to furnish him with notes of their speeches at the late debate on phrenology.”
—A copy of the circular was annexed.

This letter being communicated to the Society at their next meeting on 28th November, the president of that meeting, as instructed by the Society, returned the following answer:

“Edinburgh, 28th November 1823.—The President of the Medical Society presents compliments to the Editor of the Phrenological Journal,—acknowledges receipt of the note from him of this date, requesting that the Medical Society would be pleased to grant permission to their members to furnish him with notes of their speeches at the debate on phrenology, and informs the Editor, that said note having been communicated to the Society at their meeting this evening, the request therein contained was unanimously refused.”

To the circular, the Editor received the following answers, the names subscribed to which he suppresses, out of respect to the writers, but the originals are ready to be produced when called for:—

“Dr —— begs to acquaint the Editor of the Phrenological Journal, in reply to his obliging communication of the 27th ult., that his regard for the laws of the Society of which he is a member prevents him from complying with the condescending request of the Editor.”

" SIR,—In answer to your circular, I have the honour to inform you, that, by the laws of the Medical Society, I should incur the penalty of expulsion, were I, of my own unauthorised movement, to furnish you with any materials for the publication of its debates. I would decline doing so on this ground also, that what I stated in the course of Tuesday evening, with the exception of the mere facts, was the product entirely of the discussion, unassisted by notes or previous preparation, so that I no longer can give an account of the arguments I employed on that occasion. Besides, I must confess, that, even were I both permitted and able to give you the information you desire, I should withhold it in consideration of the tone of your letter, which, permit me to say it, has more the air of a summons than a request, and seems to imply, what is the reverse of the truth, that I must be ambitious of seeing my name figure in the pages of the Phrenological Journal. I have the honour to be, sir, your most obedient humble servant,

" * * * * * "

" To the Editor of the Phrenological Journal."

" Mr ———, presents his compliments to Dr ———, as Editor of the Phrenological Journal, and begs to inform him, that a compliance with his request will subject Mr ——— to expulsion from the Medical Society, and the Editor, if he perseveres in his determination of publishing an account of the debate, to a prosecution for breach of privilege of the Society. If, however, the Editor chooses to make an application to Mr ——— as a private individual, Mr ——— will, after duly weighing the matter, and finishing his researches, be happy to write a paper for his Journal. To publish the crude undigested facts which Mr ——— was PERMITTED to state to the Society, would destroy Mr ———'s reputation as a man of scientific research,—be discredit to the Medical Society,—and afford no just grounds of honour to the phrenologists."

Edinburgh, 2d December 1823.

" SIR,—I had the honour of receiving from you, some days ago, a note requesting me to send you the substance of my speech at the Medical Society at the recent debate on phrenology. I should have had no objection to send you whatever I might recollect of my speech, or rather speeches, (for I spoke at the end of the second as well as at the beginning of the first debate), but that it is contrary to an express law of the Society, and also contrary to its wish, as signified at the last meeting.

" Considering these circumstances, I must beg to decline comply-

* This letter is from the gentleman who called in question the accuracy of the statements made by the phrenologists, relative to the casts in the Society's collection. We add no comment.

ing with demand; and I have, in my turn to request, as any notes taken by you or your friends at the time must necessarily be incomplete, and perhaps beset with errors in several points, that you will not publish any thing that I may have said, as you will thus most probably give a garbled statement to the public. I remain,

Sir,
Your very obedient servant."

"**SIR**,—Having received from a committee of the Royal Medical Society, their orders not to publish the speeches on phrenology, you will of course see that it is out of my power to give you an abstract of mine. In place of it, therefore, be pleased to receive my opinion of the science, as concisely expressed as possible, viz.

"I.—Those organs which we possess in common with the lower animals are seated in the base and back part of the head.

"II.—Those intellectual organs to which there is only an approximation in the higher orders of brutes, are seated in the middle and highest parts of the brain, advancing as far as the frontal sinus.

"III.—Those organs which are purely intellectual and human, and to which there is no approximation in the lower animals, are seated in the forehead and projecting parts of the brain.

"That part of phrenology which has been founded upon observations upon the lower animals I will and must believe; but it appears to me, that the central parts of the brain are not capable of that minute subdivision into organs which we find in Dr Spurzheim's work, and that the organs in the forehead have been brought to a degree of ideal perfection which can scarcely be founded upon actual observation.

"Farther, I cannot conceive that these organs, even where they exist, are the sole cause or even the main cause of human actions. The cause of human actions is a certain powerful impulse, which guides us and prompts us to our deeds. Upon such organs as do not exist, the impulse cannot operate; but where they do, the impulse acting upon the organs produces effects not in proportion to the size of those organs. In fine, to make my ideas better known by a comparison, I would say, that the impulse is to the organ as the male is to the female; and, as we find men produce greater effects in society than women, so we must assign, after all, an unknown impulse as the main cause of human actions. I am,

Sir,
Your very obedient Servant."

"P.S.—Your society is at full liberty to publish this letter if they think fit."

The refusal of the members to furnish their own speeches was followed up instantly with a threat, by the agent, of legal proceedings if we should dare to publish any account of

our own. This gave the affair a totally new aspect; it became a question vitally affecting the rights of the conductors of a periodical journal, and the liberty of the press; and a duty was imposed on us to resist all pretensions which might circumscribe the one or the other. After a brief correspondence with the law-agent of the Medical Society, we were served with an application to the Court of Session for an interdict, (in England, injunction), to restrain us from publishing the debate, until farther orders of Court.

The Editor lodged answers to the bill, in which, after narrating the circumstances which had laid him under the necessity to publish the debate in vindication of the science which he advocated, he pleaded, first, that there is no literary property in words spoken, so that even the speakers themselves could not claim a legal right in their speeches, and on this ground, prevent their publication,—and much less could the Society do so; and, secondly, that as there is no censorship of the press in this country, no person has a right in law to prohibit the publication of any writings, on the *allegation*, that the matter contained in them will prove false or libellous, or disagreeable; the proper remedy consisting in an action for damages and reparation *after publication*, if just grounds for such a claim shall be given.

Lord Eldin, as Lord Ordinary on the bills, passed the bill, and granted the interdict, *pro tempore*. The effect of this would have been to restrain us, in the meantime, from publishing the debate till a final decision of the question at law, whether that restraint should be rendered perpetual, or be recalled? We have, however, no intention to prosecute the litigation farther. Lord Eldin has viewed the question as one which does not involve the liberties of the press, but only the privileges of a private society. These we have neither interest nor inclination to abridge; and our leading object in regard to phrenology is already gained by the proceedings that have taken place. To explode for ever the pretension of the Medical Society that they had refuted phrenology, it was imperative on us either to lay the whole

discussion fairly and fully before the public, or to shew, that we were prevented from doing so by the hand of power, *at the instigation of the Society itself*. The latter alternative has occurred, and no person can now, for a moment, listen to any member of that Society who may affirm that its efforts were fatal, or even formidable, to the science which we defend.

After what has been said, few observations will be necessary on the moral propriety of the course which we have pursued. Nothing was farther from our wishes than to injure the Medical Society in thought, word, or deed; but encompassed as phrenology is with opponents of every description, and in every quarter, it was impossible for us, when that Society boasted a victory, to remain silent, and acquiesce in their pretensions. The course we followed appeared the most manly and honourable that could be adopted; and now that matters are placed upon their proper footing, we assure the Society that we have no desire to do any thing that may be disagreeable to it as a body, or its members as individuals. The assertion, that we designed to hold up to ridicule the private proceedings of a juvenile society, to which we had been courteously admitted as visitors for the night, is a gross misrepresentation, both of our intentions and of the circumstances of the case. It must be obvious to every reader, that our object was to give an impartial report of the discussion; and we have already set to rights the notion, that the speakers in opposition to phrenology were youths destitute of general information and experience. On the statement, that the meeting was private, we have only to observe, that at least four hundred persons were present, of whom more than a half were visitors. At the commencement of the proceedings on the second evening, about forty persons were admitted in a body, on a motion by a member of the Society, without tickets, and without their names being so much as known. Not only so, but we could produce individuals who entered during the discussion, both on the first and second evening, without any questions being asked, or

interruption offered at the door, who neither had tickets, nor had heard of the Society having passed any vote authorising their admission, but believed the assembly to be public and open to all who chose to enter.

ARTICLE XVI.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

THERE is a strong prejudice (in baser natures amounting to hatred) constantly lurking in the public mind against phrenology, just as the same feelings have been exhibited against all discoveries equally new and important, and it breaks out into the most ludicrous and fantastic forms. If any strong and striking fact in favour of the science is published by us, or in some of the friendly journals, all the hostile part of the press forbears to notice it. If a work in favour of phrenology, ably written, and powerful in argument and fact, such as the *Transactions*, appears, that part of the press passes it over in solemn silence. When, however, the silliest nonsense against the science appears in any miserable journal, it is greedily seized upon, and goes the round of Great Britain and Ireland. So low, indeed, has this spirit descended, that Blackwood's version of the turnip, borrowed from our first number, has travelled widely over England and Ireland, (not *Scotland*, the Scotch editors have too much Conscientiousness), in the newspapers, omitting altogether the *correction* given by us, and which is by far the best joke in the story. We smile at such paltry prejudices and intellectual absurdities. The phrenologists pitted against the evil passions of the world would be feeble indeed; but wo to the wight who encounters the humblest champion of truth with nature as his protector! Here lies our strength,—it is mighty—and we repose in it with most assured confidence of victory. The operation of nature, indeed, is already conspicuous in

the contest, and our readers must have remarked it. If phrenology be *true*, no man can possibly oppose it who is not either uninformed concerning it,—limited in intellect, so as to be unable to comprehend it, or destitute of honesty to admit the conviction which he feels. If any person, of good sentiment and penetrating understanding, will carefully peruse every piece of wit or reasoning employed against the science, he will be struck with the truth of this observation. The pitiable displays of drivelling in opposition, with which the press has teemed, betray, in the strongest manner, one or other of the deficiencies here imputed. Wherever an honest and able man has advanced to the charge, he has uniformly displayed unacquaintance with the subject; and we know, on the other hand, of some noble minds who have buckled on their armour in the ranks of the enemy, but who enrolled themselves as friends the moment they had closely examined the fabric they meant to attack.

This prejudiced feeling shewed itself strongly in the late case of Thurtell. The most stupid notice that we ever saw in print, on the subject of phrenology, appeared in the Medical Adviser, and it was instantly copied into the English newspapers with eager haste. A refutation of it was given,—they were silent as to it. We speak in general terms, for there are exceptions. The Scotch newspapers did not so generally commit this piece of silliness as the English and Irish,—and some of these, too, were candid, and gave both versions. The organ of Conscientiousness is large in the people of Britain in general, and certain are we that such methods of deception will soon meet their merited reward.

The same spirit manifests itself in other and equally ludicrous forms. It was currently reported here, about six weeks ago, that phrenology was refuted, because Mr ———, who has not written plays like Shakspeare, has as large an organ of Ideality as the greatest poet of England. A worthy bailie of a far-famed city, brought forth this fact as overturning the whole science. A phrenologist present mentioned, that even supposing Ideality to be the only source of

Shakspeare's genius, which it was not, no cast of his head from nature was in existence, and that the skull was in his tomb, and, therefore, that no human being could know the size of the organ of Ideality in it, or tell whether it was greater or less than in the gentleman's head referred to. The laugh went against the bailie; and we afterwards learned, that the head in question had been measured along with a mask taken from a small artificial bust of Shakspeare, of which hundreds, of every variety of size, are sold in the shops, and that hence the story had arisen.

About the same time, we were told that phrenology was refuted, because Madame Catalani had no organ of Tune, and the name of a learned professor was attached to this *fact* as the authority on which it rested. In the head of the lady in question, the organ is conspicuously large to the eye, and we are able to add, that we have been permitted even to manipulate the head, and will forfeit our own if the organ of melody is not very largely developed in it.

Another assertion, emanating, it is said, also from a professor of this university, is now running its course, namely, that Tiedeman and Rudolphi* have refuted phrenology in Germany. This is a poor compliment to the learned heads of Britain who have attempted its refutation, and who, by this professor's not alluding to them, are admitted to have failed. It is cruel, when the pupils of a class in the University of Edinburgh are to be warned against phrenology, to pass over the labours of Dr Gordon, Dr Roget, and Dr Barclay, which are quite accessible to them, and to refer them to German refutations, in works which they cannot procure, and in a language which they do not understand. We presume, the German professors will find it equally convenient to refer their students to the refutation of phrenology in England by the great authors now mentioned, who have so little honour paid to them at home.

* We have seen Rudolphi's objections. They are weaker than Dr Barclay's. We shall notice them in our next.

Notwithstanding of all these efforts, however, the science is steadily and rapidly advancing. The sale of phrenological works and casts is extensive and rapid, the desire for phrenological information is intense; and even the scoffers give indications of envying the clear and precise views and extensive information concerning the human mind, in all its varieties of aspect, which they perceive the thorough phrenologist to possess, and the want of which they feel as humiliating even while they endeavour to force up a smile at the science.

ARTICLE XVII.

OUR FIRST NUMBER.

“It is as bad as Blackwood,” says one; “It is full of scurrility,” says another; “That is not the way to teach phrenology,” adds a third. By all this we have been vastly amused. In the *first* place, The name of our late adversary appears to have attained to the painful pre-eminence of being used as the *worst* degree of comparison. “As bad as Blackwood!” No more need be said—this includes all literary delinquencies, actual and possible. But, in the *second* place, we deny the justice of the comparison: although phrenologists have been slandered, ridiculed, and abused in every form in which malignity could vent itself, not only *as phrenologists*, but *as individuals*, nevertheless there is not a syllable of ridicule against *any individual* in our first Number; nor shall there be any in our subsequent Numbers, unless offenders provoke such treatment by their own gross misconduct. In the *third* place, the real source of these complaints was the application to themselves, by the consciences of individuals, of the satire directed against the enemies of phrenology in general. This is just what we intended, and the little fretfulness excited by our jokes is a proof of returning good sense and good

feeling in those who experienced it. They are becoming ashamed of the parts which they ignorantly acted towards the science, and are displeased with themselves: not to injure their self-esteem too deeply, by an unreserved acknowledgment, they affect to be a little angry with us, and knowing, as we do, the whole process going on in their minds, we have humoured them in this Number, and have been grave, but, we trust, not dull, throughout.

The criticisms of our contemporaries have also been a source of phrenological entertainment. Each critic writes according to the impression made by our articles on his own combination of faculties, and gives forth his decision as wisdom in the abstract. The following contradictions are explicable on no principle, except that the authors of the different paragraphs possessed widely different degrees of the organ of Causality.

CHARACTER OF MACBETH.

The most interesting article of all to the general reader is a paper "On the Application of Phrenology to Criticism, and on Shakspeare's "Character of Macbeth," in which, it must be allowed, some new and very curious light is thrown, and some very ingenious illustrations of character attempted.—*Gentleman's Magazine, January 1824.*

THE SAME SUBJECT, *from Glasgow Free Press, * 13th January 1824.*

There is one paper, however, of a sober, contemplative kind, which, before we conclude, we must take the liberty of noticing. It is No XI., which affects to shew the applicability of the science to the purposes of criticism. In our humble conception, it is the most important-looking piece of nonsense we ever met with. The writer takes the characters of Macbeth and Lady Macbeth, and affects to dissect them by the rules of phrenology—the rules of stuff! "A new species of criticism," he calls it!—very new, indeed! One word to this gentleman—we shall be happy to receive a paper from

* This newspaper has manfully avowed its conversion to phrenology; which we are glad of, as a proof of spirit in the Editor, and of the progress of truth. He will never repent the decisive declaration of his belief. In fact, no subject more interests the public, and they do not like half-measures in matters of serious import.

him on the same subject, when he shall procure the skulls of these personages.

THE SAME SUBJECT, *from the Dundee Courier, January 1, 1824.*

The most interesting and elaborate paper in the Journal is, perhaps, the examination of the character of Macbeth by the principles of Phrenology; in which the critic endeavours to account for actions apparently anomalous by the combination of the lower propensities with the higher sentiments, in different degrees of relative strength, in the same individual. Though aware of the inconsistencies which exhibit themselves in the characters of mankind, the critic maintains that the doctrines of Phrenology explain whence these inconsistencies arise, which by the old systems of philosophy cannot be made intelligible.

The wit also of our first Number has been characterized as pleasing or displeasing, according to the *side* on which the reader stood. We have received letters from decided disciples, declaring it to be admirable. The Lectures of Doctor Donnerblitzenhausen have caused the initiated to ache with excessive laughter. Those, however, who class themselves among the scoffers, have pronounced us less successful in wit than in argument; but no man admires the joke which cuts himself. The friends of phrenology are the best judges of our success in this point, and they have enjoyed the fun to our entire satisfaction. In short, the reception of our first Number has been altogether gratifying and satisfactory, and we shall strenuously endeavour to merit a continuance of the success which has attended it.

ARTICLE XVIII.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE PHRENOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

1823, *Nov. 13.*—The Society met for the first time this season. An essay was read by a member, shewing the application of phrenology to criticism, in an analysis of Shakespeare's character of Macbeth. A Circassian skull, procured by Mr W. Scott, and a notice of the dispositions which it indicated, by Mr A. Combe, were submitted to the Society.

Mr G. Combe laid before the meeting a notice of the state of phrenology in London, communicated by Dr Elliotson.

1823, *Nov.* 27.—Mr Lyon read an Essay on the Harmony of Phrenology with the Scripture Doctrine of Conversion. A cast, taken by permission of Dr Monro, from the head of Robert Scott, the murderer of two men at Fanns, in Berwickshire, was presented to the meeting.*

1823, *Dec.* 8.—This day the annual general meeting of the Society for the election of office-bearers was held. At the close of the ballot the following gentlemen were declared duly elected :

Dr Richard Poole, President.

Vice Presidents { George Combe, | James Simpson,
 { Melville Burd, | George Lyon.

Council.

David Bridges, jun. | William Waddell, | James Bridges,
Andrew Combe, | Patrick Neill, | Samuel Joseph.

William Scott, Secretary.—Thomas Lees, Clerk.—

Luke O'Neill, jun. Figure-Caster.

1823, *Dec.* 11.—Sir George Mackenzie read, “Remarks on the Faculties of Locality, Individuality, and Phenomena.” Mr G. Combe read a notice respecting John Hepburn, who accompanied Captain Franklin in the arctic expedition, with a statement of the cerebral development of Mr Hepburn, illustrative of his dispositions as represented by Captain Franklin.

Mr James Tod, W.S. was balloted for and admitted as an ordinary member.

1824, *Jan.* 8.—Mr G. Combe read a Phrenological Analysis of Mr Owen’s New Views of Society. Mr Robert Ellis exhibited and described a craniometer invented by him. An instrument intended to answer the same purpose, upon a less complicated construction, made by Mr William Gray, was also laid

* Part of the integuments had been cut before this cast was taken, and the report on it is delayed, until the skull, now undergoing maceration, be examined.

before the meeting. The Society remitted to these two gentlemen to adjust an instrument comprising the advantages of both. A letter from Dr Forster to the Secretary, containing some interesting statements regarding the science, was read. On a ballot, John Scott, M. D. was unanimously admitted.

Jan. 22.—Dr Poole read Phrenological Observations on the Origin and Nature of Language. A letter from Dr Spurzheim, expressing his highest approbation of the Transactions of the Society, and returning his thanks for the copy presented to him, was read. Also a letter from Dr Forster to Sir George Mackenzie, offering to present the Society with a small collection of skulls and some phrenological communications. A letter from the Secretary of the Phrenological Society of London, intimating, that that Society had elected the members of the Phrenological Society corresponding members of the London Institution, was read by the Secretary. The thanks of the Society were returned, and the members of the London Society unanimously elected corresponding members of the Phrenological Society. Mr John O'Donnell, L. B., one of the Presidents of the Medical Society, also Mr William Gray, Gorgie-Mains, were admitted as ordinary members.

The following books, presented to the Society by the author, were laid before the meeting, viz.—Observations on the Casual and Periodical Influence of particular States of the Atmosphere on Human Health and Diseases. By THOMAS FORSTER, M.D.F.L.S., &c. &c. Somatopsychonologia, being an Examination of the Controversy concerning Life. Essay on the Application of the Organology of the Brain to Education. The thanks of the Society were returned for this donation.

1824, *Feb. 5.*—Mr William Scott read a Phrenological Analysis of the Character and Genius of Raphael, illustrated by a cast of his skull. The Secretary read a letter from Dr Gall, expressing his high approbation of the Transactions of the Society and the Phrenological Journal; returning thanks

for the present of the former, and also announcing a donation to the Society of his octavo work, in six volumes. A letter from Dr Murray Paterson, with a donation of an illustration of the organs of Cautiousness, and a letter from Mr Thomas Pringle, Cape Town, accompanied with a donation of a skull of a Bushman robber, were laid before the Society. It was stated that Mr Pringle had sent also the skull of an East Indian criminal, but that it had been lost from the vessel in the voyage home. The thanks of the Society were voted for these communications and donations. The following gentlemen were balloted for, and duly admitted,—as **ORDINARY MEMBERS**—the Honourable D. Gordon Hallyburton, Hallyburton House, Forfarshire; Mr Thomas Buchanan, Pilgrimage Street, Leith Walk; Mr John Overend, B. A., London, Member of the Medical Society of Edinburgh;—as **CORRESPONDING MEMBERS**—Mr Colin Smith, Bocarid, county of Argyle, and Mr J. E. A. Sadler, M. D., St Christophers.

A cast of the skull of JOHN THURTELL, executed on 9th January 1824, for the murder of Mr Weare, presented to the Society by Mr James De Ville, Strand, London, was produced to the meeting, and the thanks of the Society returned to Mr De Ville for the donation. Mr G. Combe stated, that the cast had arrived since the printed billets announcing this meeting were circulated, and that on this account it had not been mentioned in them, and no time had been afforded for preparing a report on the subject. Looking at the cast generally, the Society would observe, that Thurtell had belonged to the class of persons in whom the organs of the animal propensities were very largely developed, and the organs of the sentiments also considerable in size; while the organs of intellect were deficient in proportion to these others. Such individuals, as stated in the Transactions, page 309, are, to a considerable extent, the creatures of circumstances, and the phrenologist would expect to find in their conduct alternate manifestations of the lower propensities in great vehemence with the most opposite and inconsistent displays of higher and better

feeling, just as different occurrences or different individuals called the one or other class of faculties into predominating activity for the time. This, so far as can be gathered from the printed reports, appears to have been the character of Thurtell. But to do justice to the case, it would be requisite to obtain minute and authentic information concerning the real traits of his character as they appeared in his private life, as well as in the dreadful public exhibition with which his career terminated. Mr C. pointed out the absurdity of the reports which were circulated by some of the newspapers, that Thurtell had no Destructiveness. He demonstrated to the meeting, that the organs of Destructiveness, Combativeness, Secretiveness, Self-esteem, and Firmness, were all decidedly large,—in perfect conformity with the manifestations in the murder of Mr Weare. As Benevolence was also fully developed, a phrenologist would infer, that the real motive of the crime was revenge for injuries, real or supposed, proceeding from wounded Self-esteem and Love of Approbation united with Destructiveness, rather than a blood-thirsty desire of cold-blooded murder or of simple robbery. The head, in many particulars, although not in all, bore a resemblance to that of King Robert Bruce, of which Mr Scott had said, “no one could tell, on examining this head, whether it was the head of a great and valiant chief of a rude and semibarbarous people, or of a common traitor or murderer. We see that the character, as formerly observed, is one of great power, and we know the nature of the power; but it is impossible to predicate, whether it is to seek its gratification in a legitimate or illegitimate sphere of action.”—(P. 278.) Thurtell, it would be recollected, had, at one period of his life, moved in good society, and did not habitually display the atrocious feelings which disgraced his latter end. A member of the Society stated, that he had conversed with a person who was acquainted with him when a lieutenant on board of the *Adamant*, in Leith Roads, and that his character then was that of a dashing, thoughtless, good-hearted

officer, and as opposite to his ultimate conduct as night to day. In Pierce Egan's Recollections of Thurtell a similar notice of him is given. The phrenologist must account for both aspects of his life, and must shew elements sufficient to account for his conduct in all its varieties of views. If the organs of the moral sentiments had been very greatly deficient, those of the animal propensities remaining as large as they are, the phrenological character would have been that of a fiend, and the better dispositions which he actually manifested would, on such a supposition, have been as inexplicable as the murder would have been, if Destructiveness, Secretiveness, and Firmness, had been small. The development presented by the cast is, in harmony, equally with the good and evil of his character; and the comparatively deficient intellect points out at once, that he would resemble a ship without a helm; now tossed by the fury of the storm, now reposing softly in sunshine, deserted by the winds. It was hoped that some member of the Society would make the necessary investigation, and produce a report upon the case, and then it would constitute one of the most interesting and instructive that had yet been presented for consideration.

ARTICLE XIX.

REMARKS ON THE CEREBRAL DEVELOPMENT AND DISPOSITIONS OF JOHN THURTELL.*

SIR,—Some of the enemies of phrenology, who, I trust, are also strangers to phrenologists, have thrown out hints that such conformations only of heads as are in concordance with

* We have been favoured with this notice from a correspondent in the south, just as we were closing this Number. It will be found to coincide with the view of the character given in anticipation by Mr Combe, when he adverted to the indications of the cast before the Phrenological Society, immediately on its arrival in Edinburgh.

the system of Drs Gall and Spurzheim are adduced, while those which make against the system, (and it is gratuitously supposed that such exist), are passed over in silence, and anxiously kept out of sight. They who have felt no reluctance in throwing out hints of this description cannot, it may well be imagined, have found any difficulty in hinting also, that casts of heads are sometimes artificially fabricated to support our views. Such surmises are utterly without reason. A true phrenologist is a devoted lover of truth, and, with this character, any unfairness is incompatible. The slightest deviation from perfect candour would be severely visited by the body of phrenologists, who are too well satisfied of the foundation of their doctrines to entertain the slightest desire, to have indeed the slightest temptation, to resort to artifice. Respecting the case of which I purpose now to treat, no one will venture to make such suggestions. Before John Thurtell's head had been seen by a phrenologist, most of the members of the Phrenological Society of London had declared to all they met, that no pains should be spared to procure a cast of it; influence was used with the friends of the High Sheriff of Hertfordshire for this purpose; and, after express permission had been granted to the Society, Dr Willis and the two Mr Devilles, posted to Hertford at the time of the execution, and a few hours after the body was cut down, took the cast which now lies before me. The development will be found in complete unison with the character; but the enemies of phrenology must allow it might have turned out otherwise, although phrenologists knew this to be impossible.

We occasionally hear another objection, and this from liberal and candid persons, that the character of an individual is not readily known, and consequently the accordance of the character to the organization may be more imaginary than real. Granting this to be the case in some instances, the objection is inapplicable to the present,—the character of Thurtell admits of no doubt.

Certain, therefore, of the character of our subject, and of

the authenticity of our cast, let us examine and compare them.

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

From between the eyebrows, (lower Individuality), to middle of Philoprogenitiveness,	8 $\frac{1}{2}$ inches
From orifice of ear to lower Individuality,	5 $\frac{1}{2}$
----- Philoprogenitiveness,	5
----- Self-esteem,	6
----- Love of Approbation,	5
----- Firmness,	6 $\frac{1}{10}$
----- Veneration,	6 $\frac{1}{10}$
----- Benevolence,	6 $\frac{1}{2}$
----- Conscientiousness,	5 $\frac{1}{2}$
----- Hope,	5 $\frac{1}{2}$
----- Imitation,	5 $\frac{1}{2}$
----- Wit,	4 $\frac{3}{8}$
Cautiousness to Cautiousness,	6 $\frac{1}{2}$
Secretiveness to Secretiveness,	6 $\frac{1}{2}$
Destructiveness to Destructiveness,	6 $\frac{4}{10}$
Combativeness to Combativeness,	5 $\frac{1}{2}$
Covetiveness to Covetiveness,	6
Constructiveness to Constructiveness,	5 $\frac{1}{2}$
Tune to Tune,	4 $\frac{1}{2}$
Ideality to Ideality,	5 $\frac{1}{2}$
From centre of axis of ear to lower Individuality,	4 $\frac{1}{10}$

With so many organs *large*, (and there are eight which deserve this epithet,) and so many *very large* (and no fewer than nine are very large,) while two only can be marked small, the whole head must necessarily be large, and consequently, *cæteris paribus*, have been endowed with considerable power and activity. But it is at first sight evident, that

the bulk of the head depends chiefly on the great development of the posterior and posterior-lateral parts. The central-superior parts also are well raised, and particularly their anterior portion (*Benevolence*;) but the forehead slopes, and is exceedingly narrow. While at Destructiveness, Cautiousness, and Secretiveness, the width is about $6\frac{1}{2}$ inches, it is only about $5\frac{1}{2}$ at Constructiveness and Ideality, and only $4\frac{1}{2}$ at the organ of Tune. A phrenologist would, therefore, without hesitation conclude, that although the individual had no deficiency of intellect, his animal propensities must have far exceeded his intellectual powers;—that his energy, courage, and firmness, must have rendered him very conspicuous, but not in connexion with any thing intellectual.

If we direct our attention to particular organs, we find Amativeness, Adhesiveness, Combativeness, Destructiveness, Secretiveness, Love of Approbation, Cautiousness, Benevolence, and Firmness, of great size.

1. His sexual propensities were exceedingly strong. He was notoriously addicted to women, and, it is said, at a very early age. His disposition, in this respect, was no doubt a powerful cause of the unsteadiness and wildness of his character. This, however, must have been, in a great measure, owing to the immense size of his organs of Combativeness and Destructiveness. Even as a boy he was most violent and daring. Ever in mischief, he was incessantly engaged in feats of bodily activity and enterprise: he was considered and called a very dare-devil, and few excelled him in running, wrestling, fighting, and similar exploits. When he grew up, he associated chiefly with gentlemen of the fancy; was at every prize-fight, and took a great share in making up pugilistic matches; was passionately fond of sparring, and would thrash any one he thought deserved it. He was exceedingly irascible,—a circumstance arising from the great development of Combativeness and Destructiveness,—and so addicted to shooting as to be called a murderous shot, though the act which brought him to his untimely end sufficiently proved his destructive propensities. Of 43 heads of murderers in

a collection at London, five only are so wide as Destructiveness as Thurtell's—his Combativeness is also immense, and no murder was ever committed with more daring. He was to have been assisted, but, being disappointed, he did not hesitate to perpetrate the deed himself; and, when his pistol failed him, nothing but the most savage ferocity enabled him to accomplish his purpose.

Yet the organ of Benevolence is very large; and this is no contradiction, but a confirmation, of phrenology. Thurtell, with all his violence and dissipation, was a kind-hearted man. No metaphysical system of the human mind will explain the undeniable truth, that a passionate, revengeful, and not very conscientious person, may be warm-hearted, generous, and compassionate. Mary Mackinnes, executed for stabbing a man in a brothel, for which crime she showed no keen contrition, who, moreover, was an egregious liar, was in the habit of visiting the poor in her neighbourhood, and of administering to their relief, and was known to have been particularly kind to a poor man whose wife had nursed one of her children. One murderer, whose cast is on sale, gave to the poor the plunder which he obtained from his victims; and Haggart, who was executed for murder, exhibited also in his nature a portion of benevolent feeling. In regard to Thurtell, we are told, that a person of the name of John Clark, well-known in the sporting circles, had been ill for a long time, that fresh air was advised for him by his physicians, and that a few friends, unknown to Clark, were determined to make a subscription for him, and send him into the country. Among the number applied to for that purpose was J. Thurtell, who, at the time, was very much distressed in pecuniary matters. However, he pulled out of his pocket the last half-sovereign he possessed in the world, and said to the applicant, "Here, take half of this." Then recollecting himself,—“No no,” he continued,—“keep the whole of it; Clark is in want of money, and I am sure I shall never be poorer for it.” Upon witnessing a quarrel, which had nearly ended in a fight, between Harry Harmer and Ned Painter, at the house

of the former pugilist,—the Plough in Smithfield,—and which originated through Thurtell, he felt so much hurt, that he shed tears in reconciling them to each other. His behaviour in prison was of so affectionate and endearing a nature, that the account of the parting scene between him and the gaoler, and others who had been in the habit of great intercourse with him during his confinement, is affecting enough to draw tears from every one whose heart is not of stone. His uniform kindness to Hunt, after Probert had escaped punishment as King's evidence, up to the moment of his execution, was of the warmest nature. Although Hunt was probably drawn into a share of the bloody transaction by Thurtell, the affectionate conduct of Thurtell towards him so completely overpowered him, that had Thurtell been the most virtuous person upon earth, and he and Hunt of opposite sexes, Thurtell could not have rendered himself more beloved than every action of Hunt proved that he was. The murder committed by Thurtell was a predetermined, cold-blooded deed,—nothing can justify it.* Revenge against Weare for having gambled too successfully, and, as he imagined, unfairly with him, prompted it; but there is every probability that Thurtell laid the unwarrantable unction to his soul, that he would do a service to others by destroying Weare. He considered Weare as a complete rascal,—one who had robbed many as

* It is amazing to observe the shallowness of the objections which are imagined to overturn phrenology. That Thurtell, with a large Benevolence, should commit such a deed, was reckoned by many completely subversive of the science. Do such persons recollect the character of one Othello, drawn by a person named William Shakspeare? Is there no Adhesiveness, no Generosity, no Benevolence in that mind, as portrayed by the poet? and was a more cool and deliberate murder ever committed? Shakspeare is greatly admired for his insight into nature, which taught him that such opposite elements may co-exist in the human mind; that in the happier moments of life, a man may really display much warm and excellent feeling, and yet, at another time, when under the influence of wounded Self-esteem and highly-excited Destructiveness (the elements of the passion of Revenge), commit deeds at which humanity shudders; but when Nature herself exhibits such a character in actual existence, and the phrenologists point to it as an illustration of their science, which is a mere interpretation of her laws, she and they are laughed at by the little wits of the world! Nature, however, is a staunch friend and a fearful adversary.—The long day will prove all.—EDITOR.

well as himself, and one who, if he lived, would rob many more; and hence lessened the repugnance of Benevolence and Conscientiousness to the deed. In the first conversation he had with Hunt and Probert, he is reported to have said, that he had had his revenge upon Weare, who had robbed him of £300, and that the rogue would never again be able to rob him or others; that others would now be out of danger of suffering by the rascal. Looking at Thurtell's development, I am led to doubt whether he would have murdered, in cold blood, one whom he considered a good man, for the sake of robbing him. I have heard that he once cautioned some young men, who were playing with Weare, that they were pitted against one who would bring them to ruin.

Equally large with his Benevolence was Thurtell's Adhesiveness, and the co-operation of these two powerfully-developed organs explains much of his conduct.

Adhesiveness had a part in some of the favourable traits, already mentioned, of his character, and particularly in his attachment to Hunt. Pierce Egan relates, that once on taking leave of a friend at the point of death, he blubbered like a child, until he was rallied by the afflicted person to compose himself. His distress at taking leave of his brother, his last remembrances to his own family, who were the objects of his last cares, and particularly to his mother, prove the warmth of his attachment. All this apparent inconsistency, inexplicable by metaphysics and systems of moral philosophy, is at once solved by phrenology. Combativeness and Destructiveness were powerful, but Benevolence and Adhesiveness were also powerful.

One of the most striking parts of his behaviour was his Firmness. The organ of this is very large. To illustrate his Firmness would be superfluous. His was a continued manifestation of firmness, from the moment of the crime to the moment of his execution: imperturbable firmness, such as would have well become an innocent person. No pride, no vanity, no hope, no consciousness of innocence, could have given him this. Consciousness of innocence he had

not. Hope he might have had during his trial, but not at the time of execution ; as to religious hope that he surely had not, while he uttered the most palpable untruths ; and at the last, certainly, he had not such intensity of religious feeling as to allow us to ascribe his firmness to his fervent hopes of a blessed hereafter. Neither could pride nor vanity, I think, have given him firmness at parting with his brother, when his Benevolence and Adhesiveness were in full operation. His brother was so affected, that Thurtell called to the turnkey to take him away by force ; “ for God’s sake,” said Thurtell, “ take him away, for he unmans me.” In truth, firmness is a distinct attribute or function of the mind, and totally inexplicable on any other supposition. A person may have motives enough to be firm, but may, notwithstanding this, be deficient in firmness. Thurtell was violent, amicable, passionate, and very kind-hearted, yet was prodigiously firm. I was convinced that Firmness was a distinct power, before studying phrenology, by reading Mr Forster’s well-known, and justly-esteemed essay on Decision of Character : Thurtell had extraordinary Firmness of character, and his organ of Firmness was very large. Secretiveness was also of very large size, and Secretiveness was a remarkable part of Thurtell’s character. I have heard that when young he was a notorious liar—that his word could never be at all depended upon. His defence was an egregious falsehood ; and the solemn appeal to the Almighty of his innocence was too shocking to be contemplated. Secretiveness gives the disposition and power to conceal our real feelings, and in this Thurtell was eminently successful. During the trial he betrayed no emotion, not even when the verdict was delivered and sentence was passed upon him. Firmness, of course, materially co-operated with his Secretiveness. At the time of execution, a nice observer could detect, in a slight quivering of the lips, and a little shaking of the head, the inward agony of his soul, but nothing more was discernible. A martyr could not have perished more heroically. On a friend remarking to him, after his condemnation, that he could not be accused

of having betrayed his friends, "No," replied he with marked expression, "before any one could have got the secret from me, he must have torn my heart from my breast." His organ of the Love of Approbation was very large, and his Self-esteem was likewise large. He shewed himself greatly alive to the good opinion of others upon many occasions. When he kept a public-house, he always appeared ashamed of his situation. He was vain of his defence; and, upon Hunt remarking to him at the end of the first day's proceedings on the trial, that he had said scarcely a word, replied, "Wait till to-morrow, my boy, and hear me, before you give your opinion, and only see if I don't astonish you;" and, on receiving some compliments on his defence, "I think," said he, "I have taken a little of the sting out of the poisoned shafts that have been levelled against me, and I know that the lads of the village will be pleased with my conduct." Lamentable! that his Love of Approbation was not directed to the approbation of the virtuous and respectable part of mankind.

The size of 9 and 10 must have powerfully excited him to the propriety of demeanour observed during the whole of his confinement, his trial, and execution. It was on his good opinion of himself, and his love of applause, that he split, according to Pierce Egan, when he came to London among the knowing ones. Thurtell flattered himself that he was a knowing clever fellow, and was soon the prey of those more knowing than himself.

The last organ stated as very large is that of Cautiousness. This part of his character was displayed in the pains he took to conceal the murder—to hide the body—to remove any risk of the deed, and causing Weare's card to be left at Lord Egremont's, in Sussex, about the time he murdered the man in Hertfordshire. His extreme care in preparing his defence, and in the whole of his conduct after apprehension, need not be dwelt upon.

The 8 organs mentioned as large, were—2, Philoprogenitiveness,—3, Inhabitiveness, or Concentrativeness,—10, Self-

esteem,—14, Veneration,—15, Hope,—19, Individuality,—20, Form,—and, 88, Imitativeness. Of Philoprogenitiveness and Inhabitiveness, I have nothing to say. Of Self-esteem I have spoken. Veneration does not necessarily give a disposition to religion, but to a general respect for those who are above us. Thurtell's behaviour during the whole of his imprisonment was most respectful. His hope of acquittal was unquestionably very great. He professed that he should astonish the world by his defence, but his great Secretiveness and Firmness prevented the effects of his disappointment from being discernible.

Imitation is large; and, it is remarkable, we are informed that Thurtell was, at one period, attached to theatricals, and that his imitations of Kean were considered very far above mediocrity. Conscientiousness is certainly full; but 9 organs are very large, and 8 large. He was sensible, but not much alive. In regard to the intellectual faculties, they are, though not very deficient, certainly not large; they are completely outdone by the other organs. Causality and Comparison are rather small; that of Wonder is moderate, and Wit actually small. Individuality is large; and he might have had a quick observation and memory of facts. Language also is full; and we thus see how he remembered and detailed all the facts of which his long defence was composed; but the comparative smallness of the higher intellectual faculties accounts for the total want of sound reasoning in it. This poverty of mind, conspiring with his Love of Approbation, accounts for his learning a long speech by heart, rather than composing it of solid materials, and reading it, and trusting solely to the force of argument. Or if no sound arguments could have been urged, a sound intellect would have perceived the folly of making any defence at all. He was easily over-matched at the gaming-table. In the betting-room he was considered a complete novice among the sporting-people; and whatever knowledge he might have possessed of book-keeping, according to the rule of three, acquired at school, his betting-book has often proved the

source of laughter among his companions. In short, as a gambler, he had not talents to win, unless his luck was ready made.

I will not detain the reader any longer, but trust enough has been said to show, that if ever head confirmed phrenology, it is the head of Thurtell.—E.

END OF NUMBER SECOND

Oliver & Boyd, Printers.

THE
PHRENOLOGICAL JOURNAL.

No III.

ARTICLE I.

PHRENOLOGICAL ESSAY, BY MR ANDREW COMBE,
READ TO THE MEDICAL SOCIETY OF EDINBURGH, NOV. 21, 1823, AND
PUBLISHED BY PERMISSION OF THE SOCIETY.

This Essay occasioned the very long and animated debate in the Medical Society, on 21st and 25th November, alluded to in our last Number; and we have been induced by this circumstance to solicit the author's permission to give it to the public, which he has kindly granted.—EDITOR.

*QUESTION,—Does Phrenology afford a satisfactory Explanation of the Moral and Intellectual Faculties of Man?**

MR PRESIDENT,

A LATE writer in the Edinburgh Review, in speaking of the mode of inquiry which appeared to him best calculated to advance the progress of mental philosophy, observes, that "Speculations regarding the *nature* of mind seem now "to be universally abandoned as endless and unprofitable;"† for we have at last practically discovered, that mind detached from matter is wholly without the sphere of our faculties. This is one great step in the acquisition of knowledge; but there is yet another and a greater, which, although a direct

* The Author begs leave to state, that the following Essay was written solely in obedience to a law of the Medical Society, which obliges each Member, in his turn, to write a Dissertation for discussion on a subject selected by a Committee appointed for the purpose, and not with the slightest view to publication. He has, therefore, made a few verbal alterations, but no change of matter or ideas.

† No xlviii. p. 439.

consequence of the former, seems to have been long overlooked, and is even now scarcely attended to, viz. the necessity this lays us under of studying the human mind as it exists in nature, united with and influenced by its material organ. To the neglect of this important consequence, the slow progress of the philosophy of mind is mainly to be attributed.

This oversight is the more astonishing, that it has been so clearly perceived and pointed out by the very persons who have committed it. For while many of the metaphysicians, and, among others, Mr Stewart himself explicitly states,* "That among the difficult articles connected with the natural history of the human species, the laws of union betwixt the mind and body, and the mutual influence they have on one another, is one of the *most important inquiries* that ever engaged the attention of mankind, and almost equally necessary in the *sciences of morals and of medicine*;" yet, by some strange fatality, he, as well as the rest, uniformly proceeds, in the face of this admission, to investigate the laws which regulate the operations of mind, with as little regard to the influence of the organization, as if it had no actual existence. Laying aside the legitimate object of inquiry, so clearly laid down by themselves, these philosophers tell us elsewhere, "That the objects of metaphysical speculation are the immaterial properties of an immaterial being;"† and aware, as they are, that our senses and powers of observation are totally inadequate to the perception of "immaterial properties of immaterial beings," they have recourse to a mode of investigation, in contradistinction to the ordinary one by observation, which they conceive to be more efficient, viz. Reflection upon Consciousness. "As all our knowledge of the *material world*," says Mr Stewart, "rests ultimately on facts ascertained by *observation*, so all our knowledge of the *human mind* rests ultimately on facts for which we have the evidence of Consciousness."‡ And, in his "Essays," || he says, "I have accordingly, in my own inquiries, aimed at nothing more than to ascertain, in the first place, the laws of our constitution, AS FAR AS THEY CAN BE

* Stewart's Preliminary Dissertation, Part II. pp. 199, 200.

† Edinburgh Review, No lxxviii. p. 391.

‡ Outlines of Moral Philosophy.

|| P. 2.

“ DISCOVERED BY ATTENTION TO THE SUBJECTS OF OUR CONSCIOUSNESS, and afterwards to apply these laws as principles, for the synthetical explanation of the more complicated phenomena of the understanding.”

From these quotations no one could have the smallest doubt of the adequacy of Consciousness to afford us that information “ concerning the laws of union and the mutual influence of mind and body,” which Mr S. justly declares to be so “ necessary in the sciences of morals and medicine.”— What then must be our astonishment on finding, that, so far from Consciousness throwing any light upon the connection between different states of the mind, and different conditions of the material organ, it does not inform us even of the existence of the latter? This fact, however, furnishes a very simple and satisfactory explanation of the cause of the constant failure which has ever attended the efforts of the most profound and ingenious men, whose talents and industry have been expended during so many ages in the barren fields of metaphysical research; and it explains perfectly the superior success which has attended the labours of Gall and Spurzheim, conducted as they were with the most scrupulous and constant reference to the effects of the material organ. It was a deep conviction of the necessity of always keeping in view the influence of the organization, that induced Dr Gall to devote so much time and attention to the observation of the effects of different forms and conditions of the brain upon the power of manifesting individual mental faculties; and it was the extensive application to Nature of this better mode of investigation, that ultimately enabled him to establish the following principles, the most important of those upon which the new system is founded, viz.

1. That the mind is endowed with a plurality of innate faculties.

2. That each of these faculties manifests itself through the medium of an appropriate organ, of which organs the brain is a *congeries*.

3. That the power of manifesting each faculty bears a constant and uniform relation, *ceteris paribus*, to the size of

the organ, or part of the brain with which it is more immediately connected.

4. That it is possible to ascertain the relative size of these different organs during life, by observing the different forms of the skull to which the brain gives its shape.

Hence, if these principles are correct, by adopting the mode of inquiry to which they naturally give rise, by comparing development of brain with manifestation of mind, it becomes possible to discover the nature and number of the primitive faculties, with a degree of certainty absolutely unattainable by any other method. For, besides avoiding the great error of neglecting the influence of the organization, we also avoid another equally great, into which the metaphysical philosophers have fallen, in prosecuting their inquiries by reflection on Consciousness alone. It is that of each taking his own mind as the standard or type of those of the human race, and thus regularly beginning the erection of his own theory by the demolition of that of his predecessor; because, on account of the natural and undeniable differences between the minds of different individuals, Consciousness does not and cannot present the same results on the presentment of the same object to any two of them; and much less can the Consciousness of any one individual agree with that of all others at one or at different times; which it must necessarily be shewn to do, before laws or principles, applicable to all, can be deduced from the consciousness of *one*. Phrenology, on the other hand, explicitly lays down these differences, in disposition and talents, as natural, and one of its chief objects is to ascertain, by observation, the causes upon which they depend.

Some have been led to deny the truth of the observations of the phrenologists, because the results at which they have arrived often differ so widely from the opinions entertained by the most esteemed metaphysical writers, whom they have been accustomed to revere as the only legitimate authorities in the science of mind. But he, who contemplates for a moment the fundamental differences of the two modes of

inquiry, will pause before rejecting them on that ground alone, and will feel any thing rather than surprise, at a considerable difference of result. Phrenology is a science of observation, and its principles are a direct inference from facts in Nature, while that of metaphysicians is derived solely from reflection in the closet. No wonder then, that the phrenological mode of investigation should have led to the discovery of much that must have remained unknown to the metaphysician. It is like a new agent in chemistry, or a new power in mechanics, the results of which can be ascertained by experience alone, and not by deductions from the analogies of things essentially different.

It is so far fortunate for the new system, that, to disprove a science founded on observation, it is not sufficient merely to deny its truth; we must commence our operations on the facts upon which it is built, and, by confirming or undermining these, support or undermine the superstructure. This mode of proceeding ought *invariably* to be followed as the only one which is either philosophical or conclusive; and is that which I would adopt on the present occasion, if it were in my power to do so. Unfortunately, however, in as far as Phrenology is concerned, it can only be followed in the wide and varied field of nature, and not within the limits of a hall like this. I might, no doubt, go over a long detail of facts observed in that field by myself and others; but to the minds of those, who are not *practically* acquainted with the principles of Phrenology, so many sources of fallacy immediately present themselves, and so much calm reflection is, at first, required to perceive the relation of the facts to the principles, that such a detail would be tedious and uninteresting, and would, probably, seem inconclusive. The committee, who selected this question for discussion, seem to have been aware of this. They do not ask if Phrenology is founded on fact? because the affirmative or negative can be proved only by repeating the observations and verifying the facts themselves. But they very justly suppose, that if it has a foundation in nature, its doctrines

must be consistent with and explanatory of all the known phenomena of mind. They, therefore, ask simply if Phrenology affords a satisfactory explanation of these phenomena, trusting to the consistency or inconsistency which shall be shewn to exist between them for the strongest presumptive evidence of its truth or erroneousness which it is possible to obtain. To the examination of this kind of evidence, therefore, I shall strictly confine myself, and the order which I shall adopt is as follows :—

Taking for granted, what nobody now thinks of denying, (and which those who do will find demonstrated in Mr M'Farlane's excellent paper, read to this Society about two years ago,) that the brain is the organ of mind, I shall endeavour to shew that all the mental phenomena are explicable by, or consistent with the fundamental phrenological principles already mentioned as established by Dr Gall, while they are at variance with every theory which regards the organ of mind as single, or the mind itself as a single power existing in different states. And to prove that the individual faculties admitted as ascertained, are really necessary and original powers, I shall give a few examples of their application to the analysis of the moral and intellectual nature of man, as exhibited in the varied characters of individuals and of nations. I shall dwell most upon the proof of the principles, because they lie at the root of all the others, and, if once admitted and acted upon, will soon lead to the demonstration of what are primitive faculties and what are not.

In endeavouring to shew that the mental phenomena are explicable by the principle of a plurality of faculties and organs, I shall begin with the consideration of the intellectual, and then proceed to that of the moral nature of man.

The first order of intellectual phenomena, for the explanation of which the admission of the above principle is necessary, is that of the successive development of the different powers of the mind in infancy and youth. At

birth, the infant mind seems nearly insensible to surrounding objects. The powers of observation are then gradually developed, and mere existence is recognized long before an idea is formed of the qualities of objects. By and by the powers of perceiving the qualities of colour, of form, and also the relative positions of objects, are developed, while yet there is no idea of distance, size, or weight; and an object is thus grasped at when far beyond the reach of the infant. The faculty which, by comparing objects with each other, enables us to perceive resemblances, then comes into play, but long before that which leads us to attend to the distinguishing differences, so that one thing is often confounded with another to which it bears a very slight resemblance. It is only about the age of puberty that the reasoning power is possessed in much activity, and it is not till adult age that it arrives at maturity.

That this is the general order of the development of the mental powers, is proved by the progress of language, which is known to take its character from the nature of the predominant faculties of those by whom it is used. At first, it is merely a collection of nouns, of words denoting existence, and nothing more, as man, horse, tree. To these are soon added words expressive of qualities, and those expressive of colour and form are generally understood, and *used with intelligence*, before those of size, distance, or weight; and those expressive of resemblance precede those of differences; and those of individuals, those of abstracts or classes.

The same rule of successive development is observed to hold with regard to the moral sentiments and propensities, although it is more difficult to trace the order of their appearance. A single instance, however, is sufficient to prove the fact; and, as that is all we want at present, I shall merely mention it. It is that of the late development of the sexual propensity, which, however strong it may become in after life, is rarely perceptible before the age of puberty, and bears no constant relation to any other quality of mind at any period of our lives.

The fact of the successive development of the different faculties of the mind is indeed admitted by all philosophers. But if we try to explain it, by the supposition of the gradual perfection, or of some general change in the constitution of the whole brain, as the single organ of mind, as is generally done, we meet with nothing but contradiction. The organ of mind being single, and serving for the manifestation of all the faculties, ought, on this supposition, to be equally fit for the operation of all at the same time, which we have seen it not to be. If we admit the phrenological principle, however, nothing can be more simple, or true to nature, than the explanation we then have. According to this principle, each mental faculty, like each of the five senses, will depend, for the power of manifesting itself, upon the healthy condition of a particular organ. So that, just as the power of vision is, *ceteris paribus*, always proportioned to the perfection of the eye, or organ of vision, the energy of each mental faculty may be proportioned to the state of its own organ; and, as from the sense of sight being exercised by an appropriate organ, we sometimes find it sooner and more perfectly developed than that of hearing or of smell, in like manner we can easily conceive how the faculty of Individuality, which disposes to observation, from having also an appropriate organ, may be sooner and more perfectly developed than that of Causality, or of Tune, or of Number, or more in one person than in another. Indeed, the moment we admit the plurality of mental faculties and organs, the explanation of the early or late, successive or simultaneous, perfect or imperfect development of one, of several, or of all the mental powers, becomes so simple and easy as to present itself to the mind of every inquirer.

In proof of the *fact* of the later development of some portions of the brain than of others, I have only to state what is well known to anatomists,—1st, That, in infancy, the cerebellum bears a much smaller proportion to the rest of the cerebral mass than it does in after life; in the former, being only about one-fifteenth, and in the latter, one-sixth or

one-eighth, which corresponds precisely with the function ascribed to it, of being the organ of the Amative propensity; 2d, That, in infancy and youth, the middle and central parts of the forehead are generally so much more prominent than the upper lateral parts, as to give a kind of roundness, compared to the square appearance which it afterwards assumes, upon the farther development of those portions of the anterior lobes of the brain, which form the organs of the reasoning powers. In relation to this fact, it may be worth while to add, that the parts first developed are known to be the organs of the faculty of Individuality, which is said to observe and to know; while the later are those of Causality, or reflection;—thus in strict accordance with nature.

The differences in the mental constitution of the two sexes are also inexplicable on other than phrenological principles. It is admitted, that the female generally differs from the male in character, dispositions, and talents. In their earlier years, the boy and the girl can scarcely be distinguished, except by their dress; but a difference gradually shews itself, while yet external circumstances remain the same, and proceeds till the distinctive character of each is broadly marked. That this is the course of nature, and not of art, is manifest from the change occurring while circumstances are unaltered, and from its occurring at an earlier or later period in different individuals similarly situated, and from some individuals of one sex retaining through life most of the mental qualities of the other. If we attempt to explain the difference by the supposition of some original difference in the animating principle, uninfluenced by the organization, we are refuted by the occasional occurrence of females possessing all the mental attributes of the male, and, *vice versa*, males with all the mental qualities of the female. But the moment we admit the phrenological principle of plurality of organs and faculties the difficulty vanishes. We have only to suppose, that the parts of the brain which constitute the organs of the love of offspring, of attachment, and of the other faculties which predominate in the female mind,

by some unknown law of nature, become more fully developed relatively to the others, in the female than in the male brain; and the natural result will be a greater degree of activity of these faculties. The female intellect is like that of youth, more remarkable for acuteness, readiness, and extent of memory, and a perception of qualities and resemblances, than for depth of reflection or solidity of judgment. The female forehead, therefore, if this explanation be the true one, should, more than that of the male, resemble the youthful brow; and a moment's reflection will satisfy every one that, in point of fact, it does resemble it; and the proof is, that that very roundness and sloping away of the upper lateral parts has always been regarded as a point of beauty in the female forehead.

Another order of intellectual phenomena, viz. those of Genius, are of themselves sufficient to prove the plurality of mental faculties and organs; for Genius, in almost every instance, is partial or limited to the possession of a few faculties only, which it could not be if the organ of mind were single. Thus, an individual may now and then be met with, who possesses much genius for poetry, for music, for reasoning, for mechanics, or for the fine arts; but we very rarely meet with one who is able to excel in all, or in several of these at the same time, however anxious he may be to do so, and whatever efforts he may make. We are told indeed by some authors, such as Mr Stewart, that "a genius for poetry, for painting, for music, or for mathematics,"* is "gradually formed by particular habits of study or of business;" and that "invention in the arts and sciences † is the result of acquired habits, aided by favourable circumstances, and not the original gift of nature." But if we consult a yet higher authority than Mr Stewart, viz. Nature herself, we find these opinions contradicted by facts: for genius most frequently appears at such an early age as to put habits of study or cultivation as a producing cause entirely out of the question. We are told, for instance, that at three years, Mozart's great amusement was

* Moral Philosophy, p. 16.

† Stewart's Elements, 1st vol., 50th ch. part 1, § 4.

in finding out concords on the piano, that nothing could equal his delight at discovering an harmonious interval, and that before six, he had invented several pieces of some extent and intricacy. We are also informed, that Haydn had distinguished himself before the age of twelve; that Handel, before the age of fourteen, had produced an opera which had a run of thirty successive nights; and that so far from his habits of study being the result of great cultivation, they were formed in the retirement of a garret, and in spite of every species of discouragement. Miss Paton too, who, in her late visit to Edinburgh, afforded so much delight, was remarkable as a performer at the age of eight.*

Among the poets again, the same early appearance of genius occurs where cultivation could not possibly have had time to operate. Dr Johnson, in his Lives of the Poets, tells us, that Cowley, Milton, and Pope "might be said "to lisp in numbers," "and to have given such early proofs "not only of powers of language, but of comprehension of "things, as to more tardy minds seem scarcely credible." Cowley, for instance, wrote a tragedy in his tenth year. Miss Clara Fisher also in her seventh year manifested amazing powers of comprehension and of dramatic talent; and yet so little were her parents aware of any laborious studies on her part, that they simply affirm, that these talents appeared all at once after seeing a play. Mr George Bidder, too, when still a child, manifested his prodigious calculating powers, and invented rules for himself which his teachers could never discover, and which, consequently, he could not have derived from them. Again, turning our attention to invention in the Arts and Sciences, which we are told is *not a gift of nature, but the result of acquired habits, aided by favourable circumstances*, equally contradictory instances occur. Dupin, for example, speaks of two brothers, journeymen-bakers, whom he saw in Glasgow. "Deux frères "boulangers, qui, dans l'intervalle d'une cuisson à l'autre, "s'occupent à faire des machines et des instruments de physique. Ils ont coulé, tourné, ajusté toutes les pièces d'une

* Edinburgh Review, No. lxvi. May 1820, p. 380.

“ petite machine à vapeur, dont la modeste bouilloire chauffe à côté du four aux petits pâtés. Elle sert à faire aller un tour en l’air, à l’aide duquel nos deux artistes tournent les métaux et façonnent des lentilles pour des instruments d’optique. Ils ont construit un petit appareil pour éclairer par le gaz leurs boutiques et leurs appartements, &c. &c.”* One would expect, that in such a case, if Mr Stewart’s theory were true, the combination of circumstances must have been very favourable indeed to produce such an effect on men of a profession which is universally considered as any thing but intellectual. Monsieur Dupin, however, in expressing a hope, that “ They will one day quit their profession to cultivate with success the natural sciences,” adds,—“ Mais leur fortune dépend d’un oncle qui *préfère de beaucoup la boulangerie et la pâtisserie à la gazometrie et à l’astronomie*, et qui, jaloux du titre héréditaire de sa famille, veut transmettre à ses arrière-neveux le pétrin de ses ancêtres.” And so little is he satisfied with the uncle’s mode of encouraging science, and of forming habits of study, that he immediately exclaims,—“ Hélas ! combien d’hommes sont parmi nous, sans s’en douter, l’oncle des deux pâtisseries !” And that there are men who have even a still more oblique perception of what constitutes “ favourable circumstances,” I shall presently shew.

During my residence in Paris, I had the pleasure of knowing intimately a man remarkable for his “ powers of invention in music and in mechanics,” and who had raised himself to riches by the exercise of these powers. I was at that time studying phrenology, and looking about for information. I therefore eagerly embraced the opportunity of asking him, whose house was filled with the results of his own inventions, by what habits of study he had formed his genius, and what “ favourable circumstances” had aided him in his career of excellence ? He gratified my curiosity, and gave me the history of his life, which seemed, however, to prove that in this case, as in the others, his genius had formed his habits, instead of his habits forming his genius. He was born in Germany, and at about four years of age was sent to school ; but instead of learning to read, he occupied himself in constructing and carving with his knife all sorts

* Mémoires sur la Marine, p. 69.

of small pieces of machinery which he had seen. For this perversity, as it was called, he was reprimanded and beaten. At the age of about seven, he was positively denied all means of cultivating those talents, and was most severely threatened for the future. He at that time had an opportunity of minutely inspecting a violin, and after much toil and secret working, he succeeded in constructing one which answered his purpose. But when the discovery was made a considerable time after, home was made so disagreeable to him by the beatings and upbraidings which he received to induce him to form other habits, that, when still a very young boy, he left it with a few pence in his pocket, and entered upon the business of life. After seeking in vain for employment, from wrights, turners, and other artificers, congenial to his taste, he was forced to engage with a barber, merely to keep soul and body together. The barber fortunately was musical, and on one occasion, broke the instrument upon which he played. The boy having repaired it for him, and given such proofs of ingenuity as to set the barber a-talking, the attention of an instrument-maker was drawn to him, into whose employment he was soon after received. From one step to another, he advanced to that of a musical-instrument maker in Paris, in full employment, and more than once received the compliments of the Institute for his discoveries and improvements. The celebrated Abbé Haüy was one of those who were appointed by that body to examine and report upon these improvements; and in doing so, the two formed an acquaintance which ended only with the life of the latter. He was never happy when not exercising his inventive powers, and many a time have I heard him regret the want of education in his youth, as he was thus left to waste much of his time and talents in *discovering* the first principles of a science, which a few weeks study would have taught him. To the uninitiated, it is difficult to conceive in what the favourable circumstances of this gentleman's life consisted, if not in nature herself having bestowed upon him energies calculated to rise superior to every species of repression and discouragement.

If indeed any one could acquire a genius for poetry, for music, or for any thing else, by forming any habits of study, or by any sort of training, then we need not go to Phrenology for an explanation of the phenomena of genius. But as the fact is notoriously the reverse, let us see if the new system reveals any conditions which are not under our control, and which limit the power of forming habits or of acquiring a genius for any pursuit.

From such observations as the preceding, the phrenologists contend, that genius is the gift of nature, and not the result of even the most favourable combination of external circumstances, and that it is in general partial or limited to a number only of the mental faculties. Experience shews also, that a certain condition of the brain or organ of mind is somehow or other necessary for its manifestations; for, besides the occasional appearance of genius during disease, where none was possessed before, we uniformly see the power of manifesting the faculties vary with every change in the state of their material organs, and reach their greatest degree of vigour when the brain arrives at its full growth. We see them constantly disturbed by its injuries, and varying with its changes; from which, and from innumerable other observations demonstrative of the fact, the phrenologists affirm, that genius is always accompanied with a certain condition of the brain, and without which condition it cannot possibly appear. They farther contend, that the phenomena are not reconcilable with the idea of the brain, or any other part, *as a whole*, being the single organ of mind, as it is generally stated to be when referred to by the metaphysicians. For if the organ of mind were single, genius ought ALWAYS to be general, and a man should be equally great in every department, or at least should have equal power of becoming great in every department; or, to use Mr Stewart's words, "of forming any habits he chooses, if aided by favourable circumstances," since the single organ ought to be equally fitted for manifesting one faculty as another. In some instances indeed, such as in the Admirable Crichton, Michael Angelo, and a few

more, genius seems to be general. But the puzzling question for the metaphysician comes to be, *Why is it not so in every instance?* To the phrenologist, the explanation of both cases is extremely easy; for in general genius, he finds the organs of *all* the intellectual and higher faculties largely developed, whereas in partial, a few only are extremely large. In the portraits of the Admirable Crichton, this is strikingly displayed; and in an excellent bust of Michael Angelo, which I have seen in the church of the Santa Croce at Florence, the same extraordinary development of all the intellectual organs is extremely remarkable. With regard to partial genius, on the principle of the different mental powers being connected with and depending for their manifestations upon different cerebral parts, we can easily conceive how these may be differently proportioned to each other, not only in different individuals, but in the same individual at different periods of his life? or how one man may have a natural power or facility of forming habits of a certain kind, which is denied to another, while he may be excelled in his turn with respect to the power of forming habits of a different kind? In such cases as those of Mozart, Handel, and Haydn, the cerebral organs upon the size of which a great endowment of the faculties of Tune, of Time, and of Ideality depend, may on this principle be easily conceived to have existed without bearing any necessary relation to the degree of endowment of the other faculties. In Pope, Milton, and Cowley, the cerebral organs, with which the faculties of Ideality, Language, &c. are connected, might also easily have existed in large development, although those of Tune, of Constructiveness, or of Number, might be possessed in a much smaller degree. In Addison, who disliked music, the organ of Tune might thus be very small, although that of Ideality was large. And in my friend, the organs of Constructiveness, Tune, Number, and Causality might thus be, and I can say from observation, were largely possessed, although those of Language or of Colour were small. The same must have been the case with the bakers; and each might thus easily be able to form

habits which the others could not have formed under any circumstances.

On the same principle, the peculiarities of genius are easily explicable. No two persons, for example, write poetry, compose music, or paint or draw, precisely in the same style. Thomson, Cowper, and Byron, are all of them poets, but they all differ from each other. Ideality is essential for a poet, Tune and Time for the musician ; but according to the combination of these with other faculties, will be the character of the production. Much Ideality, with full development of Adheiveness, Benevolence, Hope, Conscientiousness, Veneration, and Cautiousness, produce the poetry of a Cowper. A large endowment of Tune, with the same combination, produces sweet, soft, and plaintive notes, which melt the soul. The same Tune or Ideality, combined with much Destructiveness, Combativeness, Self-esteem, and Firmness, will produce warlike music or poetry. It is thus an easy matter for the phrenologist, after ascertaining the relative development of the organs of the different faculties of an author, to tell the general character of his productions, or, after reading the latter, to infer what are the predominant faculties in the mind of the author. An instance of this kind will be found in the New Edinburgh Review in a phrenological critique of Tennant's poetry.

Having now shewn that the phenomena of intellect admit of an easy explanation on phrenological principles, we proceed to the differences observable in the moral dispositions of individuals, which are also the result of their natural constitution, as they are perceptible from their earliest years, and often continue through life, unchanged under every variety of circumstances. On the one side we have many whose moral principles it seems almost impossible to contaminate, and who have grown up unspotted in the midst of temptations and of bad example. On the other, we have too many whose every motion was watched, and received the most complete moral training which it is possible for man to bestow, and who, notwithstanding, manifested a ferocity

and baseness of character which it is painful to contemplate. These qualities cannot be said to be in any degree proportioned to the power of intellect which the individual possesses; for "we find," says that accurate observer, Dr Rush,* "the moral feeling in a state of vigour in persons in whom reason and taste exist in a weak or in an uncultivated state. I once saw "a man," he says, "who discovered no one mark of reason, who possessed the moral sense or faculty in so high a degree that he spent his whole life in acts of beneficence. He was not only inoffensive (which is not always the case), but he was kind and affectionate to every body. He took great delight in public worship, and spent several hours a day in devotion." Similar instances are so frequently met with, that no one can deny their truth.

The explanation of these phenomena, which have puzzled philosophers in every age, is easily found in Phrenology. On its principles, the cruelty manifested by the Count Charolois, by Louis XI., and by the Neros and Caligulas of more modern times, is naturally referable to an excessive and uncontrolled activity of the organs of the animal propensities, which in these instances, may easily be conceived to have been very large in proportion to those of the moral or restraining powers, under the control of which nature had destined them to act. The moral faculties may thus be present with every degree of intellect. They may be powerful where the intellect is weak or where it is strong, just as the sense of sight may be acute when taste or hearing are either also acute or altogether gone. Let us take, for instance, the two opposite historical characters of Louis XI. and Henri IV. of France. Both possessed an equal share of intellectual power; but how different in their moral nature! In Louis the intellect was made subservient to the gratification of the powerful faculties of Destructiveness, Secretiveness, Acquisitiveness, Self-esteem, uncontrolled by justice or benevolence. In Henri, again, it was guided by strong faculties of Attachment, Benevolence, and Love of Approbation, unbiassed by the dark workings of Secretiveness, Selfishness, and Cruelty. The one was abhorred and detested, the other loved and admired.

* Medical Inquiries, vol. II.

The proof of this explanation being the true one, is the fact of similar characters being met with in private life, whose sentiments, propensities, and intellect, are analogous, and produce corresponding effects, but on a scale proportioned to their rank and power, and the progress of civilization. On the same principle, the moral and devotional tendencies of the idiot mentioned by Dr Rush are easily accounted for.

The phenomena of dreaming and of somnambulism are also equally embarrassing for the metaphysicians, and equally consistent with Phrenology. Indeed, the unprejudiced mind can scarcely ask a more convincing proof, than that afforded by the phenomena of dreaming, of the existence of a plurality of mental faculties and organs. During that state several of the mental faculties, moral and affective, as well as intellectual, are evidently active, while the remainder continue dormant, just as we sometimes retain the sense of hearing awake when sight and smell no longer transmit ordinary impressions. This must be admitted, because if *all* our mental powers are awake, there can be no sleep; and if they are all dormant there can be no dream; and if some can be awake when others are dormant they must of necessity have different organs. The natural result of such an arrangement is, that we sometimes imagine ourselves engaged in actions, which, in our waking moments, we should never have undertaken, because, in the latter state, our decision would have been influenced by feelings or faculties now dormant. Thus, a person with a large and active endowment of Combative-ness, but in whose waking hours it is regulated and kept in check by the higher sentiments and intellect, may, when these are inactive during sleep, frequently dream of being engaged in broils and battles. The restraining powers being dormant, and the propensity active, it takes its full swing. It happens occasionally, and for a similar reason, that a person whose reasoning powers are naturally very powerful, will dream of philosophy and serious reflection, as is recorded of Condillac and Franklin, and that reflection then going on undisturbed by other emotions or states of the mind will

produce better ideas than they could have invented when awake.

The phenomena of somnambulism admit of a similar explanation, as it is merely a variety of dreaming, in which one or more of the external senses are in simultaneous activity with some of the internal faculties, and in which the power of voluntary motion is possessed.

After having thus exposed the consistency and harmony which obtains between the principles of Phrenology and the *sound* phenomena of mind, we ought next to try their consistency with those of the diseased state, as the true theory of mind must *always* be consistent with nature. It has ever been a grievous defect in the theories drawn from the closets of the speculative philosophers, that not one of them was ever applicable to actual life, and that any attempt to reconcile their opinions with diseased phenomena of mind instantly laid their systems at their feet.* It is the peculiar excellence of Phrenology that its doctrines have been drawn, not from the consciousness of individuals, erected into standards of the race, but from observations made upon the minds of thousands and of tens of thousands, and that they are found consistent not only in all their parts and in all their applications, but that they explain simply many of what were formerly considered the most intricate phenomena in the philosophy of mind. I regret, therefore, that want of time prevents me entering minutely upon this point, and forces me to confine myself to a very general outline.

In partial idiocy, for instance, the individual is exceedingly deficient in most of the intellectual powers, and frequently in some of the moral sentiments, and yet possesses a few of them in considerable vigour. Thus an idiot may have a talent for imitation, for drawing, or for music, and be incapable of comprehending a single abstract idea; or he may

* Hill, the well-known writer on Insanity, seems to be impressed with the same idea, when he says, at page 29, that "The Scotch philosophers, who may hereafter wish to detect the fallacy of some of the most important tenets contained in their creed, must explore with unprejudiced zeal the history of the diseases of man, which are productive of Dementia."

manifest the sentiment of Veneration, or of Benevolence, or the feeling of Destructiveness, or Amativeness, and yet possess no other power of intellect or of feeling in a perceptible degree. And in the state of partial insanity, the very name equally implies disease of a limited number of faculties, while others remain sound. Thus in melancholy, the whole intellectual powers seem sometimes to remain unimpaired, while sentiments only are diseased. Neither of these states could occur did all the faculties of the mind manifest themselves through the medium of a single organ, as is generally supposed. Even dissections, vague as they must yet be considered in reference to insanity and to Phrenology, confirm the truth of the fundamental principles of the latter; for Morgani* tells us, that there is no more striking characteristic of the brains of the insane than that of the variety of the states of their different parts; some being soft while others are hard; some of one appearance and some of another; and, when we recollect that madness is generally partial, this will be admitted to correspond in a remarkable degree with what a phrenologist would expect *a priori*. If the organ of mind were single, partial madness, *i. e.* madness limited to certain faculties only, would evidently be impossible, unless we admit of disease of the immaterial principle. On that supposition each faculty ought to be affected to an equal degree, and insanity could have no permanent or fixed character.

Having now shewn that the phrenological principle of a plurality of faculties and organs is indispensably necessary to explain the phenomena either of sound or diseased mind, we come next to inquire, whether the phrenological mode of investigation, viz. that of comparing development with manifestations, seems to be founded in reason, and to be adequate to the attainment of the end in view?

Philosophers of every creed now so generally admit the existence of *natural* differences in the talents and dispositions of individuals, that I shall, on the present occasion, and after what I have already said, take it for granted.

* *De Scilibus et Causis Morborum.*

These differences can depend only on one of two causes; *1st*, Either they are inherent in the nature of the immaterial principle; or, *2d*, They are caused by corresponding differences in the condition of the brain, as the organ of mind. Now, although we are entirely ignorant of what the immaterial principle or mind is in itself, yet we have many weighty reasons for not believing the differences to be so inherent in its nature as to be uninfluenced by the organization. The chief of these, as mentioned in the beginning of this paper, are the successive development of the faculties corresponding to that of the brain, and the great changes produced by disease. As the immaterial principle is held to be unsusceptible of change, and as these phenomena can be simply accounted for by the changes in the state of the brain, which we observe to accompany the changes in the constitution of the mind, it seems much more philosophical to satisfy ourselves with an explanation which comes within the cognizance of our faculties, than to have recourse to one entirely hypothetical and incapable of proof; more especially, when the former accords strictly with facts which daily and hourly present themselves to our notice.

Admitting the principle then, that each primitive mental faculty manifests itself by means of an appropriate and distinct cerebral organ, and that the energy and activity of its manifestations vary with the changes in the condition of the material organ, we have next to inquire, to what organic cause the natural facility which we possess of manifesting one faculty, or set of faculties, more powerfully than another, is to be attributed? Even reasoning *a priori*, we can see no other than that of size. General size of the brain, it must be observed, is distinctly recognized by the physiologist as an indispensable requisite for sound and vigorous manifestations, and the degree of general power is admitted to vary with the degree of size, from the small brain of the idiot up to the large brain of a Bacon or a Shakspeare. Now what applies to the brain as a whole must be equally true in regard to its parts. If we suppose

each organ, or part of the brain, to be equal in activity and equal in perfection of structure, it is difficult to see how there can be any inequality of function, or any possibility of manifesting one faculty more powerfully than another. But let us suppose one organ to be greater in point of size than the other, and all other things to be equal, we see at once, on the principle above stated, a possibility of its performing its functions with more energy.

To this it may, perhaps, be objected, that a *faculty is sometimes very vigorously manifested* during disease, although the size of its organ has undergone no change. This is perfectly true, but it is no less true, that if an organ of a larger size is subjected to the same degree of morbid excitement, its functions will be performed with still more energy. An important condition is changed. A small muscle, for instance, suffering from diseased excitement, will often operate more powerfully than a larger muscle in its healthy state; but no one doubts that, upon exciting the latter to the same pitch, it will operate with a greater degree of power exactly proportioned to its greater size; so that it may be safely admitted as a truth, that, *ceteris paribus*, the larger organ will always produce the greater result. Hence, the principle of size exerting an influence upon the energy of the mental manifestations is perfectly consonant to all the known laws of nature, and is no new nor idle proposition started to serve a particular purpose.*

* This principle, I am perfectly aware, is ridiculed by many as too absurd to be entertained for a moment, and various authors are quoted to prove it to be so. For the sake of such persons I beg leave to subjoin a passage from a Report, by the celebrated Cuvier, to the French Institute, in 1822. Speaking of the cerebral lobes being the place "where all the sensations take a distinct form, and leave durable impressions," he adds, "l'anatomie comparée en offre une autre confirmation dans la proportion constante du volume de ces lobes avec le degré d'intelligence des animaux." Thus admitting the influence of *size* of the cerebral organs upon the power of manifesting the mental faculties, as distinctly as Dr Gall himself can do. And it must farther be remarked, that Cuvier here speaks the sentiments of Portal, Berthollet, Pinael, and Dumeril, who, along with himself, formed a commission to examine and report upon the experiments of Monsieur Flourens. This statement, however, taken in detail, is not sufficiently precise, for, in point of fact, the de-

Assuming then that the mind manifests each faculty by means of an appropriate organ, and that the varieties in the power of manifesting the different faculties observable in the same individual, may, even reasoning *a priori*, be philosophically explained by a difference in size; if the phrenologists can shew, that it is possible during life to determine the relative size of the different organs or parts of the brain, we can no longer with a shadow of reason call in question the truth of their premises, and the importance of their mode of investigation, as compared with those hitherto in use. The possibility of doing so is easily proved.

Nobody now thinks of denying, that it is the brain which gives the form to the skull; and any one may easily satisfy himself how easy it is to distinguish by the feeling, through the integuments, the shape of every part of the skull except the base, of which the phrenologists do not pretend to know any thing. So that if the brain gives the form to the skull, and we are able to ascertain during life what that form is, we must at once admit the possibility of solving the question. The want of entire and absolute parallelism between the two tables of the skull, has sometimes been proposed as an insuperable objection to this mode of proceeding; but even admitting that it does sometimes occur, when we know that while the whole thickness of a skull seldom exceeds from one to three lines, the differences in the development of brain extend to *inches*, this objection falls to the ground. Besides,

gree of intelligence is not in relation to the size of the *whole* hemispheres, but only to that of their anterior lobes; when I quote it, therefore, in support of the *principle*, it is not because it makes the fact either clearer or stronger to those who had observed for themselves, but because it has been much the fashion to refer to, and hold up the *opinions* of eminent men against Phrenology, even although they had not studied it, as deserving of far more weight than the *observations or facts* of those who had; and because many are willing to yield to authority, in order to save themselves the trouble of consulting nature. Had this testimony of Cuvier, and his learned associates, however, been merely an opinion, I would not have brought it forward; but, as it contains the expression of unbiassed fact, the result of immense observation, under the most favourable circumstances, I do think it merits attention. In his Comparative Anatomy also, the same Author distinctly states the size of the nerves to be an indication of the energy of their function; and, if it were here the place, it would not be difficult to shew that, to be consistent with himself, he must be a Phrenologist in principle.

these inequalities are confined to mere points, and seldom extend to the whole surface of an organ. But this has been so clearly demonstrated in all the works on Phrenology, and is so generally assented to, that it would be a mere waste of time to say a word more about it.

Having now adverted to the three essential points,—*1st*, The plurality of mental faculties and organs; *2d*, The influence of size upon the power of manifesting the faculties; and, *3d*, The possibility of ascertaining during life the relative size of the different organs; and shewn that it is absolutely necessary to admit these principles in order to reconcile the phenomena to the ordinary laws of nature, it follows as a necessary consequence, that if the discovery of the primitive powers of the mind is ever to be attained by man, it must be by the application to nature of the mode of investigation discovered by Dr Gall; and that the only way to ascertain whether the phrenologists are correct in receiving such and such faculties as primitive and established, is to examine nature, and to verify or refute the facts upon which they stand. But, as already mentioned, this can be done only in the great field of nature. All that we can do *here*, is to offer presumptive evidence of their truth, by shewing how far they go to explain the varieties of moral and intellectual character of individuals and of nations. If they seem to explain these satisfactorily, they may then be regarded as resting upon the basis of truth, and to have at least this one great advantage over other systems of the philosophy of mind, none of which throw any light upon this interesting subject. In proceeding to try the primitive phrenological faculties by this standard, we must however never forget, that it is by *observation alone* that their actual existence must ultimately stand or fall.

As an example of the application of Phrenology to the analysis of character, I shall select a few sketches from the life of Dr Samuel Johnson, prefixed to the 12^{mo} edition of his works, published at Edinburgh in 1806.

That commanding energy and force which pervaded every part of his character in such a remarkable degree, and which

impressed themselves so strongly on inferior minds, are now known to phrenologists to be the accompaniments of a very large brain only, almost every part of which must in his instance have been largely developed. Power indeed is one of the most remarkable qualities of his mind. His biographer says, "one of the most striking peculiarities in his character was a tendency towards melancholy." By him the Creator was "feared as an awful judge," and "not contemplated as the beneficent Author of a system of improvement and felicity;" and "death was ever present to his mind." We are told also, "that he adhered through life to his early religion of the nursery, from a want of sufficient intellectual intrepidity to investigate any part of it by the force of his own understanding; and that he could never witness the slightest symptom of religious incredulity without being filled with 'rage and horror.'" His biographer very justly observes, "that these distempered symptoms could not have exhibited themselves in a man whose belief was founded upon conviction resulting from the investigation of evidence." Had he been a phrenologist, he would have added, that these feelings arose from a large Cautiousness, Veneration, and Wonder.

Upon consulting any of the works on Phrenology, Mr Combe's Essays for instance,* we find it stated, that "the internal and involuntary activity of the faculty of Cautiousness in those in whom it is too powerful, produces sensations of dread and apprehension without an adequate external cause; and which are often exceedingly distressing to the individual." Dr Spurzheim says, "that when very powerful, it produces doubts, hesitation, uneasiness, melancholy, and hypochondria."

The sentiment of Veneration, which I have stated as strongly manifested, is said in the works on Phrenology, "to predispose to religious feeling; but not to judge what ought to be venerated." "It gives the feeling of respect," says Dr Spurzheim, "and leads us to look upon some things as sacred;" it venerates old age and whatever is respectable, and it adores God." Besides the proof already afforded us of the activity of this feeling in the mind of Johnson, we are expressly told, that the tendency was so strong, as to prevent him exercising his intellect in determining the objects of worship. "His veneration," it is stated, "for every thing connected with religion was extraordinary; he pulled off his hat when he entered within the walls of ruinous Catholic churches."

* Essay on Phrenology, p. 164.

“land; and he regarded the bishops and dignified clergy of the “church of England *with great reverence* ;” and he displayed a high admiration of whatever seemed ancient and venerable, so as to give him “*want of hardihood in the exercise of his under-standing*.” It is mentioned in the Outlines, that this sentiment “leads to a reverence of ancestry and of superiors in “society.” This then was clearly the source of those feelings in Johnson’s mind.

Nothing has excited more astonishment in the minds of philosophers, than that a man of Dr Johnson’s mighty intellect should have been so credulous and superstitious as to believe in supernatural agency, ghosts, second sight, lucky days, &c., for, says his biographer,—“though “a jealous examiner of the evidence of ordinary facts, yet “his weakness on the side of religion, or where any thing “*supernatural* was supposed to be concerned, rendered him “willing to give credit to various notions with which superstition imposes upon the fears and the credulity of mankind.” “In his conversations concerning ghosts, he appears to have “been aware of the ridicule attached to credulity; but his actual “belief can scarcely be doubted.” P. 70. But Phrenology again shews its superiority in the simplicity with which it explains this singular feature. Dr Spurzheim, for instance, in speaking of the faculty of Wonder, says, that he has observed that a large endowment of the organ “gives the tendency to seek and see the supernatural in every thing,” “and “to believe in inspirations, forewarnings, phantoms, demons, visions, witchcraft and astrology, and such like;” and that it contributes much to religious faith, by a belief of mysteries and miracles.” This tendency, depending on an appropriate organ, may thus exist with any degree of intellect from the highest to the lowest. And so correctly does Dr Spurzheim, in the above passage, pourtray this peculiarity in Dr Johnson’s character, that it almost seems as if the latter had sat for his likeness.

We are told also, that “he was proud and extremely conscious “of the talents with which he was endowed;” that “the independence of his mind, and the sense of his own worth, gave rise “to an asperity of manners,” during his less prosperous days, which often made his company disagreeable. P. 76. “He not “only asserted his opinions in a presumptuous and dictatorial “form, but he considered so little the trouble which he gave “to others, that he was usually an unwelcome visitor to the mistress of every house.” He was likewise remarkable for

an impatience of restraint, and a desire to engross the attention of the company. These peculiarities are easily referable to a large endowment of the phrenological faculty of Self-esteem, which is said to "lead to pride, arrogance, and disdain,"* and when very large, and not duly regulated, "to induce the impression in others, by an unserved and authoritative manner, that the individual considers himself as infinitely elevated above his fellow-men. The expression which it gives to the tone and manners is cold and repulsive." His biographer, after saying that he was a man of "violent passions," informs us, that "he was extremely fond of disputation, and as he could never endure to be outdone, he uniformly contended for victory at whatever cost, and he did not hesitate in the strife, to make reason turn traitor to herself, and to support sentiments altogether opposite to what he himself seriously judged to be true and rational. He rose into the most boisterous vehemence of voice and manner," and used "the utmost asperity, or even gross rudeness and insolence of language," so as to receive from Garrick, who loved and respected him, the name of a "*tremendous companion*."†

To shew how easy it is to analyze character phrenologically, and to refer every manifestation to its simple elements, I shall again quote a few sentences from the works on Phrenology. Mr Scott, in his account of Combativeness, says, "he who is endowed with this power dashes through obstacles and struggles on to the last," and those who have it very large "are great arguers. The spirit of contention and opposition is so strong in them, that they cannot prevail upon themselves to assent to the simplest proposition, and 'even though vanquished they can argue still.' Joined to large Destructiveness," it is stated "to give the tendency to rage," and the form "in which this combination manifests itself when opposed or not duly restrained by the higher powers, seems to be the "passion of anger:" "it excites to loud threatening," and "imparts a bitterness and force to every kind of vituperation and sarcasm." This was then, undoubtedly, the source of his violent passions. The prejudices which beset the mind of Dr Johnson, were the effect of this large endowment of propensities and sentiments, which made it impossible for him to use his intellect in every instance with proper effect. His judgment was biassed by these feelings, just as that of a man in love is with regard to the object of his attachment, whose bad

* Outlines, p. 72. Combe's Essays, 159.

† Goldsmith has said, "There is no arguing with Johnson, for when his pistol misses fire, he knocks you down with the butt end of it."

qualities he cannot discern, although he may be very sharp-sighted in regard to those of other people.

The misery in which the life of Johnson was constantly involved arose from a want of harmony in the proportions of his most powerful faculties. The animal propensities were in a state of continual warfare with his higher sentiments, which we know to have been powerful, from the general tendency of his writings towards virtue, from his religious feelings, and from many acts of "generosity and humanity" which he performed, "when not under the influence of personal pique, of pride, or of religious or political prejudices;" all of which interested his predominant faculties too strongly to allow his benevolence alone to work against them. Unfortunately for his happiness, society was the very field for still farther exciting faculties naturally too active, in a degree that his moral and religious sentiments made him feel keenly was improper, but which they were unable to restrain. Their effect was aggravated by large and almost diseased sentiments of Cautiousness and Wonder, which we have seen added a gloomy and superstitious despondency to his inward discontent. When placed in circumstances in which his Self-esteem, Firmness, Combativeness, and Cautiousness, could find no object to contend with, as, when writing in his closet on general subjects, his moral sentiments and intellect maintained a complete ascendancy, and infused a spirit of benevolence and justice into all his productions. Even in society, when "listened to with reverence," he was "placid and instructive." But when his Pride, his Combativeness, and his Firmness, were excited by opposition, they all worked in one direction, with an energy proportioned to his large brain and mighty mind, and made him in reality a "*tremendous companion*." If he had possessed a smaller share either of moral sentiments, or of animal propensities, he would have been happier. In the first case, his happiness would have been allied to that of the brutes, indulging their propensities without any feeling of remorse; in the second, it

would have been the happiness of the good man, whose tendencies rarely lead him into temptation.

His favourite intellectual pursuits, we are told, were those of metaphysical discussion, moral theories, biography, &c. ; but he was never systematical. He knew little, and cared less, about history or the natural sciences. This is explained phrenologically, by a larger endowment of Causality and Comparison, "which give deep penetration and a perception of logical consequence in argument, and are large in metaphysicians," &c. than of Individuality, which gives a "capacity for observation and detail," and for "natural history, botany," &c. for "knowing something of almost all sciences and arts" with ease to the possessor.

In this short analysis, I have confined myself entirely to the more prominent features in the character of Dr Johnson, because many of those whom I now address, being unacquainted with Phrenology, would be unable to understand the explanation of the more delicate shades into the composition of which a combination of faculties enters. Instead of pursuing it farther, I therefore prefer a short examination of some peculiarities in the character of Pope, as given in Dr Johnson's Lives of the Poets, and which are equally inexplicable on any metaphysical theory with which I am acquainted. But in this, as in the former, it must be kept in mind, that I do not mean to embrace the whole, but a part only, of the character.

Dr Johnson tells us, that Pope was remarkable for "great delight in artifice, and that he endeavoured to attain all his purposes by indirect and unsuspected methods;" that "he hardly drank tea without a stratagem;" that if he wanted any thing in the house of a friend, he never asked for it in plain terms, but would mention it remotely, as something convenient." He practised his arts on such small occasions, that Lady Bolingbroke used to say, in a French phrase, that he played the politician about cabbages and turnips." Dr J. adds, that "he, Pope, was afraid of writing, lest the clerks of the post-office should know his secrets," and then speaks of "his general habit of secrecy and cunning."

There is no metaphysical principle to which this peculiarity of Pope's character can be referred; but, upon opening

the first book on Phrenology, we see at once that it comes precisely within the domain of the faculty of Secretiveness. Mr Combe, for instance, tells us in his "Essays," that those in whom this organ is "largely developed, are fond of "throwing a dense covering of secrecy over all their sentiments and actions, even the most trifling and unimportant, and conceive that the eye of the world (in Pope's case, the eye of the clerk of the post-office,) is always looking into their breasts, to read the purposes and designs there hatched, but which discovery they are solicitous to prevent." This faculty was clearly the moving principle in such conduct.

We are next told, that he had a great deal of vanity, "and felt great delight in enumerating the men of high rank with whom he was acquainted;" and that "he was so extremely sensible to praise and censure, that every pamphlet disturbed his quiet, and his extreme irritability laid him open to perpetual vexation." This comes precisely within the limits of the phrenological faculty of Love of Approbation, which is said to "make us attentive to the opinions of others," and "to give the capacity of being delighted with applause and grieved with censure."

The extent to which this paper has already run, forces me to omit other points in Pope's character, which admit of as easy explanation as the above. What I have said, however, is sufficient to shew how every diversity of moral and animal character may co-exist with every variety of intellectual powers, and admit of a simple and consistent explanation on the principles of the new philosophy. In farther illustration of this part of the subject, I beg leave to refer to some beautiful and interesting specimens, contained in the Transactions of the Phrenological Society, of the successful application of Phrenology to the analysis of the talents and dispositions both of virtuous and of vicious individuals. The first of these by Mr Scott, on the natural talents and dispositions of King Robert Bruce, as compared with the cerebral development indicated by his skull, will be read with intense interest by every lover of nature. Nor are the reports on the natural characters of Mary M'Innes, Gordon, Bellingham, &c., of less interest or importance to the philosopher, whose object is the improvement and happiness of

the human race. Indeed, I may safely affirm, that that single volume contains evidence sufficient to settle for ever the question now under consideration.

If the peculiarities of individual character are so easily referable to, and explicable by, the principles of Phrenology as I have shewn them to be, it is natural to suppose that those of national character will admit of as simple a reference and explanation. This point I now propose shortly to discuss.

Many philosophers, mistaking the effect for a cause, attribute the varieties of mental constitution which distinguish nations from each other to a difference of customs, habits, laws, and government; which, although not without a considerable re-active effect, are, strictly speaking, the result only and not the cause of the former. Phrenology will be found to afford us much assistance in investigating this interesting subject, as will be seen by a reference to a paper on the Phrenology of Indostan by Dr Paterson, read to the Phrenological Society, and published in their Transactions. His conclusions are drawn from the actual examination of upwards of 3000 Hindoo heads, of every tribe, and of every province, and from the careful study of many native crania, which he took the precaution of measuring to prevent mistakes. He thence explains, most satisfactorily, the weakness of the Hindoo character, taken as a nation, and their subjection to a few thousand Europeans, and also their stationary state of civilization; for the average size of the adult Hindoo head does not exceed that of a European at 15, consequently the mental energy and capacities are proportionate. They are very remarkable as observers, which he found to be uniformly connected with a large development of Individuality. The mildness and passive softness which characterize them he found to arise from a deficient Combativeness and Destructiveness, and their cunning from a large development of Secretiveness. Dr Paterson's paper, in short, affords a novelty in the philosophy of mind, that of different individuals, in different parts of the

world, totally unconnected with each other, studying the phenomena of mind, and uniformly referring them to the same general principles or faculties—a thing utterly unknown to the old schools, and of itself a strong proof of the soundness of the principles of the new philosophy. Dr P. presented the Phrenological Society with a dozen of Hindoo crania, in illustration, which were selected for him by the celebrated Ram Mohan Roy. These skulls are open to public inspection.

Among the barbarous and uncultivated nations of America, Asia, and Africa, the differences of cerebral development are more perceptible to the inexperienced eye, and more easily detected by the application of the callipers, and the traits of character are, in general, more broadly marked than among the civilized nations of Europe, and they consequently are more easily appreciated by those who are on the spot. Notwithstanding all these advantages, however, I shall not select them for examination, because the difficulty of obtaining a fair average form of head from travellers who have paid no attention to it, and of becoming acquainted with their motives and modes of thinking, from unacquaintance with their language, might be urged, however unjustly, against the strongest evidence which they could afford. Having resided for a considerable time in France, and made many observations of the development and manifestations of that nation, both in its capital and provinces, I shall content myself with a short but necessarily imperfect phrenological analysis and comparison of some of their natural talents and dispositions with those of the English. I choose these, because, if wrong in any one respect, I can most easily be confuted by other observers now present, who can speak as to the character, at least, if not as to the development of brain.

The French are universally admitted to be more ingenious than we are in the invention and construction of gew-gaws, trinkets, and such trifling contrivances as require more neatness of workmanship than depth of reflection. It is also

admitted, that they have greater quickness of perception, and a greater talent for observing, acquiring, and retaining a knowledge of facts, phenomena, and details, without, however, having so much power of tracing links of causation, and arriving at general principle. Thus, while they are extremely ingenious in making new observations and isolated discoveries in physical and natural science, it is frequently left to the English, or to the Germans, to find out the principle which connects them together, and to render them available to the purposes of life. Even a slight acquaintance with Phrenology would lead us at once to ascribe this peculiarity of mental constitution to the French having a larger endowment of Constructiveness and of Individuality, and a smaller endowment of Causality, than the English have; and I may add, that, from observation, I know this to be the case. The propensity to construct and invent is greatly aided by, but is by no means a constant accompaniment, or result of, intellectual power; for many idiots manifest it in a great degree. Fodéré knew several, who taught themselves the "repairing of watches, and the construction of some pieces of mechanism;" and he expressly adds, "that this could not be attributed to the intellect, for these individuals not only could not read books which treated of the principles of mechanics, but they became confused if they were mentioned, and never made farther progress."

The superior quickness of perception and talent for the observation and recollection of phenomena which the French possess, are easily explained by a large Individuality, which leads us, says Dr Spurzheim, to "observe and recognize individual existence," and when too active, it personifies every thing, even life, movement, fever, &c. Sometimes it is not sufficiently active, as in those who deny the existence of a "material world." "It enables us to take an interest in every thing;" it wishes to "know and to take cognisance of all that is passing around." "Those who know enough to speak with ease, and, in fact, speak much, and relate well, and who are called brilliant in society, have much of this organ." This faculty, therefore, combined with Constructiveness, accounts for their ingenuity. Their inferiority to us in

the discovery of principle, and in the useful application of their knowledge, is to be ascribed to a smaller endowment of Causality or reasoning power. "When Causality is weak, we are told* there is a difficulty in perceiving the connexion between premises and conclusions; an incapacity of thinking deeply; and a mental blindness to all abstract and philosophical disquisitions. It (Causality) gives a genius for metaphysics, and for deep reasoning of every kind." Now, it is well known, that the French have never excelled as metaphysicians, while our own countrymen have always been remarkable for metaphysical writing. It is from this great endowment of Individuality, and the other perceptive powers, joined to moderate Causality, that the French are fond of knowledge without any great regard to its utility; and that they excel in natural history, chemistry, botany, and in those departments of science and of art, which require an accurate observation of the qualities and changes of bodies rather than depth of reflection. It is this combination also which fits them for excelling in anecdote and biography, and in the delineation of individual existences; while they want the power of taking profound or comprehensive views. Hence it is also, that, while their literature abounds in "*Memoires pour servir à l'histoire*," it can scarcely boast of a history itself. The English again, with more Causality and less Individuality, are more constantly in pursuit of causes and principles than of mere facts. They endeavour to penetrate motives as well as actions, and to take deep and extensive views of nature, and hence with fewer *Memoires pour servir à l'histoire*, they have more of history itself.

The French and English differ extremely in another respect. In the company of strangers, of whom he knows nothing, a Frenchman will begin to talk of himself and his own affairs without reserve, in a way that at first astonishes our wary countrymen, and leads them to suspect there is a

* Combe's Essays, p. 202.

design under it.* The true Briton, in the same circumstances, maintains a long silence, or talks a little about indifferent subjects, and makes his own observations on his company, and it is only when his scruples are satisfied that he will allow a word about himself to escape his lips. This is often remarked by the French, and by them is falsely ascribed altogether to pride. Self-esteem is no doubt one of the ingredients, but it is much assisted by our great endowment of Secretiveness, and *Cautiousness*. The former is said to "give an instinctive tendency to conceal, which, according to its degree of intensity, and the direction it receives from the other faculties, may produce alyness or cunning;" and "those in whom it is deficient" are said "to be too open for the general intercourse of society." "It is essential to a prudent character," and enables us to suppress thoughts or feelings, the expression of which might be injurious to ourselves and others. Cautiousness, again, as the name expresses, constantly bids us "beware." It is the want of these two which produces a rattle-pate. It is their activity which tempts the Scotsman to answer one question by asking another, which a true Frenchman never does. It gives the desire, and in a certain degree the power, of divining the active feelings and thoughts in the mind of another, by putting ourselves in his place, and thus, with a certain combination, enables a per-

* The French are thus described by Dr Heylin in 1670:—"The present French, then, is nothing but an old Gaule moulded into a new name; as rash he is, as headstrong, and as hare-brained. A nation whom you shall winne with a feather, and loose with a straw; upon the first sight of him, you shall have him as familiar as your sleep, or the necessity of breathing: in one hour's confidence you may endear him to you, in the second unbutton him, the third pumps him dry of all his secrets, and he gives them as faithfully as if you were his ghostly father, and bound to conceal them *sud sigillo confessionis*. When you have learned this, you may lay him aside, for he is no longer serviceable."—"He hath said over his lesson now unto you, and now must find out somebody else to whom to repeat it. Fare him well; he is a garment whom I would be loath to wear above two days together, for in that time he will be threadbare."—"In a word, (for I have held him ~~for~~ long,) he is a walking vanitie in a new fashion."

son to avoid giving offence, by saying things which would hurt the feelings of another. It gives what may be called *tact*, which our countrymen possess in a higher degree than the French. The latter, even when most anxious to please, will often say things which would give offence, if we did not know that none was meant. This the Frenchman is very apt to do in the company of those whose habits of thinking differ much from his own.

The doubts, and hesitations, and dismal forebodings, which lead the Englishman to look towards the future, and to consider thoroughly the consequences, before resolving upon action, are plainly referable to a larger Cautiousness than that possessed by our more vivacious neighbours, who habitually look to the present more than to futurity. This feeling is the source of that tinge of melancholy which has often been remarked in us, and when very active it leads to despondency. Joined with much Secretiveness, it gives a suspicious cast to the mind, and makes us attend to the motives more than to the mere act; for we think there is something hidden which we ought to see. None of these feelings predominate in the mind of a Frenchman. He acts more on the spur of the moment. If good come of it, *tant mieux*; if evil, *tant pis*; but he does not afflict himself with the reflection that he might have done better. "Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof" is his principle.

The love of praise, and the consequent vanity of the Frenchman, are clearly referable to a great endowment of the phrenological faculty of "Love of Approbation," the organ of which I know to be larger in them than in the heads of our countrymen, and more especially when compared to that of Self-esteem, of which we have undoubtedly the greater share. It is the greater Self-esteem which, joined to other faculties, gives that nice sense of dignity for which the English are remarkable, and which, to the Frenchman, often appears somewhat ludicrous. To the latter, no mode of enjoyment,

however trivial or childish it may seem to be, is ever, on that account, rejected. His dignity takes no offence. But with the Englishman it is widely different. He often rejects an amusement harmless in itself, from a sense of offended dignity, although, in other respects, he may have a relish for it. His love of approbation is swayed by his Self-esteem, whereas the love of praise is the ruling passion of the Frenchman, and forms no small ingredient in the production of that politeness for which his nation has long been celebrated. It is the source of their vanity, of their love of finery, and of novelty, and of that ever-to-be-repeated and never-ceasing sound in the mouth of a Frenchman, "*Glory.*" It is also the source of many of their noblest institutions, and, joined to a certain portion of veneration, is the chief source of that intense admiration of courts and courtiers, red ribbons and crosses, by which they have always been distinguished.

That compound feeling of the mind, which is almost unknown to the French, but which they have kindly denominated "*mauvaise honte,*" arises from a combination of the faculties which I have just said mark our character. *Mauvaise honte* is merely an excessive desire to attract notice, and to please, arising from Self-esteem and Love of Approbation, the former of which gives a kind of feeling of deserving it,—joined to an excessive fear of not succeeding in our object, arising from Cautiousness,—and a strong desire to lie half-concealed, and to advance with a measured pace, step by step, as we feel ourselves becoming more and more secure, arising from large Secretiveness. The full blaze of instant attention cannot be endured without as instant confusion, and the very fear of failure often produces it.

In point of Firmness, Perseverance, and Steadiness, the French are much our inferiors; indeed, fickleness has long formed a part of their character. This is to be ascribed to a powerful faculty of Firmness, which the English possess in so high a degree as often to produce stubbornness and obstinacy, which may be well or ill applied, according to circumstances.

"Grace aux Anglais," said the Professor Faujas St Fond, in allusion to this part of our character, "*qui s'obstinent à penetrer dans les pays les plus steriles et les plus barbares,*" the boundaries "of science were daily enlarged. It is not alone," said he, "in the flowery paths of science that you find them; but, at "one time, broiling under the meridian sun of Africa, and at "another, frozen amidst the polar ice." It is this strong perseverance, combined with the faculties already mentioned, which fits the English for difficult enterprise. From their active Cautiousness, they seldom act until they have formed a pretty correct estimate of the good or bad consequences likely to result from or accompany the intended action. This they are enabled to do from their larger Causality, or power of tracing cause and effect; and hence they act upon principle, and hence they must, before beginning, be satisfied of the adequacy of the means to the end proposed. Such preparation, joined to large Self-esteem and Firmness, produces a rational feeling of independence and perseverance that is superior to almost any circumstances.

The Frenchman, on the other hand, buoyed up by a great endowment of "Hope," unassailed by the useful though at times gloomy foresight of Cautiousness, and with no remarkable portion of reasoning power, dreams not of obstacles until they actually start up before him. If easily surmounted, all is yet well. But if they seem to be insurmountable, or so far formidable as to require a long-sustained effort to overcome them, then his confidence, not being founded on any estimate of what he had to hope for or fear, or on a feeling of his own superiority to the circumstances, as suddenly forsakes him as it was suddenly generated. If indeed he is in a situation where *the love of glory* may still affect him; where he knows that the eyes of his country or his king are upon him, he may still bear up; but not if thrown entirely upon his own resources, and upon the native energy of his own mind. Many historical facts prove the truth of these remarks, and the conduct of the crews of both nations, on the loss of the Alceste and Medusa frigates, is in itself an excellent *illustration*.

The lively gesture and vivid natural language of the French proceed from this difference in their mental constitution, aided by more Imitation than we have. Every faculty being active, has a language of its own, easily intelligible to those who have the same in an ordinary degree. Now the natural language of Love of Approbation is the display of every quality to attract notice, and the vivid and unrestrained emission of every thought as it rises in the mind. The natural language of Secretiveness, on the other hand, is that of the cat watching the mouse ; it is quiet and concealment ; that of Cautiousness is attention and seriousness. In point of fact, therefore, we exhibit the natural language of the different faculties quite as correctly as the French do. The only difference is, that the faculties which predominate in us are only secondary in the mind of the Frenchman, and *vice versa*. So that an Englishman meeting a stranger, with a grave face and silent tongue, exhibits the natural language of his predominant feelings, quite as much as the more vivacious Frenchman with the friendly smile, polite bow, and shrug of the shoulders.

The French have long excelled as elemental writers in natural and physical science, from the clearness and precision with which they apprehend and communicate their ideas. This is to be explained, partly from their large Individuality enabling them to perceive and to retain for use what they have once acquired, and partly from a large Concentrativeness, which enables them to separate what is essential from what is of no importance, and merely to state what bears upon the point. Individuality furnishes them with a ready command of the ideas which they have in store. Hence the perspicuity and fluency of many of their lecturers, Guy Lussac and Thenard for instance, who never use written discourses or even notes.

There is another general but important difference which Phrenology has more clearly brought to light and explained, and for it I beg leave to use the words of the Edinburgh

Review*, lest it be imagined that it is a difference perceptible only to "*oculi interni*."

"To their ability in the art of war, the French have joined considerable glory in literature, in the fine arts, and much ingenuity, but hardly any of those things which denote or constitute dignity of intellect, or energy of character, or vast and comprehensive capacities; in short, they are deficient in most of the features which the large pencil of history would paint as exalted. In painting true and general nature, in delineating great features of mind, and strong emotions of the soul, they cannot be compared to us, because they have an imperfect original of these things before their eyes." Some of these peculiarities are referable to the particular combination of faculties already mentioned, but the general effect is to be attributed to a smaller size of the brain, as a whole, than is found in England. It is general size alone, joined to a favourable combination, which gives a commanding power and energy to the mind, and fixes the attention and makes an indelible impression on the minds of others, and it is in such cases that every tone seems to an inferior mind the natural accent of command. In our own profession, Gregory was an excellent instance of this effect of size, and Abernethy is still another. The French have not this quality; they have greater activity of brain, they work more cleverly, and go over a great deal of matter in a very pleasing manner and in a short time; but there is no overpowering sense of greatness to weigh down the hearer, or make him feel his inferiority.—Such are a few of the distinguishing characteristics of the French and English characters, and such is the explanation of them afforded by Phrenology: it is for you to judge how far it is sound or satisfactory.†

Having now shewn as clearly as my own abilities and the narrow limits of an essay would admit, that Phrenology has a real foundation in nature, and that it does afford a satis-

* Edinburgh Review, 1821, p. 176.

† I need scarcely add, that although the development here stated as characteristic of the French, is the result of numerous observations made both in the capital and provinces, on the dead as well as on the living, I do not, by any means, lay it down as ascertained. The shades of some of the organs may be different, but I believe the outline will be found correct. The subject is too extensive for one individual.

factory explanation of the moral and intellectual nature of man, I will scarcely be asked of what use or importance it can be to the medical man to be acquainted with its doctrines. For when we consider our almost total ignorance of the nature of Insanity, and the assistance to be derived in our future inquiries from a knowledge of the primitive mental faculties and of the organs by which they act, in enabling us to distinguish what is merely symptomatic from what is essential, and in enabling us to conduct the moral, as well as the medical treatment, on the soundest principles, we cannot look without a feeling of admiration on the labours of the two distinguished men who have done so much to fill up one of the greatest deficiencies which ever existed in medical and philosophical science. This is only one of its numerous and beautiful applications. In every branch of knowledge in which man is the object of our inquiries, its uses are infinite, because it furnishes the only sound principles upon which we can with safety proceed to educate, to enlighten, or to legislate. I have already trespassed too long on the time of the Society to admit of my saying more, either by way of illustration, of obviating objections, or of proving its utility. The objections I must leave to the debate, and have now only to apologize once more for the length to which this essay has run, for the time which I have consumed, and for the imperfect way in which I have treated the subject, which, indeed, is by far too extensive to be judged of or comprised in an essay, even had my powers been equal to my wishes. If I have succeeded in stating the question so as to elicit a full and candid discussion of its merits, and to incite to observation those who are still unacquainted with it, my object will be completely fulfilled. I now, therefore, leave the essay, with all its faults, to the indulgent consideration of my fellow-members.

ANDREW COMBE.

ARTICLE II.

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 shewn a large organ of Destructiveness in the head of a murderer—that is all 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 op-

ponents 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 $4\frac{1}{2}$ 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:—

————— “Chiefs 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 which 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 proofs that 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 endeavour to shew 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 development 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 shew 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 favours 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, renders the in-

dividual 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 that 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 his 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 that there never were such a set of ill-tempered, disobedient, awkward, stupid, intolerable brats; that all children are a pest, and that 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 were 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 to 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 be perhaps 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 Combaticiveness 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 endeavour 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 sha'n't say a word to him. "You sha'n'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 a just but 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 rancour, 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, shew 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 Evadne 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 endeavoured 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 shew 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 shews 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 shew, 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 broad-cloth. 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 desirable one, when it leads us no farther than to a just degree of self-respect shewn 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 of the world. He will be sorely tempted to "covet his neighbour'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 proportion as to prevent any unfair means being used to acquire, the self-esteeming acquisitive man will probably shew 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 accumulate 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. be-

ing 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 protestations 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 her 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, Conscientiousness, 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 rivalry, 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 shews itself sometimes in the most ridiculous manner, and when all idea of rivalry 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, shew 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 or 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 sirloin 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 honour ; 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 shews 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 these ; 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 shew 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, endeavour, 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, shews 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 shew 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 the 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 shew 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 satisfied 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 become 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 pic-

tures, 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 *profanum 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 everywhere 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, gavè rise to such structures, has now yielded to unfavourable 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 shew 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 sticking 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 heav'n;

“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 valour, 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 cases shewn, 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 colours: 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 cases 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 demeanour, 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 ac-
 “ counted 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

"*says.* *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" 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 hot-bed 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 meantime 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.

ARTICLE III.

SHAKSPEARE'S IAGO.

WE propose, in the present article, to redeem the pledge given in our last Number, to unfold the principles on which the sketch of the natural dispositions and talents of Iago was inferred from the note of the development* given to the author of it. Having done this, we will then compare the sketch with the character as drawn by Shakspeare, and thus enable our readers to judge for themselves how far the two may be deemed counterparts to each other.

The chief difficulty experienced in drawing the sketch was how to state what the development really indicated. The character pointed out by it appeared so utterly depraved, that it required a constant reference to first principles to justify the unmeasured language which it was found necessary to employ. But when the author had overcome the scruples suggested by delicacy, and mustered resolution fearlessly to follow out the principles of the science, it was easy for him to

* We subjoin the development as given in our last Number :

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

proceed, for the character was so strongly marked that he could scarcely mistake its leading features.

This remark is especially applicable to the first inference from the development, viz. the utter Selfishness of the individual. Selfishness is the result of large Self-esteem and Acquisitiveness, with deficient Benevolence and Conscientiousness, and if Adhesiveness also be small, it will indeed "reign with a predominating sway." Love of Approbation also being moderate, it was inferred that the individual "never gave a penny in charity in his life," because there is not a single feeling left in the mind which would prompt to the performance of a charitable action.

That "he would witness with indifference a case of distress or outrage," was inferred chiefly from his small Benevolence, joined with the combination which produced his complete Selfishness. Cautiousness would add to his indifference by suggesting the possibility of troublesome or injurious consequences to himself from the display of active Benevolence. To excuse to his own mind his apathy in a case of extreme injustice or distress, he is represented as adding, with a growl or a curse, "Why did they (the sufferers) not take better care of themselves?" &c. This would arise from a conscious feeling in himself that, with his superior Cautiousness and intellect, he would have taken better care had he been placed in similar circumstances; and hence the aspect of their distress excites in him only Self-esteem, and gives rise to contempt for the folly of those who had placed themselves in such situations.

Self-esteem prides itself upon those qualities which the individual most strongly possesses, and it gives a sort of contempt for those in which he is deficient; and, as in the subject before us, the feelings were all selfish, with a deficiency of the moral sentiments, it was inferred, not only that he would "utterly despise and condemn those who acted from noble and disinterested motives," but that it would be "extremely difficult for him to conceive this to be possible." But though difficult it was not impossible,—the large endowment of the intellectual faculties could not but lead him to

perceive that some persons did occasionally act in opposition to their apparent self-interest. This discovery, however, would by no means raise them in his estimation. Esteeming nothing to be valuable which did not directly or indirectly terminate in *self*, he would "assuredly turn round and regard those as fools and blockheads" who acted from motives, the excellence of which he was utterly incapable of perceiving.

Generosity of conduct springs from Benevolence and Conscientiousness. We have seen that these formed no part of the character we are considering; and, though Love of Approbation, or the desire of standing well in the opinion of others, might have exerted a considerable influence on the conduct, this sentiment was also moderate; and hence that love of fame which often prompts to deeds of virtuous enterprise would be in a great degree a stranger to his bosom. He would not, therefore, "seek reputation at the cannon's mouth." Selfishness, which we have seen enters so deeply into the character, would ever prompt the question "*cui bono?*" And his want of sympathy with those who acted under the influence of love of glory or renown would lead him to add them "to the aforesaid catalogue of fools."

That "he would tremble at every joint before the battle commenced" is chiefly referable to his very large endowment of Cautiousness, and to his moderate endowment of Hope. In such trying circumstances, a sense of duty often sustains the mind; but he could derive no support from this source; and when we advert to the whole development, we may easily conceive the gloom and the horror which would take possession of his soul. Even in the best constituted minds, and to those who are veterans in war, the "dreadful note of preparation" will always inspire with more or less of the sentiment of fear. Cautiousness is the first faculty which is brought into activity in the immediate prospect of a battle, and it is not till after the action is fairly begun that Combativeness, Destructiveness, Love of Approbation, Self-esteem, and Firmness, come into activity, and almost,

if not altogether, overpower that fear which at first was so predominant. The individual in question would therefore "by no means be a coward," not only because his Combativeness was full, but chiefly from the large endowment of Self-esteem and Firmness which gives determination to the character, and the resolution to stand to the last. Still, however, his large Cautiousness and moderate Love of Approbation would manifest themselves. He would not be found in the "forlorn hope," or fighting in the foremost ranks, "but would take especial care not to run *unnecessarily* into danger." In short, he would be better fitted to *sustain* than to *make* an attack. "But wo to the hapless victim whom his sword should strike to the ground!" &c. Combativeness, Destructiveness, and Self-esteem, uncontrolled by Benevolence or Conscientiousness, would then come into resistless activity, and the most intense delight would be experienced in "transfixing him with multiplied wounds." The same combination would lead him to view with ecstasy the destruction of every rank and battalion of the enemy, "and if by the artillery so much the better;" not only because the destruction would be more complete, but because it would be effected with much less personal risk. His capacity of perceiving the advantages of skilful manœuvres is evidently founded on his powerful intellectual development.

A talent for humour is inferred from Wit and Secretiveness;* and when, to this combination, Destructiveness is added, it produces *satire*. Benevolence and Conscientiousness being deficient would render it "biting, severe, and sarcastic;" and his small Adhesiveness would lead him to "spare neither friend nor foe."

It is scarcely possible to conceive a development more admirably fitted for enabling its possessor to "veil himself and his doings in the most impenetrable secrecy;" and when we advert to the nature of these "doings," never was such a development more necessary. When it was inferred that

* Phrenological Transactions, p. 174.

“ he would pursue his own selfish ends and gratifications “ without once being turned aside by the calls of benevolence, justice, or friendship,” it is evident that his actions would be of the most nefarious and criminal nature. And it is stated towards the end of the sketch, that but for his large endowment of intellect and of Cautiousness, “ he must “ long since have committed crimes which the justice of his “ country would have avenged.” It has often been remarked, that of all professions that of a consummate rogue is the most difficult to follow, and which most of all requires the constant exercise of the greatest talents. Accordingly these are possessed in the present case in a very high degree. The primitive faculties which produce them are,—Intellect to conceive and devise the best laid plan of villany—Secretiveness to conceal the deep design, with the additional power which this faculty gives, not only to penetrate into the motives of others, but also to personate a character totally the reverse of the real one—Cautiousness to inspire constant watchfulness and circumspection—and Firmness to persevere to the last. No “compunctious visitings of nature” would interfere with his “ fell purpose” of revenge (and it was predicated that he would be “ revengeful”), or whatever other deed of darkness he might be prosecuting; and this arises from Benevolence, Conscientiousness, and Adhesiveness, being all decidedly deficient. To the whole of this combination we have to add the large endowment of Individuality. This faculty takes cognizance of facts and occurrences, and gives a capacity for details. Nothing escapes the observation of one in whom it is large, and acting along with Secretiveness, it gives the tact of perceiving whether what we have said or done has produced the effect we wished and intended. Where it is remarkably deficient, the individual is apt to be more attentive to what is passing in his own mind, or to what he himself is saying (particularly if Concentrativeness be large), than to be keenly observant of the impression he has made on those to whom he has addressed himself. Firmness, Self-esteem, and Secre-

tiveness, are the chief elements on which the inference was founded, that "no human being would ever be able to extract from him that which he had determined to conceal," though the other faculties mentioned materially aid this power. His pride and implacability were inferred from his large Self-esteem and Destructiveness, with deficient Benevolence and Conscientiousness.

That he would be "an adept at seduction," and that he would "most delight in this way to gratify his passions," was inferred from his large Self-esteem, Secretiveness, and Amativeness, with deficient Conscientiousness. On this point we beg to refer to an article of our present Number on the combinations of Self-esteem with the other primitive faculties.

His moderate Ideality and the other sentiments, particularly Hope, being also moderate or deficient, accounts for his distaste for poetry; and his large Acquisitiveness would lead him to marvel at any extravagance of expenditure in purchasing works of this nature.

Hope, as its name sufficiently indicates, inspires with delightful anticipations in the prospect of the future, while Cautiousness gives rise to feelings of an opposite description. It is easy therefore to see that "his anticipations would never be delightful, but always full of apprehension."

Veneration is the chief ingredient which enters into filial duty. This is the only one of the higher sentiments which is well developed; and being the only one, nothing more could be predicated than that "he would not be *deficient* in respect for his parents." Veneration also leads "to reverence of ancestry and of superiors in society," and thus is one of the elements of the sentiment of loyalty. But as loyalty, in the most comprehensive sense of the word, would seem also to imply Adhesiveness and some of the higher sentiments, not mentioned as large, this feeling is represented in the individual before us to partake of a considerable admixture of selfish principles, which would lead him in some degree to identify *himself* with the prince whom he served

Hence also his exclusive preference for his own company, regiment, and country.

It is unnecessary to inform our readers that the author of the sketch believed he was treating of the talents and dispositions of an actual living human being; and it is farther evident that he was under the impression of his being an officer in the British army. Now it is scarcely possible to conceive a character more completely antipodal to the character of the French than that now under consideration. There is scarcely a faculty possessed between them in common. The French development presents moderate Self-esteem and Secretiveness, with comparatively deficient Firmness, Cautiousness, and Causality, all of which we have seen are largely developed in our supposed British officer; while Love of Approbation, of which the French have a large endowment, was in him only moderate in degree. When we recollect, at the same time, the dreadful preponderance of the lower propensities over the higher sentiments, it is easy to see from what sources that deep hatred and unmixed contempt which he is supposed to cherish towards those whom he would regard as the natural enemies of Britain arose; and to justify the ascribing to him "all that bitterness, "hatred, and contempt, which the vehement, unrestrained, "and combined activity of Self-esteem, Combativeness, and "Destructiveness, would produce."

Tune ministers to the gratification of many of the other mental faculties; and the kind of music which will afford the greatest delight will depend on the particular development of each individual. Hence Tune, when combined with Veneration and some of the other higher faculties, will give a taste for sacred music; and, combined with Combativeness and Destructiveness, as in the case before us, "martial music will then be felt and "appreciated." Tune, in combination with Self-esteem and Veneration, would account for the pleasure derived in hearing the King's Anthem. But as Benevolence is deficient, and Hope and Ideality only moderate, while all the lower propensities are strongly developed, "he would take to

“delight in that music which was of a gay, cheerful, soft, or melting kind.”

We have already adverted to the large endowment of Individuality, and stated its functions. Form being moderate would make it difficult for him to recollect “faces or persons.”

Concentrativeness being full, and Individuality, Comparison, and Wit, (which last we consider an intellectual faculty,) being large, and Causality very large, sufficiently warrant the inference, that he would “be acute, penetrating, and even profound.” His intellectual faculties, as applied to the knowledge of human nature, would be powerfully aided by Secretiveness.

The concluding observations in the sketch in our Second Number speak for themselves, and render any comment superfluous.

Before proceeding to compare the character attempted in the sketch with that delineated by Shakspeare, it may not be improper to state, that a gentleman, a friend of the author, and also a phrenologist, happened to call on him just as he had finished it, and to whom it was read over. As at this time both were equally ignorant of the source of the development, the gentleman immediately objected to the accuracy of the sketch, and said, that some error must have been committed, either in taking the development, or in drawing the inferences, because it was impossible that a character so utterly depraved could exist. The author admitted to a certain extent the justice of the criticism, and added, that the same objection had repeatedly occurred to his own mind as he proceeded; but that, after the most attentive consideration of the development, he had found it impossible to modify or alter the sketch, or to make it otherwise than he had done. Now it is somewhat curious, and not unimportant to remark, that the same objection which was thus made to the sketch, has been made by the critics to the character as drawn by Shakspeare. Thus Lord Kames observes,—
“Objects of horror must be excepted from the foregoing theory; for no description, however lively, is sufficient to

“ overbalance the disgust raised even by the idea of such objects. Every thing horrible ought therefore to be avoided in a description.”* His Lordship illustrates this remark, by observing, “ Iago’s character in the tragedy of Othello is in a sufferably monstrous and satanical: not even Shakspeare’s masterly hand can make the picture agreeable.”† We may be permitted to illustrate his Lordship’s observation by a quotation from our critique on Shakspeare’s tragedy of Macbeth in our first Number. We there observed,‡ that though Lady Macbeth is represented as almost totally void of benevolent feeling, or of any of the higher moral sentiments, she is nowhere represented as incapable of attachment or domestic affection; that these two species of feelings are totally distinct, and not at all dependent on each other; and that there are many who possess a strong Adhesiveness who have yet no feelings of love or charity, 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.*”

There is one feature of the character delineated in the sketch, which appears to be at variance with the character as pourtrayed by Shakspeare, viz. that Iago is a married man. When it was stated that he would be “ an adept in seduction,” &c. the idea of marriage is almost excluded; and, though not expressly stated, we know that the author of the sketch never for a moment imagined the possibility of his being married. A phrenologist never would have thought of predicating this, when he perceived the lower propensities so powerful, and Adhesiveness and Benevolence, and the other sentiments, so feeble. No doubt Iago might have married from mere selfish considerations, but

* Elements of Criticism, vol. ii. p. 366. † Ibid. p. 368. ‡ P. 109.

as he is introduced to us by Shakspeare as a married man, we have no *data* from which to judge of the motives which induced him to submit to what he would think the trammels of matrimony.

We now proceed to compare the sketch with the character as delineated in Othello.

It was predicated that he would be utterly selfish; that he would be proud and revengeful; that he would never forget or forgive an injury; and that he would utterly despise and contemn those who acted from noble and disinterested motives. These features of character are exemplified in the opening scene of the play.

Enter RODRIGO and IAGO.

Rod. Tush, never tell me, I take it much unkindly,
That thou, Iago,—who hast had my purse,
As if the strings were thine,—should'st know of this.

Iago. 'Sblood, but you will not hear me:—
If ever I did dream of such a matter,
Abhor me.

Rod. Thou told'st me, thou didst hold him in thy hate.

Iago. Despise me, if I did not. Three great ones of the city,
In personal suit to make me his lieutenant,
Oft capp'd to him;—and, by the faith of man,
I know my price, I am worth no worse a place.
But he, as loving his own pride and purposes,
Evades them, with a bombast circumstance,
Horribly stuff'd with epithets of war;
And, in conclusion, nonsuits
My mediators; for, *certes*, says he,
I have already chose my officer.

And what was he?

Forsooth, a great arithmetician,
One Michael Cassio, a Florentine,
A fellow almost damn'd in a fair wife;
That never set a squadron in the field,
Nor the division of a battle knows
More than a spinster; unless the bookish theoretic,
Wherein the toged consuls can propose
As masterly as he: mere prattle, without practice,
Is all his soldiership. But he, sir, had the election:
And I,—of whom his eyes had seen the proof,
At Rhodes, at Cyprus; and on other grounds,
Christian and heathen,—must be be-lee'd and calm'd
By debtor and creditor, this counter-caster;
He, in good time, must his lieutenant be,

And I, (God bless the mark!) his Moor-shif's ancient.

Rod. By heaven, I rather would have been his hangman.

Iago. But there's no remedy, 'tis the curse of service ;
 Preferment goes by letter, and affection,
 Not by the old gradation, where each second
 Stood heir to the first. Now, sir, be judge yourself,
 Whether I in any just term am affin'd
 To love the Moor.

We may merely remark in passing, the overweening pride arising from his large Self-esteem and deficient Conscientiousness which is manifested in this conversation, together with that hatred which, from his disappointed hopes and large Destructiveness, he begins to cherish not only against Cassio, but against Othello, who had preferred him to be his lieutenant. In what follows, Iago's character stands forth in its true colours.

Rod. I would not follow him then.

Iago. O, sir, content you ;
I follow him to serve my turn upon him :
 We cannot all be masters, nor all masters
 Cannot be truly follow'd. *You shall mark*
Many a dutious and knee-crooking knave,
That, doting on his own obsequious bondage,
Wears out his time, much like his master's ass,
For nought but provender ; and, when he's old, cashier'd ;
 WHIP ME SUCH HONEST KNAVES.

As a commentary on this passage we merely repeat the words of the sketch : " He will utterly despise and condemn those who act from noble and disinterested motives," and " will assuredly esteem them fools and " blockheads." That he would " pursue his own selfish ends and gratifications without being once turned aside " by the calls of benevolence, justice, or friendship," is proved by what follows :

Others there are,
 Who, trimm'd in forms and visages of duty,
 KEEP YET THEIR HEARTS ATTENDING ON THEMSELVES ;
 And, throwing but shows of service on their lords,
 Do well thrive by them, and when they have lined their coats,
 Do themselves homage : these fellows have some soul ;
 AND SUCH AN ONE DO I PROFESS MYSELF.
 For, sir,
 It is as sure as you are Roderigo,
 Were I the Moor, I would not be Iago :
In following him I follow but myself ;
 Heaven is my judge, not I for love and duty,

*But seeming so, for my peculiar end :
 For when my outward action doth demonstrate
 The native act and figure of my heart
 In compliment extern, 'tis not long after
 But I will wear my heart upon my sleeve
 For daws to peck at : I AM NOT WHAT I AM.*

After calling up Brabantio, the Venetian senator, to inform him of his daughter Desdemona's connexion or marriage with Othello, Iago manifests his Cautiousness: by keeping out of the way, lest he should be compelled to appear as an informer against Othello, of whom he thus speaks to Roderigo :

In which regard,
*Though I do hate him as I do hell pains,
 Yet, for necessity of present life,
 I must show out a flag and sign of love,
 Which is indeed but sign.*

It now appears that Desdemona is actually married to Othello; who, after vindicating his marriage to the Venetian senators, commits his wife to the care of Iago and Emilia, preparatory to his setting sail for Cyprus, of which he had been appointed the governor, under the apprehension of an invasion from the Turks. Desdemona's marriage appeared a death-blow to the hopes of Roderigo, and it requires all Iago's art and persuasion to induce him to persevere in his suit, to which Iago encourages him, by the hope that "it cannot be that Desdemona should long continue her love to the Moor." Iago had a deep interest in Roderigo's perseverance. Desdemona was to be corrupted by gifts of jewels, &c. and as he was the pretended channel of their conveyance, he took especial care that they should never reach the place of their destination. We cannot afford room for the whole of the conversation between Iago and Roderigo, contained in scene III. but the following passage is so characteristic of Iago's predominating Acquisitiveness, that we hope we shall be excused for quoting it :

Iago. It is merely a lust of the blood, and a permission of the will. Come, be a man: Drown thyself? drown cats and blind puppies. I have professed me thy friend, and I confess

me knit to thy deserving with cables of perdurable toughness; I could never better stead thee than now. *Put money in thy purse*; follow these wars; defeat thy favour with an usurped beard; I say, put money in thy purse. It cannot be, that Desdemona should long continue her love to the Moor,—*put money in thy purse*;—nor he his to her: it was a violent commencement, and thou shalt see an answerable sequestration;—*put but money in thy purse*.—These Moors are changeable in their wills;—*fill thy purse with money*: the food, that to him now is as luscious as locusts, shall be to him shortly as bitter as coloquintida. She must change for youth: when she is sated with his body, she will find the error of her choice.—She must have change, she must: *therefore put money in thy purse*.—If thou wilt needs damn thyself, do it a more delicate way than drowning. *Make all the money thou canst*: if sanctimony and a frail vow, betwixt an erring barbarian and a supersubtle Venetian, be not too hard for my wits, and all the tribe of hell, thou shalt enjoy her; *therefore make money*. A pox of drowning thyself! it is clean out of the way: seek thou rather to be hanged in compassing thy joy, than to be drowned and go without her.

Rod. Wilt thou be fast to my hopes, if I depend on the issue?

Iago. Thou art sure of me;—*Go make money*:—I have told thee often, and I re-tell thee again and again, I hate the Moor: My cause is hearted; thine hath no less reason: let us be conjunctive in our revenge against him: if thou canst cuckold him, thou dost thyself a pleasure, and me a sport. There are many events in the womb of time, which will be delivered. *Traverse*; go; *provide thy money*. We will have more of this to-morrow. Adieu.

Rod. Where shall we meet i'the morning?

Iago. At my lodging.

Rod. I'll be with thee betimes.

Iago. Go to; farewell. Do you hear, Roderigo?

Rod. What say you?

Iago. No more of drowning, do you hear.

Rod. I am changed. *I'll sell all my land*.

Iago. Go to; farewell: *put money enough in your purse*.

[*Exit Roderigo.*]

It was inferred in the sketch that he would be “an adept at seduction.” The instructions which he gives to Roderigo in the scene from which we have given the above quotation, and the grounds of his belief that Desdemona might be seduced, prove that such practices were not uncommon to him, and shew how he himself would have acted in similar circumstances.

The soliloquy which immediately follows our last quotation is too important to be omitted:

Thus do I ever make my fool my purse :
 For I mine own gain'd knowledge should profane,
 If I would time expend with such a snipe,
But for my sport and profit. I hate the Moor ;
 And it is thought abroad, that 'twixt my sheets
 He has done my office : I know not if't be true ;
But I, for mere suspicion in that kind,
Will do, as if for surety. He holds me well ;
 The better shall my purpose work on him.
 Cassio's a proper man : Let me see now ;
 To get his place, and to plume up my will ;
 A double knavery,—How ? how ?—Let me see :
 After some time, to abuse Othello's ear,
 That he is too familiar with his wife :—
 He hath a person, and a smooth dispose,
 To be suspected ; framed to make women false.
 The Moor is of a free and open nature,
 That thinks men honest, that but seem to be so ;
 And will as tenderly be led by the nose,
 As asses are.
 I have't ;—it is engender'd :—Hell and night
 Must bring this monstrous birth to the world's light. [Exit.

In this soliloquy Iago begins to hatch his deep-laid schemes of villany. His first object seemed to be merely to cheat and rob Roderigo of his money, by pretending to assist him in his suit with Desdemona. But now his villany takes a wider range. His pride was hurt, and his revenge excited, *first*, against Othello, for not bestowing on him the office of his lieutenant, and giving it to Cassio ; and, *secondly*, against Cassio himself, as standing in the way of his advancement. His hatred of the Moor was farther excited by a suspicion of his wife's infidelity with him. He therefore determines for revenge, by insinuating that Desdemona was unfaithful with Cassio, so as at once to destroy Othello's peace of mind, to ruin Cassio, and eventually to obtain his place. Here then are plots and plans, wheels within wheels, and a different game to be played with Roderigo, Othello, and Cassio, and indeed with every individual in the drama. Nothing short of the high intellectual endowment marked in the development, joined to his Secretiveness, Cautiousness, &c. could have conceived, planned, and carried on enterprises, at once so difficult and so hazardous.

In the first scene of Act II. we have a display of Iago's

satirical powers in a conversation with Desdemona, and to which we refer our readers as a proof that he would "be remarkably distinguished by a talent for satire." During the conversation, Cassio, who was present, takes Desdemona by the hand, on which Iago observes aside, "He takes her by the palm. Ay, well said, whisper: with as little a web as this will I ensnare as great a fly as Cassio. Ay, smile upon her, do; I will gyve thee in thine own courtship. You say true; 'tis so indeed: if such tricks as those strip you out of your lieutenantancy, it had been better you had not kissed your three fingers so oft, which now again you are most apt to play the air in. Very good; well kissed! an excellent courtesy! 'tis so, indeed.—Yet again your fingers to your lips? *would they were clyster-pipes for your sake.*"

It appears from a soliloquy which we shall quote presently, that Desdemona's charms had made an impression on Iago himself, and jealousy at her supposed preference of Cassio excites his revenge against the latter, and generates that satire or irony which it was stated in the sketch would be "biting, severe, and sarcastic."

In his next interview with Roderigo, Iago informs him, that "Desdemona is directly in love with Cassio." Roderigo naturally exclaims, "Why, 'tis not possible,"—but "this poor trash of Venice" was no match for so profound and accomplished a villain as Iago, by whom he is "as tenderly led by the nose as asses are." He is therefore soon convinced by Iago's arguments, that he has every thing to fear from Cassio, and to regard him as a formidable rival. Iago had a double purpose to serve in producing this conviction in Roderigo's mind. In the *first* place, it tended to satisfy him that Desdemona's virtue was not unassailable, since it had so far yielded to Cassio's supposed addresses; while, at the same time, this afforded a pretext to Iago for his want of success in prosecuting Roderigo's suit with Desdemona. And, in the *second* place, he now urges Roderigo to pick a quarrel with Cassio, that this obstacle to his success may be taken out of the way, "and the impediment most profitably removed, without the which there were no expectation of our prosperity." "Selfishness still reigns

“with a predominating sway.” Afraid of Cassio himself, he artfully engages Roderigo to execute his own purposes of revenge, under the mask of disinterested friendship for the latter; thus taking “especial care not to run unnecessarily “into danger.” We may farther observe, that the above dialogue affords another proof of Iago’s knowledge of the arts of seduction.

It is in his soliloquies that his plans of villany stand forth in all their nakedness; and we therefore give the next entire:—

Iago. That Cassio loves her, I do well believe it;
That she loves him, ’tis apt, and of great credit;
The Moor—howbeit that I endure him not,—
Is of a constant, loving, noble nature;
And, I dare think, he’ll prove to Desdemona
A most dear husband. *Now I do love her too;*
Not out of absolute lust, (though, peradventure,
I stand accountant for as great a sin,)
But partly led to diet my revenge,
For that I do suspect the lusty Moor
Hath leap’t into my seat: the thought whereof
Doth, like a poisonous mineral, gnaw my inwards;
*And nothing can nor shall content my soul,
Till I am even with him, wife for wife;*
Or, failing so, yet that I put the Moor
At least into a jealousy so strong,
That judgment cannot cure. Which thing to do,—
If this poor trash of Venice, whom I trash
For his quick hunting, stand the putting on,
I’ll have our Michael Cassio on the hip;
Abuse him to the Moor in the rank garb,—
For I fear Cassio with my night-cap too;
Make the Moor thank me, love me, and reward me,
For making him egregiously an ass,
*And practising upon his peace and quiet,
Even to madness.* ’Tis here, but yet confused;
Knavery’s plain face is never seen till used.

Cassio is intrusted by Othello with the command of the guard on the evening of a day set apart for festivity and rejoicing, on account of the news of the destruction of the Turkish fleet, and the celebration of Othello’s nuptials. Iago’s next plan is to embroil Cassio with Othello, by making the former drunk while on duty, and thus to bring down upon him the displeasure of his superior. And at the same

time to stir up the incipient quarrel between Cassio and Roderigo, by encouraging the latter to attack the former when in a state of intoxication, and thereby an easy prey. The plan succeeds. Cassio, plied hard by Iago, gets drunk. Montano, Othello's predecessor in the government of Cyprus, is a witness to his exceptionable conduct, and his reputation is proportionably injured in his estimation. Roderigo meanwhile makes his appearance, goes after Cassio, and they reappear fighting. The quarrel is witnessed by Montano, who is himself attacked and wounded by Cassio; and the uproar to which it gives rise is heard by Othello, who enters to inquire into its cause. Iago, alone, is cool and collected, and appears the only one who has taken no part in the fray. He avails himself to the utmost of the advantage he has gained, and magnifies and exaggerates, in the most artful manner, the misconduct of Cassio to Othello. In his subsequent conversation with Cassio, he assumes the mask of friendship, and, with deep sagacity, urges Cassio to make his court to Desdemona, and engage her to plead for him with Othello. On this he makes the following soliloquy:—

Iago. And what's he then, that says,—I play the villain?
 When this advice is free, I give, and honest,
 Probal to thinking, and (indeed) the course
 To win the Moor again? * * * * *

How am I then a villain,
 To counsel Cassio to this parallel course,
 Directly to his good?—Divinity of hell!
 When devils will the blackest sins put on,
 They do suggest at first with heavenly shows,
 As I do now: For, while this *honest fool*
 Plies Desdemona to repair his fortunes,
 And she for him pleads strongly to the Moor,
 I'll pour this pestilence into his ear,—
 That she repeals him for her body's lust;
 And, by how much she strives to do him good,
 She shall undo her credit with the Moor.
 So will I turn her virtue into pitch;
 And out of her own goodness make the net
 That shall enmesh them all.

We think it almost unnecessary again to repeat the infer-

ence stated in the sketch, that "he would be proud and revengeful, and would never forgive or forget an injury."

Roderigo meanwhile becomes impatient on finding that his "money is almost spent;" that he has farther been "exceedingly well cudgelled;" "and so with no money at all, and a little more wit," he proposes "to return to Venice." But he has to encounter an intellect far superior to his own, and he is again the dupe of Iago.

Iago's schemes of villany are prosecuted through the third and fourth acts, in which, step by step, by hints and innuendoes, and by distorting and magnifying trifles, in themselves "light as air," he gradually infuses the poison of jealousy into Othello's mind, and paves the way for the catastrophe of the play. The adaptation of means to an end, though that end is a most infernal one, are truly admirable; and throughout the greatest intellectual powers, with the deepest insight into human nature, are manifested.

Roderigo's impatience is now at its height, and he more than suspects that Iago has been playing foul with him.

Rod. I do not find, that thou deal'st justly with me,

Iago. Will you hear me, Roderigo?

Rod. 'Faith, I have heard too much; for your words, and performances, are no kin together.

But he is doomed again to fall before the artifices of Iago, who not only contrives to allay his suspicions, but to concert with and engage him in a plan for attacking and killing Cassio, in which Iago falsely promises him his assistance. A Phrenologist would infer, that the size of Roderigo's head must have been much inferior to that of Iago's.

It was stated in the sketch, that he would take especial care not to run unnecessarily into danger, that his victim would be transfixed with multiplied wounds, and would expire without exciting one emotion of pity. Those features of character are illustrated in the following scene, and we trust that our readers will excuse the length of our quotation, as the whole of it is necessary for the comparison which we wish to institute.

ACT V.—SCENE I.—*Enter IAGO and RODERIGO.*

Iago. Here, stand behind this bulk ; straight will he come :
Wear thy good rapier bare, and put it home ;
Quick, quick ; fear nothing ; I'll be at thy elbow :
It makes us, or it mars us ; think on that,
And fix most firm thy resolution.

Rod. Be near at hand ; I may miscarry in't.

Iago. Here, at thy hand ; be bold, and take thy sword.

[RETIRES TO A LITTLE DISTANCE.]

Rod. I have no great devotion to the deed ;

And yet he has given me satisfying reasons :—

'Tis but a man gone :—forth, my sword ; he dies.

[Goes to his stand.]

Iago. I have rubb'd this young quat almost to the sense,

And he grows angry. Now, whether he kill Cassio,

Or Cassio him, or each do kill the other,

EVERY WAY MAKES MY GAIN : Live Roderigo,

He calls me to a restitution large

Of gold, and jewels, that I bobb'd from him,

As gifts to Desdemona ;

It must not be : if Cassio do remain,

He hath a daily beauty in his life,

That makes me ugly ; and, besides, the Moor

May unfold me to him ; there stand I in much peril :

[It was inferred that his anticipations of the future would
be full of apprehension.]

No, he must die : But so, I hear him coming.

Enter CASSIO.

Rod. I know his gait, 'tis he :—Villain, thou diest.

[Rushes from his post, and makes a pass at Cassio.]

Cas. That thrust had been mine enemy indeed,

But that my coat is better than thou think'st ;

I will make proof of thine.

[Draws, and wounds Roderigo.]

Rod. O, I am slain !

[IAGO RUSHES FROM HIS POST, CUTS CASSIO BEHIND
IN THE LEG, AND EXIT !]

Cas. I am maim'd for ever !—Help, ho ! murder ! murder !

[Falls.]

Othello enters at a distance, and while Cassio is crying for assistance, the former recognizes the voice of the latter, and imagining that Iago had inflicted the wound under a sense of his injured commander's wrongs, exclaims,—

Oth. 'Tis he ;—O brave Iago, honest, and just,
Thou hast such noble sense of thy friend's wrong !
Thou teachest me,—Minion, your dear lies dead,
And your fate hies apace :—Strumpet, I come :

Forth of my heart those charms, thine eyes are blotted ;
Thy bed, lust-stain'd, shall with lust's blood be spotted.

[*Exit Othello.*]

Othello then retires, and Lodovico and Gratiano enter at a distance. They too hear the cries of Cassio and Roderigo, while Iago enters with a light.

Lod. Hark !

Gra *Here's one come in his shirt, with light and weapons.*

Iago. Who's there ? whose noise is this, that cries on murder ?

[*Iago's appearance in his shirt, and his first address, afford a remarkable proof of his Cautiousness and Secretiveness.*]

Lod. We do not know.

Iago. Did you not hear a cry ?

Cas. Here, here ; for heaven's sake, help me.

Iago. What's the matter ?

Gra. This is Othello's ancient, as I take it.

Lod. The same, indeed ; a very valiant fellow.

Iago. What are you here that cry so grievously ?

Cas. Iago ? O, I am spoil'd, undone by villains ! Give me some help.

Iago. O me, lieutenant ! what villains have done this ?

Cas. I think that one of them is hereabout,
And cannot make away.

Iago. O treacherous villains !—

What are you there ? come in, and give some help.

[*To Lodovico and Gratiano.*]

Rod. O, help me here !

Cas. That's one of them.

Iago. O MURDEROUS SLAVE ! O VILLAIN !

[*IAGO STABS RODERIGO.*]

Rod. O damn'd Iago ! O inhuman dog ! O ! O ! O !

Iago. Kill men i' the dark !—Where be these bloody thieves ?
How silent is this town !—Ho ! murder ! murder !

What may you be ? are you of good, or evil ?

Lod. As you shall prove us, praise us.

Iago. Signior Lodovico ?

Lod. He, sir.

Iago. I cry you mercy : Here's Cassio hurt
By villains.

Gra. Cassio ?

Iago. How is it, brother ?

Cas. My leg is cut in two.

Iago. Marry, heaven forbid !—

Light, gentlemen ; I'll bind it with my shirt.

Bianco, Cassio's mistress, then enters, and with unparalleled effrontery, Iago charges her as “ a party in this in-

“jury,” and looking about, he pretends to discover the dead body of Roderigo.

Know we this face or no ?

Alas ! my friend, and my dear countrymen,

Roderigo ? no :—Yes, sure ; O heavens ! Roderigo.

Towards the conclusion of the sketch, it is observed,—

“ But let him be on his guard, these may not always be sufficient to restrain him from evil.”

In the last scene accordingly, the whole of Iago’s schemes of villany are detected, and chiefly by his wife ; and his utter Selfishness and Destructiveness are dreadfully manifested, by stabbing her to death. After this, he attempts to escape, but is soon overtaken and brought back a prisoner. The poet discovers the greatest knowledge of human nature, in representing Iago as henceforth doggedly silent. To a question from Othello, he replies :—

Demand me nothing : What you know, you know ;

From this time forth, I never will speak a word.

This is just the conduct which we should expect from one in whom, with deficient moral sentiments, Secretiveness, Firmness, and Cautiousness were predominating faculties.

The play concludes with a speech from Lodovico, with which we will conclude our quotations and the present article :

Lod. O Spartan dog,

More fell than anguish, hunger, or the sea !

Look on the tragic loading of this bed ; [To Iago.

This is thy work : the object poisons sight ;—

Let it be hid.—Gratiano, keep the house,

And seize upon the fortunes of the Moor,

For they succeed to you.—To you, lord governor,

Remains the censure of this hellish villain ;

The time, the place, the torture,—O enforce it !

Myself will straight aboard ; and, to the state,

This heavy act with heavy heart relate. : [Exeunt.

ARTICLE IV.

LETTER FROM AN OBSERVER OF NATURE.

SIR,—Living in an obscure corner of Fifeshire, with little opportunity of knowing what is going on in the literary world, a friend handed in, for an evening's amusement, a number of your Phrenological Journal. My name can add no weight to my observations, of course can be of very little consequence in this instance, but may be given in a future communication, if such observations are considered illustrative of truth.

In April 1819, I had occasion to be in the Upper Ward of Lanarkshire, and having an hour to spare before dinner, I took a glance over my memorandums, and found that an early and very intimate friend of my father's lived near the village of——, and ascertaining the distance, I resolved to walk that length after dinner to call on him. On going into the clachan I asked the first intelligent face I met, where Mr —— lived. As there was more than ordinary shrewdness in the lineaments of my informant's physiognomy, I begged him to accompany me to the best public-house in the place, until I found a boy to go for Mr ——. He shewed me to the public-house, and then, as I supposed, from the time he was absent, had gone for the gentleman himself, which was so far fortunate, as this brought me in contact with the landlord, who, after poking the fire, and making the usual routine of remarks on the weather, was desired to bring a little of his best ——, when I asked him to sit down and give a stranger his news. He had a peculiar expression of countenance, and, on uncovering, showed a head perfectly bald and of uncommon formation. I begged he would change seats with me, on pretence of the light being offensive to my eyes, which threw the glare with fine effect over the surface of his bald pate. I drew his attention, first to the antique frame of a mirror, placed immediately over the fire-

place, and had every minutiae of its history detailed; then to the departure of the Prodigal Son, on the one side, and next to the Fatted Calf on the other, till I had seen the head in all its bearings. To feel was unnecessary. Having made up my mind regarding his most prominent propensities, I waited the arrival of my expected friend.

When he and the individual first mentioned came in, I told them whose son I was. Having never seen either of the parties before, both claimed school acquaintance of my father, and as there appeared a shade of familiarity between my new friends, I begged them to sit down. The landlord withdrew, when my premier acquaintance of the face *sagess* made an apology for leaving me so long; but remarked, the landlord's stories would find me amusement. I told them I had been very much entertained and amused with the landlord, who I conceived to be a man of very peculiar habits and disposition. I then described his general and strongest propensities; his deficiency in the finer feelings; his extreme selfishness; his passionate irritability and savage ferocity of countenance when in anger; and even when his immediate profit induced him to act the part of benevolence, his demeanour was so awkwardly constrained and reluctant, as to satisfy me that benevolent actions were not the natural feelings of his mind.

Mr —— expressed his astonishment at my intimate acquaintance with the landlord, and wondered I had never called on him before, and made his house my home, as I must have been often in the neighbourhood, and in company with the landlord to know them so well. I assured them I had never seen him before to my knowledge, that I never was in the place but once, and that only passing rapidly through it. It is impossible to describe their astonishment: their looks at one another would have befitted the pencil of Hogarth or Tim Bobbin. At last one remarked, that "I might be very thankful I had not lived in the days of *Beatty Laing*, or I might have adorned a pile or fat tar barrel."

To satisfy them of my having never seen the landlord, I begged them to call him. Mr — did so, and asked him why he did not inform them that this was a most intimate acquaintance of his own. "An acquaintance of mine!" he exclaimed in suspicion; "it's impossible. I never saw the gentleman before in my life—not I."

AN OBSERVER OF NATURE.

ARTICLE V.

REPORT ON THE CAST OF JOHN PALLET,

EXECUTED AT COLCHESTER FOR THE MURDER OF MR JAMES MUMFORD.

READ AT THE PHRENOLOGICAL SOCIETY, APRIL 1824.

THE cast which is now before the Society was presented by Dr Elliotson of London. It is that of John Pallet, who was executed in December last for the murder of Mr James Mumford. Pallet had formerly been employed as a labourer on the farm of Mr Mumford's father; but, in the course of last autumn, was discharged for misconduct, and shortly afterwards had his pigs seized in payment of a fine which he had incurred for riot and drunkenness; and, as he conceived these misfortunes to have been brought upon him solely in consequence of the interference of Mr J. Mumford, he ever after bore him a grudge, and swore that he would have his revenge. About three weeks before the murder he was even heard to say, that "he would not mind hacking his "whistle for him, and that he would be damned but he "would smash him." For some time no opportunity presented itself for carrying his threats into execution; but on 8th December, 1823, between seven and eight o'clock in the evening, one of the Walden coaches from London, in which Mumford was an outside passenger, unfortunately drove up to the Coach and Horses tavern in Quendon, where Pallet had spent the afternoon in drinking, in company with one Kidman, a huckster, and at the door of which he was at that moment standing, when his attention was attracted by

the arrival of the coach. The night was too dark for him to be able to distinguish the features of any of the passengers, but he very soon discovered Mumford to be one of them by hearing him give directions about his luggage, as he was to leave the coach at a cross-road a little farther on, in order to walk home; and also by hearing some one remark, that "it was a dark night for Mr Mumford to walk to Widdington;" and in consequence his resolution was soon taken.

The propensities of Self-esteem, Combativeness, and Destructiveness, which lead to the feeling of revenge, naturally powerful in Pallet's mind, were now glowing under the additional excitement of half intoxication, and when he recollected that his victim had to walk through a long, lonely, and sequestered lane, where no one could observe or interrupt him, he could not resist the opportunity which he had so often longed for of taking *immediate* vengeance upon him for all his wrongs. He, therefore, set out along with Kidman at a quick pace, in order to reach the lane before the coach should come up, and they were scarcely arrived at the spot when they perceived Mumford alight. Pallet and Kidman now separated, and the latter, ignorant of Pallet's intention, proceeded on his way, after having got back a knife which Pallet had borrowed from him to cut the stick with which he committed the murder. Pallet followed, and by striking across a field soon came up with Mumford, and at a convenient place attacked him, and struck him repeatedly on the head till he fell. He then rifled his pockets of their contents, and finding him not yet dead, he attempted to cut his throat with a knife taken from his pocket. The night being very dark, and Mumford very near-sighted, he did not discover Pallet till he received the blow; and even had he known his intention, his weakness and diminutive size were such as to have given him no chance in coping with the strong coarse built frame of his murderer.

Such is an outline of the horrid deed for which Pallet suf-

ferred; and if ever a murder was committed under the most brutal and ferocious impulses of our nature, unrestrained by intellect or moral sentiments, it was unquestionably this one; and consequently if there is truth in our science, it is in such a case as that of Pallet's that the Phrenologist may safely and confidently predicate a development of the most unfavourable kind. Accordingly, a moment's inspection of the cast now before us will satisfy even the most incredulous as to the striking resemblance which it bears to the worst specimens of that class of criminals to which he belongs.* In him, as in the other murderers, the quantity of brain posterior to the *meatus auditorius* is more than equal to that lying before, showing a very decided preponderance of the animal propensities. The coronal surface rises a little in the middle, but it wants the broad expansion which indi-

* The measurement and development of the cast of the head of Pallet is as follows:—

From occipital spine to lower	Individuality,	- -	7½ inches.
..... Concentrativeness to Comparison,	- -	- -	6½
..... <i>Meatus auditorius</i> to Philoprogenitiveness,	- -	- -	5
..... Individuality,	- -	- -	4½
..... Firmness,	- -	- -	5½
..... Benevolence,	- -	- -	5½
..... Destructiveness to Destructiveness,	- -	- -	6½
..... Secretiveness to Secretiveness,	- -	- -	6½
..... Cautiousness to Cautiousness,	- -	- -	5½
..... Ideality to Ideality,	- -	- -	4½
..... Constructiveness to Constructiveness,	- -	- -	5½

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

cates a full development of the organs of the moral sentiments, and in the frontal region a great and lamentable deficiency exists. To estimate this properly it is of importance to remark the breadth and filling up of the occipital region, compared to the sloping and narrowness of the forehead; since it is no uncommon thing to meet in society with very worthy and excellent men, in whom the measurement behind equals that before the ear, but with this great difference, that, besides the much superior moral development which they possess, we shall generally find the breadth of the posterior region to be a great deal less, and that of the frontal region a great deal more in such individuals, than in criminals.

In Pallet the breadth and general size of the posterior far exceeds that of the interior part of the head. The forehead is indeed broad at *the base*; but it is narrow, low, and retreating above; thus presenting rather a full development of the knowing organs, but a miserable endowment of those of Ideality, Language, Comparison, Causality, and Wit. No endowment even of moral sentiments can effectually compensate such a deficiency in directing the conduct, where the propensities are also strong. It is the reflecting faculties alone which set before us the nature and consequences of an action, and which lead us to anticipate whether the different sentiments will approve or disapprove of our intended acts before performing them. Where the intellect is weak, the faculties most excited for the moment command our conduct, and it is only after the deed is done that the sentiments feel pleased or dissatisfied; for a weak intellect is unable to represent to the mind an hypothetical case so strongly as to excite the different sentiments, to form a judgment of its propriety. The intellectual faculties thus enter largely into the production of a rational *will*. Without them we act upon the first impulse which rises in the mind, and the next moment under a different impulse we act in opposition to what we did before; but this will be best understood by stating an hypothetical case.

Thus, if a person is injured or insulted, the propensities of Self-esteem and Love of Approbation, being disagreeably affected, become active, and excite Combativeness and Destructiveness, which prompt to instant retaliation and infliction of pain upon the aggressor. But the intellect, also, when it is possessed, comes into play, and takes the circumstances and motives into consideration; and if it finds the provocation to have been unintentional, it excites Conscientiousness and Benevolence and the other higher powers to direct or restrain the blind impulse of the propensities. If, however, the intellect perceives the injury to have been a deliberate act, it excites Conscientiousness and Benevolence to go so far along with the Combativeness and Destructiveness, in the infliction of punishment, as shall prevent a repetition of the aggression. But supposing the intellect, which ought to judge of the motives, to be very weak, and the sentiments which approve or disapprove to be also weak, while the propensities remain very strong; then, instead of the actions being the deliberate result of the activity of all the three orders of faculties, it is clear that they will be the result of the activity of the propensities alone; or, in other words, that, when the injury is received, the impulse to retaliate will be yielded to without hesitation or demur, and thus the general conduct of the individual will be characterized by the purest manifestations of the lower propensities. This unfortunate effect is aggravated by the very constitution of the propensities themselves. All of them, in the daily occurrences of life, easily meet with and recognize the objects which call them into activity, while the moral sentiments require a much greater degree of intellect to operate with effect, and to enable them to see their true objects. Thus a stupid man's Combativeness is much more easily roused by the appearance of opposition than a stupid man's Conscientiousness by the simple statement of a wrong; and hence the propensities, like all other parts in constant use, acquire a facility or proneness to enter into action on every occasion,

till at last the actions proceed as entirely from them as if neither intellect nor sentiments existed. Now Pallet's cast is one of those which exhibit this great and unfavourable deficiency in the organs of intellect and moral sentiments, joined to a great endowment of all the animal propensities. Hence we may expect to find him yielding to his strongest feelings without either consistency or restraint, and his general conduct to be characterized by every species of brutality, violence, and passion. Accordingly we are told "that his profligate conduct had long been a subject of animadversion in the neighbourhood in which he lived," and that his aged mother "often expressed the greatest anxiety as to his fate, and that she tried, but tried in vain, to check him in his career of guilt." The prisoner himself seemed quite aware of the strength of his passions, and of the difficulty of restraining them within bounds, and feelingly lamented his own fate in being born to be hanged.

The crime for which he suffered, like that of Thurtel, was clearly committed under the impulse of revenge, which, as already stated, arises from large Self-esteem, Combative-ness, and Destructiveness, uncontrolled by Conscientiousness or Benevolence, prompting to the destruction or annoyance of the offending object. All these propensities are strongly developed in Pallet, and his low state of intellect, obscured as it was by these violent passions, altogether prevented him from perceiving either the propriety of Mumford's behaviour, or the folly of yielding to the brutal purpose which agitated his breast.

It has been frequently and justly remarked, that where Self-esteem is largely possessed the individual prides himself on those qualities in which he supposes himself to excel, and this was obviously the case with Pallet. His Self-esteem was large, and it seemed to him the very essence of degradation that he should be thwarted in his favourite actions by a man for whose diminutive size, and peaceful habits, he had often felt and expressed the most sovereign contempt. He esteemed a man in proportion to his muscular strength

and combative propensities; and to be thwarted even by his equal would have been galling to his Self-esteem; but to find himself set at nought, and, as he conceived, wantonly trampled upon, by one so immeasurably his inferior, and more especially to find that person completely in his power, was too much for such a combination to withstand, heated as it was by his afternoon's dissipation. He therefore proceeded to execute his purpose; and, having come up behind Mumford unperceived, he "was about to strike the fatal blow, but his heart failed, and he desisted. Mr Mumford heard some person near him, but from the defect in his vision, and the darkness of the night, he could not see who it was; he, however, asked, in a tone of alarm, 'Who's there?' The prisoner made no answer, but stood still, and withheld his breath; Mr Mumford then again went on; and the prisoner, by a short cut through a field, got before him, and stood by a gate, ready once more to strike; his heart again misgave him, and he again desisted; Mr Mumford went on to the spot in which his body was first seen by Mr Smith, and thither the prisoner followed him, and made finally a desperate blow at his head with the bludgeon, which knocked off his hat; with a second blow he felled him to the ground, and then, by repeated strokes, literally smashed his skull to atoms." Pallet, however, declared that he did not mean to murder him, but only to beat him with such severity as he should not soon forget. Nor is this statement altogether inconsistent with his organization; for when we see in ordinary individuals, with good and even powerful intellects, how completely reason often yields to passion in directing the conduct, we cannot wonder that Pallet's enormous Combative-ness, Destructive-ness, and Self-esteem, once called into activity to chastise his foe, should so far master the feeble glimmerings of his benighted intellect as to render him for the time insensible to the extent of the crime which he was committing. Accordingly, on retiring into 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." He seems even to have been struck with a degree of remorse and compassion for his fallen victim; for, after having accomplished his dreadful purpose, he retired a short distance from the scene of slaughter, and resolved to run away; but, overpowered by the consciousness of his villany,

“ he became as it were rivetted to the spot, and had not the
 “ power to move one foot before the other, his eyes being still
 “ directed towards the body of his victim. In this state, in a
 “ retired part of the road, he remained until Mr Smith came up ;
 “ he saw him approach the body and ride away ; but still he
 “ did not move. Once more he essayed to escape, and to quit
 “ the dreadful spectacle, but he could not resist the impulse to
 “ again approach the body ; and, without exactly determining
 “ on what he should do, kneeling down upon one knee, he
 “ placed it upon the other, and rested his chin upon his left
 “ shoulder, when the blood poured down his neck, and dyed the
 “ collar of his shirt.”

After some pause, he took up the body on his back, and proceeded to Widdington, with the idea that he should be able to convince the family that he had found it on the road, and thus throw all suspicion off himself. This notion was clearly dictated by large Secretiveness, aided by his moderate but excited Cautiousness, the one prompting to concealment, the other to apprehension for his own safety ; but again the deficiency of intellect betrays his scheme. As he proceeded with his burden, he soon met with four men, who had been sent out by Mr Smith, whose horse had started at the sight of the body, while Pallet was lying in the field. One of the four men gave the following account of the meeting :—

“ And I heard some person say, ‘ *Hoy!* ’ the person was in the
 “ road, and within three or four rods of us ; I knew the voice
 “ to be John Pallet’s ; besides ‘ *Hoy,* ’ he said here is Jem
 “ Mumford ; he added, ‘ I picked him up in the road ; ’ the
 “ body was across Pallet’s back. I put the lantern close to the
 “ deceased’s face, and said, ‘ I am sure it is not James Mum-
 “ ford ; ’ my brother also said the same ; I had known the de-
 “ ceased for many years ; I took the body off Pallet’s back and
 “ set it on my son’s knee, until the cart came up ; Pallet
 “ remained, and assisted in putting the body into the cart ;
 “ Pallet walked voluntarily towards this house, and insisted
 “ that the body was that of Mr Mumford, but I thought not ;
 “ when he was brought to this house and put into a chair, I
 “ examined his cheek for a mole, which I found, and then be-
 “ lieved it was Mr Mumford ; his shirt was marked ‘ J. M.’
 “ which confirmed it ; his head was knocked to pieces, a large
 “ piece being cut out from the head ; Pallet then sat down,
 “ and commenced drinking in the tap-room ! ” Now, consider-
 ing the darkness of the night, and that the head was so mangled as not to be recognizable even with a lantern, and

more especially after hearing this witness, who knew Mumford well, repeatedly declare the body not to be his, if Pallet had had a particle of reflection, he must instantly have perceived that no one but the *murderer* himself could positively assert the contrary; and that by persisting in his assertion, he irresistibly pointed to himself as the guilty man. So far from being aware of their giving any just grounds for suspicion, Pallet, under the influence of Secretiveness, which assured him, that because he *wished* to be hidden, he therefore *must be hidden*, or like a child, who, when it shuts its eyes and sees nobody, imagines that it also in its turn becomes invisible to others, went to the tap-room, and renewed his drinking, as if nothing had happened.

The obvious inference that Pallet must have been concerned in the murder did not escape those about him. For when Mr Campbell, the minister of Widdington, arrived, and heard the manner in which the deceased was found, he ordered Pallet to be taken into custody; and the scene which took place upon his apprehension shews still more the debased nature of the man. Pallet said at first, that he was willing to go with the constable, but when removed to another room, he insisted on having something to eat and drink. Upon being denied this, he swore with many oaths that he would have something, and jumping up, knocked over the table, and broke the plates, glasses, and decanters upon it, but after much resistance was secured. Here, his whole lower propensities seem to have been extremely excited, and to have acted without any restraint either from the intellectual faculties or moral sentiments. The violent resistance and breaking of the table and glasses were a pure manifestation of Destructiveness and Combativeness, aided by Self-esteem and Firmness, as was the murder itself; and his call for food and drink in such circumstances, is a curious confirmation of an idea, which there is some ground for entertaining, of hunger and thirst being connected with some part at the base of the brain, which in Pallet is obviously of great size and breadth.

Next morning, upon the constable taking off Pallett's shoes to compare them with the foot-marks in the field, limited as his intellect was, he could not but see the certainty of detection which such a trial would produce; and accordingly he exclaimed, "Then I am sure to be done; it is a hard thing to be born to be hung, I shall be sure to be hung. If I could get off with transportation I should not care." This he was constantly repeating on his way to the workhouse, crying bitterly all the while; and his small Causality could not enable him to perceive that he was thus putting the guilt upon himself; and it was only when he was asked *why he was sure of being hung* that he remained silent. The force of evidence came upon him so irresistibly, where, from his large Secretiveness, he expected none, that he at last said,—“There is no use in denying it, I did murder Mr Mumford;” and in this statement he persisted for some time.

And it is curious to remark, that although his object was revenge and not plunder, he, apparently without being aware of what he was doing, ransacked Mumford's pockets, and emptied them of their contents; and carried about with him Mumford's knife, which, if he had exercised any Causality at all, he might easily have known would of itself lead to suspicion.

His Benevolence is but moderately developed, and he expressed no regret for having committed the crime; and with that true Selfishness which large Acquisitiveness and Self-esteem, with little Benevolence, aggravated by want of intellect, uniformly give, he was entirely occupied about himself, and sometimes gave way to tears and exclamations about his own hard fate, manifesting in other respects as much apathy as Firmness. Abundant evidence is also afforded of his intellectual deficiencies; for it is mentioned, “that his ignorance exceeded belief;” that he never was able to learn to read, or even to repeat a single sentence of the Lord's prayer, although he frequented the parish church. In accordance with this, the organ of Language, as

already mentioned, is exceedingly small, and, combined with the deficiency of the organs of Causality and Comparison, satisfactorily accounts for his little progress in reading and education. From this deficiency also arose the difficulty or impossibility of directing his large Veneration to its highest object. He could not comprehend what he could not *see* or *touch*; and thus, while he expressed no apprehension about the fate of his soul, he was extremely uneasy at the idea of his body being dissected. This absence of apprehension seems to me to have arisen as much from an inability to comprehend any abstract idea as from any other cause. Dissection was a thing easily admissible to his mind through the medium of his eyes; but future existence and future remorse could find no tangible form. Even on the morning of execution, he was awaked at half-past six, but immediately fell asleep again, and seemed totally unable to go a step beyond what was before his eyes.

There are other points of Pallet's character about which it would have been desirable to have had information; but I have made use of all that could be obtained from the newspapers of the day. His Adhesiveness and Philoprogenitiveness are large; but their manifestations are not mentioned. It is said, however, that his brother and five young men, all relations of his own, appeared early in the morning at the place of execution, and wept most bitterly, uttering convulsive sobs, and in an agony of distress. As it rarely happens that great attachment is felt without being repaid, we may perhaps be allowed to infer, that even Pallet, violent, brutal, and selfish as he unquestionably was, was not altogether destitute of some of the more social affections. His utter destitution of intellectual power unfortunately rendered him too much the slave of his propensities to admit of his exhibiting more frequently even the small portion of good feeling which he possessed. But so far as our information extends, the development and manifestations, as every Phrenologist would have expected,

harmonize in every point. The Society is now in possession of so many casts and reports on criminals, as to render it quite unnecessary to bring forward any more as *proofs of the truth of Phrenology*; but every new case is interesting in another view, as it tends to throw additional light upon the causes that lead to the commission of crime, and points out the best means of arriving at its prevention and cure. Indeed, it is only the prospect of this ultimate good which can compensate for the painful feeling which the near contemplation of such cases raises in the mind.

ARTICLE V.

MASTER JAMES HUBARD.

THE subject of this notice is a native of Shropshire, aged 14. He is now well known in Edinburgh for the talent which shall afterwards be described; but in January, 1824, and before coming here, he had exhibited publicly in Glasgow, and had excited some controversy betwixt the Phrenologists and Anti-phrenologists of that city. Mr W. Bewick was in Glasgow at the same time, exhibiting his copy of Mr Haydon's *Lazarus*, and some other historical pictures; and being aware that his friend Mr W. Ritchie (3, Hill Square, Edinburgh,) was a Phrenologist, he suggested a plan by which, on Master Hubard's going to Edinburgh, the points in dispute might be put to rest. Accordingly, in February, and before Master Hubard had exhibited in Edinburgh, or was at all known here, Mr James Edmonston of Princes' Street, at Mr Bewick's request, waited on Mr Ritchie, to whom he was unknown, and, without any previous notice, introduced himself and the boy, by a letter from Mr Bewick, which simply mentioned, that a boy would be introduced to him, who was possessed of a *peculiar* talent, and who had

excited controversy in Glasgow, as to whether the development of his brain corresponded with the manifestations of his faculties. Mr Ritchie stated, that he had not cultivated the science so arduously as to be able to speak with perfect confidence respecting some of the minute organs; but that he would examine the boy's head, and mention frankly what it indicated. Mr Ritchie then stated, without hesitation, what, according to the development, were the leading talents and propensities of the boy before him, observing that he was gifted especially with those organs which enable one to distinguish himself as an artist. When he had given this opinion, Mr Edmonston expressed a wish, on the part of his Glasgow friends, that the boy, while unknown, should also be seen by Mr G. Combe; and the whole party, without separating, proceeded forthwith to this gentleman's house. There the party remained together in the room they were first shewn into, until Mr Combe was brought to them; and, without any other intimation than that there was a wish to test *Phrenology* by an examination by Phrenologists of the boy's head, and an opinion as to his talents, Mr Combe proceeded to ascertain the development and dictate an opinion. This was all done and certified in presence of Mr Edmonston, and before any of the party left the room. Mr Ritchie, in his examination, did not measure the head, nor note down the development of the several organs; but Mr Edmonston certified that the account of talents and character given by him virtually corresponded exactly with what was dictated separately by Mr Combe, and which was as follows:—

Occipital spine to lower Individuality,	-	7½ inches.
From Concentrativeness to Comparison,	-	5 ⁷ / ₁₆
— hollow of the ear to Occipital spine,	-	3 ⁷ / ₈
— do. do. to lower Individuality,	-	4 ³ / ₈
— do. do. to Firmness,	-	5½
— Destructiveness to Destructiveness across,	-	5 ¹ / ₄
— Secretiveness to Secretiveness,	-	5 ² / ₁₆
— Cautiousness to Cautiousness,	-	5½
— Constructiveness to Constructiveness,	-	4 ³ / ₈
— Ideality to Ideality,	-	5
— <i>Meatus auditorius</i> to Benevolence,	-	5 ³ / ₈

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| 1. Amativeness, large | 19. Individuality, } decidedly large |
| 2. Philoprogenitiveness, do. | 20. Form, |
| 3. Concentrativeness, do. | 21. Size, very large |
| 4. Adhesiveness, do. | 22. Weight, not ascertained |
| 5. Combativeness, do. | 23. Colouring, large |
| 6. Destructiveness, do. | 24. Locality, rather large |
| 7. Constructiveness, rather large | 25. Order, full |
| 8. Acquisitiveness, full | 26. Time, rather full |
| 9. Secretiveness, very large | 27. Number, do. do. |
| 10. Self-esteem, rather large | 28. Tune, do. do. |
| 11. Love of Approbation, large | 29. Language, full |
| 12. Oastiousness, full | 30. Comparison, large |
| 13. Benevolence, rather large | 31. Consality, full |
| 14. Veneration, do. do. | 32. Wit, rather full |
| 15. Hope, moderate | 33. Imitation, large, more on one
side than the other |
| 16. Ideality, full | 34. Wonder, full. |
| 17. Conscientiousness, do. | |
| 18. Firmness, large | |

“ The head is large, and the organs of the propensities are considerably developed, which indicate power. The organs of the faculties which give the social affections are large, so that while there will be the elements of a good hater or a formidable enemy, there will be also the constituent feelings of a warm and excellent friend. The combination of Concentrativeness, Love of Approbation, Conscientiousness, and Intellect generally, will give a philosophic character to the mind, and fit the individual for comprehending and applying principle in all his undertakings. The distinguishing characteristic, however, is his talent for art. The combination of Secretiveness, Form, Size, and Imitation, with Individuality and Comparison, should give him the tact of combining expression of character with great truth and accuracy in the details of his work. At his time of life it is probable that the talent will have shewn itself in cutting or clipping figures of animals, men, &c. Colouring is also fully developed, and he might succeed as a painter; but his power of colouring will not be equal to his power of drawing and giving expression.”

Many of our readers have probably seen Master Hubard, as he has practised his art, in the way of public exhibition, in the principal cities of England and Scotland, and is now, we believe, in Dublin. He clips in paper profile likenesses of those who visit his gallery at the charges of one shilling each for half-lengths, and five shillings for whole-lengths; and the walls of his exhibition-room are hung round with many beautiful specimens of his skill. “ The Western Luminary” gives the following account of him and of some of his productions:—“ Little *Hubard's* talents were

“ discovered at nearly six years of age. He had been with his
 “ parents to the village-church, and was observed to be re-
 “ markably attentive during the service. They were pleased
 “ at such an early appearance of devotion, and, wishing to see it
 “ continued, made no remarks to him respecting it. Great,
 “ however, was their surprise shortly after his return home,
 “ to observe their *pious boy* cutting pictures from a sheet of
 “ blank paper, and how much was that surprise increased,
 “ when they saw the most striking likenesses of their minister,
 “ his pulpit, and his precentor.

“ Nature had so strongly spoken out in this instance, that
 “ she could not be mistaken. His talent was encouraged,
 “ until he arrived at that acmé of perfection in which we now
 “ behold him, and which we shall endeavour to give a more
 “ vivid and detailed view of, by describing the various figures
 “ in the Exhibition Room.

“ *The Duke of York.*—One of the best likenesses of this
 “ princely personage we have ever seen: he is beautifully
 “ bronzed.

“ *Going to the Races.*—A very long picture, with some hun-
 “ dreds of figures. One or two of the sketches conceived with
 “ great fidelity, and executed with great effect. A dandizette
 “ trying to save her bonnet, and a dandy thrown from his
 “ balance, very picturesque. A horse stopping to drink, and
 “ being kindly inclined, giving his rider a drink too, *sans cere-*
 “ *monie*, happily imagined. Bear-dancers, and monkey on
 “ bruin’s back, highly ludicrous.

“ *Children.*—Both very beautiful. The child putting a flower
 “ into a basket, simple and natural. The girl leading a fawn
 “ with a ribband, most playful. The fawn is full of fun, the
 “ child of innocence.

“ *The Glasgow Catholic Chapel.*—This is the most astonish-
 “ ing performance of the whole. Without the least shading,
 “ save the white upon the black, it presents the most beauti-
 “ ful perspective, the most exquisite symmetry, and the most
 “ faithful outline of that fine specimen of modern architec-
 “ ture we ever saw—we could gaze an hour, and yet not be
 “ satiated.”

To convey an idea of Master Hubbard’s rapidity and dex-
 terity of workmanship, we select the following description
 from the letter of a correspondent:—“ I went to Glasgow
 “ one day ignorant of this boy’s existence. It happened that I
 “ had two or three hours to wait there for a gentleman, who
 “ was to return with me to —, and I was really at a loss how
 “ to occupy the time. Accident carried me to Master Hubbard’s
 “ exhibition room, and, I assure you, that, in my life, I never
 “ was so much surprised and pleased with any *exhibition*;
 “ never at least with one of that sort. The boy’s talent is, in

" my humble opinion, truly astonishing. To view it to advantage you should, as I did, see him (to use a happy enough expression of a newspaper writer) despatch 300 victims at an average of 20 seconds each. It was a Saturday, and said to be his last day. Men, women, and children of all sorts and sizes passed in review before the little conjurer, and were committed to paper, with this extraordinary celerity. I took my turn, and was scarcely seated on the stool when I was to be displaced by another. Hubbard asked me, do you choose to have *two or one, sir?* (he cuts the paper double), those who took the two copies, paying an additional sixpence. Now, as to the accuracy of these outlines, I watched him attentively for at least an hour, comparing a multitude of his copies with the originals, and it struck me that many of them were very faithful and spirited likenesses. With others (my own among the number) I was not so well satisfied, but I ascribed their defects to no deficiency of talent in the artist, but to the ridiculous rapidity with which he worked. I resolved, therefore, to try him again in my own person, at a full-length, (the others were busts,) if he would agree to do it. Most willingly, sir, when the crowd is gone, was his answer. When the crowd did go, it was threatening to get dark, and no time was to be lost for *my execution*. I stood on the floor in a fixed and *condemned* attitude. The day being cold, I happened to wear a dress lined and edged with fur, cut in the German or Polish fashion. Such a coat, in short, as I should prefer for a portrait, though certainly I had not put it on for Master Hubbard, but being on, I considered that the unusual shape, the folds, the collar, and edging of fur, presented a very fair trial of his skill. Before letting him begin I took out of my pocket the busts he had done of me an hour before, and said, 'Be so good, Master Hubbard, as to look at these, and see if you are yourself perfectly satisfied with the likeness so far as it goes.' He looked at them for a moment, and replied, 'No, sir, I am *not*; I will make the next much better. I have made the upper-lip too prominent, &c. &c.' Well, in five minutes exactly, my execution was over; the sentence of pillory and dissection with scissors being completed.

" The opinion of every one to whom I shewed it was, that a more spirited and faithful outline in profile could not possibly be made. One person at — said he has caught your very *air*. He had altered the position, and the way in which I held my hat at the moment, which shewed great readiness, as he did not desire me to change my position."

We have heard it observed, that the present exceeded in extravagance all the cases of the Phrenologists; for that here they had found an organ for paper-clipping! This

remark is so truly puerile, that we should not have noticed it, except to say that the talent is by no means rare, in an inferior degree, and that, in the works of Phrenology it is repeatedly mentioned, and ascribed to the faculties which predominate in Master Hubbard. We have met with several instances of it in Edinburgh, and one, in particular, was adverted to in an article on Constructiveness in our last Number. On another occasion, we happened to remark a great development of Constructiveness, Form, and Imitation, in the head of a child of seven years, and asked if he was not fond of drawing or clipping, or cutting figures. His father produced a portfolio of his productions; among which was a regiment of Highlanders, then in town, cut in all the varieties of costume, from the drum-boy to the colonel on horseback. The great source of Hubbard's excellence is the peculiar combination of Form, Size, Individuality, Constructiveness, Secretiveness, Ideality, and Imitation, all well developed. We have seen many instances in which one or two of these organs were larger; but have never met with one in which they were *all so large*. The case confirms strikingly the doctrine long since laid down in the systems of Phrenology, that Secretiveness and Imitation give expression in the fine arts. It is easy to account for the assertions of the opponents in regard to this boy. They look for the "bump," to use their own expression, although they have been told very frequently that it is the *size* of an organ in length and breadth, from the *medulla oblongata*, which indicates the power of the faculty, and that where several contiguous organs are all large, there can be no projecting eminences. Accordingly, in Hubbard, the superciliary ridge projects in an unusual degree over the cheek-bones, and this indicates a great development of the whole organs there situated; but not one of them presents the appearance of a swell. In the next place, Benevolence is large, and Imitation is nearly equal with it, and no bump is found there; but in those

in whom Benevolence is large and Imitation small, there a sloping surface is felt in the situation of the latter organ, instead of a full and flat line as in Hubard.

ARTICLE VI.

ST RONAN'S WELL, by the Author of Waverley, &c. Constable & Co. Edinburgh; and Hurst, Robinson, & Co. London. 1824. 3 vols.

THIS novel is not so interesting as some of the author's other productions. The characters in it are of an inferior species, and the theatre of action is circumscribed and not dignified. Some of the portraits are also mere sketches, destitute of the strong lineaments of individuality, so characteristic of actual existence, and the display of which brings this author, in many of his works, so close up to Shakspeare in originality and vigour of invention. Nevertheless the hand of a mighty master is here distinguishable, and we shall point out a few instances in which it may be forcibly recognised.

The faculties of *Combativeness* and *Destructiveness* have been much derided, but our author appears to have an intuitive perception of the important feature which they constitute in human character, and a truly phrenological knowledge of the effects on the dispositions of their combinations in different degrees of relative strength. *Combativeness* gives courage, and the tendency to oppose or fight; *Destructiveness* produces the disposition to destroy that which we do not like, and displays itself, when not properly directed, in rage and general severity of temper. *Combativeness* large, combined with *Destructiveness* moderate, and *Benevolence* large, would constitute the brave but generous soldier, ready to fight at the call of duty, but

whose arm is instinctively stretched forth to save and to succour the vanquished. Combativeness small, with Destructiveness large, and Benevolence moderate, produce the heartless scoundrel, full of malignity and deadly hate; but deficient in courage to indulge his humour where danger threatens to attend his doing so. This last is the character of Sir Bingo Binks. "As for Sir Bingo," says the author, "he already began to nourish the genuine hatred always entertained by a mean spirit against an antagonist before whom it is conscious of having made a dishonourable retreat. He forgot not the manner, look, and tone, with which Tyrrel had checked his unauthorised intrusion, and though he had sunk beneath it at the moment, the recollection rankled in his heart as an affront to be avenged. As he drank his wine, *courage, the want of which was*, in his more sober moments, *a check upon his bad temper*, began to inflame his malignity, and he ventured, upon several occasions, to shew his spleen, by contradicting Tyrrel more flatly than good manners permitted upon so short an acquaintance and without any provocation. Tyrrel saw his ill-humour, and despised it, as that of an overgrown school-boy, whom it was not worth his while to answer according to his folly." Vol. i. p. 179.

In a subsequent part of the novel, the author represents Sir Bingo as actually sending a challenge to Tyrrel, but he preserves perfect consistency in the motives and manner of doing it. He informs us, that "Though sluggish and inert when called to action, the Baronet was by no means an absolute coward; or, if so, he was of that class which fights when reduced to extremity." It was, accordingly, pure terror of being found "on the road towards the ancient city of Coventry," when Lord Etherington was expected to arrive, that stimulated Sir Bingo to such a hazardous display of prowess. In phrenological language, he was prompted to fight by the Love of Approbation, when he had no relish for the field of honour for its own sake. Such a character is obviously natural, and the motives correctly assigned; but let not the Phrenologists be condemned as seeking back-doors and means of escape, when they state the principle as doctrine, that the same action may proceed from a variety of motives, and hence that a coward may die, even on the field of battle. They appeal to the author of *Waverley*, and to a

greater authority than he, to nature, that this is sound philosophy.

Another objection is frequently started to Phrenology, that Thurtel murdered, and yet possessed a large organ of Benevolence. The answer is, that he possessed also a large organ of Destructiveness, and that the whole faculties of the mind do not come into play in the same circumstances; and hence, that when placed in a situation to call out Destructiveness, this individual manifested it with energy, and when differently situated he might manifest Benevolence with equal vivacity. It would have constituted a real objection if he had murdered from a strong impulse of Destructiveness, and this organ had been found *small*. Dr Thomas Brown illustrates this theory of the successive manifestation of our faculties in a striking manner. It has been objected, says he, to the doctrine of a natural susceptibility of moral emotion, that an individual, in whom, from his general conduct, this sentiment appears to be strong, acts in particular instances as if it had no existence in his mind; which, say the objectors, could not occur if the sentiment were natural, and ever present in the constitution. Dr Brown replies, that men in general indisputably possess the power of telling how many three times three make; and yet place a person in circumstances which excite violent rage or extreme terror, and you may ask him the simplest arithmetical question, and he will be unable to solve it; because his whole soul is engrossed for the time by the overwhelming passion, and his intellect is disturbed and rendered incapable of action: and so also, says he, when anger, revenge, or any other furious impulse, predominates for the time, the individual is as incapable of exercising the moral emotion as he is of solving questions in arithmetic or algebra; but this does not prove that he does not possess and act under it in his cooler moments.

It is interesting to find this view of the human constitution also familiarly represented by our author. Mowbray of St Ronan's is soliciting his sister Clara to lend him a large

portion of her little fortune, which he has destined in his own mind to the gaming table. " 'Alas, Clara,' says he, 'if you would help me you must draw the neck of the goose which lays the golden egg—you must lend me the whole stock.'—'And why not, John, if it will do you a kindness? Are you not my natural guardian? Are you not a kind one? And is not my little fortune entirely at your disposal? You will, I am sure, do all for the best.' "

" 'I fear I may not,' said Mowbray, starting from her, and more distressed by her sudden and unsuspecting compliance, than he would have been by difficulties or remonstrance. In the latter case he would have stifled the pangs of conscience amid the manoeuvres which he must have resorted to for obtaining her acquiescence."—Vol. i. p. 256. This is just saying that her frank offer of the money did away with the excitement of any of the lower faculties, in consequence of which the intellect and higher sentiments were left at liberty coolly to survey and to condemn the action; but that *if Secretiveness and Acquisitiveness, and Self-esteem, and Combativeness, had* been excited by her resistance, the activity of the moral sentiments would have been proportionally diminished, and his conscience would have smitten him less. This scene is beautifully conceived; for Clara's unsuspecting confidence in her brother affords the most direct and powerful appeal to his Conscientiousness which it was possible to make, and it was the more forcible, that this sentiment was taken by surprise at the only point in which it was vulnerable. The excitement which a moment before was confined to those faculties on which he expected her resistance to operate, was now transferred to Conscientiousness, and he was stung with remorse at his success when he only expected a combat to obtain it. The author proceeds, "As matters stood there was all the difference that there is between slaughtering a tame and unresisting animal, and pursuing wild game, until the animation of the sportsman's exertions overcomes the internal sense of his own cruelty. The same idea occurred to Mowbray himself."—Vol. i. p. 256. Here also we have a profound remark thrown out, as is this author's practice, much at random. Place a tame and unresisting animal before the sportsman, and no circumstance is present to excite the destructive propensity, and hence Benevolence acts with the fullest effect.

Let the animal resist, or let it be provided with means of escape, it then rouses Combativeness, Destructiveness, and Love of Approbation, and calls forth a vigorous display of skill and dexterity in overcoming it; and this "animation" overpowers for the time the dictates of Benevolence. This passage too contains a clear admission of the co-existence of Destructiveness and Benevolence in the same mind; and it is surprising that even the shallow critics who write Balaam for the common periodicals should fail to see that it is in perfect accordance with human nature.

In the following sentence we have an excellent description of the talent produced by a great development of Individuality and the other Knowing organs, combined with a moderate endowment of those of the Reflecting powers. "Touchwood, in particular, was loud in his approbation, from which the correctness of the costume must be inferred; for that honest gentleman, like many other critics, was indeed not very much distinguished for good taste, but had a capital memory for petty matters of fact; and while the most impressive look or gesture of an actor might have failed to interest him, would have censured most severely the fashion of a sleeve or the colour of a shoe-tie."—Vol. ii. pp. 187-8. This last remark is also eminently in harmony with the character assigned to Touchwood. Secretiveness is known to contribute largely to the talent of penetrating into the mental constitution of others, and understanding "the impressive look or gesture of an actor." Touchwood is drawn with a deficient Secretiveness in his conduct, is made to display almost a total want of the tact which it, joined with other powers, confers; and hence also arises his insensibility to the essential excellencies of acting, while by means of Individuality he would be a critic in the fashion of a sleeve. His character is subsequently unfolded with great judgment and vigour of conception. We have adverted to his intellect; his sentiments are described as follows: "Being in fact as good-natured a man as any in the world, Mr Touchwood was at the same time one of the most conceited, and was very apt to suppose that his presence, advice, and assistance, were of the most indispensable consequence to those with whom he lived; and that not only on great emergencies, but even in the most ordinary occurrences of life."—Vol. ii. p. 196. This indicates

Benevolence and Self-esteem both large, with moderate reflecting faculties. In perfect conformity with this endowment, Touchwood is represented throughout as attentive in a remarkable degree to his personal comforts and enjoyments, the result of large Self-esteem; as, at the same time, kind in his dissensions, arising from Benevolence, but officious and self-important in his manner of shewing it, the consequence of Self-esteem, and also as moderately endowed with reflection; for his schemes miscarry from a mere overweening conceit of his own abilities, accompanied with little actual foresight and penetration.

Lord Etherington is, we believe, a fair representation of a young nobleman, possessed of a certain combination of faculties, let loose upon the world with a large fortune. His character, when analyzed phrenologically, presents the following elements:—Amativeness, Combativeness, Destructiveness, Secretiveness, Self-esteem, and Love of Approbation, all large; Adhesiveness, Acquisitiveness, Cautiousness, Benevolence, and the reflecting organs, full; Ideality, Hope, and the knowing organs, large; while Conscientiousness, and probably Veneration, are decidedly deficient. An individual with such a combination, virtuously educated and placed in the middle rank of life among persons in whose creed morality and the point of honour coincide, might pass through life creditably and usefully, guided by large Love of Approbation, and full Benevolence and intellect, without any glaring deficiencies being discovered in his moral perceptions. Left, however, to act on the spontaneous suggestions of his own faculties, and to form a creed and code of honour for himself, or to adopt those which harmonize with his natural feelings, possessed also of wealth sufficient to command the gratifications which he denied, and to enable him to set at defiance the criticisms which condemned the manner of his indulgences, he could scarcely fail to turn out exactly what Lord Etherington is represented to be in the novel before us. The deficiency of Conscientiousness would render his own mind a stranger to genuine sentiments

of rectitude, justice, and honour, while his large Self-esteem and deficient Veneration would prompt him to set at nought all maxims of conduct dictated by others, in so far as they did not coincide with his own perceptions of excellence. His own theory of life, springing as it were indigenously from the combination of faculties supposed, would be, that man was born to enjoy life, and that enjoyment consisted in the gratification of as many of his desires as possible; that the doctrine which teaches self-denial and restraint, for the sake of the happiness of others as well as of our own, is fudge, got up to gull the million, but too flimsy to deceive a person of his taste and penetration. This is the natural language, in short, of strong animal and selfish propensities when not counterbalanced by equally vigorous moral emotions. Accordingly, Amativeness, acting along with Secretiveness, and uncontrolled by Conscientiousness, would prompt to seduction, and to the practice without remorse of every species of deceit to accomplish it. Self-esteem is pleased with success in such pursuits, and associates, possessing a similar combination, approve of and praise them, and this gratifies Love of Approbation. Self-esteem, Acquisitiveness, and Hope, lead to gaming, another species of selfish indulgence; Adhesiveness and a full Benevolence prompt to a liking for associates of similar dispositions, and this affection of companionship is dignified with the name of friendship. Benevolence and Love of Approbation *may* prompt even to pecuniary sacrifices for such friends; but still the end would be selfish; he that is obliged must render good service in return. At the same time there is no morality in the union; on the contrary, selfishness is the undisguised principle of action in all such characters, and while they appear to live as friends, they have the fear of sword and pistol constantly before their eyes. This destitution of real worth, with much Love of Approbation, renders them touchy on the point of honour; and whereas a well-constituted mind would avert reproach by rectitude of conduct, they call in the aid of Combativeness and Destructiveness,

and impose silence by threatening to shoot the man who dares to call their actions by their right names. Secretiveness, the knowing organs, Love of Approbation, and Ideality, all large, produce that ease, elegance, and appearance of refinement by which such persons impose upon the superficial. Secretiveness is an essential ingredient in their composition. It contributes largely to that knowing tact which they imagine themselves to possess of concealing themselves and deciphering others; combined with Firmness and Self-esteem large, it produces that power of exhibiting in public an exterior expressive only of indifference, whatever emotions may harrow up the mind. Combined with deficient Conscientiousness, it renders all those little equivocations, false assurances, and promises, made only to be broken, which distinguish the fashionable of easy practice. At the same time, Love of Approbation fixes a limit to this unprincipled but disguised baseness; it permits the individual to go just as far as the manners and maxims of his class will permit, and arrests him on the verge of every offence which would be visited by loss of caste.

Our object in this long analysis is to remark, that such conduct and qualifications are displays of great natural mental defects; that they bespeak extreme poverty in Conscientiousness, one of the noblest sentiments of our nature, and indicate a close resemblance in natural constitution between the persons we have described, and criminals in lower life who perish on the scaffold. Instead of their system of selfishness, and deceit, and animal indulgence, being the emanation of an intellect more profound and knowing than that which admires the purer and nobler code of honesty, it is exactly the reverse; for while the latter results from the activity of *all* the faculties in the highest degree of energy and enlightenment, the former is the offspring of deficient faculties, and an intellect blind to the constitution of the moral world. When Phrenology is thoroughly known, a man will no more be proud of exhibiting his mental weaknesses than he is at present of showing

off a crook in his leg or a hump upon his back. Etherington, however, is the representative only of the class of fashionables which may be denominated blackguard. True elegance and refinement of manners, the characteristics of nature's nobility, proceed from a predominant endowment of the higher sentiments and intellect, and when this combination occurs, the individual, if properly educated, will surpass the flash pretenders to breeding as much in grace as in morality and honour.

Tyrrel, speaking of Etherington's fraudulent marriage with Clara Mowbray, says,—“ Had there been passion in his conduct, it had been the act of a man, a wicked man indeed, but still a human creature, acting under the influence of human passions; but his was the deed of a calm, cold, calculating demon, actuated by the basest and most sordid motives of Self-interest, joined, as I firmly believe, to an early and inveterate hatred of one whose claims he considered as at variance with his own”^a This description is given by an exasperated opponent; but it is fundamentally in accordance with the author's portrait of his lordship. Nevertheless, the author afterwards observes, that “ whatever were Etherington's faults, he did not want *charity*, so far as it consists in giving alms.” This, in phrenological language, is saying, that, with all his unprincipled Selfishness, Benevolence was not wanting in his mind; and that when it could be indulged without sacrifice of his other and more predominating feelings, he was not averse to its exercise. This representation is perfectly consistent with nature; and although the Phrenologists would not have been permitted by their sapient opponents to say so on the authority of their science, it may perhaps be allowed to pass without severe censure, when found in the pages of the Great Unknown. The key to the character is, that Benevolence was not deficient; but that Selfishness was a far more powerful feeling, and that there was not sufficient moral principle to repress the latter and enforce the dictates of the former as a matter of duty and obedience.

Etherington, in his correspondence, exerts all his Secre-

^a Vol. III. p. 60.

tiveness to conceal his real feelings towards Tyrrel; yet the latter tells him, "I detect your hatred to this man *in every line of your letter*; even when you write with the greatest coolness; even where there is an affectation of gayety, I read your sentiments on this subject, and they are such as,—I will not preach to you,—I will not say a good man,—but such as every wise man,—every man who wishes to live on fair terms with the world, and to escape general malediction, and perhaps a violent death, where all men will clap their hands and rejoice at the punishment of the patricide, would, with all possible speed, eradicate from his breast."*

We notice this passage to remark, that it forms an answer to the superficial objection often stated against our science, that the genuine sentiments of the mind cannot be discovered, and of course cannot be compared with the development of the brain. Where the feelings act with energy, and the observer possesses Concentrativeness, Secretiveness, Imitation, Individuality, and Causality large, a combination which gives tact for appreciating character, the deepest disguise will prove thin as the airy cobweb, and the workings of the mind will stand revealed to his intellect in perfect transparency. This combination, no doubt, is denied to many; and then only *actions* are perceived. Such persons see with their *eyes*, but not with their understandings; and as *motives* have neither form, magnitude, nor colour, they are withdrawn from their observation, and when spoken of by others, appear as pure fictions of the imagination. These objectors, like many other opponents of newly-discovered truths, claim the merit of exercising a spirit of philosophic hesitation, when in fact they merely display intellectual deficiencies.

"I know not, says Etherington, *whether such doubts are natural to all who have secret measures to pursue, or whether nature has given me an unusual share of anxious suspicion*; but I cannot divest myself of the idea, that I am closely watched by some one whom I cannot discover." This is the natural language of Secretiveness and Cautiousness, when the mind is conscious of a wicked purpose.

"A shy cock this Frank Tyrrel," thought Touchwood; "a very complete dodger! But no matter, I shall wind him, were

“ he to double like a fox. *I am resolved to make his matters my own ; and if I cannot carry him through, I know not who can.*” We have already remarked, that Self-esteem is a leading feature of Touchwood’s character ; and this passage contains a forcible representation of the manner of feeling produced by the faculty. The first person is ever on the tongue, as it is always in the thoughts of him in whom this is a predominating organ.

When any faculty is vehemently active, it fills the mind with desires corresponding to its nature, and prompts to conduct calculated to afford it gratification. “ Fool,” said Mowbray to his sister, “ let me go ! Who cares for thy worthless life ? Who cares if thou live or die ? Live if thou can’st, and be the hate and scorn of every one else as much as thou art mine.”

“ He grasped her by the shoulder, with one hand pushed her from him ; and as she rose from the floor, and again pressed to throw her arms around his neck, he repulsed her with his arm and hand, with a push or blow, it might be termed either one or the other,—violent enough, in her weak state, to have again extended her on the ground, had not a chair received her as she fell. *He looked at her with ferocity, grappled a moment in his pocket ; then ran to the window, and throwing the sash violently up, thrust himself as far as he could, without falling, into the open air.* Terrified, and yet her feelings of his unkindness predominating even above her fears, Clara continued to exclaim, Oh, brother, say you did not mean this ! —Oh, say you did not mean to strike me !—Oh, whatever I have deserved, be not you the executioner !—It is not manly, —it is not natural,—there are but two of us in the world.”

“ She fearfully, yet firmly, seized the skirt of his coat, as if anxious to preserve him from the effects of that despair which so lately seemed turned against her, and now against himself.

“ He felt the pressure of her hand, and drawing himself angrily back, asked her sternly what she wanted.

“ ‘ Nothing,’ she said, quitting her hold of his coat ; ‘ but what—what did he look after so anxiously ?’

“ ‘ After the devil !’ he answered, fiercely ; then drawing in his head and taking her hand, ‘ By my soul, Clara, it is true, if ever there was truth in such a tale ! He stood by me just now, and urged me to murder thee ! *What else could have put my hunting knife into my thought ? Ay, by God, and into my very hand, at such a moment ?* Yonder, I could almost fancy I see him fly the wood, the rock, and the water, gleaming back the dark-red furnace-light, that is shed on them by his dragon-wings !—By my soul, I can hardly suppose it fancy !

“ I can hardly think but that *I was under the influence of an evil spirit, under an act of fiendish possession!* But gone as he is, gone let him be; and thou, too ready implement of evil, be thou gone after him!” He drew from his pocket his right hand, which had all this time held his hunting-knife, and threw the implement into the court-yard as he spoke; then with a mournful quietness and solemnity of manner, shut the window, and led his sister by the hand to her usual seat, which her tottering steps scarce enabled her to reach.”

The conflict betwixt Destructiveness, on the one hand, and Benevolence and Cautiousness on the other, is here fearfully depicted. This bearing in, as the old writers termed it, of wicked purposes on the mind, attended with Consciousness, at the same time, of their horrible atrocity, is in exact correspondence with the doctrine of a plurality of higher and lower powers, each performing its own functions in connexion with, but to a certain extent independent of the others.

The following passage is strongly descriptive of great and overwhelming natural energy in the lower propensities, and of a fearful deficiency in the moral powers. The early companion of Clara Mowbray, who had aided Etherington in the deception practised upon her in the marriage, proceeds:—

“ They say every woman that yields, makes herself a slave to her seducer; but I sold my liberty not to a man, but a demon! He made me serve him in his vile schemes against my friend and patroness;—and oh! he found in me an agent too willing, from mere envy, to destroy the virtue which I had lost myself. Do not listen to me any more. Go and leave me to my fate; I am the most detestable wretch that ever lived,—detestable to myself, worst of all, because even in my penitence there is a secret whisper that tells me, that were I as I have been, I would again act over all the wickedness I have done, and much worse. Oh! for Heaven’s assistance to crush the wicked thought!”

At the very point of death she repeats the same sentiment,—“ Do not despair,” said Cargill, “ Grace is omnipotent,—to doubt this is in itself a great crime.”

“ Be it so!—I cannot help it,—my heart is hardened, Mr Cargill; and there is something here,” she pressed her bosom, “ which tells me, that with prolonged life and renewed health, even my present agonies would be forgotten, and I should become the same I have been before.”* Either this is out of

* Vol. III. p. 290.

nature, or the Phrenologists are correct in saying, that the most depraved of human beings cannot be changed into the most amiable and virtuous, even by the terrors of death itself. This character is a shade darker than that of Etherington. The animal propensities are a degree more vigorous, and the controlling powers one degree more feeble.

Mowbray, after ruining his fortune by gambling, and shooting Lord Etherington in a duel, procures a commission, and serves as an officer in Spain. "Nothing," says the author, "could be more strikingly different than was the conduct of the young Laird of St Ronan's, and of Lieutenant Mowbray. The former, as we know, was gay, venturous, and prodigal; the latter lived on his pay, and even within it, denied himself comforts, and often decencies, when doing so, could save a guinea; and turned pale with apprehension, if on any extraordinary occasion, he ventured sixpence to a corner at whist. This meanness or closeness of disposition prevents his holding the high character to which his bravery and attention to his regimental duties might otherwise entitle him. The same close and accurate calculation of pounds, shillings, and pence, marked his communications with his agent Michel-wham, who might otherwise have had better pickings out of the estate of St Ronan's, which is now at nurse, and thriving full fast; especially since some debts of rather an usurious character have been paid up by M. Touchwood, who contented himself with more moderate usage.

"On the subject of this property, Mr Mowbray, generally speaking, gave such minute directions for acquiring and saving, that his old acquaintance, Mr Winterblossom, tapping his morocco snuff-box, with the sly look which intimated the coming of a good thing, was wont to say, that he had reversed the usual order of transformation, and was turned into a grub, after having been a butterfly." This change of character, if it had occurred in real life, would have been cited as an admirable refutation of our science; but the author solves the difficulty, and on the most correct phrenological principles, in the following words:—"After all, this narrowness, though a more ordinary modification of the spirit of avarice, may be founded on the same desire of acquisition, which, in his earlier days, sent him to the gaming table." We thank the author for his powerful aid in the cause of Phrenology, by favouring us with such illustrations; and we forgive the scorn which he displays for its doctrine, knowing that only ignorance of its nature could prompt him to view it with disrespect.

ARTICLE VII.

FLOURENS ON THE NERVOUS SYSTEM.

ABOUT two years ago Monsieur Flourens, a young French physician and physiologist, laid before the French Institute an account of an "Inquiry into the Properties and Functions of the Nervous System" in which he had been engaged, and in the course of which he had performed a great variety of experiments and mutilations on the nerves, brains, and spinal marrows of the lower animals. The results which he obtained from these seemed to him to establish, *1st*, That "the nerves, spinal cord, medulla oblongata, and corpora "quadrigemina," are the only parts of the nervous system possessing *Irritability*, or "the property of provoking sensation and motion without experiencing them;" *2d*, That the cerebral lobes or hemispheres are the seat of sensation and volition; and, *3d*, That the cerebellum is the *regulator of motion*.

In proof of the first he states, that when the nerves, spinal marrow, medulla oblongata, and corpora quadrigemina, are pricked, cut, or otherwise stimulated, *pain* and muscular contractions are instantly excited; but that the brain proper and cerebellum, are quite insensible, and may be cut, squeezed, or injured, without causing either pain or muscular contraction. The limit between the *irritable* and *non-irritable* parts is not yet precisely defined, but it seems to be about the posterior part of the optic thalami.

In proof of the cerebral lobes being the seat of sensation, perception, and volition, Flourens states, that when these are removed in any animal, it loses at once the senses of hearing and of sight, while the cerebellum alone may be removed without injury to either. Taste and smell, according to Flourens, also disappear, but it is more difficult to determine their presence or absence. On removal of both hemispheres, *the will no longer operates*, and stupor, not unlike

profound sleep, is induced. The animal "remains calm, and as if abstracted," does not move of its own accord, and when it encounters an obstacle, strikes against it again and again, without trying to avoid it. It preserves its equilibrium, and struggles if held, swallows water dropped into its mouth, walks when pushed, and flies when thrown into the air. The French commissioners, before whom Flourens repeated his experiments, are of opinion that the inferences which he draws from them are not sufficiently limited and precise. Cuvier, who drew up their report, remarks, in alluding to the alleged absence of sensation, that "it is difficult to believe that all these actions are accomplished without being provoked by some sensation. It is true, they are not the result of *reason*. The animal escapes without an object; he has no memory, and strikes repeatedly against the same obstacle; but this at most proves only that such an animal is, to use Flourens' own expression, in a state of sleep. He acts like a man asleep. But we cannot believe that a man, who in sleeping accommodates and changes his position, is altogether without sensation, merely because he has no recollection of having had any; therefore," continues Cuvier, "we would confine ourselves to saying that these lobes are the only receptacle where the sensations of sight and hearing can be perfected and become perceptible to the animal; and if we wished to add to this, we would say that it is there also where all sensations take a distinct form and leave traces and lasting recollections; that they are, in one word, the seat of memory, a property by which they furnish the animal with the materials of judgment. This conclusion," he adds, "becomes the more probable, that, besides its being supported by the structure of these lobes, and their connexion with the rest of the system, comparative anatomy affords another confirmation of its truth, in the constant relation which the size of these lobes bears to the intelligence of the animal."*

In support of the third point, or that which regards the cerebellum as the "regulator of motion," Flourens states such observations as the following. On removing the first layers of the cerebellum in the pigeon or guinea-pig for instance, weakness and hesitation in walking are produced. When the middle layers are cut out, the animal staggers

* *Revue Encyclopedique* for July 1822.

much, but hears and sees perfectly, and does not express pain. When the whole cerebellum is removed, an inability to fly, walk, or run, takes place, and the animal lies down. Whence he infers that the cerebellum is the organ by which all the locomotive actions are regulated.

The peculiar nature and results of these experiments, which are really interesting, in so far as the mere *qualities* or *properties* of the different kinds of nervous matter are concerned, have, we conceive, led to very exaggerated expectations, of what may be ultimately accomplished by following out this mode of inquiry in our attempts to ascertain the functions performed by different portions of the brain. The sympathies between the different parts of the nervous system are so numerous and so intricate, that it is often impossible to determine between the effects which are the necessary consequences of a particular injury, and those which result from sympathy. If we add to these the difficulties arising from the impossibility of deciding how much of the effect is attributable to the shock given to the whole animal system by the very severe wounds of other parts, and how much is due to the mutilation of the brain itself, our hopes of success will be very moderate. And while we know so little of the functions of the primitive mental faculties, as still to be disputing about their *number* and *nature*, it seems to us little short of absurd to expect to discover *which of them* has disappeared. But in thus plainly stating our opinion, we must be allowed to observe, that we are not in any degree biassed by the fear of any *facts* being brought to light which shall be found at variance with the *facts* obtained by the phrenological mode of investigation. Nature is ever the same, and we know too well how beautifully every truth harmonises with all other truths, to fear any such thing. Flourens' *opinions* may be at variance with Dr Gall's *opinions*, but the *facts* of both must ever be consistent.

Of the three propositions which Flourens attempts to establish, the two first rest upon a much firmer foundation

than the last, and they are so much in harmony with previously known *facts*, and with many of the observations of the phrenologists, that we should have satisfied ourselves with a bare statement of them, and left them to be decided by further observation, had we not, to our surprise, seen them held out, by a writer in a very respectable medical journal, as utterly subversive of our science. This circumstance alone obliges us to enter into them with more detail than we would otherwise have thought necessary.

"Dr Gall," says the journalist, "*incensed to find his organs of Love, Philoprogenitiveness, and many other propensities and noble faculties, all snatched from his hands to make up one poor paltry machine, for regulating the baser bodily motions, and another equally contemptible for conveying to the mind the impressions of sense, has vehemently resisted such an appropriation, and endeavoured to obstruct his adversaries' progress.*" After stating that Dr Gall repeated Flourens' experiments on the cerebellum, and obtained from them different results, it is added, that "he, Dr G., should not venture to uphold his few, meagre, imperfect, and most prejudiced experiments, before the careful and varied researches of Flourens and Rondo, and still more the deliberate approval of the illustrious Cuvier, and his no less distinguished coadjutors;" and the journalist thinks "it is no small proof of Flourens' accuracy, that so acute and captious a controversialist as Dr Gall has been reduced to such sorry subterfuges;" and that Gall's objections "are very odd ones, for such a fanciful and reckless theorist."*

This is mere critical slang, written in ignorance and read with prejudice, because it is the fashion to abuse Dr Gall. No observer was ever more grossly misrepresented. The experiments performed, and the facts observed and collected by him from other authors, in regard to the single organ of Amativeness, occupying 190 pages of his octavo work; and we fearlessly maintain that a more philosophical induction and irresistible demonstration were never offered to the consideration of Physiologists. The peculiar nature of the subject alone prevents us laying these details before our readers. The gentlemen of the old school do not choose to read Dr Gall, while they very unceremoniously as-

* Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal for January 1824.

sume the privilege of criticising him according to their own fancies. It will be our duty to expose such conduct. The anti-phrenological zeal, not to say prejudice, of this opponent, had undoubtedly blunted the usual acuteness of his intellectual perceptions before he penned the preceding sentences. Flourens' first proposition of the "*irritability*" of the nerves, spinal cord, &c. and of the *non-irritability* and absence of pain in injuries of the cerebral hemispheres, is not only in perfect harmony with all the phrenological doctrines, but long before Flourens appeared, we had more than once heard Dr Spurzheim insist on the importance of attending to the insensibility of the cerebral substance, as from the absence of pain, it was often suffering from disease, where, even although its mental functions were clearly deranged, no such thing was suspected; and in his very valuable work on Insanity, this circumstance is assigned as one of the causes which have given rise to so much misconception as to the real seat of that disease. A single quotation, which now presents itself on opening the book, will show this:—"The hypersthenical state of the brain," says Dr Spurzheim, "*is often without pain, which easily leads the physician into error, when he forgets that the brain is insensible, and differs in this respect from the nerves of the body. They ought, however, to know, that fear, fury, contempt, and other disagreeable affections, are to the brain what pain is to the nerves.*"* But farther, the mere fact of the brain being *irritable, or not irritable*, throws no light upon the nature of the functions which it performs. When we merely know, for instance, that a muscle, when cut or injured, does or does not feel pain, we are still very far from knowing what function it performs. In the same way, when we wish to discover the functions of the brain, it is no very great step merely to know that it may be cut without causing pain; for this fact of itself can furnish no argument either for or against any theory of its functions which may be afterwards brought forward. Neither is the Journalist more happy in his witty description of the snatching from Dr Gall's hands

* Spurzheim, sur la folle, p. 316.

of the organs of Philoprogenitiveness, and many other propensities and noble faculties, to make up a "contemptible" machine for conveying to the mind the impressions of "sense." For be it observed, that in removing the whole hemispheres of the brain, we necessarily remove the organs of *all* the "propensities and noble faculties," with the exception of Amativeness, and the result is said by Flourens to be the loss of hearing, sight, taste, and smell, and also of the *will*. The animal no longer moves of its own accord, and it runs its head against obstacles again and again. To the phrenologist, who believes from observation, that the organs of the knowing faculties, or those which *perceive the presence of external objects*, and those of all the propensities, and among others, of Cautiousness, which leads to the avoiding of pain or danger; are situated in different parts of the hemispheres, it seems a very obvious and natural result, that upon their removal the animal should have so weak a perception of the qualities of surrounding objects, and should feel so little of the sentiment of Cautiousness, as first to run its head against an obstacle, as if it did not see it, and then to strike it again and again, as if it neither felt its presence, nor any desire to avoid it. To the phrenologist it seems equally natural, that, when the organs of Constructiveness are thus destroyed and removed, the animal should manifest so little inclination for construction, as not to build a nest, or dig a hole in the ground. Our opponent, however, takes another view of the matter, and infers, from the animal not manifesting intellect, Cautiousness, or Constructiveness, *after the organs of these faculties are destroyed*, that the whole hemisphere (including these organs) can be nothing more than a *contemptible machine*, for conveying to the mind the impressions of sense, and that they can have nothing to do with the functions which the phrenologists have ascertained to belong to them; and he infers from the function disappearing with the organ, that the latter cannot possibly be the instrument of the former! The phrenologists, on the other hand, sup-

pose, that the *simultaneous* disappearance of an organ and faculty, if it does not establish, is *at least consistent with*, the idea of their being connected with each other. Nay, they even go farther, and say, that if a function remains active after an organ is destroyed, the two *cannot* be dependent on each other. As, therefore, notwithstanding all our endeavours, we can really see nothing in Flourens' two first propositions which is at variance with our previous belief, we pass on to

The third proposition, or that which regards the cerebellum as the regulator of motion. It is stated that Dr Gall repeated these experiments, but with different results; but he, we are told, is not to be listened to, for reasons already mentioned; let us ask Cuvier and his illustrious associates, continues the journalist, whether the organ of Amativeness has not been snatched from Gall's unwilling hand? We shall call upon these gentlemen by-and-bye, but as a matter of courtesy, we are willing to begin with the journalist himself. In a kind of summing up, in which he had his eye fixed, not upon Dr Gall, but upon the question itself, this gentleman justly observes, "that on a subject of so much nicety and intricacy, the medical world will naturally receive, not *without much wariness and hesitation*, doctrines *so precise, so important, and so unexpected*;" and in another place, he speaks of the difficulty of determining by what causes the phenomena are actually produced, as the sympathetic connexion of the several parts of the nervous system is so close and intricate, that one part cannot be injured without a shock being communicated to the rest. Next, turning to Cuvier, we find his "deliberate approval" to be as follows: after stating that he recollects no other physiologist who has made known any such results as those already mentioned, he continues: "The experiments upon the cerebella of quadrupeds, and especially of adults, are very difficult, on account of *the thick osseous parts which must be removed, and the great vessels which must be opened. Besides, most experimenters operated according to some previous theory, and saw a little too clearly what they wished to see; and certainly no one before this ever thought of the cerebellum being the regulator of motion. This discovery, if experiments*

"repeated with every possible precaution, prove its reality, will do great honour to the young observer whose labours we are analysing." But as this deliberat  approval still leaves the matter in doubt, let us inquire at another eminent physiologist, who has repeated the experiment with every possible precaution, viz. Majendie. In his Journal de Physiologie, he first notices the extreme difficulty of making a conclusive experiment on the cerebellum, and then remarks, that he could only observe that severe injury of that organ took away the power of advancing, and excited a constant tendency to walk, run, or swim backwards. But if this result is sufficient to entitle us to erect the cerebellum into a regulator of motion, then must we erect the thalami optici and corpora striata into assistant regulators; for, in a subsequent number of his journal, Majendie states, that a particular lesion of these bodies produces an irresistible tendency to run forwards. In short, for any thing yet published to the contrary, the function which the phrenologists ascribe to the cerebellum stands as firm and unshaken as ever. In common with other observers, we are perfectly aware how much the energy and activity of the propensity of Amativeness influences the development of the muscular system; but, in the first place, it is a very different thing to say, that one circumstance is the cause of, and to say, that it has an effect upon, another; and, in the second place, we know that the other systems participate in this influence almost, if not altogether, as much as the muscular. In the cases of castrati, the osseous, nervous, and vascular systems, sustain as great a check, and remain as feebly developed as the muscles. It is no proof, therefore, of the cerebellum being the regulator of motion, and not the organ of Amativeness, to say, that when it is injured, muscular weakness is induced, and that, too, in the midst of the pain, violence, and disturbance caused by the infliction of serious and deadly wounds. We suspect that it will be long before such a mode of proceeding will supply any evidence calculated to weigh at all against the innumerable facts observed by the phrenologists, under all the disadvantages which they possess. The organ in question is one

of large size and easily observed. Its function does not manifest itself with vigour till puberty, when the organ visibly increases in size. Its diseases and wounds produce symptoms precisely such as we should expect from the function assigned to it, while muscular motion remains undisturbed; and it is impossible, in the face of such evidence, to believe it to be any thing else than the organ of Amativeness.

ARTICLE VIII.

PHRENOLOGY AND MR OWEN.

OUR readers will recollect, that in our last Number we laid before them an Analysis of Mr Owen's New Views of Society, in which we endeavoured to point out in what respects they were consistent with, and in what they differed from the views of human nature afforded by Phrenology. In preparing that analysis, every precaution that could be thought of was taken to ensure a fair and accurate statement of the nature of Mr Owen's doctrines. With this view, as stated at p. 218, the manuscript was submitted to the revision of one of Mr Owen's most intelligent and most devoted disciples, who was requested to make corrections in the shape of notes, wherever an erroneous statement was to be found. After this request was obligingly complied with, the paper was read to the Phrenological Society in the presence of that gentleman and several other Owenites. The corrective notes were read along with the text, and all present were requested to make any observations that occurred to them, but nothing was said. After being printed, a *proof* was sent to the same gentleman, and at his suggestion some slight alterations were again made; and, last of all, the three concluding pages were sent in proof to Mr Owen himself, and his notes to them were also added. The author of the article had previously perused with attention Mr Owen's printed works; he had heard that

gentleman publicly expound his system, and he had frequently conversed with him in private on the subject, and therefore, when he gave a plain statement of his impressions of what the new views really were, derived from such authentic sources, and corrected with so much care, and even scrupulosity, it will easily be credited that he did not contemplate the possibility of their JUSTLY giving rise to such a manifesto on the part of Mr Owen as the following, inserted in the Edinburgh Advertiser of 2d March, 1824, and in most of the newspapers about that time.

To the EDITOR of the ADVERTISER.

“SIR,—I have just received the second Number of the Phrenological Journal, in which is given what is called ‘A Phrenological Analysis of Mr Owen’s New Views of Society.’

“Where the writer of that article found this new view of society I know not; certainly not in any of my writings; for in its most essential principles and practical details it bears no resemblance whatever to the plan which I recommend.

“And I solemnly protest against such a *compound of folly, absurdity, and immorality, being given to the world for a system, the sole object of which is to improve the moral and intellectual powers, and to increase the happiness of man; not by these wild and imaginary flights of fancy, but by well-devised, judicious, practical measures, founded on a correct knowledge of the nature of man, and upon the experience of his past history.*

(Signed)

“ROBERT OWEN.

“*New Lanark, 26th February, 1824.*”

Now we cannot help thinking that Mr Owen has been rather hasty in criticising in such terms what was *honestly* meant as a fair *exposé* of his peculiar views. For, in the *first* place, this “*compound of folly, absurdity, and immorality.*” is *so very like* what his own writings and conversation would lead us to believe his system to be, that his very intelligent disciple, who had actually published on the subject, and who was supposed to be intimately acquainted with the new views, clearly conceived them to be fairly stated in the *text as corrected by his notes.* If therefore Mr Owen’s views are of so obscure a nature as to admit of a “*compound of folly, immorality, and absurdity*” being substituted in their place, without his own followers being able to perceive the

change, he ought to be very gentle in his reproaches to men of *old* society, when they fail to apprehend his meaning.

In the *second* place. If Mr Owen had delayed bestowing on us such a wholesale condemnation, until he had told in what points the representation of his views is erroneous, his denunciation would have been much more effectual and philosophical. Indeed, so far as we have been able to learn, (and we have it from pretty good authority,) his objections extend only or chiefly to two statements, one regarding the indulgence of the sexual propensity, and the other regarding the existence of an intelligent First Cause, on neither of which, he says, has he ever fully explained himself. But even granting that our statements on these points do not contain Mr Owen's ideas, it must be observed, that this does not in any degree weaken our argument; for his opinions on these topics form a mere fractional part of his system, or rather they form no part of it at all, as they have no necessary connexion with his principles. Indeed, the very circumstance of his never having explained himself on them, while he has been so long and so zealously disseminating all his other views, affords a demonstrative proof of the justice of this inference.

Mr Owen, therefore, in inviting us to publish a contradiction of our statements in regard to the New Views, *without previously convincing us by evidence* that we have really misapprehended and misrepresented him, seems to forget an important tenet in his own creed, viz. that OUR BELIEF IS NOT IN OUR OWN POWER, and that, constituted as we are, we must yield faith to the *stronger* evidence; and as all that evidence forces us to believe that we have not done Mr Owen injustice, we cannot recant until he operate a change in our perceptions. To give him, however, every facility of doing so, we offered to insert a short refutation from himself if he chose to take up, and confine himself to our facts and arguments. To this proposal he has agreed; but we suppose, from the pressure of other avocations, he has not yet found time to favour us with any remarks. In

the meantime, justice to ourselves demanded that we should take some notice of his widely-circulated letter.

ARTICLE X.

PHRENOLOGICAL EXPLANATION OF THE VOCAL ILLUSIONS COMMONLY CALLED VENTRILQUIZM.

IF Phrenology be true, all the phenomena of the moral and intellectual nature of man, however hitherto perplexing, must be made plain before it. Indeed, many of its opponents already admit, that it affords at least a *sufficient* explanation of phenomena which have been given up in despair, by metaphysicians of all descriptions, as inexplicable—according to the formula in that behalf—in the present state of human knowledge. This *sufficiency*, however, supplies one of the Baconian requisites for the admissibility of a cause. The other, the existence, is still disputed; phrenologists say it is demonstrated, as will be plain to their antagonists, when they condescend to do justice to the evidence.

The nature of the singular art called, or rather miscalled, Ventriloquism, has been variously viewed by philosophical writers, both of the present and former times. The nearest approach to the truth was undoubtedly made by the French philosophers, who investigated the subject in the year 1770. The light of Phrenology enables us now to confirm their views, so far as they go, and, as we humbly think, to complete the demonstration. A brief description and history of this extraordinary vocal illusion, while it is necessary to our present purpose, may not be unacceptable to our readers.

Those who possess the art have invariably the power of imitating with their voice the voices of other persons, the cries of animals, and even the sounds produced by the motion and impulse of inanimate matter. They are always perfect imitators of sounds of every variety and description;

but their most mysterious power is that of deluding those they address into the persuasion that the sound comes from a point not only out of, but at a considerable distance from, the speaker's own person. The voice, in such cases, having always a certain stifled sound, as if it originated in the chest, and being often uttered with the mouth nearly shut, at least with very little or no movement of the lips, was long, in ignorance of its true nature, referred to the stomach or belly ; whence its name. It is not by any means clear, however, that the deluded would have established the stomach and belly as the *parts of speech*, if the deluders had not themselves directed them there ; and this leads us to a brief statement of what is known historically of this art. It seems to have been much more prevalent in ancient times than we now find it. It is known to have been among the Assyrians, the Egyptians, the Jews, and the Greeks ; and these were just the climates where great flexibility in the organs of speech, being joined with the requisite mental powers, we should have expected to have found it. Scripture makes many references to the magicians, the wizards, the charmers, and those that have familiar spirits ; and the profound Selden saw reason to translate the Hebrew *Ob*—plural, *Oboth*, (generally translated Python, or magician), by Demon or Spirit, which was believed to dwell in the belly, and speak within the possessed without their exercising their own organs of speech. Accordingly, the Septuagint translates *Ob* by the Greek word *engastrimuthos*, and the Vulgate by *ventriloquus*, both words signifying the same thing, namely, speaking with, or at least from, the belly. This was too valuable a deception not to be practised by the cunning deluders of the superstitious ancients, and it became so common as to form a kind of divination called *gastromancy*, where the diviner answered without appearing to move his lips, so that the listener believed he heard an aerial voice. There has been much controversy, even among divines, as to the reality of the ghost of

Samuel. Eustathius, Archbishop of Antioch, in the fourth century, composed a treatise in Greek, to prove that the supposed evocation of Samuel was the deception of a demon, of which the Witch of Endor was possessed. This is, in truth, a treatise on engastrimism, according to the notions then entertained of it; for the Archbishop has no idea that the art was not preternatural. It is by no means clear, that Saul saw Samuel, the word *perceived* being more properly *understood*, as he takes his information from the woman with regard to what did *appear*, and is prostrate on the earth when Samuel speaks.* Now, ventriloquism in the woman has been supposed all that was required. The Septuagint calls her *engastrimuthon*; and Selden expressly says, that in the original, this woman spoke by means of *Ob*, or a demon, which word is, in other places of the Old Testament, translated ventriloquus. The opinion is common, that the Pythian responses were delivered by the same vocal illusions; and in the Vulgate, the Witch of Endor herself is said *habere pythionem*.

In the earlier ages of Christianity the same art prevailed; and St Chrysostom and Œcumenius both make mention of diviners who were called *Engastrimandri*. There is no reason to believe that so imposing and profitable an engine to move a rude people was unknown to the necromancers and enchanters of the dark ages; but we have no account of an individual ventriloquist earlier than the sixteenth century, when one appeared in France of the name of Louis Brabant, valet de chambre of Francis First. This man practised his art solely for purposes of swindling. It is related of him, that being denied the hand of a young woman of fortune and station much above his own, by her father, he renewed his addresses after the father's death, and when in the presence of the lady and her mother, imitated the deceased's voice, which seemed to come from the ceiling of the apart-

* 1 Sam xxviii. 7, 8.

ment; with cries and groans he imputed his aggravated tortures in purgatory, to his refusal of his daughter to Louis Brabant, and conjured her, "if e'er she did her poor father love," to marry the said Louis forthwith; which, in suitable horror, consternation, and filial piety, she did. The swindling bridegroom succeeded, at the same time, in enriching himself, so as to meet his bride's fortune. He frightened a rich old usurer out of ten thousand crowns, by a well-timed intimation, *en ventriloque*, of what awaited him in purgatory, with a distinct exposition of the *only* method of averting the otherwise certain doom. This accomplished person, we may presume, did much business on a smaller scale, besides these two great *coups du maitre*.

A century after this period, probably in consequence of the appearance of another or other ventriloquists, the first modern attempts seem to have been made to write upon the subject; and Allazzi, an Italian, in 1629, published a work entitled *Leonis Allatii de Engastrimytho Syntagma*. Allazzi, in the same work, translated the Greek treatise of Eustathius into Latin; but his own treatise, as well as that of the Archbishop, is confined to the question of the evocation of the ghost of Samuel, on which controversy the works are eruditè and argumentative.

Conrad Amman, a Dutch doctor in medicine, had observed the ventriloquists of the beginning of the last century, and published a Latin treatise at Amsterdam in 1700, to explode the old notion, current, it would appear, till then, that Engastrimism is a demon in the belly. His observations seem chiefly to have been made on an old woman at Amsterdam, who possessed the talent of ventriloquism. His theory was, that the effect was produced by a sort of swallowing of the words, or forcing them to retrograde as it were by the tracheal artery;—by speaking during inspiration of the breath, and not, as in ordinary speech, during expiration.—“*Quidquid hactenus*,” says Conrad Amman, “*de voce et loquela dixi, de quotidiana illa et vulgari accipi velim, quæ fit expirando; est enim adhuc modus eam per inspira-*

“*tionem* formandi, qui non cuivis datus est, et quam aliquoties in
 “*Gastrimythis* quibusdam admiratus sum: et Amstædæmi
 “olim *vetulam quandam* audivi utroque modo loquentem, sibique
 “ad quæsitâ quasi *inspirando* respondentem; ut eam cum viro,
 “duos ad minimum passus ab ea remoto colloqui dejerassem;
 “vocem enim, inter *inspirandum* absorptam e longinquo venire
 “credebam. Muliercula hæc *Pythiam* agere facile potuisset,”
 &c.

Nothing farther appears on the nature or history of ventriloquism till the year 1772, when a work appeared on the subject by M. de la Chapelle, *Conseur Royal* at Paris, and a member of several learned bodies, besides the Royal Society of London. This, although a greatly over-learned work, with a prodigious display of irrelevant erudition, gives a most satisfactory explanation of ventriloquism, which was confirmed by a committee of the Academy of Sciences at Paris, and ultimately by the whole Academy. We have the more confidence in the theory, that it is demonstrated to be true, so far as it goes, by what we hold to be the surest of all tests—by Phrenology. The existing ventriloquists of M. de la Chapelle’s time were two:—a Baron Mengen, in the household of Prince Lichtenstein, at Vienna; and a person of the name of Saint Gille, a grocer at St Germain-en-Laye, near Paris. Both these ventriloquists were communicative, made no secret of their art, and contributed descriptions of their own experiences, to forward the inquiry which seems, in that time of profound peace, to have made some noise in France.

Baron Mengen ridiculed the old prejudice, that ventriloquists speak from, much less with, the stomach and belly; and made no pretence to any other aid than that of the common organs of speech. The Baron’s account of himself is in substance this:—That he owed his art to a *passion*, which showed itself in him at a very early age, to *counterfeit* the cries of animals and the voices of persons; and he soon found, that he had the power of *imitating sounds in such a way*, as to give them the appearance of coming from points different from his own mouth. That his organs gained flexibility by use, so as to be able to sustain a long illusion.

For the sake of amusing his friends, he made a small figure or doll, with a contrivance with which, by inserting his hand under the dress, he could occasion appropriate motion of the lips. With this figure, from which he could make his voice to appear to come, he carried on droll and often highly-satirical conversations. His own words, describing the kind of vocal exertion he made, are as follows:—"I press my tongue strongly against my teeth and left cheek, and the voice; which appears articulated by the mouth of the figure, is formed in reality between the teeth and left cheek of my own. For this I use the precaution to *hold in reserve* in the wind-pipe (*le gosier**) a sufficient portion of air, either to sing or speak, without the stomach or belly giving any assistance; and it is solely with that portion of air in reserve, *moderated*, retained, and suffered to escape with effort, that I produce the voice which I wish to make heard. Add to that a *quality in my tongue extremely subtle* and rarely possessed, by means of which I articulate all syllables and words, (either singing or speaking,) without in the least moving the lips; and taking great care to retain to the end of each period, phrase, or sentence, the air which comes from the *lungs* for the renewing of my respiration, *which requires a very good chest.*"

M. Saint Gille was more at hand, and was often visited and experimented upon by M. de la Chapelle. In their first interview, the ventriloquist surprised and rather alarmed the philosopher, by producing a distinct cry of "M. de la Chapelle!" as if from the roof of a neighbouring house. On farther acquaintance, M. de la Chapelle accompanied Saint Gille on occasions of many amusing and perfectly innocent applications of his art. On one of these, he addressed many individuals of rank, of both sexes, to their great consternation, as they sat on the grass, at a fete champetre, with many witty personal remarks, for which he had been previously prepared—the effect may easily be conceived. On another, he imposed incessant mass-singing upon a fraternity of monks who had been remiss in their attention to the departed soul of one of their number. The deceased spoke as from the roof of the choir where they were assembled, and uttered

* This is physically impossible; and the Baron afterwards shows that he means the lungs or chest.

loud complaints and awful threatenings against the survivors for their neglect of him.

On some occasions, M. Saint Gille put his powers to good uses, in mortifying vanity, abasing pride, disappointing avarice, and changing selfish and base purposes. Several very diverting instances of these are detailed by M. de la Chapelle.

M. Saint Gille made no mystery of his art more than Baron Menges, and attributed all his success to an *extreme desire* and continued habit of exercising his organs in that *imitative* way. He gained the accomplishment in a very short time—eight days—at Martinique, by *imitating* another ventriloquist. This circumstance leads M. de la Chapelle into the only mistake he commits,—namely, that any one that chooses may become a ventriloquist. It is the very circumstance which forces a Phrenologist to the opposite conclusion.

The theory of M. de la Chapelle, as confirmed by the Academy, is in substance as follows:—The *same* sound varies in its effect on the ear according to the distance or place from which it comes. But every sound, as it reaches the ear, is a sound that may be imitated. A power of imitating sounds, which we are all accustomed to refer to certain distances and certain situations, is the whole art of ventriloquism. It is worthy of remark, that by custom the illusion lost its effect on M. de la Chapelle,—he referring the words to the mouth of the speaker, which all others referred to distant points. The members of the Academy commissioned to make the inquiry with M. de la Chapelle, compare this gradation of sound to the imitations of distance in the symphonies of the opera; the distance being judged by the first sound heard, diminishes in appearance as the sounds become fainter.

The *Savans*, satisfied that the effect produced was *imitation* of the sounds appropriate to certain distances, applied themselves to investigate the nature of the organic power which produced this effect, and they referred it to a

power acquired by habit over the larynx, by which it could be readily shut and opened to the required degree, with the additional power, from *flexibility* of tongue, to articulate *within* the mouth, or even in the *back part of it*. The constriction and expansion of the larynx they believed to be very fatiguing, and attended with hoarseness after a lengthened exertion. They observed that M. Saint Gille appeared fatigued before the end of his exhibition, and lost some degree of his power to create the illusion; that each exertion was followed by the irritation of a slight cough; and that, when he was *enrhumé*, or (as we translate it in Scotland by a most convenient word,) *colded*, he had great difficulty of speaking *en ventriloque*. Hippocrates, treating of a particular ailment of the throat, says, that those affected with it spoke as if they had been Engastrimuthoi. If, say the reporter, there be a diseased state of throat, which produces this effect, it is easy to suppose the effect of the malady imitated, or the throat brought artificially into the same state.

M. de la Chapelle, and the other academicians, unite in their refutation of Conrad Amman's theory, that ventriloquism is articulating during inspiration of the breath. This mistake was repeated evidently from Amman by the Abbé Nollet, in his *Leçons de Physique Experimentale*, 1745.

It is admitted, that a low stifled sound may be produced for a few seconds during inspiration; but the high and often strong voice of the ventriloquists can only result from a brisk *expulsion* of air from the *trachea*, by an increased action of the part. The Amsterdam woman spoke high, but it was Conrad that concluded she spoke during inspiration. Besides, there is no reply to the objection, that inspiration no more than speaking with the belly will account for variations and distances.

Last of all, it was observed that Saint Gille opened his mouth and even moved his lips; and that, to conceal these movements, he always turned away his face when he spoke *en ventriloque*. When any one stood in front of him, and

saw his mouth opened and his lips moved, the illusion, in their case, did not take place.

We do not think it worth while to occupy our readers with detailing an attempt made to explain the illusion of distance in ventriloquism, by supposing that the speaker avails himself of *artificial echoes*, to throw back the sound to the ear of his hearer. A paper, maintaining this view, was read to the Philosophical Society of Manchester by Mr Gouch, in 1801, and is preserved in the second part of the fifth volume of their Transactions. There is much scientific clearness and justness of exposition in that paper on the laws of acoustics, but these laws are woefully misapplied to ventriloquism. It at once occurs to ask the author of that paper how the ventriloquist is to command even one echo when he wishes it,—one fixed material distant obstacle to reflect the voice? But when he is to modulate his voice gradually as the sound is supposed to advance or retire, or when he shifts the voice from above to below, and all around, where shall he command his succession of echoes, or the change of their position? Mr Gouch saw the ventriloquist—we think of the name of Garbutt,—who travelled to most towns in this island about 1796. This ventriloquist made his voice seem to come from the part of the room behind the audience; but, if on Mr Gouch's own shewing, sound will reach the ear by the shortest road, how did it first pass the audience, and then return to them? Garbutt farther brought the voice, as it were, from under the benches on which the spectators sat, to which locality he first strongly directed their attention, and he occasionally made it appear to be the voice of a child confined under a glass. Echoes for all these illusions are evidently out of the question. But how did Garbutt carry about his echo with him, when he alarmed a fish-woman in Edinburgh, by making her own fish contradict a declaration of their freshness? or when he made a poor man unload a whole cart of hay to extricate a crying child, whose cries were heard more and more plainly as the hay diminished,

till they concluded with an imp's laugh, when the last particle was examined? The notion of echo seems to have been hinted before, for M. de la Chapelle himself disproves it, by an experiment made by M. Saint Gille in the open park of St German-en-Laye, where he astonished an Italian by speaking to him from every point of the compass.

It cannot have failed to strike the reader, that, as admitted by the French Savans, a ventriloquist must cheat the judgment as well as the ear. This is effectually done, as will be made more clearly to appear presently, by establishing a *local*, from which it is intended the audience shall believe that the voice comes. Garbutt had recourse to this finesse in the illusions which he performed.

When we mention Mathews, we consider his powers of vocal illusion as the least of his comic accomplishments; but it is of great consequence for our readers to keep in mind that so perfect a comic imitator as Mathews does possess to a considerable degree that power of imitating sounds, which is called ventriloquism. Indeed, we have observed, that most clever comedians have some degree of the same talent.

Such was the state of this curious question, when means equally unexpected and ample have come within our own reach, of verifying former theories, and observing for ourselves both directly and phrenologically. This opportunity has been afforded us, and indeed our attention has been called for the first time in our lives to the subject, by the late arrival in Edinburgh of the celebrated Monsieur Alexandre, a native of Paris, and beyond all rivalry the possessor of the most astonishing powers of vocal illusion which we have either heard or read of. This young man has already, at the early age of twenty-five, exhibited his powers in almost every country of Europe. His vocal illusions are displayed in amusing comic pieces, in which he is the sole actor, and which he has exhibited in six or eight different languages. Nay, he performed one of these in English for six months, before he had learned the language, so as to understand what he was

uttering; and it is said with very few mistakes. He exhibits testimonials from crowned heads, princes, nobles, and *savans* on the continent,* and from a great number of persons of rank and literary and scientific eminence in England, (of which, besides performing 150 times in London, he visited most of the great towns,) all bearing witness to his astonishing powers, and most of them commending his manners and qualifications as a gentleman. He brought letters to many individuals in Edinburgh; one of which was the means of our introduction to him, which has been to us so satisfactory. M. Alexandre's first exhibition was announced to take place in the Caledonian Theatre, to which we went, and watched as narrowly as we could every thing he did or said, as he succeeded by his own unassisted exertions in engrossing and highly diverting a crowded audience for three hours.†

We shall now endeavour to describe what we saw, as minutely as we observed it narrowly. He performed a sort of drama, the hero of which is a clever young rogue, in the service of an old physic-taking valetudinarian and his careful fantastical wife, upon whom he perpetrates all sorts of mischievous tricks, both in revenge of his own short commons, and in furtherance of a scheme, for which he is well paid, to unite the hands of the only daughter to a very agreeable young officer of infantry, quartered in the neighbourhood. Without merit as a comedy, the incidents of this piece—some of them very ludicrous—afforded him the means of exhibiting every variety of his vocal illusion. He represents the whole characters, male and female, young and

* The kings of Prussia, Bavaria, and Saxony, Princes Blucher, Swartzenberg, Metternich, Wrede, M. Goethe, Blumenback, &c. &c. It is a curious fact, that the aged Landgravine of Hesse Darmstadt was enabled, by having seen M. Saint Gille in Paris, to compare his powers with M. Alexandre's, to which last she gave the decided preference.

† M. Alexandre's success and popularity in Edinburgh, he himself says, has not been exceeded any where. Besides commanding overflowing houses, he has visited many of the most respectable inhabitants, and made the most favourable impression on all who have conversed with him, by his agreeable appearance, engaging manners, and liberal sentiments.

old, himself; and besides displaying an *address and quickness* which we never saw exceeded, he changes his dress at least 30 or 40 times, with a rapidity which appears almost preternatural; so that the deception is perfect, that the whole *dramatis personæ* are bustling and talking at the same moment.*

His change of dress is not, however, more complete than his change of manner, voice, and whole character. He spoke with his own natural voice in the valet; with a deep strong voice in the old man; in a whining and chattering, and most affected voice in the lady; with a degagé easy style in the dandy officer; and with the softest tripping femininism in the dandy's beloved. Of all these, he maintained the character with such judgment and effect, as to convince us of one truth, which our readers are requested to mark, that his histrionic powers—*his talents as an actor*—are very considerable.

As it is of great moment for our phrenological tests in the sequel, to keep steadily in view the power of *imitation*, we may here mention a sort of interlude, which M. Alexandre performed, in which he manifested his possession of that talent, with the farther power of *concealing* self, to a degree of intensity which, till we saw them, we could not have believed possible. He exhibited the visages, voices, and manners of several different nuns of a convent, where he is supposed to have served *outside* the grate. He is first a very pretty novice endeavouring to sing, but covered with bashfulness and heigh-hos!

“ Her pretty oath by yea and nay,

“ She could not, must not, durst not play.”

* M. Alexandre told us, that his attendants who attire him, behind the scenes, often urge him to wait a reasonable time to prevent doubts of his identity. He paid an unconscious compliment to the unsuspecting British character, when he added, that although on some occasions, on the continent, he has found it necessary to station a responsible public officer on the stage, to vouch for him, he has been delighted with the absence of all suspicion, of which the cordial manner of his British spectators has given him the most encouraging assurances. Some of the changes are almost incredible; the old lady's long train has scarcely disappeared on one side of the stage, when the slim jacketed domestic enters on the other, with a frying-pan in his hand, to make an omelet for his master.

In an instant he is the angry abbess chiding her foolish pupil, with a face as round, as flat, and as pitted as a split muffin, and a voice to suit. Anon he rises, like a ghost from the ground, as Sister Beatrice, with a face double the length of the average of the human countenance. Down he sits again, and shows a face as preternaturally broad as the other was long, just above the level of the table, the said face being the index to the soul of Sister Agnes. A visage reduced to the size of a man's fist now peeps the hood of sister Angelina. The next face is all gone off to the east, its successor to the west, till he concludes with Sister Celestine's lamentable paralytic deformity, an exhibition greatly too like reality not to be exquisitely painful to the spectators, and which we have heard many say, M. Alexandre would gain credit for good taste as well as good feeling by omitting altogether. His other personations, amounting to an absolute change of identity before our eyes, are quite sufficient to establish him the most wonderful *personator* that ever exhibited.*

M. Alexandre's vocal exhibition consisted of two very obviously distinguishable parts:—First, His mere imitations, or changes of voice to suit the different characters in which he *appeared* on the stage; in which he meant no farther illusion, and left the audience to take the personage in their sight for the speaker. In this it is obvious there was comic imitation, but none of the illusion more strictly called ventriloquism. To this class belong his imitations of animals

* M. Alexandre paid a visit to a distinguished individual of Edinburgh, to deliver a letter of introduction. This was put into the gentleman's hands by a young man of very interesting and genteel appearance, and with the greatest modesty. He read it, and when he looked up to reply, a being stood before him as different in identity from what he had last looked upon, as an old grim French quack-doctor may be supposed to be from the first personage we have described. The gentleman started, and with an exclamation of wonder, asked if he could possibly be the same person who had two minutes before delivered him the letter! Our accomplished friend, Mr Joseph, has succeeded admirably with two busts of M. Alexandre, one in each of these dissimilar characters, and thus *fixed down* a real instead of an evanescent proof of the power of *personation*, which is especially valuable to phrenology.

and inanimate things, as a plane, a screw, a saw, an omelet frying, &c. Secondly, His ventriloquial efforts. In these he produced the effect of persons speaking from a distance; from the other side of a door, both shut and open; from a trunk, also alternately open and shut; from a chimney-top; and from a cellar, with gradation of the voice as the person in the chimney and cellar ascended or descended. With his ventriloquial exertions alone we have to do here; and in these the illusion of confinement, freedom, distance, and gradual approach and recession was complete. In M. Alexandre's production of these curious effects, we observed several particulars:

1. His voice, to give the illusion of distance or confinement, was invariably a stifled voice; and in changing from confinement to freedom, he dropt ventriloquism, and spoke merely in character, as first above distinguished.

2. He never began to speak *en ventriloque* without previously establishing a point, place, or *local*, or at least direction from which the audience should believe the voice to come. This he did in course of the incidents of the piece, so that all impression of arrangement was prevented, and the audience never dreamed of disputing the *direction* with the performer, but took all that for granted, to his most perfect satisfaction. He aided the illusion by his own action and attitude, as he spoke into a cellar, up a chimney, into a trunk or press, or through a door.

3. We never saw his face, at least his front face, when speaking *en ventriloque*; but we observed it always turned towards us when he spoke as the person in our sight.

4. We observed, that after his ventriloquial exertions, he often coughed; and, lastly, he counterfeited inimitably the hoarseness of a severe cold.

On returning from this singular exhibition, our own conjectures on the subject of ventriloquism were these:—

1. That by the force of uncommonly acute powers of perception, which nothing that happens around him escapes,

whether visible, tangible, or audible, (phrenologice a large endowment of all the knowing organs, particularly *Tune* and *Individuality*,) he has become perfect master of sounds in all their varieties and modifications. In this, *per se*, he may have, and no doubt has, multitudes of rivals.

2. Having got familiar with the intensities of sounds which alight upon the human ear, from various distances and certain places, he does nothing more than imitate the sound desired, not as it is where uttered, but where heard. It is in either case an imitable sound. It would seem to follow, that the closer the person to be deceived is to the ventriloquist, the illusion must be the more complete, seeing that the sound imitated is the sound that strikes his own ear, which, it is obvious, may not suit the variously arranged spectators in a large theatre.

3. As the sound which reaches our ears must necessarily vary with the distance it has come; but as each variation is a specific imitable sound, so the ventriloquist has only—assuredly it requires exquisite skill—to vary his imitation progressively, in either direction, to give the perfect illusion of advance and retreat. An analogy occurred to us, in which, if as yet unknown to ourselves, we have ever been anticipated, we should only have the more confidence. Distance is artificially represented to the eye on the landscape-painter's canvass by gradual diminution, according to the rules of mathematical perspective, of the size of the successive objects; and, according to those of aerial perspective, of the strength of their colouring; from the large and bold fore-ground, to the diminished distance, almost blending with the tints of the sky. Now, M. Alexandre's vocal illusions are, as it were, the *perspective* of sounds, and address to the ear a gradation which we cannot help associating with the successive distance of the landscape whence they come. What an extent of country a hunting party may be made to traverse in imagination in the theatre, by a skilful gradation of the sounds of their bugles, from the faint sound in the distant hills, till the boisterous Nimrods—their tunics of scarlet—

are smacking their whips on the stage. As to the direction of the sound, we conjectured this to be exclusively the doing of the imaginations of the audience, when a locality was established. This we put to the test; believing that the performer could do no more than imitate distance, without the possibility of imitating direction, which has no distinctive sound; as such, we tried to reverse, in our own minds, the direction of the chimney-top and the cellar, and we found the identity of the sound suit either place. It is obvious, when a ventriloquist fairly alarms people, he may give any direction he pleases to his voice.

That this *perspective* of sound is the essence of the effect produced we could not doubt; of the physiology of the inquiry—the physical power by which the effect is produced, we were by no means so certain. Organs of speech in the stomach or belly we at once discarded as a barbarous absurdity; but we really saw nothing in the imitations which might not be executed by a person who possessed a great power over the movements of the larynx, directed by a good ear, and seconded by a very flexible tongue.

We were not disappointed in our hopes to obtain M. Alexandre's own account of his singular powers. He has been as liberal as Baron Menges and M. Saint Gille, and has unfolded to us his own views on the subject. He makes no mystery of it, and he is perfectly safe in his openness; for his talent is so rare, and his art so difficult, however clearly explained, that it requires the cover of secrecy much as the accomplishment of the man who stood on his head on the cross of St Paul's Cathedral required the protection of the patent which was offered him, we think by George the First.

M. Alexandre assured us,—1. That his voice does not come from his stomach or belly, in which, as he said in ridicule, he has neither tongue nor teeth; and against which inelegant region he has a sort of ill-will, for having occasioned the disgusting as well as absurd name of ventriloquism to an art which is merely vocal illusion. He wished to have offered himself in England as a *professeur of vocal illu-*

sion ; but was advised that John Bull loves the marvellous, and would rather give his money to see a man who can speak with his stomach, than one who avowedly can only speak with his mouth.

2. That he possesses uncommon power and flexibility in the organs of speech ; he can extend and contract the larynx or windpipe, which has great muscular strength, so as to produce all the gradations from a bass voice of great power to the shrillest squeak ; and his tongue has a degree of flexibility and power of change of shape and position in the mouth, which enables him to do any thing with it he pleases. The exertion, he says, does not exhaust or fatigue him.

3. He is not conscious of speaking even during expiration, certainly he does not speak during *inspiration* upon any occasion. When he speaks *en ventriloque*, he is not aware that he breathes at all, but seems to use a confined supply of air, which he retains in his chest till the period is finished, when he breathes again. He must, however, although unconsciously, expend it in expiration as he speaks. This seems proved by what follows next.

4. That he cannot ventriloquize *with his lips shut*.

5. That he cannot articulate the labial consonants M. B. and P. without using the lips. When he uses these consonants, therefore, he turns away his face from the person he wishes to deceive. He endeavours, as much as possible, to avoid the labials, and then he can speak without the slightest movement of the lips, or of any muscle of the face.

6. That he makes no use of echoes existing, much less does he create any, such a thing being far beyond human power. He scrupulously avoids places where echoes already exist, and this is the first thing he tries.

7. That he deceives the audience into the belief of the direction of the sound, entirely by previously fixing the direction, and trusting, which he never does in vain, to their imagination for the rest. He says, when he has fairly frightened people, which he has often done, he has no farther trouble ; which way soever he looks, that becomes the direction of

the dreaded sounds. He once horrified a party of visitors to the embalmed bodies of the Prince and Princess of Lignitz, in Silesia, in the vault in which they had lain 230 years. He first declared himself 250 years old, and that he was present at the interment, and then made the Prince and Princess complain of want of air, in consequence of an order of the magistracy to prevent the coffin being opened to gratify public curiosity. The attendants, in consternation, made no attempt to prevent him from opening the coffins, for which service he received the grateful thanks of the Prince and Princess therein reposing, and an inconvenient quantity of holy water to exorcise him, as he came out of the vault.

Last of all, Mr Alexandre declares, that he has a ready perception of the varieties of sound, according to distances, and that each distance having its own *specific* sound, he IMITATES the sound as it is when it reaches his own ear. He has particularly studied this power of gradation, and has repeatedly imitated a person's voice who spoke at intervals as he receded above 300 yards. He has likewise sent a chimney-sweeper up a vent, with instructions to speak down every few yards, and has imitated the voice in its gradations so exactly, that the persons in the room could not tell which was his and which the chimney-sweeper's. On one occasion in Vienna, at Prince Metternich's Hotel, he hung a rope from the window of an apartment on the third floor from the ground, to which a weight was suspended to serve for a man whom he undertook to pull up, and with whom he conversed every yard or two as he pulled the rope, the voice of the man gradually getting plainer, till he was at the window sill, when all at once, M. Alexandre allowed the rope to slip, and down went the poor man with a scream, and many a groan, as he lay *knocked to pieces* on the ground. The company were terrified, and it required a clear exposition of the illusion to restore their composure. We made the remark to him, that this gradation was like perspective in painting. He answered, that the same comparison is engraved on a medal which was given him by the University of Ghent.

This we have seen, but find M. Alexandre mistaken. The medal merely alluding to *modulation of voice*.*

He gave no other account of his change of countenance in the nuns, quack doctor, &c. than that his endeavour was to CONCEAL HIMSELF, and *imitate*, or as near as possible, *be* another person. He has often *disguised himself* by this means when he wished not to be known. Aware of the severe trial to which such exertions must put the nerves of voluntary motion, and the subservient muscles, we asked him if he has no fears of some permanent *set* in these hideous forms? He answered, that at Manchester he did *remain* the quack doctor some hours longer than he intended, having walked in the street disguised by that gaily personification. He can remain voluntarily for a great length of time so metamorphosed; and Mr Joseph assures us, that he never varied while his bust was modelling.

Our phrenological readers are well able to finish this sketch for themselves. Aware of the strong case of IMITATION which is established at every step as we proceeded, aware, also, that to effect perfect imitation in the voice and manner, nay, in the very countenance and person of another, has been found by numerous cases, and no exceptions, to require the agency of that important power SECRETIVENESS,† which enables all perfect actors (and imitation is only a species of acting) to copy what they see and hear, but likewise to *secret* what they are aware will spoil the illusion if allowed to appear; to exercise in perfection that art consisting in concealing art, which, as actors, they cannot do, unless they conceal *themselves*;—unless, by the exercise of this power, they change the tones of the voice, alter the usual and recognised action of every muscle, by the effects

* The reverse of the medal is inscribed as follows:—"Quod, sono vocis
" *scitè modulando*, sive hæc naturæ dos ait sive artis, notias: *anonimus* legibus
" aut inludit aut inludera videtur."

† See the Transactions of the Phrenological Society, (vol i.) on the nature and range of the faculty of *Secretiveness*. We make reference to what is written before, to satisfy the impartial reader, that we do not create the combination to suit the case of M. Alexandre.

of which on the countenance, the shape, the movements, they are identified as individuals;—unless, in short, they sink their own character and very presence, and conjure up the individual to be personated. Who, for one moment, during the unparalleled personation of the Nuns, could recognise in one point the individual M. Alexandre?

This combination of Secretiveness with Imitation, then, gives not only the impulse to imitate, which, for the wisest purposes, is part of man's nature, but the power to personate; not only to copy, but for a time to *be* the original. Without Secretiveness, M. Alexandre might imitate the quack doctor, but he would not *be* the quack doctor during the exhibition; he would still be M. Alexandre, doing as the quack doctor does. There are many who possess the power of mimickry to this extent, but this is not *personation*.

The phrenological reader will at once see, that a good ventriloquist must be a perfect imitator of sounds, and of all sounds within the compass of his vocal powers; and must possess a great flexibility of larynx and tongue, to execute his imitations; and that this is the whole secret of that art, which was for ages considered too wonderful not to be preternatural.

Our readers will naturally look for some information on the actual cerebral development of M. Alexandre, as confirming or shaking our explanation of his talent. We are enabled to gratify them, in consequence of M. Alexandre's having most readily allowed Mr Joseph to take a cast of his head, besides modelling the busts formerly mentioned; and it is impossible to imagine any result more satisfactory. To ourselves it is the more delightful, that we inferred by *anticipation* every prominent organ, on leaving M. Alexandre's first exhibition, and stated our expectations of what his head would turn out, to several friends who were with us.

1. We expected, of course, that *Imitation* and *Secretiveness* would be large, if not very large, especially the latter; and *Tune*, for variation of sound, we thought requisite.

2. We looked for the powers of observation to be large. *Individuality, Form, Size.*

3. From the boldness, energy, confidence, and sustained character of the whole most difficult exhibition, we expected *Combativeness, Destructiveness, Firmness, and Self-esteem*, all large.

4. From much of his general manner, and from his complete conception of all the affectations of Miss Flirtilla, we anticipated a considerable *Love of Approbation*. And, lastly, We referred the neatness and cleverness of his arrangements and changes to his *Constructiveness*, added to his mechanical skill and quickness of observation.

The development was some days after taken by Mr Andrew Combe, who had not seen his exhibition; and it will be seen, by a note of it subjoined,* how invariable nature is, as unveiled by Phrenology. The Imitation and Secretiveness are not exceeded in Mr Joseph's bust of Mathews, or in the cast of Clara Fisher, in the collection of the Phrenological Society.

In the same collection is deposited the cast from M. Alexandre's head, presented by Mr Joseph, which all are invited to see, measure, and compare; but particularly those who still compliment the good faith of the Phrenologists, by believing, at least by alleging, that they *find* what suits their purpose, in any head whatever.

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

ARTICLE XI.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE PHRENOLOGICAL SOCIETY,
FROM 5th FEB. 1834.

1824, Feb. 19.—*Notice of John Thurtell.*

(This was mentioned in last Number.)

MR LYON read a phrenological exposition of the principles on which he proceeded, in inferring the natural dispositions and talents of *Iago*, from a development put into his hands, and also illustrations from the character, as delineated by Shakspeare, showing its exact conformity with the sketch, as given in our last Number. A notice by Mr Ritchie, on the talents and cerebral development of Master Hubbard, was also read.

March 4.—Mr W. Scott read a phrenological essay on the formation of Shakspeare's characters in general, and additional remarks on *Macbeth*. A letter was read from Mr B. A. Hoppe of Copenhagen, intimating a donation of several Danish skulls to be made by him. Mr M. N. Macdonald, W. S., and Mr W. R. Henderson, younger of Warriston, were balloted for, and admitted ordinary members.

March 18.—Mr G. Combe read a phrenological notice of the celebrated juvenile actor, Master G. F. Smith. Suggestions on the notation of cerebral development, by Sir G. S. Mackenzie, were read, and remitted to the council. Mr R. Buchanan read a phrenological analysis of Shakspeare's character of Othello. The secretary exhibited a cast taken by permission of Professor Jameson, from a skull said to be that of George Buchanan, the historian, deposited in the College Museum. He also exhibited the skull of a Circassian girl, presented to the Society by Mr Wilkie, surgeon, Innerleithan, and read a letter from Mr Wilkie, containing some remarks about this skull, and another one belonging to Dr Monro, of a cast of which the Society is in possession. He likewise exhibited a cast of the head of Pallet, the murderer of James Mumford, presented by Dr Elliotson of

London; and six skulls presented by Dr Forster; and read an interesting letter from Monsieur A. A. Royer of Paris, announcing donation of skulls.

April 1.—Mr Andrew Combe read a reply to objections to Phrenology, by Professor D. Karl Asmund Rudolphi of Berlin. Mr R. Ellis exhibited a new craniometer, as improved by himself and Mr William Gray, with which the Society expressed themselves highly pleased, and appointed the instrument to be used on all future occasions, when the measurement of development requires to be taken. Mr William Ellis, solicitor, Supreme Courts, was admitted an ordinary member; and Mr James Douglas Oliver, rector of the grammar school, Selkirk, a corresponding member.

April 15.—Mr Simpson read an essay on the functions of the organ of weight, as the instinctive adaptation of animal movements to the laws of equilibrium. Mr Andrew Combe read a report upon the cerebral development of John Pallet, executed for the murder of James Mumford. The Secretary read a letter from the Director of the Bulletin Universal des Sciences et des Arts, Paris, soliciting periodical information of the proceedings of the Society. The Secretary exhibited a cast of the head of Charles MacEwen, lately executed at Edinburgh for the murder of his wife, presented by Dr Monro. A mask of Richard Robert Jones of Liverpool, a celebrated linguist, with a notice of his dispositions and talents, by Dr George Douglas Cameron of Liverpool;—and the skull of a beaver by Andrew Bonar, Esq. of Kimmerghame, upon which last, Mr William Bonar made a few remarks,—were laid before the Society. The Rev. Frederick Leo of Mecklenburgh Schwerin was admitted a corresponding member.

April 29.—An essay by Mr John Hamilton, advocate, on the accordance betwixt Phrenology and Christianity, was read, communicated by Dr R. Hamilton, Mr John Hamilton not being a member of the Society. The Secretary read a phrenological notice by Dr Oswald of Douglas, Isle of Man, of John Camaish, executed at Castleton, in the Isle of Man, in April, 1823, for poisoning his wife. Camaiah's skull was

presented to the Society by Dr Oswald. He also read a letter from Monsieur A. A. Royer of Paris, announcing a donation of two boxes, containing as under.* Mr W. A. F.

* CONTENTS OF THE BOX No I.

No	<i>Casts of the Heads of</i>	No	<i>Casts of the Heads of</i>
2	Le Chevallier de Lyon	15	Madame Carter, suicide
3	Boutillier	16	Chapotelle, mechanician
4	Charles Dautun, fratricide	17	Horace Vernet, painter and artist
5	Charles Le Normand	18	Legouve, poet
6	Houster	20	Brain of an Idiot
7	Guichet	23	Portion of the brain of Deville the poet
9	Martin, parricide	24	Skull of an Ourang-ou-tang
10	Pretre, incendiary	26	Baron Destassart (Prefet)
11	Lecouffe	27	M·K——, a young Englishman deficient in No I and 2
12	The mother of Lecouffe	33	Skull of Raphael
13	Feldman, executed for rape and murder		

CONTENTS OF No II.

No	<i>Casts of</i>	No	<i>Skulls of</i>
1	Pleignier, mechanician and conspirator	50	A Dolphin
8	Madelaine Albert, murderer	51	A young Female
14	Brain of Feldman	52	A young Calf
19	A Male Idiot	53	A Singe Mandrill, male
21	A Female Idiot	54	A Singe Macque, male
23	A Dwarf	55	Two Dogs
25	Skull of Heloise	56	A young Lion
28	Top of the skull of Bichat	57	A young Hind
	<i>Casts of the Skulls of</i>	58	Three Foxes, 2 male, 1 female
29	General Wurmser	59	Two Cats, male and female
30	A Hungarian soldier	59	A Rat
31	A French soldier	60	Polecat, male and female
32	A milliner of Vienna	61	<i>Ai</i>
	<i>Masks of</i>	62	A Tatou
34	Johannis	63	A Turkish Dog
35	Mr Park	64	A Dog
36	Emperor Joseph II.	65	Hedgehog, male and female
37	Müller the Swiss historian	66	A Marmotte des Alpes
38	Cartouche the robber	67	Guinea Pigs, male and female
39	Marat, of revolutionary notoriety	68	Goats, male and female
40	Deshayes, engineer	69	A Roebeck, young
41	The young Carner	70	A European Badger
42	Cast of a human brain	71	A Seal, male
43	Cast of the skull of Françoise, murderer	72	A Spaniel Dog
	<i>Skulls of</i>	73	A young Polecat
44	Lemercier, murderer	74	A common Rat
45	An old woman who served all her life in the dragoons, and died in the "Hospital des Femmes," Paris	75	A Rabbit of 4 months
46	A madman and suicide of Bicetre	76	A Shrewmouse
47	A woman of the Salpatriere	77	A male Frog
48	Sanglier d'Ethiopie (Barbiroussa)	78	Two Swans and one Goose
49	A young Male	79	A Parrot, male and female (Amazon)
		80	Domestic Fowls, male and female
		81	A common Turkey
		82	Poule Sultane
		83	A Balbuzard and one Chereche

Boorne, student of medicine, and Mr John Cox of Gorgie Mill, were admitted ordinary members. And Mr James C. Miller, Stranraer, and Mr Vandenhoff, of the Theatre Royal, Edinburgh, as corresponding members. Mr Robert Ellis was appointed Keeper of the Museum; and the Secretary was instructed to announce the arrival of Monsieur Royer's donation when it should come to hand; and, at same time, to intimate to the public, that the Hall will continue open, as usual, upon the Saturdays, for exhibition of the casts.

ARTICLE XII.

DR MILLIGAN v. PHRENOLOGY.

DR MILLIGAN has translated "Majendie's Elementary Treatise on Physiology, for the use of Students," and enriched it with notes. Among other topics he discusses Phrenology. We have not room to analyse all his statements, but submit a few observations on the following:—

Dr Milligan. "We here take no notice of the hypothesis of Gall and Spurzheim, which supposes that there are 35 different faculties, all seated on the surface of the brain."

The Phrenological Doctrine. "It must be recollected that the organs are NOT CONFINED TO THE SURFACE OR CONVOLUTIONS OF THE BRAIN, but that they extend from the surface to the basis, or medulla oblongata."—COMBE'S *Essays on Phrenology*, p. 211.

Dr Milligan. "An eminent anatomist, Dr Barclay, (on Life, p. 376,) asserts, that no supporter of this hypothesis will undertake to point out eminences in the brain, which correspond to these external osseous protuberances."

Dr Barclay has made no such assertion; and if Dr Milligan will read again the page of this author's work to which he refers, he will find that he does not touch in the slightest degree upon the question, whether the "eminences in the brain correspond to the external osseous protuberances," or not.

Dr Milligan. "The Phrenologists, however, now very properly appeal from *anatomy and physiology to facts.*"

It is absurd to say that the Phrenologists appeal from the anatomy and physiology of *the brain* to facts of a different kind, because the anatomy of the brain does not indicate the functions of its different parts, and therefore cannot prove any thing against Phrenology, if it establishes nothing in its favour. Does Dr Milligan recollect, that his coadjutor, in the refutation of our science, Dr Roget, has said, that "the brain is still as incomprehensible in its functions as it is subtle and complex in its anatomy;" and that "*its structure is so void of apparent adaptation to any purpose we can understand, that it will suit any physiological system equally well?*" It is sheer absurdity, therefore, to talk of appealing from anatomy and physiology, as if they either had shed or were capable of furnishing a single ray of light concerning the functions of the different parts of the brain. We venture to assert, that although Dr Milligan has translated "*Majendie's Compendium of Physiology for the use of Students,*" and added to it "*the translator's Notes,*" he knows no more of the functions of these different parts, in virtue of his anatomy and physiology, than the goose quill with which he penned the foregoing precious specimens of philosophical acumen.

Dr Milligan. "Phrenology places all the finer and more exalted faculties of our nature in some region or other of the forehead."

This is equally incorrect with the Doctor's other observations. The organs of Concentrativeness and Love of Approbation are marked in the upper and back part of the head, and the organs of the whole moral sentiments in the coronal surface, and they extend to the *medulla oblongata* respectively, altogether unconnected with the forehead.

Dr Milligan. "I have repeatedly observed, that the most extensive and available mental powers, as well as the most enthusiastic proclivity for individual pursuits, occur frequently in persons whose forehead is perfectly free of any bumps or protuberance whatever."

The Phrenological Doctrine. "Our aim ought to be to distinguish the SIZE AND NOT THE MERE PROMINENCE of each organ. If one organ be much developed, and the neighbouring organs very little, the developed organ presents an elevation or pro-

"tubercance : but if the neighbouring organs be developed in proportion, NO PROTUBERANCE CAN BE PERCEIVED, AND THE SURFACE IS SMOOTH." *Essays on Phrenology*, p. 211.—Did Dr Milligan imagine, when he wrote the foregoing sentence, that he was stating an objection to Phrenology? There are no *bumps* in the forehead of Lord Bacon!

Dr Milligan. "Every one of course will judge for himself in this way; as far as my own experience has gone, it has been entirely unfavourable to craniology; and my trials have both been numerous, and made on persons whose *internal faculties* were strongly developed."

Dr Milligan was in a fine condition for making accurate observations. His *own notes* show an ignorance of the principles of the science surpassed only by his unacquaintance with its practical details.

Dr Milligan. "On the whole, facts seem to go against the Phrenologist: his doctrine has now been submitted to the experience of the world for nearly thirty years, yet, in all that period, so marked by a maniacal rage for scribbling, no one scientific person of *eminence** has appeared in its defence. "We count *not small authors* in a matter so important."

Phrenology has been assailed by the Combativeness and Destructiveness of some opponents, and by the wit of others; but it was reserved to Dr Milligan to form and act upon the brilliant conception of extinguishing it by a mighty manifestation of SELF-ESTEEM! Surely induction itself must yield before the rebuke of so *great* a man, as "E. MILLIGAN, M.D., LICENTIATE OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS, EXTRAORDINARY MEMBER OF THE ROYAL MEDICAL SOCIETY, LECTURER ON PHYSIOLOGY AND THERAPEUTICS IN EDINBURGH, AND TRANSLATOR OF MAJENDIE'S COMPENDIUM FOR THE USE OF STUDENTS!!!"

* This is Dr Milligan's typography.

END OF No III.



Ideality

Ideality

Ideality

Ideality



LOCKE



CHAUCER



SHAKESPEARE



W^m COBBETT



BURDUSSEAT

THE
PHRENOLOGICAL JOURNAL.

No IV.

ARTICLE I.

IDEALITY.

DR GALL gives the following account of the discovery of this organ. The first poet whose head arrested his attention on account of its form, was one of his friends, who frequently composed extempore verses when least expected to do so, and who had thereby acquired a sort of reputation, although in other respects a very ordinary person. His forehead, immediately above the nose, rose perpendicularly, then retreated, and extended itself a good deal laterally, as if a part had been added on each side. He recollected having seen the same form in the bust of Ovid. In other poets he did not find; as a constant circumstance, the forehead first perpendicular, and then retreating; so that he regarded this shape as accidental; but in all of them he observed the prominences in the anterior lateral parts of the head, above the temples. He began then to look upon these prominences as the distinctive marks of a natural talent for poetry; but still he spoke to his hearers on the subject with a degree of doubt; especially as at this period he was not convinced that a talent for poetry depended on a primitive mental faculty. He waited, therefore, before deciding definitely, till he had made a greater number of observations.

A short time afterwards, he got the head of the poet *Aixinger*, in which this part of the brain, and also the organ of *Adhesiveness*, are very much developed, while the other portions are so only in a small degree. A little after this, the poet *Jünger* died; and *Gall* found also in his head the same prominences. He found the same parts still larger in the poet *Blumauer*, with a large organ of *Wit*. At this time, *Wilhelmine Maisch* acquired reputation at *Vienna* by his poetry; and the same enlargement was found in his head above the temples. *Dr Gall* observed the same organization in *Madame Laroche*, at *Offenbach*, near *Frankfort*; in *Angelique Kauffmann*; in *Sophia Clementina of Merken*; in *Klopstock*; in *Schiller*, of whom he has a mask; and also in *Gessner* of *Zurich*. In *Berlin* he continued to speak of this organ still with considerable reserve, when *M. Nicolai* invited him and *Dr Spurzheim* to see a collection of about thirty busts of poets in his possession. They found in every one of them the part in question projecting more or less considerably, according as the talent was manifested in a higher or lower degree by each poet. From that moment he taught boldly, that the talent for poetry depends on a primitive faculty, and that it is connected with this part of the brain as its special organ.

In *Paris* *Dr Gall* moulded the head of *Legouvé* after his death, and found this organ large. He and *Dr Spurzheim* opened the head of the late *Delille*, and pointed out to several physicians who were present the full development of the convolutions placed under the external prominences at this part: these convolutions projected beyond all the others. *Dr Gall* preserves the cast of one of the hemispheres of the brain; so that this statement may still be verified. In a rather numerous assemblage, *Dr Gall* was asked what he thought of a little man, who sat at a considerable distance from him? As it was rather dark, he said, that in truth he could not see him very distinctly, but that he observed, nevertheless, the organ of poetry extremely developed. He was then informed, that this was the famous poet *François*, generally

named Condorinier, from his having been bred a shoemaker.*

"If we pass in review," says Dr Gall, "the portraits and busts of the poets of all ages, we shall find this configuration of head common to them all; as in Pindar, Euripides, Sophocles, Hæcæclides, Plautus, Terence, Virgil, Tibullus, Ovid, Horace, Juvenal, Boccaccio, Ariosto, Arétin, Tasso, Milton, Boileau, J. B. Rousseau, Pope, Young, Grosset, Voltaire, Gesmer, Klopstock, Wieland, &c." Dr Bailly, in a letter dated Rome, 30th May, 1822, addressed to Dr Brayer, says, "You may tell Dr Gall, that I have a mask of Tasso, taken from nature, and that, although part of the organ of Poetry be cut off, nevertheless the lateral breadth of the cranium in this direction is enormous."

The bust of Homer presents an extraordinary development at this part of the head. It is doubted whether it is authentic; but be it real or ideal, the existence of the prominence is remarkable. If it is ideal, why was the artist led to give this particular form, which is the only one in accordance with nature? If he modelled the head of the most distinguished poet of his day, as the best representative of Homer, the existence of this development is still a fact in favour of the organ.

In an hospital, Dr Gall found this organ considerably developed in a man who was insane; and remarked to the physicians who accompanied him, that he observed the exterior sign which indicated a talent for poetry. He possessed this talent in point of fact; for in his state of alienation, he continually composed verses, which sometimes were not deficient in point and vigour. He belonged to the lowest class, and had received no education. In the collection of M. Esquirol; Dr Gall saw a mask of an insane person, who also was habitually occupied in versifying; and in it the organ in question is considerably larger than any of the others.

So far Dr Gall. Dr Spurzheim observes,—“It is impossible that Poetry in general should be confined to one single organ; and I therefore think that the name ‘organ of Poetry’ does not indicate its essential faculty.”—“In every kind of

* A cast of the head of this individual is in the Phrenological Society's Collection, Edinburgh, and in De Ville's, London. The organ in question is uncommonly large.

“poetry, the sentiments are exalted, the expressions warm; and there must be rapture, inspiration, what is commonly called ‘imagination or fancy.’ This emotion, then, of exalted enthusiasm, Dr Spurzheim considers to be the primitive function; and he names the faculty Ideality, and in this we agree with him.

The following account of it is given in Mr Combe’s *Essays on Phrenology*:—“This is a sentiment: it gives only a manner of feeling, and does not form ideas. It produces the feeling of exquisitiveness or perfectibility, and is delighted with what the French call ‘Le beau idéal.’ It is this faculty which gives *inspiration* to the poet. The knowing and reflecting faculties perceive qualities as they exist in nature; but this faculty desires for its gratification something more exquisitely perfect than the scenes of reality. It desires to elevate and to endow with a splendid excellence every object presented to the mind. It stimulates the faculties which form ideas to create scenes, in which every object is invested with the qualities which it delights to contemplate, rather than with the degree of excellence which nature usually bestows. It is this faculty which inspires exaggeration and enthusiasm, which prompts to embellishment and splendid conceptions. It gives a manner of feeling and of thinking, besitting the regions of fancy, rather than the abodes of men. Hence, those only on whom it is powerfully bestowed can possibly be poets, and hence the proverb, ‘*Poeta nascitur non fit.*’

“Individuals differ exceedingly in regard to the endowment of this faculty which they possess. According to the energy and activity of it, poetry is prized or relished. I have met individuals who declared that they could perceive no excellence in poetical compositions, and could derive no gratification from them; and yet such individuals were endowed with every degree of understanding and penetration, according as they possessed the other faculties strongly or weakly, and were not uniformly deficient, either in moral sentiments or judgment, in proportion to their want of poetic fire.

“This faculty gives a peculiar tinge to all the other faculties. It makes them, in every thing, aspire to ideality. A cast of the human head is a plain transcript of nature, elevated and adorned by the ideality of a Chantry or a Joseph. Add a large development of this organ to the reflecting powers, and it expands the field of their interest; carries them outwards, and forwards, and upwards; and causes them to delight in schemes of improvement. In common life, we may easily distinguish those who have from those who have not a considerable endowment of it. The former speak in general in an elevated strain of language, and, when animated, show a splendour of eloquence and of poetical feeling, which the latter are never able to command. It gives to conversation a

“fascinating sprightliness and buoyancy, the very opposite of the qualities expressed by the epithets dryness and dullness.”

This sentiment tends also to refinement and elevation in manners, and in this respect is favourable to morality. The organ is generally found small in the most depraved individuals, whose occupation is crime. The following measurements of the breadth across the head, from Ideality to Ideality, will give an idea of the comparative size of the organ in several individuals, some of whom eminently display the faculty. The measurements do not denote the *absolute* size of Ideality in each, and are not given as such; for the absolute size of an organ is ascertained by measurement from the medulla oblongata, to obtain the length, and the breadth is judged of by the expansion at the peripheral surface.

MASKS OR BUSTS FROM NATURE,*

From Ideality to Ideality.

	Inches.
In Mr Joseph Hume,	5 $\frac{1}{2}$
Rev. Dr Chalmers,	6 $\frac{1}{2}$
François, Cordonnier, Poet,	6 $\frac{1}{2}$
Mr Haydon, Historical Painter,	5 $\frac{1}{2}$
Mr Joseph, Sculptor,	6 $\frac{1}{2}$
Mr Wordsworth, Poet,	6
Mr David Wilkie, R. A.,	5 $\frac{1}{2}$
Henri Quatre, of France,	5 $\frac{1}{2}$
David Haggart,	4 $\frac{1}{2}$
Mary M'Innes,	4
Scott, executed at Jedburgh for Murder,	4 $\frac{1}{2}$

SKULLS.

	Inches.
Bellingham,	4 $\frac{1}{2}$
Gordon, Murderer,	4 $\frac{1}{2}$

* In Phrenological Society's Collection.

		Inches.
New-Hollander,	No 17	3 $\frac{1}{2}$
Ditto,	No 18	3
Ditto,	No	3 $\frac{1}{4}$
Hindoo,	No 68	4 $\frac{1}{2}$
Ditto,	No 63	4 $\frac{3}{8}$
Ditto,	No 70	3 $\frac{3}{8}$
Negro,	No 21	3 $\frac{1}{8}$
Ditto,	No 22	4 $\frac{1}{8}$
European,	No 44	4 $\frac{1}{4}$
Ditto,	No 46	4 $\frac{1}{8}$
Raphael, Painter,		5 $\frac{1}{8}$
La Fontaine, of France,		4 $\frac{1}{8}$

The plate prefixed to this Number contains portraits of Locke, Cobbett, Chaucer, Shakspeare, and Rousseau, in illustration of Ideality. The situation of the organ is indicated on each head, and a single glance will be sufficient to discover that in Locke and Cobbett it is comparatively small, and in Chaucer and Rousseau decidedly large. Every reader who is familiar with the styles of these authors will at once recognise how truly the manifestations correspond in each with the development of brain.

The portrait of LOCKE indicates a large organ of language, denoted by the eyes being pressed outwards and downwards, and also a high expansion of the organs of Comparison and Causality, situated immediately below the hair, which give metaphysical acumen and deep reflecting power. Ideality, on the other hand, placed at the upper and exterior angles of the forehead, decidedly slopes away, indicating deficiency. The phrenologist would infer from this combination, a profound and comprehensive, but plain and sober understanding, accompanied with command of expression in style, but with the absence of ornament, enthusiasm, flights of imagination, and every quality connected with Ideality.

It is said in No 79 of the Edinburgh Review, that " Mr Landor 'cries up Mr Locke as' the most *elegant* of English prose writers, for no other reason, (as we apprehend,) than " that he has often been considered as the least so."

“ It is Lord Chatham who is made to pronounce the panegyric upon Locke, as ‘ the most elegant of English prose writers,’ which, if our author (Landor) were not a deliberate paradox-monger, might seem an uncivil irony. His eulogist does not mend the matter much by his definition of elegance,” which we would think intended as a test of Lord Chesterfield’s politeness. He makes it to consist in a mean between too much prolixity and too much conciseness. Now, (supposing this to be intended seriously,) Mr Locke was certainly one of the most circuitous and diffuse of all writers. This distinguished person *neither excelled in the graces of style*, according to our author’s singular assertion, nor was he (according to the common opinion) the founder of the modern system of metaphysical philosophy. The credit of having completed the great outline of the plan is beyond all question due to the philosopher of Malmesbury. Mr Locke’s real forte was *great practical good sense*, (the result of a favourable development of the organs of Propensity, Sentiment, and Intellect,) a determination to look at every question free from prejudice, and according to the evidence suggested to him, (the effect of large Conscientiousness and Firmness,) and a patient and persevering *doggedness of understanding* in contending with difficulties, and *finding out and weighing arguments of opposite tendency*,” (produced by great Firmness, Conscientiousness, Comparison and Causality, with little Ideality.) The most valuable parts of his “ celebrated essay are those which relate not to the *nature*, but to the *conduct* of the understanding; and on that subject he often proves himself a most sage and judicious adviser,” (great reflecting power and good sentiments.)

The forehead of COBBETT resembles that of Locke in its essential features: there is the great height and the full expansion of the upper portion, indicating ample organs of Causality and Comparison, with the sloping away at the superior angles, denoting a moderate or small development of Ideality. No two men could differ more than Locke and Cobbett in *sentiments*; but the organs of Self-esteem, Conscientiousness, Veneration, &c. lie in the back and coronal aspects of the head, and cannot be accurately judged of from portraits. It is therefore, only in their *intellectual* qualities that they are here compared. The Edinburgh Review, in giving the character of Cobbett’s Political Register, says,—

“ It is written with great freedom, and often with *great force of argument*. It flatters few national prejudices, except our love

* Ideality is a chief element in it.

“ of detraction and abuse; (indulgences of Self-esteem, Destructiveness, &c.,) and has often had the merit of maintaining bold truths, both against the party in power, and the prevailing sentiments of the nation. It consists, in general, of *solid argument*, (Comparison and Causality large,) and copious detail, (Individuality large,) and *no attraction of playfulness*, (absence of Ideality and Wit.)—Disgusted as we have often been with his arrogance, (Self-esteem enormous,) irritated by his coarse and clamorous abuse, (Combativeness and Destructiveness mis-applied,) and wearied with the needless vehemence and disproportioned fury with which he frequently descanted on trifles, (the last-named faculties excessively active,) we could still admire his intrepidity, (Combativeness; and Firmness, legitimately employed,) and respect his force of understanding, (Causality and Comparison large,) vol. x. p. 386. This description, so far as relates to the intellect, coincides exactly with the intellectual character of Locke; just as their heads correspond in the organs of the understanding.

CHAUCER has long been regarded as the father of English poetry. Previous to his time the English language was uncultivated and rude, and little adapted to set off the elegant thoughts and high imaginings of a poet; and therefore the more merit is to be ascribed to him, who not only first contrived to avail himself of it successfully, as a vehicle of poetry of every varied kind, but who has the farther merit of polishing and refining it to a degree, that, considering the difficulties he had to contend with, is altogether marvellous. Spencer has acknowledged our obligations to him in this respect, where he mentions him as “ that renowned poet:”—

“ Dan Chaucer, *well* of English undefyled

“ On Fame’s eternal bead-roll worthy to be fyled.”

The talents of Chaucer, when we consider at once the number and excellency of his works, and the rudeness of the age in which they were produced, appear to be more various and vast, than those of almost any English poet, Shakspeare alone excepted. Mr Godwin observes,—“ The two names which perhaps do the greatest honour to the annals of English literature are these of Chaucer and of Shakspeare. Shakspeare we have long and justly been accustomed to regard as the first in the catalogue of poetical and creative minds; and after the dramas of Shakspeare, there is no production of man that displays more various and vigorous talent than

"the Canterbury Tales. Splendour of narrative, richness of fancy, (indicating great Ideality, Comparison and Individuality,) pathetic simplicity of incident and feeling, (Benevolence and Conscientiousness,—and in general an excellent endowment of the sentiments,) and an animated vein of comic humour, (Secretiveness, Imitation, and Wit,) each takes its turn in this wonderful performance, and each in turn appears to be that in which the author was most qualified to excel."

It indeed appears, that in Ideality,—Chaucer excels Shakspeare himself. There is more about his writings of that feeling of exquisiteness, and of the "love of what is pure and perfect," than in Shakspeare, who, when treating of sublunary subjects, generally contents himself with what is natural, and what is actually found in the world. This particularly appears in Chaucer's earlier works, The "Court of Love," produced by him at the age of eighteen, the "Remains of the Rose," the "Flower and the Leaf," and some others. It is difficult now to determine how much of these productions is original, and for how much Chaucer was indebted to the French and Italian poets; but it is evident, that the subjects and the style of writing coincided with the bent of his own mind,—when he so early expended so much of his time upon them. In these he entirely quits the "working day world," and wanders and luxuriates in the delightful wilds of poetry and fancy, and particularly in that rich field of poetical imagery, allegory. The Canterbury Tales are the production of his maturer years; and in them, accordingly, we find more knowledge of the world, a deeper insight into human nature, and a delineation of the character and manners of his time, which, in accuracy and vividness of detail, are surpassed by Shakspeare alone,—and in splendour of effect, and richness of colouring, are not surpassed, if they are equalled, even by him.

In the poem of Troilus and Cressida of Chaucer, and in the play upon the same subject, founded upon it, by Shakspeare, we see displayed the difference of genius of these two gifted writers. The great beauty of Shakspeare's play, says Mr Godwin, "beyond all didactic morality, beyond all mere flights of fancy, and in which no writer, ancient or modern, can

" come in competition with him, is, that his men are men; his
 " sentiments are living, and his characters marked with those
 " delicate, evanescent, undefinable tinctures, which identify
 " them with the great delineations of nature."—" Yet," says he,
 " after every degree of homage has been paid to the glorious
 " and awful superiorities of Shakspeare, it would be unpardon-
 " able to forget one particular in which the play of *Troilus and*
 " *Cressida* does not eclipse, but, on the contrary, falls far short
 " of the poem of Chaucer. This, too, is a particular in which,
 " as the times of Shakspeare were more enlightened and refined
 " than those of Chaucer, the preponderance of excellence might
 " well be expected to be found in the opposite scale. The fact,
 " however, is unquestionable, that the characters of Chaucer
 " are more respectable and love-worthy than the corresponding
 " personages in Shakspeare. In Chaucer, *Troilus* is the pattern
 " of an honourable lover, choosing rather every extremity, and
 " the loss of life, than to divulge, whether in a direct or indi-
 " rect manner, any thing that might compromise the reputation
 " of his mistress, or lay open her name as a topic for the coun-
 " cements of the vulgar. *Cressida*, (as Mr Urry has observed,)
 " however she proves at last a ' false inconstant whore,' yet in
 " the commencement, and for a considerable time, preserves
 " those ingenuous manners, and that propriety of conduct, which
 " are the brightest ornaments of the female character. Even
 " *Pandarus*, low and dishonourable as is the part he has to play,
 " is, in Chaucer, merely a friendly and kind-hearted man, so
 " easy in his temper, that, rather than not contribute to the
 " happiness of the man he loves, he is content to overlook the
 " odious names and construction to which his proceedings are
 " entitled. Not so in Shakspeare. His *Troilus*, shows no re-
 " luctance to render his amour a subject of notoriety to the
 " whole city. His *Cressida* (for example, in the scene with the
 " Grecian chiefs), assumes the meanness of the most abandoned
 " prostitute; and his *Pandarus* enters upon his vile occupation,
 " not from any venial partiality to the desires of his friends,
 " but from the direct and simple love of what is gross, impu-
 " dent, and profligate."

Now, without stopping to consider which of these delinea-
 tions of character is more natural, or which of them is most
 pleasing, we can predicate that the former (that of Chaucer)
 bespeaks more *Conscientiousness* and *Ideality* in the author
 than that of Shakspeare. *Conscientiousness* would make the
 better and more amiable view of the characters congenial to
 the mind; while *Ideality* would lead to the endeavour, if
 they could not be presented to the reader in all the beauty
 of virtue, at least to avoid in the representation of them much
 of the deformity of vice.

Two points are mentioned in which this poet was defective; the first is the power of description, in which he is said to yield by many degrees to Spencer. This must have been owing to an inferior endowment of the pictorial organs, (Form, Size, Locality, &c.) which give to their possessor a vivid and a lasting impression of the scenery of external nature. The other defect spoken of is the want of power to produce terror, or to depict the constancy of resentment and repulse. This must have been owing to a deficiency of the power of Destructiveness, which, in no part of Chaucer's works, appears to have been a predominating quality in his mind. He never seems to delight in blood, or to revel in the work of destruction; and though, when his story requires it, he endeavours to describe the encounters of valorous knights, these are not given in the *con amore* style, which distinguishes his pathetic and humorous scenes; the patience and long endeavour of Grisildis, the soft affectations of the tender-hearted nun, or the hearty and well-conditioned temperament of the "Wife of Bath."

From the superior *Conscientiousness* and *Ideality* of Chaucer, and his inferior powers of description and raising terror,—probably arises his apparent inferiority as a poet to Shakspeare. Though there is much about him that is truly excellent, he wants also much of that which gives the *piquante* relish to Shakspeare's delineations,—the salt which is necessary to season the mass of the poet's conceptions,—and without which, as man is constituted, a predominance even of what is most excellent and praiseworthy will render a work as insipid as a too liberal supply of sugar, and deficiency of lemon and spirit, will spoil the harmonious mixture in a bowl of punch. But, inferior as he must be allowed to be, in these respects, to Shakspeare, Chaucer is a true poet; and in those two great constituents of poetry, *Ideality* and *Wis*, he has never been surpassed. In the portrait before us, the temporal regions where *Ideality* is situated; on the left side of the head next the spectator, will be seen to be considerably elevated, and even swelled out in a

lateral direction, and his hood is, as it would almost appear, purposely raised up, in order to afford a view of it. On the opposite side there is seen, in profile, the organ of *Wis*, rising square and perpendicular above the corner of the eyebrow. The whole forehead is well developed, and corresponds exactly with what we have seen of the poet's character.

The middle portrait is one of WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE, ætatis 46, anno 1610. It is given in Mr Boaden's excellent inquiry into the authenticity of various pictures and prints offered to the public as portraits of Shakspeare. This is represented as the most genuine, being copied from an original picture by Cornelius Jansen, in the collection of his Grace the Duke of Somerset. The great height of the forehead, indicating prodigious intellectual power, first attracts attention. In proceeding to the details of the head, we perceive the eyes projecting and depressed, indicating a large development of the organs of Language. The eyebrow is arched, indicating Colouring large; and the distance between the eyes is considerable, indicating Form, also amply developed. The head appears to fall in a little at the organ of Constructiveness, the cheek-bones being more prominent than the temples at the seat of that organ. It then swells out at the regions of Tune and Ideality. This last organ will be perceived to be greatly larger than the same part in Locke and Cobbett, but somewhat less than in Chaucer; and we have ventured the opinion, that in the manifestations of this faculty, the superiority must be assigned to Chaucer. In following the outline of Shakspeare's head, an immense expansion appears in the regions of Wonder and Imitation. The former faculty would produce the witches in Macbeth, and, combined with Ideality, it would inspire him with the conception of Ariel in the Tempest. Imitation is essential to the power of writing in dialogue and dramatizing. Highest of all, in the outline, stands the organ of Benevolence, which also is very large. The middle and lateral parts of the upper region of the forehead are greatly developed, indicating corresponding vigour in the faculties of Comparison,

Causality, and Wit. On the principle, that power of manifestation bears a relation to size in the organ, this forehead indicates gigantic greatness. The phrenologist ceases to wonder that, with such a development, Shakespeare should have been a prodigy in dramatic genius.

The fourth portrait represents J. J. ROUSSEAU. The organ of Language is here largely developed, as also that of Causality; but the chief feature for which we have selected it is the organ of Ideality, which stands prominently forth at the upper and anterior angle of the head. In Rousseau this faculty appears to have been in a state of almost diseased excitement; and it communicates to his conceptions, an exquisiteness of beauty and refinement, contrasting, in a remarkable degree, with the manner of thinking and writing of Cobbett and of Locke.

ARTICLE II.

PHRENOLOGY APPLIED IN THE EDUCATION OF A YOUTH.*

MR EASON,

SIR,—THE subject of this letter, when a child, was remarkable for an active spirit, combined with much good nature, and the purest simplicity, amounting even to bluntness of manner. When sent to school to learn to read, he made the least possible progress, and afterwards, when an attempt was made to teach him Latin, he stood absolutely still. His father and mother were almost in despair, and feared that he would turn out a blockhead, fit for the mortar-tub, or the pick and shovel, but destitute of capacity for any liberal pursuit. As a last effort, they sent him to board with a celebrated teacher in the country, in the hopes that the discipline of his seminary might rouse his latent faculties, if, in fact, he possessed any. Here, however, his progress was a little flattering as

* We are able to certify that this is a real case.—ED.

before. He was made the sag of boys older and stouter than himself, or even, I suspect, of some of his own age; and, as for learning, he could not be brought to comprehend a single rule of Latin, and scarcely was able to master three sentences of French: in geography and arithmetic he was very little more successful.

In this state of matters, Dr Spurzheim arrived in this country, and a gentleman who attended his lectures imagined that the case might not be so hopeless as was conceived. He examined the boy's head, and declared that the mystery was cleared up. He found the organ of Language very decidedly deficient, and the knowing organs in general not large; while the reflecting organs were far above an average in point of size for that period of life. Combativeness he found rather small, while Cautiousness, Conscientiousness, Self-esteem, Love of Approbation, Firmness, Adhesiveness, Benevolence, and Ideality, were all amply developed, and Destructiveness was not deficient. Tune also was large. He pointed out that the boy's proneness to active sports indicated a healthy condition of the brain; that his softness of disposition arose from deficient Combativeness joined with large Conscientiousness, Cautiousness, Benevolence, and Love of Approbation; that his inaptitude for languages was owing to the small development of the organ connected with this faculty; and that his general dulness arose from the knowing or perceptive organs being on the whole but moderate in size, while those of reflection, which were decidedly large, did not come into full activity till a later period of life, and did not, till then, meet with studies and pursuits suited to their gratification. He advised, therefore, that the youth should be taken from school, and sent for three or four years to learn the trade to which it was intended to bring him up; and that, thereafter, namely, at the age of seventeen or eighteen, his education should be begun anew.

This accordingly was done, and with the happiest effects. When he had passed the age of puberty his manner greatly changed. Instead of the raw, blunt, timid boy, he acquired

a sedate, shrewd, and intellectual expression of countenance; and, although extremely bashful and embarrassed in company, it was easy to perceive that thought was now active, and that the previous vacuity of mind, which had alarmed his relations, had entirely disappeared. His studies were now directed entirely according to his development. He was absolved at once from all drudgery with Greek and Latin; but told that, as he was destined to move in the rank of a merchant and manufacturer, it was indispensable that he should be master of his own language, and even know a little French. He, therefore, at seventeen, set about learning English grammar, and having now the aid of his reflecting powers, he apprehended, as intellectual perceptions, what as a child he was utterly incapable, owing to his deficient organ of Language, of learning by rote. He studied French at the same time, and profited in his apprehension of the English construction, by the stronger illustrations of concord and government which that language affords. He soon succeeded so completely as to write a correct and precise English style; and he could also read a French author with facility. His other studies were geography, algebra, and mathematics; and in these also he now took pleasure, and stated distinctly, that he saw the *principle* and application of them, and obtained from them food for reflection. His next course was chemistry, natural history, natural philosophy, and anatomy; and the pleasure with which he followed the lectures on these branches of knowledge was intense, and his improvement proportionally great.

Among other subjects, he was led to the study of Phrenology, and I shall allow him to speak for himself on this topic.

“As to Phrenology,” says he, “I am convinced I owe as much, if not more, to it than to any other of my studies. The extreme diffidence, which formed so remarkable a feature of my disposition, arose partly from natural timidity; but it was greatly aggravated by my being conscious of deficiency in some intellectual powers, compared with other persons; and entertaining most exaggerated notions of the impediments which these defects threw in the way of my attaining even ordinary proficiency in any thing. In short, before I knew

"Phrenology, I was persuaded that I was a blockhead, and my
 "whole character and conduct were on the point of being
 "formed and regulated on this principle. When, however, I
 "was told that my timidity arose from a deficiency of Comb-
 "ativeness; joined with large Cautiousness, Conscientiousness,
 "and Love of Approbation, I felt the truth of the observation
 "instinctively; and as I have a good Self-esteem, and no de-
 "ficiency of Firmness, I felt as if a mountain had been taken
 "off my shoulders, and hoped that I should yet be able to hold
 "up my head in society. The knowledge also, that the con-
 "fidence of many of my associates, whose presence of mind I
 "had envied, and attributed to great intellectual superiority,
 "arose merely from larger Combativeness and less Cautious-
 "ness than mine, gave me additional courage; and I found
 "that this theory of their dispositions was correct, not only
 "by observing their heads, but by comparing with it their
 "manner and conduct when boys, and discovering how beau-
 "tifully it explained them. I had a natural tendency to im-
 "plicit belief in all that was presented to my mind, and took
 "every one's pretensions for actual attainments; and in this
 "way could never feel that I was half wise enough to act on
 "my own opinion, if any human being chose to call it in
 "question. Phrenology gave me an invaluable insight into
 "character, and enabled me to distinguish the chaff from the
 "wheat; and also to try my own views by the standard of
 "nature, and not by the mere notions of other men. The
 "knowledge of character which it has communicated is as va-
 "luable as at least ten years' experience of the world would
 "have been to a mind such as mine. My timidity and want of
 "confidence are naturally so great, that I can scarcely imagine
 "the time when I would have had courage to place myself
 "in situations calculated to afford experience. Possessed of
 "Phrenology, I feel myself invested with something like the
 "invisible ring of the fairy tales; I enter into society with an
 "instrument which enables me to appreciate individuals with
 "truth and accuracy; this knowledge makes me know my real
 "situation, and feel safe; and then I am enabled to act without
 "fear or embarrassment. Phrenology has placed my mind at
 "peace also with itself. I know my deficiencies, and avoid re-
 "liance on them; while I know also the powers that are given,
 "and the purposes to which they may be applied, and gratitude
 "to Providence, with a due feeling of responsibility, have suc-
 "ceeded to fear and diffidence, which can never exist in a high
 "degree without some portion of discontent. Much, therefore,
 "as Phrenology is despised, I must always regard an acquaint-
 "ance with it as one of the happiest circumstances of my life,
 "and have no doubt that others will entertain the same opinion
 "when they are practically acquainted with its truths. C. J."

ARTICLE III.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE PHRENOLOGICAL JOURNAL.

SIR,—WHEN engaged some time ago in the study of Phrenology, I had the pleasure of becoming acquainted with the subject of the following letter, whose cerebral development struck me from the first as a very remarkable one, and the complete accordance of whose manifestations with it served not a little, if not to satisfy me of the truth of the science, at least to encourage me to undertake a very extensive series of observations, which ultimately ended in a perfect and sincere conversion. If you think that the case may be useful to any of your readers, it is at your service.

When I first saw Mr S.—he was about 60 years of age, of a short stout make, rather inclined to corpulency, but possessed of great natural activity. His head was altogether of great size, broad in all its parts, and somewhat higher than usual. In the situation of the organ of Constructiveness, immediately above and behind the external angles of the eyes, the temples projected so much outwards, as, at a little distance, to bring them into the line of the forehead; which presented that squareness of aspect stated by Drs Gall and Spurzheim as characterizing the heads of eminent mechanics, sculptors, painters, and artists. The forehead was broad, and the lower part, or superciliary ridge, projected considerably over the eyes, indicating great development of Weight, Size, Locality, Form, and lower Individuality. These organs, combined with Constructiveness, constitute the essential elements both of an inventive and operative genius. This combination was aided by more than usual development of Number and Tune, and by a very good Comparison and *fair* Causality. The external angle of the eye in the situation of the organ of Number was depressed like that of Jedediah Buxton, in Dr Spurzheim's plates, and the forehead rose to a considerable height with a slight slope. The organs of Ideality, Colour, Order, and Language, were decidedly under an average, and Upper Individuality was only moderate.

This statement of itself would enable the Phrenologist to predicate the kind of intellectual character which the individual would display. For the sake of the less advanced reader, however, I shall shortly state *how* the faculties manifested themselves in point of fact.

Mr S. received almost no education. At a very early age he was sent to school to learn to read; but instead of minding his letters, he began to show a peculiar talent and liking for mechanics and construction, of which his parents highly disapproved, and which they did every thing in their power to repress, but in vain. Finding the continual restraint under which he was forced to live at home becoming daily more irksome, as his faculties continued to expand, he, while yet a boy, with a confidence in his own untried powers, which great size of brain can alone give, forsook the paternal roof, and set out, he knew not where, to push his fortune. On his arrival at L——, after various vicissitudes, he obtained employment in a profession calculated to exercise those peculiar powers with which nature had so liberally endowed him, and by his excellence in which he ultimately attained wealth and eminence. But the regular calls of business were by no means sufficient to afford an adequate outlet for his mental activity. His leisure hours were *most actively* spent in inventing and constructing models of all kinds of machinery, in fruitless attempts to discover the perpetual motion, in simplifying the air-pump, in improving the diving-bell, in making carriages to go by machinery, in attempting to regulate the motion of balloons, and in innumerable other things, upon which he expended much money and no less labour, but with intense delight. At one of my visits he showed me a large garret room filled with the collected models of past years, the whole of which, as his great Constructiveness gave him the power, were made by himself. His wife used often to mention, as illustrative of his *hobby*, that the first time she heard of the existence of her "future beloved," was one day in passing along the bridge of ———, when she saw a crowd gazing intently on the water below. She inquired at

what they were looking, and was told that it was "Mr S——" "*at the bottom of the river in his diving-bell;*" and she shortly after saw him emerge.

In the works on Phrenology, it is stated that mathematical talent depends on a combination of Size, Form, Locality, Comparison, and Individuality, and that it does not require great Causality. In Mr S——, all these organs, except Upper Individuality and Causality, were decidedly large, and in him they were aided by Number. He was never taught mathematics; but, on coming to maturity, he studied them from books with great success, and was ever afterwards in the constant habit of applying them to determine the probable results of such new or untried combinations of mechanical forces as he was desirous of forming, and he rarely failed of obtaining an accurate answer to the most complicated and novel questions.

His Tune is stated as large; and it is a curious fact, that one of his first constructive efforts was made to provide himself with an instrument by which he might gratify it; and he afterwards followed the profession of a musical instrument-maker, in order to gratify both sets of faculties at once. When I last saw him, he had just finished a small instrument like a piano in miniature, but with only *one* string, and upon which he was able to play several airs. It was intended as a standard by which to tune instruments in the country, as, from all the notes being struck upon the same string, it could not go out of tune. This instrument was entirely the result of an analysis of the causes of the difference of sounds produced by strings of different lengths. I saw him when engaged in the calculation, and expressed my opinion of the impracticability of the scheme; upon which he explained the principle to me, and said that he could not fail, and in a few days more showed me the instrument complete, and allowed me to examine it minutely, so as to satisfy myself of his perfect success.

With a great deal of enthusiasm and power of invention in his favourite pursuits, Mr S—— had extremely little of that

kind of imagination which is dependent on a great endowment of Ideality, the organ of which in him was decidedly deficient. The "beau idéal," and the glowing and coloured conceptions of the poet, were to him as empty sounds. His intellect was plain, penetrating, and sound, but with somewhat of a tendency to vulgarity and grossness, the natural result of an imperfect education upon such an organization. Language was little developed, and he always felt much difficulty in expressing his ideas. He felt great delight in the practical study of natural philosophy.

The development of the organs of the propensities and sentiments, in Mr S——, was also remarkable; but I have already encroached too much on your pages, to allow me to enter into farther detail: I shall therefore only add, that the manifestations corresponded in every point. I am not at liberty to publish the name of the gentleman; but, as I pledge myself for the accuracy of the facts stated, I am ready to communicate it to you, and am, Sir, &c.

ARTICLE IV.

SHAKSPEARE'S OTHELLO.

THOSE who are unacquainted with Phrenology may smile at the attempt to apply it in analyzing a character which probably never had any existence beyond the pages of the volume in which we find it described. They ask us, What have we proved, when we have traced each indication of passion, or feeling, or intellect, to what we call an elementary source, and designated that source by a phrenological name? The argument in favour of our science, which is thus afforded, is certainly not of that obvious and palpable kind, which is likely at once to carry conviction to a mind whose attention is for the first time directed to the investigation; but to those who have already made some progress in the study, it is, though an indirect, a most beautiful and convincing proof that nature and Phrenology are one. They

discover in it the elements of the most various and opposite appearances which the mind of man does or can assume. And if a system so perfect and complete is assigned by its enemies to the invention of Gall and Spurzheim, they assert what in truth it is harder to believe than the proposition which they themselves reject on the mere ground of its incredibility.

In the character of Othello, such as it is drawn by Shakspeare, the first thing we remark is its power and energy. He seems to move along among the personages of that inimitable drama, as if conscious of his superiority, and these seem to recognise that superiority, by the submissiveness and awe with which his presence affects them. There is in whatever he utters or performs that indescribable force, which, had he really existed, we must have immediately assigned to the general largeness of his cerebral organization. It is not, however, the ascendancy which results from the possession of a commanding intellect, as will presently be seen from the analysis of his character, but rather that superiority which flows from elevation of sentiment, stimulated by the fire of passion. The propensities and sentiments, indeed, are, with few exceptions, so strongly manifested as to occasion little difficulty in describing their proportions. Of the intellectual faculties the indications are less complete, and the difficulty of deciding on their relative energy is consequently greater. Their general vigour is undoubtedly inferior to that of the two other great divisions, under which, together with this of intellect, the different faculties of the human mind are classed by Phrenology. The preponderance of intellect is manifested in man, by the complete subjection in which it holds the inferior parts of his nature. Whether that subjection may prove effectual for good or for wicked purposes will in a great measure depend on the strength or deficiency of the sentiments; but no influence of passion will be allowed to interfere with the accomplishment of an object. In Othello, on the other hand, the force of his propensities may be frequently seen sweeping intellect along in a tide, which,

but for the opposition offered by counteracting sentiments, would have been altogether resistless.

Self-esteem is the prevailing feature in his character; being combined, however, with large Conscientiousness and Love of Approbation, its presence is manifested rather by a conscious greatness and magnanimity, than by the more offensive and less dignified indications with which we are apt to associate its predominance. Under this form it is discoverable in the first words he utters. In the second scene of the first act, he is introduced in conversation with Iago, whose immense Secretiveness and powerful intellect enabled him thoroughly to comprehend the character of his general's mind, and whose whole speech accordingly is directed to this combination, which it immediately excites. Brabantio's merits and influence with the duke are stated so as to contrast them with the Moor's, and his reply finely exhibits the combination to which I have adverted:

Oth. Let him do his spite:
 My services, which I have done the signiory,
 Shall out-tongue his complaints. 'Tis yet to know,
 (Which, when I know that boasting is an honour,
 I shall promulgate,) I fetch my life and being
 From men of royal siege; and my demerits
 May speak, unbombed, to as proud a fortune
 As this that I have reach'd: For know, Iago,
 But that I love the gentle Desdemona,
 I would not my unhoused free condition
 Put into circumscription and confine
 For the sea's worth.—

A more accurate display of Self-esteem, Love of Approbation, and Conscientiousness could hardly be produced. It is not the disgusting apotheosis of self, which results from the first of these sentiments when the others are deficient, nor the idle boasting of a Captain Bobadil, who, with his single arm, and his good toledo, could kill "his twenty men per day," demonstrating the vigour of love of Approbation, and the weakness of Conscientiousness and Self-esteem,—for the latter sentiment acts as a restraint on boasting, as may be seen in the character of Coriolanus,—but it is the simple assertion

of conscious merit, of services which he knows he has performed, and whose value he can fully estimate.

But there is something more unfolded in this passage :—

I would not my unhoused free condition
Put into circumscription and confine
For the sea's worth—

proves the general largeness of his propensities, communicating, with his large Self-esteem, to his temperament a fire and restlessness, which is averse from every species of control:—and the words which precede,

But that I love the gentle Desdemona,

evinces also in particular the power of his Amativeness and Adhesiveness producing a motive strong enough to overcome this aversion to bondage. It is these two faculties which give birth to conjugal love,—a love, which, when they are largely developed, clings to its object with a devotedness, which seems to hold life and love as of synonymous import. Such it was in Othello,—

Were't to renounce his captain,—(says Iago.)—
All seals and symbols of redeemed sin,
His soul is so unfettered to her love
That she may make, unmake, do what she list :—

When we have noticed the proofs of his large Combative-ness and Destructiveness, we shall have before us the great elements of action in the Moor's mental constitution; and which being directed into a particular channel by the fiendish cunning of his officer, lead to the main incident which the drama involves. Of the energy of these two propensities we have ample testimony, as well from every word he utters as from every deed he performs. He had been, as he tells the senators in the "round unvarnished tale" he delivers in justification of his marriage with Desdemona, a soldier from childhood; and if the pith of his little arm could not at seven years be very terrible to his enemies, his disposition to raise it "in the tented field" spoke of the spirit which was nursing the future hero. But it is not alone in these "feats of broils and battle" in which his life had been spent, that we discover the vigour of the two propensities in ques-

tion. It is true, that wherever they are strongly developed, they communicate to the character an instinctive desire to encounter, and struggle with, and conquer opposition :—and Othello tells the senators of Venice,—

I do agonize
A natural and prompt alacrity
I find in hardness.—

Like the war-horse, when the trumpet sounds the onset, and the din of arms startles his ear, spurning the earth with his impatient tread, and panting for the shock of battle, the rider, sharing the spirit of the noble animal which bears him, longs for the command that bids him rush like a destroying angel to scatter destruction among the foe. Conjoined, however, with the sentiments which Othello possessed in such distinguished proportion, the natural fierceness of these propensities would be restrained, until a strong exciting cause was presented. But their operation was not therefore suspended. Even in this quiescent state they impart to every accent of command, an expression which can never be misunderstood by those to whom it is addressed ; conveying, although uttered with all the external seeming of coolness and composure, an intimation,—to use the words of Mr Scott,—of the will of the Speaker, coupled with the farther intimation, expressed or implied, that disobedience will be attended with fatal or inconvenient consequences.

There is a striking exemplification of this in the second scene of the first act, where Othello thus replies to the puny clamours of the aged and feeble Brabantio, and the party he leads.—

Keep up your bright swords, for the dew will rust them.—
Good signior, you shall more command with years,
Than with your weapons.—

And again, after every abusive epithet has been lavished upon him—far from being chafed by an opposition, his Self-esteem, Combativeness, and Destructiveness, give him an inward consciousness of power to crush by a single movement of his arm,—he calls to those of both parties, who were preparing to bring the matter to the decision of arms,—

Hold your hands,
 Both you of my inclining, and the rest :
 Were it my cue to fight, I should have known it
 Without a prompter.—

Othello is now the husband of Desdemona, the object of his entire and unmeasured affection. The sentiments of Self-esteem, Love of Approbation, and Conscientiousness, which we have seen so powerfully indicated, would entitle us to predicate that pleasure and dalliance, though fully enjoyed, would never relax one necessary exertion in the cause of his country. The sense of his own dignity, of the opinion of the world, and of duty which they must naturally produce, are offerings too valuable to be sacrificed on the shrine of the Cyprian goddess. We feel assured, when his sails are spread to carry him to the seat of war, that he will not, like another Antony, spend those hours on the couch, or at the festive board, which should have seen him "turning the tide of battle with his arm," at the head of his legions; nor fly, like the luxurious Roman, to hide the ignominy of defeat and overthrow in the bosom of his mistress. We recognise the ruling principles of his previous character, when he speaks thus to his Venetian masters :—

And Heaven defend your good souls, that you think
 I will your serious and great business scant,
 For she is with me : No, when light-wing'd toys
 Of feather'd Cupid seel with wanton dulness
 My speculative and active instruments,
 That my disports corrupt and taint my business,
 Let housewives make a skillet of my helm,
 And all indign and base adversities
 Make head against my estimation.

As it is at this period the great event on which this drama is made to turn begins to be evolved, it may be useful in order fully to comprehend how the crafty insinuations of Iago operate, and the consequences to which they lead, to glance at those features in the Moor's character which have not hitherto been adverted to. Of the propensities, we seem already to have noticed all of which there is any indication; of the sentiments, not one appears to have been deficient; Firmness, Hope, Ideality, Cautiousness, Benevolence, and

Veneration, if less expressly manifested than the three others, whose combined activity has been pointed out, discover at the same time their influence, in every modification of mind into which they could enter. Firmness, Hope, and Ideality, when in vigorous existence, produce, even where Cautiousness is full, a sanguine and decided disposition. And if it happens, as in Othello's case, that Self-esteem is a prevailing sentiment, undisturbed confidence in his power to execute what he undertakes will be the result which this combination will generate. Othello's intellect would seem to have been of a knowing rather than of a reflective and philosophic cast. It is not from any individual and particular indication we are led to this conclusion, but rather from the general tone of the whole character. Such personages as Macbeth and Richard III. give proofs of a superior intellect in almost every sentence they are made to utter. We find in nearly all their soliloquies a tracing of cause and effect, from abstract propositions, which at once demonstrates the vigorous action of those faculties we have noticed as defective in Othello, in whose whole language we cannot discover above one or two such manifestations, and these in the simplest form. The consequence of this deficiency cannot be more forcibly stated than in the words of Iago, by which Shakespeare undoubtedly meant to convey a true idea of his hero:

The Moor is of a free and open nature,
That thinks men honest, that but seem to be so ;
And will as tenderly be led by the nose
As asses are.

In this particular he is strongly contrasted with Iago, whose powers of this class are far beyond the reach of his General's grasp. The contrast indeed is deepened by the different degrees of Secretiveness which they possess ; and we omitted to notice, that in the Moor it could only have been of moderate size ; while the thick veil which it enables his officer to draw over thoughts already too profound to be scanned by Othello's penetration, well entitle him to exclaim,

For when my outward action doth demonstrate
The native act and figure of my heart

In compliment ~~to him~~, 'tis not long after
 But I will wear my heart upon my sleeve,
 For daws to peck at: I am not what I am.

But a powerful intellect was not necessary to Othello's office as a general; not even to his being the great and redoubted one which the tragedy describes him. He had a mind exactly fitted to obtain a high ascendancy in the camp or in the field of battle. With Cautiousness sufficient to prevent rashness, with Combativeness and Destructiveness, and Love of Approbation, to make him fight from inclination as well as from the desire of fame, with Firmness and Self-esteem, to make him persevere against ten thousand obstacles, with that benignity of deportment, and genuine humanity, which spring from Veneration and Benevolence; we see in Othello at once the joy of his soldiers, and the scourge and terror of his enemy. It remains to observe how these elements of domestic love, of noble dignity, of severe justice, are converted into a burning sense of disappointed affection, insulted pride, and implacable revenge. It remains, in a word, to trace the progress of Othello's jealousy.

Before proceeding with this part of our task, however, perhaps it may not be deemed inappropriate to make a few general remarks on jealousy itself.

It is a truth not less indisputable than it is melancholy, that many of those feelings in our mental constitution which the hand of nature planted there, to add to the security, and happiness, and dignity of our existence, do often become, by perversion and abuse, the very means by which we are rendered strangers to each and all of these much-desired and truly-desirable objects. The passion of jealousy,—to use the common phraseology,—is but one exemplification of this statement, out of the long catalogue which the history of humanity presents. It is a passion into whose composition several elementary principles enter, and the different aspects it assumes spring from the variety in number and in modes of combination in which these principles unite. As it is not our present purpose, however, to examine and discriminate between the features by which these modifications are seve-

rally characterized, we shall merely observe in proceeding, that Self-esteem is the root from which they all originate. That wherever this faculty exists in large proportion, and is accompanied by a vigorous Love of Approbation, together with a deficient sentiment of Conscientiousness, the individual in whom this combination exists will be very liable to entertain a jealousy, which will take its distinguishing character from some other prominent point in his mental constitution. Unless in cases where Love of Approbation is itself the prevailing feature, and in such, jealousy of fame will be the tone it will assume.

The Self-esteem of such a person is wounded when those about him rise to higher eminence than himself, in the department which, from his cast of mind, he considers as peculiarly his own; because he is thus compelled to admit, though it be only in the secrecy of his own bosom, that he is inferior; and the bitterness which this admission carries along with it, is increased tenfold by the injury his sentiment of the Love of Approbation receives, by witnessing the tide of human applause flowing rapidly towards these detested objects. Had Conscientiousness been large, it would have impressed him, in spite of himself, with the feeling, that the award was just; he would more easily have submitted to receive the inferior portion of fame, which his merits might still secure to him; and he would have looked with less bitterness on the names that occupied a higher station than his own on the scale of excellence.

Saul, King of Israel, is a striking exemplification of the kind of jealousy we have been describing. When the virgins met him returning from battle, and sung to the notes of their instruments of music, that "Saul had slain his thousand, and David his tens of thousands," the "king was very wroth, and the saying displeased him." In this instance Destructiveness was also powerful, which, being stimulated by the combination above specified, prompted him to destroy the object of his jealousy. The poet, with these sentiments, combined in the manner and degree described, is

jealous of the authorship of his rivals in the favour of the sacred nine; the architect looks with a scowling and discontented eye on the rising towers and swelling arches which he sees growing up under the rod of a more potent wizard than himself; the artist hates every line of beauty which the marble assumes under the more skilfully guided tool of a brother sculptor; and the loveliest Madonna that ever graced the walls of the cloister, would fail to draw from him one regard of worshipping admiration. But the principle on which the passion proceeds being explained, it is unnecessary to dwell on the modified forms it may in different individuals assume. Jealousy, in all the states to which we have yet alluded, is insignificant and contemptible, and generally is consistent with a constitution of mind, which, even if this passion were abstracted, would neither be truly great nor amiable. But there is a jealousy which can excite the deepest sympathies of our nature, which can be insinuated into a mind of the noblest mould, and make him, who once was great and good, "fallen in the practice of a cursed slave," to assume the form of a revengeful demon. Such a cursed slave was Iago, and Othello was such a victim to his malignity.

The great elements of Othello's character, whose influence and operation we have remarked in the early part of his history, continued throughout to give equally incontestable evidence of their presiding power. The clouds were now gathering, which were soon to shut out for ever from his soul every beam of happiness; but even amid the storm which followed, and in the ruin of which it was the cause, we find no deviation from the principles with which Shakspeare at first invested his mental constitution. There reigns from beginning to end a conformity and a truth to nature, which in this, as in every other portrait sketched by the same hand, renders our great poet the glory of his country. Othello loved his wife,—loved his friends,—loved honour,—and hated the very appearance of deceit or injustice; and yet withal, he becomes the murderer of that wife,—~~does~~

his truest friend to the dagger of an assassin,—and finally to these adds the crime of suicide; yet nature is never once violated. Othello in the last scene of the play, pointed at with the finger of amazement and horror, is the same Othello, whom in the first act we had seen honoured by the Venetian senate as the prop and bulwark of the empire.

Iago himself informs us of the plan he is now preparing to execute. Thoroughly acquainted at once with the strength and weakness of his General's mind, he knew every avenue through which his devilish insinuations could be introduced with the greatest safety and the most perfect effect.

I will, he says,

Make the Moor thank me, love me, and reward me,
For making him egregiously an ass,
And practising upon his peace and quiet
Even to madness.

His Adhesiveness, his Love of Approbation, his Self-esteem, and even his Conscientiousness, are all to be assailed, and every proof of Desdemona's infamy is to be made to carry that stamp which will render its impression irresistible to such a mind.

At the first step Cassio is brought into disgrace, and the detail of the event brings out into a strong light, some of those leading features in Othello's character to which we have been adverting. Love had not lulled to sleep, as we observed might have been predicated, the Cautiousness of the soldier even on the bridal night.

Good Michael, (he says to Cassio,) look you to the guard to-night:
Let's teach ourselves that honourable stop,
Not to out-sport discretion.

By the machinations of Iago, however, the honest Lieutenant's wits are confounded by a too liberal sacrifice to Bacchus, and his choleric temper being thus unmuzzled, the court of guard becomes a scene of uproar and confusion. The alarm-bell is rung, and the inhabitants of a "town of war get wild, the people's hearts brimful of fear," thrown into a state of commotion. The scene, the third of the second act, which ensues, is finely descriptive of the disposition of mind we have assigned to Othello, illustrated alike in what

he himself utters, as in the crafty wording of Iago's explanations:

Oth. Hold, for your lives.

Iago. Hold, hold, lieutenant—sir, Montano—gentlemen, Have you forgot all sense of place and duty?

.... The general speaks to you; hold, hold, for shame!

Oth. Why, how now, ho! From whence ariseth this?

Are we turned Turks; and to ourselves do that

Which Heaven hath forbid the Ottomites?

For Christian shame, put by this barbarous brawl:

He that stirs next to carve for his own rage,
Holds his soul light; he dies upon his motion.—

Silence that dreadful bell, it frights the isle

From her propriety.—What is the matter?....

Honest Iago, that looks dead with grieving,

Speak, who began this? on thy love I charge thee.

Hitherto Self-esteem, Conscientiousness, Firmness, and the Benevolence which was diffused through his nature, keep his kindling Destructiveness in subjection; but when, on farther investigation, he cannot obtain the true account how "this foul rout began," his anger begins to break through all restraint, while his higher faculties, still struggling against its rising power, make him aware of the consequences which are about to ensue:

Oth. Now, by Heaven;

My blood begins my safer guides to rule;

And passion, having my best judgment collied,

Assays to lead the way: If I once stir,

Or do but lift this arm, the best of you

Shall sink in my rebuke.

Iago, being thus apparently driven to avow the truth, arranges his words with such a depth of cunning, as to make it appear to the Moor that his "honesty and love doth mince this matter, making it light to Cassio," when, in truth, he has told all, and infused into the General's mind suspicions of much more. He thus gains the double object of prepossessing the latter in *his* favour, while he utterly ruins Cassio, and by this means lays the ground-work of all his subsequent operations.

Conscientiousness, accompanied by Self-esteem, and stimulated by Destructiveness, manifest their presence in circumstances like those in which Othello is now placed, by the

stern and severe application of justice to punish so palpable a breach of duty as appears to have been committed; the more especially, since that duty had arisen from a command issued by himself. What follows, therefore, is in strict harmony with nature. The faithful soldier and the valued friend must submit to the stern decree of inflexible justice:

Cassio, I love thee;

But never more be officer of mine.

The scene which follows soon after, wherein Iago first insinuates the damning suspicion into his General's mind, is perhaps the finest in the whole play. He does not begin by hinting at once that the intimacy of the Lieutenant with Desdemona exceeded propriety; but, as if merely expressing aloud a thought which had suddenly passed across his mind, he cries,—

Ha! I like not that.

Oth. What dost thou say?

Iago. Nothing, my lord: or if—I know not what.

Oth. Was not that Cassio, parted from my wife?

Iago. Cassio, my lord? No, sure, I cannot think it,
That he would steal away so guilty like,
Seeing you coming—

Othello himself is thus made to suggest the idea on which Iago had himself apparently just lighted; and in the dialogue that ensues, the crafty ancient puts his interrogatories with the air of one who desires simply to satisfy his own mind. Othello's attention being thus arrested, and a gleam of suspicion darting across him, he becomes himself the inquisitor; and every word which Iago now utters has the appearance of being forced from him, and wears the complete aspect of friendship and truth:

Iago. My lord, you know I love you.

Oth. I think, thou dost;

And,—for I know that thou art full of love and honesty,
And weigh'st thy words before thou giv'st them breath,—
'Therefore these stops of thine fright me the more: . . .
For such things, in a false disloyal knave,
Are tricks of custom; but, in a man that's just,
They're close denotements working from the heart
That passion cannot rule.

The complete confidence he reposed in Iago's friendship,

in the honesty of his disposition, and in his zeal for his service, gave to every half-uttered and broken syllable the force of an appeal from Adhesiveness, Self-esteem, and Conscientiousness, in the one, to the same faculties in the other. But the Moor's love for his wife was too strong, and his trust in her virtue too well-founded, to give way to bare suspicions :

'Tis not to make me jealous,
To say—my wife is fair, feeds well, loves company,
Is free of speech, sings, plays, and dances well ;
Where virtue is, these are more virtuous.

But his Destructiveness, Self-esteem, and Firmness, all of which we have seen to maintain a powerful sway in his character; are strongly manifested in the following declaration :

Think'st thou I'd make a life of jealousy
To follow still the changes of the moon
With fresh suspicions? No!—to be at once in doubt
Is once to be resolved.

Iago's object is now attained. Othello has been made himself broadly to express and entertain what his insidious enemy hardly ventures to breathe; the "iron has entered his soul," and is left corroding his very vitals.

But every obstacle is not yet removed. His conjugal affection, arising from his large Amativeness and Adhesiveness, still clings fondly to its object, and the paroxysm to which it leads suggests the possibility of his suspicions being false. The course of Conscientiousness being thus for a moment turned, reproaches him for having wronged a faithful wife; and Destructiveness, kindling within him at the thought of such baseness, he holds over the head of his insidious foe the sword of a just and terrible revenge, ready to stab him to perdition, if his information should prove false :

Villain! be sure thou prove my love a whore ;
Be sure of it: give me the ocular proof ;
Or, by the worth of mine eternal soul,
Thou had'st been better have been born a dog;
Than answer my waked wrath.

Immediately, however, there is a re-action of Conscientiousness, and he fears he has wronged the object of his threats.

Nay, stay :—thou should'st be honest.

The current of his passion is now arrested, and flows towards another object. The Love and Conscientiousness which, a moment before, had been as a spur to urge him on to avenge a calumniated wife, now stimulate him to doom to assassination her supposed seducer, and to find "some swift means of death" for the "fair devil" herself.

In the dialogue which ensues here between Othello and Iago, we see those faculties in the mind of the former which we have noticed as being the most predominant in a state of alternate activity, according as his jealousy or affection gets the ascendant :

Oth. O, Iago!

Iago. And did you see the handkerchief?

Oth. Was that mine?

Iago. Yours, by this hand, &c.

Oth. I would have him nine years a killing :—

A fine woman! a fair woman! a sweet woman!

Iago. Nay, you must forget that.

Oth. Ay, let her rot, and perish, and be damned to-night; for she shall not live: No, my heart is turned to stone; I strike it, and it hurts my hand. O, the world hath not a sweeter creature, &c.

Iago. Nay, that's not your way.

Oth. Hang her! I do but say what she is :—So delicate with her needle!—An admirable musician! O, she will sing the savageness out of a bear!—Of so high and plenteous wit and invention!

Iago. She's the worse for all this.

Oth. O, a thousand, a thousand times :—And then of so gentle a condition!

Iago. Ay, too gentle.

Oth. Nay, that's certain: But yet the pity of it, Iago!—O, Iago, the pity of it, Iago!

Iago. If you are so fond over her iniquity, give her patent to offend; for, if it touch not you, it comes near nobody.

Oth. I will chop her into messes :—Cuckold me!

Iago. O, 'tis foul in her.

Oth. With mine officer!

Iago. That's fouler.

Oth. Get me some poison, Iago; this night :—I'll not expostulate with her, lest her body and beauty unprovide my mind again :—this night, Iago.

We see here *Combativeness* and *Destructiveness* directed chiefly against Cassio, but also in a high degree against Dea-

demonia. Then Amativeness, Adhesiveness, Ideality, and Veneration, come into play, and he enumerates all his wife's admirable qualities. Again, wounded Self-esteem and re-kindling Destructiveness cry out for revenge, and thus the balance sways from side to side several times before it settles in the bloody resolution, which it requires all Iago's art to keep fixed and steady. It is this circumstance in the progress of jealousy,—this vibration from love to hatred and revenge,—which induced Collins so to pourtray it in his imitable Ode to the Passions :

Thy numbers, Jealousy, to nought were fix'd,
 Sad proof of thy distressful state ;
 Of differing themes the veering song was mix'd,
 And now it courted love, now raving called on hate.

However strange the assertion may seem, it is in the works of the poet, rather than of the philosopher, we are to look for correct delineations of human nature and human feelings. The latter, ever wedded to some favourite hypothesis, saw facts through a medium which often entirely changed their aspect, and even distorted the information which was supplied by his own consciousness. The poet, on the other hand, describes what he has seen in others, or has experienced within himself, with no other view than to give it force and effect : and the consequence has been hitherto, that, while the one has generally exhibited an " airy nothing," the other has frequently produced the reality of life.

To return to Othello.—His Love and Pride are lacerated and torn by the wounds they have received, his Destructiveness is excited to revenge his wrongs, and Conscientiousness, deeply offended by the base return he has received for all the love, and friendship, and honour he had preserved so inviolate, lends even more than an approving voice to the deed he meditates. There is a speech occurs here, in which Othello, now contemplating the completeness of his misery, almost pourtrays his own character :

Had it pleased Heaven, (he says,)
 To try me with affliction ; had he rained
 All kinds of sores, and shames, on my bare head ;
 Steeped me in poverty to the very lips ;

Given to captivity me and my utmost hopes ;
 I should have found in *some part of my soul*
A drop of patience : But (alas !) to make me
 A fixed figure, for the time of scorn
 To point his slow, unmoving finger at,—
 O ! O !

Yet could I bear that too ; well, very well :
 But there, where I have garner'd up my heart ;
 Where either I must live, or bear no life ;
 The fountain, from the which my current runs,
 Or else dries up ; to be discarded thence !
 Or keep it as a cistern, for foul toads
 To knot and gender in !—turn thy complexion there !
 Patience, thou young and rose-lipp'd cherubim ;
 Aye, there, look grim as hell !

Self-esteem and Firmness would enable him to bear any physical hardships. Of these, as we learn from his speech to the senate, he had already borne many, and was even proud of the endurance of them. Acquisitiveness being in all probability moderate, the idea of poverty carries with it nothing very terrible or alarming ; and under its pressure he feels that Conscientiousness and Hope would supply him with the “drops of patience,” of which, in such circumstances, he would stand in need :

But, alas ! to make me

A fix'd figure, &c.

To a mind in which Self-esteem is a presiding sentiment, and where Love of Approbation is also large, contempt is much harder to bear than poverty. If conscious, however, that the contempt is undeserved, Conscientiousness may enable it to endure even the “world's dread laugh :”

Yet could I bear that too :—

But there, where I have garner'd up my heart, &c.

_____ to be discarded thence !

Or keep it as a cistern, for foul toads

To knot and gender in !—turn thy complexion there !

There indeed the last drop of patience had been dried up. This large Amativeness and Adhesiveness, producing such a love for Desdemona as rendered his soul a chaos of unutterable darkness when its light was withdrawn, influenced, as is usual in the indications of his character, by his great Self-esteem, which comes out conspicuously in the last lines

of his speech, had sustained a laceration that was altogether intolerable. He has now parted with all that constituted the happiness of his life and made existence desirable; and the speech in which he does so is a beautiful and striking emanation from those propensities and sentiments which we have seen so predominant in his character:

O now, for ever,
 Farewell the tranquil mind! farewell content!
 Farewell the plumed troop, and the big wars,
 That make ambition virtue! O, farewell!
 Farewell the neighing steed, and the shrill trump,
 The spirit-stirring drum, the ear-piercing fife,
 The royal banner; and all quality,
 Pride, pomp, and circumstance of glorious war!
 And O, you mortal engines, whose rude throats
 Th' immortal Jove's dread clamours counterfeit,
 Farewell! Othello's occupation's gone.

It is unnecessary to carry our analysis through all the scenes which precede the completion of what he has resolved. Iago continues to adduce his damning proofs, until no prop remains on which he can sustain a single doubt of his dishonour. His mind is a prey to a succession of paroxysms, and the energy of his character seems but to drive him from misery to madness. Accordingly, when he enters Desdemona's chamber to execute the purpose with which he was fraught, Reason seems almost tottering on her throne. It is not alone, however, the deed he is about to commit which produces the dreadful agitation of mind under which he labours, but rather the shock his prevailing propensities and sentiments have sustained by the information he has received. The abruptness of the soliloquy here renders its meaning somewhat obscure, which Johnson has noticed and explained in the following words:—"I am here, says Othello in his mind, overwhelmed with horror. What is the reason of this perturbation? Is it want of resolution to do justice? Is it the dread of shedding blood? No. It is not the action that shocks me; but it is the cause,—it is the cause, *my soul!* Let me not name it to you, ye chaste stars, it is the cause." It is very probable that this is the true meaning Shakspeare meant to convey by these words; but we are inclined to

suspect Othello would have been deceiving himself had he really uttered them. His Benevolence and Adhesiveness, in the prospect of such a violation of the feelings they are calculated to generate, must have produced, independent of the *cause* which appeared to render such a violation necessary, a considerable share of his mental agony and agitation. In proof of this opinion, we see the influence of these very faculties staying his murderous arm, and half-subduing, for a moment, the dreadful frenzy which filled his soul:

O balmy breath, that dost almost persuade
Justice to break her sword!—One more, one more.—
Be thus when thou art dead, and I will kill thee,
And love thee after.

And it is not till these traces of lingering affection have awakened his unhappy wife, and that the transient calm had been succeeded by the storm of rage which he excites by recurring to the evidences of her guilt, that the opposition of these restraining faculties is overcome, and the deed of horror is committed.—We have said, that Conscientiousness lent even more than an approving voice to the commission of this foul deed. Wounded Self-esteem and Destructiveness appear, indeed, to have been the feelings under whose influence the murder was first resolved on, and it is evident they had again the ascendancy at the moment of its perpetration. During the whole period that intervened, however, the voice of Conscientiousness may be distinctly heard speaking in aid of his resolution. When Iago suggests to him to strangle her on the bed she had contaminated, he answers,

Good. The justice of it pleases me.

Afterwards, in the chamber, when he says he will not shed her blood, he adds,

Yet she must die, else she'll betray more men.

When he kisses her before the murder, he says,

Oh balmy breath, that dost almost persuade
Justice to break her sword.

And again, when he justifies the deed to Emilia,

O, I were damn'd beneath all depth in hell,
But that I did proceed upon just grounds
To this extremity.

No sooner are his eyes opened to the treachery that had been practised to deceive him, than the combination which produced his jealous fury changes its mode of action: Conscientiousness, Love of Approbation, and Self-esteem, are again in vigorous exercise; but it is only to tell him that a blind and headlong passion has made him the murderer of an innocent and affectionate wife; that henceforth he must regard his proud name as stained with the foulest of crimes; that the reputation of him that "was Othello" is lost for ever. When the story of the handkerchief is explained, and Othello sees how completely he has been gulled by Iago, all his sentiments and propensities are turned against him, and against the deed he has committed. Self-esteem and Love of Approbation, tortured by the idea of his being so cheated, and so blind as not to see the cheat, are finely indicated in the exclamation he utters when every doubt has been removed.

O fool! fool! fool!

All his fondness for his wife revives, and what he had so lately persuaded himself was an act of justice, now wears the horrid features of foul and atrocious murder. Of what description his feelings now were, we may judge from the following words, in which his paroxysm exhausts itself:

O cursed, cursed slave!—Whip me, ye devils,
From the possession of this heavenly sight!
Blow me about in winds! roast me in sulphur!
Wash me in steep-down gulfs of liquid fire!—
O Desdemona! Desdemona! dead!

He is reduced to a perfect wreck, and his faculties are in such a state of internal warfare, that even his usual valour forsakes him:

I am not valiant neither,
But every puny whipster gets my sword.

And again,

Man but a rush before Othello's breast,
And he retires.

Remembrance of the dreadful deed he has committed, sets in array against him every nobler sentiment of his soul. He feels that a stain has fallen on his reputation which no-

thing can remove ; that he has inflicted a wound upon himself which ages could not heal : and, racked with such intolerable misery, he hurries to find a shelter in the arms of suicide.

ARTICLE V.

REDGAUNTLET.

THIS novel, although abounding in occasional excellencies and beauties, displays, as a whole, less of the author's gifted talents than even *St Ronan's Well*. The story is not well concatenated, and many of the personages conduce very little, and some of them nothing at all, to the ultimate result. Mr Saunders Fairford, poor Peter Peebles, Quaker Geddes, Wandering Willie and his Wife, and even Allan Fairford and Darsie Latimer, are no ways instrumental in breaking up the Jacobite conspiracy, or bringing about the re-embarkation of the Pretender, which is the consummation of the story. There are also fewer profound representations of human nature, and in consequence less scope for phrenological remark. Nanty Ewart is a specimen of the character produced when the organs of Propensity, Sentiment, and Intellect, are nearly in equilibrio, and the individual is left without efficient external restraint. He then becomes the very sport of circumstances. Nanty commences life with a sincere desire to conduct himself with propriety ; but temptation presents itself, and he yields. He is then hurried into a vortex of iniquity ; and under this influence his propensities gain the most frightly ascendancy. He is first a seducer, and then becomes a confirmed drunkard, smuggler, and pirate. The moral sentiments, however, burst forth in occasional gleams of better feeling. He is visited with recollections of the loveliness of virtue, and deep consciousness of the degradation induced by his crimes ; he feels remorse, while yet he despairs of reformation ; and longs for death as the only termination to his sufferings and crimes. His despair, and a glow of tenderness, (the result of Benevolence and Adhe-

siveness still unextinguished,) breaking out almost unknown to himself, bring him within the range of our sympathies, and excite pity for the man while we abhor his actions. His intellect is represented as acute, and partially cultivated, but deficient in native vigour to control the unfortunate combination of propensities that has fallen to his lot.

As a contrast to him, Joshua Geddes, a quaker, is represented as possessing, from nature, a great endowment of Combativeness and Destructiveness; but over-balanced by so vigorous an intellect, and such powerful moral sentiments, that they are kept under habitual restraint. They shew their presence and energy, however, in occasionally bringing the good man to the very verge of a passion; instantly checked indeed, but serving to remind him of the old Adam still dwelling within him; and they inspire him also with great intrepidity of character,—a more legitimate; but equally characteristic, object of their functions.

Our chief object, however, in noticing Redgauntlet, we confess, is to point out one great mistake in point of description which the author has committed, and which comes peculiarly within our province of criticism. He describes Herries of Birrenswork, and informs us, that “his head was *small*, “with a large forehead and well-formed ears.” (Vol. i. p. 71.) Now, we are disposed to risk not only our reputation as Phrenologists, but our heads as men, that the mental character which in nature accompanies such a development of brain, is marked by deficiency of energy in propensity and sentiment, and by vigour of intellect alone. The individual, in short, would be regarded in the world as acute, and probably profound; but he would be felt as singularly deficient in active energy and susceptibility of emotion. Every one would assign the closet, or the hall of a library, as his appropriate fields of exertion, while for the busy haunts of men he would be regarded as nearly incapacitated. The author, however, entertains a different opinion; and represents Herries, who afterwards turns out to be Redgauntlet himself, as possessing prodigious force of character, especially in propensity and

sentiment, the very parts in which nature, if she had given him such a head, would have constituted him feeble. "That "I have seen you before," says Davie Latimer to him, "is "certain; for none can forget the look with which you seem "to have the power of blighting those upon whom you cast it." V. ii. p. 131. No human being can produce such a look unless he possess large Destructiveness, with a head in general far above an average size. King Robert Bruce could have done so, while a man with such a head as the author describes would excite ridicule in attempting it. The author, although at fault in regard to the head, is consistent throughout in his representation of the mental character of Redgauntlet. "He flung the warrant," says he, "into the fire with one hand, "and fixed the other with irresistible gripe on the breast of the "attorney, who, totally unable to contend with him in either "personal strength or *mental energy*, trembled like a chicken "in the raven's clutch." V. ii. p. 152. See also v. ii. p. 148, and v. iii. p. 124, and 132.

ARTICLE VI.

NEW MONTHLY MAGAZINE *versus* PHRENOLOGY.

THE New Monthly Magazine for June contains an article adverse to our science. The editor informs his readers in a note, that he 'believes himself indebted for it to 'the brother of the gallant and lamented general who fell 'at Corunna.' After an attentive perusal, we are almost compelled to believe that this gentleman has been reposing under the shade of his brother's laurels, altogether unconscious of every thing that has been written, said, and done about Phrenology, since the year of grace 1815. Moreover, he is very ill-informed of its condition even then. A few examples will prove both positions. We shall give the statements of the gallant General's brother, and merely add to them quotations from the works of Drs Gall and Spurzheim themselves. These will show that he misrepresents their doctrines in a manner unworthy of a philosopher and a man

of sense. To an ingenuous mind this is the severest chastisement, and those who cannot feel such a reproof, would not be mended by any other.

The New Monthly Magazine.—"Lavater could only measure and examine superficially the human features; but Gall could dissect with skill the brains of men and all animals. This he industriously performed, and by a method invented by himself, which other anatomists acknowledged to be the best, he traced minutely the course of the nerves, and the structure of the medullary substance. In this study his curiosity rose to enthusiasm; he developed and followed with his knife the fibres of the brain, even to their source; UNTIL AT LENGTH HE FONDLY IMAGINED THAT HE HAD DISCOVERED THE SEAT AND SUBSTANCE OF THE INTELLECTUAL POWERS OF MAN."

Dr Spurzheim.—"Many natural philosophers have expected to succeed in pointing out the organs of the intellectual faculties by means of the anatomy of the human brain in particular, or, at all events, by comparative anatomy in general. It is also pretty generally believed that our new philosophy of the brain is the result of its anatomy. Here, therefore, I shall make some reflections on human anatomy in particular, and on comparative anatomy in general. There are then very few cases where the structure of any part indicates its function; and the opinion that this is the case is never more than conjectural. Before the motions of muscles were observed, it was impossible to infer from their structure that they were contractile. The structure of the heart was known a long time before its function was discovered. The deepest perspicuity would not, *a priori*, have attributed the smell to the pituitary membrane of the nose, the taste to the nervous papillæ of the tongue, the sensation of light to the optic nerve, &c. Who, in seeing the structure of the stomach, could conjecture its digestive power? Who, from the structure of the viscera, could decide that the liver secretes bile, the kidneys urine? Who, from the structure and form of the nerves, can determine what kind of impressions they propagate? IT IS THE SAME WITH THE BRAIN. Let the direction of its fibres be known; and let anatomists distinguish their greater or less consistence, their more or less white colour, their different size, length, &c. what conclusion can they draw from these circumstances? NONE." "Thus it is certain that the anatomical knowledge of any part DOES NOT INDICATE ITS FUNCTION; and it is therefore necessary to have recourse to other means in order to discover it." "If indeed it were possible to determine the functions of the organization according to its structure, we should no longer have occasion to refute many errors; to show, for instance, that the moral sentiments do neither result from the viscera or nervous plexus and ganglia of the abdomen, nor from the temperaments, &c. Many organs of the brain were discovered before

“its structure was demonstrated; and these discoveries might have subsisted for many centuries without the structure of the brain being known.”—*Physiognomical System*, p. 203, 4, 5.

The New Monthly.—“The brain of man being larger than that of animals, is brought forward to ACCOUNT FOR THE SUPERIORITY OF HUMAN INTELLIGENCE, and to IDENTIFY OUR MENTAL FACULTIES WITH SOLID FLESH. But this butcher-like argument* is annihilated by the facts, that the brains of elephants and whales are greater than those of men; and also by this common observation, that large men with large heads have not superior capacities to those of moderate dimensions.”

Dr Spurzheim.—“The greater number of natural philosophers, being convinced that the brain is the organ of the soul, have concluded that its functions must be proportionate to its size. The brain of man was accordingly found larger than of the majority of tame animals, as the horse, ox, &c. Without, therefore, examining living beings more strictly, the superiority of man was at once attributed to the absolute size of his brain. Thus, according to Erasistratus, Aristotle, Pliny, Galen, Portal,† and others, man has the largest brain. Modern discoveries, however, have shewn that the brains of whales and elephants are larger than those of man. Those, therefore, who measure the faculties of animal life according to the absolute size of the brain must err; for whatever the understanding of the elephant may be, and though the whale be declared king of the inhabitants of the sea, no one will attribute either to the one or the other those superior faculties which constitute the distinctive character of man. Besides, if we more closely study nature, we find that the brains of the monkey and dog are smaller than those of the ox, ass, and hog, yet the former come more nearly to man in respect to their intellectual faculties.” “It is not possible, even in individuals of the same kind, to measure their faculties according to the absolute size of their brain. Hence it is necessary to look for other means for determining the degree of the faculties of the mind.”

The New Monthly.—“Never was there a more humiliating conception of man than this; by which love, reason, wit, and all the nobler faculties of the human mind, are framed of a number of masses of flesh conglomerated together, which enlarge and diminish while we live, and rot when we die.”

Dr Spurzheim.—“We never venture beyond experience. We neither deny nor affirm any thing which cannot be verified by experiment. We neither make researches upon the dead body nor upon the soul alone, but upon man as he appears in life. We consider the faculties of the mind only as far as they become apparent to us by the organization. We never ques-

* This is a very baby-like argument to be resorted to by so respectable an opponent.

† *Anatomic Medicale*, tom. iv. p. 30.

"tion what the moral and intellectual faculties may be in themselves. We do not attempt to explain how the body and soul are joined together and exercise a mutual influence."—*Physiognomical System*, p. 250.

The New Monthly.—"Gall happening one day to see a beggar with a bump on the upper posterior part of his head, inquired of him the cause of his mendicity. The beggar replied, that 'pride was the cause: he considered himself too important to acquire any business, and therefore only spent money, and did not think of earning a livelihood.' From *this answer*, Professor Gall was convinced that the organ of pride had elevated the beggar's skull, as well as all others who imagine themselves emperors, kings, and ministers."

Dr Gall himself.—Dr Gall, after mentioning the case of the beggar, who, from being the son of a rich merchant, came to mendicity through excessive pride, notices the cases of a boy who, at seven years of age, was infatuated with pride, and refused to follow any occupation, and of a German prince, whose pride was excessive, and remarks, that in all the three the same part of the brain was very largely developed. He adds, that these instances gave him the *first idea* of the feeling of pride depending on a primitive faculty; and continues, "These proofs DID NOT APPEAR to me SUFFICIENT to establish the seat and external appearance of this organ. I collected new facts to avoid the reproach of gratuitously maintaining paradoxes. I am obliged to restrain myself to a small number of facts in regard to this organ, as is the case in regard to the others. My object is accomplished, if those I do narrate enable naturalists to make farther observations for themselves.*"

"A young man, he adds, endowed with faculties above mediocrity, had manifested, from his infancy, insupportable pride. He constantly maintained that he was of too good a family to work or apply himself to any thing. Nothing could free him of this almidity; he was even put, for eighteen months, into a house of correction at Hainar. A physician of Vienna, an otherwise amiable man, carried the feeling of pride to such a point, that every time when called to a consultation, even with practitioners older than himself, or with public professors, he regularly took the precedence both in entering and coming out of the apartment. When any document was to be subscribed, he insisted on adhibiting his signature first. He had connected himself with the director of the Great Hospital, but solely, as he told himself afterwards, for the purpose of supplanting him. At Heidelberg, I saw a girl of eighteen, of a remarkable character. Every word or gesture

* *Physiologie du Cerveau*, vol. iv. p. 268.

“ in the least free revolted her. She called on God on every
 “ occasion, as if he took a special interest in her affairs. When
 “ she spoke, assurance and presumption were painted in her
 “ features ; she carried her head high and a little backwards,
 “ and all the movements of her head expressed pride. She was
 “ not capable of submission ; when in a passion, she was violent
 “ and disposed to proceed to all extremities. Although only
 “ the daughter of a quill merchant, she spoke her native lan-
 “ guage with extraordinary purity, and communicated only with
 “ persons of a rank superior to her own.” “ In all these indi-
 “ viduals the organ of Self-esteem was very largely developed.”

“ The organ was equally conspicuous in an insane patient at
 “ Baden, near Rastadt. This man’s insanity consisted in be-
 “ lieving himself a Major. He had a small head, and the
 “ only organ which was developed in a high degree, was that
 “ of Self-esteem ; the whole other convolutions of the brain being
 “ very small. In the charity workhouse of Fribourg, we saw
 “ an insane man who was extremely proud. He declares, in a
 “ vehement and pathetic tone, that he is supported by the aid
 “ of which God created and preserves the world ; that he has
 “ been crowned by Jesus Christ ; that he is the young man
 “ whom the Queen of Heaven has selected for her spouse. His
 “ attitude is that of an arrogant despot. Deeply inspired with
 “ sentiments of his high importance, he crosses his arms, and,
 “ to give an idea of the astonishing force which he possesses, he
 “ strikes his breast and sides with violence. In general, he
 “ stands with one foot placed before the other, the body erect,
 “ and a little inclined backwards. When I requested him to
 “ allow me to touch his head, he replied, with astonishing arro-
 “ gance, ‘ Ich habe Keinen Kopf, sondern ein Haupt.’ I have no
 “ head such as common men possess, but a *Haupt* or head peculiar
 “ to Kings and Gods. He turned away, holding us to be totally
 “ unworthy of approaching him. We observed, however, very
 “ distinctly, that he had the organ of Self-esteem very largely
 “ developed.” Dr Gall mentions, that he had examined
 also the heads of a number of Chiefs of Brigands, remarkable
 for this quality of mind, and that he had found the organ
 largely developed in them all.

We could add a great number of observations of our own
 in corroboration of this organ ; but as the question with the
 General’s brother relates to what Gall has said of it, we
 withhold these, and only observe, that we are greatly at a loss
 to perceive either wit or sense in asserting, as he does, and
 as many others have done, that Gall set down the organ of
 Self-esteem as established *for no reason* but that he found it
 large in a beggar. We wish we had our fingers over the

heads of such opponents. There is so much impudence and conceit in assertions so absurd and unfounded, that we infer no small endowment of the organ in these sapient gentlemen themselves. If it is deficient in them, this fact would shake our faith in it more than all the arguments they are fit to bring forward in a year.

The New Monthly.—"The difference between one man and another is prodigious, and the pretended cause is evanescent. For when the head of a humane man is compared with that of a murderer, and even when their brains are dissected, no distinction can be perceived, except by the adept! and he owns that the difference is hardly discernible."

If the lamented General's brother will make a peregrination to the shop of Mr James Deville, 367, Strand, he will find casts of the heads of above forty murderers, and of many humane men, and if he cannot distinguish the differences, amounting in some parts to upwards of an inch, we renounce the science for ever. This is a fair challenge, for most assuredly he is no adept!

The New Monthly.—"The most celebrated of the ancient philosophers, in order to inspire virtuous deeds, were wont to extol the dignity of human nature; whereas some of the moderns strive to vilify it by assimilating men to the nature of beasts. But this plan of self-degradation has been carried by Gall and Spurzheim to the utmost extreme, as they have classed mankind among the carnivorous animals, and given him an organ of Destructiveness, which instils the propensity of killing animals, and of tormenting and murdering men."

Dr Spurzheim.—"It is now to be examined with what view nature has created this propensity. We cannot imagine that this propensity is innate in order to murder man. Carnivorous animals are endowed with this propensity, but they do not kill other individuals of their own kind, they kill other animals in order that they themselves may live. In what, then, does the food of man consist? He lives on other animals, and, therefore, he must kill them." See also No I. of this Journal, p. 25.

Lord Kames versus the New Monthly Magazine.—"There is a contrivance of nature no less simple than effectual, which engages men to bear with cheerfulness the fatigues of hunting and the uncertainty of capture; and that is an appetite for hunting."—"It is an illustrious instance of providential care, the adapting the internal constitution of man to his external circumstances. The appetite for hunting, though among us little necessary for food, is, to this day, remarkable in young men, high and low, rich and poor: Natural propensities may be rendered

“faint and obscure, but never are totally eradicated.”—*Kamer's Sketches*, b. 1. § 4.

The New Monthly.—“The disorder produced in the brain by augmentation of certain organs when childhood is past, would be still greater; for as the cranium is always full, and at that age completely ossified, no external yielding could ensue: consequently the increase of one set of organs would compress, injure, or destroy the adjoining ones.”

Dr Spurzheim.—“The parts of our body are continually decomposed and composed again, the matter which constitutes our body being evacuated by excretions, and replaced by other matter, furnished by alimentation. Like all other parts of our body, the brain and skull are submitted to this decomposition and composition; and, according to the natural law established between the skull and the brain, the brain, AT ALL AGES, commands the directions in which the bony mass is deposited in order to form the skull. If the whole brain, or some parts, increase or decrease, the ossification of the skull follows always the size and form of the brain.” (P. 244.) “The diseased state of the brain also proves our assertion relative to the form of the skull. There is no skull without brain; for if monsters be born without brain, their skull also is wanting. If in idiots from birth, the brain be hindered from increasing, the skull remains small; and if, on the contrary, the brain be distended by water accumulated in its cavities, the skull participates in this extension, whether it be general, or exist only in particular places.” (P. 225.)—Will the gallant General's brother dispute these statements as correct physiological doctrines?

Our opponent makes a variety of other erroneous statements, stale as stories told for the twentieth time, and as often corrected and refuted in reviews and magazines, and especially in the *Phrenological Transactions and Journal*. Not one word of these discussions appears to have reached this gentleman's eyes, and he writes boldly on, as if all the world were as ignorant of them as himself. Yet he means fairly, and we bear him no malice, but sincerely trust, that next time he wields the pen for war, he will point it more sharply, and charge it heavier with fact and argument.

ARTICLE VII.

DR HIBBERT ON THE PHILOSOPHY OF APPARITIONS.*

IN treating of the subject of apparitions, we shall state,—
1st, The phenomena to be accounted for. *2dly*, The
 phrenological theory by which they are explained. *3dly*,
 The theory of Dr Hibbert; and, *lastly*, We shall mention
 some facts which have been observed by Phrenologists in
 regard to persons who see apparitions.

“ One of the most authentic instances that has ever been re-
 corded of spectral illusions, is contained in the curious narra-
 tive written many years ago by Nicolai, the famous bookseller
 and author of Berlin. It is, indeed, a case which affords cor-
 rect data for investigations relative to the belief in apparitions;
 on which account, I shall take the liberty of transcribing the
 narrative in this essay, however frequently it may have
 appeared before the public.

“ ‘Those who pretend to have seen and heard ghosts,’ says
 this writer, ‘obstinately maintain, that they perceived ap-
 paritions by means of their senses. In order to defeat that
 belief, we generally desire them to consider how many peo-
 ple have been imposed upon by artful novices, and how
 liable we are to deceive ourselves; we advise them to lay
 hold of the supposed spectres, assuring them, that they are
 generally found to be of a very corporeal nature. But those
 who have a predilection for the miraculous pay no regard to
 these objections; insisting, that the productions of their dis-
 ordered imaginations are real beings. We cannot, therefore,
 collect too many of such well-substantiated facts, as show
 how easily our imagination imposes on us erroneous no-
 tions, and deludes not only delirious persons, but even those
 who are in the full possession of their faculties, by causing
 them to see phantoms which scarcely can be distinguished
 from real appearances.

“ ‘I have myself experienced a case of this nature, which to
 me appears highly remarkable, both psychologically and me-
 dically; I saw, in a state of mind completely sound, and
 after the first terror was over, with perfect calmness, for
 nearly two months, almost constantly and involuntarily, a
 vast number of human and other forms, and even heard
 their voices, though all this was merely the consequence of

* Sketches of the Philosophy of Apparitions; or, an Attempt to trace such Illusions to their Physical Causes; by Samuel Hibbert, M. D. Edinburgh, Oliver & Boyd, and G. & W. B. Whittaker, London, 1824.

“ ‘ a diseased state of the nerves, and an irregular circulation of the blood.’

“ ‘The narrator now explains the state of his system at the time ; but this important part of the account not being at present connected with our subject, it will be noticed in its proper place.

“ ‘I had, in January and February of the year 1791,’ continues this author, ‘the additional misfortune to experience several extremely unpleasant circumstances, which were followed on the 24th of February by a most violent altercation. My wife and another person came into my apartment in the morning, in order to console me, but I was too much agitated by a series of incidents, which had most powerfully affected my moral feeling, to be capable of attending to them. On a sudden, I perceived, at about the distance of ten steps, a form like that of a deceased person. I pointed at it, asking my wife if she did not see it? It was but natural that she should not see any thing ; my question, therefore, alarmed her very much, and she sent immediately for a physician. The phantasm continued about eight minutes. I grew at length more calm, and being extremely exhausted, fell into a restless sleep, which lasted about half an hour. The physician ascribed the apparition to a violent mental emotion, and hoped there would be no return ; but the violent agitation of my mind had in some way disordered my nerves, and produced farther consequences, which deserve a more minute description.

“ ‘At four in the afternoon, the form which I had seen in the morning re-appeared. I was by myself when this happened, and being rather uneasy at the incident, went to my wife’s apartment, but there likewise I was prevented by the apparition, which, however, at intervals disappeared, and always presented itself in a standing posture. About six o’clock there appeared also several walking figures, which had no connexion with the first.’

“ ‘Nicolai now makes some very important remarks on the subject of these waking dreams, and on their incongruous character. Of these observations I shall not fail to avail myself on another occasion. The narrative then proceeds after the following manner :

“ ‘After the first day the form of the deceased person no more appeared, but its place was supplied with many other phantasms, sometimes representing acquaintances, but mostly strangers ; those whom I knew were composed of living and deceased persons, but the number of the latter was comparatively small. I observed the persons with whom I daily conversed did not appear as phantasms, these representing chiefly persons who lived at some distance from me.

“ ‘These phantasms seemed equally clear and distinct at all times, and under all circumstances, both when I was by my-

* self, and when I was in company, and as well in the day as
 " at night, and in my own house as well as abroad ; they were,
 " however, less frequent when I was in the house of a friend,
 " and rarely appeared to me in the street. When I shut my
 " eyes, these phantasms would sometimes vanish entirely,
 " though there were instances when I beheld them with my
 " eyes closed, yet, when they disappeared on such occasions,
 " they generally returned when I opened my eyes. I con-
 " versed sometimes with my physician and my wife of the
 " phantasms which at the moment surrounded me ; they ap-
 " peared more frequently walking than at rest, nor were they
 " constantly present. They frequently did not come for some
 " time, but always re-appeared for a longer or shorter period,
 " either singly or in company, the latter, however, being most
 " frequently the case. I generally saw human forms of both
 " sexes, but they usually seemed not to take the smallest no-
 " tice of each other, moving as in a market-place, where all are
 " eager to press through the crowd ; at times, however, they
 " seemed to be transacting business with each other. I also
 " saw several times people on horseback, dogs, and birds. All
 " these phantasms appeared to me in their natural size, and as
 " distinct as if alive, exhibiting different shades of carnation in
 " the uncovered parts, as well as in different colours and fa-
 " shions in their dresses, though the colours seemed somewhat
 " paler than in real nature ; none of the figures appeared par-
 " ticularly terrible, comical, or disgusting, most of them being
 " of an indifferent shape, and some presenting a pleasing as-
 " pect. The longer these phantoms continued to visit me,
 " the more frequently did they return, while, at the same time,
 " they increased in number about four weeks after they had
 " first appeared. I also began to hear them talk ; the phan-
 " toms sometimes conversed among themselves, but more fre-
 " quently addressed their discourse to me ; their speeches were
 " commonly short, and never of an unpleasant turn. At differ-
 " ent times there appeared to me both dear and sensible friends
 " of both sexes, whose addresses tended to appease my grief,
 " which had not yet wholly subsided : their consolatory
 " speeches were in general addressed to me when I was alone.
 " Sometimes, however, I was accosted by these consoling
 " friends while I was engaged in company, and not unfre-
 " quently while real persons were speaking to me. The con-
 " solatory addresses consisted sometimes of abrupt phrases,
 " and at other times they were regularly executed.
 " " Though my mind and body were in a tolerable state of
 " sanity all this time, and these phantasms became so familiar
 " to me that they did not cause me the slightest uneasiness, and
 " though I even sometimes amused myself with surveying
 " them, and spoke jocularly of them to my physician and my
 " wife, I yet did not neglect to use proper medicines, especi-
 " ally when they began to haunt me the whole day, and even
 " at night, as soon as I awaked.' "

" 'At last,' says Nicolai, 'it was agreed that leeches should
 " 'be again applied to me, as formerly; which was actually
 " 'done, April 20th, 1791, at eleven o'clock in the morning.
 " 'No person was with me besides the surgeon; but during the
 " 'operation, my chamber was crowded with human phantasms
 " 'of all descriptions. This continued uninterruptedly till about
 " 'half an hour after four o'clock, just when my digestion
 " 'commenced. I then perceived that they began to move more
 " 'slowly. Soon after, their colour began to fade, and at seven
 " 'o'clock they were entirely white. But they moved very
 " 'little, though the forms was as distinct as before; growing,
 " 'however, by degrees, more obscure, yet not fewer in number,
 " 'as had generally been the case. The phantoms did not with-
 " 'draw nor did they vanish,—a circumstance which, previous to
 " 'that time, had frequently happened. They now seemed to
 " 'dissolve in the air, while fragments of some of them contin-
 " 'ued visible a considerable time. About eight o'clock the room
 " 'was entirely cleared of my fantastic visitors.

" 'Since this time I have felt, twice or three times, a sensa-
 " 'tion, as if these phantasms were going to re-appear, without,
 " 'however, actually seeing any thing. The same sensation sur-
 " 'prised me, just before I drew up this account, while I was
 " 'examining some papers relative to these apparitions, which
 " 'I had drawn up in the year 1792.'

" A very curious case of spectral illusions is related by Dr
 " Alderson of Hull, in which the irritation of the brain or its
 " membranes seems to have resulted from an extended inflam-
 " mation under the scalp.

" 'A few months ago,' says this writer, 'I visited Mr R.,
 " 'who was seized, in his passage from America, with a most
 " 'excruciating headach. He obtained some temporary relief
 " 'from the formation of matter under the scalp; swellings
 " 'came on in the throat, and he had some difficulty of respira-
 " 'tion when in bed. At this time, he complained to me that
 " 'he had troublesome dreams, and that he seemed to dream
 " 'whilst awake. In a short time after, he told me he had,
 " 'for an hour or two, been convinced that he had seen
 " 'his wife and family, when his right judgment told him
 " 'that they were in America; and the impression was so
 " 'strong a few nights afterwards, and the conversation he had
 " 'with his son so very particular and important, that he could
 " 'not help relating the whole to his friends in the morning,
 " 'and requesting to know if his wife and son were not actually
 " 'arrived from America, and at that time in the house. I was
 " 'sent for to hold consultation, and he evidently saw that they
 " 'all took him to be insane. He therefore immediately turned
 " 'to me, and asked me, whether the complaint he then had
 " 'would bring on the imagination of spectres, and apparitions,
 " 'and figures; for he had always hitherto been an unbeliever
 " 'in ghosts, and in every thing else; he felt, and his friends like-
 " 'wise acknowledged, that he was perfectly sane, and strong in
 " 'mind as ever he was in his life. Having satisfied him with the

" 'nature and extent of his complaint, and that it would soon
 " 'vanish with his bodily sufferings, he and his friends were
 " 'made easy in their minds; but the phantoms became at
 " 'length more troublesome, so that he could not bear to go in-
 " 'to his bed-room, whers every picture brought with it the
 " 'association, and conjured up the spirits of the departed, or
 " 'introduced a train of unpleasant companions. He remained
 " 'after this in a low room, and was for a time free from in-
 " 'truders; but in a bright brass lock he again saw his transat-
 " 'lantic friends, and never afterwards could he look to it bu
 " 'he saw them; and when I have been with him, and have
 " 'purposely taken up a book, I have seen him hold conversa-
 " 'tion in his mind's eye with them; and I have momentarily
 " 'known him consider me as hearing and seeing them too—I say
 " 'momentarily, for he is a man of strong parts, and perfectly
 " 'convinced of the nature of the complaint; for whenever I
 " 'spoke, and he turned from the lock, he could converse on
 " 'religion, physic, and politics, as well as ever. He then
 " 'changed his house; the matter again formed under the scalp,
 " 'and he is now in a state of convalescence, and totally free
 " 'from such visitations.'"^{*}

" 'A case even still more curious, is related by Dr Alderson.*
 " 'I was called upon,' he observes, 'some time ago, to visit
 " 'Mr ———, who at that time kept a dram-shop. Having
 " 'at different times attended, and thence knowing him very
 " 'well, I was struck with something singular upon my first en-
 " 'trance. He went up stairs with me, but evidently hesitated
 " 'occasionally as he went. When he got into his chamber, he
 " 'expressed some apprehension lest I should consider him as
 " 'insane, and send him to the asylum of York, whither I had
 " 'not long before sent one of his pot-companions. Whence
 " 'all these apprehensions?—What is the matter with you?—
 " 'Why do you look so full of terror? He then sat down, and
 " 'gave me a history of his complaint.

" 'About a week or ten days before, after drawing some liquor
 " 'in his cellar for a girl, he desired her to take away the oys-
 " 'ters which lay upon the floor, and which he supposed she
 " 'had dropped;—the girl thinking him drunk, laughed at him,
 " 'and went out of the room.

" 'He endeavoured to take them up himself, and to his great
 " 'astonishment could find none.—He was then going out of the
 " 'cellar, when at the door he saw a soldier, whose looks he did
 " 'not like, attempting to enter the room in which he then was.
 " 'He desired to know what he wanted there; and upon receiv-
 " 'ing no answer, but, as he thought, a menacing look, he sprung
 " 'forward to seize the intruder, and to his no small surprisè
 " 'found it a phantom. The cold sweat hung upon his brow—
 " 'he trembled in every limb. It was the dusk of the evening

* Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal, vol. vi. p. 201.

“ as he passed along the passage—the phantom sitted before his
“ eyes—he attempted to follow it, resolutely determined to sa-
“ tisfy himself; but as it vanished, there appeared others, and
“ some of them at a distance, and he exhausted himself by
“ fruitless attempts to lay hold of them. He hastened to his
“ family, with marks of terror and confusion; for though a man
“ of the most undaunted resolution, he confessed to me that he
“ never had before felt what it was to be completely terrified.
“ During the whole of that night, he was constantly torment-
“ ed with a variety of spectres, sometimes of people who had
“ been long dead, and other times of friends who were living;
“ and harassed himself with continually getting out of bed,
“ to ascertain whether the people he saw were real or not.
“ Nor could he always distinguish who were and who were
“ not real customers, as they came into the rooms in the day-
“ time, so that his conduct became the subject of observation;
“ and though it was for a time attributed to private drinking,
“ it was at last suspected to arise from some other cause; and
“ when I was sent for, the family were under the full convic-
“ tion that he was insane, although they confessed, that, in
“ every thing else, except the foolish notion of seeing apparitions,
“ he was perfectly rational and steady; and during the
“ whole of the time that he was relating his case to me, and his
“ mind was fully occupied, he felt the most gratifying relief, for
“ in that time he had not seen one apparition; and he was elated
“ with pleasure indeed, when I told him I should not send
“ him to York, for his was a complaint I could cure at home.
“ But whilst I was writing a prescription, and had suffered
“ him to be at rest, I saw him suddenly get up, and go with
“ a hurried step to the door. What did you do that for?—He
“ looked ashamed and mortified:—he had been so well whilst
“ in conversation with me, that he could not believe that the
“ soldier whom he saw enter the room was a phantom, and
“ he got up to convince himself.
“ I need not here detail particularly the medical treatment
“ adopted; but it may be as well just to state the circum-
“ stances which probably led to the complaint, and the prin-
“ ciple of cure. Some time previously he had had a quarrel
“ with a drunken soldier, who attempted, against his inclina-
“ tion, to enter his house at an unseasonable hour, and in the
“ struggle to turn him out, the soldier drew his bayonet, and,
“ having struck him across the temples, divided the temporal
“ artery; in consequence of which he bled a very large
“ quantity before a surgeon arrived, as there was no one who
“ knew that, in such a case, simple compression with the fin-
“ ger, upon the spouting artery, would stop the effusion of
“ blood. He had scarcely recovered from the effects of this
“ loss of blood, when he undertook to accompany a friend in
“ his walking match against time, in which he went forty-
“ two miles in nine hours. Elated with success, he spent the

" whole of the following day in drinking ; but found himself
 " a short time afterwards, so much out of health, that he
 " came to the resolution of abstaining altogether from liquor.
 " It was in the course of the week following that abstinence
 " from his usual habits, that he had the disease. It kept
 " increasing for several days till I saw him, allowing him
 " no time for rest. Never was he able to get rid of these
 " shadows by night when in bed, nor by day when in mo-
 " tion ; though he sometimes walked miles with that view,
 " and at others got into a variety of company. He told me
 " he suffered even bodily pain, from the severe lashing of a
 " waggoner with his whip, who came every night to a particu-
 " lar corner of his bed, but who always disappeared when he
 " jumped out of bed to retort, which he did several nights
 " successively. The whole of this complaint was effectually
 " removed by bleeding with leeches and active purgatives.
 " After the first employment of these means, he saw no more
 " phantoms in the day time ; and after the second, only once
 " saw his milkman in his bed-room, between sleeping and
 " waking. He has remained perfectly rational and well ever
 " since, and can go out in the dark as well as ever, having re-
 " ceived a perfect conviction of the nature of ghosts."

The phrenological theory of these facts is very simple. The brain consists of a congeries of organs, each of which manifests a particular power of the mind. Among these organs one serves to perceive Form ; another Colour ; a third Size ; while other and *distinct* faculties and organs experience emotions and reflect. Each faculty being active, produces the special kind of ideas which it is fitted to form ; and each may become active by an internal stimulus of its organ. The organs may be excited by an unusual influx of blood into the vessels which supply them ; by inflammation ; or by nervous irritation. If the organs of Form, Colouring, and Size were stimulated into excessive activity, by any of these causes, the mind would be presented with the kind of conceptions which each of them, by its natural constitution, is fitted to produce ; or, in other words, Forms, invested with the attributes of Colour and Magnitude, would be presented involuntarily to the mind. If the organs of the reflecting faculties did not participate in the affection, their functions would not be disturbed, and the mind would feel and reflect in a state of perfect sanity. It is almost unnecessary to point out how completely this theory accord-

with and explains the foregoing phenomena ; the most striking feature in all of the cases having been that the mental disease extended only to particular classes of conceptions, and that the other functions of the mind remained unaffected. This indicates irresistibly that there must be distinct organs, by means of which different mental operations are accomplished ; for if the organ of mind were single, it is against all logic to suppose that it can be both deranged and sound at the same time.

Dr Hibbert's theory is different. He says, " The essential view of the mind which I have adopted in preference to every other, is that of the late much-lamented professor of moral philosophy in the university of Edinburgh. Dr Brown, in considering the mind as simple and indivisible, conceives that every mental feeling is only the mind itself, existing in a certain state.*" He does not favour us with any theory concerning the organs of the mind, or inform us with what part of the body he conceives it to be immediately connected. He enters into some observations upon the blood, from which he draws the general conclusion, that " the corpuscles of the vital fluids possess within themselves an inherent dilatibility and contractility, by the alternate force of which they are enabled to act upon the elastic coats of the vessels of the human body." " It would appear, that, with an increase of the volume of the circulating fluid, a general sense of pleasure is experienced." P. 11. He afterwards mentions several facts, from which he draws the conclusion, " that with the varying force of the sanguineous influence, the degree of intensity which takes place in the qualities of our mental state keeps a remarkable pace."

" A distinction is always made," says he, " between those states of the mind which are induced when causes impressing our organs of sense are present, and those which occur as revivals of prior mental states ; the former being termed *sensations*, the latter *ideas*, or, more correctly, *renovated feelings*. Sensations and renovated feelings differ essentially in nothing but *degree*. Thus, the latter are *less intense*, *less vivid*, or *fainter*, than the former. This distinction is acknowledged by all metaphysicians." P. 15. After adverting to the effects of nitrous oxid gas, and the febrile miasma of Cadiz and

* The reader is referred to No II. of this Journal, p. 206, for the phreological view of the mind and its different faculties.

Malaga, on the mental sensations and ideas, he adds, "Our inquiry will now perhaps be found not wholly devoid of interest. A pathological principle in this investigation has been established, that when sensations and ideas are, from some peculiar state of the sanguineous fluid, simultaneously rendered highly intense, the former arrive at a certain height of vividness, and gradually become fainter, while the latter, in an inverse ratio, increase in vividness; the result being, that recollected images of thought, vivified to the height of actual impressions, exclusively, or nearly so, constitute the states of the mind." P. 18.

In the commencement of chapter 8th, Dr H. observes, "Our researches have hitherto been confined to the blood, which we have considered as giving rise, from its own independent chemical properties or bulk, to certain intense states of the mind. It is now of importance to inquire if similar effects may not be referred to nervous influence." And he proceeds to the consideration of "spectral illusions arising from inflammation of the brain." He regards the nerves as producing "numerous changes on the blood, and with them equally numerous states of the mind;" but we cannot discover that he regards the mind as connected with any particular part as its organ, the changes on the condition of which affect the states of the mind. He treats also of "spectral illusions resulting from the highly-excited states of particular temperament,"—"from the hysteric temperament;"—"from neglect of accustomed periodical blood letting,"—"also those which occasionally occur in hectic symptoms,"—"those which arise from febrile and inflammatory affections,"—"from a highly-excited state of nervous irritability acting generally on the system,"—and "from hypochondriasis."

We leave Dr Hibbert's theory to the judgment of the reader, with very few remarks. If the blood be in the condition which vivifies recollected images to the height of actual impressions, how does it happen that it does not vivify the feelings, and the conceptions formed by the reflecting faculties to an equal or to any uncommon extent? According to the phrenological theory, it would not produce this last effect, unless it excited the organs of Propensity, Sentiment, and Reflection, as well as those of the knowing or perceptive faculties; but Dr H. admits no such views. In the next place, similar causes operating in similar circum-

stances ought to produce similar effects; and yet, out of a hundred patients whose blood is in a state similar to Nicolai's, or who are affected with hysteria, hectic symptoms, nervous irritability, &c., perhaps only one will see visions. This proves that there is some particular circumstance present when visions are seen, which Dr H. has omitted, and the absence of which, in the ninety-nine cases, is the cause why this effect does not follow. The Phrenologist is not embarrassed with such an inconsistency; for these diseases may exist in innumerable instances, without being attended with spectral illusions, if they do not attack the particular mental organs whose function is to excite such perceptions. *Finally*, Dr Hibbert would have done well to have explained how the mind can be insane in some points, and yet so sane in other respects as to perceive its own disease, if "every mental feeling is only the mind itself, existing in a certain state."

Without wishing to detract from the merits of Dr Hibbert as a man of science, we must say, that we have rarely seen a work intended for a theory or philosophical elucidation of phenomena, more defective in principle and consistency than the one before us; and, nevertheless, it has been cried up in periodical journals as a masterpiece of learning. The fact, that an author of Dr Hibbert's attainments has offered such a production to the public as scientific, and that they have received it as such, are highly valuable, as ascertaining the actual extent of philosophical knowledge concerning the phenomena of mind possessed even by educated men in the present day, and they will be referred to as a proof of the value of the contribution made by Dr Gall to science by his discovery of the functions of the different parts of the brain. It is amusing to us to observe, that in Dr Hibbert's work, Phrenology is never once alluded to; and that every species of inconsistency is preferred to the simple and satisfactory view of the subject afforded by this science. This, we believe, constituted the chief merit of the work in the judgment of the other journalists, many of whom being unfortunately committed against Phrenology, grasp eagerly at any prop to

support their reputation, which they imagine must fall in proportion as the system rises.

Finally, Spectral illusions are experienced by some individuals in the absence of bodily disease, and apparently in consequence of a mere peculiarity of cerebral development. When the part of the brain lying between Ideality and Imitation, named by Dr Spurzheim, Surnaturalite, and by us "Wonder," is very large, a tendency to see visions is a common accompaniment. Dr Gall mentions, that Dr Jung Stilling, whom he often saw with the late Grand Duke of Baden, was a tailor in his youth, then a tutor, and afterwards doctor in medicine, moralist, divine, journalist, illuminatus, and visionary; and in him this part of the brain was largely developed. He believed firmly in apparitions, and wrote a book in exposition of this doctrine. In the *Maison de Detention* at Berne, Dr Gall saw a fanatic who believed that Jesus Christ, surrounded by a brilliant light, as if a million of suns had combined their splendours, had appeared to him to reveal the true religion. A gentleman who moves in the best society in Paris, asked Dr Gall to examine his head. The doctor's first remark was, "You sometimes see visions, and believe in apparitions." The gentleman started from his chair in astonishment, and said, that he *had* frequent visions; but never, up to this moment, had he spoken on the subject to any human being, through fear of being set down for being absurdly credulous.—On another occasion, Dr Gall, when he observed the development of the head of Dr W., said, that he ought to have a strong liking for the marvellous and supernatural. "For once," replied he, "you are completely mistaken, for I have laid down the rule, to believe in nothing which cannot be mathematically demonstrated." After talking with him on various scientific subjects, Dr Gall turned the conversation towards animal magnetism, which appeared a fit topic to put the mathematical rigour of his proofs to the test. He instantly became greatly animated, assured Dr Gall again very solemnly, that he admitted nothing as true that was not mathematically demonstrated; but added,

he was convinced that a spiritual being acted in magnetism ; that it operated at great distances ; that no distance indeed presented an obstacle to its action, and that on this account it could sympathize with persons in any part of the world.

“ It is the same cause,” continued he, “ which produces apparitions. Apparitions and visions are rare, no doubt, but they undoubtedly exist, and I am acquainted with the laws which regulate their production. On this occasion,” says Dr Gall, “ I thought within myself, that my inference from his development was not so very erroneous as the worthy doctor wished me to believe.”

A man named Halleran, of Vienna; imagined himself continually accompanied by a familiar spirit ; he saw the spirit, and conversed with it. When he reached his 60th year, his genius appeared as if he wished to leave him, and only on certain days in the month was he favoured with his presence. At Gersbach, near Durlach, in the Grand Duchy of Baden, Dr Gall knew a curate who was confined because he conceived himself to have a familiar spirit. At Manheim there is a man who sees himself continually attended by several spirits. Sometimes they march at his side, in visible forms ; at other times they attend him under ground. In these persons Dr Gall found the part of the brain in question largely developed. He states as questions for consideration, “ Does this convolution form part of the organ of Imitation ? and does its extreme development exalt the talent for mimicry to such a degree as to personify simple ideas, and to give them a locality thus metamorphosed out of the individual ? or does it constitute parts both of Ideality and Imagination ? or, finally, does it constitute a separate organ ? These points can be determined only by farther researches.” (*Sur les fonctions du cerveau, tome v. p. 346.*)

Mr Combe, in the Elements of Phrenology, when treating of this part of the brain, observes, “ Dr Spurzheim states, “ that the faculty connected with this organ produces the tendency to believe in inspirations, presentiments, phantoms, &c. ; and in his French work, he calls it ‘ *Supernaturalité*.’ In giving it this name, he appears to me to commit an error of the same kind as that which Dr Gall fell into when he styled Destructiveness the organ of Murder, and Acquisitiveness the organ of Theft ; these appellations denoting abuses, and not the primitive functions of these faculties. I have met with persons excessively fond of news, which, if extravagant, were the more

" acceptable ; prone to the expression of surprise and astonish-
 " ment in ordinary discourse ; deeply affected by tales of won-
 " der ; delighting in the Arabian Nights Entertainments, and
 " the mysterious incidents abounding in the Waverley novels ;
 " and in them I have uniformly found the part of the brain in
 " question largely developed. When the organ predominates
 " in an individual, there is a peculiar and unconscious turning
 " up of the exterior angles of the eyelashes, expressive of sur-
 " prise. In other persons, I have found the part of the brain in
 " question small ; and in them it was accompanied with a staid
 " soberness of feeling, diametrically the opposite of the mani-
 " festations above described. Such individuals were annoyed
 " by every thing new or strange ; they scarcely felt or expressed
 " surprise, and had no taste for narratives leaving the beaten
 " tracks of probability or reality, and soaring into the regions of
 " supernatural fiction. On analyzing these manifestations, they
 " all appear to be referable to the sentiment of Wonder, an emo-
 " tion which is quite distinguishable from those hitherto enu-
 " merated. This sentiment, in a state of extreme and uncon-
 " trolled energy, may give rise to those extraordinary feelings
 " and disturbed imaginations which have led Dr Spurzheim to
 " name the faculty '*Surnaturalité*.'" P. 72.

According to this view, an extreme exaltation of the senti-
 ment of Wonder would stimulate the knowing and reflect-
 ing faculties to conceive objects fitted to gratify it, just as
 Ideality excites those powers to form magnificent conceptions,
 and thus to produce poetry. Spectres, apparitions, spirits, &c.,
 are the kind of ideas suited to please an inordinate Wonder ;
 and being congenial to the mind, the reality of such con-
 ceptions will meet with a ready belief. Something of the
 same kind takes place from an extreme intensity of Hope.
 Persons in whom this organ excessively predominates, believe
 in the occurrence of future events which they desire to hap-
 pen, with as absolute a conviction of their certainty, as if
 they actually saw them with their eyes.

Cases similar to those observed by Dr Gall are not rare.
 In London Bedlam, we examined the head of a patient
 whose insanity consisted in seeing phantoms, and being led
 to act as if they were realities ; although, as he himself stat-
 ed, he was convinced by his understanding at the very time,
 that they were mere illusions ; but could not regulate his
 conduct on this conviction. In him the organ of Form was
 well developed, and that of Wonder was decidedly large.

When asked whether he experienced any sensation in the head when afflicted with visions, he pointed to the spot on each side where the organ of Wonder is situated, and said, that he felt an uneasy sensation there. We have been informed that there are two persons in Edinburgh, not in a state of insanity, who also see visions; but we have not yet had an opportunity of examining their heads. A clergyman in the country likewise informed us, that in his parish there are two persons in a similar condition; and at our request he examined their heads, and mentions, "That the men in question are much and strongly marked in the region either of Ideality or of Wonder; I think the latter, but am not perfectly sure, not being very apt in finding the precise regions on the living head. One of them is a steady and most intelligent man, and a great reader; the other an exceedingly clever man, but versatile. Both the men have had spectral illusions all their days; and in early life were annoyed and tormented with them."

The facts now stated throw light on some traits in the history of eminent individuals, which have greatly puzzled their biographers. Socrates spoke frequently and very readily to his disciples of a demon or genius which served him for his guide. Dr Gall remarks, that he is quite aware of the common explanation, that Socrates referred only to the force and justness of his own understanding; but adds, that if he had not himself believed in a genius communicating with him, the opinion that he had one would have been lost in the twenty-three years, during which Aristophanes had made it a subject of ridicule, and his accusers would not have revived this as a charge against him. Joan of Arc also related an appearance of St Michael to her, who told her that God had pity on France, and that she was commissioned to raise the siege of Orleans, and to instal Charles VII. as king. Tasso also pretended to have been once healed by the interposition of the Virgin and St Scholasticus, who appeared to him in a violent fit of fever. He believed, during his delirium, that he conversed with familiar spirits. Swedenborg also imagined himself miraculously called to reveal to the world the most hidden mysteries. "In 1743," says he, "it pleased

“ the Lord to manifest himself to me, and to appear to me personally, to give me a knowledge of the spiritual world, “ and to put me in communication with angels and spirits; “ and this power has been continued to me since.” The opinion generally entertained of such men is, that they are hypocrites or impostors. The Phrenologist would regard them as sincere believers in what they assert, but as victims of excessive excitement of the organ of Wonder. The visions of those who pretend to the second-sight may probably arise from the same cause; and we think it highly probable, that Joanna Southcote also owed to it her delusion; and that her disciples were individuals in whom this organ was naturally very large, and who thus had a predisposition for the marvellous, on which her prophecies and assertions operated. Such persons might be sound and sensible on every topic that did not excite their predominating Wonder; while, under its influence, they might be quite sincere in their belief of the doctrines which they espoused.

The views which we have now detailed are not new, for Drs Gall and Spurzheim published them many years ago; and we cannot help thinking, that Dr Hibbert would have done better to have put them to the test of observation, and either refuted or admitted them, than to have passed them over as non-existing, and written such a mass of crude speculation as the work before us.

ARTICLE VIII.

ON THE ACCORDANCE WHICH SUBSISTS BETWEEN PHRENOLOGY AND THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF REGENERATION.

An Essay read at one of the Meetings of the Phrenological Society, by a Gentleman, not a Member, who has kindly allowed us to insert it in our Journal.

No attempt has been made to assail the induction upon which the Phrenologists assert that their science rests. The method taken by their opponents is to start a variety

of speculative objections, the effect of which, as it is conceived, is to show that the system *cannot* be founded in nature, in respect that it stands opposed to, and is inconsistent with, certain acknowledged and established truths, both in physics and in morals. But this is a very dangerous mode of reasoning. Nothing requires greater caution, at least in the higher and more abstract departments of science, than to *infer* the falseness of one proposition from its *apparent* inconsistency with another proposition conceived or known to be true.* The whole history of the human mind demonstrates that this way of philosophizing is full of peril. It is not suitable to our limited faculties, or to the partial and inadequate nature of our conceptions. Until we can take wide and comprehensive views of the whole of general and abstract truth, it is premature to judge of its proportions, or to decide upon the relations and bearings of one part upon another. Seeing *so very little* as we do, and seeing that little *so very imperfectly*, if we still venture upon such decisions, we are in imminent hazard of trespassing against the very first lesson of sound philosophy and sound sense, which inculcates the *humble* exercise of our faculties as the only means of arriving at a single truth.

This much is certain, that the mode of reasoning referred to, is not likely to bring the discussion between the Phrenologists and their opponents *to a speedy termination*. It opens up a scene of debate which may be filled with dust and confusion, so long as the combatants have obstinacy to maintain the strife. It would be far better, therefore, to

* We do not participate in the author's apprehensions of the perils attending the mode of reasoning here reprobated. The only *real* danger seems to us to arise from arguing from a thing as *true* or *consistent*, which, if we saw far enough, we would discover to be *false* or *inconsistent*. In point of fact, all analogical proof rests on the possibility of inferring the *truth* of one proposition from its *consistency* with another which we know to be true, and the evidence derived from this source is second only to that of direct facts. We are not afraid to peril the fate of Phrenology on its consistency with all *known truths*; and the author himself virtually expresses the same opinion, when he writes an essay to show that its doctrines and those of Scripture harmonize.—EDITOR.

try the science, once for all, upon the ground of its alleged *induction*. Here the parties cannot fail to meet, and stand confronted. If our induction can be shown to be incorrect or defective, the science is subverted from its foundation; if our induction shall appear to be accurate and complete, the science is impregnable, and ought at once to be received as the truth and reality of nature.

But while we thus keep to our induction as forming the stronghold and fortress of our science, there is no reason why we should not go forth occasionally, to meet our enemies wherever we can find them. If the system is founded in nature, as we believe it to be, there can be no province of nature or of truth which is not in harmony and alliance with us. Go where we will we can meet with no real or actual collision, and it is an animating and invigorating exercise of our faculties to *prove* and *demonstrate* that there is none.

So far as I have gone in investigating the objections which have been urged against Phrenology, I can safely say that I have found no collision. On the contrary, all these objections appear to me, when investigated, to resolve into unequivocal corroborations of its truth. The object of the following remarks is to prove, that such is the character of the objection which has been drawn from the scripture doctrine of regeneration. I intend to show that that doctrine of revealed religion is in entire and perfect accordance with the doctrines of Phrenology.

The first step of our investigation must be to *state distinctly* what the several doctrines in question are; if they are once understood it will not, I think, be difficult to make their consistency apparent.

The following, then, I take to be a correct statement of the respective doctrines:

The doctrine of *Phrenology* is, that the strength of the different propensities, sentiments, and intellectual faculties with which any individual is *endowed by nature*, bears a relation to the size of different portions of his brain; and

may be ascertained by examining the configuration and dimensions of his cranium.

The doctrine of *Christianity* is, that *all* men, whatever be their natural character, are called upon to repent, to believe in the Saviour, and to turn from sin to God and holiness.

Now, the objection drawn from these doctrines has been twofold:

1st, In the *first* place, there is an inconsistency said to lie in this,—that if a man is *proved* by Phrenology to have a bad natural character, it is *impossible* for that man to obey the gospel-call, to turn from his evil ways, and to walk in the paths of righteousness.

To the objection, when thus stated, the answer is extremely obvious; and it is this, that, if it be an objection to any thing at all, it is an objection, *not* to *Phrenology*, but to *Christianity*. Phrenology does not pretend to *make* men's minds, but simply to *know* them as they have been formed by the hand of Nature. That there *are* great natural diversities in human character, and that there are some men naturally very bad, no person will deny; and if any one chooses to say that this undoubted *fact* militates *against* *Christianity*, we refer him to the divines for an answer to his objection. But to impute the objection to *Phrenology*, which merely asserts, and proceeds upon this *fact*, already known and allowed by all, is very short-sighted, or very perverse. Every body knows that there are some men by nature extremely wicked. Such characters may be discovered by common observation. Phrenology furnishes another mode of observation by which they may be discovered. But as to their capacity of embracing Christianity, we leave that as we found it. If their having bad natural characters does indeed incapacitate them from embracing Christianity, the incapacity arises *from their character*, and not from *our becoming acquainted with it*, either by one means or another.

2d, But the objection has been put in another shape, which will require somewhat more attention. It has been

said, if the characters of all men are *fixed down*, by the boundaries of their *crania*, in the determinate way which Phrenology represents, how is it possible that they should undergo that *total revolution* which Christianity requires? When a man is converted, is his whole cranium *new modelled*? Certainly not; and what I now proceed to show is, not only that the doctrine of regeneration, as laid down in scripture, does *not imply any* change of the *original* powers and qualities of a man's mind, but that scripture most distinctly and expressly declares, that no *such* change *does* take place, either at conversion, or at any future period of the Christian's course, and that the native elements and constitution of the Christian's mind remain unaltered till his dying day.

In order that the full import of the proposition now announced may be understood, and that its effect in reconciling the doctrines of Phrenology and Christianity may be distinctly perceived, it will be necessary to expound at somewhat greater length the doctrines of the two systems which have been briefly stated above.

And, *first*, with regard to the doctrine of *Phrenology*.— I have stated, that the phrenological doctrine is, “that the strength of the different propensities, sentiments, and faculties with which *nature has endowed* any individual, may be *ascertained* by examining the configuration and dimensions of his *cranium*.” It is the *primary elements* of intellectual and moral character *conferred by nature* which Phrenology proposes to discover, and nothing else. It does not pretend that the *cranium* gives information as to the *actual attainments* which any individual has made either in intellectual or moral pursuits. It reveals a man's *capabilities and tendencies*, but not the extent and manner in which these may have been fostered, controlled, and regulated, or neglected, crushed, and perverted.

Circumstances and education have an extensive power in modifying human character. Both the intellectual powers and the moral qualities are alike subject to their influence; the good may be cherished, or it may be thwarted; the evil may be checked, or it may be pampered

and nursed into unnatural activity. *The mode in which these causes operate upon the human mind is not very material to my present inquiry.* It is obvious however to remark, that every mental power and disposition has certain external circumstances which are adapted to its nature, which excite it into activity, and form, as it were, the element in which it naturally moves and acts. By placing any individual, therefore, carefully and constantly, in circumstances which exercise one set of his faculties or dispositions, and by removing and separating him from those circumstances which would exercise a different set of his natural faculties or dispositions, the one class of exercises becomes familiar and habitual, while the individual remains unacquainted with or becomes estranged from the other class of exercises. It is moreover possible, indeed it is what is done every day, to *fix in the mind itself* certain maxims, rules, and motives of conduct, which propel and stimulate in one direction, while they restrain or form, as it were, a barrier in another direction. One course may be made to appear to the mind as fit or honourable, or as profitable and satisfactory in the long run; while another course is made to appear unworthy, degrading, unsatisfying, and in the end ruinous. This may be regarded as only a different modification of the influence of circumstances over the mental functions. It is the bringing of *future* and *distant* circumstances, of indirect and remote consequences into view, representing these vividly, and impressing them strongly upon the mind. Whether the representations thus made to the mind be true or false, they are taken by the mind to be true,—as true as *existing realities*; and it is this impression of their reality which gives them their control over the workings and habits of the mind. Res without stopping to illustrate this subject farther, I observe that *the fact*, that circumstances and training have an extensive sway over the human mind, is beyond all dispute. Now, Phrenology does not stand opposed to this plain truth; nor does it pretend that a man's whole circumstances, education, and history, are stamped in the

shape of his skull. It does not pretend to gather one iota of these from an examination of the cranium; and the *whole effects* which they are capable of producing upon the character are, and are acknowledged to be, utterly beyond its ken. What it has to do with, are the *natural endowments* of the mind.*

But, the natural endowments of men's minds are as various as are the natural dimensions and proportions of their bodies. The influence which circumstances and training exercise over body and mind is great; but it is still limited. It will never make either mind or body anew. A pigmy cannot be converted into a giant; a puny and sickly constitution cannot put on the strength and be nerved with the power of a Hercules; a clumsy and deformed man will never be made a model of grace, or the champion in athletic exercises. And as it is with the body, so it is with the mind. There are pigmy minds, and there are gigantic minds; minds puny and morbidly weak, and minds of Herculean nerve and prowess; clumsy minds and awkward minds, cripples and deformed; and the variety of these *natural* mental frames and constitutions is, at the least, as great and as conspicuous and undeniable as are the diversities of corporeal form and power.

This then is the province of Phrenology; and a wide and legitimate province it is, and one which it is easy enough to distinguish from the province of circumstances, education, and habit, with which it has been too often ignorantly or designedly confounded. The Phrenologists do not pretend to tell whether a man actually speaks Greek, or writes poems, or commits murders. What they undertake to do, is to tell how far a man possesses the *natural powers* which, under

* To speak more correctly, Phrenology affords external indications by which we can estimate the relative strength of the different powers of the mind as bestowed by nature, and it thus furnishes a key to the discovery of the effects likely to be produced by any combination of circumstances on the characters and dispositions of different individuals; but it affords no indication by the observation of which we can tell in what circumstances an individual has been placed, or which of the faculties possessed by him have been most cultivated and excited.—EDITOR.

proper circumstances, would enable him, with ease or with difficulty, to attain either to high or to moderate excellence in any branch of intellectual pursuit; or how far his *natural tendencies* either to good or to evil are strong or feeble. But whether all or any of the powers and qualities of his *mind* have had *scope* and *opportunity* to exercise and display themselves, whether the mind has been raised and stimulated, and sustained in its exercises; or whether its good qualities have been damped, or its bad qualities disciplined and brought under control, Phrenology does not inform, and the Phrenologists do not pretend to tell.

If there is any strong *natural* peculiarity,—and every person knows what is meant by a natural peculiarity, and how distinguishable it is from what is acquired and artificial,—if there is any strong natural peculiarity in any department of mind, temper, or character, the Phrenologist will have no difficulty in detecting it, though nothing should occur in his presence to call it into play, or though it should be habitually concealed, so as altogether to elude the notice of ordinary observers. And it is thus with *every one individual* faculty and quality, whose separate and independent existence our science has revealed to us. We can say in what degree any person has the *capacity* or *tendency* to exercise or indulge it; but whether it *has been manifested* according to its native strength,—that depends not only on the capacity—which we know, but upon circumstances and opportunities—of which we know, and upon which therefore we will decide nothing.

The doctrine of Phrenology is now, I hope, pretty distinctly understood; and, before proceeding, I will only farther observe in passing, that by thus defining the legitimate province of Phrenology, it must not be supposed that I am leaving nothing in it that is useful and practical. As has just been observed, it always affords the means of detecting decided peculiarities of natural character, however much they may have been thwarted by circumstances or counteracted by education. And although the science does not give

information as to man's circumstances and education, yet, after the Phrenologist is informed of these particulars in regard to any individual, he will be enabled, by the application of the science, to analyse his character with a degree of completeness and philosophical precision of which a person destitute of the science can form no conception. But what is infinitely more important to observe, the high pretensions of the science are grounded upon this, that, if it be true, it presents us with *an entirely new and a correct delineation of man's intellectual and moral nature*. If it be true, it supplies the greatest *desideratum* in the whole range of human science; for the *human mind*, the most noble and interesting of all the subjects of physical inquiry, has hitherto been a mere blank,—a barren and unproductive waste, in which men of the most transcendent genius have toiled and laboured absolutely in vain.

But I must now turn to the doctrines of *Christianity*, and what I have to show in regard to them is, that the change which they require to be produced upon a man's character and conduct is not of such a nature as to alter any of the *original or constitutional properties* of his mind; or, in other words, to alter any thing which the Phrenologists assert is ever discoverable from an examination of the *cranium*. The *cranium* remains the same, because the man in all his natural powers and tendencies remains the same.

The change which Christianity is calculated to produce, and which it does produce, upon the minds of men, is certainly very great. It produces this change sometimes rapidly, or almost suddenly, but for the most part slowly and progressively; but whether the effect is produced in the one way or in the other, I apprehend it to be clear that the change is of a nature which leaves the radical and elementary qualities of the mind just as it found them. It works its marvellous renovations and transformations by means of *a regulating and controlling influence*, not by means of *eradication*; and the great superiority of the change which its discipline and training effects upon the heart and character,

above that which is produced by any other system, arises from the transcendently superior and divine means which it employs for the attainment of its glorious and heavenly object.

What is the great means which Christianity employs at first for changing and afterwards for improving and perfecting the human character? I need hardly say that it is the principle of a true and living faith. Now, observe the nature of this principle, and the mode of its operation. What is faith? The Apostle Paul presents us with a most explicit and pointed definition of it in these words: "Faith is the *EVIDENCE of things not seen*;" an abiding and realising belief of the whole truths of revealed religion. Let a man then have this faith, which is the gift of God, and the means of his conversion, (for "by grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God;") and observe what a mighty principle you have implanted in his breast, for regulating, controlling, and directing all the principles of his nature. Give a man faith; that is to say, let him have an abiding and realising conviction of the presence of a God, holy, just, avenging, long-suffering, and compassionate, but who cannot look upon sin, and will by no means clear the guilty; of a Saviour, the Son of God, who abased himself, and died that we might live; that we might rise from the degradation and death of sin, and live to God, and walk with him in newness of life, and be made heirs of immortality. I say, let a man have faith in these, and all the other glorious and affecting truths of revelation; let him have "the evidence of these things not seen," abiding and prevalent in his mind; why, you have placed the man in a new world; "old things are passed away, all things are become new;" you have annihilated in a great measure as to him the things of time and sense; or, at all events, you have placed him in the very midst of a new scene, a new creation of high and holy and heavenly realities, which till that moment were to him as if they had had no existence. He was formerly an irreligious

man,—"God was not in all his thoughts;" and if his mind was unfortunately constituted, he was an immoral man, indulging his natural propensities and passions without restraint; for there was nothing *present to his mind* calculated to restrain them. But he has now received *faith*. He "believes in God; he believes also in Christ," and in all the other relative and harmonious truths which go to make up these "glad tidings of great joy," which are proclaimed to fallen, sinful, and abject man. This system of truth is "*evidenced*" to his mind by faith. It is thereby *mads present* to his mind; it *occupies* his mind and fills it; calls it off from the world and sin, and fixes it upon God and Christ, and holiness and heaven. No doubt the man is not yet perfect; but he is *converted*; that is to say, he is *turned*; his course is changed. He has hitherto gone on in the downward path of sin; he now begins to ascend the upward path of virtue. His descent may have been easy and rapid; his ascent may be difficult and slow. But his face is set heavenward; and he will now *go on*—shining as he goes,—and "shining brighter and brighter unto the perfect day."

Such, I think, will be admitted, by every one acquainted with Scripture, to be a correct view of the general nature of the doctrine of conversion. But before I ask whether it is not consistent with Phrenology, I must clear the ground of a difficulty which arises from the writings of some of the Phrenologists themselves. At one time there was a certain portion of the brain designated as *the organ of Faith*. It is now, I rejoice to say, a long while since this was altered. But, if I mistake not, in the writings of that individual to whom our science is so greatly indebted, it is still laid down that Faith is connected very intimately, if not exclusively, with the organ of Hope. Now, without taking any other way of removing whatever difficulty might be supposed to arise from this opinion, if it were correct, I must, with great deference, submit, that it is an opinion which must have been taken up without a due consideration of the subject in all its extent. No doubt there is a great deal in the faith of

a Christian to awaken and animate his *hope*, and to make this faculty dwell with delightful anticipation upon the bright futurity which is opened up to its view, and which it may discern and exult in even in the lowest depths of worldly debasement, and in the darkest hours of this world's sorrow. But has Christianity no truths which speak to the *fears* of a believer,—which may give exercise to his Cautiousness; his Adhesiveness; his Conscientiousness; his Firmness, his Veneration, his Ideality, and even his Combativeness, seeing he is called to *fight* and to *wrestle*? &c. In short, is there one active principle in human nature to which Christianity does not apply itself in the most urgent and affecting appeals, by means of a genuine and living faith in its truths? There is, it must be allowed, a certain degree of *intelligence* necessary, in order that these truths may be *received* into the mind; and without that degree of intelligence there can be no Christian, for there is in fact no man. But if the truths are admitted into the mind, and impressed upon it by genuine Christian faith, it seems obvious that it raises *the whole man*, and gives ample scope for the exercise of all his natural sentiments and powers.

Having put this matter in what, I hope, will appear to be its just light, I now proceed to observe, that it seems quite manifest, that the principle of Faith, which is the great means of turning a sinner from the error of his way, leaves a man's *natural* powers and qualities unaltered.

Faith *implies* that the man who has been made the recipient of it is placed in a world of *new circumstances*; it *consists* in this, that these circumstances, which are of the most affecting kind, and address every power and faculty of the soul, are habitually and constantly *present to the mind*; these affecting circumstances being thus made habitually present to the mind, they *solicit* all its powers, and *exercise* them all, habitually, *in a new way*; but they do not change the *nature* of the powers, or alter either the absolute or the relative strength of any one of them. It is not of the nature of the faith or belief of any truths whatever to alter or touch

the *intrinsic quality and constitution* of the mind which believes them. It is the mind, *such as it is*, which faith employs and exercises; but it seems inconsistent with the very idea and conception of it, that it should confer upon the mind a new power, or take away an old one, or that it should affect in the slightest degree the inherent character of the powers which actually exist.

But the Scripture doctrine will be seen more clearly, and the whole subject will be illustrated, if we direct our attention for a moment to a general view of what the Scripture unfolds to us of the *future course and progress* of a Christian, after he has undergone the first great and decisive change of conversion.

The Christian then is not only converted by means of faith, but he is *sanctified* in the same way; by which is meant, that he is enabled to advance in a gradual and progressive course of moral improvement. But faith enables him to do so, not by giving him a power to *root out* any of his natural tendencies, but by empowering him *practically* to *subject* and *subdue* them. If a man, at his conversion, has an evil tendency, it will remain with him to the last. There is, however, no evil tendency in human nature for which the *armoury of faith* does not furnish a suitable and tempered weapon wherewith to *combat* it. When the tendency is felt, it is met and put down by a scriptural application suited to the occasion; when it springs up again, it is watched and put down in the same manner. The Christian gets as familiar with the antidote as with the disease; and the feeling of the one at length naturally and without effort leads him to the instant and effectual application of the other. He gradually obtains the mastery over the enemy; and he thus strives to *keep under* his *whole* body, and to bring it more and more into subjection to the law of Christ. The tendencies still remain; but all their impulses are thwarted and strangled in their first risings. The man gradually gets estranged from what he never indulges in; a new and opposing habit is formed, a new and purer taste is ac-

quired. The mind, in one word, though still the *same mind*, has had its views elevated from earth to heaven, and expanded from time to eternity.

But still, I repeat it, the Scripture doctrine is, that the Christian's *natural* tendencies and dispositions continue always the same. He is called upon to watch, to pray, to contend, to fight, to wrestle; there is *no period* of his course that he is allowed to think himself secure or safe from any, even the *greatest* failings and sins. The flesh ever lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh. If the Christian is to prevail, it is by being *strong in the faith*; and in conformity with the contemplations and sentiments which his faith awakens, he must watch, and pray, and strive. If he ceases to be thus exercised at any one moment, his whole strength has departed from him, and there is not one of the feeblest of his spiritual enemies that may not start up and surprise him, and gain an advantage over him. This doctrine cannot be stated in stronger terms than it is represented by the Apostle Paul, in his own experience. "For we know," says he, "that the law is spiritual, but *I am carnal, sold under sin.*" "For the good that I would I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do." "There is a *law* in my members *warring against* the law of my mind, and bringing me *into captivity to the law of sin*, which is in my members. Oh! wretched man that I am, who will deliver me from the body of this death!"

Now, here is no change of the natural powers and tendencies. The whole improvement effected on the believer is, literally, and without any figure of speech, the effect of circumstances, training, and habit. The mind has been *awakened* by faith to the perception of a *new class* of objects; it has been *made alive* to God and heavenly things, to which it was formerly *dead* and *insensible*; as faith is strengthened, its sway over the powers and principles of the mind is extended, and its ascendancy is confirmed; but the powers which are thus awakened, and quickened, and kept alive, and exercised by Faith, are the *self-same* powers which existed before. The only difference is, that they were formerly devoted to objects less worthy of them, less en-

nobling, or, it may have been, positively debasing. But by means of the divine principle of faith implanted, and growing stronger in his breast, the Christian is removed from the contact and contamination of whatever is low or polluting. He *lives by faith*. Though in the world he is living continually *above it*. His mind is *conversant* with the sublime and glorious things revealed to his believing eye; and it is his contemplation of these, and his converse with them, which are *not transforming* the powers and faculties of his mind, but *schooling* and *exercising* them; and which are thus gradually moulding his *habits* and his *tastes* into a meetness for the fellowship of the saints in light.

If the view now submitted is scriptural, which nobody, I think, can doubt, it establishes the principle which I am maintaining; and shows that Scripture and Phrenology, so far from being at variance, are in entire and beautiful coincidence.

But this is not all. So strong are man's natural tendencies to evil, and so completely does Scripture recognize their *permanent hold and seat* in the heart of man, that even the divine principle of faith is not sufficient of itself to enable him to overcome them. He must continually ask for and obtain *the aids of the holy spirit of God*, to help his infirmities, and to strengthen his otherwise feeble and vain resistance. He is weak in himself, but when he is weak, *then* is he strong; for the strength of God is made perfect *in his weakness*, and he is strengthened with might *by the spirit* in the inner man.

Is it possible, I ask, to conceive any thing that could convey a stronger idea of *fixed* and *deep-rooted* propensities than this doctrine implies?

And if any thing should still be thought wanting, I would appeal to one other doctrine of our holy religion, a doctrine which is eminently peculiar to and characteristic of Christianity, which never had a place in any merely human system of faith, which was the subject of mockery and derision to the philosophers of Athens, but which, in the most strik-

ing manner, countenances and accords with the whole system of Phrenology: I allude to the doctrine of the *resurrection*, which proclaims, in language not to be mistaken, the dignity and the *essential importance* of our material part. For we are taught that notwithstanding all that Christian faith and Christian exertion and steadfastness, and the spirit of God himself, can do for us, the victory over the flesh will never be complete on this side the grave. It is not until this *body* has died, and been changed, and *made anew*, that the *soul* is to be completely fitted for its eternal home. "This *corruptible* shall put on incorruption, this *mortal* shall put on *immortality*." "Our *bodies* shall be fashioned like unto Christ's *glorious body*," and *then* shall we ascend and "meet the Lord *in the air*, and *so* shall we be for ever with the Lord."

I say, therefore, that the Phrenologists are not contradicted, but are most expressly and powerfully confirmed, by Scripture, when they hold that no change is produced upon the *original* faculties and qualities of the human mind by the reception of Christianity. Phrenologists cannot tell whether a man is a Christian from the examination of his *cranium*, any more than they can tell whether he has been the subject of human teaching or human training. The effects of Christianity are infinitely greater than what are produced by any merely human teaching, or by any merely human discipline, *because* the Christian is *taught of God*, and is *sustained* by the spirit of the *Almighty*. Under the influence of *such* means, the very chief of sinners may be brought from darkness into light, and from sin unto holiness. But the fact, that *such* means are employed, and are *necessary to the last*, is the very fact which shows that the innate principles and constitution of the mind remain unaltered, and which establishes my proposition, that there is an entire accordance between the doctrines of Christianity and of Phrenology.

ARTICLE IX.

AMBROSIAN MANUSCRIPT.

The following fragment of a MS. was handed to our publisher by the police-officer of West Register Street, who mentioned that he had found it in Gabriel's Road at five o'clock in the morning of Sunday the 27th June, and as he saw it contained the word Phrenology, he supposed might concern the Phrenological Journal. The MS., when we received it, smelt considerably of rum-punch, and bore other marks of intense conviviality. Notwithstanding of which, we have succeeded in deciphering it, and now present it for the edification of our readers.

North. Yes; the pursuits of literature was well enough in its way; but I mean to write a poem some of these days that will beat it hollow.

Tickler. What is your subject?

North. *Science and the men.* I think it will go hard but I shall make your philosophers look like a parcel of fools.

Tickler. You cannot make them look more foolish than they do already. When will you see such a set of block-heads? from Thales, who tumbled into a ditch when he was looking at the stars, down to the geologists, who wish to tell us how the world was made?

North. Infernal idiots every one of them.

The Shepherd. Weel, it's my real opinion that philosophy's a' just a parcel of nonsense.

Odoherly. Right, Shepherd. What is philosophy compared with fly-fishing?

North. What is that idiot Buckland about? I have not heard any thing of his *Reliquiæ Deluvianæ* lately.

Tickler. *Reliquiæ Deluvianæ!*—a parcel of rotten bones found in an old quarry. There's a foundation to raise a theory upon, of the duration of the world before the flood.

The Shepherd. The jaw-banes of an hyæna! That is to rout the Huttonians, horse, foot, and dragoons. It puts me in mind of Samson with his jaw-bane of an ass.

Tickler. Has Davy discovered any more new metals lately?

The Shepherd. Feint-ma-care whether he has or no. What

is the use of a' his metals? No ane of them wad make a flae-heuk with a preen, or even a preen itsel' to buck a bonny lassie wi'.

North. Well, there is something after all in the association of ideas. Who would have thought that Sir H. Davy and *potassium* would have led the Shepherd to think of a bonny lassie.

The Shepherd. Oo, man, it diana need ony thing at a' to make me think of a bonny lassie. It just comes as natural to me as the bool of a pint-stoup.

North. Talking of bonny lassies; what is that idiot Leslie doing with his ice? I have not seen "Leslie's patent ice-creams" advertised yet.

Tickler. Leslie is too great a philosopher to turn his discoveries to any use. He leaves that to the practical men,—Baxter, Montgomery, and Weddell, and the rest of the epicureans. By his method, any one can make half-a-quarter of an ounce of ice for little more than five shillings, or about £.4000 the hundred weight; and if, after this, people will not take advantage of so brilliant a discovery, but will be such fools as to build ice-houses, and get it in ship-loads from Norway, that is not his fault.

North. We need not say any thing about the kaleidoscope,—that is dead and buried.

The Shepherd. Ay, it was a bonny die for the muckle bairns; but they tired o't right soon—just as folk tires o' sawmon and lamb i' the summer time, and wearies for beef and mutton again.

Tickler. There's nothing like fly-fishing after all, Shepherd.

The Shepherd. Ye ha'e just said it, Maister Tickler. There's naething else that a man can stick to for days and days without tiring. Nae matter whether he catches aught or no. What need he care? He has the bonny blue flit aboon his head—and the bonny green hills around him—and the bonny clear streams—or, they are rather the better of being a little drummily, purling away before his nose, and making

a-singin' din as they fa' o'er the bits a' clints; and maybe there'll be the mooring of an-owr nolt over ayont the hill, and the bummung of a bee fleeing past him, as it flits frae gowan to heath-hall, just a' conspiring to lull the soul into a sweet repose—a delightful respite frae a' care and thinking. Oh, it is a pleasant recreation!

Tickler. Isaac Walton for ever!—Set the Shepherd upon fly-fishing, and there is no end of them.

Odoherly. Pleasur in the way we like it. Now, with all reverence for fly-fishing, I rather opine, that a bowl of punch—

Mullus. If the ingredients are well mixed, the fire clear, and the wit sparkling.

The Shepherd. Punch! I will not yield to one of you in devotion for punch; and above all, in a bowl. Oh, a bowl's the thing! Awa' wi' your tumblers; there's nothing in the world I like better than a bowl.

Tickler. Saving always and excepting the bonny lassies, Shepherd.

The Shepherd. Whisht, man, whisht! disna prophane the lassies wi' talking o' them sae lightly. I do like the dears to be sure, and wha disna?

Tickler. None but the philosophers, Shepherd. They, you know, are all woman-haters.

The Shepherd. Weel, I am thankfu' I'm no a philosopher. I wadna gi'e the dimple on a rosy cheek, or the blink of a bonny blue e'e, for a' the philosophy in the world.

Odoherly. Well, but philosophy has done us good even here: What say you to the steam-engine, and all the products of that wonderful invention? The richest and the most delicate fabrics thus adorn the female form.

The Shepherd. Pride; naething but pride. The lassies were far better afore, when they had to spin a' their ain brows. They're a' spoiled with perfect conceit now, with their muslin gowns and their shawls amaisht like India. Now there is naething for them to do but crimping and pletting o' mitch-es, and fal-de-rals for their wacks; and they look at an

honest lad, in hodden-gray, like the far end of a fiddle. Set them up!—There's nane of the scaff and daffing now i' the for-a-supper-times, when the spinning and the clashing o' tongues was trying wha to be loudest. Oh, commend me to the rock and the muckle wheel!

Tickler. But the steam-boats, Shepherd. Surely ye'll not deny that they are useful.

The Shepherd. Fient a bit. They're good for naething but to encourage stravaiging and vagabondizing. It was far better lang syne when folk staid at hame and minded their wark, and gaed to the kirk i' the Sunday, than now when they pretend to travel and see the world as they ca't. There's a' the Glasgow weaver bodies maun gang down to Iuverary i' the Saturdays to see the Highland hills, and drink Glenlivet, just as if they couldna get fou at hame wi' honest rum-punch, as they would be obliged to do if we hadna steam-boats. And that's a' your steam-boats are gude for.

Tickler. Well, but gas-lights. There is an invention worth something!

The Shepherd. I deny't. Nasty, blue, wan, earthly light it gie's; and gars folk look like ghaists, with a smell fit to scomfish the deevil. I wish Ambrose would pit away that glaring gas, and gie us twa gude four-i'-the-pounds instead o't.

Tickler. But for the street.

Odoherly. I protest against the street-light. I declare, I think all honest fellows should petition parliament against it; and to let us have back our fine old glimmering, half-lighted, darkness visible oil illumin—: No, I can't call them illuminators. They lighted nothing,—that was the beauty of them,—and then you could speak to an old acquaintance in the full blaze of one of these no-lights, and nobody a bit the wiser; but now you may as well take one of them by the hand at the cross on a Wednesday between two and four *p. m.*

The Shepherd. Weel, that is a disadvantage to be sure, I didna think of. But I'm nae just sae weel acquaint wi' that

kind o' thing as you, Maister Odoherty. We hae nae gaslights about Yarrow.

Odoherty. Except will-o'-the-wisp. You forget that, Shepherd. You have that in perfection.

The Shepherd. No personal reflections, if you please, Maister Odoherty. Will-o'-the-wisp in your teeth. We a' ken you.

North. Come, come, gentlemen; quiet words are best; no sparring among friends. I thank you all for your excellent hints. I see I shall have no lack of matter for my poem.

Tickler. Do you mean to give us a canto on Phrenology?

North. No: hang it. It would be honouring the trash and its supporters too much to rank them among philosophy and philosophers.

The Shepherd. Now I differ frae ye there clean. You admit that philosophers are a' idiots, and a' their discoveries trash and trumpery; and what waur can ye say o' Phrenology than that?

North. But there are degrees of idiocy as well as of glory,—and the Phrenologists——!

The Shepherd. I deny your major. An idiot is never nothing but just an idiot; and you canno' make him waur. Now there was that prince o' philosophers, Bacon, as ye ca' him; what was he but an idiot?—Wha but an idiot wad hae got himsel' turned out frae being chancellor just for a bit two-penny-halfpenny bribe? It was going to the de'il wi' a dish-clout ony how. And there are his writings about Idols, and his prosing about Experience and Observation; what was the use o't? Did he ever find out a thing that was worth a button? If he had even, with a' his experience and observation, shewn us the way to dress a flie hook, I wad hae thought something. Johnnie Leslie, ye ken, has settled his merits wi' a vengeance. Diamond cut diamond—There's naething like it.

Tickler. Then there was the Honourable Mr Robert Boyle;—What was he?

North. An ass. It is pretended that he discovered a substance more powerful and destructive than gunpowder; and that he concealed the invention, and allowed it to die with him, rather than present so pernicious a gift to the human race. Did you ever hear of such a ninny?

The Shepherd. His organ o' destructiveness had been sma'er than your's, Christopher.

North. I say, if we had such a powder now to blow up the Phrenological Society, and all that belongs to them, it would be a benefit to the human race past calculation.

The Shepherd. O man, but ye're bitter against thae Phrenological bodies! I dinna see ony ill they hae done just to be sent to the moon in that kind o' gate.

North. The moon is the fittest place for them.

The Shepherd. Now I am rather i' the mind that we are the better of them. Is it not a great comfort now to the like of you and Mr Tickler, wha hae sic an a grand talent for abuse, whenever you are like to run out of matter, to have Phrenology just ready at your hand to exercise your talents on? You dinna ken how muckle ye're obliged to Mr Combe and the rest of them. You'll no see sic a subject for you in a' the world, and your subjects are getting rather scarce; for there's Buonaparte, honest man, he's dead and gane, ye hae na him to abuse now; and there's the bits o' radical bodies are wearing away to amaist naething; and even the whigs,—why they canna get ony faults to find with the ministry, and what fault syne can ye get to find wi' them?

North. Sink Phrenology! Call another cause.

Tickler. With all my heart. If you want to prove philosophy to be nonsense, and all philosophers fools, you may have scope to tire even your soaring wing without stooping to notice Phrenology. There was Berkley, that proved there was no such thing as matter.

North. There was Hume, who proved there was no such thing as mind.

Tickler. There was Hartly, who showed that the mind was a mere bundle of vibrations and vibratiuncles.

The Shepherd. That's a' great havers to be sure, and nane but idiots wad hae thought o' sic trash; but what's the system now, I wad like to ken? What kind o' nonsense do they teach in the College now about mind and metaphysics, that they gar the bits o' student laddies pay their guineas for?

North. Shepherd, these are mysteries beyond your ken. You should leave metaphysics, and stick to sheep and fly-fishing.

The Shepherd. O man, if I had done aye that I wad na hae written the Queen's Wake; and that's a better poem than you or ony o' your band can produce to match wi' it.

North. What is that he says?

Tickler. Never mind him, Kit. He is only praising his own poems, and you know he is privileged to do that, *quibusdam in terris*, but particularly in the land of Ambrose.

The Shepherd. But I want to be at the bottom o' thae metaphysics. I wish the professor wad but just publish a bit pamphlet booky, where we might hae it a' fairly set down for a matter of aughteen-pence.

Tickler. Oh—Outlines of his course. Stewart published Outlines.

The Shepherd. Ay. I wad like to see thae Outlines as ye ca' them. What for does na he gi'e us them? I wadna care to study metaphysics, if I could win to the far end of them in a rainy afternoon. But I hae nae broo o' ye're muckle books, if it binna poetry.

North. Confound that twinge! I believe I am to have my old friend, podagra, again.

Tickler. Is it not rather in your stomach, North? Me-thinks the Shepherd's prosing makes you wince.

North. Shepherd, I tell you, you talk of what you don't understand. Metaphysics are above your pitch.

The Shepherd. What do you say is above my pitch? I say I can understand aught that has ony sense in it; and if metaphysics have ony I could understand it. But I'm in the mind it has nane.

North. We could show you the contrary of that.

The Shepherd. Weel, show it, and don't keep talking about it.

ARTICLE X.

SPURZHEIM ON EDUCATION.*

THE objects of education, using the word in its widest and most legitimate sense, are, *1st*, To increase the energy and activity of those faculties of the mind and body, which are naturally too weak. *2d*, To repress the inordinate action of those which are naturally too strong; and, *3d*, To give to the combined operation of the whole such a direction as shall most certainly and effectually increase the happiness and extend the sphere of usefulness of the individual.

To attain these ends, our efforts must be conducted in strict obedience to the laws which nature has established for the regulation of the functions of both mind and body. It is therefore particularly necessary that we should be previously in possession of a true theory of the human mind, capable of unfolding to us not only the number and functions of the primitive mental faculties themselves, but also the organic conditions which conduce to their greater or less degree of energy,—the laws which regulate their activity,—and the effects produced upon the general character by their different proportional combinations. Accordingly, the want of such a theory of mind is the true reason why, in ignorance of Phrenology, the most profound writers on education are still so much occupied in discussing contested points of very secondary importance, instead of starting, as is recommended by Mr Stewart, from undeniable first principles, obtained from “ a previous examination of those faculties and “ principles of the mind, which it is the great object of edu-

* A View of the Elementary Principles of Education, founded on the Study of the Nature of Man. By J. G. Spurzheim, M. D. Constable & Co. 12mo. pp. 360. 1821.

“ cation to improve ;”* and we are therefore disposed to regard it as in itself no small proof of the truth and value of the phrenological philosophy, that it already affords a sure, stable, and *consistent* basis for the erection of an improved system of education, and that it supplies the *desiderata* above stated.

In analyzing the valuable work now before us, and in conscientiously recommending it to the attentive consideration of our readers, it is proper to state, that, as Phrenology constitutes the basis upon which the fabric is reared, so an intimate acquaintance with its doctrines is necessary to the perception of the full value and to the adequate practical application of the precepts which it inculcates. But we can also state, that much of the important and interesting information contained in its pages is perfectly accessible to the common sense and good feelings of every reader ; only the unphrenological will fail to perceive the links which connect the different parts of the chain, and will thus see each observation as an isolated fact, and not in its true and most valuable light.

Dr Spurzheim divides his work into two great sections. In the first he treats of the means to be employed for increasing the activity of the faculties ; and, in the second, of the means to be employed for directing each faculty to its proper object. At present we shall confine ourselves to the consideration of the first section, reserving the second for another Number.

The chief circumstances which influence the *activity* of the faculties may be comprised under four heads or chapters : *1st*, Original Constitution ; *2d*, Physical Education ; *3d*, The mode in which each faculty is exercised ; and, *4th*, Their mutual influence in exciting or repressing each other.

Original Constitution.—Dr Spurzheim goes a step farther back than most other writers on education, and taking observation for his guide, and finding the mental qualities and capacities of the progeny to be intimately connected with and

* Stewart's Essays.

dependent upon the bodily constitution inherited from the parents, and believing that education ought to be an *imitation of nature's own laws*, and not an invention of ours, he strenuously insists that we ought to begin at the root, and that, after having ascertained, by careful observation, what qualities of mind and body in the parents are most likely to secure for their offspring the most favourable moral, intellectual, and corporeal constitution, we ought to seek for and combine these qualities, or the nearest approximation to them, which can be found. Nor is this a matter of little moment; for the more we examine nature, the more we shall be convinced that *education operates invariably in subjection to the laws of organisation*, and that it is impossible to improve the mind beyond the limits imposed upon it by its connexion with its material organ, or even to alter materially such lineaments of the character as are strongly drawn by the hand of nature. It is at once an illustration of, and in obedience to this law, that we find great intellectual power and favourable moral dispositions as invariably connected with a large, healthy, well-developed brain, and feeble intellect and moral deficiency as invariably the attendants of a small or very defective brain, and different or opposite dispositions and talents as invariably accompanied with very different states or configurations of brain, as if mind were merely a function of matter. Hence, as the brain is a component part of the animal system, and is subject to all the laws of living organized matter, its peculiarities, and the mental qualities consequent upon them, are transmitted from parents to children with as much certainty, because in obedience to the same laws, as features, noses, forms, or diseases.

It has indeed been long known as an abstract fact, in the natural history of man and animals, that the qualities of the mind as well as of the body descend from generation to generation,—that children of weak and nervous parents are themselves delicate, easily agitated, and subject to convulsions,—that the idiots, or Cretins of Switzerland, produce a race inferior to themselves,—that the children of

insane parents are generally, sooner or later, afflicted with the same disease, and that those of healthy, robust, and long-lived ancestors, are in general distinguished for similar qualities; but, either from ignorance of the principle according to which it happens, and which demonstrates that it will happen again, or from an absurd fear of degradation, by admitting his own subjection to the laws which God has set over animal nature, *Man* has not chosen to act upon it in improving his own species, but has married and given in marriage, as if all the qualities of mind and body were directly under his own control; and when overtaken by the consequences of his own neglect, and when Vice, Imbecility, and Disease usurp in his offspring the place of that Virtue, Talent, and Vigour, which he in vain expected to arise from good education alone, he looks upon himself as a hapless and devoted victim, who had no share in the production of his own misery, and whose only duty is to submit to the painful dispensations of a Superior Power, without making an effort to decipher and profit by the lessons which these inflictions are meant to convey. The laws of nature are ever the same; and in the days of Moses we find them giving rise to restrictions on the marriage of blood-relations, for the very reason that they are either unfruitful, or productive of degenerate offspring. If a knowledge of the operation of these laws were deeply impressed upon the mind of our youth, it is scarcely conceivable that we should so often have to lament the extinction of whole families by consumption, the quickly-spreading miseries of Insanity and Imbecility, and the innumerable ills attending weak and infirm health.

The chapter on this subject is one of the most valuable in Dr Spurzheim's book, and to it we must refer the reader for further details. It is written with perfect good taste, delicacy, and propriety. We shall only add, that among other important requisites in parents, Dr S. mentions a sound constitution, untainted with any hereditary disease, and a sound, active, *well-balanced* mind, indicated by a large and well-

proportioned brain, and that these qualities should be chosen in preference, in families where they have been the accompaniment of generations; as where a good individual appears in a bad or indifferent race, the chance of the re-appearance in the offspring of the indifferent qualities of the stock is very great. Hence the importance attached to pedigree is in reality founded in a law of nature; and hence also the value attached to it in the case of the lower animals, where each parent has been selected for his peculiar excellencies. In man, it is by no means so sure an index of the possession of the virtues of the original stock, as the choice of partners is scarcely attended to.

The age of the parents, their health, and especially that of the mother, and their state of mind, all exercise much influence on the destinies of their progeny;—but this is not the place to enter further into detail.

Having pointed out the means likely to secure a good constitution to those unborn, Dr Spurzheim proceeds, in the second chapter, to lay down the principles which ought to guide us in our endeavours to improve that which nature has already given. With this view, he discusses the laws which regulate the existence of the human being after birth, and those which influence the growth or development of the different systems or parts of the body. And even in a purely mental training, a knowledge of these is of much importance; because, during life, the mental manifestations are so dependent on organic conditions, and the action and reaction between mind and body are so immediate and so constant, as to render abortive any attempts at improving the mind which are not made in harmony with the laws of the animal system. And as no part should be favoured at the expense of the rest, our first object should be to secure to the child the best health and most perfect development of *all his parts*, which his natural constitution will permit. This will be best done by attending to the rules which Dr S. lays down for the regulation of Temperature, Nourishment, Choice of Nurse, Clothing, Air, Light, Cleanliness, Sleep, Repose, and Exercise, on each

of which he offers many most judicious and practical observations, but upon which we cannot now dwell. The effects of them on the general health have alone been attended to, but they are highly deserving of more particular study; for there is no doubt that modifications of them—of diet, for instance, favour the development of different systems; and it is extremely probable that, in the same way, some may operate more immediately than others in the development of different parts of the brain, and consequently on that of the different mental powers.

In the next chapter Dr Spurzheim discusses “the Laws of Exercise,” by observing which, the different faculties may be made to act with the greatest ease and energy, of which the natural constitution, improved by a proper management of the modifying causes last mentioned, is susceptible. This, indeed, includes all that is generally embraced under the name of Education, or, properly speaking, it includes a great deal more, for it treats of the cultivation of the *moral* as well as of the *intellectual* faculties.

The first circumstance which Phrenology points out as deserving of attention in attempting the cultivation of the mental powers is, that the capacity for improvement of each of the internal faculties, like that of each of the external senses, is exactly proportioned to and is limited by the degree of development and healthy condition of its own organ, and that the result of education is merely an increased facility of operation in that organ, and not a change in the mind itself, independent of the organization, as is generally supposed. Whence the Phrenologists contend, that just as we habitually regard the power of vision, and the degree of improvement of which it is susceptible, as in exact relation to the native constitution of the eye, and the superior quickness of sight consequent upon its judicious exercise, as always referable to a change produced, not in the unembodied principle of mind, but in the organ of vision itself, so we ought to regard each and all of the internal faculties, *ex. g.* the reasoning power, or the faculties of Tune or of Language, and the degree of

improvement of which they are susceptible, as in exact relation to the natural constitution of their respective cerebral organs, and the superior aptitude for deep thinking, for Music, or for Language, consequent upon their exercise, as the result of a change in the state of these organs, and not in the immaterial principle alone; and hence that we should, in every instance, adapt our means to the kind of faculties and organization possessed; and that, as we cannot bend the mental character to suit any circumstances, we should therefore adapt the profession and circumstances to the character and dispositions of the individual, in so far as conduces to his happiness and utility. Hence also the absurdity of seeking for laws of mind as *distinct* and *separate* from the laws which regulate the union and the mutual influence of mind and body; since, so long as life remains, not a moment passes over our heads which is not pregnant with proof of their inseparable connexion; and hence it is the very basis of our success, 1st, that we must employ each primitive mental faculty which we wish to cultivate directly upon its own objects, and not trust to its improvement following that of a faculty altogether different; and, 2dly, that we must proportion the degree of exercise of each to the original constitution of its own organ.

1st; It is a very common mistake in our schools, and in the received systems of education; to suppose that, by cultivating one faculty, we necessarily exercise the others; that by studying languages or mathematics, for instance, we necessarily cultivate the reasoning powers, or that, by cultivating the latter, we necessarily improve the moral sentiments. Phrenology puts an end to this delusion, by showing that each faculty depends, for its power of acting, upon the state of its own organ; and that thus whole pages may be learned by rote in virtue of the activity of the organ and faculty of Language alone, without exciting, in any degree, those of Causality or Comparison, upon which reflection depends. It shows that mathematics, being a science of relative proportions and numbers, exercises almost exclusively the organs

and faculties of Locality, Form, Size, Individuality, Comparison, and Number, while it leaves Causality almost inactive. It shows that the memory of facts and details depends on a good endowment of Individuality, and, consequently, that the mere acquisition of knowledge does not exercise the reasoning powers or moral sentiments. It shows that the latter, as well as the intellect, depend upon particular organs, and that each, in order to be cultivated, must be excited directly by its own object, and, in short, that it would be as philosophical to attempt to educate sight by listening to the sounds of a violin, or hearing by reading a treatise on acoustics, or touch by smelling a nosegay, as to attempt to improve the reasoning powers by learning a collection of words, or the moral sentiments, by objects exclusively addressed to the intellect.

Hence, when we wish to cultivate the reasoning powers, let us employ them directly in tracing the relation of cause and effect, and in the discovery of general principles. When we mean to cultivate the knowing faculties, let us exercise Number, for example, in the study of arithmetic and algebra; Language in the acquisition of the dead and living Languages, and in the structure of their sentences; Locality and Individuality in the study of Geography and the Natural History of different countries of the world. And again, when we intend to cultivate the moral sentiments, let us exercise Conscientiousness in the habitual practice and example of even-handed justice, instead of thinking to enforce it by precepts adapted to the organs of intellect alone; let us excite the activity of Benevolence in our children, by practising it towards others, rather than by bare words, with which our conduct is at variance, and let us not complain of a want of respect in our children depending on inactive Veneration, when we ourselves habitually treat others as if it were a sin to be respectful. In short, let us always exercise *directly* the faculty we wish to cultivate, for it is only by so doing that we shall at all succeed.

2d, As some faculties are possessed in greater proportion

than others, and as the most powerful are always the most capable of exercise, we must proportion the degree of exercise of each to its original constitution, so as neither to weaken it by too little action, nor to exhaust it by too much. In weak, delicate subjects, and at periods of growth, the faculties should be left a good deal to themselves, and more attention be paid to the general health and consolidation of the system. Precocious talent is frequently, from neglect of this, very soon exhausted. No general rule can be laid down, but the *same principle* applies as in the exercise of weak muscles, stomach, eyes, or any other part. In order to employ all the faculties to the best advantage, it thus becomes extremely desirable to know, before-hand, the proportions in which they are respectively possessed, so that no time nor labour need be lost in attempting to force those which nature has given in sparing quantity, nor mischief produced by the over-exercise or complete neglect of others, in which she has been more liberal. Phrenology puts the means of obtaining this knowledge completely in our power, and it is our own fault if we do not make use of it. And as we would never dream of giving a blind man the education of a painter, or a deaf man that of a musician, so Phrenology teaches us not to expect philosophic profundity from a person to whom nature has denied a large endowment of Causality, and therefore not to attempt to educate him for a profession in which great reasoning power is essential for success. It also teaches us not to set down as a fool or a dunce, the boy, whose depth of mind, depending on great Comparison and Causality, is merely hidden by the difficulty which, owing to small Language, he feels in clothing his ideas with words; for where the reflecting power is present, it will, in after-life, place its possessor far above his more superficial companion who excelled him at school, merely from having a much greater endowment of Language and Individuality. Phrenology thus enables us to avoid the mischief so often resulting from misdirected talents, and to select, with discrimination, the sphere in which each is fitted to move.

As some faculties arrive at maturity at a much earlier period than others, it is extremely advantageous to know the general order of their successive development,—because, by attempting to force into activity those faculties, the organs of which are not yet fully developed, and by neglecting those which are, our labour is not only entirely lost, but positive mischief produced. Information is still wanting on this point ; but inquiries are now going on, which will ultimately lead to valuable results. Dr Spurzheim thinks, from observation, that the organs of Individuality are perhaps the earliest of the intellectual order. Those of Form, Comparison, and Language, also appear early in life ; and those of Size, Colour, Locality, Tune, Number, and Order, appear successively. Among the propensities and sentiments, he thinks Amativeness and Veneration are the latest. Hence, every thing connected with observation, facts, history, geography, and general information, are best adapted to the youthful, and reasoning and deep reflection to the mature mind. Almost all the sentiments come into action at a very early age, and hence they ought to be carefully cultivated from the very beginning,—according to the law, already mentioned, of exercising each faculty upon its own objects. And as artificial signs or language cannot be understood, until the feelings or ideas which they represent are felt by the individual, we should be very careful to use such only as can be completely understood, as otherwise we run much danger of cultivating the single faculty of Language, when we believe we are cultivating all the powers of intellect. What signs could convey to the mind of one who had never felt them, the sensations expressed by the words Hunger, Thirst, Cold, Heat, Anger, or Benevolence ?

As it is desirable, in every system of education, to leave none of the faculties inactive, so that system is to be preferred which is calculated to exercise the greatest number of them. And, in this respect, the Lancasterian, or Mutual Instruction System, undoubtedly excels, as it brings into action many of the higher sentiments, as well as intellectual

powers, which either slumbered or became absolutely vitiated under the old practice. It excites a greater degree of attention in the pupil by addressing itself directly to Individuality, Comparison, &c., at the same time as to Language. And by making the pupils teach each other, and judge of each other's conduct, it calls into direct action the faculties of Conscientiousness, Benevolence, and Veneration, and gives the most virtuous direction to those of Self-esteem and Love of Approbation, so often perverted to the production of Envy, Jealousy, and Pride. It thus encourages the timid, and morally represses the overbearing and selfish, and produces that rational feeling of superiority founded on superior conduct. The emulation which it excites is of a far more generous kind than that of the old school. In the one, the child is led to conceive himself as one of many, and an equal among equals; in the other, as concentrated in self, and in opposition to both master and scholars.

As no part of the system should be cultivated at the expense of the rest, nor the mind at the expense of the bodily health, neither should the intellect be cultivated at the expense of the moral. Each should be duly exercised, and made to harmonize as much as possible with the other; and, with this view, we ought carefully to distinguish between the nature of the faculties and their particular applications. Thus one manner of satisfying an inclination may be innocent in itself, but if granted to a faculty already too active, it becomes blameable. Thus praise is in itself a very good thing; but if we remark a child who possesses the faculty of Love of Approbation in an uncommon degree, let us beware of flattering and praising him for the beauty of his face, his voice, or his figure. By doing so we prepare future misery for him. We complain of a child who is passionate, and yet we are foolish enough to encourage him to vent his anger upon a chair or a stone!

It is from this difference in the original strength of the natural dispositions, that the same treatment produces different and even opposite effects upon different persons. Thus an

individual, with small Conscientiousness and Benevolence, and large Acquisitiveness, Self-esteem, and Combativeness, will become worse under misfortune or injustice, and will think of revenge, and of making others as miserable as himself, where another, with a different combination, would submit with serenity and resignation. But the fact, that such a difference of result does take place, only shows more forcibly the necessity of knowing the functions and laws of the primitive faculties:

It may be asked if exercise increases the size of the cerebral organs? Analogy would lead us to suppose that it did, but we have no positive information on the subject. But as agility or quickness may be acquired without increase of muscle or nerve, it is also probable that the cerebral organs may be made to work with greater *activity* from exercise, even when they do not increase in size.

Having considered the laws of exercise, Dr Spurzheim proceeds, in the 4th chapter, to treat of the mutual influence of the faculties, in exciting each other to activity. Thus, from the influence of Philoprogenitiveness upon Combativeness, females defend their young with more energy and resolution than any thing else; and thus Acquisitiveness often calls Cautiousness and Secretiveness into action to gain its object. And thus also Love of Approbation excites the intellectual faculties, as is daily seen in schools and in society. The intellectual faculties also excite and assist each other. Thus a person, with moderate Language and large Locality, in trying to commit to memory, will often succeed by mentally dividing the page into compartments, and fixing a few lines in each. It thus becomes an object of some consequence to ascertain the mental constitution of the individual, because, as the faculties most largely possessed always tend to act along with each other, the one may be used, when necessary, as a means of exciting another. This knowledge, which is only to be found in Phenology, lies at the bottom of the doctrine of motives, for one will exert himself for praise which another despises; and a second will act from the hope of gratifying his large Acquisitiveness; and a third

from an innate sense of duty; and a fourth from excessive constitutional activity making rest painful to him. The insight into human nature which Phrenology bestows upon its disciples, thus supplies them with an engine of immense power in the education and management of youth. But, for the present, we must stop, and defer to another Number the analysis of the second part of the book, or that which relates to the direction of the faculties.

ARTICLE XI.

ON SIZE.

WE have received the following letter from a correspondent, addressed to the Editor of the Phrenological Journal:

Edinburgh, June 3, 1824.

It is a principle of Phrenology, that if the head be large in all its parts, the individual so constructed will be distinguished for general talent; whereas, if the head be small in all its parts, but equally so, there will be observed talents in every department, but by no means to the extent to which it is seen in the large head. This is what Mr Combe, I think, calls difference in respect of *power*. To this, though I have not yet passed the Rubicon of scepticism, I completely assent. We see many instances of individuals who, as to general formation, possess a development equal to Byron's or Scott's or Chalmers', but who, though never ridiculous, and often acute, yet *take no hold of the public mind*.

Now, sir, the difficulty which I have experienced, and for which I have been unable to find a solution, is the standard by which we are to estimate the general size of the head. We know that the head of Chalmers is, from Ideality to Ideality, upwards of six inches. Would you consider, say seven inches, as the limit of this faculty on the one hand; or is there any rule of figures laid down by phrenologists by which I, for the first time, taking the callipers in my hand, could pronounce this to be a head of power?—And, connected with this question, (although my query may appear very like that of a novice), when you state one part to be large and another small, is such a notice given by a comparison of one part of the head with another part, or in relation to some standard of excellence generally fixed?

If you do not consider these queries beneath your notice, I would feel much obliged if you would notice them shortly in your next number of the Phrenological Journal, or drop a note to S. R., Mr Stewart's, bookseller, Howe Street; embracing a short and satisfactory answer. Might it not be in the power of

scientific men to state the sort of beau ideal of a head at once distinguished for excellence and power?—Wishing you all success in the prosecution of a subject which, whether it be true or false in all its positions, is at least extremely interesting, and confirmed in many particulars, I am, &c. S. R.

We prefer noticing this letter in the Journal, as the same difficulties may have presented themselves to other readers.

1st, In regard to “the standard by which we are to estimate the general size of the head,” Mr Combe, in his Elements of Phrenology, gives the following table.

“Measurement by callipers,” says he, “is useful for ascertaining general size. The following are a few measurements from nature, taken promiscuously from many more in my possession.

Table of Measurements by Callipers.

Males between 25 and 50.	From Occipital Spine to Lower Individuality.	From Occipital Spine to Ear.	From Ear to Lower Individuality.	From Ear to Forebrain.	From Destructiveness to Destructiveness.	From Cautionness to Cautionness.	From Identity to Identity.
1.	7 $\frac{5}{8}$	4 $\frac{3}{8}$	4 $\frac{7}{8}$	5 $\frac{7}{8}$	5 $\frac{7}{8}$	5 $\frac{1}{8}$	5 $\frac{3}{8}$
2.	6 $\frac{3}{8}$	3 $\frac{3}{8}$	4 $\frac{4}{8}$	5 $\frac{5}{8}$	5 $\frac{5}{8}$	5 $\frac{0}{8}$	4 $\frac{0}{8}$
3.	8 $\frac{1}{8}$	4 $\frac{1}{8}$	5 $\frac{1}{8}$	6 $\frac{1}{8}$	6 $\frac{1}{8}$	6 $\frac{0}{8}$	5 $\frac{5}{8}$
4.	7 $\frac{1}{8}$	4 $\frac{1}{8}$	5 $\frac{1}{8}$	5 $\frac{1}{8}$	6 $\frac{0}{8}$	5 $\frac{1}{8}$	5 $\frac{5}{8}$
5.	8	4 $\frac{7}{8}$	5 $\frac{2}{8}$	6 $\frac{0}{8}$	6 $\frac{0}{8}$	6 $\frac{0}{8}$	5 $\frac{5}{8}$
6.	8	4 $\frac{3}{8}$	4 $\frac{4}{8}$	5 $\frac{2}{8}$	5 $\frac{1}{8}$	5 $\frac{0}{8}$	5 $\frac{5}{8}$
7.	7 $\frac{1}{8}$	4 $\frac{3}{8}$	4 $\frac{4}{8}$	5 $\frac{5}{8}$	6 $\frac{1}{8}$	5 $\frac{7}{8}$	5 $\frac{3}{8}$
8.	7 $\frac{1}{8}$	4 $\frac{3}{8}$	4 $\frac{4}{8}$	5 $\frac{5}{8}$	5 $\frac{5}{8}$	5 $\frac{5}{8}$	5 $\frac{5}{8}$
9.	7 $\frac{1}{8}$	4 $\frac{3}{8}$	4 $\frac{4}{8}$	5 $\frac{6}{8}$	5 $\frac{5}{8}$	5 $\frac{5}{8}$	5 $\frac{5}{8}$
10.	8 $\frac{1}{8}$	5	5 $\frac{5}{8}$	5 $\frac{7}{8}$	6 $\frac{0}{8}$	5 $\frac{5}{8}$	5 $\frac{5}{8}$
11.	7 $\frac{3}{8}$	4 $\frac{3}{8}$	5	5 $\frac{5}{8}$	5 $\frac{1}{8}$	5 $\frac{5}{8}$	4 $\frac{4}{8}$
12.	7 $\frac{1}{8}$	4 $\frac{1}{8}$	5	5 $\frac{6}{8}$	5 $\frac{5}{8}$	5 $\frac{5}{8}$	4 $\frac{4}{8}$
13.	7 $\frac{1}{8}$	4 $\frac{1}{8}$	4 $\frac{4}{8}$	5 $\frac{6}{8}$	5 $\frac{5}{8}$	5 $\frac{5}{8}$	5 $\frac{5}{8}$
14.	7 $\frac{1}{8}$	3 $\frac{3}{8}$	4 $\frac{4}{8}$	5 $\frac{3}{8}$	6 $\frac{0}{8}$	5 $\frac{1}{8}$	5 $\frac{5}{8}$
15.	7 $\frac{1}{8}$	4 $\frac{1}{8}$	4 $\frac{4}{8}$	5 $\frac{6}{8}$	6	6	5 $\frac{5}{8}$
16.	7 $\frac{1}{8}$	4 $\frac{3}{8}$	5 $\frac{1}{8}$	6	6 $\frac{1}{8}$	5 $\frac{8}{8}$	5 $\frac{5}{8}$
17.	7 $\frac{1}{8}$	4 $\frac{1}{8}$	5 $\frac{1}{8}$	6 $\frac{1}{8}$	6 $\frac{1}{8}$	6 $\frac{1}{8}$	5 $\frac{5}{8}$
18.	7 $\frac{1}{8}$	4 $\frac{1}{8}$	5	6 $\frac{1}{8}$	5 $\frac{1}{8}$	6 $\frac{1}{8}$	4 $\frac{4}{8}$
19.	8	4 $\frac{3}{8}$	5 $\frac{1}{8}$	6	6	6	4 $\frac{4}{8}$
20.	7	4 $\frac{1}{8}$	4 $\frac{4}{8}$	5 $\frac{5}{8}$	5 $\frac{5}{8}$	5 $\frac{5}{8}$	4 $\frac{4}{8}$
	150 $\frac{1}{8}$	86 $\frac{3}{8}$	99 $\frac{1}{8}$	118 $\frac{1}{8}$	119 $\frac{1}{8}$	113 $\frac{1}{8}$	103 $\frac{1}{8}$
Total divided by 20 gives average	7 $\frac{1}{2}$	4 $\frac{1}{4}$	4 $\frac{7}{8}$	5 $\frac{7}{8}$	5 $\frac{7}{8}$	5 $\frac{5}{8}$	5 $\frac{1}{4}$

“ These measurements are taken above the muscular integuments, and shew the size of heads in these directions ; but they are not given as indications of the absolute dimensions of any of the pre-nological organs. The callipers are not suited for giving this latter information, for they do not measure from the medulla oblongata, nor do they indicate breadth of fibre. The new craniometer is preferable for ascertaining absolute length, and the breadth may be judged by means of the hand or eye. The average of these twenty heads will be higher than that of the natives of Britain generally, because there are several large heads among them, and none small.”

It would not be easy to lay down the dimensions of a standard head ; but we may remark generally, that when the dimensions are equal to the largest of which the measurements are here given, the brain, if in sound health and possessing corresponding activity, will be one of power ; and, on the other hand, if it be greatly less than the least of these, there will be deficiency in energy.

2dly, When we state one part to be large and another small ; we indicate only the relative size of each organ to the other organs in the *same head* ; because the preponderance of particular feelings or talent in an individual is owing to the predominance of particular organs in his own head. We refer our correspondent to Mr Combe's Elements for a farther elucidation of the effects of SIZE ; and also for an explanation of the doctrine of ACTIVITY.

ARTICLE XII.

PROFESSOR RUDOLPHI AND PHRENOLOGY.

THE anti-phrenologists of the present day seem to be bent upon demonstrating the truth of an assertion which has often been made by the advocates of the new system, from a sincere and deliberate conviction of its truth, viz. that, from the clearness, consistency, and irresistible force of the *mass* of evidence which supports their science, it is impossible for any person of ordinary candour and attainments fairly to investigate it, without himself becoming a phrenologist ; and hence

that it is *impossible* for any one who really knows the subject, and who is not blinded by prejudice, to speak or to write against it. Dr Gordon, Dr Roget, Dr Barclay, Dr Milligan, and Mr Rennel, have all taken considerable pains to prove to the satisfaction of the public the truth of this statement, by exhibiting, in their own attacks, a degree of ignorance, which, in other sciences, it is rare to meet with. And the public is now indebted to the zeal of a celebrated Professor of this city, for having the name of Professor Rudolphi of Berlin added to the above list. We might not, for years to come, have had the pleasure of knowing the extent of Rudolphi's efforts, had not the Scotch Professor, in the course of last session, strongly dissuaded his pupils from wasting their money and time in purchasing and reading works on phrenology, on the ground that Professor Rudolphi, in a German work then publishing at Berlin,* (and of which scarcely a copy had yet reached this country,) had entirely and utterly demolished the whole science, facts, principles, and applications. Anxious as we have always been to meet with a philosophical opponent, we now thought our wish about to be realized. But when we at last succeeded in getting a sight of this vaunted production, we found it to contain the same kind of misrepresentation, and the same kind of arguments, so often and so unsuccessfully brought forward in Britain against our inductive science. To take up each of these in succession would be tedious and uninteresting to most of our readers. We therefore prefer selecting such specimens as will be sufficient to shew whether the British Professor acted with his usual wisdom, when he rested his friendly and decisive admonition on such a basis. We beg to add, that we entertain a real respect for Rudolphi as a physiologist; but when he chooses to expose himself on a subject of which he is profoundly ignorant, his is the fault, and not ours, if his labours are not rewarded with an increase of his fame.

* *Grundriss der Physiologie von D. Karl Asmund Rudolphi, &c. Berlin, 1821. vol. ii. 1823.*

Professor Rudolphi first states, as an objection to Phrenology, that although we can easily believe different parts of the brain to perform different functions, yet "we can never regard it, *with Dr Gall*, as an aggregate of *unconnected* parts;" whereas *Dr Gall himself* says, that, on account of this very connexion, "we cannot indicate with precision the *limits of all the organs.*" Vol. ii. p. 391.

Professor Rudolphi is next of opinion, that "Dr Gall's marking out of the skull is *arbitrary* and *fantastic*;" and he comments on "the *absurdity* of the circles which surround certain organs." All this would be extremely proper, if the Professor would first take the trouble to prove either that Dr Gall *alone*, and not Nature, gave a particular form to particular organs; or that their form is, *de facto*, inconsistent with the functions assigned to them. Until this is done, we think it may be quite as philosophically objected to the theory of the circulation of the blood, that the heart is of a pyramidal shape, and shut up in a bag; or to the function of the kidneys, that they are shaped like a French bean, and lie imbedded in fat; as to the organ of Benevolence that it is of an oval shape, or to that of Tune, that it is somewhat pyramidal.

Professor Rudolphi remarks it as an *inconsistency* in Dr Gall's system, that "there are spaces left on the skull and brain possessing in every respect the same properties as those called organs," but to which Dr Gall has assigned no function. If the Professor had had even a glimpse of the real nature of Phrenology, he would never have reproached Dr Gall with *inconsistency for not inventing functions* for parts, *the real uses of which he had not then discovered.* In writing these remarks, the Professor had clearly taken it *for granted*, that the new philosophy had no other or firmer foundation than that of Dr Gall's imagination, and under this impression he conceived that Dr G. might as easily have fancied functions for 30 or for 50 organs, as for 10 or 20. But in this assumption he will ere long find himself woefully mistaken.

Professor Rudolphi goes on to amuse the German public with Dr Barclay's stale assertion of the impossibility of distinguishing one isolated organ from another, *e. g.* the sublime one of Veneration, as he calls it, from the unhappy one of Murder; and we shall therefore only refer the reader, for an answer, to the refutation of Dr Barclay's objections in the Phrenological Transactions.

The Professor, in another place, confidently avers, that the convolutions of the two sides of the brain "*are not sufficiently symmetrical*" to execute the important functions assigned them by Dr Gall. If the Professor had known any thing at all about their functions, or about the effects of their greater or less degree of symmetry in modifying the performance of these functions, this objection would have been a little more feasible. In ignorance of both, it is too absurd to require a serious answer. What will such a stickler for symmetry say to the very *unsymmetrical* appearance of the right and left lungs, connected, as they are known to be, with the very *important* function of respiration?

Professor Rudolphi next informs us, that not a single organ of Dr Gall's system is ever diseased singly, but "sometimes the whole surface, and sometimes *here* and *there* a *particular part* without any particular rule." Query, Is not this "particular part" in the situation of some particular organ? Our experience says that it is; and Rudolphi does not show that it is not. The diseased appearances, however, generally extend to more than one organ, as it almost always happens that more than one faculty is diseased at the same time.

After enumerating a whole host of facts directly proving that different parts of the brain perform different functions, Dr Gall adduces the analogy of the lower animals in farther support of it, because they possess fewer faculties, and their brains are more simple, and have fewer component parts, than the human brain. Professor Rudolphi objects to this, that among the mammalia we find the brain *consisting of precisely the same parts, only proportionally reduced in size.*

But if this were fact, the brains of the lower animals would present the appearance of a human brain in miniature, and we should find in the ass, the horse, and the whale, the upright head, the broad coronal surface, and the covered cerebellum of man. Our readers can answer for themselves, whether such animals have ever crossed their path, and whether they have ever read, even in fabulous history, of donkeys, for instance, possessing the upright foreheads of a Shakspeare or a Bacon.

But, adds the Professor, "How little depends on the convolutions," (the very symmetry of which he but a moment before upheld as of vital importance,) "is evident from their being wanting in the *human embryo*; and in many of the "smaller mammalia." Where, we would ask the Professor, are the proofs of the great energy of character, or of the great intellectual vigour of an embryo, for which convolutions should be needed, supposing them to be necessary for the manifestations of the mind? Is it really possible that Professor Rudolphi could imagine, even in a dream, that the smaller mammalia, or the human embryo, ever manifest the same faculties, and the same scope of mind, as the more perfect of their species, and the adult man, in whom convolutions exist? We have not yet seen the *convolutionless embryo*, whose mental powers were equal to the production even of a tirade against Phrenology, the lowest of all kinds of mental exhibitions, much less to that of the *novum organon*, which may be ranked among the highest.

Professor Rudolphi goes on to furnish us with farther irresistible evidence of his unacquaintance with the doctrines which he attacks, by representing Dr Gall as arguing, that since we see in organic structure different organs for different phenomena, there must be "different organs in the brain for the *different kinds of activity of the faculties*," whereas every tyro in Phrenology is aware that its supporters only contend for different organs for *different faculties*, and not for the different *kinds* of activity of the same faculty.

Professor Rudolphi proceeds to ask a very important,

though simple question,—“but *who can decide,*” says he, “whether a plurality of mental organs is indispensably necessary, and if it is, *who can tell* for what purposes the mind requires the same, and for what different organs?”—If we were to answer, that Dr. G. and the phrenologists, in consequence of observation, can decide, Rudolphi would probably smile at our presumption, but the fact would not on that account be the less true. If we fairly analyze the question, it will be seen to destroy most effectually all Rudolphi's arguments; for it amounts to neither more nor less than a confession, that the question cannot be decided either by reasoning or by the analogy of any thing yet known, but only by the evidence of new facts and observations, and that therefore it is needless, in the absence of such, to argue about the matter. Rudolphi having no facts to adduce, is clearly *hors du combat*, and has no right to disturb Dr. Gall in his possession of the field, otherwise than by wresting his facts and observations from his hand, and supplying their place by those of an opposite nature; but this he will never do.

Professor Rudolphi, still taking it for granted that Phrenology is a mere phantom of Dr. Gall's imagination, says,—“Gall thinks he has discovered a great number of organs, and he is quite clear about many of them, but the source of his pretended knowledge is almost entirely an absolutely untenable craniotomy; he thought, for example, that in men distinguished for any particular talent, (which they possessed in common), music, for instance, or verbal memory, he had always found a certain formation of the head, and thus, if a part of the skull was prominent, he fancied that behind it there was developed a certain portion of the brain on which that talent depended; *vice versa*, he assumed, that where the talent was deficient, the elevation also was wanting, and thence he was obliged to place all the organs on the surface of the brain. Those cases which were calculated to support his hypothesis were brought forward, but the unfavourable ones got rid of in a manner which proves the nullity of the whole.”

Let those of our readers who think us too severe towards our opponents, ponder well the preceding quotation; and, before passing sentence, let them recollect, that Dr. Gall has published four closely-printed quarto volumes of facts

and proofs in support of all his statements,—that he has laid down rules for repeating his observations, and for verifying his facts,—that he has illustrated these by an immense series of plates,—and that he has challenged the world to disprove their accuracy,—and that Professor Rudolphi, without pretending to refute, utterly disregards all these labours, and, in profound ignorance, and with much presumption, boldly proceeds to charge Dr Gall with deceiving the world by fancies and assumptions; and finishes by the gratuitous and insulting accusation, that he, Gall, has met with cases unfavourable to his cause, but which he disingenuously conceals from the public. If the phrenologists can find differences of development and elevations on the head, only by “*assuming that they are present,*” and “*fancying they see them,*” why do they, with such labour and expense, collect skulls, and casts of heads and skulls, from all quarters of the world, and not only freely admit, but anxiously invite the public to inspect and to compare them with each other; and, above all, why do they put a pair of calliper compasses into the hands of their visitors, and request them to measure the differences of development in inches and tenths of inches? If these differences had no existence but in the fancies of Dr Gall and his followers, how long could this delusion last with such infallible means of destroying it placed in the hands of our enemies?

As to being obliged to place all the organs on the *surface* of the brain, it has already been stated, for the hundredth time, that they are not confined to the surface, but extend to it from the *medulla oblongata*; and, in truth, we are wearied of hearing this weak and glaring perversion of Dr Gall's words thus eternally repeated.

Such is a sample of the objections with which a great German physiologist chooses to assail Phrenology; and so very desperate is the condition of the opponents at home, that such arguments are hailed and proclaimed by them, as for ever exploding the only philosophy of mind which could boast of resting on the firm basis of Nature!

Professor Rudolphi notices the existence of the Phrenological Society, and kindly adds, that although Phrenology is nonsense, there cannot be a doubt but that some good will result to science from that association. We would recommend to him an early and attentive perusal of the Society's Transactions.

ARTICLE XIII.

DR NARES ON PHRENOLOGY.

WE lately chanced to light upon a work bearing the title of "Elements of General History, Ancient and Modern, by the Reverend Edward Nares, D. D. Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford;" published in 1822; and we found in it the following sentence: "Even the names of Mesmer, Mainaduc, Gall, and Spurzheim, may require to be mentioned, as having for some time, in an extraordinary manner, amazed the ignorant, and deceived the credulous, by their strange systems of Animal Magnetism and Craniology."—(Vol. II. p. 489.)

It is difficult to say precisely to what faculties such a manifestation ought to be attributed. The confident conceit of it is the first quality that arrests our attention, for it bears intrinsic evidence that the reverend historian is profoundly ignorant of the "strange systems of Animal Magnetism and Craniology," upon which he pronounces so decided an opinion. To persons who have studied Dr Gall's four volumes on the physiology of the brain, and found them replete with facts and arguments about which Dr Nares evidently knows nothing, and to which no opponent has ventured to reply, except by dogmatism and drivelling,—to those who have read Dr Spurzheim's works, distinguished by reflection, and the most pure and elevated sentiment,—and to those who have perused the Transactions of the Phrenological Society, abounding with the most interesting and authentic cases, and

bearing a long list of respectable names testifying to the truth, dignity, and utility of the science after examination, (not to mention our own Journal,) such observations as the foregoing, when introduced into a grave historical work, appear *strange* and *extraordinary* in no common degree. They *amaze* not the *ignorant*, but the *informed*, and seem truly calculated to *deceive the credulous*, for only the most simple gulls can mistake "confident nonsense" for the decision of a penetrating and enlightened understanding. Perhaps, however, Doctor Nares was carried away by the current of popular delusion, and wrote the above sentence through mere unreflecting levity, and in this case he may merit less severity of censure. His offence would then be attributable to much Love of Approbation, which prompts one to follow the multitude, and deficient Cautiousness. He should recollect, however, that *littera scripta manet*, and that the tendency of this sentence is to perpetuate the prejudice under which he laboured by instilling it into young minds for whom chiefly his history is composed; and it is this circumstance which has drawn upon him our present animadversions. If his history comes to a second edition, we recommend to him to read the works both on Magnetism and Phrenology before deciding as an oracle on their merits. If he does so, we predict a change of sentiment, at least in regard to the latter.

ARTICLE XIV.

CAPTAIN ROSS ON DECIMAL NOTATION OF THE ORGANS.*

I HAVE practised phrenological observation a good deal; and finding a manifest defect in the common mode of expressing the value of the respective organs by words, I had recourse to the plan of setting them down on paper decimally as I examined them. To accomplish this, I called moderate 1000;

* We submit this communication to our readers without being understood as adopting all Captain Ross's ideas.

when the organ is so small as to be of no effect or value, (as in an idiot) I call it 0.000; and when "very large," so as to be particularly predominant, I called it 2.000; according to what the value relatively of each organ appeared to be in my mind I expressed it decimally in like manner; for example, 1,150 would be rather full. Thus a review of the whole gave me a far more correct idea of what my mind had conceived to be the actual value of each organ, than the common mode of expressing it in words could do. This mode I found particularly useful when intended for the opinion of other phrenologists; and for the elucidation of which I shall give you examples of two.

L. E. J.—, aged 20.

Organs.	Size.	Organs.	Size.
No 1=1.000	18=1.750	No 1=1.002	18=1.000
2=1.450	19=1.000	2=1.342	19=1.321
3=1.000	20=1.275	3=1.200	20=1.250
4=1.450	21=1.275	4=1.574	21=1.150
5=1.275	22=uncertain	5=0.975	22=uncertain
6=0.200	23=1.275	6=0.875	23=1.250
7=0.500	24=1.400	7=0.890	24=1.250
8=0.600	25=1.250	8=0.902	25=1.000
9=1.150	26=1.150	9=0.940	26=1.150
10=0.875	27=1.000	10=1.100	27=0.900
11=0.800	28=1.150	11=0.900	28=1.450
12=0.275	29=1.000	12=1.200	29=1.000
13=1.250	30=1.150	13=1.975	30=1.050
14=1.050	31=0.975	14=1.027	31=1.500
15=1.000	32=1.050	15=1.037	32=0.975
16=1.275	33=1.150	16=1.254	33=1.150
17=1.500	34=0.275	17=1.035	34=0.875

J. L.—, age 26.

Organs.	Size.	Organs.	Size.
No 1=1.002	18=1.000	No 1=1.002	18=1.000
2=1.342	19=1.321	2=1.342	19=1.321
3=1.200	20=1.250	3=1.200	20=1.250
4=1.574	21=1.150	4=1.574	21=1.150
5=0.975	22=uncertain	5=0.975	22=uncertain
6=0.875	23=1.250	6=0.875	23=1.250
7=0.890	24=1.250	7=0.890	24=1.250
8=0.902	25=1.000	8=0.902	25=1.000
9=0.940	26=1.150	9=0.940	26=1.150
10=1.100	27=0.900	10=1.100	27=0.900
11=0.900	28=1.450	11=0.900	28=1.450
12=1.200	29=1.000	12=1.200	29=1.000
13=1.975	30=1.050	13=1.975	30=1.050
14=1.027	31=1.500	14=1.027	31=1.500
15=1.037	32=0.975	15=1.037	32=0.975
16=1.254	33=1.150	16=1.254	33=1.150
17=1.035	34=0.875	17=1.035	34=0.875

For the sake of experiment I proceeded to class the organs according to Dr Spurzheim, and having added together the respective decimals, and divided by the number of organs, I got the mean value of each class, and having taken the 1st, 2d, and 3d differences, (as will be seen by the following example,) I arrived at the value of the influence of each class as regards the rest, and was astonished, as well as gratified, to find how exactly the arithmetical results corresponded with the characters of the individuals.

EXAMPLE.

Class 1.	ORDER I.	Class 2.	ORDER II.
1=1.400	Class 3.	14=1.250	20=1.150
2=1.200	10=1.350	15=1.000	21=1.150
3=1.250	11=1.750	16=1.150	22=1.000
4=1.500	12=1.500	17=1.450	23=1.150
5=1.150	13=1.500	18=1.150	24=1.000
6=1.350	4)2100	5)1000	25=1.000
7=1.150	1.525	1.200	26=1.300
8=1.450	1.305		27=1.200
9=1.300	1.200		28=1.400
9)2750	3)1030		29=1.900
1.306	1.343		30=1.350
	2d Order 1.223		31=1.000

1st difference being the difference of the two orders.

1.120 1st difference shows that the individual is 1.120 more of an intellectual being than otherwise.

2d difference being the difference between each class and the first difference.

2d difference shows the value of each class with regard to the decimal 1.120, and need not be enumerated.

3d difference being the difference between each organ and the first difference.

3d difference shows the value of each organ, compared with the decimal 1.120, and need not be enumerated.

149196
1.223

ARTICLE XV.

FIELDING'S MISS MATTHEWS.

THE novels of Fielding, (an acute observer, and a faithful, though, on the whole, a coarse painter of human nature,) abound in combinations which no system of mental science, Phrenology excepted, can explain. His characters, generally speaking, are much less the creatures of his imagination than transcripts of those men and women whom he actually saw and conversed with in the world. They are, therefore, very mixed beings, and hardly ever act in a uniform manner, like the personages in most other novels; but seem to be influenced by different passions at different times, and consequently display very different aspects and appearances. These re-

marks apply particularly to *Amelia*, the last of his novels, which, on this very account, will be highly appreciated as a study by a phrenological reader. Some critics have ventured to speak lightly of it, as inferior to his earlier productions; but not to urge, what no one will question, that it may, nevertheless, be an able and an interesting work, there are not wanting individuals who would give it the preference, on the grounds of the greater range and variety of its characters, the singular unhesitating fidelity with which their failings and vices are delineated, and, above all things, a sobriety of judgment as to the world, and a diffusion of tenderness and delicacy, both in sentiment and delineation, which would entitle Fielding to a more elevated rank as a moralist than can possibly be procured for him by the conjoined merits of all its predecessors. Even Mr Murphy, who says of it, that "it has indeed the marks of genius, but of a genius beginning to fall into its decay," almost concurs in the opinion now expressed, while he is endeavouring to substantiate the correctness of his observation as to its comparative inferiority.

"The author's invention in this performance does not appear to have lost its fertility; his judgment, too, seems as strong as ever; but the warmth of imagination is abated; and, in his landscapes or his scenes of life, Mr Fielding is no longer the colourist he was before. The personages of the piece delight too much in narratives, and their characters have not those touches of singularity, those specific differences, which are so beautifully marked in our author's former works: of course the humour, which consists in happy delineations of the caprices and predominant foibles of the human mind, loses much of its high flavour and relish. And yet *Amelia* holds the same proportion to *Tom Jones* that the *Odyssey* of Homer bears, in the estimation of Longinus, to the *Iliad*. A fine vein of morality runs through the whole; many of the situations are affecting and tender; the sentiments are delicate; and, upon the whole, it is the *Odyssey*, the moral and pathetic work of Henry Fielding."

The reason why the characters have not "those touches of singularity, those specific differences, which are so beautifully marked in Fielding's former works," is held to be one not disadvantageous in the eyes of a reader who wishes rather genuine portraits than caricatures, and whose object is

to understand human nature, not merely to amuse himself with the fictions of a humourist. As to the remark, that "in his landscapes, or his scenes of life, Mr Fielding, in his *Amelia*, is no longer the colourist he was before," the very contrary judgment which Mr Chalmers has pronounced may be quoted as a perfectly satisfactory answer in a question of taste, dependent greatly on diversities of constitutions:—

"Those who have seen much," says he, "and thought much of the errors and distresses of domestic life, will probably feel that our author's colouring in this work is more just, as well as more chaste, than in any of his other novels. The appeals to the heart are, in my opinion, far more forcible. The whole of *Miss Matthews'* narrative abounds with exquisite touches of nature and passion; but what may be referred to with most confidence, are chap. vi. of book x., and chap. viii. of book xi. Where do we find the consequences of imprudence or guilt "represented with such irresistible tenderness?"

A few examples of the combinations to be met with in *Amelia*, and some illustrations of them in Fielding's own words, from which we may deduce his views of human nature, will probably afford both amusement and edification to the reader. He will discover them to be decidedly phrenological.

In the character of *Miss Matthews*, to which we shall at present confine ourselves, we find *Amativeness*; *Adhesiveness*, *Destructiveness*, *Firmness*, *Self-esteem*, and *Benevolence*, largely displayed, and appearing either in subjection or collision, sometimes with fearful effects.

Mr Booth, who had known her in early life, is introduced to her in prison, where she, under the name of *Vincent*, was confined on a premature accusation of having murdered her seducer; Booth himself, besides some pecuniary difficulties, being charged with beating a watchman in the execution of his office and breaking his lantern. The account of their recognition is striking enough to be transcribed; its phrenological bearings are very obvious and decisive. Perhaps the pen of the novelist has rarely brought out a more impassioned and varied scene; and it deserves the more attention, because the discordant elements displayed in it are roused into commotion by apparently slight excitements, rather of inter-

nal origin than from without, and consequently indicating great mental activity. Benevolence and Adhesiveness are excited by the presence of Booth, and the latter principle is evidently much aided in its manifestation by the combination which leads to bewitching softness, and the full efficacy of which Booth himself had soon after the misfortune to experience. Then her Self-esteem and Love of Approbation, awakened and wounded by the idea of the odious place in which she finds herself, have scarcely time to be quieted by the respectful attentions of Booth, when, in alliance with Adhesiveness, and, in some degree, Benevolence, Conscientiousness, and Veneration, they are again excited and pained to the uttermost by the associations connected with the name of her father. The perfect sincerity of her passion on this occasion is beyond question. Again recovering, and feeling gratified by the tenderness and sympathy of Booth, from which her Self-esteem and Love of Approbation prompt her to anticipate a large increase of pleasing concern, she is prepared for his suggesting a topic, which, in an individual, especially a female, in whom Destructiveness was not very powerful, whatever Self-esteem might be, and however a sense of justice or necessity might moderate repugnance and self-reproach, would be sure to produce a feeling of horror. Very different was the case of Miss Matthews, who positively exults in the recollection of the bloody act for which she was committed, with a fervour and luxuriance to be sought for only in a tiger, or the most ferocious of Indian savages. Her firmness is apparent throughout, but becomes peculiarly energetic in contemplating the issue of her life.

“Eight or nine years had passed since any interview between Mr Booth and Miss Matthews; and their meeting now in so extraordinary a place affected both of them with an equal surprise. After some immaterial ceremonies, the lady acquainted Mr B. that having heard there was a person in the prison who knew her by the name of Matthews, she had great curiosity to inquire who he was, whereupon he had been shown to her from the window of the house; that she immediately recollected him, and being informed of his dis-

“tressful situation, for which she expressed great concern, she had sent him that guinea which he had received the day before; and then proceeded to excuse herself for not having desired to see him at that time, when she was under the greatest disorder and hurry of spirits.

Booth made many handsome acknowledgments of her favour; and added, that he very little wondered at the disorder of her spirits, concluding, that he was heartily concerned at seeing her there; but I hope, Madam, said he, — Here he hesitated; upon which, bursting into an agony of tears, she cried out, ‘O captain! captain! many extraordinary things have past since last I saw you. O gracious heaven! did I ever expect that this would be the next place of our meeting!’ She then flung herself into her chair, where she gave a loose to her passion, whilst he, in the most affectionate and tender manner, endeavoured to sooth and comfort her; but passion itself did probably more for its own relief than all his friendly consolations. Having vented this in a large flood of tears, she became pretty well composed; but Booth unhappily mentioning her father, she again relapsed into an agony, and cried out, ‘Why, why will you repeat the name of that dear man? I have disgraced him, Mr Booth. I am unworthy the name of his daughter.’ Here passion again stopped her words, and discharged itself in tears. When she had recovered her faculties, she perceived Booth standing silent, with a mixture of concern and astonishment in his countenance; then addressing herself to him with an air of most bewitching softness, of which she was a perfect mistress, she said, ‘I do not wonder at your amazement, Captain Booth, nor indeed at the concern which you so plainly discover for me; for I well know the goodness of your nature; but O, Mr Booth! believe me, when you know what hath happened since our last meeting, your concern will be raised, however your astonishment may cease. O, Sir! you are a stranger to the cause of my sorrows.’ ‘I hope I am, Madam,’ answered he, ‘for I cannot believe what I have heard in this prison—surely murder,—at which words she started from her chair, repeating murder! ‘Oh! it is music in my ears!—You have heard then the cause of my commitment, my glory, my delight, my reparation:—Yes, my old friend, this is the hand, this is the arm that drove the penknife to his heart. Unkind fortune, that not one drop of his blood reached my hand. Indeed, Sir, I would never have washed it from it. But though I have not the happiness to see it on my hand, I have the glorious satisfaction of remembering I saw it run in rivers on the floor; I saw it forsake his cheeks. I saw him fall a martyr to my revenge. And is the killing a villain to be called murder? perhaps the law calls it so.—Let it call it what it will, or punish me as it pleases.—Punish me!—no, no,—that is not in the power of any man not

“ ‘ of that monster man, Mr Booth. I am undone, and am re-
 “ ‘ venged, and have now no more business for life ; let them
 “ ‘ take it from me when they will.’ Our poor gentleman turned
 “ ‘ pale with horror at this speech, and the ejaculation of Good
 “ ‘ Heavens ! What do I hear ! burst spontaneously from his lips ;
 “ ‘ nor can we wonder at this, though he was the bravest of men :
 “ ‘ for her voice, her looks, her gestures, were properly adapted
 “ ‘ to the sentiments she expressed. Such, indeed, was her image,
 “ ‘ that neither Shakspeare could describe, nor Hogarth paint,
 “ ‘ nor Clive act a fury in higher perfection.”

Fielding, aware of the probability of objections to the contrast exhibited in the behaviour and the language of Miss Matthews, offers an apology for it, drawn from the analogy of nature. The Phrenologist, whatever he may think of the poetic diction in which it is couched, or its political allusion, will give it so far credit ; but the metaphysical theorists of the day must find it somewhat difficult of digestion, and would undoubtedly laugh at him if he had seriously advanced it in illustration of any similar contrariety in character.

“ ‘ It may be necessary to whisper a word or two to the critics,
 “ ‘ who have, perhaps, begun to express no less astonishment
 “ ‘ than Mr Booth, that a lady, in whom we had remarked a
 “ ‘ most extraordinary power of displaying softness, should, the
 “ ‘ very moment after her words were out of her mouth, express
 “ ‘ sentiments becoming the lips of a Dalila, Jezebel, Medea,
 “ ‘ Semiramis, &c. We desire such critics to remember, that it
 “ ‘ is the same English climate in which, on the lovely 10th of
 “ ‘ June, under a serene sky, the amorous Jacobite, kissing the
 “ ‘ odoriferous zephyr’s breath, gathers a nosegay of white roses
 “ ‘ to deck the whiter breast of Celia ; and in which, on the 11th
 “ ‘ of June, the very next day, the boisterous Boreas, roused by
 “ ‘ the hollow thunder, rushes horrible through the air, and
 “ ‘ driving the wet tempest before him, levels the hope of the
 “ ‘ husbandman with the earth : Dreadful remembrance of the
 “ ‘ consequences of the revolution !”

Can any known system of metaphysics account for such phenomena, or furnish even a catalogue of the elements concerned in them ? If not, is the philosophy of the Phrenologist to be despised which leads him to another interpreter,—or his sincerity to be called in question, which puts the means of detection or confirmation beneath the very noses of his opponents ? It is quite in accordance with such liability to sudden changes, that this tender-hearted fury, after having shown the *warmest* affection for Booth, and bestowed every

favour in her power on him, contrives the aggravation of his misery, because, under the combined influence of Conscientiousness and regard to his wife, he refuses to continue her paramour.

Some of her peculiarities displayed themselves at a masquerade. Her Self-esteem, goaded into jealousy, combines with an excited and threatening Destructiveness, to urge the unstable Booth into an appointment which his moral principles and his love for Amelia condemned. Such is the danger of associating with a woman of her cast.

“Booth had been prevented searching farther after his wife, by the lady in the blue domino who had joined him again. He had now made three discoveries; that the lady was pretty well acquainted with him; that she was a woman of fashion; and that she had a particular regard for him. But though he was a gay man, he was, in reality, so fond of his Amelia, that he thought of no other woman; wherefore, though not absolutely a Joseph, as we have seen, yet could he not be guilty of premeditated inconstancy. He was indeed, so very cold and insensible to the hints which were given, that the lady began to complain of his dullness. When the shepherdess, again came up, and heard this accusation against him, she confirmed it, saying, ‘I do assure you, Madam, he is the dullest fellow in the world. Indeed, I should almost take you for his wife, by finding you a second time with him; for I do assure you the gentleman very seldom keeps any other company.’ Are you so well acquainted with him, Madam?” said the domino. ‘I have had that honour longer than your ladyship, I believe,’ answered the shepherdess. ‘Possibly you may, Madam,’ cries the domino; but I wish you would not interrupt us at present, for we have some business together.’ ‘I believe, Madam,’ answered the shepherdess, ‘my business with the gentleman is altogether as important as yours; and therefore your ladyship may withdraw, if you please.’—‘My dear ladies,’ cries Booth, ‘I beg you will not quarrel about me.’—‘Not at all,’ answered the domino, ‘since you are so indifferent, I resign my pretensions with all my heart. If you had not been the dullest fellow upon earth, I am convinced you must have discovered me.’—She then went off muttering to herself, that she was satisfied the shepherdess was some wretched creature whom nobody knew.”

“The shepherdess overheard the sarcasm, and answered it, by asking Booth what contemptible wretch he had picked up?” ‘Indeed, madam,’ said he, ‘you know as much of her as I do; she is a masquerade acquaintance like yourself.’ ‘Like me!’ repeated she. ‘Do you think, if this had been our first acquaintance, I should have wasted so much time with you as I have?’ For your part, indeed, I believe a woman will get

"very little advantage by her having been formerly intimate
 "with you." "I do not know, Madam," saith Booth, "that I de-
 "serve that character any more than I know the person that
 "now gives it me." "And you have the assurance then," said
 "she in her own voice, 'to affect not to remember me?' 'I
 "think," cries Booth, "I have heard that voice before; but,
 "upon my soul, I do not recollect it." "Do you recollect," said
 "she, 'no woman that you have used with the highest barbari-
 "ty, I will not say ingratitude?' 'No, upon my honour,' an-
 "swered Booth. 'Mention not honour,' said she, 'thou wretch;
 "for, hardened as thou art, I could show thee a face, that, in
 "spite of thy consummate impudence, would confound thee with
 "shame and horror.' 'Dost thou not yet know me?' 'I do,
 "Madam, indeed," answered Booth; "and I confess, that, of all
 "women in the world, you have the most reason for what you
 "said.—Here a long dialogue ensued; consisting chiefly of vio-
 "lent upbraidings on her side, and excuses on his. He at
 "length pacified her with a promise to make her a visit, which
 "promise she extorted from him, swearing bitterly in the most
 "solemn manner, unless he made it her, she would expose
 "both him and herself at the masquerade. As he knew the vio-
 "lence of the lady's passions, and to what heights they were
 "capable of rising, he was obliged to come into these terms;
 "for he had no fear upon earth equal to that of Amelia's know-
 "ing what it was in the power of Miss Matthews to communi-
 "cate to her; and which to conceal from her he had already
 "undergone so much uneasiness."

The animosity of Miss Matthews was not confined to vio-
 lent upbraidings and denunciations of wrath, in case of her
 will and pleasure being thwarted. She could doom to misery,
 of the direst kind, the wretch, whom, as she had once favour-
 ed him with her affection, she conceived she had made a slave
 for ever; and she had so much of a good hater in her, arising
 from Firmness, Self-esteem, and Destructiveness, that she
 could carry that doom into execution with a resolute and un-
 faltering mind. Booth did not keep his appointment; for,
 besides his positive disinclination, he had abundance of occu-
 pation elsewhere. Her next interview with him drew forth
 a little of the bewitching softness of which she was so com-
 plete a mistress; but displayed a still larger portion of her
 terrific qualities, and one singularity in the character of Self-
 esteem, namely, that, when excessive, it blinds the mind to
 the claims and feelings of others. Miss Matthews, under its
 predominating sway, seems to have persuaded herself that

even Booth's wife would take part with her in punishing the delinquent!

"In his way home, Booth was met by a lady, in a chair, who, immediately upon seeing him, stopped her chair, bolted out of it, and, going directly up to him, said, 'So, Mr Booth, you have kept your word with me.' This lady was no other than Miss Matthews, and the speech she meant was of a promise made to her at the masquerade of visiting her within a day or two. Booth was too sensible and too well-bred to make the excuse of forgetfulness to a lady, nor could he readily find any other. While he stood therefore hesitating, and looking not over-wise, Miss Matthews said, 'Well, Sir, since, by your confusion, I see you have some grace left, I will pardon you, on one condition, and that is, that you sap with me this night. But, if you fail me now, expect all the revenge of an injured woman.' She then bound herself, by a most outrageous oath, that she would complain to his wife. 'And I am sure,' says she, 'she is so much of a woman of honour as to do me justice. And though I miscarried in my first attempt, be assured I will take care of my second.' Booth asked what she meant by her first attempt? to which she answered, that she had already written to his wife, on account of his ill-usage of her, but that she was pleased it had miscarried. She then repeated her asseverations, that she would now do it effectually, if he disappointed her. This threat she reckoned would most certainly terrify poor Booth; and, indeed, she was not mistaken, for it would have been impossible, by any other menace, or by any other means, to have brought him once even to balance in his mind on this question. But by this threat she prevailed; and Booth promised, upon his word and honour, to come to her at the hour she appointed. After which, she took leave of him with a squeeze of the hand, and a smiling countenance, and walked back to her chair."

Booth, in making this promise, resolved against the consequence so apparently intended by the lady, and purposed, by keeping his word, to convince her, if possible, that, from a regard to his honour only, he having pledged himself to Colonel James that he would not visit her, he must discontinue her acquaintance, and, failing success in his arguments, to communicate the whole truth himself to Amelia. It is not to be wondered at, that with a person so constituted and so deeply interested as Miss Matthews, the reasoning of Booth, at his valedictory visit, should prove ineffectual; rather, indeed, provokes a larger measure of indignation; that, as he was for once true to his better principle,

consequence was no other than an absolute quarrel. It is unnecessary to pursue the story farther, as enough has been detailed to illustrate the character of Miss Matthews. It is one of unhappy composition and fearful energy, and one, which, to have become safe to the possessor and useful to the world, would have required a very different training from what she received. That it is perfectly natural will be questioned by no one to whom the principles of Phrenology are familiar, and might be amply proved by some very distressing examples, on record, of atrocity and crime in that sex, to whom, in their palmy state, we are accustomed to look with confidence for our highest solace and refinement, but by whom, when, from the prevalence of the lower propensities co-operating with the villainy of selfish men, they have passed the bounds of decency and fair repute, it is not unusual, alas! to be shocked by some of the grossest corruption and most appalling iniquity to be met with in the history of our species. Love of Approbation is probably of greater frequency than Self-esteem, in the combination which leads, or is liable, to such depravity; but the latter, though it may contribute to reserve and decorum, will undoubtedly, where it predominates, be more untractable and dangerous.

ARTICLE XVI.

OBSERVATIONS ON SECRETIVENESS.

To the EDITOR of the PHRENOLOGICAL JOURNAL.

SIR,—In lately looking over the extensive collection, belonging to the Phrenological Society, of casts and skulls of executed criminals, and comparing them with the recorded notes of development of many unexecuted offenders, whose heads have been manipulated, I was much struck with the large size of the organ of Secretiveness in almost all of them; and I began to think what effect such an endowment, combined with the deficient moral sentiment and moderate intellect, by which these unfortunate beings are characterized,

could have in leading to the formation of vicious habits; and it occurred to me that it operated by removing or diminishing some of the strongest restraints which the laws and the customs of society have placed upon the irregular indulgence of the animal propensities. Its effect in leading to the *successful* perpetration of crime, no one can doubt who is at all acquainted with its functions; but to make the other effect equally evident, may require a few observations.

Human actions are the result of the tension of the understanding upon a variety of motives, and the more numerous or the more powerful those are which impel us in the same direction, the more certainly do we yield to them implicit obedience. Motives, again, are numerous and powerful in proportion to the number and strength of the primitive faculties with which we are endowed. Thus, if there was a being who, along with intellect, possessed only the two faculties of Acquisitiveness and Conscientiousness, &c., and he took a fancy for any thing to which he had no right, it is clear that he would steal it or not steal it exactly as his Acquisitiveness or Conscientiousness happened to predominate. But if, to a weak Conscientiousness, you add a large Cautiousness, inspiring with the fear of detection and punishment, the individual would very probably let the subject alone. The same effect will be produced by the addition of large Love of Approbation, which gives a fear of losing the esteem and favour of our fellow-men. Now, it is well known that an immense number of individuals exist, who act honestly from such secondary but powerful motives, and therefore if, by any means, it follows that the force of these restraining powers be diminished, while other circumstances remain the same, the number of individuals who yield to the temptation must also necessarily and considerably increase. Secretiveness has this very effect, as I will now endeavour to show.

Suppose we have A. B. with a large Acquisitiveness, moderate Conscientiousness, average Cautiousness, Self-esteem, and Love of Approbation, with small or moderate Secretiveness,—and that he is so situated as to have his Acquisitive-

ness considerably excited to embezzle or plunder any valuable object. He has thus a strong desire to possess himself of it; but against this he has a kind of conscience which merely hints to him that it would be very wrong, but is not sufficiently strong to be felt as a restraint. Cautiousness, however, gets active, and suggests the punishment which would follow detection. Love of Approbation, too, talks of the disgrace which would ensue, and the small Secretiveness feels even its inmost thoughts lying so open to inspection, that it declares it utterly impossible to purloin it without instantly betraying itself. Thus, with numerous weaker motives pitched against the single strong one, the intellect has little difficulty in determining that honesty is the best policy,—and therefore it says, Let us be honest.

But take C. D. with the same combination and *large* Secretiveness, which puts on a face that sets all scrutiny of what is passing in the mind at utter defiance, which leads its possessor to veil every thing in an impenetrable shade, and to appear the very opposite of what he is, which gives that tact of observing, and reading the countenance of others, and which enables him to provide in time for his own safety, *then* the effect will be very different. The Conscientiousness, as before, is too weak to operate as a check. Cautiousness, as before, speaks of the danger, but is instantly stopped by Secretiveness, detailing a plan by which he may possess the treasure *without risk* to any one. Love of Approbation is quieted by the same means, and Secretiveness falls to work, and manages matters so as, he thinks, will quash suspicion fall in any direction but the right one; and he therefore appears with a bold and brazen face. If detection were certainly and unavoidably to follow, then Cautiousness and Love of Approbation would operate as checks of the most powerful kind. But, remove the *possibility* of detection, or, what is the same thing, give the individual a *positive feeling of security and impossibility of discovery*, and these motives immediately lose so much of their weight, that the individual yields readily to temptations, which, with the certainty of detection before

him, he could easily have resisted. Now there is nothing more certain than that a small Secretiveness gives that perfect feeling of openness and impossibility of hiding, which is equivalent to a certainty of detection, and that a large one gives that feeling of concealment and impenetrability, which, in its effects, is almost equivalent to a physical impossibility of discovery; and thus, even independent of experience, we might safely infer, that the *same* combination of faculties will act very differently in the *same* circumstances, according as it is joined with a *large* or *small* Secretiveness.

By the same principle it is easily explained why publicity in all public matters is productive of so much good. For, with the best intentions in the world, it is not consistent with human nature to suppose that an individual will do a thing equally zealously and equally carefully with three motives as with six. So long as Secretiveness keeps every thing close and snug, there are no motives but those from within, and in such a case a man may mean very well, and yet, from natural indolence, or fifty other causes, he may put off and neglect the performance of his duties. But the moment you allow the public to look over his shoulder, you give him the very powerful additional motives to exertion and integrity, arising from Love of Approbation, Self-esteem, Cautionness, &c. and these, as auxiliaries, are by no means to be despised.

In conclusion, I beg leave to add, that the same idea of the effect of Secretiveness will be found at p. 164 of the Phrenological Transactions in Mr Scott's Essay. I was not aware of the fact when I began this letter, but it seems to me an additional proof of its soundness; and, as it is a principle from which many valuable practical hints are to be obtained, I think it may be well to bring it more plainly under the notice of your readers. If, therefore, you think this communication fit for the purpose, it is very much at your service. Yours,
A.

ARTICLE XVII.

ELEMENTS OF PHRENOLOGY. By GEORGE COMBE, President of the Phrenological Society. Edinburgh, 1824. pp. 224. 12mo.

EVER since Phrenology began to excite attention in this country, it has been a *desideratum* with many to have a short intelligible statement of its doctrines published within a moderate compass, and at a moderate expense. The writings of the original founders of the system were beyond the reach of most readers, and by their voluminous size, and the necessary dryness of many of their details, deterred the bulk even of the speculative and inquiring from entering upon their perusal; so that, notwithstanding the publication of Dr Spurzheim's larger work and outlines in an English form in 1815, Mr Combe may be said to have been the first who, by the judicious abstract of the system given in his *Essays on Phrenology*, published in 1820, laid open to the English reader the treasures of valuable information and sound philosophy which that work contained. The same gentleman has now favoured us with a still shorter abstract, in which he has given, in the most condensed and manageable form, the substance of what is contained in the larger books, and also much useful and practical information that is not to be found in any previous work whatever.

The volume commences with an account of the discovery of the science, and of the manner in which Dr Gall was led to it, by comparing cerebral development with mental manifestation. Some observations are then made on the defects of former theories of mind, and on the manner in which the phrenological method of observation is calculated to obviate these defects. This is illustrated by comparing the mind, or rather its organ, the brain, to a musical instrument, which is played in an adjoining room, or behind a curtain. So long as the instrument is out of sight, we cannot tell whether the notes are produced by different states of a single piece of metal, as a trumpet, or monochord, merely by its being blown

or struck with different degrees of force, or whether there is a separate string for the production of each particular note. The metaphysicians never could discover this, by reflecting on their own Consciousness, because Consciousness does not reveal the organs by means of which the mind manifests itself. The metaphysicians were therefore in the state of those who heard the instrument sounded behind the curtain; but, in the phrenological mode of inquiry, the curtain is withdrawn.—“The phrenologist studies man in society, and “in comparing the power of manifesting particular faculties “with the size of particular organs, resembles a person who, to “discover the mode of operation of the instrument, should examine narrowly its structure, and make it sound while he observes it.”

A short statement is then given of the general principles of the system, and to this follows an admirably luminous and distinct account of the thirty-four phrenological faculties, according to the arrangement of them in Dr Spurzheim's English work. Although there may be little or nothing in this part of the work that is really new, we recommend it to our readers, even those who are most advanced in the science, as well worthy of an attentive and repeated perusal, and as containing a more full, clear, and satisfactory system of human nature, and a greater number of valuable facts in regard to the primitive faculties of man, than will be found within the same compass in any other book, ancient or modern. We have no hesitation in saying, there is more to be learned from this little work, in the real knowledge of ourselves and our fellow-creatures, than in the works of all the metaphysical writers put together.

Prefixed to the account of each separate faculty, is an account of the situation of the organ in the head, which is highly useful to those who wish to make observations for themselves. The author does not profess to give the evidence by which the functions of the different organs are established, nor to answer objections that have been made to the system of faculties; but, in the course of his observations, he occasionally does both; and we cannot resist quoting the follow-

ing passage, in which he has, we think, been particularly happy in obviating an objection which has often been most ignorantly and absurdly made to Phrenology.

“It has been objected, that nature cannot have placed a faculty of Benevolence, and another of Destructiveness, in the same mind; but man is confessedly an assemblage of contradictions. The great unknown novelist speaks of ‘the well-known cases of those men of undoubted Benevolence of character and disposition; whose principal delight is to see a miserable criminal, degraded alike by his previous crimes, and the sentence which he has incurred, conclude a vicious and a wretched life by an ignominious and cruel death.’ (St Ronan’s Well.) This indicates Benevolence co-existing in the same individual with Destructiveness. The greatest of poets has said,—

“O thou goddess,
 “Thou divine Nature, how thyself thou blazon’st,
 “In these two princely boys. They are as gentle
 “As zephyrs blowing below the violet,
 “Not wagging his sweet head; and yet as rough,
 “Their royal blood enchafed, as the rud’st wind
 “That by the top doth take the mountain-pine,
 “And make him stoop to the vale.”

“Here Shakspeare informs us that these boys manifested much Combativeness and Destructiveness, combined with great Benevolence. The sword is one of the emblems of State, and what is it but the symbol of Destruction ready to fall on the heads of those who offend against the laws? ministering thus, in its very severity, to purposes of Benevolence and Justice. What are the implements of war but instruments of destruction; and for what end do soldiers take the field, but to destroy their enemies? And yet surgeons and numerous assistants attend on armies, to succour those on whom the calamities of war have fallen; the two faculties which are deemed incompatible, being thus manifested together, with deliberate design. Without Combativeness and Destructiveness there would be no war; and without Benevolence, if these existed, there would be neither mercy nor compassion. Instead, therefore, of the co-existence of these faculties forming an objection to the phrenological system, it shows its harmony with nature.”

We shall also quote the following statement of the function of Individuality, as distinct from those of the other known faculties. Those who have not allowed themselves to

* Lord Nelson’s celebrated prayer before the battle of Trafalgar might be cited as another instance, in which he expresses a hope, that humanity to the conquered may always be the characteristic of Britons.

give due attention to this subject, whether learned or unlearned as to other matters, have made themselves particularly merry with this faculty of Individuality,—which they conceive to be a mere invention of the phrenologists, and which they affect not to understand, or represent as a piece of unintelligible absurdity. We refer any one whose mind is not warped by preconceived opinions to the following statement, and we ask whether it is not intelligible, and, indeed, whether it is not in the highest degree consistent with our constant and every-day experience in regard to the observing powers of the mind?

“ In the preceding pages, it is stated, that the faculty of Form perceives the forms of objects;—Colouring their colour;—Size their dimensions;—and that Individuality takes cognizance of existences and events in general. The question naturally occurs, if the minor knowing powers apprehend *all* the separate qualities of external objects, what purpose does Individuality serve in the mental economy? Its function is to form a single intellectual conception out of the different items of information communicated by the other knowing faculties. In perceiving a tree, the object apprehended by the mind is not colour, form, and size, as separate qualities; but a *single thing or being*, named a tree. The mind having, by means of Individuality, obtained the idea of a tree, as an individual existence, may analyze it, and resolve it into its constituent parts of form, colour, magnitude; but the contemplation of it in this manner is at once felt to be widely different from the conception attached to the word tree as a whole. The function of Individuality, therefore, is to embody the separate elements furnished by the other knowing faculties into one, and to produce out of them conceptions of aggregate objects as a whole; which objects are afterwards viewed by the mind as individual existences, and are remembered and spoken of as such, without thinking of their constituent parts. Children early use and understand abstract terms, such as tree, man, ship; and the organ of Individuality is very prominently developed in them. Form, Colour, and Size, furnish certain elementary conceptions, which Individuality unites and conceives, as the being called a man. The faculty of Number called into action gives the idea of plurality; that of Order furnishes the idea of gradations of rank and arrangement. Now, Individuality, receiving the intimations of all these separate faculties, *combines* them again, and contemplates the *combination* as an *individual object*, and this is an *army*. After the idea of an army is thus formed, the mind drops the recollection of the constituent parts, and afterwards thinks of the

“*aggregate only*, or of the combined conception formed by Individuality; and regards it as a single object.

“It is interesting to observe the Phrenological System, which at first sight appears rude and unphilosophical, harmonizing thus simply and beautifully with Nature. Had it been constructed by imagination or reflection alone, it is more than probable that the objection of the minor knowing faculties rendering Individuality superfluous, would have appeared so strong and unsurmountable, as to have ensured the exclusion of one or the other as unnecessary; and yet, until both were discovered and admitted, the function of such terms as these we have considered, was altogether inexplicable.”

The next section contains an account of the different modes of activity of the faculties,—and it is here shewn, in a manner to us the most distinct and convincing, that the faculties assumed by the metaphysicians, such as perception, memory, judgment, imagination, and the rest, are merely certain *modes* of the separate faculties discovered by the Phrenologists. Thus *Perception* is shewn not to be a separate faculty, but merely the lowest degree of activity of the observing powers. The faculty of Tune perceives melody, the faculty of Colouring perceives colours, the faculty of Causality perceives the logical steps of an argument, or the connexion between cause and effect.—*Memory* is the second degree of activity;—Tune remembers music;—Individuality facts. Dr Watts, it is mentioned, seems to have anticipated, by a very acute conjecture, the real philosophy of memory. He says, “It is most probable, that those very fibres of the brain which assist at the first idea or *perception* of an object, are the same which assist also at the recollection of it; and then it will follow that the *Memory* has no special part of the brain devoted to its own service, but uses all those in general which subserve our sensation as well as our thinking and reasoning powers.” This is just the Phrenological doctrine. The notion of past time, which is implied in memory, is held to be supplied by the faculty of *Time*. Thus Individuality recalling circumstances, without the notion of time, would produce *Conception* only;—if the idea of past time be added, it would be *Memory*.

When the faculties are powerfully active, from internal excitement, whether by the will, or from natural activity, the ideas they have previously formed are vividly and rapid.

ly called up to review,—and this active state of mind is styled *Conception* or *Imagination*. This is the third degree of activity,—and in this state new combinations are formed in all possible varieties; but no idea is produced which is positively new, or which had not previously existed in the mind. Thus the poet may imagine *seas of milk and ships of amber*, which, however bold exertions of the imagination, are merely new combinations of previously existing ideas, arising from the high state of excitement to which the faculties are raised.

Lastly, Judgment, in the philosophical sense, belongs to the reflecting faculties alone, and is merely one of the states of their activity. These faculties have memory and imagination also,—and he who possesses them powerfully, perceives, remembers, and imagines processes of deduction, or ideas of abstract relations, with facility and correctness.

Attention is not a faculty of the mind, but merely consists in a vivid application of the faculties which form ideas. *Association*, which makes so great a figure in the works of some metaphysicians, expresses only the mutual influence of the faculties on each other, and which, so far from being subject to any general laws, is different in every different individual, according as any particular faculty or faculties happen to be predominant. The tender mother, in whom Philoprogenitiveness is strong, will be led, by almost every possible circumstance, to think of her children,—the thoughts of the warrior will run on deeds of arms,—those of the poet on images of beauty,—while those of the philosopher will be chiefly connected by the relations of strict logical reasoning. *Habit*, which, next to association, makes the most conspicuous figure in Mr Stewart's philosophy, is merely the continued exercise of faculties already possessed;—and its power only the increased readiness which continued exercise confers on all our movements, bodily and mental. *Taste* is the result of the harmonious action of the faculties generally, and the just balance which maintains among them in a well-organized mind. If any one is too powerful it destroys this balance, and intro-

duces some offence against good taste. If Ideality is in excess, it produces bombast;—too great Causality produces unintelligible refinement. If *Wit* is excessive, it degenerates into impertinence.

This section, which contains much valuable matter besides what we have adverted to, will probably be regarded as the newest portion of the work; not that it is altogether new, for it is merely an extension of Dr Spurzheim's speculations upon the same subject,—but because it applies accurately to that particular system of the intellectual faculties which has been generally received in this country,—and which has received the name of Scotch metaphysics,—the system, namely, of Reid and Stewart. The system of these philosophers is not founded on any recondite examination of the operations of mind, as revealed by consciousness, or elaborated by intense meditation,—but adopts the most obvious and the broadest distinctions which are recognised by the ordinary intellect, or what these philosophers call *common sense*. In fact, this system is founded, in a great measure, if not entirely, upon the common vernacular terms of our language,—expressive of mental manifestations; and instead of inventing terms to express the faculties, faculties are assumed to suit the terms already existing. Thus, because *Memory* was a term applicable to a certain class of mental operations, they have assumed a general faculty of *Memory*; the same with *Imagination*, *Judgment*, *Taste*, and the rest. They have, indeed, guarded us against supposing that what they thus assume as faculties are separate portions of mind, or, indeed, any thing separate from the mind itself;—and some who have wished to speak with the greatest accuracy, have defined a faculty to be merely the mind existing in a certain state. This definition is perfectly accurate as applied to the faculties of the common-sense system,—and Mr Combe's analysis of them has shown it to be in entire correspondence with Phrenology; and that what is called *Memory*, *Imagination*, *Taste*, &c., are nothing more than the faculties revealed by Phrenology, “existing in a certain state.” We think, that if the disciples of Reid

and Stewart would allow themselves to reflect a little on this subject, and, above all, to study and to understand the Phrenological doctrine, they would be satisfied that this is the case ; —and their system does not and never can afford a complete theory of mind,—as it merely shows the surface of the subject, and leaves the substance untouched. Granting it to be true as far as it goes, it is useless for any practical purpose ; as it never can account for or explain the real movements or elements of any one mind, and far less the characteristic differences which exist between one mind and another.

We next come to a dissertation on the effects of size and activity in the organs, and practical directions for observing development. The effects of size and activity are, in this section, illustrated more fully than in the essays on Phrenology, or in the work of Spurzheim ; and we beg to call the attention of the public to it, as this is a subject on which much misapprehension prevails. Great offence has been taken by some at the supposed doctrine, that because size indicates power, therefore great size of head necessarily implies great power of intellect, and *vice versa*. It is obvious, that it may or may not do so, according as the intellectual faculties and moral powers have or have not their organs fully or largely developed ; for if this is not the case, even although the head is altogether large, the manifestations may be far inferior to those of a much smaller head, where the higher sentiments and intellect are proportionally better developed. The following observations deserve particularly to be attended to :—

“ That size is a measure of power, is not to be held as implying, that power is the only, or even the most valuable quality,
 “ which a mind in all circumstances can possess. To drag artillery over a mountain, or a ponderous car through the streets
 “ of London, we would prefer an elephant, or a horse of great
 “ size and muscular power ; while, for graceful motion, agility,
 “ and nimbleness, we would select an Arabian palfrey. In like
 “ manner, to lead men in gigantic and difficult enterprises,—to
 “ command by native greatness, in perilous times, when law is
 “ trampled under foot,—to call forth the energies of a people
 “ and direct them against a tyrant at home, or an alliance of
 “ tyrants abroad,—to stamp the impress of a single mind upon

" an age ;—to infuse strength into thoughts, and depth into
 " feelings, which shall command the homage of enlightened men
 " in every period of time ;—in short, to be a BRUCE, BUONA-
 " PARTE, LUTHER, KNOX, DEMOSTHENES, SHAKSPEARE, or
 " MILTON, a large brain is indispensably requisite ; but to dis-
 " play skill, enterprise, and fidelity, in the various professions
 " of civil life ;—to cultivate, with success, the less arduous
 " branches of philosophy ;—to excel in acuteness, taste, and fel-
 " city of expression ;—to acquire extensive erudition and refin-
 " ed manners, a brain of a moderate size is perhaps more suit-
 " able than one that is very large ; for wherever the energy is
 " intense, it is rare that delicacy, refinement, and taste are pre-
 " sent in an equal degree. Individuals possessing moderate-
 " sized brains readily find their proper sphere, and enjoy in it
 " scope for all their energy. In ordinary circumstances, they
 " distinguish themselves ; but sink when difficulties accumulate
 " around them. Persons with large brains, on the other hand,
 " do not easily attain their appropriate place ; common occur-
 " rences do not rouse or call them forth ; and, while unknown,
 " they are not trusted with great undertakings. Often, there-
 " fore, such men pine and die in obscurity. When, however,
 " they attain their proper element, they feel conscious greatness,
 " and glory in the expansion of their powers. Their mental
 " energies rise in proportion to the obstacles to be surmounted,
 " and blaze forth in all the magnificence of genius, when feeble
 " minds expire in despair."

: The practical directions for observing the organs will doubtless attract the attention of all who desire to make observations for themselves, and every one ought to do so who studies Phrenology ; for we can tell them by experience, that it is the only means of studying it with effect. Nothing makes such an impression upon the mind, as a series of unvarying facts, such as every one meets with, who sets himself duly and earnestly to make observations on natural objects : and the observer will in this way not only confirm his faith at every step, but will constantly meet with facts worthy of his attention, which will gradually open and enlarge his views of the science and of human nature.

We have not time to extend our remarks to the subsequent sections, or combinations in size, and combinations in activity. They are exceedingly good, and to the more advanced student will afford a fund of reflection which he will do well to cultivate : but the subject is too abstruse and difficult to be dismissed in a few sentences, and indeed it can

hardly be made intelligible by any shorter statement than is given in the work itself. It is however one of the most important if not *the* most important subject in Phrenology—and is the superstructure to which all the previous parts only serve as the foundation. By means of the combinations, the phrenologist is enabled to trace many, if not all, of the minutest as well as the broadest shades of character—and the darkest as well as the most obvious workings of the human heart, which to former inquirers only presented a labyrinth of inextricable intricacy. By the clue which Phrenology affords we are enabled, with ease and with the most perfect certainty, to thread all the windings of the maze—and to wander through all the obscurest and most tortuous passages without losing our way. This affords a proof by itself that the system is true, which is found to be so minutely in accordance with nature, and to explain so easily her most important secrets.

A section on Materialism follows, of which we need say nothing, as it has been already published in our First Number, and our readers have had an opportunity of judging of its merits.

The last section contains an account of the different classifications and numerations of the organs adopted by different Phrenologists,—and particularly a statement of the arrangement of Dr Gall, who, as is known, has not yet adopted several of the organs, the functions of which have been discovered by Dr Spurzheim. Some variations, it is also mentioned, have been made by Dr Spurzheim himself upon his own enumeration, which, for reasons which appear to us quite satisfactory, Mr Combe has for the present declined adopting.

The book concludes with the description of a craniometer, or instrument for taking the dimensions of the organs with greater accuracy than the common callipers—and a plate is given containing a representation of the instrument.

Upon the whole, we can safely recommend this little work as the best compendium of Phrenology within a moderate

compass which has yet appeared—and we congratulate the author on the successful manner in which he has contrived to communicate so much useful information in so small a space. The work is neatly printed; and, as a book, is, we may inform our readers, remarkably cheap, as the same quantity of letter-press, on such a type, is not easily afforded under 6s. or 7s.

We may mention, that we have just seen a copy of the American edition of Mr Combe's *Essays on Phrenology*, published at Philadelphia in 1822, by Dr John Bell, and dedicated to Dr P. S. Physick, president of the Phrenological Society of that city, a gentleman whose medical and literary reputation is well known in Europe. The volume is printed in a respectable form, and contains, besides the *Essays*, a preface and introduction by the editor, together with an abstract of the anatomical parts of Dr Spurzheim's works, which are not so fully given by Mr Combe. The appearance of this volume, re-printed in so remote a quarter, certainly presents some encouraging views with regard to the spreading of the science of Phrenology.

ARTICLE XVIII.

OUTLINES OF PHRENOLOGY. London, printed for J. DE VILLE, 367, Strand, 1824, pp. 123.

WE embrace this opportunity of expressing our high opinion of M. De Ville's exertion in promoting the cause of Phrenology. At a considerable expense, both of money and personal exertion, he has formed a large and valuable collection of casts, not only of heads and skulls, generally accessible, but of busts of eminent private individuals, not easily to be come at in any other quarter. His liberality in affording access to the collection to the public is equally deserving of our approbation. We know, from personal observation, that he devotes no small portion of time to the exhibition of it; and that he is eminently zealous to communicate all the informa-

tion which he possesses on the subject. He enables the friends of Phrenology to refer all inquirers to a great and valuable mass of evidence of its truth, and affords the means of instruction to all who are desirous to obtain it. For these services, M. De Ville merits the esteem of every Phrenologist.

We regret that we cannot extend this commendation to the little work, the title of which is prefixed to this article, published by him as an accompaniment to his busts. He appears unfortunately to have intrusted the compilation and editing of it to some person not possessed of information and ability adequate to do justice to the subject. It is composed chiefly of extracts from the works of Dr Spurzheim and Mr Combe, and from the Phrenological Transactions, and they are neither skilfully put together, nor accurately copied; so that an incorrect view is given of the science. It is our duty to watch over all phrenological doctrine, and to maintain its philosophical purity;—not that we desire to erect Drs Gall and Spurzheim, or any other individual, into standards whom all must follow; but that we are bound to see that their views are not mis-stated or misrepresented through mere ignorance or negligence. A few extracts will shew the imperfections of the present Outlines.

The following sentence is *original* composition, and is rather a favourable specimen of the compiler's taste and powers of expression:—"In *these outlines and introduction* to the study of Phrenology, *its* objects are to point out, by the numbers on the bust, the different organs, and the situation of them; and also to give short illustrations, tending to give the powers and manifestations of their different functions, as much as can be given, in so small a publication, of the different faculties." P. 7. Afterwards we are informed, that Dr Spurzheim, in his '*Observations sur Phrænologie*,' Paris 1818, has made a new arrangement of his order of the members and the special faculties, by dividing them in a more philosophical form and arrangement; although the nomenclature of the number is altered, the names of the organs are the same. To those who have given the science any consideration, they will meet with no difficulty; it being thought advisable to follow his new classification of the numbers and faculties as soon after him as possible." P. 10.

The compiler tries his hand at a definition. "The first nine faculties or propensities," says he, "are that species of faculties which give that of desire or propensity; they are internal, and exist independent of the intent or will; they are Amativeness, Philoprogenitiveness, &c.; there are, besides, other affective faculties, which are also internal, and produce equalization of the inclinations, but which do not mean those which are called Desires; they manifest more of the emotions of the soul, which are called Sentiments, and will be spoken of under that name and order." P. 11.

In treating of *Concentrativeness* in the Outlines of Phrenology, published in the Phrenological Transactions, it is said, "From more enlarged observation, it now seems probable that part of its function is to maintain two or more powers in simultaneous and combined action, and to determine them towards one object." In M. De Ville's Outlines, this doctrine is stated as follows:—"Mr Combe, and some of the principal Phrenologists of Edinburgh, consider that it (the organ No III.) has the power of concentrating two or more IDEAS into a general one, and therefore call it Concentrativeness." P. 18.

Dr Spurzheim, in his French work, says,—"*D'ailleurs, il y a quelque chose d'involontaire dans l'amitié, et elle est souvent trop prompte pour resulter de la réflexion; elle est quelque-fois dénuée de tout sentiment moral. Il y a des mal-fauteurs qui ont beaucoup d'attachement, et qui se détruisent pour n'être pas forcés de trahir leurs complices.*"—M. De Ville's editor translates this as follows:—"Moreover there is a thing involuntary in friendship, and it is frequently too prompt for the result reflection; it is now and then void of all moral sentiments. There are malefactors which frustrate themselves, because they will not be forced to betray their accomplices."

In another passage, Dr Spurzheim has the following words,—"*Il y a, en outre, d'autres facultés affectives qui sont aussi intérieures, et produisent, également, des inclinations, mais qui ne sont pas bornées à ce qu'on appelle désirs; elles manifestent encore des émotions de l'âme qu'on peut nommer sentimens, et qu'il faut sentir soi-même pour les connaître. Les penchans sont seulement destinés à faire agir les animaux et l'homme; les sentimens modifient les actions des penchans, et produisent d'autres actions d'après leurs propres désirs.*"

In M. De Ville's Outlines the translation is as follows:—"The following twelve faculties are, by Dr Spurzheim, called the Second Order of Affective Faculties, Sentiments, viz. Self-esteem, Love of Approbation," &c.—"Of these other affective faculties, which are also internal, and produce equalization of the inclinations, but which do not mean those which are called desires; they manifest more of the emotions of the

“ soul, and which are called sentiments, and which must be
 “ sensible of itself, for knowing that the propensities are solely
 “ designed to act the animal and man, the sentiments to qualify
 “ the actions of the propensities, and produce other actions after
 “ their own desires.”

It is unnecessary to pursue this analysis farther, every reader will judge of the work for himself.

One word on the phrenological busts made and sold by M. De Ville. In them the organs are not marked in the same manner as on the busts used by Drs Gall and Spurzheim. The founders of the science state that each organ has received a particular shape from nature, and that, in marking the busts, they have copied these forms as accurately as possible; for example, in the cast of Mrs H., the two organs of Conscientiousness are seen rising in eminences corresponding exactly with the forms assigned to this organ in Dr Spurzheim's busts. In King Robert Bruce's cast, Firmness stands out also in the same manner. In Bellingham, Destructiveness presents the figure assigned to that organ,—and so on with the others. Now M. De Ville, in his busts, has indicated merely the position of each organ by a small circle, and has not given the forms or dimensions of them as they appear in nature. It will be more difficult to become a practical phrenologist by means of his than by the older busts. Conviction is greatly strengthened by observing the same forms in nature that appear on the casts, and this cannot happen to those who use M. De Ville's busts, as the forms in these are entirely artificial. Every head does not present every organ in its peculiar shape; but it is impossible to observe cases in which *single organs* are decidedly large or small, without recognizing a distinct form, and which uniformly recurs in all similar cases; and, as this is clearly nature's stamp, we cannot see a reason for neglecting it.

We repeat, that we have a sincere respect for M. De Ville, and entertain a high sense of the services rendered by him to Phrenology. Let him, however, not pass beyond his sphere, and forbear diminishing with one hand the good he is doing

with the other. This admonition is offered in perfect respect and kindness, and we know his good sense so well, that we do not doubt that it will be taken in equal good part on his side.

ARTICLE XIX.

LORD BYRON.

WE copy the following account of the dissection of Lord Byron's body from the public newspapers, not because it at present throws any phrenological light upon his character, but that it may be preserved and referred to should any circumstances yet transpire which may give it greater value.

“ The following account of the opening of Lord Byron's body, and the appearance it exhibited, is given by the professional gentlemen to whom that office was intrusted.

“ ‘ 1. The bones of the head were found to be excessively hard, and the skull was without the slightest sign of *suture*, like that of an octogenarian. It might have been said to consist of a single bone without *diploes*.

“ ‘ 2. The *dura meninge* was so firmly attached to the internal surface of the cranium, that it required the repeated exertions of two strong men to separate the outer bones from it. The vessels of this membrane were greatly distended and completely full, and it was united to the *pia mater* in different parts, by some membranous filaments.

“ ‘ 3. Between the *pia meninge* and the furrows of the brain, a great many bubbles of air were found with drops of lymph adhering in several places to the *pia meninge*.

“ ‘ 4. The grand *fulc* of the brain was crossed with membranous filaments, which attached it firmly to both the hemispheres; it was likewise extremely full of blood.

“ ‘ 5. The cerebral medulla was full of minute blood-vessels of a bright red colour, and very much swoln. Under the *pons Variolii* at the base of the hemispheres, in the two superior or lateral ventricles, there was found an extravasation of about two ounces of bloody serum; and at the bottom of the *cerebellum* there was a similar expansion, the effects of a severe inflammation of the brain.

“ ‘ 6. The medullary substance was in much greater proportion than is common in the *cortex*, and was very firm and consistent. The *cerebrum* and *cerebellum*, without any of the integuments, weighed about six medical pounds.

“ ‘7. The impressions or furrows of the blood-vessels, in the internal part of the skull-bones, though small, were much more numerous than usual.

“ ‘8. The lungs were very fine, perfectly sound, but large, to a size almost gigantic.

“ ‘9. Between the *pericardium* and the heart there was an ounce of lymphatic water. The heart was more ample and voluminous than ordinary, but its muscular substance was very relaxed and fibreless.

“ ‘10. The liver was smaller than the natural size, as were likewise the biliary vessels, which, instead of bile, contained air. The intestines were distended with air, and of a deep yellow colour.

“ ‘11. The reins were very large and healthy, and the urinary vessels comparatively small.

“ ‘From this examination it was unanimously concluded, by the medical gentlemen who attended it, that if Lord Byron, from the commencement of his illness, had consented to any loss of blood, as his private physician repeatedly advised, or even if, at a more advanced stage of the disorder, he had yielded to the pressing solicitations of his medical advisers, to allow a copious bleeding, his Lordship would not have fallen a victim to this attack. From the statements marked 1, 8, 9, it may be confidently asserted, that his Lordship could not have lived many years, from his extreme susceptibility of disease, either through the strength of his passions, his excessive occupations, or even through his utter disregard of all the necessary means to prevent the effects of congestion.’ ”*

Our medical readers will be aware that the appearances mentioned in the first six notes are the product of very acute inflammation, and greatly increased action of the vessels of the head; and those who have had frequent opportunities of examining the bodies of the insane, will recognize, in the excessive hardness and compactness of structure of the skull mentioned in Note 1, a deep shade of that ivory hardness and appearance which is frequently met with after chronic insanity, and which is known to denote diseased action of very considerable standing. It is impossible to believe these changes, from the healthy state in Lord Byron, to have been entirely the

* It is proper to notice, that the account of his Lordship's illness and death, given by his servant, and recently published, shews the necessity of receiving the preceding remarks with some caution.—EDITOR.

result of the ten days illness which brought him to his grave; for a much longer period is required for their completion. The appearances are altogether such as lead us to suppose that his Lordship's mental constitution, his propensities, sentiments, and intellectual faculties, even when in perfect health, must have been endowed with no small share of that intense and almost uncontrollable activity which is peculiar to great genius, and which, from standing so close upon the verge of insanity, has given rise to the old adage of genius being allied to madness. At present we shall offer no other remarks; but, if it shall turn out that a cast of his Lordship's head has been preserved, we may take another opportunity of returning to the subject.

ARTIC E XX.

MR ROLPH AND THE PHILADELPHIA JOURNAL ON PHRENOLOGY.

WHEN this sheet was about to be sent to the printer, two books were handed in for our perusal. The one entitled, "Strictures on Phrenology, showing that *Anatomy, Reason, Common Sense, and Scripture, ARE NOT IN ACCORDANCE WITH PHRENOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES,*" by Thomas Rolph, Surgeon, &c. London, 1st July, 1824; and the other, "The Philadelphia Journal of Medical and Physical Sciences," No XV. for May, 1824, containing a long analytical review of the Transactions of the Phrenological Society. Upon looking into them we were amused to find that they were, in every respect, the antipodes of each other. The first is far beneath any kind of refutation, and we notice it merely historically, as, in after times, our pages will be referred to for an account of all the circumstances attending the progress of the new philosophy. With this view we select a few specimens of its contents, as a record of the manner in which the science was received by this author in the year

1824. At the same time it is proper to add, that the opinions contained in it cannot be safely predicated to be those really entertained by Mr Rolph; for at the end of the table of contents we observe, "N. B. *The Editor is sorry to find so many errors of the press have escaped his notice, and that want of time alone prevents him from giving a list of errata.*" When we read the title-page, "showing that anatomy, reason, common sense, and Scripture, are not in accordance with phrenological principles," we were led to suspect that the whole book might be one GREAT ERRATUM from beginning to end, because this title clearly imports the author's design to be, to upset anatomy, reason, and Scripture, on account of their inconsistency with phrenological principles. On perusing his work, however, we were satisfied that this could not be his meaning, and that he really intended to show that *Phrenology* was not in accordance with anatomy, reason, &c., and that therefore *its principles* must be false. We shall add a few passages, by way of contrast to Mr Rolph, from our highly respectable contemporary, the Philadelphia Journal, to which we solicit the attention of our readers.

Mr Rolph.—"Since this work has been in the press, another of the official journals of the phrenological triumvirate, viz. Messrs Gall, Spurzheim, and Combe, has made its appearance: in *folly* and *obovination* it is fully equal to any of the former emanations from the phrenological skulls;—in *impudence* and *audacity*, it much exceeds any former phrenological effort. The organ of Destructiveness now begins to display its deadly effect indeed; since they, the craniologists, seem quite determined to utterly subvert ethics, metaphysics, and religion." "I hope and feel confident, that the public will soon discover this *inductive science* to be, what it really is, a *scandalous and hitherto unparalleled delusion,*" &c. P. 37.

"Flouren's experiments are far more worthy of the attention of the scientific and philosophic part of the public, than the *wild, visionary, upstart, speculative theories, ridiculous and unphilosophical experiments* of Drs Gall and Spurzheim. They may affect to laugh and sneer at these experiments,—Mr Combe may employ a little of his logic, and attempt to overthrow them by specious reasoning and fallacious argument, but it will soon appear whether the *wild ravings, foolish speculations,* and untheological system of Drs G. and S. and Mr

“ Combe,—that is, whether this new system, which began in error, and is supported only by distorted facts and prejudiced conclusions, whether this system, which is opposed to anatomy, philosophy, and common sense, will triumph over the united efforts of the friends of truth, philosophy, and morality.” P. 44, 45.

“ But how does Mr Combe account for these contrary phenomena? Why, in order to render void the arguments of some of the greatest physiologists who ever wrote or lived, he, Mr Combe, with a logic almost satanic, has attempted to subvert all that they have said.” P. 48.

“ Every one else is to be discredited and laughed at, in order that the *fantasies and fooleries* of Gall and Spurzheim may be believed.

“ As my object in writing this work is to furnish a complete and perfect exposure of this *baneful system* of Phrenology.” P. 64.

In explaining a sudden change in the character of Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, Mr Rolph has the following unparalleled piece of sublimity and grandeur:—“ What a dreadful

“ and dire convulsion must have taken place in his SKULL!! The whole of it must have been shook to pieces; he must have had an earthquake in his brains, the right lobe must have changed place with the left ventricle,—the right ventricle with the left lobe,—and, in lieu of the baser organs of matter, the organs of Veneration, Benevolence, Hope, Firmness, &c. must have sprung up. The mine sprung in his brain far exceeds the discoveries of Congreve’s bombs and shells,—rockets and exploders. The army of dry bones which were called into life and action, the account of which is related by Ezekiel, could not have created a greater commotion,” p. 77.

“ Let them then satisfactorily answer the following queries, before they attempt to palm upon us an *infamous and delusive system*.” P. 80.

“ Then, as a palliative to their *infamous and horrid cant*, they say, they only know what organs dispose too not precisely the actions that will take place. So Mary Magdalene might have loved her Saviour from the organ of Amativeness,” &c. P. 88.

And, lastly, “ My object is not to inflame the passions, or excite the prejudices of the public against Phrenology. *Magna est veritas et prevalebit*. No, the utmost of my ambition is to demonstrate the deadly mischiefs which Phrenology is calculated to produce, and to erect a standard of reason and truth, in opposition to its wild speculations and groundless assumptions.” P. 93.

American Journal.

“ When the late Dr Gordon penned his passionate notice of the doctrines, anatomical and physiological, of Gall and Spurzheim, little did he, or the confraternity con-

“ ducting the Edinburgh Review, imagine that, in the lapse
 “ of a few years, the method of dissecting the brain, so as to
 “ display its fibrous structure, and unfold its convolutions, re-
 “ commended and practised by the above-named gentlemen,
 “ would be very generally adopted, and acknowledged univer-
 “ sally as preferable to all former modes,—or that, within the
 “ same period, the alleged ridiculous and reviled positions of
 “ Craniology would assume such consistency and form, as to be
 “ ranked among the sciences, and stand foremost among the sys-
 “ tems of the philosophy of the human mind.

“ Accredited in many parts of Germany,—taught in Paris as
 “ a branch of medico-philosophical education by its able and
 “ eloquent founders,—embraced and supported in Edinburgh
 “ by a society composed of physicians, lawyers, divines, and
 “ naturalists,—its truth avowed by men of various and exten-
 “ sive knowledge in London,—*Phrenology has crossed the At-
 “ lantic, and found a reception*, by no means discouraging,
 “ in places conspicuous for the zeal and ability with which
 “ general literature and the exact sciences, as well as medi-
 “ cal and legal knowledge, are cultivated and expounded.
 “ The current, at first adverse, now begins to set in its fa-
 “ vour, and we have more reason to fear, at present, that its
 “ followers, flushed with success, may be too impetuously hur-
 “ ried on, than we had formerly to apprehend their discouragement
 “ at the little progress made. But the same love of truth,
 “ and conviction of having, in part, found it, which supported them
 “ amid evil report, in the first instance, will be a sufficient guarantee
 “ for the steadiness of their pursuit in time to come. If, as they
 “ assure us, they have cleared away the rubbish accumulated
 “ during former ages, we have a right to hope that, in its place,
 “ they will erect a temple of fair and ample proportions, the
 “ porticos of which are to be crowded with people of all nations
 “ and tongues, who shall hear continually uttered the lessons of
 “ wisdom and practical philosophy.

“ We have been led into this train of reflection on seeing the
 “ two works, the titles of which are prefixed to this article,
 “ (The Phrenological Transactions, and ‘ Elements of Phreno-
 “ logy,’ by Charles Caldwell, M. D. Professor of the Institutes
 “ of Medicine in Transylvania University. Lexington, 1834.)
 “ They furnish a commentary, neither to be overlooked nor mis-
 “ understood, on the nature, influence, and diffusion of the prin-
 “ ciples of Phrenology, which are thus brought home to the
 “ comprehension of every thinking mind, and applied to the
 “ purposes of education, and the guidance of conduct. Each
 “ faculty of the mind will, in the new system, form a most in-
 “ teresting subject of philosophical inquiry, and may, to a cer-
 “ tain extent, be studied separately from the other,—while the
 “ union of them all forms a beautiful exposition of individual cha-
 “ racter; and an explanation of the apparently innumerable con-
 “ tradictions of human nature.

“ The Transactions of the Phrenological Society of Edin-

" brought, now before us, form a volume of no ordinary interest,
 " whether we regard the subjects proposed for elucidation, or
 " the candid and dispassionate manner in which they are treated,
 " —and we freely submit it to be judged by the standard of a
 " late eloquent female writer, (Madame de Staël), that ' meta-
 " physics, arts, and sciences, all ought to be appreciated ac-
 " cordingly as they contribute to the moral perfection of man-
 " kind." P. 172.
 " We feel ourselves more peculiarly called upon to the fre-
 " quent and open avowal of our conviction of the truth of this
 " science, as a kind of atonement for having so long and so wil-
 " fully declined inquiring into its merits, and for having
 " spoken of it with a warmth of intolerance which, we fear,
 " may have been regarded as an infringement on the rules of
 " politeness and a breach of courtesy. We may still farther
 " confess, and, in so doing, speak for many of our friends, that
 " accident, more than any fixed intention of making ourselves
 " acquainted with the philosophy of the human mind, first led
 " to our knowledge of Phrenology. Months had elapsed with-
 " out ever inquiring after Gall and Spurzheim, though living
 " in the same city with them,—and we might have left Paris,
 " but for an introduction to one of those good easy men, whose
 " probity we are more apt to admire than their talent. This
 " gentleman, in the course of conversation, alluded to Dr Spurz-
 " heim's lectures on Phrenology, which were to commence on
 " the following day, and spoke of them and the science in terms
 " of approbation. In reply to our expressions of ridicule, he
 " merely remarked, that before he heard the doctor lecture, he
 " thought as the present company then did on the subject; but
 " he would add, in conclusion, that if we took the same trouble,
 " our conviction of the excellent tendency of the system would
 " be as strong as his own. The proposition implied in this
 " opinion was so reasonable, that we could make no answer,
 " and determined to avail ourselves of the opportunity thus of-
 " fered, without, however, an expectation of our sentiments un-
 " dergoing any change. We attended Dr Spurzheim's lectures to
 " gain fresh matter for ridicule, rather than with a hope to add
 " to our stock of useful knowledge. The duration of the course
 " was short, and the vogue in which the new doctrines were
 " seemed to justify the sacrifice of a few days. The first hour
 " was sufficient to dispel the prejudices arising from preconceived
 " notions of Dr S.'s manner. We did not, as we expected,
 " see a charlatan of the *quai*, with all his hurried utterance and
 " vehement gestures, but a man calm and dispassionate in the
 " delivery of his opinions, which, though advanced with philoso-
 " phic caution, were supported by positive testimony, and occasion-
 " ally embellished by a variety of analogical illustrations. De-
 " termined henceforth to listen to the doctor dispassionately,
 " we soon experienced a revolution in our mind, and felt that con-
 " viction of the truth of the great outlines of Phrenology had su-

“ *preceded prejudice and disbelief.* We found, now, something more practical and important in this method of studying the philosophy of the human mind, than by those we had formerly essayed. We had not possession of *words* so harmonious in sound, or poetically collocated in writing, but we obtained *more definite and precise ideas* of human nature, and a certain facility of analyzing the operations of the human mind, and tracing the motives of conduct.” P. 180.

“ Here we conclude our extracts from the Transactions of the Phrenological Society ;—and we hope they have been sufficiently copious and connected to show the scope and aim of the science of Phrenology. We now see that, while pursued in all its details, it affords inexhaustible themes for inquiry. It may, at the same time, be brought to bear on all the dearest interests of humanity. It is ‘ the proper study of mankind,’ which, like mysteries the most sacred, and truths the most sublime, may still be sneered at as visionary and absurd, by *learned prejudice or licensed ignorance*, but cannot fail, ere long, to arrest the attention, and engage the admiration of every thinking mind. To bring about more promptly this favourable consummation, a Phrenological Journal is now published quarterly in Edinburgh,” &c. P. 209.

Want of space alone prevents our giving a few more passages from the same paper, but we have given enough to show the spirit in which it is written, and we leave it to our readers to judge whether we do not justly feel a great increase of respect and esteem for the moral and intellectual qualities of a man who has thus magnanimity enough to retrace his steps, when he finds himself in the wrong, and to pursue, with redoubled ardour, the true paths of honour and philosophy ; and who, from having, *in ignorance*, abused the new doctrines, now conscientiously, and *with knowledge*, declares, that “ as an inquiry into the philosophy of mind, they *must interest every profession and every individual.*”

ARTICLE XXI.

PHRENOLOGY ILLUSTRATED BY QUOTATIONS FROM THE POETS.

WE have frequently endeavoured to turn the attention of our readers to the very accurate delineations of the primary fa-

culties of man, recognized in the system of Phrenology, which are sometimes to be met with in our best authors, who wrote before Phrenology was heard of. This is just what is to be looked for, if Phrenology is a true system of mind; and the correctness of many such delineations is just an additional proof, if any was wanted, that it is so. The poets drew, as we do, from nature and observation; and wherever their delineations are correct, they are found to harmonize with the phrenological system. We mean to give, from time to time, specimens of them, without regard to method or arrangement, as one of the best means of accustoming our readers to think phrenologically, and to translate descriptions of character from ordinary into phrenological language. We may afterwards propose some of them by way of *phrenological exercises*; but at present we shall point out, in a few instances, what the faculty or faculties are, the manifestations or combinations of which have been, as we think, successfully described.

The simple feeling of Benevolence, as manifested in regard to the inferior animals, is well described by a poet in whom that feeling was highly predominant:—

The heart is hard in nature, and unfit
 For human fellowship, as being void
 Of sympathy, and therefore dead alike
 To love and friendship both, that is not pleased
 With sight of animals enjoying life,
 Nor feels their happiness augment his own.
 The bounding fawn that darts across the glade
 When none pursues, through mere delight of heart;
 And spirits buoyant with excess of glee;
 The horse as wanton, and almost as fleet,
 That skims the spacious meadow at full speed,
 Then stops, and snorts, and throwing high his heels,
 Starts to the voluntary race again:
 The very kine that gambol at high noon,
 The total herd receiving first from one,
 That leads the dance, a summons to be gay,
 Though wild their strange vagaries, and uncouth
 Their efforts, yet resolved with one consent
 To give such act and utterance as they may
 To ecstasy too big to be suppress'd—
 These, and a thousand images of bliss,

With which kind Nature graces ev'ry scene,
 Where cruel man defeats not her design,
 Impart to the benevolent who wish
 All that are capable of pleasure pleased,
 A far superior happiness to their's,
 The comfort of a reasonable joy.—COWPER.

The "Love of Approbation," when accompanied with slender intellect, and weak Conscientiousness and Self-esteem, leads to a vain desire of applause, even in circumstances the most abject—a vanity which is more the object of our compassion than our censure. The manifestations arising from such a combination are thus described by a skilful anatomist of vanity:—

Now friendless, sick, and old, and wanting bread,
 The first-born tears of fallen pride were shed :
 True, bitter tears, and yet that wounded pride,
 Among the poor, for poor distinctions sigh'd.
 Though now her tales were to her audience fit ;
 Though loud her tones, and vulgar grown her wit ;
 Though now her dress—(but let me not explain
 The piteous patch-work of the needy vain ;
 The flirtish form to coarse materials lent,
 And one poor robe through fifty fashions sent) ;
 Though all within was sad, without was mean—
 Still 'twas her wish, her comfort to be seen.
 She would to plays on lowest terms resort,
 Where once her box was to the beaux a court ;
 "And, strange delight ! to that same house where she
 Join'd in the dance, all gayety and glee,
 Now, with the menials, crowding to the wall,
 She'd see, not share, the pleasures of the ball ;
 And with degraded vanity unfold,
 How she, too, triumph'd in the years of old.
 To her poor friends 'tis now her pride to tell,
 On what a height she stood before she fell ;
 At church, she points to one tall seat, and " There
 " We sat," she cries, " when my papa was mayor."—CRANKE.

Bashfulness is thus described and traced with perfect accuracy to the phrenological combination of feelings to which it owes its existence,—Self-esteem, Love of Approbation, Cautiousness, and Secretiveness, all large, and not balanced with sufficient Firmness and Combativeness:—

I pity bashful men, who feel the pain
 Of fancied scorn and undeserv'd disdain,
 And bear the marks upon a blushing face
 Of needless shame, and self-imposed disgrace.

Our sensibilities are so acute,
 The fear of being silent makes us mute.
 We sometimes think we could a speech produce
 Much to the purpose, if our tongues were loose ;
 But being tried, it dies upon the lip,
 Faint as a chicken's note that has the pip :
 Our wasted oil unprofitably burns,
 Like hidden lamps in old sepulchral urns.
 Few Frenchmen of this evil have complain'd ;
 It seems as if we Britons were ordain'd,
 By way of wholesome curb upon our pride,
 To fear each other, fearing none beside.
 The cause perhaps inquiry may descry,
 Self-searching with an introverted eye,
 Conceal'd within an unsuspected part,
 The vainest corner of our own vain heart :
 For ever aiming at the world's esteem,
 Our self-importance ruins its own scheme ;
 In other eyes our talents rarely shown,
 Become at length so splendid in our own,
 We dare not risk them into public view,
 Lest they miscarry of what seems their due.—COWPER.

Wit, Self-esteem, and Combativeness, with moderate Benevolence, Veneration, and Conscientiousness, produce a disposition to deride every thing and every person, and to laugh at all that is serious and praiseworthy. Such a combination would produce the following character :—

Disdain and scorn ride sparkling in her eyes,
 Misprising what they look on ; and her wit
 Values itself so highly, that to her
 All matter else seems weak : she cannot love,
 Nor take no shape nor project of affection,
 She is so self-endear'd.
 I never yet saw man,
 How wise, how noble, young, how rarely featured,
 But she would spell him backward : if fair-faced,
 She'd swear, the gentleman should be her sister ;
 If black, why, nature, drawing of an antic,
 Made a foul blot ; if tall, a lance ill headed ;
 If low, an agate very vilely cut :
 If speaking, why, a vane blown with all wind :
 If silent, why, a block moved with none.
 So turns she every man the wrong side out :
 And never gives to truth and virtue, that
 Which simpleness and merit purchaseth.—SHAKESPEARE.

The manifestations of Wonder, both in the youthful and aged mind, and its uses in inciting us to quit our homes, and

search in foreign climes for objects new and astonishing, and also the delight which is felt in relations of what is supernatural,—a pleasure which is so great as to overcome all the uneasy feelings of fear which such relations inspire,—are thus described by Akenside:—

Witness the sprightly joy when aught unknown
Strikes the quick sense, and wakes each active power
To brisker measures: witness the neglect
Of all familiar prospects, though beheld
With transport once; the fond attentive gaze
Of young astonishment; the sober zeal
Of age, commenting on prodigious things.—

For this the daring youth
Breaks from his weeping mother's anxious arms,
In foreign climes to rove; the pensive sage,
Heedless of sleep or midnight's harmful damp,
Hangs o'er the sickly taper: and untired
The virgin follows, with enchanted step,
The mazes of some wild and wondrous tale.—

Hence, finally, by night
The village-matron round the blazing hearth
Suspends the infant audience with her tales,
Breathing astonishment! of witching rhymes,
And evil spirits; of the death-bed call
Of him who robb'd the widow, and devour'd
The orphan's portion; of unquiet souls
Risen from the grave to ease the heavy guilt
Of deeds in life conceal'd; of shapes that walk
At dead of night, and clank their chains, and wave
The torch of hell around the murderer's bed.
At every solemn pause, the crowd recoil,
Gazing each other speechless, and congeal'd
With shivering signs; till, eager for the event,
Around the beldame all erect they hang,
Each trembling heart with grateful terrors quell'd.

AKENSIDE.

The following description of solitary musing is given by a poet who delighted in this species of mental exercise. And it will be observed, that in describing the feelings which are alternately excited in the mind in such reveries, he enumerates almost by their names, and at all events with perfect distinctness, the principal phrenological sentiments and propensities:—Veneration, Ideality, Benevolence, Hope, Self-esteem, Firmness, Conscientiousness, Love of Approbation, Amativeness, Philoprogenitiveness, and Adhesiveness:—

He comes! he comes! in every breeze the power
 Of philosophic melancholy comes!
 His near approach the sudden starting tear,
 The glowing cheek, the mild dejected air,
 The soften'd feature, and the beating heart,
 Pierced deep with many a virtuous pang, declare.
 O'er all the soul his sacred influence breathes!
 Inflames imagination; through the breast
 Infuses every tenderness; and far
 Beyond dim earth exalts the swelling thought.
 Ten thousand thousand fleet ideas, such
 As never mingled with the vulgar dream,
 Crowd fast into the mind's creative eye.
 As fast the correspondent passions rise,
 As varied, and as high: Devotion raised
 To rapture, and divine astonishment;
 The love of nature, unconfined, and, chief,
 Of human race; the large ambitious wish,
 To make them blest; the sigh for suffering worth
 Lost in obscurity; the noble scorn
 Of tyrant-pride; the fearless great resolve;
 The wonder which the dying patriot draws,
 Inspiring glory through remotest time;
 Th' awaken'd throb for virtue, and for fame;
 The sympathies of love, and friendship dear:
 With all the social offspring of the heart.—THOMSON.

ARTICLE XXII.

THE ENCYCLOPEDIA EDINENSIS AND PHRENOLOGY.

It is some evidence of increasing liberality towards our science, for which we ought to be grateful, that a work, evidently intended for popular use, and certain, if at all well conducted, to be extensively read, should show a disposition not only to do justice to the labours and discoveries of Gall and Spurzheim, but also to profit by them. We are induced to offer this remark in favour of the *Encyclopædia Edinensis*, now in course of publication, to which our attention has been repeatedly called by the candour it has manifested, whenever any allusion was made in it to Phrenology. The articles on Beauty, Education, and Language, are evidences of this; and to them we have to add Mind,—a very brief

essay, it is to be regretted, but one in which the peculiar claims of the science are distinctly recognized. We are the more pleased with it, because, as the reader will perceive from the very pointed nature of the reference in the following extract, it prepares us for at least a fair exposition of the merits of the system in which we feel so deeply interested. The proprietor and editor of the work, Dr Sommers, a respectable clergyman in the church of Scotland, has our sincere thanks for his manly conduct in permitting the insertion of so unequivocal a testimony, and our best wishes for the success of his undertaking. We shall wait, with some impatience, for the appearance of that part of it in which the pledge thus spiritedly proffered shall be redeemed.

“ If in addition to what Consciousness suggests, we have recourse to observation, we shall find that all the mental powers of our fellow-creatures are manifested through the medium of bodily organs. The remark applies equally to the very highest powers of which our nature is susceptible, as to those of the lowest order which we have in common with the brutes. It would seem, then, a perfectly correct and philosophical inquiry, What are the portions of our organized bodies with which our minds are most intimately connected? and, again, as it is most certain that we have not only different degrees, but also different kinds of mental powers, some distinctions in which have already been enumerated, are there any differences in those portions, wherever situated, corresponding with such mental powers?

“ Sensation is of different kinds, and is assuredly performed by different organs,—or, in other words, different parts of our bodily system are appropriated to different senses. It would be quite according to analogy to infer, that other faculties of mind have their specific organs, though we might never be able to discover where they are placed. It is quite conceivable, too, that even though, by some means or other, they were discovered, so that we should be entitled to say with confidence, that such and such portions of our bodies were the instruments by which the mind manifested such and such powers, we might be nevertheless completely in the dark both as to the mode in which these portions were so employed, and also as to the precise kind of connexion, not to speak of resemblance, which would be nonsensical, subsisting between them. The case of the organs of the senses is quite in point here. Our knowledge of the structure of the eye, of the exact similitude it bears to an optical instrument, by no

“ means accounts for the mode in which the mind sees by
 “ means of it ; for though we have discovered the production
 “ of pictures on the retina, we cannot explain how these pic-
 “ tures are perceived by an agent, or intelligent being, which
 “ is positively not only altogether unconscious of them, but is
 “ actually conscious of seeing the things which they resemble
 “ in a very different position and place. The same thing may
 “ be said of the sense of hearing, in which our knowledge of
 “ the anatomical structure of the organ concerned in it aids us
 “ not at all in the exposition of the general phenomenon ; and
 “ we may extend the observation to all the other senses, be-
 “ tween which and the perceptions we make by means of them
 “ we can trace no similitude. Should the case be the same
 “ with respect to any of the higher powers, and their supposed
 “ organs, it would be foolish for us either to be surprised, or to
 “ consider the circumstance as an objection to the discovery of
 “ their relation and connexion.

“ Enough has been said, perhaps, to show the necessity of
 “ cultivating the science of mind, not, as has often been done,
 “ by reflection on the objects of Consciousness alone, but in de-
 “ pendence on and in alliance with those organized systems by
 “ which the powers and properties of mind are manifested, and
 “ separate from which, it is certain, the existence of mind is
 “ not discoverable by any of our faculties. If farther proof of
 “ this necessity were requisite, it is abundantly supplied in the
 “ history of the science itself, from which we learn the mortify-
 “ ing but most salutary truth, that no ingenuity, no excellence
 “ of talent, no perseverance in the solitary abstract study in
 “ which the metaphysicians have indulged, has hitherto been so
 “ successful as to recommend a process of investigation, the
 “ very first principle of which is the hypothetical disjunction of
 “ two things which nature always presents to us combined and
 “ mutually influential. Some thousands of years have been
 “ spent in pursuing this process, the general adoption of which
 “ is perfectly consistent, be it remarked, with numberless pecu-
 “ liarities of theory ; it is surely full time that mankind, per-
 “ ceiving its unprofitableness, and regretting, as worse than
 “ lost, the labours of those who engaged in it, should have re-
 “ course to another, the essential advantage of which is, that it
 “ respects as inviolable a harmony and an alliance as old as the
 “ creation.”—*Vide PHRENOLOGY.*



ANALYTICAL INDEX

TO

THE FIRST VOLUME

OF THE

Phrenological Journal and Miscellany.

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT. Condition of public mind as to Phrenology easily accounted for, and somewhat excusable, iii. Influence of the Edinburgh Review in extending, prolonging, and embodying the prejudices against the system, iv. The terms of Phrenology vindicated, *ib. note*. Consequence of such prejudices and malign influence—the science either totally neglected, or used as a laughing-stock, v. The better feelings now shown towards it result from its revival, and this augurs much in its favour, *ib.* The converts were philosophical and disinterested, *ib. &c.* Some of them specially named, vi. Phrenology treated as a science in France—the English the only satirists there, vii. Its growing importance discoverable in the increased hostility of its opponents, viii. Their pitiful behaviour described, ix. A main difficulty of an advocate is to impart knowledge on the subject to those who despise it, x. The necessary effect of that knowledge is conviction of the truth of the science, xi. The objects of the Journal—to disabuse the world, to expose the delusions of metaphysics, to demonstrate, by analysis of the best writers, the vast though unconscious prevalence of phrenological principles, to illustrate Phrenology by reviews of appropriate new publications, to obviate objections and reconcile conscientious scruples, to adduce and explain facts regarding human nature, to point out the absurdities and incongruities of rival or established theories, and to hold up to merited scorn the various delinquencies committed by certain specified enemies of Phrenology, viz.—**RAILING and ABUSE—FALSEHOODS and MALIGNITIES—IMPERTINENCIES and INSOLENCIES—DULL JOKEs—INDECENCIES—NASTINESSES, and BRUTALITIES**, exemplified in the *Edinburgh Review*, *Quarterly Review*, *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, *Rennell on Scepticism*, and the *London Literary Gazette*, xi.—xxix. The rules of conduct to be adopted towards unfair and fair opponents, xxix. Advice to men of science—"to cease from scorning and begin to learn," xxx. One sign of the times deserving the serious regard of established philosophers—the rapid progress of Phrenology and its absorbing influence among the rising generation, xxxi.

SUPPRESSION OF PHRENOLOGY. A philosopher denounces Phrenology as "pestiferous nonsense, which ought to be put down by the hand of power," 1. This sagacious decree appears to have been seriously contemplated by the official guardians of truth, who have recourse to various powers, in order to get it executed, 2. A convocation of metaphysicians determined on, who, after much communing, agree on an appeal and petition

to the very profoundest authorities in the regions of transcendentalism, CHAOS, NIGHT, and DULNESS, 3. This petition sheweth the labours, merits, and rights of the petitioners as cultivators of metaphysics, 3;—their extraordinary success, and the brilliant anticipations, extending to at least two thousand years, founded thereon, 4;—their prudence in neglecting all consideration of the body while prosecuting this philosophy of mind, which, in consequence, becomes exalted immeasurably above what the vulgar call “nature,” 7;—and their emotions in viewing, with prophetic eye, the far distant consummation of their sublime science, 9. Petitioners then complain of the disturbance of their prospects, and the violation of their multiform right, by the fearless interruption, disloyal behaviour, and fraudulent pretensions of Drs Gall and Spurzheim, aided by two hateful but suitable companions, Reason and Experience, 9;—*first*, in questioning the consciousness of each of the petitioners to be an exact type of the minds of the whole human race, in neglecting and vilifying the speculations of the petitioners, and adopting instead thereof, a mode of investigating mind which awfully threatens to bring down the highest science to the capacities of the “common drudges of business,” 10;—*secondly*, by introducing a heresy of the most dangerous nature, and fraught with direst ill, namely, that the mind is actually influenced by, and dependent for the power of manifesting its faculties on, the condition of the body, 11;—*thirdly*, by daringly and absurdly claiming for a mass of pulpy matter, the brain, that it is the organ of the mind, in opposition to the most authentic cases of individuals living without any brains whatsoever, 12;—and, *fourthly*, by wickedly and malignantly collecting the skulls of the dead, pawing and gauging the heads of the living, making or taking casts thereof, as well as parading skulls of sundry unseemly animals, all for various most dishonourable and absurd purposes, 12. Against which manifold evils and vexations, the petitioners pray,—*first*, That Gall and Spurzheim be declared Germans, and so incapable of making any discovery in science, 16;—*secondly*, That the whole of their doctrines, facts, &c. be declared negatively much worse than good for nothing, and positively, should they gain ground, a very nuisance to an enlightened age; and that the discoverers and inventors thereof, as also all their disciples, be declared and subjected to be treated as every thing that is nefarious, miscreant, incorrigibly stupid, certainly horn mad, and, beyond remedy, altogether natural;—*thirdly*, That the mind and the body be declared united or not united just as the various necessities of the petitioners may require;—*fourthly*, That the brain be declared not only of no use, but also positively rather an encumbrance;—*fifthly*, That each hemisphere thereof be ordained to resolve itself into one undistinguishable mass, in place of assuming the special allotments unwarrantably awarded it by Gall and Spurzheim;—*sixthly*, That all the propensities and powers discovered by those two persons be abolished;—*seventhly*, That the sole right of making and selling theories of the mind be declared to belong exclusively to the petitioners;—*eighthly*, That an endless number of the most discordant and fantastical systems of metaphysics, being the product of the privileged, established, and endowed manufacturers and dealers in the science, be confirmed, revived, revered, and taught, as the only legitimate science of mind, in all schools, colleges, and universities, within the dominions of the three Profundities addressed;—and, *ninthly*, That due punishment be inflicted on Gall and Spurzheim; and that they, together with Reason and Experience, be thereafter banished for ever beyond the bounds of the dominions of the said Profundities, 16—20.

RECENT ATTACKS ON PHRENOLOGY. The ceaseless labours of the opponents of Phrenology have left the task of refutation still to be performed, 20. The doctrine gains ground rapidly, 21. Phrenologists have, for good reasons, hitherto avoided particular notice of opponents, 22. Conduct of opponents very unphilosophical, 23. Their want of candour and logic shown, 23. The number of the facts on which the phrenological system

rests, occasions no small trouble to its advocates, by multiplying the sources of ignorant objections, and rendering a short defence impossible, 24. A single faculty and organ, namely, of "Destructiveness," selected for the purpose of furnishing a specimen of the manner in which the science has been advanced and is supported, 25. The evidence, consisting of numerous observations stated, on which Gall founded his belief in the existence of this organ and propensity, *ib.* The corresponding evidence stated on which the present writers found their belief of the same, 31. Certain phenomena in human nature adduced, from which the existence of the propensity may be inferred, 35. History and recent testimonies appealed to for proof of it, 40. Common sense and common candour challenged to gainsay such evidence and resist such inferences, 44.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN MR GEORGE COMBE AND DR BARCLAY. Mr Combe kindly requests Dr Barclay's attention to certain misrepresentations concerning Phrenology, reported to have been delivered in his lectures, and furnishes notes of one special lecture of an offensive nature, 46. Dr B. admits the fidelity of the notes generally—but excepts, with remarkable qualification, a sentence which states him to have asserted that Dr Spurzheim was one of his best friends—and promises to adopt some measures to remove or prevent misconceptions on the part of his students, 48. Mr Combe expresses his satisfaction with the Dr's letter, and, on the faith of its friendliness and spirit, furnishes a statement of the principles on which Phrenology is founded, to be read after his former communication if the Dr should think proper, 49. Dr B. voluntarily engages to read the same, 52. Mr Combe expresses regret that his letter was read to Dr B's class when only eleven persons were present, whereas the erroneous statement was made before more than forty—and repeats his anxiety to have justice done to Gall, Spurzheim, himself, and the science maintained by them, 53. Dr B. accounts for the thinness of his class on the occasion—pleads that he could not foresee a circumstance so unfortunate for Mr C.'s letter, and that he endeavoured to remedy the consequent evil—confesses his having laboured under a mistake respecting Edinburgh Phrenologists—compliments some recent accommodations to the tastes and feelings of the ladies and their beaux, who may think proper to cultivate the science—and declines controversy on the subject, because, besides that the necessary organs are out of tune in him, he suspects he cannot now climb precipices like a goat, or live in a garret like a black rat, 54.

PHRENOLOGY AND PROFESSOR JAMESON. Museum of Edinburgh College greatly aided by objects brought from Paris, 55. Mr Royer, a phrenologist, transmitted to it about seventy skulls, which, however, have never yet been exhibited, for a very unsatisfactory reason, 56. The professor, no doubt, not to blame as to this, but admonished of the duty of fairness towards Phrenology, *ib.* The skulls described as very interesting to a student of the science, 57. A similar collection from India noticed, 58.

BELL ON THE FUNCTIONS OF THE NERVES. This part of anatomy and physiology amazingly elucidated of late, and now leading to correct views of the mode of studying mind, 58. The existing probability of greater improvement on this subject, in ten years, than has ever been made hitherto, 60. A view of some of Mr Bell's important discoveries, and a commentary to show their accordance with phrenological doctrines, *ib.* His great merit in first demonstrating the difference of functions performed by different sets of nerves, and having accomplished for the physiology of the nerves what Gall did for that of the brain, 65.

A DIALOGUE ON PHRENOLOGY BETWEEN A PHILOSOPHER OF THE OLD SCHOOL AND A PHRENOLOGIST. The philosopher, on the ground solely of his ignorance of it, and under the influence of ill-devised and absurd prejudice, holds the science to be unworthy of attention, 66. Some of his objections stated and answered, *ib.* He becomes warm—but then sobers

- down a little, 67. The phrenologist gains on him, 68. The philosopher vainly has recourse to the anatomists, 69. Then argues on the absurd modes of prosecuting Phrenology; and charges its disciples with extravagance, 71. The phrenologist retorts the pains taken to furnish opponents with facts and means quite adequate either to prove the system to be true, or discover where it is false—and exposes the self-esteem and arrogant conceit of the opponents, 73. The philosopher silenced takes leave, 72.
- ALLEGED CLAIM OF REIL TO DR GALL'S DISCOVERIES IN THE ANATOMY OF THE BRAIN.** Dr Monro commended for justice done by him to Drs Gall and Spurzheim, 72. The charge against them, as borrowing from Reil, first made by Dr Gordon, 73. Answered by quotations from Birchhoff and Loder, 76.
- THE SPIDER AND THE BEE.** A correspondent speaks of his experiencing the persecution attendant on a profession of Phrenology; and describes a dinner-party where he had to contend for his faith, 74. On getting home, he betook himself for recreation to Swift's "Battle of the Books," in reading which he fell asleep and had a dream, 75. The spider spoken of by Swift annoyed in his cobweb by a venturesome bee, whom he upbraids and abuses, 76. Their colloquy, in which the spider represents a metaphysician of the old school, and the bee a phrenologist, 77.
- THE ENEMIES OF PHRENOLOGY.** They may be likened unto various animals, as WAPPS, BUTTERFLIES, ANTS, GEESE, DUCKS, OWLS, PARROTS, MONKIES, BEARS, SWINE, ASSES, CURS. Blackwood's Menagerie in a rage, 86.
- MISS CORDELIA HEARTLESS, LETTER FROM.** Her brother, a phrenologist, had long told her of bumps, skulls, &c., which she thought to be nonsense, till she heard of some eminent men giving credit to Phrenology, 86. She becomes a convert, 87. But is concerned at the loss of her heart, and alarms her lover by declaring she has none, and pointing to her head as the source of affection, 88. He thinks her deranged and leaves her, 90. She has not seen or heard of him for a week; but hopes, by means of the journal, to assure him of her entire *adherence*, 91.
- APPLICATION OF PHRENOLOGY TO CRITICISM.** The superiority of Phrenology to metaphysics, in respect to utility, and its power of application to explain the characters and talents of men, 92. Examples of its application projected, 93. The character of Macbeth first chosen, analyzed phrenologically, and illustrated by quotations, 94. Concluding estimate of its peculiarities and consistency with nature, 115.
- ON THE SKULLS OF THREE MURDERERS.** A Swiss gentleman in Edinburgh reports what he had heard in Dublin, as to certain skulls not indicating destructiveness, 116. Conduct of the phrenologists in consequence; thorough inquiry, which is completely successful, 117. Measurement and comparison of the skulls, confirm the development assigned by Phrenology, 119.
- MATERIALISM AND SCEPTICISM.** The objection that Phrenology leads to materialism stated, and shown to be absurd, 120. The question of materialism discussed generally, 121. Proved to be trivial, 122. Neither observation nor reflection on Consciousness can give any insight as to the substance of the mind, 124. But contemplation of the powers of the mind may afford reasonable presumption of its immortality, 125, which, however, does not depend on its being immaterial, 126. Mr Rennel absurdly attempts to show that mind acts independently of organization, 127. His controversy with Sir C. Morgan and Mr Lawrence noticed, 127. A common error among the friends of religion, to suppose that the materiality of the mind necessarily concludes its being neither immortal nor responsible, 129. We ought to argue from the *qualities* of beings, and not the substance of which they are made, as to what is

the purpose for which they are destined, 130. The Almighty can commit no mistake as to the essence of his creatures, 131. Mr Rennel pursues a very erroneous course in replying to the materialist, *ib.*, and shows great want of judgment in his arguments, 132. The phrenological principles which bear on the point distinctly stated, *first*, that we know nothing of the *substance* of the mind, and that all discussion about it is vain; *secondly*, that our ignorance respecting it cannot prejudice the interests of society, for that there is no discoverable connexion between the substance of the mind and its future existence; and, *thirdly*, that the evidence of its immortality, so far as philosophy can reach, is to be gathered from the aim and relations of the faculties, 136. Strictures on Mr Rennel's unfairness towards Phrenology, 137. Christianity decidedly supported by it, 139. Philostratus, a phrenologist, characterized, and somewhat censured, 140. Phrenology accounts for peculiar tendencies to atheism, 142. Dr Thomas Brown affords a similar solution of them, 143, as does also Mr Hume, who, moreover, plainly affirms the propensity to believe in invisible intelligent power to be a general attendant of human nature, 145. The idea that consciousness of personal identity possibly depends on a particular portion of the brain, hinted, 146.

TRANSACTIONS OF THE PHRENOLOGICAL SOCIETY. The volumes so called generally noticed, 146. Its contents specially named and characterized,—The Preliminary Dissertation, by Mr G. Combe,—*Outlines of Phrenology*,—*Dr Poole's View of some of Dr Spurzheim's Lectures*,—*Mr William Scott on the Functions of Constructiveness, Destructiveness, and Secretiveness*,—*Mr A. Combe on the Effect of Injuries of the Brain upon the Manifestations of the Mind*,—*Cases of Deficiency in the Power of perceiving Colours*, by Dr Butler and Mr G. Combe,—*Notice of a case in which the patient suddenly forgot the use of spoken and written Languages*, by Mr Alexander Heed,—*Remarks on the Cerebral Development of King Robert Bruce*, by Mr William Scott,—*Report upon the Case of Miss Clara Fisher*, by Mr G. Combe,—*The Case of J. G., aged ten Years*, by Mr D. Bridges, junior,—*On inferring Natural Dispositions and Talents from Development of Brain*,” consisting of a Case reported by Mr B. Donkin,—*a Report on the skull of Gordon, a Murderer*, by Mr R. Suchanan,—*a Report by Sir George M'Kenzie on the Skull of Bellingham, the Assassin of Mr Perceval*, and a Report by Mr G. Combe on the Head of Mary Mackinnon, who murdered William Howat,—*Observations on the mode of studying Natural Dispositions*, by Mr Carmichael of Dublin,—*a Phrenological Analysis of some of Rochefoucault's Maxims*,—*Mr Andrew Combe's Answers to Dr Barclay's Objections to Phrenology*, and an *Essay on the Phrenology of Hindostan*, by Dr George Murray Paterson, 147—154.

DOWNERBLITZENHAUSEN'S LECTURES. The Sieur announced, and his appearance described, 155. Genuine account and fac-simile of his first lecture,—his extraordinary highly merited titles given by himself, *ib.* His course of fourteen lectures on Akephalonologia, pronounced in suitable language, with appropriate specimens, in which he purposes to accomplish the entire demolition of Gall and Spurzheim's quackery, on pain of being grid-ironed, 156,—to expose the falseness of the particular phrenological organs, by extirpating their alleged allotments of brain, *ib.*,—to demonstrate the utter uselessness of brain, 157,—to cut off and replace a young lady's head, not only without detriment to the possessor, but also with much improvement to her beauty, 158,—to confirm the truth of metaphysics, by coming out of his own body and returning to it, *ib.*,—to destroy the claims of the body by a fit of intoxication, which shall leave him as able an opponent of Phrenology as the best of the bitterest, 159,—to prove that horsehair in the skull can answer every good purpose of brain, *ib.*,—to transpose heads, without any material consequence or difference to the owners thereof, 160,—to confound and overturn the doc-

trine of Gall and Spurzheim, by showing that the mind resides not in the upper, but in the lower end of man, *ib.* The Steur's luminous advertisement specifies the virtues of his wonderful drugs, and proves their efficacy by certificates from Anti-phrenologus, William Wastle, Morgan Odoberty, Timothy Tickler, and Christopher North, 161. His warning against fraud, and address, 164.

CRANIOSCOPY. The opponents of phrenology are never content with any previous refutation of it, and always aim at originality in their attempts to demolish it, 165. Dr Roget's article in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* now brought forward as allowing a fair occasion for reply to objections, 166. His first objection as to injuries of the brain having been unaccompanied with deranged functions, discussed, in the *Transactions of the Phrenological Society*, 167. He properly objects to analogy alone being trusted to as a basis for a theory on the subject of the mind and brain, in which opinion he is joined by Drs Gall and Spurzheim; but then he very inconsistently sets about refuting, by means of analogy alone, what they allege to be founded on observations, 168. He never assails the principles of Phrenology, but argues about the difficulty of applying them, 169. His statement, as to nerves, though not distinguishable into different bundles of fibres, performing both volition and sensation, from which he infers the same part of the brain may perform double duties, singularly unfortunate in point of fact, and consequently in logical bearing, as shown in the notice of Mr C. Bell's observations on the nervous system, 170. Dr Roget's power of conception, as the source of an objection, is not to be argued against, but can give no trouble, 171. His objection to the anatomical evidence for Phrenology has no force whatever, because one of the very first principles of Phrenology provides against reliance on or hope from such evidence, 172. What he says about want of parallelism in the tables of the skull easily disposed of, *ib.* His attack on the principle regarding size of organs being any criterion of energy, fairly resisted, 173. This boasted article, *Cranioscopy*, now thoroughly gone through, turns out to be a very harmless work, and not at all able to do the mischief to Phrenology assigned to it, 175.

QUENTIN DURWARD. The character of Louis XI, as therein described, analyzed and explained satisfactorily on phrenological principles, 176. Secretiveness and Self-esteem particularly commented on, 179. Character of Charles the Bold, a contrast to that of Louis, discussed in a similar manner, 186. Supposed developments of both in a tabular form, 186. Their behaviour, when brought into contact, shown quite conformable to the principles of the science as applied to their character, 187. Phrenology alone, of all the systems of the mind, can afford solutions of such conduct as is described, 192. The author sometimes theoretically wrong, though his sketches be true to nature, 193. His very injudicious allusion to Phrenology censured, 194.

MILTON'S GARDEN OF EDEN. Mr Dugald Stewart's exposition of the powers necessary to form it, 195, compared with what Phrenology would suggest, 197. The value of the two theories estimated, by considering Milton in relation to the character of Locke, *ib.* The preference awarded to the Phrenological theory, 199.

SECOND DIALOGUE BETWEEN A PHILOSOPHER AND A PHRENOLOGIST. The philosopher, content with former systems of mind, 200, allows that Phrenology has not been refuted by ridicule, but he is stumbled at the want of great men to advocate its pretensions, 201. The phrenologist annoys him on this point, *ib.*, and then forces him to abandon it, 204. The philosopher states insuperable difficulties, and the phrenologist shows that they have no place in the system, 205. The former becomes considerate, respectful, inquisitive, 206, but is still puzzled, 207, gains more insight into the matter, 209, and concedes a little, 210. The phrenologist ex-

tiates at length; and is heard, *ib.*; with advantage, 212. The philosopher, rather silenced than convinced, has recourse to hackneyed objections, 213, which are readily encountered, 214, but not allowed to be entirely disposed of by the philosopher, 215. who, after starting what he thinks a formidable difficulty, 216, and seeing it obviated, admits there may be more absurd things in the world than Phrenology, 217.

PHRENOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF MR OWEN'S NEW VIEWS OF SOCIETY.

Mr Owen blunders in the outset, by assuming a constitution of the human mind without evidence, and which does not comprehend all the original powers, 218. One general consequence of this error is necessarily a mistake as to any remedial application, 219. The leading principle in his theory is at variance with Phrenology, which is held to be a transcript of nature, and not an invention, 220. The character of an individual admitted, and conceived by phrenologists to result from propensities, &c. modified by education, and this assented to verbally by Mr Owen, 222. Three fundamental propositions respecting modifying causes, *first*, we cannot eradicate what is natural; *secondly*, we cannot essentially change natural feelings; and, *thirdly*, we are limited to restraining and directing them, *ib.* Differences of character, and causes of them, must be admitted, 223. Mr Owen holds human nature to be a passive compound,—phrenologists, that it is eminently active, *ib.* Three great classes of mankind,—those in whom the animal propensities predominate—those in whom they are nearly equally balanced by the moral sentiments and intellect—and those in whom the moral sentiments and intellect preponderate, 225. How far, and the means by which, these may be influenced so as to be improved, according to Mr Owen and according to Phrenology, 226. The discussion thereon leads to sundry observations on the primitive powers of human nature, and to the exposure of sundry inconsistencies and absurdities in Mr Owen's plans and views—as respecting the indulgence of Amativeness, 226,—Controlling or limiting the Love of Offspring, 228,—Adhesiveness, 229,—Constructiveness, Destructiveness, and Acquisitiveness, 230,—Secretiveness, Self-esteem, and Love of Approbation, 231,—Cautiousness, 232. The influence of Veneration, so great in Old Society, is merely tolerated, not provided for in the New System, 233. Conscientiousness, though a natural sentiment, is to be supplanted by Benevolence in Mr Owen's establishments, 234. Examination of Mr O.'s head furnishes a key to his views, 235. His character and proposed arrangements quite in harmony, 237.

BURKE, FOX, AND PITT. Phrenological sketches of them proposed, 238.

Burke is conceived to have possessed Comparison, Causality, Wit, Ideality, and Language, large, *ib.* Great Self-esteem and Love of Approbation, moderate Firmness, defective Concentrativeness, 239. The characters given of him by Johnson and Goldsmith considered in relation to this estimate, *ib.* His Combativeness and Destructiveness were too inconsiderable for a mob-orator, and his Self-esteem and Conscientiousness too great to suffer him to be either servile or wrongly biased, 241. Mr Fox and Mr Pitt contrasted, 242. The former supposed to have had a large portion of Combativeness and Destructiveness, and, at the same time, Benevolence, very considerable Ideality, Hope, and Love of Approbation, 243. Mr Pitt seems to have been largely endowed with Individuality and Comparison, but to have had Causality, Wit, and Ideality, in a less degree,—more Cautiousness and less Hope than Mr Fox, 244,—more Self-esteem and Firmness than either Burke or Fox, and great Concentrativeness, 245. The importance of Phrenology in making such sketches, 246.

ON THE ORGAN AND FACULTY OF CONSTRUCTIVENESS. The subject proposed to be treated, as Destructiveness was in the first Number, 247. How and where discovered by Dr Gall, *ib.* Observations on which belief in it is founded, 251. Circumstances illustrative of its existence as a

- defect power of the mind, 234. The direction of it depends on other faculties, 238.
- PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF PHRENOLOGY ON A VOYAGE.** Advantages of Phrenology as a travelling companion, 259. An individual described phrenologically, 260, and his character, as ascertained by his conduct, proved to coincide with it, 261.
- BIBLICAL FRAGMENTS.** Mr Lyon successfully discusses the objection to Phrenology as inconsistent with a scriptural doctrine, 265. Mrs Schhampeinnack's excellent work quoted in proof of the harmony between Phrenology and piety, 270.
- CAPTAIN FRANKLIN'S JOURNEY.** An unfortunate effect of the opposition made to Phrenology is the deterring from the study of it men to whom a knowledge of its principles would have proved of the highest utility, 274. Phrenological deductions from the narrative respecting Orkney and English seamen, the Esquimaux, 275,—the Cree Indians, 276,—the influence of the laws of propagation on mental manifestations, 278,—the Stone Indians and Chipewyans, 280, and other tribes, 282. Character and phrenological estimate of John Hepburn, 283.
- SHAKESPEARE'S CHARACTER OF IAGO.** Two classes of readers not always easily pleased by the journalists, and not much inclined to make allowances for each other,—anxiety to obtain the favour of both, 287. The character of Iago analyzed, and the assigned phrenological development, 288. The latter, without intimation of its fictitious nature, submitted to a phrenologist, who undertakes, but with some apprehensions from its awful import, to point out the nature of the individual to whom it belongs, 289. The sketch founded thereon, 290. Inference as to the power of Phrenology in such expository operations, 292.
- ON THE FRONTAL SINUS.** The table, diploe, and sutures of the bones of the skull described, 292. Nature of the frontal sinus, 293. Objections to Phrenology deduced therefrom considered and obviated, 294.
- EFFECTS OF SIZE AND ACTIVITY IN THE ORGANS.** Power and activity distinguishable in physics and in mental manifestations, 297. The differences discussed on phrenological principles, and in relation to Phrenology, 298. Size indispensable to power, 299. The fairness of the phrenological reasoning on the subject is admitted in analogous cases, 301. A valid objection to Phrenology conceivable, but not verified by fact, 303. The inference derived by phrenologists is conceded to physiologists, 304.
- GENERAL DIRECTIONS FOR OBSERVING DEVELOPMENT.** Differences in general dimensions of heads easily pointed out, and must be attended to, 305. Observations requisite in ascertaining individual organs, 306. Some sources of error specified, 307.
- PHRENOLOGY AND MEDICAL SOCIETY.** A question regarding Phrenology as a satisfactory system proposed by the Medical Society for the subject of an essay,—and Mr A. Combe appointed to write on it, 307. Debate thereon eagerly expected,—and arrangements made for it, and for its being resumed after an adjournment, 308. The journalists prevented from publishing an account thereof,—but state generally by whom and in what manner it was carried on, 308. Some members of the society subsequently announce the entire demolition of Phrenology on that occasion,—which induces solicitude to give a complete and candid view of the proceedings and arguments from very ample notes, proposed to be corrected by the speakers themselves, 310. The Editor, acting in entire good faith therein, and conceiving he should rather gratify than offend the triumphant orators, is officially from the body, and individually by the members, denied all aid and countenance, 314. Such refusal followed up by threatened legal prosecution, and an application to the Court of Session to prevent publication of the debate, 314. The success of the appli-

- cation, as granted, *pro tempore*, by the Lord Ordinary, is perfectly agreeable to the journalists, who must, in consequence, be held by the public to be restrained by the hand of power alone from proving that a victory cannot be claimed by any member of the society, 314. Justification of the course adopted by journalists, 318.
- SIGNS OF THE TIMES.** The opposition to Phrenology equally ludicrous and dishonourable, 316. Examples of it in the case of Thurtell, 317—in what has been alleged as to Shakespeare's head, *ib.*—and of Catelini, 318. Absurd, but very suspicious reference, by a professor, to foreign refuters of Phrenology, says little for those of our own country, *ib.* Phrenology still advancing, 319.
- OUR FIRST NUMBER.** Various amusing opinions of it, 319. Eminence of Blackwood's Magazine in badness, *ib.* Examples of contradictory criticisms on an article in the Journal, 320. The wit of the first Number received according to the status and sentiments of the readers, 321. Reception altogether successful, *ib.*
- PROCEEDINGS OF THE PHRENOLOGICAL SOCIETY.** When first met for the season, 321. Appointment of office-bearers, 322. Notices of various essays read, books, &c. presented, resolutions, &c., 321, 326.
- JOHN THURTELL.** Reports and surmises on the subject unfriendly to Phrenology, 326. Proceedings to obtain truth respecting Thurtell's head, 327. A tabular view of its development, 328. Classification of and general remarks on its component parts, with references to events, and illustration of his character, 329. General conclusion decidedly in confirmation of the system, 336.
- PHRENOLOGICAL ESSAY, BY MR A. COMBE.** This was the paper which occasioned the debate in the Medical Society, 337. The question stated, which it proposes to answer, *ib.* Philosophy of mind has advanced very slowly because erroneously prosecuted, 338. Four fundamental principles in regard to it established by phrenologists, 339. Character and value of Phrenology, 341. The mental phenomena are explicable by it according to these principles, but at variance with every other theory, 342. These phenomena classified and described, *ib.* Facts respecting the successive manifestations of the propensities, &c., 344. Plurality of organs an essential requisite to a satisfactory theory of mind, 345. What is known of genius illustrates this, 346. Genius must be attributed to nature, not to external circumstances,—and a certain condition of body is necessary for its manifestations, 346. Its peculiarities, and also those of the moral faculties, explicable on phrenological principles, 362. Drunkenness and somnambulism likewise accounted for, 364. Diseased states of mental manifestations explained by Phrenology, 365. The question, whether the comparison of organic development with mental manifestations be according to reason and philosophy discussed, and decided in the affirmative, 366. Objection obviated, 369. Relation of the brain to the form of the skull, 369. The only possible mode of discovering the primitive powers of the mind is that of Phrenology, 369. Example of its application to the character of Dr Johnson, *ib.* The facility of analyzing character phrenologically shown, 363. Peculiarities in the character of Pope, 365. National peculiarities equally capable of explication on the same principles, 367. Those of the French and the English specially and at length compared, 368. The truth of Phrenology being now held as demonstrated, its importance is contended for, 376. Concluding apology, 377.
- ON THE COMBINATIONS IN PHRENOLOGY.** Certain hypothetical objections found to support Phrenology, 368. Phrenology does not invent facts, but discovers them, 379. The principle of a modifying influence regarded and admitted in other physical sciences as well as in Phrenology, 380. Effect of combinations illustrated, 381. Self-esteem in its states of alliance selected as an example, 382. Its combination with Amateness

- and Love of Offspring, *ib.*,—with Adhesiveness and Combativeness, 384, —with Destructiveness, 385,—with Constructiveness, 387,—with Acquisitiveness and Secretiveness, 389,—with Love of Approbation, 390,—with Cautiousness, 391,—with Benevolence, 392,—with Veneration, 393,—with Hope, 394,—with Ideality, 395,—with Conscientiousness, 396,—with Firmness, 397,—with Wonder,—with the Intellectual Powers, *ib.* Its connexion with eccentricity of character, 401.
- SHAKESPEARE'S IAGO.** An exposition presented of the principles from which the character of Iago, given in the second Number, was inferred, in the course of which sundry illustrations of Phrenology and human nature are introduced, 402. The author of the sketch all along conceived he was treating of a particular individual, 408. The sketch compared with Shakspeare's delineation of the character, 411.
- LETTER FROM AN OBSERVER OF NATURE.** A correspondent in Fifeshire narrates a visit he made to Lanarkshire, and gives the character of the landlord of an inn, as inferred from his development, in confirmation of Phrenology, 423.
- REPORT ON THE CAST OF JOHN FALLET.** The cast presented to the Phrenological Society by Dr Elliotson, 425. Account of Fallet, and the murder committed by him, *ib.* His cerebral development, 427. General description of his head, and statement as to his character and conduct in illustration, 428. The importance of such cases, 436.
- MASTER JAMES HURARD,** now well known in Edinburgh, where he was introduced, without intimation, to certain phrenologists, for the purpose of having his peculiarities pointed out, 436. His development dictated by Mr Combe, 437. Description of his talents and performances, 438. Absurd remark made respecting the application of Phrenology to his case discussed, 440.
- ST ROMAN'S WELL.** General opinion of the work, 442. Some of the characters and scenes in it quite consistent with and illustrative of phrenological principles, *ib.*
- FLOURENS ON THE NERVOUS SYSTEM.** General statement of his inquiry and experiments respecting the properties and functions of the nervous system, 455. Cuvier drew up the report concerning them, 456. They have led to exaggerated expectations, 457. The three propositions attempted to be established by them considered, *ib.* Unfairness of the gentlemen of the old school towards Dr Gall, 458. Spurzheim anticipated Florens in some facts, &c., 459. Dr Gall's experiments respecting the cerebellum noticed, 461. Unlikely that any thing will be soon discovered to outweigh the facts adduced by phrenologists, 462.
- PHRENOLOGY AND MR OWEN.** Statement as to what was formerly done in regard to the views, &c., of that gentleman, 463,—who vehemently objects to it, 464. Remarks on his criticisms, *ib.* He was offered room for a refutation if he chose, 465.
- VENTRILOQUISM.** Various theories concerning it shown to be erroneous, and sundry historical notices given, 466. The arrival of Mr Alexandré in Edinburgh afforded peculiar opportunities to phrenologists to observe and investigate, 475. Description of what was observed in him and his performance, 479. His vocal exhibition consisted of two distinguishable parts, 468. Four particulars respecting his ventriloquial exertions, 479. Conjectures and inference thence arising as to the nature of ventriloquism, *ib.* Mr Alexandré himself very communicative as to his powers, 481. His information specified, *ib.* Phrenological account of the matter, 484. What was inferred as to his development from his exhibitions, 485. His development as actually observed, 486.
- PROCEEDINGS OF THE PHRENOLOGICAL SOCIETY.** General enumeration of essays read from the 5th February, with occasional remarks, notices of

- presentations and other matters, 447. Particular list of articles sent over by M. Royer of Paris, 469.
- DR MILLIGAN v. PHRENOLOGY.** This gentleman, the translator of Majendie's work on Physiology, discusses Phrenology in his notes, 490. Statements made by him against it, and counter-statements in its favour, *ib.* His observations generally incorrect, 491. His condition for the task of pronouncing judgment on the science singularly unhappy, 492. His attack is a marvellous example of self-esteem in a would-be-overwhelming degree, *ib.*
- IDEALITY.** Historical notice of the discovery of this organ by Dr Gall, 493. Remarkable instances of its existence among poets, 494. Dr Spurzheim's opinion as to the source of poetry, 495. Mr Combe's account of the faculty, 496. Tabular comparison of the organ as presented in various individuals, 497. References to the prefixed plate, which contains portraits of Locke, Cobbett, Chaucer, Shakspeare, and Rousseau, with remarks on their characters, in illustration thereof, 498, 505.
- EDUCATION OF A YOUTH.** Unpromising condition in early life, 505. Dr Spurzheim's examination and opinion of him held out better prospects, and suggested a different treatment, 506,—which was found to succeed, 507. The youth himself studies Phrenology, and acknowledges his obligations to it, *ib.*
- CASE OF A MECHANICAL GENIUS.** His cerebral development quite in accordance with the phrenological system, 509. The manifestations of the faculties remarkably correspond with it, 510. Tune considerable in him, and gives particular direction to some of his mechanical efforts, 511. Defective Ideality and Language, 512.
- OTHELLO.** The object or use of the argument afforded by such delineations is to show that Phrenology and nature are one, 512. General constituents in the character of Othello confer and indicate great power and influence, 513. Self-esteem prevails in it,—but is peculiarly modified, 514. His Amativeness and Adhesiveness conspicuous in his conjugal state,—his Combativeness and Destructiveness abundantly displayed, 515. But these last could be restrained by the sentiments which he possessed largely, 516. His love also kept under control by those sentiments, 517. The character of his intellect rather knowing than reflective, 518,—but quite adequate to the duties of his office, 519. The nature and constitution of jealousy described, *ib.*—exemplified in different individuals, 520. The elements of Othello's character, however variously worked up, are still true to nature, 521. The suitable and suitably exercised principles in the character of Iago, 522,—as exhibited in the progress of Othello's jealousy, 524. The contest between his affection and jealousy, 526. The picture of jealousy by Collins adduced in illustration, 527. Othello portrays his own character, *ib.* Dr Johnson's explanation of Othello's soliloquy when about to murder Desdemona, 529. Another hazarded, 530. His conscientiousness and other sentiments, brought fully into play when he discovers how he has been deceived, 531,—hurry him on to suicide, 532.
- REDGAUNTLET.** Inferior to St Ronan's Well, as characteristic of the author's talents, 532. Its chief personages little conducive to the consummation of the story,—and afford little scope for phrenological observation, *ib.* Nanty Ewart particularly considered and analyzed, *ib.* The author at fault in describing Herries as possessing a small head, which is inconsistent with the propensities and powers given to him, 533.
- NEW MONTHLY MAGAZINE v. PHRENOLOGY.** An article adverse to Phrenology ascribed to General Moore's brother, who seems to be wonderfully ill-informed on the subject, 534. The proposed examination of it confined to statements from the article, and counter statements from the works

of Gall and Spurzheim,—and shows most completely the author's unphilosophical and senseless mode of procedure, &c. Altogether, the author, apparently without bad intention, writes not only in entire ignorance of his subject, but also as if all the world were as ignorant as himself, 540.

DR HIBBERT ON THE PHILOSOPHY OF APPARITIONS. The plan of treating the subject explained, 540. *First*, Of the phenomena to be accounted for,—as exemplified in the case of Nicolai, &c.,—and another recited by Dr Alderson, 544. *Secondly*, The phrenological theory of them,—the excitement of a portion of the brain, as the organ of a special faculty, 547. *Thirdly*, Dr Hibbert's theory professedly founded on Dr Brown's views of the mind, as existing simply, indivisibly, and as a whole, in every mental feeling, and connected with certain physiological changes in the state of the blood, &c., 548. His theory considered, and his work censured for total disregard to Phrenology, 550. *Fourthly*, Facts observed by phrenologists respecting those who see apparitions, 551. These facts elucidate some points in the history of certain individuals, 554. Dr Hibbert ought to have either refuted or admitted the facts and views adduced by phrenologists, and not hazarded crude speculations of his own, 555.

ON THE ACCORDANCE WHICH SUBSISTS BETWEEN PHRENOLOGY AND THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF CONVERSION. The opponents of Phrenology have not attempted to assail the induction on which it rests, 556,—but start speculative objections to it, as inconsistent with acknowledged truths, 556. The logic of this process, and the danger of its consequences, subject to debate,—but the science had certainly better be tried on its alleged basis, &c. Phrenologists, however, must occasionally meet their opponents elsewhere, 557. The intention of the present writer is to show, in reply to an objection, that the principles of Phrenology and a scripture doctrine perfectly harmonize, &c. The objection made to Phrenology on this subject is an objection also to Christianity, 558. Christian conversion does not imply any change of the original powers, and Phrenology does not determine the actual attainments of men, 559. The latter regards only the natural endowments, and these, which are very various, may be discovered, 560. The great use of the science in this respect, 562. The influence of Christianity on the minds of men shown to be great, but not to effect eradication of natural powers, 563. The nature of faith and its operation explained, &c. An early phrenological opinion rectified, and Christianity asserted to address itself to more than one element of human nature, 565. Faith leaves the natural powers unaltered throughout the Christian course, 566. But it furnishes every necessary weapon and means to combat and control what is evil in man, 567,—who is therefore enabled thereby to live a new and a better life, 568,—in which he is aided also by the holy spirit,—and to which, as requisite to accomplish his entire fitness for the heavenly state, a resurrection of the body from death and the grave is added, 569. In conclusion, Phrenology and Christianity are asserted to be perfectly consistent, 570.

ARABIAN MANUSCRIPT. Where and by whom discovered, 571. North, Tiddler, Odoherty, the Shepherd, and Mullin discuss the merits of philosophers, and the value of recent discoveries and inventions, 573,—including Phrenologists and Phrenology, against whom and which the Shepherd conceives Mr North is ungratefully bitter, considering his great obligations to them, 575. Then the Shepherd states the subject of College Metaphysics as a system for which students must pay, 576,—and expresses his willingness and ability to comprehend it if it had any sense, which he doubts, and calls on Mr North to show, 577.

SPURZHEIM ON EDUCATION. The objects of education stated to be, 1. To increase the powers of those faculties which are too weak; 2. To repress those which are too strong; and, 3. To direct the whole to legitimate

- and useful purposes, 577. The advantage of a true theory of mind in accomplishing them, 578. The present review of Spurzheim's work confined to the first section, 579,—in which are considered the circumstances which influence, and the means to be used for increasing the activity of the faculties, *as*, 1. Original constitution, *&c.* 2. Physical education, 581. 3. The laws of exercise, 582. Wherein are discussed the error of supposing that, by cultivating one faculty, we necessarily exercise other faculties, 584. The propriety of proportioning the degree of exercise of each faculty to its original constitution, 585. The advantage of knowing the general order of succession in the development of the faculties, 586. The preference due to that system of education which exercises the greater number of faculties, 587. The necessity of distinguishing between the faculties and their particular applications, *&c.*; *and*, 4. The mutual influence of the faculties in exciting or repressing each other, 588.
- ON SIZE.** A letter from a correspondent requesting information on the subject of cerebral development, 590. In reply, are given, first, a table of measurements by callipers, 591; and, secondly, A remark as to size being considered in relation to the same head, 592.
- PROFESSOR RUDOLPHI AND PHRENOLOGY.** The observation that candid examination of the evidence of Phrenology is sure to produce conviction of its truth, seems demonstrated by the ignorance of the opponents, 592. The case of Rudolphi added to the list of them, in confirmation of this statement, 593. This vaunted refutation of the science full of misrepresentation and false argument, *&c.* His objections stated and replied to *seriatim*, 594. The low state of the opponents at home is proved by their having recourse to such insignificant foreign aid, 595. He has the goodness to admit that the Phrenological Society may advantage science, 599.
- DR NARES ON PHRENOLOGY.** This gentleman thinks proper, in his "Elements of General History," to rank Gall and Spurzheim with Mesmer and others, who have, for a time, amazed the ignorant, *&c.*, 600. His conceit and ignorance shown, *&c.* A little advice offered him, 600.
- CAPTAIN ROSS ON DECIMAL NOTATION OF THE BRAIN.** His reasons for having recourse to it, 600. A tabular view of its application, 601,—and another of the correspondence of its results with individual characters, 602.
- FIELDING'S MISS MATHEWS.** General character of Fielding as a novelist, 602. His Amelia variously but highly estimated, 603. Some peculiarities in Miss Mathews specified, 604,—and illustrated by quotation, 605. Fielding's apology for this apparent inconsistency, 607. No known system of metaphysics can account for it, *&c.* Her peculiarities again illustrated, 608,—and commented on, 609. General remarks on such a constitution as hers, 611.
- OBSERVATIONS ON SECRETIVENESS.** A correspondent mentions his being struck with the large organ of Secretiveness observable in the skulls and casts of certain criminals, 611,—and proceeds to comment on the operation of the faculty, as manifested in some hypothetical cases, 612. The effect of great and small Secretiveness described, 613,—and Mr Scott's essay on the subject referred to, 614.
- ELEMENTS OF PHRENOLOGY BY MR COMBE.** A dedication hereby supplied, 615. Contents of the volume particularly specified and illustrated, *&c.* A quotation made from it to obviate the objection regarding the supposed inconsistency of Benevolence and Destructiveness co-existing in an individual, 617. Another in illustration of Individuality, 618. The different modes of the activity of the faculties described, 619, as Perception, Memory, and Imagination, *&c.* Judgment belongs to the reflecting facul-