

Harvard University Lib.  
Cambridge

TESTIMONIALS,

ON BEHALF OF

GEORGE COMBE,

AS A

CANDIDATE FOR THE CHAIR OF LOGIC

IN THE

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH.

EDINBURGH:

JOHN ANDERSON JUN. 55 NORTH BRIDGE STREET;  
LONGMAN & CO., AND SIMPKIN & MARSHALL, LONDON.

MDCCCXXXVI.

1836,

Phil 5922.4.20

PRINTED BY NEILL & CO. OLD FISHMARKET.



23 CHARLOTTE SQUARE, EDINBURGH,  
9th April 1836.

To the LORD PROVOST  
of the City of Edinburgh.

MY LORD PROVOST,

PERCEIVING by the Newspapers that the Professorship of Logic in the University of Edinburgh is about to become vacant, I beg leave, very respectfully, to offer myself as a Candidate for the Chair. In case I should have the honour of being elected, I should leave entirely in the hands of the Council the arrangement of the allowances to be made out of the emoluments to the Rev. Dr RITCHIE, the present incumbent, and every other detail. I should also pledge myself to devote my undivided time and attention to the duties of the office.

I beg permission of your Lordship and the Council to state briefly the motives which induce me to make the present application.

The Logic, as hitherto taught, has been the junior class for the Philosophy of Mind, and I presume that it is intended to be continued on the same footing. For seventeen years I have been the public advocate of the New Philosophy of Mind founded on the functions of the Brain, and have taught that Philosophy by Lectures and in Books, with what success it does not become me to state. Regarding this as the only true science of Mind, knowing that it is making rapid and extensive advances in public favour, and believing that it is destined, like all other truths, ultimately to

\*a

triumph, I feel it an incumbent duty to bring its pretensions under the notice of your Lordship and the Council on the present occasion. Edinburgh has long been celebrated as a seat of Mental Philosophy, and if she shall be the first to honour the new science with an Academic Chair, she may, hereafter, boast of the enlightened sagacity which enabled her Civic Magistrates to anticipate the verdict of posterity, and to benefit her sons by communicating to them the great truths which are destined to occupy so large a share of the attention, and to influence so powerfully the opinions and institutions of the next generation.

In writing thus I may perhaps appear to your Lordship to be led away by a warm imagination, and I shall therefore consider it necessary to trouble you with such evidence, in the form of Testimonials, as may warrant your Lordship and the Council in giving effect to this application, without incurring the charge of rash and inconsiderate preference of novelty in the discharge of your present important duty. To remove farther any hesitation on this head, I beg to add, that I should have no hesitation to accept of an appointment during the pleasure of the Council; leaving it in their power at any time, when they saw cause to doubt the propriety of the election which they had made, to retrace their steps, and revert to the philosophy of the existing school.

I have the honour to be,

MY LORD,

Your Lordship's faithful and very obedient servant,

GEO. COMBE.

	Page
21. From Captain MACONOCHE, R N., F.G.S., Secretary to the Royal Geographical Society of London, &c. &c.	24
22. From ANDREW COMBE, M.D., Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh, and Physician in Ordinary to their Majesties the King and Queen of the Belgians,	25
23. From Professor BROUSSAIS of the Faculty of Medicine of Paris ; Dr BRESSIERES, of the Faculty of Paris, Member of the Anthropological Society, author of " An Introduction to the Study of Phrenology, &c. ; M. DAVID RICHARD, Member of the Society of Natural Sciences of France, and of the Anthropological and Phrenological Societies of Paris ; Dr CASIMIR BROUSSAIS, Physician and Professor to the Val de-Grâce, Agrégé et Professeur Suppléant d'Hygiène to the Faculty of Medicine of Paris, Member of several Learned Societies, and Vice-President of the Phrenological Society of Paris ; Dr J. ROBERTON, Member of several Learned Societies, and President of the Anthropological Society of Paris ; Dr FOSSATI, President of the Phrenological Society of Paris, Member of several Learned Societies, formerly Clinical Professor, and Director of several Italian Hospitals ; M. BOUILLAUD, Professor of Clinical Medicine to the Faculty of Paris ; M. TURPIN, Member of the French Institute ; M. JULES CLOQUET, Professor to the Faculty of Medicine of Paris, and Surgeon to the Hospital of the Faculty of Paris ; M. SANSON (Aîné), Professor of Clinical Surgery in the University of Paris, and successor to the Baron Dupuytren as Surgeon of the Hôtel-Dieu ; M. PELTIER, President of the Society of Natural Sciences and Member of the Philomathic Society ; M. FREDERICK LEO, Paris ; Dr FERRUS, Physician to the Hospital of Bicêtre, Professor of Clinical Medicine on the Diseases of the Nervous System, &c. ; Dr JOSEPH VIMONT, of the Faculty of Paris, Honorary Member of the Phrenological Societies of London, Edinburgh, Boston, &c., and Author of a " Treatise on Human and Comparative Phrenology ;" Dr GAUBERT, Ex-Professor of the University of France, Knight of the Royal Order of the Legion of Honour, Principal Editor of the Journal of the Phrenological Society of Paris, Member of the Anthropological Society, &c. ; M. DUMOUTIER, Anatomical Assistant to the Faculty of Medicine of Paris, and Honorary Member of several Learned Societies ; and	

	Dr FELIX VOISIN, of the Faculty of Paris, Physician to several Hospitals of that City, Founder of the Establishment at Vauvres for the Treatment of the Insane, and Founder of the Orthophrenic Establishment,	Page 29
24.	Extrait du Discours prononcé à la Séance Annuelle de la Société Phrénologique de Paris, par M. le Professeur ANDRAL, President, Professeur à la Faculté de Médecine de Paris, Titulaire de l'Académie Royale de Médecine, Membre des Sociétés de Médecine de Bogota, d'Edimbourg, &c. et Médecin de l'Hôpital de la Pitié, Médecin Consultant du Roi, Chevalier de la Légion d'Honneur, &c. Avril 1835. (Published in the "Journal de la Société Phrénologique de Paris,")	32
25.	From Dr W. F. EDWARDS, F.R.S., Member of the Institute of France,	33
26.	From ALEX. J. D. DORSEY, Esq. Master of the English Department in the High School of Glasgow,	34
27.	From S. HARE, Esq., Proprietor and Medical Attendant of the Retreat for the Insane near Leeds,	35
28.	From Dr WILLIAM WEIR, Lecturer on the Practice of Medicine at the Portland Street Medical School, Glasgow, formerly Surgeon to the Royal Infirmary, and one of the Editors of the Glasgow Medical Journal,	36
29.	From Dr ROBERT HUNTER, Professor of Anatomy and Physiology in the Andersonian University, Glasgow,	39
30.	From ALEXANDER HOOD, Esq., Surgeon, Kilmarnock,	ib.
31.	From JOHN MILLER, Esq., Surgeon, Kilmarnock,	40
32.	From Dr J. S. COMBE, Member of the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh,	41
33.	From GEORGE SALMOND, Esq. Procurator-Fiscal of Lanarkshire; WALTER MOIR, Esq., Sheriff-Substitute of Lanarkshire; and Mr D. M'COLL, Governor of Glasgow Jail,	42
34.	From Dr JOHN MACKINTOSH, Surgeon to the Ordnance Department in North Britain, Lecturer on the Principles of Pathology and Practice of Physic, Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh, Member of the Medico-Chirurgical and Wernerian Natural History Societies of Edinburgh, of Montreal, Heidelberg, and Brussels,	45
35.	From ANDREW CARMICHAEL, Esq., M.R.I.A., Dublin,	46

## ADDRESS

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE THE

LORD PROVOST, MAGISTRATES, AND COUNCIL,  
OF THE CITY OF EDINBURGH.

BY GEORGE COMBE.

---

23 CHARLOTTE SQUARE, EDINBURGH,  
10th May 1836.

MY LORD PROVOST AND GENTLEMEN,

ON the 9th of April last I addressed a letter to the Right Honourable the Lord Provost, offering myself to the Patrons of the University as a Candidate for the Professorship of Logic, then declared vacant; and I now very respectfully submit to your consideration some Testimonials on which my pretensions to fill that chair are founded. As I aspire to this honour on account of my exertions in maintaining, diffusing, and applying a new doctrine, which has not yet been admitted into any of the older Universities as science, I beg your indulgence while offering a few observations on the points on which the testimonials have been chiefly designed to throw light. But, before entering on these topics, I am anxious to call your attention for a moment to the history of the reception of other important discoveries by the ages to which they were first disclosed.

Professor Playfair, in his historical notice of discoveries in physical science, published in the Supplement to the Encyclopædia Britannica, observes, that 'in every society there are some who think themselves interested to maintain things in the condition wherein they have found them. The con-

siderations are indeed sufficiently obvious, which, in the moral and political world, tend to produce this effect, and to give a stability to human institutions, often so little proportionate to their real value, or to their general utility. Even in matters purely intellectual, and in which the abstract truths of arithmetic and geometry seem alone concerned, the prejudices, the selfishness, or the vanity of those who pursue them, not unfrequently combine to resist improvement, and often engage no inconsiderable degree of talent in drawing back, instead of pushing forward, the machine of science. The introduction of methods entirely new must often change the relative place of the men engaged in scientific pursuits, and must oblige many, after descending from the stations they formerly occupied, to take a lower position in the scale of intellectual improvement. The enmity of such men, if they be not animated by a spirit of real candour and the love of truth, is likely to be directed against methods by which their vanity is mortified, and their importance lessened.” \*

The treatment experienced by Galileo and by Harvey is too well known to render it necessary for me to recapitulate it here ; but, at a later age of the world, the discoveries even of Sir Isaac Newton met with a similar reception. Professor Playfair, speaking of the announcement of the composition of light by that distinguished philosopher, says : “ Though the discovery now communicated had every thing to recommend it which can arise from what is great, new, and singular ; though it was not a theory, or a system of opinions, but the generalization of facts made known by experiments ; and though it was brought forward in a most simple and unpretending form ; a host of enemies appeared, each eager to obtain the unfortunate pre-eminence of being the first to attack conclusions which the unanimous voice of posterity was to confirm.” †

These observations are applicable to Phrenology. Professor Andral, one of the most distinguished physiologists of

\* Part ii p. 27.

† P. 56.

France, remarks, that this science also " must pay the usual tax of entry ; some one must be put to inconvenience in its progress, and few persons are fond of being set aside. It has, moreover, the great fault of being younger than those it claims to enlighten ; but let it alone, and it will throw all obstacles behind it with marvellous force." \*

One of the greatest reproaches that has hitherto attached to established Universities, is their pertinacious adherence to erroneous opinions after they have been abandoned by the general judgment of enlightened men. This has led a distinguished author to compare them to " beacons moored in the stream of time, which serve only to mark the rapidity with which the tide of civilization is flowing past them." It is a characteristic feature in the constitution of the University of Edinburgh, that its Patrons do not belong to the class which has generally brought upon itself the condemnation of resisting important discoveries ; but to one engaged in the active business of life ; one which, although not boasting of a scientific character itself, possesses intelligence sufficient to appreciate the value and to understand the direction in which the currents of science are flowing, and which therefore is more open to the adoption of new truths than are those learned bodies, which cease to oppose improvements only when their individual members who have been educated in exploded opinions cease to exist. " Truth," says Mr Locke, " scarce ever yet carried it by vote any where, at its first appearance. New opinions are always suspected, and usually opposed without any other reason, than because they are not common. But truth, like gold, is not the less so, for being newly brought out of the mine. 'Tis trial and examination must give it price, and not any antique fashion ; and, though it be not yet current by the public stamp, yet it may, for all that, be as old as nature, and is certainly not the less genuine."

\* Extrait du Discours prononcé à la Séance Annuelle de la Société Phrénologique de Paris, par M. le Professeur Andral, Président. Avril 1835.

The Logic Chair, as hitherto taught in the University of Edinburgh, has embraced the study of the intellectual faculties of the mind and their applications ; and regarding it as the junior class for mental philosophy, I proceed to point out the bearing of the accompanying testimonials on the subject of appointing a new professor.

Phrenology professes to be the science of mind, discovered and matured by observations made on the manifestations which accompany the cerebral organs in a state of great development or deficiency, both in health and in disease. It possesses, therefore, two distinct characters : *1st*, That of the Science of Mind, considered apart from its connection with organs ; and, *2dly*, That of the Physiology of the Brain.

The following individuals certify that Phrenology, viewed as the abstract science of mind, is superior to any system of mental philosophy which has preceded it, namely—

His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Dublin, late Principal of St Alban's Hall, and Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, and who, by his works on Logic and Rhetoric, has established a right to be regarded as the highest British authority on this subject, p. 5 ;

Dr Barlow, p. 4 ;

Sir Geo. S. Mackenzie, p. 7 ;

Dr Macnish, p. 15 ;

Dr Evanson, p. 20 ;

Dr Gregory, p. 21 ;

Professor Nichol, p. 23 ;

Captain Maconochie, p. 24 ;

Dr A. Combe, p. 25 ;

The Hon. D. G. Hallyburton, M. P., p. 49 ;

Professor Longfield, Dublin, Appendix, p. 50 ;

Charles Maclaren, Esq. p. 57 ;

Robert Chambers, Esq. p. 55 ;

The Hon. Judge Crampton, p. 63.

&c. &c.

The following individuals certify that Phrenology contains a true exposition of the physiology of the brain :—viz.



The most distinguished Medical authorities in Paris,  
pages 28 to 33 ;

Dr Wm. Weir, p. 36 ;

Dr Mackintosh, p. 45 ;

Dr Elliotson, p. 47 ;

Richard Carmichael, Esq. Appendix, p. 3 ;

John Fife, Esq., Appendix, p. 8 ;

Alexander Hood, Esq., Appendix, p. 2 ;

Dr Robert Hunter, Appendix, p. 34 ;

Dr James Johnston, p. 67.

&c. &c.

Assuming that these certificates afford as satisfactory evidence of the nature and truth of Phrenology as can be obtained without personal investigation, the next object which I have aimed at establishing is, that it is useful. Lord Bacon inferred that the Philosophy of Aristotle was false because it was barren ; and the same rule of judging would lead to a similar conclusion regarding the philosophy of mind as hitherto taught in the established universities. It has served as a kind of mental gymnastics for exercising and sharpening the intellectual faculties of students, but it has been found inapplicable to the elucidation of insanity, education, the treatment of criminals, or almost to any purpose which a sound philosophy of mind should subserve. Phrenology claims a superiority over it in each of these particulars. Its doctrines, like those of all other natural sciences, are at once simple and profound. The moralist, the physician, the legislator, and the teacher, are able to draw from it lights to guide them in their practical duties ; while, to the student who boasts of a penetrating and adventurous intellect, it affords scope for indulging in the most recondite researches and refined analysis.

The following certificates will inform you of its application in discriminating the varieties of insanity :—

Sir William Ellis, p. 12 ;

W. A. F. Browne, Esq. p. 10 ;

S. Hare, Esq. p. 35 ;

A. Mackintosh, Esq. p. 53 ;

H. A. Galbraith, Esq. Appendix, p. 39 ;

Dr James Scott, Appendix, p. 13 ;

D. Mackintosh, Esq. Appendix, p. 20 ;

&c. &c.

The following testimonials will prove the bearing of Phrenology on the classification and treatment of criminals :—

George Salmond, Esq. p. 42 ;

Dr Otto, p. 65 ; Appendix, p. 23 ;

Dr Vimont, Appendix, p. 32 ;

Mr William Brebner, Appendix, p. 39 ;

&c. &c.

And the following will inform you of its application to the purposes of education, viz. :

Mr A. J. D. Dorsey, p. 34 ; and

Mr William Hunter, p. 51.

In addition to testimonials from persons of station and of philosophical eminence, I have procured several from individuals in various ranks and employments, with the view of shewing that the true philosophy of mind is calculated not exclusively to adorn palaces and academic halls, but also to recommend itself for its truth and utility to intelligent men of every grade. The pupils who attend the logic classes are the sons of such persons, and partake of their mental qualifications.

Two other points of importance for your consideration are, the extent to which it has already prevailed, and the probability of its future progress to general acceptance as the true philosophy of mind. An accurate opinion on these subjects can be formed only by a careful perusal and consideration of the whole documents annexed. In the letter from Robert Ferguson, Esq. M. P., p. 18, you will find its history briefly sketched from the year 1799 to the present day. In the letters of James Simpson, Esq. and Thomas Wyse, Esq. M. P., you will observe evidence that the Legislature is drawing upon it for lights in education ; in the letters of Charles Maclaren, Esq. and Robert Chambers, Esq. you will see the opinions entertained of it by two eminent conductors of the periodi-

cal press ; and in the letters of Dr Weir, p. 36, Dr Hunter, p. 51, Dr Evanson, p. 20, Dr Mackintosh, p. 45, and Dr Elliotson, p. 47, you will find that it is actually taught as established science in several great and flourishing institutions for medical education. In the certificates from the French capital, p. 28, from Dr Gregory, and Dr Otto of Copenhagen, you will see evidence which leads to the presumption that it is on the eve of being admitted into foreign universities as the science of mind and the physiology of the brain ; and only now, in all probability, will the honour be within your reach, of being the first to recognise its claims, and take the lead in doing homage to its merits.

In regard to my pretensions as an individual, I wish to say little. I appear before you as the humble representative of a great system of natural truth, and wish to be estimated by its merits alone. If Phrenology be at once a system of mental philosophy and of the physiology of the brain, and if during nearly twenty years I have not only incessantly studied it under these aspects, but publicly entered the field of controversy with every respectable opponent, combating the metaphysician with arguments, and the physiologist with facts, it may reasonably be inferred that my intellectual faculties have acquired some training that may conduce to the successful teaching of the Logic class.

I may perhaps be permitted to claim also the quality of moral intrepidity, in having braved the ridicule with which Phrenology was assailed for many years ; and if by the exercise of this attribute I shall be recognised hereafter as having in any degree benefited mankind, I shall feel contented, whatever your decision may be.

In 1819, when the all but unanimous voice of society was directed against Phrenology, I ventured to publish a book in its defence. I was then unknown in literature, destitute of influence, and entirely dependent on my profession for the means of subsistence. Many prophetic warnings were offered to me of the utter impossibility of my aiding the cause in any appreciable degree, and of the perfect certainty of my

own ruin, both as a professional man and as an author, by the insane attempt. Nor were willing instruments wanting in this city to give effect to these unfavourable auguries. For several years the wit of the talented conductor of Blackwood's Magazine was directed against Phrenology and its adherents ; Sir William Hamilton lectured and wrote against it with all the subtlety and keenness for which he is distinguished ; while Lord Jeffrey directed the full force of his refined railery, acute argumentative talents, and great reputation, to its extinction. In other cities a similar course was pursued. In Edinburgh, the enlightened editors of the Scotsman long stood singular as its defenders in the public press. I am far from insinuating that any talents of mine sufficed to stem the mighty torrent of ridicule, abuse, and argument, by which Phrenology was assailed. I was only one very humble among many able and efficient advocates of its truth ; but I *do* claim the merit of having hazarded all that is dear to the human mind,—fortune, reputation, and friendship, in its cause, at a time when that cause appeared to the world in general to be desperate. I have never repented the selection which I then made ; and the Testimonials themselves which this application has called forth, are to me more than an adequate recompense for all that I may have hazarded and done in its defence.

I forbear to press on you my own qualifications as an author and a lecturer. The certificates will speak sufficiently on these points.

I expect still to receive a few testimonials from distant quarters, which I shall take the liberty to present before the day of election. I have added, as an Appendix, some testimonials bearing on the truth of Phrenology, presented by Sir George S. Mackenzie to the Right Honourable Lord Glenelg, Secretary to the Colonies, in relation to the application of the science to the classification of criminals. It will be seen from their dates, that the greater number of them were written before the vacancy in the Logic Chair occurred ; and to them I respectfully solicit your attention.

I have to apologise to you for the great length to which these testimonials have extended, as well as for their miscellaneous nature ; but unless I could bring forward not only high but *general* evidence, that Phrenology is entitled to be received into your University as science, I conceived that my claims to your suffrages would be inadequately supported.

I beg also to mention, with the utmost respect, that it is not my intention to trouble you with a personal canvass. I regard you as judges, exercising a solemn and important trust, delegated to you by your fellow-citizens for the general good ; and I should feel it to be as unbecoming to solicit you individually for votes, as to request a judge privately to decide a cause in my favour as a litigant. If any of you desire to converse with me for the sake of obtaining additional information, I shall feel a pleasure in waiting on you ; but unless requested, I shall assume that you approve of my present resolution to make no personal applications.

It is my intention to publish these Testimonials, as bearing on a subject of general interest, and by this means you will have an opportunity of gathering also the opinion of society on the merits of the present application.

I have the honour to remain,

My LORD PROVOST and GENTLEMEN,

Your very faithful and obedient servant,

GEO. COMBE.



# CONTENTS.

To the LORD PROVOST of the City of Edinburgh, (prefixed)	Page i
ADDRESS to the Right Honourable the LORD PROVOST, MAGISTRATES, and COUNCIL of the City of Edinburgh, by GEORGE COMBE, (prefixed)	iii

## TESTIMONIALS.

1. From CHAS. COWAN, Esq., M.D.E., M.D.P., M.R.C.S.E.,  
Bachelor of Letters of the Sorbonne, Elève of the Ecôle  
Pratique, Member of the Medical Society of Observa-  
tion of Paris, &c., Lecturer on Anatomy, Translator of  
Louis on Consumption, . . . . . 3
2. From E. BARLOW, Esq. M.D.; Graduate of the University  
of Edinburgh of the year 1803; Member of the Royal  
College of Surgeons of Ireland; Fellow of the Royal  
Medical and Chirurgical Society of London; Senior  
Physician to the Bath Hospital, and to the Bath United  
Hospital, &c. &c. . . . . 4
3. From his Grace the LORD ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN, . . . . 5
4. From HEWETT COTTRELL WATSON, Esq., F.L.S., &c.; for-  
merly Senior President of the Royal Medical Society of  
Edinburgh; author of the "New Botanist's Guide,"  
the "Geographical Distribution of British Plants," and  
other works, . . . . . 6
5. From Sir G. S. MACKENZIE, Bart., F.R.S.L., formerly Pre-  
sident of the Physical Class of the Royal Society of  
Edinburgh, and V. P. of the Society of Scottish Anti-  
quarians, and President of the Astronomical Institution  
of Edinburgh; Fellow and Honorary Member of several  
Scientific and Philosophical Societies in Britain, on  
the Continent, and in America; author of "Travels in  
Iceland," of "An Essay on Taste," of "Illustrations of  
Phrenology," of "An Agricultural Survey of Ross and  
Cromarty Shires," and of various Memoirs in the Trans-  
actions of Societies and Periodical Works, and in Brew-  
ster's Edinburgh Encyclopædia, &c. . . . . 7
6. From JAS. L. DRUMMOND, Esq., M.D., Professor of Anatomy  
and Botany in the Belfast Royal Institution; President  
of the Belfast Natural History Society; Honorary Mem-

	Page
ber of the Natural History Society of Newcastle-on-Tyne, and of the Cuvierian Society of Cork ; author of "Thoughts on Natural History," "First Steps to Botany," and "Letters to a Young Naturalist," . . .	8
7. From V. F. HOVENDEN, Esq., M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cantab. . . . .	9
8. From FRANCIS FARQUHARSON, Esq., M.D., F.R.C.S. Edinburgh, Vice-President of the Phrenological Society, . .	9
9. From W. A. F. BROWNE, Surgeon, Medical Superintendent Montrose Lunatic Asylum ; formerly Lecturer on Physiology, &c. ; President of the Royal Medical, Royal Physical, and Plinian Societies, &c. . . . .	10
10. From WILLIAM WILDSMITH, Member of the Royal College of Surgeons, London, of the Council of the Literary and Philosophical Society of Leeds, &c. . . . .	11
11. From Sir W. C. ELLIS, M.D., Physician to the Lunatic Asylum for the County of Middlesex, . . . . .	12
12. From JOHN SCOTT, M.D., Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons, . . . . .	13
13. From Rear-Admiral BULLEN, . . . . .	13
14. From R. WILLIS, M.D., Member of the Royal College of Surgeons in London, Librarian to the same Institution, and Member of the Royal Medical and Chirurgical Society, . . . . .	14
15. From Dr ROBERT MACNISH, Member of the Faculty of Physicians and Surgeons of Glasgow, and author of the Philosophy of Sleep, &c. . . . .	15
16. From ROBERT FERGUSON, Esq. M. P. . . . .	17
17. From the Same, . . . . .	18
18. From RICHARD TONSON EVANSON, Esq., M.D., M.R.I.A. Professor of the Practice of Physic in the Royal College of Surgeons, Ireland, . . . . .	20
19. From Dr WILLIAM GREGORY, F.R.S.E., Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh ; Member and formerly President of the Royal Medical Society ; Corresponding Member of the Société de Pharmacie and of the Phrenological Society of Paris ; and Secretary to the Phrenological Society of Edinburgh, . .	21
20. From J. P. NICHOL, Esq. F.R.S.E., Professor of Practical Astronomy in the University of Glasgow, . . . . .	23



	Page
36. From Dr JOHN ELLIOTSON, F.R.S., President of the Royal Medical and Chirurgical, and of the London Phrenological Societies; Professor of the Principles and Practice of Medicine and of Clinical Medicine, and Dean of Faculty, in the University of London; Senior Physician of the North London Hospital; Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of London; formerly Physician to St Thomas's Hospital, and President of the Royal Medical Society of Edinburgh, &c. &c. &c.	47
37. From JAMES SIMPSON, Esq. Advocate,	48
38. From the Honourable D. G. HALLYBURTON, M.P. for Forfarshire,	49
39. From WILLIAM HUNTER, Esq. A.M., late Professor of Logic, &c. in the Andersonian University, Glasgow,	51
40. From ALEXANDER MACKINTOSH, Esq. Surgeon Superintendent, Dundee Royal Lunatic Asylum,	53
41. From ROBERT CHAMBERS, Esq. one of the Conductors of Chambers's Edinburgh Journal,	55
42. From CHARLES MACLAREN, Esq., Editor of the Scotsman Newspaper,	57
43. Second Letter from GEORGE SALMOND, Esq. Procurator-Fiscal of the County of Lanark,	60
44. From WILLIAM HUNTER, Esq. Town-Clerk of Forfar, and President of the Forfar Phrenological Society,	61
45. From DAVID MURRAY, Esq. Physician in Forfar,	62
46. From ALEXANDER SMITH, Esq. M. D. Physician in Forfar,	62
47. From JOHN F. ALLAN, Esq. Licentiate of the Royal College of Surgeons, Edinburgh,	63
48. From the Honourable Judge CRAMPTON, formerly Fellow and Professor of Law in Trinity College, Dublin,	63
49. From the Rev. Dr FRANCIS SADLER, S. F. Trin. Col. Dublin,	64
50. From C. OTTO, M. D. Professor of Medicine in the University of Copenhagen, Physician to the Civil Prisons, Member of the Royal Board of Health, and of the Medical Societies in Copenhagen, Edinburgh, Stockholm, Paris, Montpellier, Berlin, Leipzig, Lyons, &c. &c.	65
51. From THOMAS WYSE, Esq. M.P. Chairman of the Committee on Education in Ireland,	66
52. From JAMES JOHNSON, M. D. Physician-Extraordinary to	

	Page
the King, Editor of the Medico-Chirurgical Review, &c. &c. . . . .	67
53. From the Rev. Dr SPRAGUE, Pastor of a Presbyterian Church at Albany, New York, . . . . .	68

## EVIDENCE OF THE PROGRESS OF PHRENOLOGY.

### I. Books Sold—

1. Certificate of Numbers of Mr COMBE's Works printed by MESSRS NEILL & Co. Edinburgh, . . . . .	69
2. From MESSRS WILLIAM and ROBERT CHAMBERS, Booksellers, Edinburgh, . . . . .	70
3. From MESSRS LONGMAN, REES and Co., Booksellers, London, . . . . .	71
4. From MESSRS SIMPKIN, MARSHALL and Co., Booksellers, London, . . . . .	71
5. From Mr JOHN ANDERSON jun., Bookseller, Edinburgh, . . . . .	72
Foreign Editions.—In the United States of America, —in France,—in Germany,—in Sweden,—in Denmark, . . . . .	73, 74

### II. LECTURES—

1. Certificate from JAMES P. FALKNER, Esq., Secretary to the Edinburgh Philosophical Association, . . . . .	74
2. From the Same, . . . . .	75
3. From WILLIAM HUTTON, Esq., F.G.S., Member of the Geological Society of France; Secretary of the Natural History Society, and Member of the Council of the Literary and Philosophical Society of Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Honorary Member of several similar Institutions, &c. &c. . . . .	75
4. From JAMES M'CLELLAND, Esq. Accountant, Glasgow, . . . . .	77
5. Extract from a Letter from Dr JAMES COX, dated Paris, 17th April 1836, . . . . .	78
6. From WILLIAM TAIT, Esq. Surgeon, Lauder, . . . . .	78

## TESTIMONIALS.

---

- I. From CHAS. COWAN, Esq. M.D.E., M.D.P., M.R.C.S.E.  
Bachelor of Letters of the Sorbonne, Elève of the *École Pratique*, Member of the Medical Society of Observation of Paris, &c., Lecturer on Anatomy, and Translator of Louis on Consumption.

BATH, 27, RIVER-STREET,  
14th April, 1836.

MY DEAR SIR,—Finding from my friend, Dr. Barlow, that you are a candidate for the vacant Professorship of Logic in the University of Edinburgh, it affords me much pleasure to express, however feebly, my deep conviction of your high qualifications for so important a post.

While I feel that this impression might be fully justified by your acknowledged talents and general attainments, it is materially strengthened by the fact of your having so long and ably advocated Phrenology.

The evidence upon which this science is now founded appears to me quite irresistible, and the means which it affords of simplifying and rendering really practical the philosophy of

the human mind, so superior to all others, that I should consider no individual properly qualified for the Chair of Logic, who was either unacquainted with, or who disregarded its principles.

With much esteem, believe me, My Dear Sir,

Yours very truly,

CHARLES COWAN

To GEORGE COMBE, Esq.

II. From E. BARLOW, Esq. M.D.; Graduate of the University of Edinburgh of the year 1803; Member of the Royal College of Surgeons of Ireland; Fellow of the Royal Medical and Chirurgical Society of London; Senior Physician to the Bath Hospital, and to the Bath United Hospital, &c. &c.

BATH, SYDNEY-PLACE,  
April 14, 1836.

MY DEAR SIR,—I hail with peculiar gratification the announcement of your being a candidate for the Professorship of Logic in the University of Edinburgh. Convinced as I have long been that Phrenology is the true philosophy of mind, I cannot but regard it, not only as conducive to the successful teaching of a Logic class, but as the only foundation on which sound Logic can be reared. The attempt to direct the operations of mind, while overlooking its real nature and powers, must ever fail, and is a solecism which, I trust, will in no long time be banished from our schools.

Of your competency to teach the true philosophy of mind, no individual testimony can be needed, it being unequivocally attested by the unparalleled circulation of your published works, and the high estimation in which you are held as a mental philosopher, not only in this country, but over a large portion of the globe.

I shall only add, that no public event could give me more

sincere and ardent pleasure than your appointment to the University Chair; which could not fail to benefit signally the Logic Class, while it would reflect high credit on those to whom the selection of a professor is confided.

I remain, My Dear Sir, with sincere respect and esteem,  
faithfully yours,

E. BARLOW, M.D.

To GEORGE COMBE, Esq. Edinburgh.

### III. From his Grace the LORD ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.

DUBLIN, 14th April, 1836.

DEAR SIR,—I have no hesitation in repeating what I have often said before, that I have derived both entertainment and instruction from the perusal of your works. In some points I differ from you, and in several others I remain in doubt; but much that you have said I consider as highly valuable.

The anatomical and physiological portion of Phrenology—what I believe you call Organology—demands more attention than I have had leisure to bestow, to enable a cautious inquirer to make up his mind upon it. But I am convinced that even if all connection of the brain with mind were regarded not merely as doubtful, but as a perfect chimera, still the treatises of many phrenological writers, and especially yours, would be of great value, from their employing a metaphysical nomenclature far more logical, accurate, and convenient, than Locke, Stewart, and other writers of their schools.

That the religious and moral objections against the phrenological theory are utterly futile, I have from the first been fully convinced.

That clever article in the *Edinburgh Review*\* to which you replied, I consider you as having completely and de-

\* By Lord Jeffrey in No. 88.—G. C.

cisively refuted. Your answer did not indeed establish the truth of your theory, nor appeared to have such a design; but in repelling those particular objections against it, you were triumphant.

Believe me to be, with much respect, your faithful humble servant,

RICHARD DUBLIN.

To GEORGE COMBE, Esq.

---

IV. From HEWETT COTTREL WATSON, Esq. F.L.S., &c., formerly Senior President of the Royal Medical Society of Edinburgh, author of the "New Botanist's Guide," the "Geographical Distribution of British Plants," and other works.

DITTON MARSH, SURREY,

*April 14, 1836.*

Understanding that MR. GEORGE COMBE has come forward as a candidate for the vacant Professorship of Logic in the University of Edinburgh, I hereby offer to the Civic Council of Edinburgh, and other patrons of that University, my respectful but most decided testimony, that MR. COMBE's phrenological acquirements would render his lectures extremely beneficial to students of Moral Philosophy, and be eminently calculated eventually to increase the celebrity of the University in which he should be appointed a professor.

I also add, that the science of Phrenology is one of great practical value; and that no system of Logic or Moral Philosophy, in which the principles of Phrenology are neglected, can henceforth be considered on a par with the science of the present age.

It is supposed by many persons, that avowed belief in Phrenology is detrimental to the influence of individuals, and would prove injurious to the fame of any University in which that science should be taught. This has been the case until recently, but it no longer is so. I am now engaged in collecting statistical evidences to show the present state of Phrenology, and shall

shortly lay before the public the most conclusive proofs that a steady conviction of the truth and value of phrenological science is now extensively and rapidly spreading through society. In consequence of which, it may safely be predicted that colleges and academies, professors and teachers, neglecting the principles of Phrenology in future, will fail to support their acquired fame, and soon fall into disrepute.

With fervent wishes that the high scientific name of the University of Edinburgh may not be thus endangered, I subscribe my name and designation, according to the wish expressed in the circular of Mr. Combe.

HEWETT COTTREL WATSON, F. L. S., &c.

---

V. From Sir G. S. MACKENZIE, BART. F. R. S. L., formerly President of the Physical Class of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, and V. P. of the Society of Scottish Antiquaries, and President of the Astronomical Institution of Edinburgh; Fellow and Honorary Member of several Scientific and Philosophical Societies in Britain, on the Continent, and in America; Author of "Travels in Iceland;" of "An Essay on Taste;" of "Illustrations of Phrenology;" of "An Agricultural Survey of Ross and Cromarty Shires;" and of various Memoirs in the Transactions of Societies, and Periodical Works, and in Brewster's Edinburgh Encyclopædia, &c.

COUL, 15th April, 1836.

WHILE I was unacquainted with the facts on which it is founded, I scoffed, with many others, at the pretensions of the new Philosophy of Mind, as promulgated by Dr. Gall, and now known by the term Phrenology. On hearing and conversing with his most eminent disciple, the lamented Spurzheim, the light broke in upon my mind; and many years after I had neglected the study of mind, in consequence of having been disgusted with the utter uselessness and emptiness of what I

had listened to in the University of Edinburgh, I became a zealous student of what I now perceive to be truth. During the last twenty years I have lent my humble aid in resisting a torrent of ridicule and abuse, and have lived to see the true philosophy of Man establishing itself wherever talent is found capable of estimating its immense value. Mr. Combe's writings abundantly show his fitness to teach this philosophy, and all its important applications; and an intimacy with him during twenty years enables me to declare, that a more zealous, able, and faithful teacher cannot be found. It will be a proud day for Edinburgh when her rulers shall determine that substantial truth shall be taught in her University, instead of young men being forced to listen to empty and unmeaning declamation.

G. S. MACKENZIE.

VI. From JAS. L. DRUMMOND, ESQ. M.D., Professor of Anatomy and Botany in the Belfast Royal Institution, President of the Belfast Natural History Society, Honorary Member of the Natural History Society of Newcastle-on-Tyne, and of the Cuvierian Society of Cork. Author of "Thoughts on Natural History;" "First Steps to Botany;" and "Letters to a Young Naturalist."

BELFAST, 15th April, 1836.

BELIEVING that Phrenology forms the true basis of the science of mind, while it affords the best means by which the latter can be clearly and satisfactorily understood, and being also fully impressed with the conviction that it must eventually supersede every other system of Mental Philosophy, I have no hesitation in giving my opinion of its merits, and in stating my belief, that it is calculated to give a degree of success hitherto unknown to the teacher of Logic.

JAMES L. DRUMMOND, M. D.



VII. From V. F. HOVENDEN, Esq. M. A., late Fellow of  
Trinity College, Cantab.

SHIREHAMPTON, NEAR BRISTOL,  
15th April, 1836.

SIR,—You are most welcome to my opinions on the subject of Phrenology, if they can be of any service in forwarding your views with regard to the Chair of Logic in the University of Edinburgh.

I have no hesitation, then, in stating that the observations and reflections of ten years have very strongly disposed me to regard the doctrines of Phrenology, not as mere visionary speculations, but as essentially in accordance with truth and nature, and, consequently, as affording a satisfactory basis for the study of the human mind.

How much a solid ground-work was needed for that study, it is not necessary for me to say.

I am, Sir, (in great haste) your obedient Servant,

V F. HOVENDEN, M.A.

---

VIII. From FRANCIS FARQUHARSON, Esq. M.D., F.R.C.S.  
Edinburgh, Vice-President of the Phrenological Society.

EDINBURGH, April 16th, 1836.

DEAR SIR,—Your coming forward as a candidate for the Chair of Logic in the University of Edinburgh has afforded me much pleasure, and I sincerely wish you success. Convinced by the experience of many years that Phrenology is the only true science of mind, I am of opinion that Logic must be based upon it, and that it can be successfully taught only by a Phrenologist. I have perused all your works with the deepest interest, and much benefit; they contain profound and often original views of our mental constitution, and prove how capable the science is of being applied to all the import-

ant affairs of life. I have regularly attended several courses of your lectures on Phrenology, and, with great pleasure, bear testimony to the clearness of their statements, and the ingenuity and eloquence of their illustrations.

I am, Dear Sir, yours sincerely,

FRANCIS FARQUHARSON, M. D.

IX. From W.A.F. BROWNE, Esq. Surgeon, Medical Superintendent of the Montrose Lunatic Asylum, formerly Lecturer on Physiology, &c., President of the Royal Medical, Royal Physical, and Plinian Societies, &c.

MONTROSE, *April 16, 1836.*

I ATTENDED Mr. Combe's public lectures, as a pupil, for several years, and shall never cease to recur to the period as that in which I became acquainted with the laws and phenomena of the human mind, and with my own mental constitution and capabilities. I had previously completed a course of philosophical studies at the University, and was consequently, to a certain degree, competent to compare what he taught, and his mode of teaching, with what was then and what still is, the established mode of instruction. I have no hesitation in declaring that Mr. Combe's course appeared to me infinitely superior to all others, and this superiority consisted as much in its being so perspicuous as to be comprehensible by all men of ordinary intellect, and so practical as to be of universal utility, as in its being a faithful exposition of mental philosophy. Since this period I have endeavoured to investigate the different systems of philosophy with care and impartiality. I have done this with a view to qualify myself for the care and cure of the insane—for the study of mind under disease; and have come to three conclusions:

1. That the doctrines taught by Mr. Combe, or contained in his works, are founded on truth.
2. That by no other means can the phenomena of mind in general be explained, the minds of the young educated, the minds of the mature

regulated, or the minds of the diseased restored to health. 3. That Mr. C. is the most profound, eloquent, and successful teacher of these doctrines.

Upon these grounds I conceive Mr. C. is most eminently qualified to discharge the duties of the Logic chair. But these are not his only claims. He has devoted himself for the last twenty years to the study of mind in all its bearings. His knowledge of the opinions of the metaphysicians is extensive, and would enable him to give a most comprehensive view of the history or progress of mental philosophy. His manner as a public teacher is highly impressive, it bears the very impress of truth and sagacity, and his style is clear and chaste. I can, in short, imagine no man more likely to infuse a spirit of philosophical inquiry into the young, or more capable of guiding that inquiry to its legitimate results.

W. A. F. BROWNE.

X. From WILLIAM WILDSMITH, Esq. Member of the Royal College of Surgeons, London; of the Council of the Literary and Philosophical Society of Leeds, &c.; author of a work on the Connexion between the Mind and the Brain.

LEEDS, *April 16, 1836.*

MY DEAR SIR,—It gives me sincere pleasure to learn that you are a candidate for the Chair of the Professorship of Logic in the University of Edinburgh.

Having, for a series of years, taken great interest in the sciences of Metaphysics and Logic, and felt assured that the subjects could not be clearly elucidated, especially to students, without the aids which are afforded by the doctrines of Phrenology, I have ever been anxious that some of our Universities or high places of learning should associate them as kindred sciences, under the guidance of an able and impartial teacher—being confident that they have severally suffered from the want of such combination, and equally certain that much advantage will accrue from their joint study.

To no one, in my estimation, could so distinguished an honour be given than yourself, devoted as you have been to Phrenology, and successful as your efforts have ever proved in rendering the subject clear to others. Possessing a truly philosophic mind, unrestricted by any narrow bounds of prejudice, I consider you eminently qualified to undertake the arduous, yet deeply interesting duty of conveying to the rising generation truths at once so interesting and so important.

With best wishes for your success, believe me to remain,

Yours very sincerely,

WILLIAM WILDSMITH.

XI. From Sir WILLIAM C. ELLIS, M.D., Physician to the Lunatic Asylum for the County of Middlesex.

HANWELL, 16th April, 1836.

DEAR SIR,—I wish I knew in what words to address you, that would have the greatest weight with those gentlemen who have the honour of appointing to the Chair of the Professorship of Logic, now vacant in your University, that I might, if possible, induce them to burst the trammels of prejudice that have so long confined the public bodies in the United Kingdom, to pursue a system of study, that can give no solid satisfaction to any one really desirous of becoming acquainted with the science of mind. As far as my feeble testimony may have any influence, I candidly own, that until I became acquainted with Phrenology, I had no solid basis upon which I could ground any treatment for the cure of the disease of insanity, which had long had a peculiar claim upon my attention. I can only say, that I most sincerely hope you will be the professor appointed. Nothing, I think, can be fairer than your proposal to accept the chair during the pleasure of the Council; because, if they find themselves wrong, they can so easily retrace their steps. But on that head I feel quite confident, that instead of any retracing of steps, they will have the proud satisfaction of feeling they stand first in the list of those who

have taken any public steps to afford a numerous class of students an opportunity of becoming fundamentally acquainted with those principles which alone can discover the true character of man. Repeating my sincere wish for your success, I remain, Dear Sir, yours very faithfully,

W. C. ELLIS.

XII. From JOHN SCOTT, Esq. M.D., Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh.

31, NORTHUMBERLAND-STREET, 17th April, 1836.

DEAR SIR,—Believing Phrenology to be the true science of mind, I have no hesitation in stating, that in my opinion it ought to form the basis of a course of lectures on Mental Philosophy. You now occupy the highest place among living Phrenologists, and from your eminent success as a lecturer, and the great reputation you have acquired both at home and abroad from your writings, I know no one whose claims can in any way be placed in competition with yours, should the civic council adopt your views of the subject.

With best wishes, I remain, Dear Sir, yours sincerely,

JOHN SCOTT, M.D.

TO GEORGE COMBE, Esq.

XIII. From Rear-Admiral BULLEN.

BATH, 16th April, 1836.

DEAR SIR,—I am informed by my friend Dr. Barlow, that you are a candidate for the Logical Chair in the University of Edinburgh. As a very humble phrenologist, though a sincere and zealous one, you have my best wishes, in unison, I am sure, with every true phrenologist in the world, that you may be successful; as we may then expect that the true philosophy of the mind will be taught on its only firm basis,

the principles of Phrenology. I lament the distance between us prevents me from personally offering you my grateful thanks for the great pleasure and instruction I have derived from your works on Phrenology, the Constitution of Man, &c. assuring you, that they have not only enlarged the boundaries of my mind in various ways, but they have done more, for they have increased and given energy to my charity, teaching me by my own infirmities to compassionate and make every allowance for those of my neighbour.

Again proffering you my sincere wishes that you may succeed in your approaching contest, permit me to subscribe myself, yours most truly,

T. BULLEN, REAR-ADMIRAL.

TO GEORGE COMBE, ESQ.

XIV. From R. WILLIS, ESQ. M.D., Member of the Royal College of Surgeons in London, Librarian to the same Institution, and Member of the Royal Medical and Chirurgical Society.

LONDON, *April 18th*, 1836.

MY DEAR SIR,—I am glad to learn that you are in the field as a candidate for the vacant Chair of Logic in the University of Edinburgh, and, for the sake of that only true and most harmonious science of mind of which you have so long been the distinguished and able advocate, I do most heartily pray that success may crown your canvass. An old student myself in the Logic class, I can never look back but with regret on the barren path I then found myself compelled to tread; attempting, with faculties still boyish and immature, to grasp abstractions, and to gather *positive knowledge* out of a series of discussions upon *names*. Familiar for many years past with the philosophy of mind which rests on the observation of nature at large, which has followed our better acquaintance in the present day with the physiology of the brain, I feel myself competent to declare how much of interest and importance

attach to the study of the operations of our minds, and of the primary powers by which they act on the universe around us, when pursued under the guidance of the truths now brought to light, and embodied in the doctrines of Phrenology.

My frequent intercourse and long acquaintance with you personally, as well as with your writings, lead me to the conviction, not only that in the Chair of Logic and Metaphysics, you would be most completely in the place for which nature has fitted you, but that the University of Edinburgh, (my own respected *alma mater*,) would soon see reason to be proud of the choice she had made of a professor.

Believe me, my Dear Sir, to be, with great esteem,

Very sincerely yours,

R. WILLIS, M.D.

XV. FROM DR. ROBERT MACNISH, Member of the Faculty of Physicians and Surgeons of Glasgow, and Author of "The Philosophy of Sleep," &c.

29, WEST-GEORGE-STREET, GLASGOW,  
19th April, 1836.

MR. COMBE having started as a candidate for the Logic Chair in the University of Edinburgh, I feel called upon, by a sense of the high admiration which I entertain for the moral and intellectual character of that gentleman, to state my impressions as to his capability of successfully discharging the duties attached to the Chair in question.

For many years the philosophy of mind has occupied much of my attention; but till I became acquainted with the new method of mental investigation discovered by the late Dr. Gall, I found it utterly impossible to arrive at any rational conclusion upon the subject. The old system of metaphysics explained nothing satisfactorily; and like all persons who attempted to arrive at definite results by its assistance, I only experienced mortification and disappointment. Since commencing the study of Phrenology, a new light has dawned

upon me, and various phenomena which were before perfectly inexplicable upon any known theory, are now of easy solution. Nor is the influence of this light confined to a state of healthy mental manifestation; it extends equally to the functions of mind in a state of disease—giving a new insight into the hitherto dark and unaccountable mysteries of insanity, and clearing up what was formerly hid in impenetrable darkness. As a medical man, I have derived the greatest benefit from the forcible manner in which the study of Phrenology has directed my attention to the functions of the brain in health and disease. The relations subsisting between the brain and other organs have been unfolded by this science with uncommon clearness, and with a precision and accuracy hitherto undreamt of by physiologists. I have no hesitation in saying, that my notions on every subject, whether of morals or physical science, have become more just, more systematic, and more in harmony with each other, since I studied Phrenology; and I firmly believe that the same fortunate result may be calculated upon by all who pay attention to the subject.

Great light has been thrown upon this science by Mr. Combe. His System of Phrenology is a beautiful exposition of the phenomena of mind, and constitutes, in my humble opinion, by far the best system of mental philosophy in the English language. This is not the solitary opinion of a phrenologist. Many who know nothing of the doctrines, and who, in truth, do not believe in them, are convinced that, considered simply as a metaphysical account of the human mind in its various aspects, Mr. Combe's book surpasses in clearness, intelligibility, and in the ease with which its statements may be put to the test, and thus either confirmed or refuted, every work of the kind which they have had an opportunity of perusing. His volume on the Constitution of Man is a performance of an equally high order of intellect, and may be justly considered one of the most remarkable productions of the present day. Few works have met with such a circulation, and when we consider its extraordinary merits, this fact is no way wonderful.



I have heard Mr Combe lecture on Phrenology and on Moral Philosophy, and entertain the same high opinion of his oral discourses as of his written productions. They are characterised by equal clearness, sagacity, sound reasoning, and benevolent and liberal feeling. Indeed, I am not acquainted with any individual, either in Edinburgh or elsewhere, who, as a teacher of Logic or Metaphysics, can be compared with him. These facts I mention, not from a slight or casual knowledge of this gentleman and his writings, but from a minute and intimate acquaintance with both, which has enabled me to speak with a confidence upon the subject which I should not otherwise have felt authorised to do.

R. MACNISH.

XVI. From ROBERT FERGUSON, Esq. M. P.

TO GEORGE COMBE, Esq.  
MY DEAR SIR,

18 PORTMAN SQUARE,  
16th April 1836.

I find you have offered yourself as a Candidate for the Professorship of Logic now vacant in the University of Edinburgh.

I cannot presume to offer any direct certificate of my opinion of your high fitness for such a situation. But this I will say, that I consider the Chair would be filled, if the choice was made of yourself, in a way the most conducive to the progress of the Philosophy of the Human Mind, more than by the appointment of any man I know.

The important science which you have so successfully followed up, may not yet have obtained that general confidence which it must ultimately acquire; but I cannot doubt that the Philosophy of Mind, founded on the functions of the brain, so ably, so eloquently, and so philosophically maintained by you, must ere long become the basis of Mental Philosophy, and prove highly conducive to the useful teaching of the Logic Class.

Edinburgh will do itself high honour if you are the successful candidate.

Ever very truly yours,

ROBT. FERGUSON.

\* B

## XVII. From the Same.

TO GEORGE COMBE, Esq.

MY DEAR SIR,

PORTMAN SQUARE, 20th April 1836.

SINCE I wrote the enclosed note, expressive of my hope that you might be the successful candidate for the Logic Chair, it has occurred to me that I might state, that a conviction of the importance to mankind of a thorough knowledge of the Philosophy of the Mind founded on the functions of the brain, was at an early period awakened, and strongly impressed upon my mind, by the great author of the science, Dr Gall himself. I happened to be at Vienna in 1799. Doctor Gall had previously developed his theory after long and careful investigation. He was a man most eminently qualified for philosophical inquiry, and, with a singular candour and simplicity of character, hazarded nothing without being founded on observations in nature, and supported by anatomical facts, and more particularly without being supported by a combination of facts founded on comparative anatomy.

His medical friends, to whom he anxiously imparted all his discoveries, were satisfied that the great basis of his system was founded on unquestionable evidence, drawn from observations of the brain, and of human talents and dispositions.

At the time I mention, he had begun to lecture publicly on his system in German; and, encouraged by the great interest it excited, offered to lecture and develop his views in French, for the sake of the strangers then at Vienna.

I, with several English gentlemen, eagerly embraced the opportunity thus offered to us, to listen to Dr Gall.

The impressions which the novelty and interest of his discoveries excited, alarmed the priests, who, from a false and ignorant view of the subject, were led to imagine that such a theory might lead to results inconsistent with their religious tenets; and the result was, that the government was induced to interdict him from lecturing any more.

I was, however, so much struck and impressed with the truth of his discoveries, which I considered so consistent with the wise simplicity and unity which mark so forcibly the laws of our Omnipotent Creator, that I was fortunate enough to obtain Dr Gall's permission to listen to his development of his views in private.

From the persecution he met with, he, soon after that, found he could not follow out his favourite study with any advantage at Vienna; he went elsewhere, and at last fixed his residence at Paris.

I can never forget the strong impression his philosophy made upon me, and, above all, the important results which must follow from a general system of education connected with it.

When his views first attracted public notice, the able, the talented, and the enlightened attacked them, without deigning to inquire into their truth, because they were an easy prey for playful and ignorant criticism; but I am glad to find that they have been followed up by able and scientific pupils, and that they at last have gained a footing which must advance, and which cannot now retrograde.

You, Sir, have become their eloquent and successful champion, and the current is now running strong in their favour.

It is because I consider the Philosophy of the Mind founded on the functions of the brain most essential to the future advantage of education, not only in a practical, but in a philosophical point of view, that I consider your obtaining the Chair of Logic would ultimately benefit mankind most essentially.

Ever truly yours,

ROBT. FERGUSON.

XVIII. From RICHARD TONSON EVANSON, Esq., M.D.,  
M. R. I. A., Professor of the Practice of Physic in the  
Royal College of Surgeons, Ireland.

DUBLIN, 36 DAWSON STREET,  
April 15. 1836.

I HAVE long been acquainted with the science of Phrenology, and feel no hesitation in declaring my conviction of its truth.

As a system of Metaphysics, it differs from all others, in being founded on fact and built up by observation. Physiological facts are substituted for metaphysical speculations.

As a science of Mind, its doctrines inculcate morality, rationality, and religion.

It is practically useful, as well as philosophically true.

In Phrenology, we find united the best exposition of the moral sentiments, and the most approved metaphysical doctrines heretofore taught, while it surpasses all former systems in practical utility and accordance with facts; being that *alone* which is adequate to explain the phenomena of Mind.

This opinion I am emboldened to pronounce, not merely as my own conviction, but as that which I have heard expressed by some of the most scientific men and best logicians of the day.

I conceive that a knowledge of Phrenology, as the true science of Mind, must not only be "highly conducive to the successful teaching of a Logic Class," but I do not think that Metaphysical Science can be adequately taught, as it is now understood, without such knowledge; and, therefore, consider that no greater improvement could be made in academic education, than the introduction of the new philosophy of Mind.

That such improvement cannot long be deferred, must be obvious to all who observe the deep impression which Phrenology has made on the public mind, and the increasing favour with which it continues to be received.

The opportunity is now offered to the Civic Council of

Edinburgh, to secure this distinction for their University ; and I feel convinced that, by being the first to appoint a Phrenologist as teacher of Logic to their Class, they would adopt the course best calculated to raise the reputation of their University, and to advance the interests of their Students.

RICHARD TONSON EVANSON.

---

**XIX.** From Dr WILLIAM GREGORY, F.R.S.E., Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh ; Member and formerly President of the Royal Medical Society ; Corresponding Member of the Société de Pharmacie and of the Phrenological Society of Paris ; and Secretary to the Phrenological Society of Edinburgh.

To GEORGE COMBE, Esq.

AINSLIE PLACE, EDINBURGH,  
20th April 1836.

MY DEAR SIR,

ALTHOUGH I have not the vanity to think that my opinion can have much weight with the Patrons, I willingly comply with your request on the subject of the Chair of Logic.

As that Chair embraces a most important department of mental science, namely the Philosophy of the Intellect, it is obviously in the highest degree desirable that it should be entrusted to one who has not only turned his attention to the subject, but has availed himself of the discoveries which have, since the commencement of the present century, effected so great a change in this branch of knowledge.

I allude, of course, to Phrenology : and I speak with the less hesitation, because I am conscious of having used my best endeavours to satisfy myself that that science is founded in nature.

These endeavours have led to a firm conviction of the truth of Phrenology, and of its vast importance, as consti-

tuting the only satisfactory and consistent system of mental philosophy which the world has yet seen.

Such being my conviction, I cannot do otherwise than express my earnest hope that a thorough Phrenologist may be appointed to the vacant chair. Even should not this take place at present, it does not require much penetration to see that the time is not far distant when Phrenology will be recognised in our schools as the true science of mind.

In a letter which I received about a fortnight ago from Dr VIMONT of Paris, the distinguished author of a work of great magnitude and interest on Human and Comparative Phrenology, the following passage occurs:—

“The number of the partisans of Phrenology increases in France to a remarkable degree; and there is no doubt the science will now make a part of public instruction.”

Let us hope that the University of Edinburgh may be the first to do what, sooner or later, will be done universally.

The Honourable Patrons cannot surely require any testimony to your personal qualifications for the vacant Chair, further than that which may be derived from your numerous and highly valuable works, and from the fact, that you have delivered many successful courses of lectures on the Philosophy of Mind, including, of course, the department allotted to the Professor of Logic.

From what I have seen and heard of you, I am satisfied that, if the choice depended on the suffrages of those who, in foreign countries, have cultivated the same field, your election would be secure. That you may be as well appreciated by your townsmen, is my sincere hope.

With every wish for your success, I remain, my dear Sir, yours most faithfully,

WILLIAM GREGORY, M.D.

XX. From J. P. NICHOL, Esq., Professor of Practical Astronomy in the University of Glasgow.

IN availing myself of the privilege of recording my opinion of Mr Combe, I am chiefly influenced by the desire to shew what estimation of his merits may be taken by individuals, who, like myself, have not enjoyed opportunity of attaining a decided opinion concerning the minuter organology of the science whose claims he has so ably and perseveringly advocated. It must not be conceived that this qualification is intended to insinuate an opinion hostile to Phrenology—for, on the contrary, I have long considered that in the main it has a strong foundation in truth; but while I am qualified to hold this general belief, it would, in my present state of knowledge, be somewhat of presumption were I to profess myself a phrenologist: nor is such profession necessary to entitle me to express my admiration of that acuteness which has enabled Mr Combe to present the world with a more accurate account and estimate of the various faculties of the mind, than was ever given before.

I am acquainted with no work relating to Moral Philosophy, from the perusal of which so much pleasure and benefit may be reaped, as from a careful and dispassionate study of "The Constitution of Man." It unfolds views, novel in most respects, concerning the character and right treatment of the mind, which are already obtaining wide currency and acceptance in society, and preparing, more rapidly than has been usual with discoveries in this field, a large increase of happiness for mankind. It were indeed wonderful if an author so original and adventurous, should in all respects escape error; but even if errors should anywhere mingle with his speculations—and I know of none that are material—his contemporaries are bound, by what they owe to the first interests of society and of truth, to see that his labours and deservings be appreciated, not by consideration of the amount of such possible exceptions, but by those striking lights

which he has succeeded in throwing on the most difficult and important department of human inquiry.

Mr Combe's success as a teacher is demonstrated; for he has during a succession of years fixed the attention of large audiences on disquisitions from which, however important and necessary to be thought of and understood, the public had by common consent been formerly debarred. His power consists partly in the simplicity and effectiveness of his language,—partly in his possession of a comprehensive intellect, which enables him to arrange details, and subordinate them to principle,—but chiefly, perhaps, in the manifestation of those moral qualities which impelled him to assume the position he has occupied. It is never possible for Mr Combe's audience to doubt that the aim and object of his instructions is the benefit of mankind; and he is manifestly actuated by that pure and independent love of truth, which it is the highest privilege of a teacher to exhibit and infuse, but which is never a ruling principle unless in very superior minds.

J. P. NICHOL.

20th April 1836.

---

XXI. From Captain MACONCHIE, R N., F.G.S., Secretary to the Royal Geographical Society of London, &c. &c.

MY DEAR SIR,

LONDON, 20th April 1836.

I HAVE learned with great pleasure that you are a candidate for the Professorship of Logic in the University of Edinburgh; and I wish that I could persuade others, as entirely as I am myself persuaded, that your success would be a great public benefit.

I believe you know, that I have not paid so much attention to the study of Phrenology in detail as might have been expected from my opportunities. But I have been long most thoroughly convinced of the truth and correctness of its analysis of the human mind; and I am certain that it would thus confer lasting honour on the Patrons of the Uni-



versity of Edinburgh, to be the first to give it a place among the academical studies of the country. That it will eventually come to this I have not the least doubt ; and there would be a peculiar propriety in the example being first set in Edinburgh. But whether this shall be now, or a little later, depends on these gentlemen ; and I wish I could think it possible that any profession of my individual faith in the science, could have an influence in determining them to take the bolder course.

I have, however, written to our friend Trevelyan, who is now in Rome, asking him to join me in making the attempt ; and his known character as a scholar, and long residence in Edinburgh, should his answer reach me in time, may have some weight. Of the nature of that answer I can have no doubt ; knowing, as I do, the extreme interest that he takes, both in your own individual success, and in that of a branch of human knowledge which you have almost made yours, by your long-continued and successful advocacy of it, under the most trying circumstances.

I shall write again, therefore, as soon as I hear from him ; and, meanwhile, with every good wish for your success, in which many here join me, I remain, my Dear Sir, yours very truly and faithfully,

A. MACONCHIE.

XXII. FROM ANDREW COMBE, M.D., Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh, and Physician in Ordinary to their Majesties the King and Queen of the Belgians.

BEFORE expressing any opinion on the subject of Phrenology as the science of Mind, I think it proper to confess that, for nearly two years after I first heard of Dr Gall's discovery of the Physiology of the Brain, I not only disbelieved its reality, but treated it with ridicule and contempt. Circumstances, however, then occurred which induced me to

examine the doctrines more seriously, and to verify the facts on which they were said to be based. In following this more rational course, the first result at which I arrived was the mortifying conviction of my having been previously entirely ignorant of their real nature and evidences, and employed in ridiculing fancies of my own which I believed to be phrenology, but which had scarcely any resemblance to it. In proportion as my knowledge advanced and my observations were extended, the impression became the stronger, that the leading principles and facts of Phrenology were not only demonstrably true, but, like all other great truths, fraught with the most important consequences to human improvement, and to the prevention and alleviation of human suffering; because they were directly applicable to the sciences of medicine, education, and morals—including in the latter civil and criminal legislation, the regulation of the practical duties of life, the extension of true religion, and every thing in short in which human nature is concerned, either as the agent or as the object acted upon.

Sixteen years have now elapsed since the above conviction became deeply rooted in my mind; and it is worthy of remark, that it arose against the influence of prejudice, and against what I then believed to be my worldly interest; for in common with many of my friends, I imagined that, in the then state of public opinion, any open avowal of belief in Phrenology would be detrimental to my success in life. The probability, therefore, was the greater, that, in embracing it, I was not carried away by enthusiasm, but yielding solely to the force of evidence.

My whole subsequent experience has confirmed the opinion I then formed of the truth of the new philosophy, and greatly increased my sense of its importance to mankind; as constituting, in fact, that science of Mind which has been so long, so ardently, and, till now, so unsuccessfully sought after by the ablest men of every succeeding age. It is the only basis on which a true system of Logic can be erected. This, indeed, follows as a necessary consequence, if its own

truth be admitted : because Logic treats of the intellectual powers, and of their right use; and if the number, nature, and laws of action, of these powers are not previously known and explained, it is impossible to treat successfully of the means best adapted for their cultivation and right employment. Accordingly, the very first step taken by every Professor of Logic, is to unfold some theory of Mental Philosophy as his groundwork ; and from the failure of every such attempt antecedent to the discovery of Phrenology, Logic has hitherto remained an abstract and valueless subject, productive of few beneficial results beyond the mere mental exercise involved in its study. Phrenology, however, by presenting us with a true theory of mind, enables us for the first time to render Logic, as a science, useful, consistent, and intelligible to all persons of ordinary capacities and attainments ; which, in my humble opinion, it can never become until it is taught on phrenological principles.

In thus expressing so decidedly my conviction of what Phrenology is, I am only acquitting a small portion of the debt of gratitude which I owe it, not merely for teaching me the better use of my own faculties (the chief aim of Logic), but for solving many difficulties which formerly troubled and perplexed me. Even in a purely medical point of view, there is scarcely any branch of knowledge which has been more constantly and extensively useful to me, especially in the treatment of the numerous and afflicting class of mental and nervous affections ; and there is consequently none which I should be more unwilling to surrender, if I were compelled to make the sacrifice of any. But having already published my sentiments on these subjects at some length, and considering myself restricted at present to the consideration of the relation between Phrenology and Logic, I refrain from going into farther detail.

ANDREW COMBE.

BRUSSELS, 18th April 1836.

**XXIII.** From Professor BROUSSAIS of the Faculty of Medicine of Paris ; Dr BESSIERES, of the Faculty of Paris, Member of the Anthropological Society, author of " An Introduction to the Study of Phrenology," &c. ; M. DAVID RICHARD, Member of the Society of Natural Sciences of France, and of the Anthropological and Phrenological Societies of Paris ; Dr CASIMIR BROUSSAIS, Physician and Professor to the Val de-Grâce, Agrégé et Professeur Suppléant d' Hygiène to the Faculty of Medicine of Paris, Member of several Learned Societies, and Vice-President of the Phrenological Society of Paris ; Dr J. ROBERTON, Member of several Learned Societies, and President of the Anthropological Society of Paris ; Dr FOSSATI, President of the Phrenological Society of Paris, Member of several Learned Societies, formerly Clinical Professor, and Director of several Italian Hospitals ; M. BOUILLAUD, Professor of Clinical Medicine to the Faculty of Paris ; M. TURPIN, Member of the French Institute ; M. JULES CLOQUET, Professor to the Faculty of Medicine of Paris, and Surgeon to the Hospital of St Louis ; M. SANSON (Aîné), Surgeon of the Hôtel-Dieu, Paris ; M. PELTIER, President of the Society of Natural Sciences and Member of the Philomathic Society ; M. FREDERICK LEO, Paris ; Dr FERRUS, Physician to the Hospital of Bicêtre, Professor of Clinical Medicine on the Diseases of the Nervous System, &c. ; Dr JOSEPH VIMONT, of the Faculty of Paris, Honorary Member of the Phrenological Societies of London, Edinburgh, Boston, &c., and Author of a " Treatise on Human and Comparative Phrenology ;" Dr GAUBERT, Ex-Professor of the University of France, Knight of the Royal Order of the Legion of Honour, Principal Editor of the Journal of the Phrenological Society of Paris, Member of the Anthropological Society, &c. ; M. DUMOUTIER, Anatomical Assistant to the Faculty of Medicine of Paris, and Honorary Member of several Learned Societies ; and Dr FELIX VOISIN, of

the Faculty of Paris, Physician to several Hospitals of that City, Founder of the Establishment at Vauvres for the Treatment of the Insane, and Founder of the Orthophrenic Establishment.

PARIS, le 16 Avril 1836.

LA Chaire de Logique d'Edimbourg étant dans le cas d'être vacante, les soussignés seraient vivement satisfaits qu'elle fût remplie par un homme nourri des doctrines phrenologiques; car la Phrenologie étant à leurs yeux la science des facultés humaines la plus certaine et la plus complete, ils pensent que tout bon système de logique ne saurait être plus fermement basé que sur l'étude approfondie de cette science. C'est en témoignage de leurs désirs et de leur conviction sur ce point qu'ils ont transmis la présente déclaration a Monsieur George Combe, l'un de plus chauds et des plus habiles propagateurs de la philosophie positive de l'observation, fondée par Gall et perfectionnée par Spurzheim.

BROUSSAIS, Professeur à la Faculté de Médecine de Paris, forme des vœux pour que M. Combe obtienne la Chaire de Logique d'ont il s'agit. Elle ne peut être remplie par un homme plus en état de faire faire de grands et rapides progrès à la philosophie positive.

BESSIERES, Dr Med. de la Faculté de Paris; Membre de la Société Anthropologique, Auteur de l'Introduction à l'Etude de la Phrenologie, &c.

DAVID RICHARD, Membre de la Société des Sciences Naturelles de France, de la Société Anthropologique de Paris, et de la Société Phrenologique de Paris.

CASIMIR BROUSSAIS, Medecin et Professeur au Val-de-Grâce, Agrégé et Professeur suppléant d'Hygiène à la Faculté de Médecine de Paris, Membre de plusieurs sociétés savantes, Vice-President de la Société Phrenologique de Paris.

J. ROBERTON, M. D., Membre de plusieurs sociétés savantes, Président de la Société Anthropologique de Paris.

FOSSATI, President de la Société Phrenologique de Paris, Membre de plusieurs sociétés savantes, Ancien Professeur de Clinique, et Directeur de plusieurs Hopitaux en Italie.

Je me réunis à M. le Professeur Broussais, et à mes autres confrères, dans le vœu qu'ils forment pour que M. Combe obtienne la Chaire de Logique qu'il sollicite, et qui convient si bien au genre de travaux, et à la haute capacité philosophique de ce savant confrère.—BOUILLAUD, Professeur de Clinique Médicale à la Faculté de Paris.

**TURPIN**, Membre de l'Institut de France.

Je pense que M. George Combe convient parfaitement à la Chaire de Logique vacante à Edimbourg, et que ses connaissances dans la Science Phrénologique lui seront d'une grande utilité pour remplir dignement cette place.—**JULES CLOQUET**.

Je me réunis bien volontiers au sentiment de mes collègues MM. Broussais, Bouillaud, &c., et je pense que personne mieux que M. Combe ne pouvait remplir la Chaire vacante. **SANSON (Aîné)**.

**PELTIER**, Président de la Société des Sciences Naturelles, et Membre de la Société Philomatique.

**FREDERIC LEO**.

Les ouvrages publiés par M. Combe me font présumer qu'il est fort apte à populariser les connaissances philosophiques.—**FERRUS**, Médecin de l'Hospice de Bicêtre, Professeur particulier de Médecine Clinique sur les Maladies du Système Nerveux, &c.

Je considère M. Georges Combe comme la seule personne capable de remplir dignement et convenablement la Chaire de Logique vacante à Edimbourg.—**J. VIMONT**, D. M. de la Faculté de Paris ; Membre honoraire des Sociétés Phrénologiques de Londres, Edimbourg, Boston, &c.

**GAUBERT**, Ex-professeur de l'Université de France, Docteur en Médecine, Chevalier de l'Ordre Royal de la Légion d'Honneur ; Rédacteur principal du Journal de la Société Phrénologique de Paris ; Membre de la Société Anthropologique, &c.

Je souhaite ardemment pour les progrès des sciences morales et de la philosophie, et pour le bien-être de l'humanité, qu'un homme d'un mérite aussi éminent, et qui a rendu si importants services, soit appelé par tous ses concitoyens à occuper la Chaire de Logique vacante à Edimbourg ; et je joins mes vœux à ceux de mes confrères et de tous les vrais amis de l'humanité, pour que M. George Combe reçoive la nomination à laquelle ses

travaux et son savoir lui ont acquis des droits incontestables.—DUMOUTIER, Aide d'Anatomie à la Faculté de Médecine de Paris; Membre titulaire de plusieurs sociétés savantes.

FELIX VOISIN, Docteur de la Faculté de Paris, Médecin des Hôpitaux de la même ville, Fondateur de l'Etablissement à Vauvres pour le traitement des Alienés, et Fondateur de l'Etablissement Orthophrénique.\*

\* TRANSLATION.

The Logic Chair of Edinburgh being now vacant, the undersigned will derive much satisfaction from seeing it filled by a man imbued with the phrenological doctrines; for Phrenology being in their opinion the most certain and complete science of the faculties of man, they consider that a good system of Logic cannot be more firmly based than upon the profound study of that science. It is in testimony of their desires and conviction on this point that they have transmitted the present declaration to Mr George Combe, one of the warmest and most able diffusers of the positive philosophy of observation founded by Gall and improved by Spurzheim.

BROUSSAIS, Professor to the Faculty of Medicine of Paris, hopes that Mr Combe will obtain the Chair of Logic in question. It cannot be filled by a man better qualified to cause a great and rapid advancement of the positive philosophy.

BESSIERES, M. D. &c. &c.

DAVID RICHARD, &c. &c.

CASIMIR BROUSSAIS, &c. &c.

J. ROBERTON, &c. &c.

FOSSATI, &c. &c.

I concur with Professor Broussais and my other brethren in their wish that Mr Combe may obtain the Chair of Logic for which he is a candidate, and which is so well adapted to the nature of the labours and the high philosophical abilities of that learned individual.—BOUILLAUD, &c. &c.

TURPIN, Member of the French Institute.

I am of opinion that Mr Combe is excellently qualified for the vacant Chair of Logic at Edinburgh, and that his phrenological knowledge will be of great utility in enabling him to fill creditably that situation.—JULES CLOQUET.

I most willingly concur in the sentiments of my colleagues Messrs BROUSSAIS, BOUILLAUD, &c., and consider that no one is better fitted than Mr Combe to occupy the vacant Chair of Logic.—SANSON (Aîné).

PELTIER, &c. &c.

The works published by Mr Combe lead me to infer that he is well qualified to communicate philosophical knowledge in a popular manner.—FERRUS, &c. &c.

I consider

**XXIV. Extrait du Discours prononcé à la Séance Annuelle de la Société Phrénologique de Paris, par M. le Professeur ANDRAL, Président, Professeur à la Faculté de Médecine de Paris, &c. &c. Avril 1835.**

“ Dans tout ce que j’ai dit, Messieurs, je n’ai eu qu’un but, c’est celui de prouver que la science dont Gall est le fondateur, et à laquelle le nom de Phrénologie a été imposé, doit faire désormais partie des études graves et sérieuses de la physiologie. La question n’est pas de savoir si, dans la détermination des organes encéphaliques, il y a eu erreur de la part de Gall ou de ses successeurs. Quand même aucun de ces organes n’auroit encore été trouvé, les bases mêmes de la science n’en existeraient pas moins.” “ Si, d’ailleurs, le science phrénologique a pour elle la vérité, ne vous embarrassez pas de son avenir ; car il n’y a pas d’exemple d’une vérité qui, une fois lancée dans le monde, n’y ait fait son chemin. Mais il faut d’abord qu’elle y paie son droit d’entrée ; il faut qu’on se dérange pour lui faire place, et cela est du goût de fort peu de personnes. Elle a d’ailleurs le tort grave d’être plus jeune que ceux qu’elle prétend éclairer. Mais laissez-la faire ; elle saura merveilleusement jeter derrière elle tous les obstacles

---

I consider Mr George Combe as the only person capable of worthily and suitably filling the vacant Chair of Logic at Edinburgh.—J. VIMONT, &c. &c.

GAUBERT, &c. &c.

I ardently desire, for the sake of the progress of moral science and philosophy, and the well-being of the human race, that a man of such eminent merit, and who has rendered such important services, may be unanimously called by his fellow-citizens to occupy the vacant Chair of Logic at Edinburgh ; and I join with my brethren, and with all true friends of humanity, in wishing that Mr George Combe may receive the appointment to which his works and attainments have so incontestably entitled him.—DUMOUTIER, &c. &c.

FELIX VOISIN, Doctor of the Faculty of Paris, Physician to several Hospitals of that City, Founder of the Establishment at Vauvres for the Treatment of the Insane, and Founder of the Orthophrenic Establishment.



qu'on lui oppose. La terre n'est pas devenue immobile comme l'astre autour duquel elle gravite, parcequ'il y a trois ou quatre siècles, on défendit à Galilée d'annoncer que la terre tournait; et la circulation du sang n'a pas cessé d'exister, pour avoir été opiniâtement niée bien des années encore après avoir été découverte." \*

---

XXV. From Dr W. F. EDWARDS, F.R.S., Member of the  
Institute of France.

PARIS, 26th April 1836.

THE relation between mind and body is by far the most interesting subject of investigation. These two elements of human nature had been the object only of separate study, except to some physicians, with a view to mental

---

\* *Translation.*

Extract from the Discourse of Professor Andral, President of the Phrenological Society of Paris; delivered at the Annual Meeting, in April 1836. Published in the "Journal de la Société Phrénologique de Paris. Troisième année, Avril 1835." P. 210.

In all that I have said, Gentlemen, I have had but one aim, and it is—to prove that the science of which Gall is the founder, and which is known by the name of Phrenology, must henceforward be included among the grave and serious studies of Physiology. The question is not whether Gall or his successors have committed mistakes in determining the functions of the organs of the brain;—even although none of these organs were yet ascertained, the fundamental principles of the science would not on that account exist the less.....If, in short, Phrenology be true, do not concern yourselves about its future success; for there is no example of a truth, once fairly launched, having failed to make its way. It must, however, pay the usual tax of entry; some one must be put to inconvenience in its progress, and few persons are fond of being set aside. It has, moreover, the great fault of being younger than those it claims to enlighten; but let it alone, and it will throw all obstacles behind it with marvellous force. The earth did not become immoveable, like the sun round which it gravitates, because, three or four centuries ago, Galileo was forbidden to declare that it moved; and the circulation of the blood was not arrested by its being obstinately denied for many years subsequent to the labours of Harvey.

C\*

alienation, when Gall directed all the efforts of his sagacious and powerful mind to this question ; the vital importance of which, whatever be the fate of his theory, none can deny. Researches on the subject, if properly conducted, and founded on a judicious comparison of numerous and well-authenticated facts, cannot, whatever be their result with regard to Phrenology, fail of enlarging our knowledge of human nature. No man has, since Gall and Spurzheim, done so much in this respect as Mr Combe,—to whose labours the scientific world, and humanity at large, are much indebted. I am happy of this opportunity of expressing towards him my feelings of esteem and regard, and should be much gratified if my opinion of his merits met with corresponding sympathy among his countrymen, so as to promote his researches, by placing him in a situation useful to him and to the public. Scotland has the honour of having founded the science of the Wealth of Nations—she should be ambitious of adding to her glory, by promoting the first of all studies, that of Man.

W. F. EDWARDS.

---

XXVI. From ALEX. J. D. DORSEY, Esq. Master of the English Department in the High School of Glasgow.

TO GEORGE COMBE, Esq.

DEAR SIR,

26th April 1836.

IN reply to your question regarding the bearing of Phrenology upon Education, I beg to state, that, as Education, properly considered, aims at the proper development and regulation of *man's nature* ; as it is, therefore, absolutely essential to a teacher's success that he should have a GUIDE to the knowledge of *that nature* ; and as Phrenology appears to me not only the plainest, but the most satisfactory *guide* yet discovered, it is my decided opinion, that he who teaches and *trains* upon phrenological principles, will experience a constantly increasing attachment to his profession,

will invariably secure the affectionate esteem of his pupils, and will, as a necessary consequence, succeed in giving them a thorough EDUCATION, moral, intellectual, and physical. I write this not in a theorizing spirit, but from several years' extensive experience.

To enter into details would be here impossible. I may, however, briefly state, that the principle of presenting to the faculties the objects to which they are respectively related, is of itself truly invaluable in guiding the teacher to the end he has in view. Acting on this excellent principle, I have not merely employed such physical objects as tended to develop the *knowing faculties*, but have also habitually exercised the pupils in the use of their reflecting powers. In teaching morals, too, I consider *mere instruction* as very inferior to *training*. For instance, instead of *telling* a boy to be charitable, I direct his Benevolence to a suitable *object*; instead of commanding him to be just, I exercise his Conscientiousness by making him act as a juryman in deciding the petty cases of the school; and thus he *learns by practice* what others *fancy they have learned* by theory.

In History, the use of Phrenology is truly valuable. In fact, till I knew something of this beautiful system of mental philosophy, I never taught History properly, or, I may add, any thing else.

I have the honour to be, dear Sir, yours respectfully,

ALEX. J. D. DORSEY.

XXVII. From S. HARE, Esq., Proprietor and Medical Attendant of the Retreat for the Insane near Leeds.

26. EAST PARADE, LEEDS,

23d April 1836.

MY LORD PROVOST AND GENTLEMEN,

It affords me sincere pleasure to find that Mr Combe is a Candidate for the vacant office of "Professor of Logic" in the University of Edinburgh.

Having for many years studied the science of Phrenology,

c 2

and found it practically useful, I am satisfied that it has unfolded principles from which a Science or Philosophy of Mind has been deduced, infinitely superior to the one commonly taught in the schools; and consequently I consider Mr Combe eminently qualified, on account of his extensive phrenological and general knowledge, for the important situation.

It is but justice to Mr C. to state, that few publications have done more to enlighten and benefit man than those with which he has favoured the public; and his labours during many years as a Lecturer, and otherwise, in promulgating information most beneficial to the best interests of his fellow-men, are truly invaluable, and cannot but be highly estimated not only by his fellow-citizens, but by every lover of the human race; hence it will be a source of great satisfaction to me to learn that your Lordship and the Council of the City of Edinburgh have placed Mr C. in the highly honourable situation to which he aspires; for which, on account of his well-known habits of industry, perseverance, and high acquirements, he is so well calculated, and so justly entitled.

Feeling it a duty to bear this testimony to the Science of Phrenology, and to the profound and varied talents of the candidate for the office before named, I have the honour to be, my Lord and Gentlemen, very respectfully, your obedient,

S. HARE.

To the LORD PROVOST and COUNCIL  
of the CITY of EDINBURGH.

---

XXVIII. From Dr WILLIAM WEIR, Lecturer on the Practice of Medicine at the Portland Street Medical School, Glasgow, formerly Surgeon to the Royal Infirmary, and one of the Editors of the Glasgow Medical Journal.

BUCHANAN STREET,  
GLASGOW, 15th April 1836.

I HAVE much pleasure in bearing testimony to the very superior talents and high attainments of George Combe,

Esq. of Edinburgh. I have been personally acquainted with him for some time, have frequently heard him lecture, and am intimately conversant with his various writings on the Science of Mind.

Being myself firmly convinced, after many years' study of the subject, and numerous observations, that Phrenology is the true Philosophy of the Mind, I have taught it, in my lectures delivered to medical students, as the correct physiology of the brain; and I consider it impossible to give a proper view of the functions of the brain on any other but phrenological principles. In my Lectures on the Practice of Medicine, also, I have, during the last five years, applied the principles of this science towards the elucidating the nature and treatment of Insanity.

I have no hesitation in further stating my opinion, that an acquaintance with Phrenology must be eminently useful to the successful teaching of any branch of knowledge connected with the human faculties; and that, therefore, the application of its principles to the exposition of the subjects treated of in a course of logic is absolutely necessary, and highly conducive to the proper understanding of that science.

Holding these opinions, I consider Mr Combe, from his splendid talents, his vigorous and enlightened understanding, and his very superior attainments in philosophy, to be eminently qualified for the Logic Chair in the University of Edinburgh. I know that he has devoted a great portion of his time, for the last twenty years, to the study and the teaching of mental science, and that he has been very successful as a public instructor. As a lecturer his language is forcible, yet plain and simple; his demonstrations are always clear and easily understood, and his arguments at once logical and convincing. He possesses, in a very high degree, that aptness for teaching,—that power of communicating knowledge to others, so very essential to the instructor of youth; and also the capability of fixing the attention of an audience, so necessary to render the subject interesting, and

the lecturer popular with his pupils. I have heard few lecturers who could equal Mr Combe in these particulars.

Of Mr Combe's publications it is scarcely necessary for me to speak. They are in the hands of thousands. The "System of Phrenology," and "The Constitution of Man considered in relation to External Objects," are his two great works. In the former the principles of Phrenology are maintained with evidence and illustrations equally appropriate and conclusive, and with the dignity and strict accuracy of pure inductive science. It is truly a comprehensive system of mental philosophy, and contains rules for facilitating improvement in every thing connected with human happiness—education, prison-discipline, legislation, and morals. It only requires to be read by a mind free from hypothetical notions and the prejudice of authority, to bring conviction to the understanding. The "Constitution of Man" is a true exposition of the laws of the Creator as applicable to mankind, and contains a mass of information which cannot be obtained in any other work. The views of human nature laid down in this treatise are perspicuous and profound, and its tendency has always appeared to me in the highest degree useful and excellent; for it inculcates, in the strongest and most impressive language, and in a style level to the meanest capacity, the high importance of cultivating the moral and intellectual faculties, and keeping in due subjection the impulses from the lower propensities. These two publications are sufficient to stamp Mr Combe as a writer of the very highest class. The subjects are treated with the vigour and eloquence of a master, and every page exhibits a mind powerful, discriminative, and just. I must be permitted to add, that the perusal of these and his other writings has been to me the source of much instruction, and very great pleasure; and it consists with my knowledge, that they have afforded the same to very many within my own circle.

WILL. WEIR.

**XXIX.** From Dr ROBERT HUNTER, Professor of Anatomy and Physiology in the Andersonian University, Glasgow.

GLASGOW, 25th April 1836.

I HAVE had ample opportunity of ascertaining the character of Mr George Combe both as a lecturer and a philosopher. I have attended a course of his lectures on Phrenology, and perused nearly all that he has published on subjects connected with the science of mind. The lectures of Mr Combe are characterized by simplicity, clearness, elegance, and cogency of reasoning; and his writings are remarkable not only for purity of style, but for sound philosophy and right moral feeling. The mind of Mr Combe is of a high order, and adequate to the successful cultivation of any department of mental philosophy. I have no doubt he will excel as a teacher of Logic, for he has studied most profoundly the operations of the human mind, and under the refulgent lights of Phrenology.

The appointment of Mr Combe to the Chair of Logic now vacant in the University of Edinburgh, would, I conceive, add to the high character which that University has already attained, and be productive of national advantages.

ROBERT HUNTER.

**XXX.** From ALEXANDER HOOD, Esq., Surgeon, Kilmarnock.

MR GEORGE COMBE, a candidate for the Professorship of Logic in the University of Edinburgh, has been known to me for many years, as a gentleman possessed of distinguished talents, great acuteness, and deep metaphysical research. He is the able advocate and assiduous cultivator of the Philosophy of the Mind first made known to the world by Drs Gall and Spurzheim.

Believing, as I do, that Phrenology is the true science of the mind, a science which comprises all the primary functions of the brain, whether they may be for the acquisition of knowledge, the regulation of the conduct as a moral agent, or simply for supplying the wants and cravings of animal nature, I know no individual so capable of analyzing these elements of human actions, separating truth from error, and giving instructions in this most important department of knowledge (or of a good education), as Mr Combe. His various publications on this subject and on ethics have acquired for him a distinguished name in the literature of his country, and conferred on him a European reputation.

The style of his lecturing is solemn and dignified, precise and perspicuous, well suited to the treatment of the subjects which come under discussion, and rendered so intelligible as to be understood without much effort on the part of the student. Phrenology seems at no very distant date destined to supersede all the other systems of the philosophy of the mind which have preceded it ; and should the Patrons of the University deem it meet to give a wider range to the practical advantages which must necessarily result from a more extensive diffusion of the knowledge of the doctrines of which Mr Combe is the able expositor, I am confident that his talents, assiduity, integrity, and enthusiasm would advance the best interests of humanity, and confer honour on the Chair to which he aspires.

ALEX. HOOD, Surgeon.

KILMARNOCK, 22d April 1836.

---

XXXI. From JOHN MILLER, Esq., Surgeon, Kilmarnock.

KILMARNOCK, 26th April 1836.

UNDERSTANDING that the Logic Chair in the University of Edinburgh is at present vacant, and that Mr George Combe has declared himself a candidate for it, chiefly upon the ground of his qualifications as a Phrenologist ; I beg leave respectfully to offer my humble mite of support to his



pretensions. I have no hesitation in avowing my decided conviction that Phrenology is the *true* Philosophy of the Mind, and may therefore, with the greatest propriety and advantage, be substituted for the *metaphysical* system of it hitherto taught in our seminaries;—that Mr Combe, unquestionably the first of our living Phrenologists, has, by his printed works and public lectures, proved himself qualified to be an able and successful teacher of his favourite science;—and that, by his long and powerful advocacy of Phrenology, amid the scorn and derision with which he has been so virulently and so unjustly assailed, he has well earned a title to the honour of being the first to promulgate its doctrines in the halls and under the sanction of our Metropolitan University.

JOHN MILLER.

---

XXXII. From Dr J. S. COMBE, Member of the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh.

To GEORGE COMBE, Esq.

MY DEAR SIR,

LEITH, 25th April 1836.

I AM glad to learn that you are a candidate for the Chair of Logic, and I earnestly hope that the Patrons will embrace the opportunity of securing your great talents, and thus testify their sense of your extraordinary exertions in the diffusion of the true philosophy of mind.

I can imagine no individual aspiring to the honour who can stand less in need of the recommendation of his friends. For many years you have, with a zeal arising from a firm conviction of the truth of the doctrines you have taught, and with an active benevolence which your opponents have at last found could not be checked, laboured spontaneously and unremittingly in unfolding the great truths of mental philosophy, and the intimate connexion that exists between mind and body.

That your metaphysical powers are of the first character

is not less true than the admirable facility with which you can explain to others the knowledge you possess; and, in appointing you, the Patrons will therefore not only select an eminent philosopher, but a distinguished teacher.

I am, my dear Sir, most truly yours,

J. S. COMBE.

XXXIII. From GEORGE SALMOND, Esq. Procurator-Fiscal of Lanarkshire; WALTER MOIR, Esq. Sheriff-Substitute of Lanarkshire; and Mr D. M'COLL, Governor of Glasgow Jail.

To GEORGE COMBE, Esq.

DEAR SIR,

SHERIFF'S CHAMBERS,  
GLASGOW, 22d April 1836.

A FEW days ago Sheriff Moir having told me of your intention to examine phrenologically some of the criminals in Glasgow jail, I expressed a wish to be present, in order that I might have a practical test of the system, and ascertain whether your inferences of character should accord with what was privately and officially known of them by myself; and Mr Moir having kindly honoured me with an introduction to you, I had the gratification of attending your examination of a number of these persons, and of hearing with sincere interest the accurate conclusions you arrived at on each of them.

Never before having witnessed such an operation, and expecting that, after a tedious process of examination, taking notes, and comparing and calculating results, something of an oracular generality of character should be announced, I was very much pleased to observe, that while your examination of each did not average a minute, you instantly, and without hesitation, stated the character, not generally, but with specialties of feelings and propensities, surprisingly justified by what I knew of them; and being aware that you had no access to them, nor means of knowing them previously, as they were taken at the moment promiscuously from

numbers of the other criminals, I was at once led to a conviction of the truth of the science, and to see eminent advantages of such knowledge to society, and more immediately in regard to criminal jurisprudence and practice.

Of the instances of your observation, suffer me to mention a few, which at the time occurred to me as peculiarly convincing.

The first man you examined you pronounced "a thief, reckless and dangerous, who, for instance, if under the influence of liquor, would not hesitate to murder or destroy all around him." Now this fellow has for years travelled about the country with a horse and cart, selling salt and trifling articles, and has acquired the character of a masterful thief, and just now stands indicted with a cruel assault on, and highway robbery of, a poor labourer, of all his hard earnings last harvest.

Another, you observed, had "a fine intellect, and was likely to have been guilty of swindling;" and the accuracy of this observation on a *painter*, who is indicted for *falsehood, fraud, and wilful imposition, or swindling*, is self-evident.

A third, whom you pronounced "a cunning, *daring*, and decided thief," is an incorrigible thief, who for years has, in the most concealed and adroit manner, headed a gang of housebreakers, and is at present indicted for highway robbery, committed by his savagely knocking down with a heavy stob a poor man, who was almost killed on the spot. Private information leads me to understand that he has been party to another crime, of a nature equally, if not more, *daring* and *cruel*.

A fourth you described to be "a depraved and most dangerous man." He is a crony of the man last noticed; has long been a thief, and was one of the most noted corpse-lifters while subjects were bought by the medical schools; and he is said to have been concerned with the man last mentioned in the atrocious crime alluded to at the close of the observations as to him.

A fifth, whom you judged to be "a sly thief, who, with

a meek and specious aspect, possessed daring even to cruelty," is a fellow who is by trade a thief, adroit and cunning, and who has often attacked and escaped from the officers of justice. He lately stole, in broad day-light, on the streets of Glasgow, a silk handkerchief from a gentleman's pocket, and ran off. Being promptly pursued, he, as a decoy, threw from him the napkin. Being after a race overtaken, he leapt into a dung-pit, whither the gentleman could not think of following him, but stood watching him till the police he sent for arrived. On this the fellow in the most fawning manner craved sympathy, and finding this did not move the gentleman's purpose, he suddenly sprung out, and, on being seized, made a desperate struggle, bit severely the gentleman's hand, and, by his force and violence, might soon have got off had not the police arrived.

The accuracy of your conclusions has deeply impressed me with the benefit which would accrue to society from the application of such investigations toward the better classification of criminals confined before and after trial, to the selection and treatment of convicts, and even to the more certain identification of such criminals as might effect their escape from justice or confinement.

With much regard, believe me to be, dear Sir, yours most faithfully,\*

GEO. SALMOND,  
Pror.-Fiscal of Lanarkshire.

We were present on the occasion of Mr Combe's visit to the Jail of Glasgow, and testify to the perfect accuracy of Mr Salmond's representation of what happened. Mr Combe's inferences of the characters of such prisoners as he then examined, were most accurate, and never could have been the result of chance.

WALTER MOIR,  
Sheriff-Subst. of Lanarkshire.  
D. M'COLL,  
Governor of Glasgow Jail.

\* See additional Letter from Mr Salmond, p. 60.

**XXXIV.** From Dr JOHN MACKINTOSH, Surgeon to the Ordnance Department in North Britain, Lecturer on the Principles of Pathology and Practice of Physic, Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh, Member of the Medico-Chirurgical and Wernerian Natural History Societies of Edinburgh, of Montreal, Heidelberg, and Brussels.

TO GEORGE COMBE, Esq.

MY DEAR SIR,

EDINBURGH, 27th April 1836.

I HAVE received your letter announcing your intention of offering yourself as a candidate for the Chair of Logic, now vacant, in the University of Edinburgh ; and it is with very great pleasure that I bear testimony to your talents, zeal, and industry, and that you possess the rare power of communicating knowledge to others.

I have perused your works, and have frequently heard you lecture with great delight and advantage. Several times I have witnessed your uncommon coolness, acumen, and fairness in public discussions regarding the truth of that Science of which you are undoubtedly the greatest living advocate. The more closely I study nature, in health and disease, the more firm are my convictions of the soundness of phrenological doctrines. I regard Phrenology as the true basis of the Science of Mind, and as such am persuaded it will be found highly conducive to the successful teaching of Logic.

I know no one who has devoted the energies of his mind to the careful study of Phrenology who has not become a convert, and I anticipate, at no very distant date, the triumph of truth over the prejudices which have been so assiduously heaped upon the science by crafty men, or those quite ignorant of the subject. I have a high opinion of the moral and religious effect your works and lectures have al-

ready produced ; while your honourable principles, talents, and inductive method of reasoning, eminently qualify you for the important situation to which you aspire.

Wishing you success, I am, My dear Sir, yours faithfully,

JOHN MACKINTOSH.

XXXV. From ANDREW CARMICHAEL, Esq. M. R. I. A.  
Dublin.

MY DEAR SIR,

24. RUTLAND SQUARE,  
15th April 1836.

THE hopes I entertain of seeing you before long in the occupation of the Chair of Logic in your University are attended with redoubled gratification when I consider the interests of science, of society, or your own. No individual, I am bold to say, in any country, is better qualified than you are to explain the phenomena of mind, and their bearings upon legislation and government, education and morals, insanity and idiocy. No unprejudiced man who has read your various *disquisitions on Phrenology*, but must be satisfied of the truth of your views and the profoundness of your philosophy—or your *Constitution of Man*, without the almost certain anticipation that a new era awaits us, most beneficial to mankind, and that to confer on you the professorship in question will be to hasten the blessing.

I am not singular in these sentiments, and I have had an opportunity of knowing how many distinguished men hold the highest opinion of your intellectual powers and the use you make of them. When I did myself the honour to propose you as an honorary member of the Royal Irish Academy, our celebrated astronomer, Sir William Hamilton, Dr Litton, Professor of Botany of the Dublin Society, and one of the Vice-presidents of the Royal Irish Academy, and the Very Rev. Henry Dawson, Dean of St Patrick's, were all

desirous to place their names beside mine in certifying your qualifications on this occasion. There is nothing peculiar in this certificate, as the same form is always used. I need not therefore supply you with a copy.

With anxious wishes for your success, I remain, my dear Sir, very faithfully, &c.

A. CARMICHAEL.

XXXVI. From Dr JOHN ELLIOTSON, F. R. S., President of the Royal Medical and Chirurgical, and of the London Phrenological Societies; Professor of the Principles and Practice of Medicine and of Clinical Medicine, and Dean of Faculty, in the University of London; Senior Physician of the North London Hospital; Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of London; formerly Physician to St Thomas's Hospital, and President of the Royal Medical Society of Edinburgh, &c. &c. &c.

CONDUIT STREET, LONDON,  
*April 23. 1836.*

Dr ELLIOTSON takes the opportunity of a distinguished phrenologist offering himself for the Chair of Logic in the University of Edinburgh, to state, that metaphysics, or mental philosophy, have formed a favourite study with him from his youth, and that he has carefully read a large number of the best writers on the subject,—but that he feels convinced of the phrenological being the only sound view of the mind, and of Phrenology being as true, as founded in fact, as the science of Astronomy or Chemistry. Twenty years have elapsed since his attention was first directed to it, and, during the whole period, a day has not passed without some portion being devoted to its consideration. His opinions have been published in his notes to a translation of Blumenbach's Physiology, which has gone through many editions, as well as in papers which have appeared in periodicals. He

always taught it in his lectures upon insanity when he had the Chair of the Practice of Medicine in St Thomas's Hospital; and notwithstanding this was stated, he understands, to the University of London when he offered himself for the Chair of the Practice of Medicine in that Institution, he was unanimously elected to that chair, and has not only discussed the subject of insanity there, ever since, upon phrenological principles, as the only ones by which a person can have any knowledge of insanity, but has premised a statement and defence of Phrenology on arriving at that department of his course. He must add, that none but those who are totally ignorant of Phrenology regard it as a means of merely discovering natural powers and dispositions by external signs. Those who have studied it know, indeed, that the natural powers and dispositions are, *cæteris paribus*, in conformity with the size of the various parts of the brain; but they know likewise, that Phrenology unfolds the only satisfactory account of the mind, human and brute; that it contributes to establish the surest foundation for legislation, education, and morals, and presents a large department of nature in the noblest, grandest, and the only satisfactory point of view; and that those who reject or neglect Phrenology, are lamentably ignorant of much which they fancy they know, and deprive themselves not only of much intellectual delight, but of much practical utility; and, compared with phrenologists, remain as men of some centuries past.

If such is Phrenology, he feels justified in expressing his opinion, that no one could be found more fitted for the Chair of Logic than Mr Combe, and scarcely any one so fit.

---

XXXVII. From JAMES SIMPSON, Esq. Advocate.

To GEORGE COMBE, Esq.

MY DEAR SIR,

EDINBURGH, 26th April 1836.

I MAY be a partial friend as to your personal merits, but if it will have any effect on the Patrons of the Logic



Chair, I am happy to offer my testimony to the value of the Philosophy of Mind which you teach. I have long seen and felt its truth, and there can be but one analysis of the mental powers true. I was examined for seven days, four hours a day, by the Irish Education Committee of the House of Commons, last August, and endeavoured to detail to them a systematic philosophy of education; and I have the satisfaction to say, that my whole testimony was based on, and stated results to which I had been led by, that philosophy. My evidence extends to one hundred and fifteen folio printed pages in the report, and has been printed *documentarily* in the appendix of the English Committee, before which I was not examined.

I am very faithfully yours,

JAMES SIMPSON, Advocate.

XXXVIII. From the Honourable D. G. HALLYBURTON,  
M.P. for Forfarshire.

To the Right Hon. the LORD PROVOST.

20. GROSVENOR STREET WEST, GROSVENOR PLACE,  
*April 26. 1836.*

MY LORD PROVOST,

I HAVE recently been informed by my friend Mr Geo. Combe of Edinburgh, that he is a Candidate for the Chair of Logic, now vacant in your University, and he has done me the honour to request, that I, in common with some others, should state my opinion of his qualifications for that honourable appointment. I trust your Lordship will forgive the *method* I am taking to do this, which Mr Combe left to myself.

I need scarcely, I think, appeal to your Lordship, or to others of the Gentlemen who sit with you in the Town Council, that wherever Mr Combe is known (and he is very generally known in the Scotch metropolis), there is but one opinion, and that a very favourable one, of his ample qualifications, for filling with credit to himself, benefit to his pu-

D\*

pils, and honour to any learned body who should adopt him, the Chair of *such* a Professorship as that of Logic. I need not, I am persuaded, state to your Lordship, that those inquiring and competent judges, who have dispassionately, and with the sole love of truth, investigated the subject, agree almost to a man in maintaining, that Phrenology, as a true science, rests upon evidence that is irrefragable, and next to demonstrative; and that the time is not far off, when all philosophy of mind, which shall not rest upon it as a *basis*, will be put aside as very incomplete, and in so far fallacious.

The appointment of Mr Combe to the vacant chair would not necessarily imply a conviction on the part of each individual elector, that Phrenology is true; all that it would imply would be, that sufficient evidence, on the part of individuals of known intelligence and respectability who had studied it, along with the public fact of its wide diffusion and increasing popularity, had produced in their minds a reasonable presumption, on which, as public men, they are entitled to act, that the science is founded in nature, that it is about to become the standard philosophy of the age; and that the Council are therefore entitled—rather called upon—to take the lead in improvement, by placing an individual distinguished for his knowledge of it, and his powers of teaching it, in the Logic Chair.

The point at issue, then, my Lord Provost, appears to be this,—and I say so with the utmost respect to those who in the present instance are to decide the question,—whether the Magistrates and Town Council of the City of Edinburgh shall proceed a *little* in advance of the opinion and spirit of the age, or some few years hence shall appear to have lagged miserably behind such spirit, in their choice of a *Logical* Professor.

If Mr Combe shall be the fortunate choice of a majority of the Patrons, they may not, it is true, just at present be cheered on by the *unanimous* voice of popular opinion,—the new doctrine not having *yet* the sanction of fashionable ac.

quiescence,—but I would respectfully beg leave to ask your Lordship, whether the Newtonian philosophy, for example, was less true, or less important, towards the latter part of the seventeenth century, when it was carped at and opugned by many a mathematician and self-styled philosopher in Europe, than it was some thirty or forty years later, when enthroned with all academical pomp and honours, in Cambridge, its birth-place and its cradle.

Again disclaiming the slightest disrespect towards your Lordship, and the respectable Body who will act with you in this important election, and begging your Lordship's personal excuse for the trouble I am giving you, I have the honour to be, my Lord Provost, your faithful and very humble servant,

D. G. HALLYBURTON, M. P.

---

XXXIX, FROM WILLIAM HUNTER, Esq. A. M., late Professor of Logic, &c. in the Andersonian University, Glasgow, present Teacher of the Classical Department in the Grammar School of Paisley.

I AM convinced that Phrenology is the true science of the mind. Every other system is defective in enumerating, classifying, and tracing the relations of the faculties.

I consider this science indispensably necessary in teaching any branch of education properly. I find it eminently useful in giving instructions in Ancient and Modern History;—in Greek and Latin, in connexion with our vernacular tongue;—in Logic and Rhetoric, with the analysis of argumentative works on the most dissimilar subjects;—and, it is signally effective in exciting and directing the faculties of the mind without having recourse to corporal punishment, or even a peevish or resentful expression.

In studying history the learner is delighted to discover the different powers of mind which were manifested by any individual, the effects which consequently resulted, and the

D 2

powers of mind which were naturally combined and roused into activity in the community of which he was a member, as well as in the nation he opposed. In turning their attention to Logic and Rhetoric, with the analysis of argumentative writings on various subjects, students are generally not satisfied with the Aristotelian and Baconian philosophy after they have made themselves intimately acquainted with the doctrines of Phrenology. They then see the importance of viewing the faculties as naturally manifesting themselves in various combinations and degrees of activity, and of going beyond the ideas and the language, if they wish to succeed in convincing and persuading.

In prosecuting the study of Greek and Latin in connection with the English language, the capacity of the pupil for learning the *signs alone* is, by means of Phrenology, carefully distinguished from the exercise of the faculties by which the *meaning* of the signs is acquired;—his capacity of judging and feeling, of apprehending the meanings of terms, and the very definitions themselves, is duly appreciated. In this manner the peculiar attention of every pupil is secured, and his peculiar combination of faculties is improved and gratified.

The principles of Phrenology applied to the science of Political Economy were found strikingly useful, as the gentlemen who attended a Course of Lectures I lately delivered are ready to testify. When the faculties of the student are excited and directed,—when their use and abuse,—their relations to the Creator, to external objects, and to one another,—are familiarly explained and illustrated; and when judicious reference, as Phrenology directs, is made to the knowledge thus acquired, as often as a desire for intellectual inactivity or a tendency to perversion of feeling or moral sentiment is evinced, the student whose mind is thus enlightened and addressed, seldom fails to bow with gratitude and respect to his instructor.

I may add briefly—and I state from long and varied experience in teaching—that this science, when its principles

are understood and properly applied, cannot fail to be productive of justice, and benevolence, and piety.

To Mr Combe, author of "The Constitution of Man," &c. &c. I feel chiefly indebted for these views, which guide me pleasantly, and, I trust, not unprofitably, in discharging the duties of my profession; I am, therefore, in duty bound to wish every species of happiness to such a benefactor, and I should rejoice to learn that Mr Combe was elected to fill the Logic Chair in the University of Edinburgh, a situation which it is perhaps not possible to find any other philosopher qualified to hold with equal benefit to the science of Logic, profit to the student, honour to the University, and credit to the Electors.

WILLIAM HUNTER.

GRAMMAR SCHOOL, PAISLEY,  
30th April 1836.

**XL. FROM ALEXANDER MACKINTOSH, Esq. Surgeon Superintendent, Dundee Royal Lunatic Asylum.**

DUNDEE, 29th April 1836.

I HAD heard a great deal about Phrenology, but principally against it, before I went to Wakefield in Yorkshire. When there, I had repeated conversations with Dr and Mrs Ellis of the Lunatic Asylum for the West Riding; and the circumstances in which they were placed, their learning, their talents, their having been long studying insanity, together with the high character they bore for religion and morality, made me pay much attention to what they advanced in favour of the new Philosophy. I afterwards spoke to several eminent medical men in France on the subject, who, if my recollection serves me, agreed, as most people do, in the general principles of the science.

However, some years ago, I determined to look into the subject and judge for myself—the rather, as all that I had heard or read about the mind, its organ, or its manifestations, seemed only to mystify and confuse me, and also in

the hope of deriving some benefit from the pursuit. In this I have not been disappointed. I read some of Dr Spurzheim's publications carefully, but it was Mr George Combe's works that brought about conviction;—his admirable System, at once profound, perspicuous, and concise, dispelled the mist of prejudice, and convinced me that the functions of the brain presented the only true philosophy of mind; and to him I am indebted for knowing what little I do know of that interesting subject.

While Mr Combe's works instructed me by unfolding a system in unison with nature, and explaining satisfactorily what no other system ever did or could do, they also delighted and amused me—and such has been the agreeable impression, that I have recommended them to all and sundry, persuaded as I am that a careful perusal cannot fail to benefit and instruct those who engage in the study; and I am glad to say that my feeble efforts have not gone unrewarded. One of my greatest objections was removed by Sir William and Lady Ellis (now of Hanwell Lunatic Asylum), viz. that Phrenology interfered with the religion of the individual imbibing its principles. This was falsified most completely in their case; for while they advocated the science, they remained the same pious persons they had hitherto been, and all my reading and inquiry have only tended to confirm the truth of this statement.

I regret that I have not had the pleasure of hearing Mr Combe lecture. Some of my relatives and friends, however, on whose judgments I place great reliance, have heard him, and have expressed to me their unqualified approbation of his talents and eloquence as a public lecturer. As far, therefore, as I can judge of his qualifications—as an author—a scholar—a master of the real, of the only true philosophy of mind—I have no hesitation in stating my humble opinion, that he is almost the only individual of his day, at once able, zealous, and willing to fill such a chair as that of Logic in the University of Edinburgh.

ALEXANDER MACKINTOSH.

XLI. From ROBERT CHAMBERS, Esq., one of the Conductors of Chambers's Edinburgh Journal.

ANNE STREET, EDINBURGH,  
May 4. 1836.

THAT the Chair of Logic, now vacant in the University of Edinburgh, should be filled by a professor of the phrenological philosophy, instead of any one who clings to the former expositions of mind, is an object which I consider as of great importance to the community.

Without having had an opportunity of satisfying myself respecting the organology of the science, I consider the scheme of mind which results from it as not only superior to any other hitherto laid before the world, but the only reasonably complete account of human nature which we possess, and the only one which can serve as a basis for any system of instruction. To me Phrenology appears to bear the same relation to the doctrines of even the most recent metaphysicians, which the Copernican astronomy bears to the system of Ptolemy. By this science the faculties of the mind have been for the first time traced to their elementary forms; in it consequently we have at length obtained an instrument, by which ordinary men may readily unravel the complexity of their own thoughts and motives, and the thoughts and motives of others: by this power I conceive that a much greater proportion of mankind may henceforth be able to regulate both their conduct and their reasoning faculties, than have ever been able to do so heretofore. Phrenology may thus be described as a kind of *novissimum organum*—one, I grant, hitherto recognised and used only by a few, but which, I am persuaded, will ultimately become universal, and add immensely to human happiness. Nor is this system of mind so much limited in its acceptance as may be supposed. I have reason to know that, with or without the organology, it is making rapid progress amongst the more thinking portion of the middle and lower ranks; so that, while the elder schools

of mental science never consisted of any but a few learned persons, the new may be considered as tending, without the sanction of the learned, to embrace the great body of the people. Its progress would, in my opinion, have been much greater, if its pretensions as a means of discovering character from external signs had not been ignorantly confounded with those of the false sciences of the middle ages. Were the metaphysics presented alone, this obstacle would be in a great measure overcome, and multitudes who have hitherto regarded the science as only a new kind of divination or palmistry, would be astonished to view a system calculated to throw the united labours of Aristotle, Locke, Reid, and Stewart, into the shade—an almost exact reflexion of human nature, a code of sublime morality, a means of accelerating to an unprecedented degree the social progress of our race.

The objections which have been made to Phrenology as tending to Materialism, appear to me to rest upon mere verbal quibbles. The mind may be presumed to be charged, in the present state of our being, upon a material organ, from which it is to be separated at last by the Power which created both. Phrenology, so far from necessarily being interpretable into something hostile to religion, is not only conformable, but favourable to it. If we take the science as a scheme of mind founded upon observation of actual facts, and, in comparing it with Christianity, find it in exact harmony with both the doctrinal and preceptive parts of that form of faith, can we resist the conclusion that Christianity has here obtained the aid of demonstrative, in addition to testimonial evidence? Phrenology might be described as Christianity thrown into the character of a science; each is calculated to have great force in urging the other upon the convictions of mankind.

If the Patrons of the University should see fit to prefer a professor of this science, whose qualifications in other respects are satisfactory—and such I deem Mr Combe's—I should consider them as laying up a store of future praise amply compensatory of any censure which may be bestowed



upon them at the time of the act. Though I am very far from presuming to challenge any decision they may come to, I cannot help believing that they will yet regret one unfavourable to Phrenology. Indeed, were it not that many of the most enlightened men are still ignorant of the merits of the new system, the filling of the present vacancy with one who persists in describing the mind as consisting of memory, judgment, and imagination, would appear to me as a solecism not less great, than would the appointment to the Chair of Chemistry of one who continued to describe fire, earth, water, and air, as the elements of matter.

ROBERT CHAMBERS.

XLII. From CHARLES MACLAREN, Esq., Editor of the Scotsman Newspaper.

15 NORTHUMBERLAND STREET,  
6th May 1836.

MY LORD PROVOST AND GENTLEMEN,

HAVING been requested by Mr Combe to state my opinion of his qualifications for the Chair of Logic, I take the liberty to intrude upon the Patrons with a few observations.

Permit me to state in the outset, that I believe Phrenology to be founded in truth,—that the brain is the organ of the mind,—and that the character of an individual can be inferred with considerable certainty during life from the external form of the skull. But Phrenology, in my opinion, is chiefly valuable when regarded as a system of mental philosophy. Even though I had no faith in its organology, I should still hold that it possesses the following advantages: *1st*, That it exhibits a more scientific and consistent classification of the human faculties than any other system of philosophy; *2d*, That it gives a more lucid and satisfactory explanation of those varieties of national and individual character which we find in the world; *3d*, That it has a more im-

mediate and practical bearing on human conduct and the business of life, on morals, education, and legislation. We have the testimony both of the learned and the unlearned to its merits in this respect. I refer to the letters from the Archbishop of Dublin and other eminent men, among these documents—to the republication of Mr Combe's phrenological works in America, and their translation into several of the continental languages—and to the rapid and extraordinary sale of 14,000 copies of the cheap edition of the Constitution of Man within the last eight months. This sale must have been chiefly among the less wealthy and less educated classes, since 5500 copies of a more elegant and expensive edition were sold almost contemporaneously. Now, the fact of a book on a subject so abstruse, running counter also to old opinions, and courting no prejudice, being so eagerly purchased by the humbler classes, seems to me to afford a strong presumption that its doctrines are in accordance with the laws of Nature, and therefore find a response in the common sense and common feelings of mankind.

Since the object of Logic, as now taught in this University, is to explain the structure of the human mind, and the application of its powers to the discovery of truth, it follows that Phrenology, if it gives the most satisfactory explanation of mental phenomena, must afford the best foundation for a system of Logic.

With regard to Mr Combe's talents and his competence for the duties of the Chair, I would refer to the same work, his book on the "Constitution of Man." To me it seems a model of inductive reasoning and rigorous analysis, and an admirable exemplification of the rules of Logic applied to the investigation of subjects of the highest importance. I may further observe, that Mr Combe like his predecessors Drs Gall and Spurzheim, instead of applying the new doctrines to unsettle men's notions of duty by raising doubts and difficulties, has invariably employed them to strengthen the foundations of virtue and religion. The moral results of his system may be said to be, that we best promote our own wellbeing when

we venerate God, and obey the voice of conscience,—when we are temperate, industrious, and orderly, and exercise justice and charity towards our neighbour. These principles are not only enforced in the “Constitution of Man,” but they may be said to pervade every page of it.

The Professor of Logic must teach some system of mental philosophy; and the question for the Council is not whether Phrenology is a perfect system, but whether it is not preferable to any of the others presently known, which are numerous and discordant. Mr Combe’s certificates shew at least that it enjoys a sufficient reputation to vindicate the propriety of the Council’s choice, if they elect him to the Chair. In other respects, I think it will not be easy to produce an individual so well qualified for the situation. I trust the Council are superior to those vulgar prejudices which have so often verified the maxim, that a “prophet hath no honour in his own country.” Many persons in this city know Mr Combe merely as an active man of business, or as an individual often met with in society, or as an ingenious speculator whose doctrines have been ridiculed in the *Edinburgh Review*, *Blackwood’s Magazine*, and other periodicals. The documents, however, which accompany this, amply demonstrate that his name is widely known and highly respected in foreign countries, and that he is the living head of a school of philosophy which is making rapid advances, and which already numbers among its adherents a multitude of intelligent and zealous disciples, including not a few distinguished names, in the British Isles, continental Europe, and America. I have myself a strong conviction that the doctrines which he advocates, modified no doubt in various respects by future inquiries, are destined to supersede all that is now taught as the philosophy of mind. Even already they are so widely diffused, that this election will excite an interest far beyond the boundaries of the British empire. The Council are not called upon by Mr Combe’s supporters to pronounce Phrenology true: it is only required of them not to pass a sentence of proscription against opinions finding larger credence

from day to day among enlightened men,—by rejecting a candidate otherwise admirably qualified for the Chair, on account of his adherence to them. If the expectations which I entertain, in common with many better informed men, of the future progress of these opinions, be well founded, the decision of the Council will be a fact of some importance in the history of philosophy, and may be the subject of praise or censure many centuries hence.

I have the honour to be, my Lord Provost and Gentlemen,  
your very obedient servant,

CHARLES MACLAREN.

**XLIII. Second Letter from GEORGE SALMOND, Esq., Procurator-Fiscal of the County of Lanark.**

SHERIFF'S CHAMBERS, GLASGOW,  
4th May 1836.

DEAR SIR,

IN my last, I said nothing of the case of a young man charged with murder whom you examined, because the investigation as to him had not been made by me, and consequently the nature of the evidence was unknown to me; but having since heard the whole, as adduced on his trial, I beg leave to trouble you with this addition, as deeming it highly confirmatory of the justness of your remarks at the time you examined him.

You may remember that you said of him that you could discover nothing remarkable about him as indicative of strong criminal propensity; and that, on being told that he was indicted for the murder of his own father, you said, "that his head did not indicate a great tendency to violence," and that "surely he must have had very great provocation."

Now, the proof at the trial shewed that the provocation given him was such, that one of the jury was for acquitting him altogether, and the other fourteen, while they returned a verdict of culpable homicide, recommended him to the le-

niency of the court; and the latter sentenced him only to nine months' imprisonment.

I beg to refer you to the report of the evidence in the Glasgow newspapers of the 28th or 29th ultimo, as amply justifying your conclusions as to this person. His name is Robert M'Anally.

I am, dear Sir, yours faithfully,

GEORGE SALMOND.

XLIV. From WILLIAM HUNTER, Esq., Town-Clerk of Forfar, and President of the Forfar Phrenological Society.

FORFAR, 3d May 1836.

THE study of Phrenology has made great progress in this quarter among the professional and educated classes. It has removed the chief difficulties that attended the old school of mental philosophy, and has furnished an analysis of the human faculties intelligible, complete, and practical. It therefore appears to be essential to the successful teaching of Logic.

Mr Combe is justly regarded as the most profound and eloquent expositor of the doctrines of Phrenology; and his superior qualifications, as established by his writings and lectures, for discharging the duties of the Logic Chair in the University of Edinburgh, are beyond all question.

The University of Edinburgh was the first public seminary that adopted the Newtonian philosophy;\* and it may

\* My authority for this statement is a Life of Dr John Gregory, published in Edinburgh in 1788, and Whiston's Memoirs of his own Life, vol. i. p. 32. It is there said, that David Gregory, afterwards Savilean Professor of Astronomy at Oxford, while Professor of Mathematics in the University of Edinburgh, saw very early the excellence of the Newtonian Philosophy, and had the merit of being the first who introduced it into the schools by his public lectures; and, Mr Whiston adds, "that he had already caused several of his scholars to keep Acts upon several branches of the Newtonian Philosophy, while we at Cambridge, poor wretches! were ignominious-ly studying the fictitious hypotheses of the Cartesian."

not perhaps be too presumptuous to remark, that it would be no mean praise were it also to be the first to adopt the new philosophy of mind.

In this testimonial the Society over which I have the honour to preside heartily concur.

WM. HUNTER.

**XLV. From DAVID MURRAY, Esq. Physician in Forfar.**

FORFAR, 3d May 1836.

HAVING had an opportunity of attending the logical prelections of Dr Ritchie, and also a course of lectures on Phrenology by Mr Combe, and having in the course of my subsequent practice tested the latter science as opportunities occurred, I have not the slightest hesitation in declaring my conviction that Phrenology is the true science of the mind.

I therefore warmly anticipate that those who appoint a successor to Dr Ritchie will do their University the high honour of selecting one who is versed theoretically and practically in Phrenology to fill the Chair of Logic. To Mr Combe I point as that individual, and give my decided testimony to his abilities in elucidating and advocating the new philosophy to the advantage of his pupils and honour of his country.

DAVID MURRAY.

**XLVI. From ALEXANDER SMITH, Esq. M. D., Physician in Forfar.**

FORFAR, May 4. 1836.

I BEG to offer my humble testimony in favour of Mr Combe as the successor of Dr Ritchie in the Logic Chair of the Edinburgh University.

I have attentively considered the system of mental philo-

sophy so ably advocated by Mr Combe, and in the discharge of my professional duties have often found it of great utility in explaining certain mental phenomena arising from a diseased or excited brain, which were *totally inexplicable* by the old systems.

A. SMITH.

---

XLVII. From JOHN F. ALLAN, Esq., Licentiate of the Royal College of Surgeons, Edinburgh.

FORFAR, 2d May 1836.

I RESPECTFULLY offer my testimony in favour of Mr Combe, as an individual possessing the highest qualifications for filling the Chair of Logic in the University of Edinburgh.

I am convinced, from an attentive perusal of Mr Combe's works, and from having made a practical application of his doctrines to the treatment of disease, that they constitute the true science of mind, and are, in my opinion, indispensable to the successful teaching of Logic.

J. F. ALLAN.

---

XLVIII. From the Honourable Judge CRAMPTON, formerly Fellow and Professor of Law in Trinity College, Dublin.

MERION STREET, DUBLIN,  
4th May 1836.

SIR,

I HAD yesterday the honour of your letter, dated the 29th April last, announcing that you are a candidate for the Chair of Logic in the University of Edinburgh, and requesting a certificate from me in favour of Phrenology, the science of Mind, as you justly term it.

I can have no hesitation in stating my conviction, that, in the present advanced state of mental philosophy, an adequate

knowledge of Phrenology will be found to be a most useful, I had almost said a necessary, qualification for a Professor of Logic and Metaphysics ; as it is, I am sure a most valuable assistant to the medical practitioner in his treatment of insane and nervous patients, and to the schoolmaster in his education of youth.

To the above testimonial I am, however, bound in candour to add one qualification, namely, *that it comes from a person but imperfectly acquainted with the science of Phrenology* ;—sufficiently so acquainted, however, to be persuaded that *it is* amongst the most important of the acquisitions made to the stock of modern knowledge, and that upon *it* must be based every sound system of mental philosophy.

I conclude by expressing my cordial wishes, that so able and distinguished a promoter of the science of Phrenology as yourself, may be elected to fill the Chair to which you aspire. I am, Sir, your very obedient servant,

P. CRAMPTON.

To GEO. COMBE, Esq.

XLIX. From the Rev. Dr FRANCIS SADLIER, S. F. Trin.  
Col. Dublin.

To GEORGE COMBE, Esq.

SIR,

COLLEGE, DUBLIN, *May 5. 1836.*

I HAVE had the honour of receiving your letter of the 29th ult., and though I cannot suppose that my single testimony of approbation can add any thing to the great estimation in which your phrenological works are held ; yet as you desire it, I feel much pleasure in expressing it, and in stating my opinion that a person of your ingenuity and acuteness of intellect, must be eminently well qualified for the situation you tell me you are seeking.

I have the honour to be, Sir, your very humble servant,  
FRANCIS SADLIER.



L. From C. OTTO, M. D., Professor of Medicine in the University of Copenhagen, Physician to the Civil Prisons, Member of the Royal Board of Health, and of the Medical Societies in Copenhagen, Edinburgh, Stockholm, Paris, Montpellier, Berlin, Leipzig, Lyons, &c. &c.

MY DEAR SIR,

COPENHAGEN, *April 26. 1836.*

IN order to comply with your wish of receiving my opinion of Phrenology, I feel it a duty incumbent upon me to state, that, as far as twelve years' observation and study entitle me to form any judgment, I not only consider Phrenology as a true science of mind, but also as the only one that, with a sure success, may be applied to the education of children, and to the treatment of the insane and criminals. I have found it of the highest importance, as physician to the civil prisons, in acquainting myself with the character of the prisoners, and adapting my moral treatment of them to this knowledge; and, as a member of the Royal Board of Health, my votes on the motives and the misdeeds of criminals, of whose responsibility the Board is questioned, are always according to phrenological principles; and hitherto the court of justice has in all instances acted upon my judgment. In my lectures on Forensic Medicine, I treat the chapter on insanity and responsibility phrenologically, and am by the science of Phrenology more able to explain the subject than I would be by metaphysics, the doctrines of which badly accord with the precepts of common sense and daily experience.

Upon the whole, I consider Phrenology as one of the greatest benefits that of late have been bestowed upon mankind; and in which respect the world is greatly indebted to you, whose valuable works have elucidated the subjects belonging to the science in the ablest manner, and are celebrated for excellence everywhere where they are read.

But I must add, that the present Professor of Logic at our University, Professor Sibbern, a very celebrated author,

\*R

always mentions Phrenology favourably in his lectures. In his Danish book, "On the Human Mind (Menneskets aandelige Natür og Væsen)," he expresses himself in the following terms: "If, upon the whole, the brain is such an organ for the mind that the latter cannot act without the former, but is disturbed whenever the brain is morbidly affected, certainly nothing can be objected to the principle in Dr Gall's doctrine, that certain faculties of the mind require certain modes of action in the brain, and have their appropriate organs in it. To assert that a talent for mathematics requires a special organ in the brain, is no more singular than to assert that thinking in general requires a well organized brain. Psychologically considered, Dr Gall's doctrine is not at all improbable." I think this will interest you. I have also the pleasure to tell you, that next winter I again intend to begin a phrenological course.

With the deepest sentiment of gratitude, I consequently remain yours ever most sincerely,

C. OTTO.

---

LI. From THOMAS WYSE, Esq. M. P., Chairman of the Committee on Education in Ireland.\*

8 CLEVELAND ROW, ST JAMES'S,  
April 29. 1836.

MY DEAR SIR,

You must not attribute my silence to any other cause than my absence in the country, from which I have only just returned, and great pressure of public business, Committees especially, since my arrival. I feel, I trust, that high admiration for your talents, and not less for the truly Christian benevolence which directs them, which they so well merit. I shall seize the very first moment permitted me this next

\* I have not yet received the testimonial promised in this note, but I shall add it, when received, to the remaining testimonials which I may have occasion to print.—G. C.

week, to add my humble testimony to those eminent ones you have received. I was unwilling, however, to allow even that short period to pass, without conveying the expression of my esteem, and endeavouring to remove any impression that I was indifferent to the just claims you have to the Logic Chair of the University.

I beg you to believe me, Dear Sir, sincerely yours,

THOS. WYSE.

LII. From JAMES JOHNSON, M. D., Physician-Extraordinary to the King, Editor of the Medico-Chirurgical Review, &c. &c.

To GEORGE COMBE, Esq.

SUFFOLK PLACE, PALL-MALL EASTER,  
LONDON, 3d May 1836.

I HAVE been long acquainted with the writings of Mr Combe, and have considered them as exhibiting the most rational and enlightened views of the human mind, as revealed through the *organ of Mind*, in this our sublunary state of existence. I have long been convinced, that the science of *Mind* can only be understood and taught, properly, by those who have deeply studied the structure and functions of its *material instrument*—the *brain*. I am convinced that, in this world, Mind can be manifested *only* through the medium of *matter*, and that the metaphysician, who studies mind independent of its corporeal organ, works in the dark, and with only half of his requisite tools.

Without subscribing to all the details of Phrenology, I believe its fundamental principles to be based on truth ;—and, as a profound phrenologist, I have no hesitation in stating my conviction, that Mr Combe is eminently qualified to teach the manifestations of the *immortal spark* through the medium of its perishable instrument on earth.

JAMES JOHNSON, M. D.

LIII. From the Rev. Dr SPRAGUE, Pastor of a Presbyterian Church at Albany, New York.

TO GEORGE COMBE Esq.

MY DEAR SIR,

EDINBURGH, May 6. 1836.

In answering your inquiry in respect to the progress of Phrenology in the United States, it is due to candour that I should say that I have myself little knowledge of the science, as my time is necessarily so much occupied with professional duties, that I have little to devote to any thing which is not immediately connected with them. I have, however, no hesitation in giving it as my decided opinion that the science is rapidly gaining ground in the country at large, and I know that it numbers among its advocates many of our most reflecting and intelligent men. I hardly need say that your own books are very extensively circulated, and are constantly appealed to as standard works on the subject.

I am, My Dear Sir, with much regard, very truly yours,

W. B. SPRAGUE.

## EVIDENCE OF THE PROGRESS OF PHRENOLOGY.

### I. BOOKS SOLD.\*

#### 1. Certificate of Numbers of Mr COMBE's Works printed by Messrs NEILL & Co. Edinburgh.

WE hereby certify, that we have printed and delivered to various booksellers the following copies of works by Mr George Combe :—

1819, Oct. Essays on Phrenology, pp. 416, 8vo, . . . 750 copies.

This work, in subsequent editions, was  
named "A System of Phrenology."

1825, Nov. System of Phrenology, 2d edition, pp. 580,  
8vo, . . . . . 1000

1830, Oct. Do. do. 3d edition, pp. 724, 8vo, 1000

1836, April. Do. do. 4th edition, 8vo, . . . 1500

(In the Press)

Total of System, 4250 copies.

1824, July. Elements of Phrenology, pp. 240, 12mo, 1500 copies.

1825, May. Do. do. pp. 252, 12mo, 1500

1828, May. Do. do. pp. 228, 12mo, 1500

This work is out of print, and a new  
edition is preparing.

Total of Elements, 4500 copies.

\* Large editions of Dr Spurzheim's works, as well as of several smaller publications by various authors, have been sold in Britain, but I have no means of knowing the exact extent of them.—G. C.

1821, Oct.	Outlines of Phrenology,	pp. 32, 8vo,	.	1000 copies.
1823, April.	Do.	Do. pp. 28, 8vo,	.	500
1824, Oct.	Do.	Do. pp. 32, 8vo,	.	750
1829, Jan.	Do.	Do. pp. 32, 8vo,	.	500
1835, April.	Do.	Do. pp. 36, 8vo,	.	3000

Total of Outlines, 5750 copies.

1828, June.	Constitution of Man,	pp. 336, 12mo,	.	1500 copies.
1835, Feb.	Do.	do. pp. 460, 12mo,	.	3000
— July.	Do.	do. pp. 400, 12mo,	.	1000
		(Smaller type)		
— Nov.	Do.	do. pp. 408, 12mo,	.	1000
1836, Mar.	Do.	do. pp. 408, 12mo,	.	1500

Total of Constitution 8000 copies.

1833, Dec.	Three Lectures on Popular Education,	pp. 80, 8vo,	.	1000 copies.
	(This work is out of print.)			

#### ABSTRACT.

Total number of Mr Combe's Works printed by us :—

1. System of Phrenology	.	.	4250 copies.
2. Elements of do.	.	.	4500
3. Outlines of do.	.	.	5750
4. Constitution of Man,	.	.	8000
5. Lectures,	.	.	1000

TOTAL, 23500 copies.

NEILL & CO.

EDINBURGH, 30th April 1836.

#### 2. From Messrs WILLIAM and ROBERT CHAMBERS, Booksellers, Edinburgh.

WE hereby certify, that we have printed and published the following impressions of "The Constitution of Man considered in Relation to External Objects, by George Combe," in royal 8vo, double columns, and stereotyped :—

1835.

Oct. 19. First impression,	.	.	2117 copies
Nov. 20. Second do.	.	.	5250

1836.

Jan. 13. Third do.	.	.	5270
Mar. 26. Fourth do.	.	.	5278

Total	17915
-------	-------

On hand, May 2. 1836,	.	3260
-----------------------	---	------

Actual sales from Oct. 19. 1835 till this date, May 2. 1836,	.	14655 copies.
---	---	---------------

WILLIAM AND ROBERT CHAMBERS.

EDINBURGH, May 2. 1836.

---

3. From Messrs LONGMAN, REES and Co., Booksellers  
London.

DEAR SIR,

LONDON, April 14. 1836.

IT gives us great pleasure, by reference to our books, to have it in our power to certify, that your works on Phrenology have met with a regular and constantly increasing sale since 1819, when they first appeared, and that the subject of which they treat appears to be gaining, in proportion to the sale of the books, in public estimation.

We shall be happy to find that you prove successful in obtaining the Chair of Logic in your University. We are, dear Sir, yours very faithfully,

LONGMAN, REES &amp; Co.

---

4. From Messrs SIMPKIN, MARSHALL and Co., Booksellers,  
London.

DEAR SIR,

LONDON, April 14. 1836.

IT will give us great pleasure if any thing we can say respecting your books will assist you in the object you have in view. The first work of yours that we published

was the Elements of Phrenology, in 1824. We cannot specify the number we have sold of that work, but it is considerable; the sale of it has increased very much during last year, and there is a great demand for it just now. We sold many copies of the Constitution of Man prior to our becoming one of your agents in April 1835, since which we have sold about 4400 copies of the work, viz.—

500 Henderson's Edition, at 2s. 6d.

1400 royal 12mo, at 4s.

2600 People's Edition, at 1s. 6d.

Of this last near 1500 have been sold since January 23. this year, and the demand is increasing. We sold many copies of the System of Phrenology, and have many inquiries for it now. We feel no hesitation in saying, that the sale of your works has increased very much during the last eighteen months; and, from the sale of these and other works on Phrenology, we think there is more interest taken in it now than there was three or four years back.

We are, dear Sir, yours truly,

SIMPKIN, MARSHALL & Co

---

5. From Mr JOHN ANDERSON jun., Bookseller, Edinburgh.

55 NORTH BRIDGE STREET, EDINBURGH,  
12th April 1836.

MY DEAR SIR,

I RECEIVED your letter of 11th instant, and in reply have to state, that I first became publisher of works on Phrenology in the year 1823, and my inclination to do so arose from a strong conviction of the truth of that science. Then, and for a considerable period afterwards, Phrenology was subjected to much ridicule, and there was little demand for works on the subject: but the state of matters for the last six or eight years has completely altered; the study has become popular; in this city, and elsewhere, courses of lectures have been attended by numerous auditories, especially of the young; and there is now a regular and increasing de-



mand for your writings and other phrenological works, not only in this country, but also in America.

I am, my dear Sir, yours sincerely,

JOHN ANDERSON JUN.

#### FOREIGN EDITIONS.

##### *In the United States of America.*

The whole of Mr Combe's works have been reprinted in a variety of editions. Editions were published, in stereotype, by Messrs Marsh, Capon and Lyon, of Boston, in 1833-4-5.

"The Constitution of Man" was published in double columns, stereotyped, in May 1835, at New York, by William Pearson and Co., 106 Nassau Street, New York. The publishers announced the edition in these words: "The Constitution of Man considered in relation to External Objects, by George Combe, the price of which at present is D.1 C.50, will occupy only a little over two numbers" (of the *Alexandrian*, a republication of valuable literary and scientific books), "bringing the price for the complete work to a trifle over one shilling."

##### *In France.*

Essai sur la Constitution de l'Homme de M. George Combe, traduit de l'Anglais, par M. Prosper Dumont. Paris, chez Arthus Bertrand, Libraire-Editeur, Rue Haute-feuille, No. 23. 1834. 12mo, pp. 341.

Nouveau Manuel de Phrénologie, par George Combe. Ouvrage traduit de l'Anglais et augmenté d'additions nombreuses et de notes, par le Docteur J. Fossati, Président de la Société Phrénologique de Paris. Paris, Germer Baillière, Libraire-Editeur, 13 (bis), Rue de l'Ecole de Médecine, 1836. 12mo, pp. 432.

*In Germany.*

George Combe's *System der Phrenologie* aus dem Englischen übersetzt von Dr S. Ed. Hirschfeld. Braunschweig, gedruckt bei Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, 1833. 8vo. pp. 498.

Dr Hirschfeld, in a letter to Mr Combe, dated in March 1836, mentions that he has completed a translation of "The Constitution of Man" into German, which will be printed in June 1836.

*In Sweden.*

Monsieur. G. M. Schwartz, Directeur en chef du Control de Suede à Stockholm, Membre de l'Academie des Sciences, on 23d September 1833, wrote to Mr Robert Cox of Edinburgh:—"Mr Combe's work on the Constitution of Man is now translated into Swedish, and will be printed on my return to Stockholm, under the title of 'The Doctrine of Happiness on Earth.'"

*In Denmark.*

Professor Otto of Copenhagen translated large portions of Mr Combe's works, and published them in the *Phrenological Journal* of that city.

---

 II. LECTURES.

1. Certificate from JAMES P. FALKNER, Esq., Secretary to the Edinburgh Philosophical Association.

EDINBURGH, April 20. 1836.

I HEREBY certify, That Mr George Combe delivered a Course of Lectures on Phrenology to the Edinburgh Philosophical Association during session 1832-1833: That the number of Tickets sold for the course was 225, and the number of Visitors admitted 700.

Mr Combe further delivered a short Course of Lectures

on Education in the beginning of session 1833-1834, to which the holders of tickets to the other lectures delivered under the auspices of the Association during the session were admitted gratis. The number of Visitors to these lectures was 340.

A second Course of Lectures on Phrenology was delivered by Mr Combe during session 1834-1835; the number of Tickets disposed of was 224, and the Visitors admitted 1114.

JAMES P. FALKNER.

2. From the Same.

EDINBURGH, *May 9. 1836.*

I HEREBY certify, That Mr George Combe delivered a Course of Twenty Lectures on Moral Philosophy to the Edinburgh Philosophical Association, during session 1835-6, and that the number of members of that Association was 446, all of whom held transferable tickets, entitling to admission to Mr Combe's lectures, and to the other lectures delivered under their auspices. There was also sold 68 other tickets admitting to Mr Combe's class, and 495 Visitors were admitted, at the rate of 1s. for each lecture.

JAMES P. FALKNER.

3. From WILLIAM HUTTON, Esq. F.G.S., Member of the Geological Society of France; Secretary of the Natural History Society, and Member of the Council of the Literary and Philosophical Society of Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Honorary Member of several similar Institutions, &c. &c.

NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE,  
*26th April 1836.*

MY DEAR SIR,

It gives me great pleasure to find that you are a candidate for the Chair of Logic in the University of Edinburgh, and I most sincerely wish success to your application.

As I was the individual appointed by the Literary and Philosophical Society of this town, to make arrangements with you for the Course of Lectures you gave in that institution in October last, I may be allowed to state, that the Course was a most successful one, and gave more general satisfaction than any one had before given; it was attended from the beginning to the end by very large and attentive audiences, these being only limited by the size of the room, which contained 300 persons, and was inconveniently crowded every night. I may farther state, that of the persons who attended the Lectures you gave, there was a much larger portion than usual of those who are known in the town for their attachment to science, and that the public vote of thanks you received at the conclusion, which was unanimously authorized by the ruling body of the Society, was fully responded by all who attended the class.

Believing, as I do, the system upon which you teach the Philosophy of the Mind, to be the true one, I may, I hope, venture to state, that the manner in which you teach it appears to me excellent; the clearness and logical precision displayed are, I conceive, admirably fitted for a public instructor.

Of Phrenology, the ground-work of your system of teaching, I must avow myself a believer, amongst many others here, and consider that no basis upon which to erect a system of Mental Philosophy has yet been proposed, which is at the same time so simple and so comprehensive. The practical applications you made of the principles of the science in the prison \* and lunatic asylums of this town, were sufficient to convince the most sceptical.

Again heartily wishing you success, I am, my Dear Sir, yours most faithfully,

WM. HUTTON, F. G. S.

GEORGE COMBE, Esq. Edinburgh.

\* See a report of Mr Combe's visit to Newcastle jail, in Appendix, p. 44.

4. From JAMES M'CLELLAND, Esq. Accountant, Glasgow.

NO. 86 MILLER STREET, GLASGOW,  
29th April 1836.

A DESIRE having been expressed by many gentlemen of this city, that a Course of Lectures on the science of Phrenology should be delivered by George Combe, Esq. of Edinburgh, a requisition to that gentleman to do so was subscribed in a short time by upwards of 120 names.

At a public meeting of the requisitionists, a committee was appointed to conduct the detail, by whom I was authorised to correspond with Mr Combe preparatory to his arrival. During the course of lectures delivered by Mr Combe, a principal charge of the detail was taken by me.

The fourteen lectures given by Mr Combe were attended each night by audiences of upwards of five hundred, a portion of whom were ladies. The audience comprised the most respectable classes of the city, and among them many of our most talented citizens.

The applications for tickets for single lectures could not on many occasions be fully supplied, and had a larger hall been attainable previous to the commencement of the course, a considerable addition to the regular class would have been got.

Each lecture lasted upwards of an hour and a half, and the audience throughout manifested great interest in the subject, and few, I believe, have seen so large a body of ladies and gentlemen listen with so much eagerness to lectures on any of the sciences as was done during the whole of Mr Combe's course,—a sufficient proof, without any farther comment, of the acceptance of the doctrines propounded, and of the talent displayed in doing so.

Having had my attention directed to Phrenology for upwards of eighteen years, I have no hesitation in stating that a very great increase has taken place in this city in the numbers of those who understand, believe, and carry its doctrines

into practice,—that the desire for information on the subject is daily increasing,—and that little indeed is now heard of the ridicule which used to be cast upon the science, and upon those who professed to be its followers.

JAMES McCLELLAND.

5. Extract from a Letter from Dr JAMES COX, dated Paris, 17th April 1836.

To GEORGE COMBE, Esq.

“DR BROUSSAIS has commenced a course of lectures on Phrenology from pure zeal, and the amphitheatre is crowded to suffocation. Two thousand were estimated to have been at the first lecture. Three have been delivered. Never were such crowds seen at phrenological lectures before. The professor who lectured immediately previous to Broussais, finding himself interrupted by the crowds of students who poured in during his lecture to be ready for Broussais, ordered the doors to be bolted on the day following. When the crowd gathered they broke down the doors, and one individual was nearly crushed to death. Indeed no one can attend who has not great strength of ribs. The lectures are very good.”

JAMES COX, M. D.

6. From WILLIAM TAIT, Esq. Surgeon, Lauder.\*

SIR,

LAUDER, 28th April 1836.

IT gives me much pleasure and satisfaction to be able to inform you, that the desire for information on Phrenology in this district is still on the increase. Before the winter of 1835 the subject was scarcely heard of; and the principles

\* This letter, addressed to the Editor of the Phrenological Journal, is presented as an instance of the manner in which Phrenology is spreading in the country. Many similar communications could be produced.

of the science were, by the very few who had heard or read of them, treated with ridicule and disdain. It was easily discovered, on talking over the subject with any of those who hazarded an opinion regarding the claims of the science, that they were grossly ignorant of them, and probably had never read any of the standard works upon the subject. To this I am the more inclined to adhere, as some of them confessed that all their information on the subject was presented to them through the distorting medium of the *Edinburgh Review*. It is but justice to the inhabitants of this town to say, that now they have given the subject a fair hearing. You are aware that I delivered a short course of lectures last year, which were attended by about twenty-four persons, principally mechanics. I was still desirous that they should be better informed concerning the principles, and I undertook a second course of eight lectures this spring, which were attended by upwards of forty individuals, some of whom were the most respectable persons in the town and neighbourhood. At the conclusion of the course, Mr John Romanes, town-clerk, expressed his approbation of the course I had pursued in bringing the subject under their notice, and the satisfaction he had experienced while attending the lectures; and in the name of all those who honoured me with their attendance, returned thanks for the trouble and exertion I had put myself to in their behalf. He farther stated his willingness to defray the expenses incurred by the present course, and expressed a hope that I would again, next winter, resume the task, when he would be most happy to attend.

The results of these lectures are very encouraging. The Mechanics' Library has got two copies of Combe's *Constitution of Man*, and one copy of his *Elements of Phrenology*. Considerable attention is now paid to Phrenology, theoretically and practically, and many are true converts.

WILLIAM TAIT.





---

**ADDITIONAL TESTIMONIALS**

**ON BEHALF OF**

**GEORGE COMBE,**

**AS A**

**CANDIDATE FOR THE CHAIR OF LOGIC**

**IN THE**

**UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH.**

---

**31<sup>ST</sup> MAY 1836.**

**PRINTED BY NEILL & CO. OLD FISHMARKET.**

## ADDITIONAL TESTIMONIALS.

### LIV. Extracts from Letter from CHRISTOPHER DUNKIN, Esq. Albany, United States.\*

GEORGE COMBE, Esq.

ALBANY, N. Y. UNITED STATES,

MY DEAR SIR,

14th April 1836.

I trust that your zeal for the advancement of popular education will lead you to excuse the liberty I take in addressing this communication to you. \* \* \* The subject to which I would ask your attention, is the procuring of a competent infant school teacher, to organize and superintend the infant department of a school in this city, the general direction of which has just been placed in my hands.

Our school is designed to afford facilities for every branch of education from the nursery to the counting-room or college, and we are particularly anxious to make it as soon as possible perfect in its primary department, because the success of the whole institution depends so essentially on it.

Albany is in a very central situation, the capital of the most populous and enterprising state in the Union. The enterprise of our State is much of it directed to the establishment of good institutions for popular education. The schools in this city are particularly flourishing.

I venture to hope that you will be the more disposed to help us in this matter, from the consideration that by so doing you will aid a cause which you have much at heart—the cause of Phrenology. The Trustees of our Academy are ex-

\* The date of this letter will shew that it was written without any reference to the Logic Chair.

tremely well disposed to the phrenological doctrines on the subject of education, and are desirous to carry them into full operation. It is with this view that they wish to see that kind of infant school which the phrenologists have recommended. In inviting me to become principal of their institution, they expressly recognised the policy of placing the whole school on the phrenological system as far as possible. Any service, therefore, which you may render us, will, in so far as it renders the success of our experiment more certain, tend to establish and raise the character of Phrenology, as a practical science; in this quarter. Our position, as I have already said, is one of the most central in the country. Whatever we may succeed in effecting here will be copied very rapidly and very extensively. There is probably no place in the States where a school on phrenological principles would exert a wider influence on the organization of our schools in general.

Hoping that you will excuse the length to which this letter has extended; and that the request which it contains may not prove too severe a burden on your kindness, I subscribe myself, my dear sir, very respectfully and truly your obedient servant,

CHR. DUNKIN.

---

LV. From Monsieur G. M. SCHWARTZ, Ancien Professeur de Physique et de Chimie ; Directeur Général du Contrôle Royal et Directeur de l'Institut Royal Technologique ; Chevalier de l'Etoile Polaire ; Membre des Académies Royales des Sciences, d'Agriculture et des Sciences Militaires, à Stockholm, ainsi que de quelques autres Sociétés savantes de Suède et en étranger.

INFORMÉ par Mr George Combe qu'il s'est offert pour la charge de Professeur de Logique à l'Université d'Edimbourg, et engagé par lui à prononcer mon opinion, si la

Phrénologie peut remplir le but qu'on se propose généralement avec une chaire de Logique, comme fondement pour les études académiques, j'ai l'honneur de présenter ici la déclaration suivante :

1<sup>o</sup>, Autant que je puis en juger, je considère les importantes découvertes de Mr Gall, de Mr Spurzheim et autres, sur lesquelles est basée la Phrénologie, comme fondées sur des observations et inductions les plus scrupuleuses et consciencieusement faites, et comme ayant parfaitement rempli leur but : d'avoir donné à la science des facultés de l'âme, dite Psychologie, jusqu'ici purement spéculative, le même degré d'évidence que les autres sciences naturelles ; sur lequel point, la polémique en tous pays paraît avoir cessé entre les savans qui en ont pris une connaissance plus que superficielle, et qui, par le genre de leurs études, sont compétens à en juger.

2<sup>o</sup>, La Psychologie a de tous temps été regardée comme la base de toutes les études philosophiques en général, et particulièrement de la *Logique*, ou la science des fonctions intellectuelles, ainsi que de la manière de les diriger dans la recherche de la vérité, pour amener à certitude dans toutes les branches des connaissances humaines, et pour l'énonciation méthodique de la pensée, afin de la communiquer clairement et produire conviction ; de plus, la Psychologie renferme les premiers principes de morale et de droit naturel, et elle est enfin le guide le plus sûr pour un arrangement de la vie, conduisant à la félicité, conformément aux lois sages et bienveillantes du Créateur. La Phrénologie, qui n'est autre chose que la Psychologie, régénérée, ou tirée de son état stationnaire, et convertie d'une science remplie d'hypothèses en une science exacte, doit, par ces raisons, plus parfaitement remplir ces différens buts, et être, par conséquent, l'étude la plus importante.

Pour Mr Combe personnellement, les grands services qu'il a, par ses ouvrages, rendus à la science dont il est ici question, non moins en contribuant dans un degré éminent à ses progrès, qu'en la rendant plus populaire, et ayant plus qu'aucun autre mis au jour la grande importance de son application aux :

plus hauts intérêts de la vie ; mérites généralement reconnus par des savans distingués en France, en Allemagne, en Dannemark et en Suède, dans lesquels pays aussi plusieurs des ouvrages de Mr Combe ont été traduits,—ces services sont tellement au-dessus des éloges que je pourrais en faire, que je considérerais comme une inconvenance de m'en ériger le juge, et me borne à féliciter l'Université qui a le bonheur de s'approprier un aussi digne membre.\*

STOCKHOLM, ce 29 Avril 1836.

G. M. SCHWARTZ.

---

\* *Translation of M. Schwartz' Testimonial.*

Being informed by Mr G. Combe that he has offered himself as a Candidate for the Professorship of Logic in the University of Edinburgh, and being requested by him to give my opinion whether Phrenology be calculated to promote the object which is generally proposed by a chair of Logic, namely, laying a foundation for academic studies, I have the honour to present the following declaration :

1st, As far as I can judge, I consider the important discoveries of Messrs Gall, Spurzheim, and others, on which Phrenology is based, to be founded on the most scrupulous and conscientious observations and inductions, and as having perfectly achieved their object—that of giving to the science of the mental faculties, called Psychology—till now purely speculative—the same degree of evidence possessed by the other natural sciences ; on which point, controversy seems, in all countries, to have ceased among those learned men who have made themselves sufficiently acquainted with the doctrines, and who, by the nature of their studies, are competent to judge of them.

2d, In all times, Psychology has been regarded as the base of all philosophical studies in general, and especially of Logic. Logic is the science of the intellectual functions, and embraces the manner of directing them in the search after truth, and of attaining to certainty in the different branches of human knowledge. It includes also the methodical announcement of thought, in order to communicate it clearly and to produce conviction. Moreover, Psychology contains the first principles of morals and of natural rights ; and it is, in short, the safest guide by which to accomplish an arrangement of life that will conduct to happiness, in conformity to the wise and benevolent laws of the Creator. Phrenology, which is no other than Psychology regenerated, or drawn out of its stationary condition, and converted from a science of hypotheses into an exact science, ought for this reason to fulfil more perfectly these different ends—and to be consequently the most important study of all.

With

LVI. From the Reverend ADAM BROWN, Minister of the  
Cameronian Chapel, Kilmarnock.

As I understand that G. Combe, Esq. intends to stand a candidate for the Professorship of Logic in the University of Edinburgh; I beg leave to state my firm belief that few will be found better qualified to fill the vacant chair. His work on the Constitution of Man shews that the science of Logic is familiar to him, and that he ranks high as a skilful metaphysician. His Essay on Human Responsibility as affected by Phrenology also seems to accord with sound morality. And although many of the more minute facts in Phrenology are beyond my research; yet believing as I do that the leading facts are well established, I have no doubt that he will make them powerfully tell in the illustration of the subjects that will come under his review.

ADAM BROWN,  
Minister of the Cameronian Chapel.

KILMARNOCK, 2d May 1836.

With regard to Mr Combe personally, the great services he has rendered by his works to the science in question are well known, not less in contributing, in an eminent degree, to its progress, than in making it more popular, and in having, more than any other person, brought to light the great importance of its application to the highest interests of life. His merits are generally recognised by the distinguished savans of France, Germany, Denmark, and Sweden, in which countries, also, several of his works have been translated. These services are so much beyond the praises that I am capable of bestowing, that I should consider it unbecoming to erect myself into a judge of them,—and I therefore confine myself to felicitating the University which has the good fortune to appropriate so worthy a member.

G. M. SCHWARTZ,  
Late Professor of Natural Philosophy and Chemistry; Director-general of the Royal Board of Control, and Director of the Royal Technological Institution; Chevalier of the Polar Star; Member of the Royal Academies of Sciences, Agriculture, and Military Science at Stockholm; as well as of other foreign and Swedish learned Societies.

STOCKHOLM, April 29. 1836.

LVII. From Professor HOPPE', Medical Inspector of Copenhagen; Corresponding Member of the Phrenological and Medico-Chirurgical Societies of Edinburgh, &c.

MY DEAR SIR,

FROM your late letter to Dr Otto, I learn that a testimonial concerning my conviction of the truth and usefulness of Phrenology would be acceptable to you. Although it is far from me to suppose that my unknown name might contribute in the least degree to direct the public opinion in any way, yet I should think it a reprovable want of gratitude to the science that has spread for me, as for every believer, light upon the path where light is of the highest importance for every thinking being—and to you, the third defender of Phrenology, whose personal acquaintance during my stay at Edinburgh for ever shall be dear to me—if I should neglect this opportunity to comply with a wish of yours: consequently I state it as my most sincere conviction, that Phrenology is the only true Philosophy of Mind, and of course the most important of all human sciences, the influence of which, in a great many practical points of view, already has been, and still will be, more striking.

I should hail it as one of the happiest events at present for giving the right turn to thinking—and besides a splendid glory to the Council of Edinburgh—if you might obtain the vacant professorship.

I recommend myself to your kind remembrance, and remain, my Dear Sir, your most obliged and obedient servant,

B. HOPPE, M. D.

COPENHAGEN, 2d May 1836.



## LVIII. From Dr D. E. HIRSCHFELD, Bremen.

BREMEN, 5th May 1836.

I HEREBY certify, that it is my intimate conviction, that Phrenology is the true Science of Mind, and the only real Physiology of the Brain,—that it is indispensable to a sound System of Logic, which is the art of applying the intellectual faculties to the discovery and communication of truth,—and that also this Science is of the greatest utility in insanity and education.

The writings of Mr G. Combe have of late, in Germany, greatly attracted attention to the subject, and wherever they have been noticed, have met with a very favourable reception. After having translated his System of Phrenology, I am now about publishing a German edition of the “Constitution of Man,”—a work which, in my humble opinion, throws more light on human nature on earth, and which thereby is more calculated to promote human happiness, than any I am acquainted with.

It being generally acknowledged by our professional men, that the different *regions* of the brain perform different functions, there is but one step to the acknowledgment of different *organs* of mind; and the number of applications made to me from different parts of the country for more ample information as to the mode and means of verifying the existence of the phrenological organs, proves to me, that in the course of a few years the study of Phrenology will be as universally followed in Germany, as the high importance of the practical results it leads to really makes it deserve.

D. E. HIRSCHFELD, M.D.

---

LIX. From RICHARD CARMICHAEL, Esq. M.R.I.A., Corresponding Member of the Academie Royale de Medecine de France, &c. &c. &c., and Consulting Surgeon of the Richmond Surgical Hospital, Dublin.

DUBLIN, May 9. 1836.

I feel the highest gratification in stating my firm belief in the principles of Phrenology, and conceive that it explains bet-

ter than any other system of Mental Philosophy the operations of the mind. From it alone we learn why two persons educated together, and subjected to the same moral and physical impressions, may be widely different from each other as to their dispositions, talents, and acquirements. It alone explains in a satisfactory manner the various degrees of that reasoning faculty with which the lower animals are gifted, and why they should necessarily follow almost blindly their dispositions, so as to have hitherto given these tendencies to certain actions the name of Instincts, but which Phrenology has satisfactorily explained as depending upon the peculiar organization of the brain of each species of animal. Phrenology has alone afforded a satisfactory explanation of the long disputed doctrines of free will and necessity,—it teaches us to what degree we are necessitated to obey the impulses arising from organization, and how far and by what means we are free agents, to act as the superior faculties direct. By it also are satisfactorily accounted for many mental phenomena in man which all the old systems of metaphysics and morals failed to explain;—from it alone we learn why certain individuals should excel in one pursuit or branch of knowledge, and be dull in most others; why some are so disposed to commit breaches in the organic and moral laws to which man is subjected, that they can scarcely be considered as accountable persons, and are therefore better fitted for the seclusion of a lunatic asylum than for the punishment to which the criminal codes even of civilized countries would subject them; and on this account we have sufficient grounds to assume that the principles of Phrenology ought to be consulted in criminal legislation.

In the practice of medicine, Phrenology is of the highest utility, as it is manifestly the true and only physiology of the brain, and therefore upon it ought to hinge its pathology also. When the functions of this important organ are disturbed, as happens in acute and chronic inflammation of the brain, general fever, injuries of the head, and the various grades of apoplexy, from vertigo to the annihilation of the intellect, power of motion, and use of the senses, and, lastly,

in monomania and general insanity, Phrenology may assist us in the treatment, as I have already exemplified in a paper inserted in the *Dublin Medical Journal*.

I need scarcely add, after having stated so much as to my belief in the principles of Phrenology, that were education illuminated by the lights which this science is capable of throwing upon it, the state of improvement at which mankind might arrive is incalculable. In fine, as to the benefit which morals and religion may derive from this science, I need only refer to Mr George Combe's admirable work on the *Constitution of Man*, (now very generally read), which, by disclosing the true nature of the laws to which the human being is subjected, permits us to see more clearly than we ever did before, the scheme of Providence in the government of man; teaches us how much it concerns our interest to avoid the violation of these laws; how independent the organic and the moral code are of each other; how, generally, by a heedless or culpable inattention to those laws, we incur the necessary penalty of their breach; and, finally, it reconciles us without a just murmur to the events of this world.

RICHARD CARMICHAEL.

---

LX. From JAMES O'BEIRNE, Esq. M.D. of the University of Edinburgh, Surgeon Extraordinary to the King, &c. &c.

NORTH CUMBERLAND STREET, DUBLIN,

SIR,

May 9. 1836.

IT is my conviction that Phrenology is the only true science of mind—that it is all-important in the education of youth—very useful in the treatment of insanity—and eminently calculated to infuse a more just and humane spirit into criminal legislation. Such being my firm and solemn belief, it is scarcely necessary for me to add, that I consider

an intimate knowledge of this science to be indispensably necessary to the successful teaching of Logic. Indeed I entertain a very confident expectation that the day is not far distant when that body which shall be the first to vindicate its just pretensions in this respect, will be universally honoured for its bold and timely assertion of a great truth.

I sincerely hope that this high honour is reserved for the University of Edinburgh, of which I am proud to call myself a graduate. It would also be a source of great gratification to me, and to your numerous friends and admirers in this city, to hear that the choice of the Electors to the Professorship of Logic in that University, had fallen upon so distinguished a teacher and cultivator of Phrenology, as you are, with great justice, and by common consent, admitted to be.

Wishing you every success, I have the honour to be, Sir,  
your obedient humble servant,

JAMES O'BEIRNE.

LXI. From ROBERT HARRISON, Esq. M. D., M. R. I. A.,  
Member of the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland  
and London; Professor of Anatomy and Physiology in  
the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland, &c.

1. HUME STREET, DUBLIN,  
May 10. 1836.

I BELIEVE there are few persons of education who are not more or less acquainted with the admirable, ingenious, and truly philosophical writings of Mr George Combe. They are clearly the result of an acute and vigorous mind, well trained, and highly cultivated in the art and science of reasoning. The individual possessing such a mind and such acquirements, is in my opinion *pre-eminently fitted* to fill the professorship of logic. But there is one circumstance which most peculiarly points out Mr Combe as adapted for this

*chair*, namely, the devoted and successful attention which for years he has given to the science of phrenology. *Phrenology* may be called the Science of Mind, while *Logic* directs the exercise of some of its highest powers, its noblest attributes. These two branches of philosophy appear to me to be most closely allied, and the latter is most assuredly likely to receive the greatest aid, and to be urged forwards with most success, by one who may be justly called the great master of the former.

ROBERT HARRISON.

---

LXII. From D. G. KIESER, M. D. Göttingen, Ordinary Public Professor, and Member of the Medical Faculty at Jena; Privy Councillor to the Grand Duke of Saxe Weimar; Director of a Clinical Hospital; President for 1836 of the Association of German Philosophers and Physicians; Vice-President of the Imperial Academy of Sciences of Charles Leopold; Member of the Academies and Societies of Harlem, Göttingen, Moscow, Berlin, Marburg, Halle, Bonn, Erlangen, Jena, &c.; Author of several Physiological and Medical Works.

NACH vollendeter Durchsicht der Schrift des Herrn George Combe zu Edinburgh; "System of Phrenology," ergibt sich; dass der Verfasser (abgesehen von dem Werthe und der allgemeinen Gültigkeit der Phrenologie, worüber erst die Geschichte ein Endurtheil abzugeben berufen sein möchte) mit besonderem Fleiss diejenigen Organe des menschlichen Körpers, welche die Geistesverrichtungen vermitteln, so wie die wesentlichen Verhältnisse, Eigenschaften, und Combinationen der geistigen Thätigkeit selbst, studirt, und sich mit ausgezeichnetem Scharfsinn dem Studium der Phrenologie und der Psychologie gewidmet hat.

Da ein Studium der Verhältnisse des menschlichen Geistes, sowohl in seinen innern als äussern Beziehungen, in seinen

Grundlagen und Handlungen, a Basis der Kenntniss der Hauptfunction des menschlichen Geistes—des Denkens—angesehen werden muss, und da ausserdem die Schrift des Herrn Combe von einer mit vielseitiger Belesenheit verbundenen wissenschaftlichen Bildung, so wie von Reife und Consequenz des Urtheils zeugt; so dürfte es keinem Zweifel unterworfen sein,—wenn anderweitige Requisite des Lehrertalents nicht mangeln——, dass der Herr G. Combe zu einer akademischen Lehrstelle der Logik vollkommen befähiget, und derjenigen Lehranstalt Glück zu wünschen sein dürfte, welcher sein Talent zu widmen Herr Combe sich entschliessen möchte.

Vorstehendes spricht seiner Ueberzeugung gemäss auf Verlangen durch seine Namenunterschrift aus.

D. G. KIESER.

JENA, 11th May 1836.

• *Translation.*

Having read through the System of Phrenology of Mr George Combe of Edinburgh, it appears to me, (without reference to the value and universal truth of Phrenology, on which history will alone be qualified to pass a final judgment), that the author has investigated with peculiar industry those organs of the human body through which the operations of the mind are performed, as also the essential relations, properties, and combinations which characterise mental phenomena, and has devoted himself with distinguished acuteness to the study of Phrenology and Mental Philosophy (Psychology).

Since the study of the relations of the human mind, both external and internal, in its principles and in its manifestations, must be regarded as the foundation of the knowledge of the most important mental function, viz. thought; since, moreover, the work of Mr Combe evinces scientific acquirements united to profound learning, as well as maturity and consistency of judgment: it is impossible to doubt (if the other requisites of a good teacher be not wanting) that Mr Combe is perfectly well qualified for a Professorship of Logic, and that any university would be fortunate in securing his services.

The above is certified according to my conviction, and authenticated by my signature,

D. G. KIESER.

JENA, 11th May 1836.

**LXIII. From Dr W. F. MONTGOMERY, Professor of Midwifery  
to the King and Queen's College of Physicians in Ireland.**

**MOLESWORTH STREET,  
May 12. 1836.**

HAVING been requested to state my opinion as to the value of Phrenology, as a science intimately connected with Metaphysics; and, secondly, as to Mr Combe's qualifications for teaching Logic, as Professor of that branch of science, I beg to say, that upon both points experience has enabled me to arrive at very decided conclusions. Some years ago I devoted very considerable time to the study of Phrenology; and the conviction of its truth and great value, in leading to a proper understanding of the operations of the mind, then impressed upon me, has been subsequently more and more confirmed; and my present opinion is, that in all circumstances where it becomes necessary to study the workings of the human faculties, in order to establish systems of management, whether of restraint, punishment, or education, it will be best and most judiciously done by those who are best versed in Phrenology; at the same time, of course, possessing other suitable qualifications.

As to Mr Combe's fitness for the duties of Professor of Logic, I feel perfectly convinced, from a careful perusal of his published works, and from attendance on his lectures, in both of which the public have long since agreed, that he has shewn himself an able metaphysician and good practical logician.

**F. W. MONTGOMERY.**

---

**LXIV. From Dr JOHN MOLLAN, Upper Gloucester  
Street, Dublin.**

**GEORGE COMBE, Esq.  
DEAR SIR,**

**UPPER GLOUCESTER STREET,  
Dublin, May 14. 1836.**

Mr A. CARMICHAEL has informed me that you were desirous of obtaining a statement from some of the per-

sons who were present during your examinations of several of the patients of the Richmond Lunatic Asylum, with reference to the correctness of your views, an account of which has been published in the Edinburgh Phrenological Journal.

As one of the persons who were present on that occasion, I can have no hesitation in stating, that I, in common with all the other gentlemen who witnessed the examination, was particularly struck with the accuracy of your delineations of the characters of the individuals submitted to you, as well as their agreement with the hallucinations under which they laboured.

I attended your course of Lectures on Phrenology, and can vouch for the impression produced by them on the minds of the auditors. Your clear expositions and logical deductions, and the perfectly candid manner in which the subject was treated, were universally admitted, even by some who may have dissented from you as to the particular doctrines of Phrenology.

Major Edgeworth is not at present in town, otherwise, I am sure, he would have confirmed what I have so briefly stated. I am, Dear Sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN MOLLAN, M. D.

# LXV. From HILL W. ROWAN, Esq.

SAUNDERS GROVE, BALTINGLASS, IRELAND,  
May 16. 1836.

DEAR SIR,

Our friend Mr A. Carmichael of Dublin, intimated to me a few days ago, that you wished me to express my opinion respecting the accuracy with which you delineated the characters of persons confined in the Richmond General Penitentiary (the Millbank of Ireland) upon Phrenological principles, when you visited that establishment; I have much pleasure in stating that I perfectly recollect your examination of many persons then inmates of that institution: and that your representation of their characters and propensities coin-



cided, in a most extraordinary degree, with what I knew, from long experience of the individuals in question, to be their true dispositions.

I am, dear sir, very faithfully, your obedient Servant,

GEORGE COMBE, Esq.

HILL W. ROWAN,  
Chief Magistrate of Police.

LXVI. From THOMAS WYSE, Esq. M. P. Chairman of the  
Committee on Education in Ireland.

8 CLEVELAND ROW, ST JAMES'S,

May 16. 1836.

MY DEAR SIR,

I rejoice to learn that you are willing to devote your talents and benevolence to the instruction of the rising generation in a department which must be the basis of all others, the *science of mind*, and with that view have offered you self as candidate for the Chair of Logic in the University of Edinburgh.

I read your "Constitution of Man" with a deep sense not only of the importance of the subject, but also of the truly admirable manner in which you have treated it. Without feeling myself qualified to pronounce absolutely on the claims of Phrenology to the distinction of the sole or best philosophy of mind, I cannot but regard the results you have deduced from it, in the work just mentioned, as of inestimable value to the metaphysician and the moralist. In no other production do I remember to have seen Christian duty so harmoniously, I may almost say so lovingly, combined with the most extended exercise of all the faculties, intellectual, moral, and physical, bestowed upon us by the Creator. The influence of such a system on *education* especially, can scarcely be other than highly salutary, and if I wished for any confirmation of such an opinion, I should have found it in the conclusions to which it appears to have led some of the most remarkable of the witnesses examined before our committee of education last year, amongst whom I may particularly instance Mr Simpson. Nor is the doctrine impaired by the

manner in which it is conveyed. It has the eloquence of simplicity, ease, and thorough conviction, and proves a most especial fitness for the high but difficult duties of instructing and *forming* youth. Thousands can *acquire* and *retain* knowledge; how few are competent to *convey* it. Wishing well, as I do, to the fame and efficiency of the distinguished University with which you desire to be connected, as well as to your own honourable aspirations; I continue to express the most earnest hopes for your success; and am, my dear Sir, with the greatest esteem, yours faithfully,

THOS. WYSE.

To GEORGE COMBE, Esq. Edinburgh.

LXVII. From GEORGE RENNIE, Esq. Sculptor.

CHESHAM PLACE, BELGRAVE SQUARE, LONDON,  
17th May 1836.

MY DEAR SIR,

When I consider how Phrenology was scoffed at and despised at the time it was first taught in Edinburgh by Dr Spurzheim, and now that you, its ablest and most persevering advocate in this country, can come forward as a candidate for a chair in the University, supported by testimonials from so many distinguished and able men, all concurring that Phrenology is the only true philosophy of the human mind, and consequently the only means by which Logic can be taught to any practical or beneficial effect,—I cannot doubt that ere long the truths of this science must become the basis of all education and improvement.

As an artist, I have at all times found Phrenology advantageous in the practice of my art, and that expression in almost every case coincided exactly with what was indicated by the cerebral development.

Wishing you success in the object you have in view, for which your talents and acquirements qualify you more than any person I know, believe me yours very truly,

GEORGE RENNIE.

**LXVIII. From the Rev. GEORGE LAWSON, Minister of the Associate Synod, Kilmarnock.**

**KILMARNOCK, May 17. 1836.**

I do not pretend absolutely to decide on the truth of Phrenology. The mass of facts, however, which are adduced in support of it, have given it a distinguished place among the objects of human inquiry. Its leading principles appear to me to involve nothing subversive of morality, or incompatible with the doctrines of Christianity.

The writings of Mr Combe on this subject, prove that he possesses uncommon acuteness as a reasoner, and great elegance as a writer. He appears to me peculiarly skilful in applying facts to the illustration of the phenomena of intellectual and moral character. I should certainly consider the present vacancy in the Chair of Logic as a most favourable opportunity of “bringing forward the pretensions” of Phrenology “as the science of mind,” and preparing the way for a correct and final decision on its merits. These objects would be gained by the appointment of Mr Combe to that professorship. And the liberal and candid proposal which he makes in the concluding sentence of his letter to the Lord Provost of Edinburgh, certainly gives him an unusual claim to the very favourable consideration of the Council, with whom the appointment lies.

**G. LAWSON,  
Minister.**



TO THE

RIGHT HON. THE LORD PROVOST, MAGISTRATES, AND  
TOWN COUNCIL OF EDINBURGH.

MY LORD PROVOST AND GENTLEMEN,

AFTER I had offered myself as a Candidate for the Logic Chair, I received a letter from Dr Neill, a Member of Council, stating that difficulties seemed to occur to some religious persons in regard to the bearing of Phrenology on certain doctrines of our holy religion. On the 12th day of April last, I wrote to him a letter explaining my views on the subject, which has been since printed and presented to the Council, under the title of "The Suppressed Documents." Dr Neill sent that communication to the Rev. Professor Duncan for his opinion, and he wrote a long and interesting letter on the general subject of the Relation between Phrenology and Christianity. To this letter I replied, and Dr Duncan sent a second short communication to Dr Neill. By the kindness of these gentlemen I have been permitted to print and present the whole correspondence to the Council; and, as it embraces topics of great interest, I hope to be forgiven for the additional trespass which I necessarily make on their time, in requesting for them an attentive perusal.

I have the honour to remain,

MY LORD PROVOST AND GENTLEMEN,

Your very faithful and obedient servant,

GEO. COMBE.

EDINBURGH, 13th June 1836.



LETTER from rev. Professor DUNCAN to Dr NEILL.

(ON THE RELATION BETWEEN PHRENOLOGY AND  
CHRISTIANITY.)

MY DEAR SIR,

NORTH BRIDGE, MID-CALDER,  
*April 28. 1836.*

I am obliged by your communication ; but such is the difficulty of the subject, and the responsibility connected even with an opinion, in present circumstances, that, had it not been for our long-continued friendship, and some slight hope of being useful, as you say, I should have begged leave to decline any reply. The reply, for want of leisure, must be short ; but it will not therefore consist of a few hasty reflections, but exhibit the result of my past studies in Divinity, as related to the comparatively new science of Phrenology. With the latter science, I confess, my acquaintance is not so extensive as it is, or at least should be, with the former ; but as, in regard to Geology, I have my own way of reconciling all the progress yet made in discovery with the statements of Scripture, so in regard to Phrenology ; and I can perceive no discrepancy between the fundamental positions or principles of this new science, so far as founded on, or justified by, the phenomena of the human constitution, and what I have been accustomed to believe on Divine testimony. Phrenologists would manifestly err, were they to promulgate their system of mental philosophy as the all-controlling science, without duly pondering the claims of other sciences, and, according to the validity of these, endeavouring to discover and shew the consistency of Phrenology with these sciences, whether natural or revealed. They would place it under still greater

disadvantage, by representing it as at variance with them, or directly opposed to their ascertained principles. Phrenology may be calculated to assist in the regeneration of the world by a juster view of man's constitution and relation to external nature, but it will never be by superseding Revelation, or displacing any of its fundamental and prominent doctrines. Books professing to be divine exist, have long been preserved, and are known to have been greatly useful in ameliorating the condition of mankind, both by promoting human science and co-operating with it for this purpose : these facts surely demand a most careful examination of their claims.\* Predilection for any human science, or for all that comes under this description, should not be allowed so to occupy the mind, as to preclude the enquiry, whether any thing of a higher order exists, which is clearly possible, and whether the Scriptures are the record which contains it. The affirmative being admitted on due examination, it must become a fixed principle, that nothing proved to be certain in physiology or mental philosophy can be really opposed to the plain statements and prominent doctrines of Scripture. We may not be able for a time to perceive the consistency, but we ought not rashly to suppose it is wanting, or to traduce or speak unfavourably of either science, on account of the other. I should indeed have regretted much if Mr Combe had adopted a different course, as this mode of procedure must have tended to separate, and render antagonist, two great engines intended by God for the benefit of mankind, and must therefore have obstructed the rapid elevation of human nature to its true dignity. But it is pleasing to know that the disparagement of any other science, human or divine, is disclaimed by him and all sound phrenologists.

I am not exactly aware of what Mr C. means by styling our propensities and sentiments mere "blind instincts," nor

\* Phrenologists assume the existence and authority of revelation.—G. C.



can I see the propriety or philosophical accuracy of the phrase, as explained by himself, of the susceptibility of a right and wrong direction; nor do I understand how he distinguishes between these and a "superior illumination," which he seems to refer chiefly, if not solely, to reason,—admitting, as I think he does, the utility of Revelation as a guide to reason. Would it not be wise to reconsider, if not the statement, yet the terms in which it is expressed? I do not see how he will be otherwise able to escape misrepresentation. He knows the difficulties connected with the doctrine of instincts, which render it almost impossible to define them, or draw the line of demarcation between them and other phenomena of the mental constitution. He knows the misconstruction to which the term Instinct, in its ordinary acceptation, is liable, when applied to a large proportion of the human constitution.\* While a convert to the science of which he is the able and strenuous advocate, so far as I have had opportunity of studying it, my uncertainty with regard to some of his statements connected with theology, renders it necessary that I should simply give you my own views; and, by the knowledge you have of the accordance of these with Mr Combe's, you will judge how far he is sound *in my opinion*, and fitted for being an instructor of youth in Logic or mental philosophy.

Man, when first formed, was, according to Scripture, innocent, but fallible, and placed in a state of probation. To this his purely physical constitution was evidently adapted. His faculties, with all their organs, being, physically considered, *indifferent*, had only to be framed with that cast which befitted the immediate workmanship of God, that is, Veneration, Destructiveness, Acquisitiveness, Amativeness,

\* This would lead me into a long reply in elucidation of my meaning. In my "System," Pp. 228, 476, *et passim*, he will find explanations on this topic, which I feel confident must satisfy him and every candid enquirer.—G. C.

&c., all properly directed. Their susceptibility of a wrong direction, which was not precluded by Divine confirmation in the right cast, constituted his fallibility ; and, as it might be proper that God alone should appear to be naturally and necessarily infallible, the state of probation in which Man was placed, and in which the test was most wisely adapted to his circumstances, was permitted in his case (as it had been even in that of Angels) to discover his defectibility. The Scriptures declare, that he deviated from rectitude, and is now in a fallen state. In this state the organization is less perfect, the cast of all the propensities is to evil, they are constantly apt to take the wrong direction, while reason is impaired, and unable to control them. Science may do much to restore reason to its proper place, and even to render it susceptible of the power of revelation, and thus of that supernatural influence which accompanies divine truth ; but it is to revelation, accompanied with this influence, we must now look for the true regeneration of man. What is there here inconsistent with the discoveries of Phrenology, or calculated to displace its utility ?

If it be asked how all men, in consequence of the first transgression, came to be in a fallen state, I must refer, for the discussion of this point, to the Essay on the Existence of a God, part ii. sect. 2, on *the Origin and Existence of Moral Evil*, published in the first volume of the Biblical Family Library, where the account of this matter is given to the best of my power, and from which it will appear that our present fallen state is *punitive*, as well as on what principle it is so. Unless this view of the present existence of moral and physical evil, for which we are indebted to Revelation, be adopted, I see no way of vindicating the Deity from being the direct author of both. Were Mr C. to hold that the present constitution of man is that which was original, I do not conceive how he could extricate himself from the startling imputation. But I am yet to learn

that he does so, or how it is essential to Phrenology to hold such an opinion.\* On the principles which have just been suggested, the science is perfectly consistent with the Scripture account, both of the state of probation and of our present condition; and these principles afford as much satisfaction as perhaps we shall ever get, or as is necessary in the present life, with regard to the propriety of the ways of God, and his benignity to man. When I find that he had ulterior designs as to this world and its inhabitants, which could not be developed in the first formation of man, I do not enquire whether, proleptically, the physical state of inferior beings, animate and inanimate, might not be adapted to what He who seeth the end from the beginning knew would take place, and intended to permit, for the purposes of his own glory. As flowers were made to decay and fruits to perish, so might carnivorous animals be intended to feed on others, just as the graminivorous on the herbs of the field; and all this, together with the natural death of the animals, even abstract from the anticipated result of the state of human probation, might be sufficiently consistent with the utility, pleasures, and happiness of inferior creatures, who, having no responsibility, could be intended only for temporary existence. I see no necessity for supposing any change in their condition beyond that which arises from their now being employed for purposes of judgment, or that to which they are subjected by the cruelty and violence of fallen man. This the Scriptures style their being "subjected to vanity and the bondage of corruption," contrary to their original design. That the state of nature

\* See p. 36 of the 12mo. edition of *Constitution of Man*. "The view now presented, makes no attempt to explain *why* pain or evil exists, because I conceive the inquiry to surpass the limits of the human understanding." The assumption that, by Phrenology, or any other science, it can be proved that the present state of man (which alone I investigate) was his *original* state, is disclaimed by Phrenologists.—G. C.

was the same prior to the fall that it still is, seems to be indicated, by the employment assigned to man, of dressing and keeping in order the garden of Eden,—a pleasant recreation, calculated to furnish that exercise by which, as truly as by food, his life and health were to be upheld, but which implies the same necessity of restraining luxuriance, of sowing, transplanting, clearing, propagating the finer specimens, and otherwise improving both flowers and fruits, or preventing them from degenerating, which now exists, though, doubtless, not to that inconvenient and oppressive extent which is traced to the fall.—Gen. ii. 15 ; iii. 17, 18, 19. Does not this, on the principle of analogy, lead to a similar conclusion with regard to the Animal Kingdom ?

But would not man have been liable to be harmed or devoured by the *feræ*, though he had retained his primitive integrity ? There is no necessity for supposing the occurrence of such danger from defect of food, from natural inclination, or from any casual supervening malignity of disposition, on the part of the inferior animals. Man, whatever may be the analogy between him and them in organization, is such a different creature, that Reason itself must recognise him as their manifestly intended lord ; and the Scriptures preclude all idea of danger by declaring, that, in the majesty of innocence, he was invested with “ dominion over the beasts of the earth, the fowls of the air, and the fishes of the sea.” The difference between him and them, the existence of this dominion, and the safety resulting from it, were all indicated by the peaceful transition of the animals before Adam, when, pondering their characters, he gave them names, but selected no companion from among them, rejecting even those that most nearly resembled himself.\* Even on the supposition, clearly inadmissible, that circumstances incompatible with a state of innocence had

\* *Simia, quam similis, turpissima bestia nobis.* Crc. ex Ennio.

occurred, the danger *could* have been prevented, as infidels must allow, as easily as the destruction of Daniel in the lions' den, or of his companions in the fiery furnace. He who, from respect to moral integrity and religion, in the case of imperfect beings, could restrain the devouring animals or element, might surely have been expected to command absolute security for the unfallen; but, according to Scripture, the arrangements were so made, as to supersede the necessity of recourse to miraculous interposition.

But was not man naturally mortal—liable to die? There was certainly nothing in his physical constitution to prevent his liability to die. Rigidity and decay, the natural effects of old age, might have occasioned his dissolution. Thus far I agree with Mr C. But who is not aware that Revelation not only forbids the supposition of this natural process occasioning his death, or of his dying in any other way, had he not sinned, but even suggests an explanation of the subject? "There is first a natural body (dependent on air, food, &c.), and there is a spiritual body" (which can live independent of these supports), — such a body as Christ now has, or Enoch and Elijah. The possibility of this Paul illustrates from analogy, 1 Cor. xv. 39–42. Now, the former, the natural body, we derive from Adam, who was made a living soul; the latter would have been conferred, had he not fallen, without tasting of death,—as it shall be upon all the redeemed through the mediation of Christ, who are alive and remaining at the last day. It would have been but a poor felicity, of which man (even a botanist) might have become weary, to have remained for ever in this world, though surrounded with a paradisaic state of things. God intended something of a higher order for man; and, after preserving him free from danger, in all the delicious feelings of the soundest health, would have invested him with the spiritual body, that is, effected a change on the same body, calculated to fit him

for existence in another region, to which successive generations would have passed to give place to the new generations produced in this world. Though, for wise reasons, (specified in the section of the work already referred to\*), moral and physical evil is allowed to exist even with the regenerated, yet are they represented in Scripture as ultimately restored by the second Adam to all that was lost and forfeited by the first. These seem to me legitimate conclusions from such scriptures as the following:—Gen. ii. 17. iii. 19; Rom. v. 12. 17. viii. 23; 1 Cor. xv. 22. 44–50. And what is there in all this inconsistent with the true principles of Phrenology, or how can it infer the necessity of a primitive and original destination to death?

I am anxious we should have a fellowship of mind on the subject of this letter, though we should differ a little on others. I hope Mr Combe will never perceive any thing incompatible with just views of the doctrines of Scripture in the science which he has done so much to elevate to its present state. The phenomena of which it treats are in my view of great importance in mental training, and no more inconsistent with human responsibility, or favourable to materialism, than other phenomena of our physical constitution, long known, and universally admitted.

I am, my dear Sir, yours faithfully,

ALEX. DUNCAN.

LETTER from Mr COMBE to Dr NEILL.

MY DEAR SIR,

EDINBURGH, *May 15. 1836.*

I duly received your letter of the 29th of April, inclosing a letter dated the 28th of April, from the Rev. Professor Duncan to you. I have read both with great attention, and have delayed answering them till now, in consequence of your

\* Biblical Family Library, vol. i. p. 168–192.

having intimated that you were then on the eve of setting out for London. Allow me to offer my best acknowledgments to you for the kind and upright motives which induced you to apply to Professor Duncan for his opinion of the relation between my phrenological doctrines and Christianity, and to him for the excellent spirit in which he has answered your appeal. My own views are the following :

There are three questions which it is here necessary to distinguish and to treat separately, viz.

1. What facts and doctrines in Phrenology are conformable to nature?

2. What are conformable to right interpretations of Scripture?

3. What are conformable to the standards of any particular church, the Church of Scotland, for example, or that of England, or that of Rome?

I assume it as a fundamental principle, that there cannot by possibility be any discrepancy between real facts in nature, or sound deductions from them, and right interpretations of Scripture; because the God of Nature and Revelation is one: He is the fountain of truth and wisdom, and his works and word cannot be discordant.

In directing my attention, therefore, to Nature, I never once imagined that if I discriminated truth I could be deviating from Scripture; nor can I conceive this even now to be the case.

I regard Revelation as a sacred subject which ought not lightly to be brought into collision with philosophy. This may be done in two ways—by adducing ill-observed or incorrectly interpreted natural phenomena as evidence against revelation on the one hand,—or by advancing erroneous interpretations of Scripture as objections against indubitable natural truths on the other. Many sceptical writers have been guilty of the first,—while the Roman Pontiff and Cardinals who condemned Galileo, and also the reli-

gious authors who in our day denounce geology as inconsistent with Scripture,—are chargeable with the second of these errors.

It appears to me more advantageous to investigate nature *by herself first*, and to proceed to compare her phenomena with Scripture only after being certain that we have rightly observed and interpreted them.

By this method we shall preserve our minds calm and unbiassed for the investigation of truth ; we shall test Nature by herself, which is the proper standard by which to try her ; and we shall avoid bringing discredit on Revelation by involving it in unseemly conflicts with natural phenomena.

To be able to discover, in a sound and satisfactory manner, the relationship between natural truths and revelation, the investigator should be critically acquainted with both. In reading the attacks made by serious persons who are ignorant of geology against the discoveries made in that science, you must have occasionally been convinced, that, in so far as they had the power, they were injuring, while they intended to serve, the cause of religion ; because they were denouncing as subversive of Revelation, facts which could not possibly give way before any form of argument, seeing that they were founded in nature. The same error is committed every day in regard to Phrenology. Religious persons attack certain statements as *false* which are indubitably *true*, and only bring obloquy on their own cause when they imagine that they are overwhelming the advocates of the new science.

It is rare, however, particularly in the case of a new science, to find an individual qualified by his knowledge of science and Scripture to compare them advantageously. The mind of the successful explorer of nature is generally too closely and ardently directed towards her phenomena, to render him equally clear-sighted and zealous in his interpretations of Scripture. Both objects, therefore, will



be better accomplished, if he who takes the lead in interrogating nature shall confine himself to that province ; and if another individual possessed of a clear, calm, and unbiassed understanding, who has made theology his study, shall follow in his tract,—detecting his errors where he has fallen into any, yet recognising and embracing all the truth which he has brought to light,—and shall then proceed to compare this truth with Revelation, with the single and upright purpose of discovering their harmony.

Entertaining these views, I have on principle confined myself to the investigation of nature, never doubting that, in so-far as I may have discovered truth, Scripture will be found to harmonize with my doctrines. If in any instance I have observed or interpreted erroneously, I shall be most anxious, on this being pointed out, to renounce my errors. But I hope it will not be imputed to me as a fault that I have not discussed also the relation of nature to Revelation, regarding this, as I certainly do, as more properly the duty of individuals better qualified than myself for the task.

There is another distinction which is too often overlooked. All Christian churches are agreed in regard to the import and obligation of the moral precepts of Christianity, and it is only touching points of doctrine and church government that they differ. Now, Phrenology as a mere human science comes into direct relationship only with the first—the practical precepts—and it has generally been allowed by those who have attended to the subject, that no mental philosophy in existence can be compared with it, not only for its exact accordance with this great and important department of Christianity, but for the power with which it demonstrates that all nature is framed and adjusted on the principle of enforcing by positive sanctions the scheme of Christian morals.

I very respectfully maintain, therefore, that Phrenology, and the deductions which I have made from it, are in a re-

markable degree in harmony with all the points on which the Christian world in general is agreed; and when you consider that the Logic Chair is one, not of theology but of science, and that, by the constitution of your University, the class may be, and generally is, attended by students professing a variety of shades of doctrinal belief,—it may well be doubted whether this certain harmony between the principles of Phrenology, and those Christian principles in which all the students are agreed, be not a decided recommendation of it to the Patrons.

The third question before stated, or the accordance of Phrenology with the standards of the Church of Scotland, is the only one that remains to be considered. If there be harmony between the constitution of Nature and the doctrines of Phrenology, and also between the moral precepts of Christianity and these doctrines, which there assuredly is, it would be strange indeed if discord were discovered between them and sound Christian doctrine. Assuming, then, that the standards are correct deductions from Scripture, it is a fair presumption that they and Phrenology do also agree. But as philosophy is addressed to men of every variety of faith, and as I appear before you exclusively as a philosopher, I humbly urge that it is the duty of the divines of each church to adjust the relation between their own standards and any particular philosophical doctrines, if true, (and if mine be untrue I shall cheerfully abandon them); and that the members of the Church of Scotland are not entitled to insist on your rejecting my claims to a philosophical professorship, merely because they have not taken the trouble to discharge a duty incumbent exclusively on themselves.

I am confirmed in my conviction of the soundness of the course which I have adopted in avoiding all doctrinal discussion in my printed works, by a fact which cannot be generally known. I have received letters from several excellent and ingenious friends well skilled in theology, on

the relation between doctrinal Christianity and Phrenology, reconciling them ; but no two of them agree in the manner of doing so. Each proceeds according to his individual views of Christianity, and according to his individual cast of mind. Professor Duncan's views, although highly ingenious, differ from them all. This satisfies me that the time is not yet come, and that the men have not yet appeared, for doing justice to this great subject ;—and perhaps they will not arrive until both Revelation and Phrenology shall have been contemplated under broader and stronger lights than are yet possessed ; and which, I cannot doubt, will at last bring them into complete harmony. Any attempt on my part, therefore, to enter on this question at present, would prove unsatisfactory to myself and unprofitable to the public. Probably a report from a committee of the first members of the Church, after Phrenology shall have been fully studied by them as science, will be necessary before the public mind will be thoroughly satisfied on the subject, and I should allow such a committee several years for deliberation. But this affords no reason why the progress of truth should be arrested in the mean time ; why a doctrine founded in nature, and admitted by many sound theologians to be undeniably in harmony with practical Christianity, should be excluded from your University, and why I should be held forth as an enemy to religion merely because certain of those who take an interest in that sacred cause have not yet found it convenient to study the two subjects and deliberately to compare them. If I advance only doctrines founded in nature and in accordance with Christian morality, I am entitled to the benefit of the presumption that they are also in harmony with all sound doctrinal interpretations of Scripture. If any of my views are at variance with nature or Christian morality, I am ready to give them up.

You are aware that my works on Phrenology have

obtained a very extensive circulation, in this country, in America and on the Continent, and that my lectures have been numerous and respectably attended. Is it credible that I can have been teaching doctrines hostile to Christianity, and yet have been thus cordially received? I very respectfully maintain, and you as a Phrenologist are capable of judging of the point, that my whole doctrines are much more obviously in accordance with Christianity than the philosophical theories of Mr Stewart and Dr Brown, which are not generally objected to by the Christian public. In my System of Phrenology, in particular, which contains all the principles of the science that would be embraced by the Logic Chair, there is not a view that any reasonable Christian can object to. And I am ready to pledge myself, if this should be any satisfaction to the Patrons, not to go beyond the contents of that volume in teaching Logic on phrenological principles in the University. They have a guarantee for my sincerity in this assurance, in my offer to resign the Chair on their requisition to do so. To you who understand Phrenology, I need scarcely add, that the very clearness of the light which it throws on the human faculties, their objects, and applications, would afford no small security against any Professor abusing it in teaching dangerous doctrines; it would enable the students instantly to detect, to expose, and refute the errors of their master.

Allow me, in conclusion, to draw your attention to the fact, that the late Rev. Dr Andrew Thomson attended a course of my lectures on Phrenology in 1822 or 1823, and survived the publication of "The Constitution of Man," a copy of which I presented to him, for nearly three years; and although he conducted the Christian Instructor, and was a zealous, ready, and powerful writer, vividly alive to the purity of the faith which he espoused, yet he never published a word against that book. I sat for several years in his church, and was personally acquainted with him, and

yet I never received even any private remonstrance from him on the subject. Further, Dr Chalmers published his *Bridgewater Treatise* several years after my work had appeared, and although the subjects in his book and mine are closely analogous, he has stated no objection whatever to my views, which is quite inconceivable if he had regarded them as dangerous and unfounded in nature, and been prepared to refute them. Now, I very respectfully submit, that it would be unjust to presume against me, without evidence and without argument, that my facts and deductions are erroneous and at variance with Scripture, and on this presumption alone to exclude me from the Logic Chair. Instead of enjoying the natural presumption of innocence, which is allowed even to malefactors, until they be proved to be guilty, the rule is proposed to be reversed in my case. Some religious men contend for my exclusion on the bare possibility that I may, after the matter is investigated, be found to have committed heresy! They urge my exclusion without any responsible accuser having appeared against me, without a trial, and of necessity, therefore, in opposition to justice. I can only appeal to the common sense and good feelings of mankind against such proceedings.

I observe a work by Mr Scott of Teviotbank in opposition to "The Constitution of Man," announced as preparing for publication. But I can hardly anticipate that he will consider himself called on to supply the *supposed* omissions of the two learned Doctors of Divinity above named. If, however, I shall be mistaken in this, and if Mr Scott shall make any attempt to shew that my work contains doctrines inconsistent with the principles of sound Christianity, it will be sufficient for me to remind you and the public that Mr Scott is a layman, that he enjoys no reputation for theological learning, and that his opinions therefore are not of authority to decide the question. Besides, you are

well aware that Mr Scott strenuously opposed the views contained in the *Constitution of Man* when they were discussed in the Phrenological Society prior to their publication, and that the public voice in this country, in America, and on the Continent, has pronounced an opinion of the work widely different from that entertained by him.

I am, my dear Sir, yours very sincerely,

GEO. COMBE.

SECOND LETTER, Rev. Professor DUNCAN to Dr NEILL.

NORTH BRIDGE, MIDCALDER,

MY DEAR SIR,

May 31. 1836.

I received yours yesterday, with the two letters,—mine certainly in another form than I expected such a hasty production to appear in.\* However, if Mr Combe thinks the circulation of both will be of any service to him, I have no objection to your printing it. His, I think, is calculated to remove misapprehension and scruples. Tender to him my thanks for the kind manner in which he received mine, on your shewing it to him.

With his fundamental principle, (page 111,) I entirely agree,—who should not? but without relinquishing the statements, pages 103-4; for deference to ascertained facts is different from making reason judge, not of the proofs of revelation, which it must always be, (for these are facts too, though ascertained by testimony,) but of the contents or doctrines of revelation. An accredited revelation cannot be opposed to ascertained facts in physiology or any other science, but it may aid in explaining or accounting for them, and such aid ought to be sought, and cordially accepted. My sole objection was, to combining with Phrenology opinions on subjects not necessarily connected with

\* In proof sheet.

it ; and I cannot but approve of Mr Combe's distinction of the three questions, and the manner in which he follows it out, as also of the plan on which he proposes to teach Logic should the honour of the Chair be conferred upon him. It is certainly the business of divines to reconcile undeniable phenomena with Revelation. This they are bound to do, and this they will ever be able to do, with all the requisite measure of success, provided no impediment be thrown in their way, by attaching inferences or opinions to these phenomena which interfere with sound theology, or constrain to interpretations of Scripture inconsistent with the rules of just biblical criticism, or calculated to displace the necessity and make void the utility of a Divine Revelation. It gives me pleasure to find Mr Combe intends no such method of teaching.

I am, my dear Sir, yours faithfully,

ALEX. DUNCAN.

To Mr Wm. FRASER, Printer, Edinburgh.

MY DEAR SIR,

EDINBURGH, 4th June 1836.

As you have had the best opportunities of observing the effects which Phrenology has produced, and is producing, on the minds of the middle and operative classes of Edinburgh, and as you were highly instrumental in founding and promoting, for several years, the Society for procuring instruction in Useful Knowledge, now denominated the Edinburgh Philosophical Association, I shall feel greatly obliged if you will favour me with a statement of your experience and observations, in such a form as may be presented to the Council.—I am, my dear Sir, yours sincerely,

GEO. COMBE.

LETTER from Mr WILLIAM FRASER, Printer, Edinburgh.

To GEORGE COMBE, Esq.

DEAR SIR,

The Chair of Logic being that in which are or should be taught the true nature of the intellectual faculties, and the proper means of applying them to their legitimate objects, I conceive that *all* classes of the community in the kingdom, and more especially the citizens of Edinburgh, have a very deep interest in the proper selection of a Professor to fill that Chair, now vacant, in our University, and I therefore cheerfully give my humble opinion on the merits of your claims, both on public and individual grounds, to that important situation.

It was in 1828 that my attention was first practically directed to physiological and mental phenomena, by your valuable work on the Constitution of Man. For a considerable time previous my health had been seriously impaired, and although the ordinary medical means were resorted to for recovery, I have no hesitation in saying, that it was



the lucid exposition of what you denominate the **Natural Laws** in the above work, that speedily enabled me to trace the causes of my illness, to avoid these and others in future, and ultimately restored me to health. I have ever since kept the operations of the physical, the organic, and the moral laws steadily in view, and have derived, in common with many of my friends who have done the same, a corresponding portion of bodily and mental comfort.

In the spring of 1832, I accidentally heard you deliver a short course of lectures on Phrenology to a highly respectable audience of medical and other gentlemen ;—in the summer of the same year a more extended (*gratis*) course to a numerous attendance of the working classes of both sexes ;—and in the winters of 1832-3 and 1834-5 two full courses on the same subject to crowded audiences, composed (likewise of both sexes) of the mercantile and trading portions of the community. At the commencement of the above courses of lectures, the science of Phrenology was in great disrepute among these classes in Edinburgh, but the lucid and masterly exposition which you gave of its principles, and of its practical application to all the duties of life, invariably elicited unqualified praise from all ranks of your hearers, and has completely turned the tide of public opinion in its favour.

In the summer course of lectures given to the working classes, and also in the subsequent one to a higher class of auditors, you gave instruction in the general principles of Physiology, illustrated by anatomical drawings and a human skeleton. You were thus the first to introduce this interesting and essentially practical branch of knowledge into popular education. The propriety of doing so, however, was at first most vehemently denounced, both publicly and privately, as subversive of all right feeling, and a gross breach of morality ; but you soon convinced your auditors to the contrary,—persevered in your philanthropic labours,—and have since seen this description of popular lectures received into due favour with the public.

At the commencement of winter 1833-4, you delivered three lectures on general education, which were afterwards repeated in spring to an audience of the upper ranks, and printed at the request of the Directors of the institution now denominated the Edinburgh Philosophical Association, before whom they were first delivered,—an institution avowedly most deeply indebted to your exertions and liberality, for its origin, and progressive prosperity. In these lectures you ably exposed the many and great defects of the systems of general education as hitherto conducted, and no less clearly delineated the more rational and generally useful plan which should be adopted. These lectures were subsequently published as a pamphlet, and also reprinted in Chambers's Journal, and had a very extensive circulation. On this occasion, again, your views were most virulently attacked by a considerable portion of the press, and by a great majority of those engaged in public instruction; but again you most successfully triumphed; and, it may be unnecessary to remark, what is now so generally known, that numerous seminaries of education for all ages and ranks in society have been everywhere already established upon your principles, and are flourishing in an eminent degree, while those on the old plan are languishing and falling off in a corresponding ratio.

In the summer of 1835, you gave a short course of lectures on Moral Philosophy, founded on Phrenology and Physiology, as preliminary to a more extended one, intended to be delivered in winter to the Association above referred to. This course has likewise since been given to a very numerous and highly respectable class of the community, although you laboured under the great disadvantage of a majority of your auditors, many of whom were new attenders, being either totally ignorant of, or but very superficially acquainted with, the principles of either Phrenology or Physiology, upon both of which your course was chiefly based.

I have been thus minute in these details, to shew the great

and successful exertions you have made among all ranks in the cause of public education,—the all but insurmountable obstacles you have had to encounter at every step,—and that, by the manner in which you have successively and most triumphantly borne down every opposition, you have exhibited talents almost unrivalled for defending truth, exposing error, and discharging all the other important duties of a public teacher.

With regard to the system of Mental Philosophy founded on Phrenology, I have no hesitation in saying—if we may judge, from its leading principles being almost intuitively comprehended by the high and the low, the learned and the unlearned, and from its being practically applicable to all the purposes of life, as well those of the most orthodox divine as of the humblest artizan,—that there can be little doubt of its being the true philosophy of mind, or, at all events, vastly superior to any system hitherto adopted. If, therefore, it be the task of a Professor of Logic to expound the constitution of the human faculties and their proper use in the investigation of truth, and to explain their various combinations in the formation or modification of character, with the innumerable advantages to be derived and conferred on the whole community from such knowledge ;—and, farther, if a candidate most thoroughly acquainted with the new science of Mind, and in every other way eminently gifted for the art of public teaching, is to be appointed to fill the vacant chair, its Patrons will have very little difficulty in the selection.

By some I may perhaps be thought to have exceeded the limits of an ordinary testimonial ; but, in the present appointment, the progress of knowledge and the fame of our University are peculiarly at stake,—the eyes of enlightened Europe and of America are bent on the intellectual discrimination and moral courage of its Patrons,—and the rise or fall of the educational reputation of Edinburgh, with all the beneficial or baneful consequences on its mer-

cantile and other concerns, most materially depend on their decision. It becomes, therefore, as already mentioned, the duty of every citizen to state his views fully on the subject ; and, looking to the independent, intelligent, and liberal character of our present Town Council, with the unparalleled weight of unquestionable testimony which you have laid before them in your favour, I am unwilling to doubt the result of their choice.—I am, &c:

W. FRASER.

9th June 1836.

TO THE

RIGHT HON. THE LORD PROVOST, MAGISTRATES, AND  
TOWN COUNCIL OF EDINBURGH.

23. CHARLOTTE SQUARE, EDINBURGH,  
1st July 1836.

MY LORD PROVOST AND GENTLEMEN,

I beg leave to present to you a few additional Testimonials which I have received from the United States of America, and to avail myself of the occasion to offer some explanations regarding the grounds of my pretensions to the Logic Chair, which, I am informed, are still imperfectly understood by several members of Council.

It has been remarked, that, if a Chair of Phrenology were to be disposed of, my certificates might be deserving of attention, but that they have no relation to Logic.

I beg leave very respectfully to solicit the attention of those who entertain this opinion to the following words of Mr Dugald Stewart: "I have always," says he, "been convinced that it was a fundamental error of Aristotle (in which he has been followed by almost every logical writer since his time) to confine his views entirely to Reasoning or the discursive faculty, instead of aiming at the improvement of our nature in all its various parts. . . . If this remark be well founded, it obviously follows, that, in order to prepare the way for a just and comprehensive system of logic, a *previous survey of our nature considered as one comprehensive whole, is indispensably necessary.*"\*

The late Mr George Jardine, Professor of Logic in the University of Glasgow, in his "Outlines of Philosophical

\* *Philosophical Essays* by Dugald Stewart, Esq.; 2d edition, chap. ii. pp. 61-63.

Education, illustrated by the method of teaching the Logic Class" in that University, says, "To the elements of the *science of the human mind*, therefore, I have recourse on the present occasion, as the *mother science*, so to call it, from which all others derive at once their origin and nourishment. Thus *logic, metaphysics*, ethics, jurisprudence, law, and eloquence, have their common origin in mind; . . . and consequently an intimate acquaintance with the phenomena of mind must form a suitable introduction to the study of every branch of knowledge." P. 45.

The Royal Commissioners appointed to visit the Universities of Scotland, in their General Report, observe, that "Logic may be rendered more elementary and useful, by being confined to a brief and general account of the objects of human knowledge, the *faculties by which it is acquired*, and the rules for the investigation of truth." P. 28.

Assuming, then, that the philosophy of mind is indispensable to the formation of a sound and useful system of Logic, I beg leave to observe, that Phrenology, whatever notions of it individuals who have never studied it may entertain, is the philosophy of the human mind, based on observation of the mental organs.

The external senses may be adverted to in illustration of its nature and pretensions. In order to comprehend the philosophy of vision, it is necessary to study the following particulars:—

1. The structure and functions of the eye and optic nerve, which are the organs of this sense.

2. The effects of the condition of these organs on the powers of vision. One constitution of the eye, for instance, gives distant, another close vision. When the eye is diseased, we may see green objects as yellow, or we may see double, or we may be altogether incapable of seeing, according to the nature of the malady.

3. The relations of external objects to these organs. This head includes the science of optics, with its various applications to painting (*perspective*), astronomy (*making of telescopes*), &c. &c.

If the philosophy of vision were studied, by merely

naming, recording, and classifying its phenomena, without knowledge of the structure, functions, diseases, and relations of the eye, it would present precisely the same appearance which the philosophy of mind now exhibits in the pages of the metaphysicians.

In studying the works on mental philosophy by Dr Reid, Mr Dugald Stewart, and Dr Thomas Brown, who form the boast of Scotland in this department of knowledge, the following observations strike a reflecting reader.

1. These authors differ widely in regard to the number and nature of the primitive mental faculties.

If the philosophy of the senses had been studied without knowledge of their organs, we should probably have had, in like manner, disputes whether hearing and seeing, tasting and smelling, were distinct senses, or whether, by some metaphysical refinement, they could not all be referred to one sense.

2. They make no inquiry into the organs of the faculties.

3. They give no account of the obvious fact, of different individuals possessing the faculties in different degrees of endowment, which fit them for different pursuits.

4. They give no account of the effects of disease on the manifestations of the faculties.

5. They have given no philosophical account of the relations of external objects to the faculties, and cannot do so while the faculties themselves continue unknown.

In consequence of these imperfections, it is impossible to apply, with reasonable success, the philosophy of mind, as taught by these distinguished authors, to any of the following purposes :—

1. To the selection of proper pursuits for individuals according to their capacities ; or to the selection of persons endowed with the necessary natural ability to fill particular offices. Men of penetration accomplish these ends by the aid of their natural sagacity, sharpened by experience ; but metaphysical philosophy affords them no aid in doing so.

2. To the elucidation and treatment of insanity.

3. To the exposition of the relations of different sciences to the human faculties, an indispensable requisite in an effective system of education.

4. To the elucidation of the mental causes which produce the tendency to crime.

5. To the exposition of the effects of the condition of the bodily organs on the powers of mental manifestation.

Phrenology, on the other hand, is recommended by the following considerations :—

1. No faculty of mind is admitted as primitive until the organ by which it is manifested be ascertained by observation.

In consequence, the Phrenologists no more attempt to make and unmake faculties, or to analyze one into another, than they would attempt such feats in regard to the external senses. Every faculty stated as ascertained in Phrenology stands forth as a distinct mental capacity, whether of feeling or of thought, resting on the stable foundation of an organ, having specific functions, and standing related to determinate objects, very much as the external senses appear when studied in connection with their organic apparatus.

2. The fact is ascertained by observation, that the power of manifesting each of these faculties bears a relation, *cæteris paribus*, to the size of its organ ; and that the relative size of the organs differs in different individuals.

Hence, it is possible to ascertain the strong and feeble powers in individual minds, and to apply this knowledge in dedicating them to particular pursuits. The same knowledge renders it possible to select persons enjoying particular mental qualifications to fill particular offices.

3. The mental faculties being studied in relation to their organs, their constitution in health is philosophically ascertained, and it becomes easy to understand their appearances under the influence of disease.

4. The fact, that, *cæteris paribus*, the power of manifesting the faculties is in proportion to the size of the organs, enables us to comprehend how some individuals, from having



the organs of the animal feelings in excess, and the organs of the moral emotions in a state of deficiency, are prone to crime ; and the knowledge of it aids us in their treatment.

5. The mental faculties being specifically ascertained by means of their organs, it becomes possible to determine the relations in which they stand to external objects ; in other words, to form a rational system of Logic, and a really philosophical plan of education.

It is generally admitted, that Logic and mental science, as at present taught, are inapplicable to any practical purpose, except serving as a species of gymnastics for exercising the mental faculties of the young.

Professor Jardine, in speaking of the state of Logic when he entered the University of Glasgow, uses these words : “ During several sessions after my appointment, the former practice was regularly followed ; that is, the usual course of logic and metaphysics was explained by me in the most intelligible manner I could—subjected, no doubt, to the same animadversions as my predecessor. Though every day more and more convinced me that something was wrong in the system of instruction pursued in this class—that the subjects on which I lectured were not adapted to the age, the capacity, and the previous attainments of my pupils, I did not venture upon any sudden or precipitate change. Meanwhile, the daily examination of the students at a separate hour, gave me an opportunity of observing that the greater number of them comprehended very little of the doctrines explained ; that a few only of superior abilities, or of more advanced years, could give any account of them at all ; and that the greatest part of the young men remembered only a few peculiar phrases, or technical expressions, which they seemed to deliver by rote, unaccompanied with any distinct notion of their meaning. Impressed with this conviction, which the experience of every day tended to confirm, I found myself reduced to the alternative of prelecting all my life on subjects which no effort of mine could render useful to my pupils, or of making a thorough and radical change in the subject-matter of my lectures.”—P. 28.

Professor Jardine informs us, that he did make "a thorough and radical change in the subject-matter of his lectures" accordingly; and no doubt he introduced great improvements: but you may easily ascertain by inquiring at the students of the latest session, whether the foregoing observations are not, in a great degree, still applicable even to the most improved systems of Logic taught in the Scottish Universities. On this subject, indeed, Mr Stewart speaks emphatically. Alluding to the long prevalence of Aristotle's Logic, he remarks, that "the empire founded by this philosopher continued one and undivided for the period of two thousand years; and, even at this day, fallen as it is from its former grandeur, a few faithful and devoted veterans, shut up in its remaining fortresses, still bid proud defiance in their master's name to all the arrayed strength of human reason."\* "As to Logic in general," he observes, "according to my idea of it, *it is an art yet in its infancy*, and to the future advancement of which it is no more possible to fix a limit, than to the future progress of human knowledge."—P. 63. Again, he remarks, that "to speak in the actual state of the world of a complete system of logic (if by that word is meant any thing different from the logic of the schools), betrays an inattention to the object at which it aims, and to the progressive career of the human mind; but, above all, *it betrays an overweening estimate of the little which logicians have hitherto done, when compared with the magnitude of the task which they have left to their successors.*"—P. 64. In accordance with these remarks, you will observe, that in the Testimonials presented to you in favour of the champions of the existing school, no allusion is made to the *utility* of the doctrines, either in Metaphysics or in Logic.

The questions for you to determine, therefore, are, Whether the teaching of Logic in your University shall be continued on a system which the experience of ages has demonstrated to be nearly useless, and which has been condemned as barren by the highest authorities in mental philosophy:

\* *Philosophical Essays*, p. 66.

Or whether you will endeavour to introduce a new system, founded on the improvements in mental science which have recently taken place—rational, practical, and in harmony with the spirit of the age. If the former be your determination, then you should by all means reject my pretensions; but if you aim at the latter alternative, I very respectfully solicit your suffrages, because I appear before you as the representative of a new mental philosophy, capable of affording a basis for a sound system of Logic; and I have endeavoured to prove by evidence in my testimonials that that system is founded in nature, and applicable to practice.

In forming your judgment on these two questions, it may not be without advantage to bear in mind, that the history of all scientific discoveries establishes the melancholy fact, that philosophers educated in erroneous systems have in general pertinaciously adhered to them, in contempt equally of the dictates of observation, and of mathematical demonstration. You cannot, therefore, reasonably expect that the masters of the expiring systems should, in the present instance, view with any favourable eye the pretensions of the new. Experience also shews that it is equally true in philosophy as in the affairs of ordinary life, that “coming events cast their shadows before;” in other words, that the opinions of the young present the best index of the doctrines which will prevail in the next generation. There is no instance in the records of science, of the authority of great names, even although sustained by the energy of civil power, proving successful in permanently supporting error in opposition to truth; and neither is there an example of any established University, which had at an early period embraced a great discovery in science, having had occasion afterwards to repent of having done so.

In applying these historical facts as principles of judgment to the present case, I would respectfully remind you that Phrenology is now in the forty-eighth year of its promulgation, and that during the whole period of its history it has been opposed, ridiculed, misrepresented, and contemned, by almost all the men whose intellectual reputations rested on the basis of the philosophy which it is extinguishing; and that

nevertheless it has steadily advanced in public estimation, until at present, even in weighing the mere authority of names against names, it stands in Europe on an equality with the older systems, and in America it has unquestionably the ascendancy. Farther, in looking at the state of opinion in your own city on the subject, it is certain that while you will hear Phrenology condemned by the more aged patrons of the ancient school, you will find the young ardent enquirers into its doctrines. Your acute and learned member of Council, Bailie Macfarlane, will correct me if I am in error in stating, that in 1823, when he so ably and eloquently defended Phrenology in the Royal Medical Society in this city, he had scarcely any supporters; but that in proportion as he persevered, season after season, in lifting up his testimony in its favour, he found himself backed by a constantly increasing minority. And I am informed that, now, so numerous are its adherents in that body, that questions touching its truth and merits are generally carried by majorities in its favour.

In nominating a Professor of Logic, you are providing a teacher for the young; and I very respectfully beg of you to consider whether it is probable that, with the testimonials in favour of Phrenology which have been presented to you in their hands, with the books and museums on the science before their eyes, and with the constant advocacy of its truth by a highly influential portion of the periodical press, the students of the rising generation will readily bow to the authority of a philosophy which never satisfied men of practical understandings, even when it was supported by public opinion and the highest names, but which is now generally proclaimed as being useless, and which is brought into competition with a newer, a better, and a highly practical system of truth.

I have been told, that, to rest my claims on the truth and utility of Phrenology, is to deprive myself of the benefit which I might otherwise have derived from the talents which I have displayed, and the beneficial uses which I have made of them, however humble these may be. I profess myself altogether incapable of comprehending this objection. I

found my pretensions on Phrenology, because I entertain the sincere conviction that no rational or useful system of Logic can be reared without its aid. If you have confidence in the judgment and good faith of the gentlemen who have honoured me with Testimonials, you have grave authority for admitting the reasonableness of this opinion. To reject my claims, therefore, because they are based on, and bound up with Phrenology, would be simply to shut your eyes to doctrines which have been certified to you by men of the highest talents and philosophical reputation, as constituting the only basis of a sound system of Logic.

It may appear to savour of egotism in me to observe, further, that on your decision in the present instance will depend, to some considerable extent, the prosperity and reputation of your University for the next generation; but I venture to do so, because I speak not of my own importance, but of that of a great system of natural science, to the prosperity of the University of Edinburgh. As an individual I am utterly insignificant; but if, in rejecting me it shall be understood that you refuse to admit Phrenology as a science within your academic walls, then you may injure the institution over which you preside. Phrenology stands in much the same relation to the philosophy of mind and its applications, in which the discoveries of Copernicus, Galileo and Newton stood to astronomy and physical science. It is calculated to remove mystic speculations, and to supplant them by facts and the sound inductions of reason. Its first and greatest influence will be felt in leading to an important reformation in the subjects taught in classes dedicated to moral and intellectual science. Its next effect will extend to the improvement of education, rendering it at once philosophical and practical. But it will exert a still more extensive influence. Phrenology is the doctrine of the functions of the brain, and I feel and aver that if it were once admitted into your University as science, Professors of Physiology might soon find it prudent to instruct their pupils in its principles, else they would fall behind their age. It is the foundation of the most rational views of insanity, and Professors of Medical Jurisprudence might find it proper to give effect to

its doctrines, in preparing their pupils for judging of this form of disease. It affords an intelligible clue to the reciprocal influence of mind and body, and teachers of the Theory and Practice of Medicine might, I trust, be induced to avail themselves of its lights in their prelections. But while I say these things, permit me to assure you, that, if placed in the Chair, it would be my earnest study, as it would be my duty and interest, to avoid giving offence to any one ; and I am persuaded that I could teach Logic on phrenological principles without doing so.

In short, were the new philosophy introduced into your University, a very few years would justify the wisdom of your decision ; and you would maintain for your Seminary that pre-eminence as a seat of unfettered and liberal study, which it has already enjoyed, and which contributes so greatly to the fame and prosperity of the city.

On the other hand, if you shall shut your eyes to the pretensions of the new science, you will proclaim to the world that the University of Edinburgh is not disposed to take the lead in adopting the new lights of the age, and a short period may suffice to reveal to you a decline in its prosperity, which it may be extremely difficult to arrest.

I am aware of the criticisms to which I expose myself in making these remarks ; but criticism has already done its worst on me, and I have nothing farther to fear from its severity. If I did not state to you truths, and truths of the utmost importance to the welfare of your University and City, I should be bound to submit to obloquy, because it would be merited ; but if I merely present to you facts founded in nature, and endeavour to open your understandings to the perception of consequences which a few years may realize, I appeal to public opinion when enlightened by experience, to decide on the merits of the course which I have pursued.

I have the honour to be,

My LORD PROVOST and GENTLEMEN,

Your very obedient Servant,

GEO. COMBE.

From the Rev. GEORGE TREVOR SPENCER of Buxton.

EDGEMOOR, near BUXTON,

DEAR SIR,

June 9. 1836.

I have heard with great pleasure that you are a candidate for the vacant Chair of the Professorship of Logic at the University of Edinburgh, because I am convinced that no one can be better qualified to do justice to the spirit of the times, which requires truth—practical truth—as the basis of instruction, than he who has so fearlessly advocated its cause, through good report and through evil report.

Without the most distant pretension to adduce my opinion, which in so humble an individual is utterly valueless, I nevertheless feel, that, in common with thousands, I owe you a debt of gratitude for the pleasure, and, I will hope, benefit, that I have derived from the perusal of your works,—a debt which I can only discharge by expressing my sincere respect for your character, and my earnest hope that Edinburgh will render honour to herself and justice to you, by electing you to the vacant Chair.

Objections, I am aware, have been urged against Phrenology as dangerous to religion: I confess I cannot believe it to be so; on the contrary, religion being *the truth*, subordinate truth will necessarily play into her hands, and strengthen her cause. And surely we are bound to inquire whether a system of mental philosophy advocated by such talent, and supported by so many uncontroverted facts, *be truth or not*. *This*, at least, we have a right to demand, and this will be effectually done by placing you in the responsible situation, to which, in the opinion of those so well privileged to judge, you so justly aspire.

I have the honour to be, dear Sir, your very faithful servant,

G. TREVOR SPENCER.

## FROM AMERICA.

- I. From WILLIAM M. HOLLAND, Esq. Professor of Ancient Languages in Washington College, Hartford, Connecticut.

NABUM CAPEN, Esq. Boston.

HARTFORD, June 1. 1836.

DEAR SIR,—Having been requested by you, through our common friend, Dr Brigham, to state in what estimate the writings of Mr George Combe of Edinburgh are held in this region, where they have been so extensively circulated, I do not hesitate to say that they are very highly valued by all persons of intelligence and candour, who have read them, whether phrenologists or not. In my view, Mr Combe has unfolded the true science of the Human Mind ; and the learning, candour, and excellence of his writings, shew that he must be eminently qualified to give instruction in Mental Philosophy and Logic.

I am, Dear Sir, very truly your friend and obedient servant,

WM. M. HOLLAND.

In the expression of the views of the tendency of Mr Combe's writings, contained in Professor Holland's letter, we entirely concur.

N. S. WHEATON, D. D., Pres. Washington College.

SAMUEL FARMAR JARVIS, D. D., Professor of Oriental L. L. and Lit.

EDWARD P. TERRY, M. D., Consulting Physician to the Connecticut Retreat for the Insane.

AMARIAH BRIGHAM, M. D., Author of "*Observations on the Influence of Religion upon Health, and Remarks upon the Physical Welfare of Mankind ;*" and "*Mental Cultivation and Mental Excitement upon Health,*" &c.

- II. From Dr JOHN C. WARREN, Professor of Anatomy, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

TO N. CAPEN, Esq.

BOSTON, June 3. 1836.

DEAR SIR,—In reply to your question in regard to the reputation of Mr Combe in this country ; not being a phrenologist, I do not know that I should be thought a proper



judge. Independently of Phrenology, however, Mr Combe's works are highly esteemed here, and have been productive of real improvement in intellectual and physical culture. The great truth, that men have the control of health and life, to a certain extent, is set forth in his work on the Constitution of Man, with a strength of light that must strike and impress the mind. I can add, that having had some agency in distributing this work among those whom I consider to be excellent judges of its merits, I have heard but one opinion in regard to it, and this a most favourable one.

Respectfully your friend and servant,

JOHN C. WARREN.

III. From SAMUEL HOWE, M. D., Director of the New England Institution for the Education of the Blind.

N. CAPEN, Esq.

BOSTON, June 3. 1836.

DEAR SIR,—You request my opinion of the works of Mr George Combe. I cannot conceive how my individual opinion can be of any consequence; it would be but a faint note in the loud expression of approbation and admiration which I am sure would follow a question on the subject, if addressed to hundreds of our first literary men. Convinced as I thoroughly am of the soundness of Mr Combe's views, and the truth of most of his deductions, my opinion as a phrenologist might be considered as biassed in his favour; but aside from that, I speak my own deliberate opinion, and that of many of my anti-phrenological friends, when I say, that Mr Combe should be ranked among the master-spirits of the age. But one fact is worth many speculations; I have had occasion to teach the general principles of the Philosophy of Mind to the young. I have given my class the views of the older writers, and mystified them with Stewart and Brown; but on presenting the new Philosophy, as explained by Mr Combe, they said that they saw, and felt, and understood, what before was dark and unsatisfactory. I consider Mr Combe's works as invaluable to a teacher of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy. Yours truly,

SAMUEL HOWE, M. D.

IV. From C. H. STEDMAN, M. D., Surgeon and Physician to the United States Marine Hospital, Fellow of the Massachusetts Medical Society, &c.

GEORGE COMBE, Esq.

BOSTON, June 1. 1836.

SIR,—Having just heard of your application for the Professorship of Logic in the University of Edinburgh, I cannot allow the opportunity which this circumstance presents, to pass, without testifying to the fact of your extended influence over the minds of my countrymen, through the many talented works of which you are the author. Let me assure you of the continuance and constant increase of that influence, and of your usefulness in this country. It has displayed itself on many occasions, and has taken deep root among our best educated classes, and particularly in our colleges and our schools.

With the hope that your far-famed City may have the honour of taking the first *sure* step in the Science of Mind, and that your efforts in the cause of truth may be rewarded with the distinction they deserve, I beg leave respectfully to subscribe myself, your most obedient servant,

CHARLES H. STEDMAN, M. D.

V. From GEORGE HAYWARD, M. D., Professor of Surgery, Harvard University; JOHN HOMANS, M. D.; Z. B. ADAMS, M. D.; H. HOSMER, M. D.; J. H. DIX, M. D.; JOHN D. FISHER, M. D.; JOSHUA B. FLINT, M. D.; CHARLES T. HILDRETH, M. D.; JOHN FLINT, M. D.; J. T. FLAGG, M. D., *all Members of the Massachusetts Medical Society*; A. ALCOTT, M. D.; D. H. STORER, M. D., M. M. S.; W. LEWIS JUN., M. D., M. M. S.; DANIEL HARWOOD, M. D., M. M. S.

GEORGE COMBE, Esq.

BOSTON, June 2. 1836.

SIR,—We have heard with much satisfaction that you will be a candidate for the Professorship of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Edinburgh. The various works which you have written upon the Physical and Intellectual Condition of Man,—works which contain, according to our

views, the true principles of Philosophy,—all exhibit evidences of the peculiar talent and constitution of mind which should distinguish the individual who is to fill the important office of Teacher of Intellectual Philosophy. For the benefit of our fellow-men, and for the reputation of the distinguished University of your City, we sincerely hope and trust that you will be the successful candidate for the office you have applied for.

With profound respect for your talents and labours in the cause of Human Happiness, we subscribe ourselves, your obedient servants,

GEORGE HAYWARD, M. D.

JOHN HOMANS, M. D.

Z. B. ADAMS, M. D.

H. HOSMER, M. D.

J. H. DIX, M. D.

JOHN D. FISHER, M. D.

JOSHUA B. FLINT, M. D.

CHARLES T. HILDRETH, M. D.

JOHN FLINT, M. D.

J. T. FLAGG, M. D.

A. ALCOTT, M. D.

D. H. STORER, M. D., M. M. S.

W. LEWIS Jun., M. D., M. M. S.

DANIEL HARWOOD, M. D., M. M. S.



VI.—From ROBLEY DUNGLISON, M. D., Professor of Therapeutics, &c. in the University of Maryland; GEORGE H. CALVERT, Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy in the University of Maryland; JOSHUA J. COHEN, M. D., Professor of Mineralogy and Geology, University of Maryland; R. S. STEWART, M. D.; WM. L. MARSHALL, Councillor at Law; JOHN P. KENNEDY, Professor of History, University of Maryland; WM. R. FISHER, Secretary of the Maryland Academy of Science, &c.; G. L. DULANY, Councillor at Law; J. T. DUCATEL, M. D., Professor of Chemistry and Pharmacy, University of Maryland; E. GEDDINGS, M. D., Professor of Anatomy and Physiology, University of Maryland; and SAMUEL HENRY DICKSON, M. D., Professor of the Institute and Practice of Medicine in the Medical College of the State of South Carolina.

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND, *June 3. 1836.*

BEING requested to state our opinion of the reputation of Mr George Combe in the United States, we the undersigned very cheerfully bear testimony to the favourable impression produced by his "System of Phrenology," and his "Constitution of Man." These works have been republished in this country, and widely circulated. Wherever they have been read they have been admired, as well by those who do *not* as by those who do believe in the phrenological doctrines, and have given their author fame in America as man of high mental powers and fine cultivation.

ROBLEY DUNGLISON, M. D.  
GEORGE H. CALVERT,  
JOSHUA J. COHEN, M. D.  
R. S. STEWART, M. D.  
WM. L. MARSHALL,

JOHN P. KENNEDY,  
WM. R. FISHER,  
G. L. DULANY,  
J. T. DUCATEL, M. D.  
E. GEDDINGS, M. D.

BOSTON, *June 7. 1836.*

In the above favourable estimate of the value of Mr Combe's works, and of the reputation which he enjoys among the reading public of America, I heartily concur.

SAMUEL HENRY DICKSON, M. D.

VII.—From JOHN F. GRAY, M. D., Member of the Medical Society, New York, and Vice-President of Phrenological Society, New York; VALENTINE MOTT, M. D., Professor of Surgical Anatomy in the College of Physicians and Surgeons; H. J. JUDSON, M. D., Member of Medical Society, New York, and the College of Physicians, &c.; WILLIAM CHANNING, M. D., Member Medical Society, New York; JOHN SCOTT, Judge of the Marine Court, and President Phrenological Society, New York; LORING D. CHAPIN, Member of Franklin Society, Corresponding Member of Albany Institute, Secretary of the New York Phrenological Society, &c.

NEW YORK, June 8, 1836.

THE undersigned heartily concur, with very many of their fellow citizens, distinguished for intelligence and high moral character, in believing Phrenological Science to be the true and only natural philosophy of mind:—its rapid progress throughout this country is an evidence of opinion elsewhere. They also cheerfully coincide with the public press and with the clergy, in declaring their exalted opinion of the writings of Mr George Combe, for both their scientific and moral character. Few works in our language are calculated to produce more lasting and salutary effects on the moral sentiments of mankind than “Combe’s Constitution of Man.”

JOHN F. GRAY, M. D.  
VALENTINE MOTT, M. D.  
H. J. JUDSON, M. D.  
WM. CHANNING, M. D.  
JOHN SCOTT.  
LORING D. CHAPIN.

VIII. From CHARLES CALDWELL, M. D., Professor of the Institutes of Medicine and Clinical Practice in Transylvania University.

George Combe, Esq.

MY DEAR SIR,

LEXINGTON KY., June 9. 1836.

On my return, two days ago, after an absence of two months from home, I found your letter of the 24th of April. This sojourn abroad is the reason why you have not heard from me at an earlier period. The occurrence gives me much regret, not that I believe you need the feeble aid which any effort of mine could afford, but because it would have been highly gratifying to myself to make the effort. And it is gratifying to me still to tell you now something of what I would have said, with much more pleasure, under a prospect of proving serviceable to you.

The time has at length arrived, when, in the United States, Phrenology is beginning to occupy, in the public mind, somewhat of the station which justly belongs to it. Opposition to it is fast declining, and its spread is perhaps as rapid as its friends should desire. In nothing is *precocious* maturity desirable, because *debility* is always its concomitant. By every man of intelligence, who has *honestly* studied Phrenology here, it is regarded as the true, and, of course, the *only legitimate science of mind*. To this, I do not believe that a single exception exists in our country. Nor do I conceive it *possible* (this strong term is *intentionally* employed), that such an exception can exist. *Scialists* in the matter may still demur, look wise, and doubt. But who cares? Of such *snatterers* we make no account. As far as I am advised on the subject, all the active, candid, and well-informed opponents of Phrenology are either silenced, or proselyted. As yet the science has not been regularly introduced into any of the higher institutions of the United States, except that to which I myself belong, where I statedly lecture on it as a

branch of *Physiology*—of which I consider it the *highest* branch. In some of the elementary schools of the country, I am told that its principles are beginning to be taught, but to what extent I know not. In a word, though the contest has been long, and exceedingly unpleasant, the victory in favour of Phrenology, in this country, may be pronounced complete. Indeed to call the success that has crowned the struggle a “victory,” is to use a term unequal to the event. IT IS A CONQUEST.

As regards your writings on the science, there exists in the United States but one opinion. They are of the *first order*. This is true alike of their matter and manner, their argument, illustration, and style. When people ask me, as they often do, from what single volume or work they can derive most instruction in Phrenology? I uniformly direct them to your “System.” And as to your “Constitution of Man,” while its circulation has been most extensive, its praise is on the tongue of every one who has perused it. It is becoming almost as much of a “stock-book,” as the Waverley Novels, or the Pilgrim’s Progress. Were not this statement so much a matter of history and notoriety, as to amount to a *truism*, I should not hazard the making of it, lest my sincerity should be called in question. But no competent judge will contradict it. And the great merit of your works consists in their establishment of truth, by facts judiciously selected and perspicuously stated, connected with inferences correctly deduced—in positions, the product of observation, and inductions, the product of reason. And such, if I mistake not, is the mental process which constitutes LOGIC. Your peculiar fitness, therefore, for the post you aspire to cannot be doubted. And such, I trust, will prove to be the sentiment of the “Civic Council of Edinburgh.”

Allow me to renew my assurances, that I am, my dear Sir, very truly and respectfully yours,

CH. CALDWELL, M. D.



## EXTRACTS FROM NEWSPAPERS.

## FROM THE GLASGOW ARGUS.

THE testimonials presented by this gentleman (Mr Combe) in support of his claim to the Logic Chair in Edinburgh, are, in more than one respect, extremely interesting. They establish beyond question the extent to which the views of Phrenology have obtained a hold upon the public mind; they prove that, right or wrong, these views must have a powerful influence in forming the intellectual character of the rising generation; they put it beyond the power of men of science to overlook this important element of national opinion. Much discussion has been excited by Mr Combe's assertion of the claim of phrenologists to the right of full citizenship in the republic of letters. All admit the high intellectual qualifications and the intrepid devotion to what he believes to be truth evinced by this gentleman. But there are people still sufficiently influenced by a vague prejudice to be startled at the notion of placing him in the Logical Chair—some even who are by no means very decided opponents of Phrenology. We confess that we do not share their doubts. As by no means adherents of Phrenology, we cannot be suspected of sectarian bias; and we are decidedly of opinion that if, in other respects, Mr Combe's qualifications for the Chair shall prove superior to those of his competitors, the circumstance of his being a phrenologist ought to be no obstacle in the way of his appointment. The task of a Professor of Logic is threefold. He has to expound the practical sciences of correct management of the intellectual powers (logic) and *exegesis* (rhetoric); and he has to rest these upon the ultimate principles of mind (psychology). One class of investigators into the natural history of mind look only to the knowledge of its powers as derived to us from our internal consciousness. Phrenologists affirm, that, in addition to this, we can discover such a uniform coincidence between certain actions and certain external conformations of the head, as entitles us to infer the exercise of certain intellectual faculties through local organs in the brain. This is a question of fact, which can only be settled by observation. It must be admitted by every candid mind, that strong evidence has been adduced by the phrenologists in behalf of some of their organs, and the question standing thus, we do not see that a man's being a phrenologist should, of itself, exclude himself from a Logic Chair. Mr Combe's testimonials are such as we have scarcely ever seen in favour of one individual.

## FROM THE LONDON COURIER.

We mentioned some time back, that Mr Combe, the learned phrenologist, was a candidate to fill the vacant Chair of Logic in the University of Edinburgh. To make his pretensions fully known, Mr Combe has published the letters and certificates with which learned men in almost every part of Europe have honoured him on this occasion. We are surprised at their extent. They fill an octavo pamphlet of seventy pages, and among them are to be found testimonials from the Archbishop of Dublin, and from the Professor of Medicine at the University of Copenhagen. There are letters or certificates from upwards of seventy persons distinguished in literature or science in favour of Phrenology, which shew that it has spread far, and struck deep root in every part of Europe. The Archbishop of Dublin declares, that it "employs a metaphysical nomenclature, more logical, accurate, and convenient, than Locke, Stewart, and other writers of their schools." Dr Edwards, known all over Europe for the accuracy of his scientific investigations, and a Member of the Institute of France, says "that the two elements of human nature, mind and body, had been the object only of separate study, except to some physicians, with a view to mental alienation, when Gall directed all the efforts of his sagacious and powerful mind to this question, the vital importance of which, whatever be the fate of his theory, none can deny." "No man has, since Gall and Spurzheim, done so much in this respect as Mr Combe, to whose labours the scientific world, and humanity at large, are much indebted."—"The science, of which Gall is the founder," writes Professor Andral of Paris, "and which is known by the name of Phrenology, must henceforward be included among the grave and serious studies of physiology." The ingenious, acute, and scientific editor of the *Scotsman*, after declaring his conviction of the truth of Phrenology, adds, that "Phrenology, if it gives the more satisfactory explanation of mental phenomena, must afford the best foundation for a system of logic." "The Professor of Logic must teach some system of mental philosophy, and the question for the Council is not whether Phrenology is a perfect system, but whether it be not preferable to any of the others presently known, which are numerous and discordant. Mr Combe's certificates shew at least that it enjoys a sufficient reputation to vindicate the propriety of the Council's choice, if they elect him to the chair. In other respects, it will not be easy to produce an individual so well qualified for the situation." If otherwise well qualified, then, as we, from Mr Combe's excellent books and lectures, believe him to be, these testimonials, from learned men in all parts of Europe, must convince the Town Council of Edinburgh that they would gain respect and honour from conferring the chair on Mr Combe. "Scotland," says Dr Edwards, 'has the honour of having founded the science of the wealth of nations. She should be ambitious of adding to her glory by promoting the first of all studies—that of man.' We certainly are not acquainted with any individual in modern times who has done so much to promote the study; and the University of Edinburgh would enjoy the benefit of his reputation and his exertions were she to possess him as a teacher

## FROM THE FIFE HERALD.

The attention of the public seems considerably excited in various quarters relative to the choice the Town-Council of Edinburgh are likely to make of a successor to Dr Ritchie in the Logic Chair. That choice involves important consequences to the character of the Council. They have it in their power to introduce into the University a man who has shewn himself capable of cultivating and expounding the science of mind with singular originality and success, and in whose hands it has suddenly started up from the position of an inert mass of inapplicable speculation into a most powerful agent towards human improvement ; or, after the manner of their predecessors, they may deliver it over to some other, with not a single pretension above those of the most common-place of the persons who have already occupied it—some one who has never contributed one new idea to the general stock of knowledge, and under whose guidance that important chair will continue as it has been, productive of no consequences save distaste at a science which, in regard of practical purposes, is no better than a solemn mummary, and impressing on the student's mind but this one conviction—that Logic is utterly useless. It is very seldom that a body of electors are in the present position of the Edinburgh Council. A man like Mr Combe does not often appear to ask the suffrage of any body ; for individuals capable of regenerating science—of breaking up old ground, and delivering us from hereditary common-place—do not exist in the scientific world often in a century. It is possible that some of the electors may be deterred from the performance of their duty by the virulent and fanatical outcry got up in certain quarters in regard of what, after the most approved fashion of old times, is termed the “dangerousness of the new philosophy.” We solicit these gentlemen to reflect. If the choice lay merely between commonplace men, persons who have never moved one inch out of the beaten path, and paced on at the usual jog-trot—there would be no such outcry. To be pursued by a sectarian and bitter hostility is still the price which every man must pay for originality and eminence. The outcry, therefore, is at once a proof and inseparable concomitant of Mr Combe's deserts ; and the question for the resolution of the Council is, not whether there is an outcry, for that is inevitable ; but whether Mr Combe can marshal in his behalf sufficient of the suffrages of learned and enlightened men, and a sufficient weight of public opinion, to entitle them, in justice to the University, to despise and neglect that cry ? The first question is answered by Mr Combe's certificates. They bring forward a mass of influential opinion on behalf of Phrenology, which, considering the position of the individuals from whom it comes, is, we dare to say, far outweighing all that could by its most industrious enemy be collected against it ; and in reference to the latter question we undertake to speak. Large masses of our countrymen have already been delighted and elevated by the study of the new philosophy. Mr Combe has brought truth out from among misty abstractions, and thousands have read his exposition of it. If other parts of Scotland are like Fifeshire, the Town Council of Edinburgh could not perform a more popular act than by sanctioning his claims. It would be hailed by all liberal inquirers as the beginning of a new epoch in education.

## FROM THE SPECTATOR.

The approaching election of a Professor of Logic in the University of Edinburgh is exciting much interest beyond its own locality. The chief candidates are Sir William Hamilton and Mr George Combe; and the interest arises from the pretensions of the latter to establish the Phrenological Philosophy of Mind and Morals for the first time, in a university chair. We think this question an important one; for the days of an ignorant ridicule of phrenology, and of dogmatic prejudice against it, as leading to "materialism," and what not, are, by the common consent of thinking men, gone by. Mr Combe, rightly considering the patrons of the Chair (the Town-Council), whatever may be their private opinions, as placing no Professor in their University on their own judgment of the truths of his philosophy, but as being determined by the evidence of trustworthy authorities, has laid before them a whole volume of Testimonials, prefaced by a very philosophical and sensible letter from himself. At his own request, the evidence is directed more in favour of his science than of his own qualifications. Indeed, all will agree, that if this science shall be installed in the University, it must be so in the person of its most celebrated teacher, George Combe. The number, and, what is more, the weight of the certificates, have, in our degree of belief of the progress of the science, much surprised us, and would stagger the most sceptical.

The testimonialists, sixty in number, are of various countries,—for fifteen are eminent Frenchmen, some are Danish, others American; they are of various walks in science, religion, literature, and life; many of them are the well-known heads and officers of philosophical institutions, and teachers of the great schools of medicine and general science throughout Europe; and some of them members of parliament. Among them are the present philosophical and 'high-minded' Archbishop of Dublin, himself the chief authority on *Logic*, as a writer upon it; and Andral, one of the most eminent guides of the medical student. Such men, and all of them, declared it to be their deliberate opinion, on long and patient study, that Phrenology is the true science of mind and analysis of the human faculties; and many of them, that it is the only discovered physiology of the brain, for which organs no certain use was previously known. The testimonials are classed as they support one or other or both of these claims, and yet more particularly, as they bear testimony to the value of the science in different departments of human affairs,—as Education, Criminal Legislation, and Insanity. On these three, the authority of practical men is very strong. It cannot be said, according to the Baconian test, that Phrenology, like the other systems of mental philosophy, "is false because it is barren." We recommend the volume (published at Longman's) to the perusal of our readers and the scientific world, as a very singular document. We wish we had room to extract a fair portion of it; we can only afford a few bits.

The letters from Sir William Ellis, of the Hanswell Lunatic Asylum, Mr Browne, of the Montrose, and some others, are very striking; and not less so are those from persons who have the charge of criminals and of schools. Appended to the Testimonials, there are certificates from

printers and publishers (Neill & Co., Chambers & Co., Longman, Simpkin & Marshall, and John Anderson), of the immense sale of Mr Combe's various works—*above thirty-eight thousand copies*; each certificate stating that the demand is on the increase, and the interest on the subject extending among all ranks of the people. Can any thing like this be said of the old philosophy? Though we ourselves are not physiologists of the brain—in other words, *organologists*—we are not incompetent to judge of the abstract faculties, and above all of the *results*; which Mr Wyse, the Chairman of the Irish Educational Committee of Parliament, certifies to be his condition. We can observe, too, the signs of the times, in a more enlightened treatment of both lunatics and criminals, based on phrenological principles; and, above all, a system of education gaining popularity, which is nothing but the training and improvement of the faculties of the phrenological analysis, in physical, moral, and intellectual education. We see the Legislature giving that education an unusually patient investigation; and, as stated in another part of this number, a disciple of the same system honoured by a public expression of favour, by one of the most intelligent and important communities in the empire. The old pedagoguism received no such distinctions.

Our readers may ask, what has all this to do with the Chair of Logic? The certificates answer this question. Logic is the right use of the intellectual faculties in knowing and reasoning; and a just analysis of the faculties forms an essential part of the instruction of a Logic chair. The present position of the patrons is most interesting. The old philosophies of mind hitherto taught in their University have all been "barren;" and, if they ever had much, have lost authority in the scientific world. Dugald Stewart himself held that "the philosophy of mind was yet in expectation." Shall error, admitted error, be entailed upon another generation? or shall a new, and a generally admitted fruitful philosophy, have a trial? There never was a more important question; and many an eye is fixed on the patrons.

Some, it is said, object to Mr Combe's religious opinions. If it were not the Chair of Logic, but of specific *theology*, which he aspired to fill, there would be sense and consistency in this objection. But it is utterly illogical, as applied to the teacher of any science which rests, like mathematics, on a *natural* and not a scriptural foundation. The previous, the only questions, are—does Mr Combe, in his own department, teach *truth*? and does he interfere with no other department of instruction? Truth in its essence is of God, and is not less truth that there may be errors in other opinions held by the same mind that teaches it. We have *supposed* (what we know not, and have not the impertinence to inquire), that Mr Combe's religious faith actually differs from the standards of the Church of Scotland; and we ask what then? That of many conscientious christians, some of them professors in the same university, does so too. In the diversities of human faculties and their combinations, the book of life is, and must be, variously read. Who has a right to judge his brother, and escape being judged himself? "To me, and not to thy master, thou standest or fallest?" There must be an end of this pharisaical gossiping—this prying into our neighbour's conscience—this eavesdropping to learn or conjecture his religious opinions. It is a persecution worse than the Popish; which, otherwise, the Reformation has

only cast off to replace,—although the basis of the Reformation is the *right of private judgment*. But Mr Combe has not to declare his philosophy for the first time from the Logic chair; it is known to the world. Mr Combe has never questioned a religious doctrine. He has shown that the ethics he teaches are coincident with Preceptive Christianity,—indeed, some of his testimonialists consider his *Constitution of Man* as the Philosophy of Preceptive Christianity,—but he has never impugned the peculiar dogmas of any religious sect. But his philosophical views, it is replied, *tend* to certain heresies, and are *therefore* dangerous. This illogicality of intolerance, this mere twaddle of dogmatism, is disgraceful in an enlightened age. Are his views *true*? If they are,—and they can only be shown to be false by *philosophical* facts or reasonings, not by theological persecution,—they are of the Creator's establishing; and we may ask any candid and sensible man to explain to us what is meant by a *dangerous truth*! If the objection were that Mr Combe's views were *erroneous*, he would, doubtless, respect the objection and meet it, provided it were philosophically, and not theologically urged; but nothing can be more absurd than an attempt to quash philosophical opinions, on the sole ground of their alleged tendency to affect theological conclusions or scriptural interpretations. If the philosophical views are sound, then let the theologians look to *their* interpretations. Since the reformation, we have not heard of infallible theologians, more than infallible philosophers. Judging Mr Combe by his writings and lectures, we consider the *odium theologicum* for some time past raised around him as a crying injustice. It is not, however, uninstrusive, that the religious world are themselves divided in their opinion of the tendency of Mr Combe's philosophical views. Most sincere christians have declared in our own hearing, that, without in the least shaking its foundations, these views have rendered their religion more clear and practical. We have heard, on good authority, that the letters Mr Combe has received from religious persons alone, would, if published, neutralize the theological vituperation. Is this able and conscientious man, then, not to be allowed to have an opinion of his own? Is a mass of inferior minds, because it is a mass, to be permitted to control, nay, extinguish, a mind which seems raised up to enlighten them all? We hope and trust that such a blot is not to form a page of the University's history, in the second quarter of the nineteenth century; but that the patrons,—whom we know to be liberal, independent, ay, and enlightened men,—will not, from deference to Mr Combe's persecutors, either scientific or religious, lose hold of the noble opportunity, which will be speedily seized by some other seat of science, of anticipating the verdict of posterity, and opening the same gates to the new Philosophy of Mind which had the immortal honour to be the first to admit the Principia of Newton.

#### FROM THE KILMARNOCK JOURNAL.

Independently of the ability of any individual advocate of this science, or of the form in which it may be set before the public,—whether compressed into a small octodecimo, or swelling out into a goodly-sized octavo,—the interest which Phrenology now excites as a recognised system of mental philosophy, and its importance from its claims to be the

nearest approach which has yet been made to a *true and intelligible* exposition of the phenomena of mind, are sufficiently great to command the attention of those who make pretension to scientific research—to entice to its intimate acquaintance all who would not be left like “beacons on the stream of time, marking only the rapidity with which the tide of civilization flows past them.” Phrenology, long repudiated as the crude theory of dreaming enthusiasts, has now worked its way into no small degree of acceptance and respect; and those of its early advocates who have outlived the storm of ridicule and abuse with which they were for many years so virulently assailed, now number among their supporters many of the most talented and eminent in the land. The time is gone by, when Phrenology formed a standing jest for wittlings and for dabblers in metaphysics,\* and when the avowal of a belief in its doctrines required perhaps a greater exertion of intrepidity than the acknowledgment of imbecility or even of immorality itself. Now that “the winter of its days is past,”—that, as in the case of the other sciences, it has paid “the usual tax of entry,”—that, after bringing, like the discoveries of Galileo, of Harvey, and of Sir Isaac Newton, the wonted meed of persecution upon its founders, it is daily witnessing its scoffers becoming the most zealous of its devotees,—none need keep back from linking their fortunes with it, amid the fair weather and prosperity that seem now to await it. No one need shrink from declaring himself a votary of a science, which, in the opinion of many well qualified to judge, is destined soon to supersede the other systems of intellectual philosophy with which the world has so long been amused (would that we could say edified),—any one may be proud to inscribe his name in the list of those who already do homage to its claims. When from a host of these, we select the names of the Lord Archbishop of Dublin, entitled, from his talents and able works on logic and rhetoric, to be regarded as the highest British authority respecting the science of mind; of Berzelius of Stockholm, the most illustrious of living chemists; of Blumenbach, the great German physiologist; of the celebrated Otto, of Copenhagen; of Andral, Broussais, and Vimont, of Paris; of Lawrence and Elliotson, of London; of Gregory and Mackintosh, of Edinburgh; of Harrison, Marsh, and Carmichael, of Dublin,—not to speak of Mr Combe, Sir George Mackenzie, and others, so identified with Phrenology as to render the mention of them almost superfluous;—it is indisputable, that a mass of living authority is presented in its favour, incomparably weightier than has ever been *actually* arrayed against it. Among the testimonials in favour of Phrenology, and in support of the application which Mr Combe is at present making for the vacant Chair of Logic in the University of Edinburgh (to which testimonials, now printed and circulated, we invite the attention of all who still pretend to make light of this science), is one from the Archbishop of Dublin, in which he says, “That clever article in the *Edinburgh Review* (by Jeffrey), to which you (Mr Combe) replied, I consider you as having *completely and decidedly refuted*,” and “that the religious and moral objections against the phrenological theory are *utterly futile*, I have from the first been fully convinced.” Dr Elliotson, as shown by a *simi-*

\* According to the newest and most approved definition of this term,—“When we talk of things which we *do not* understand, in language which neither ourselves nor others can understand,—that is metaphysics.

lar certificate, "feels convinced of Phrenology being as true as Astronomy or Chemistry," and is satisfied "that those who reject or neglect Phrenology are lamentably ignorant of much which *they think they know*, and compared with phrenologists, remain as *men of some centuries past*." Dr Mackintosh "knows no one who has devoted the energies of his mind to the careful study of Phrenology, who has not become a convert;" and upwards of a dozen of the most distinguished physiologists of France, certify to its being "the most certain and complete science of the faculties of man," and, *par excellence*, "the positive philosophy."

#### FROM THE SCOTSMAN.

Among the crowd of aspirants for this Chair, there are three whose qualifications are of no ordinary kind; we mean, Sir William Hamilton, Mr Taylor, and Mr Combe. All of them are men of good character and undoubted talents; and each, besides high testimonials, has credentials of a more unequivocal kind to exhibit in his printed works. The merits of the two former have been copiously displayed by members of the Town-Council, and by articles in several Edinburgh papers; and far be it from us to detract from the well-earned praise they have received. We think, however, we are not stepping beyond the line of our duty in calling attention once more to the qualifications of Mr Combe, who, as the able and intrepid defender of a new system of philosophy which has many zealous opponents, is likely to get less than justice. Mr Taylor, in his eloquent address to the Council, has observed with great truth, that the Old Logic of the Schools, as now taught, affords merely a gymnastic exercise to the mind, and is practically of no use. He farther intimates, that were he in possession of the Chair, he would deem it necessary to construct a new system for himself. Now, what he proposes to do, Mr Combe has already done: what the one desiderates, the other has realized. It will be seen, from the language Mr Taylor employs, that his contemplated Logic is in substance a great system of mental philosophy, comprehending within it the moral and intellectual nature of man, and his relations to the external creation and to the Creator. By electing him, therefore, the patrons would in effect pass sentence of condemnation (as we think deservedly) on the existing metaphysics, and this as strongly as if they elected Mr Combe. Here the parallel ends. Mr Combe comes into the field armed with a system of philosophy which is already fully organized, which is already supplanting old opinions, and finding increased acceptance from day to day with the learned and the unlearned, in the face of deep-seated prejudices. What says Archbishop Whately, the first living authority on such subjects?—"That the phrenological writers employ a metaphysical nomenclature far more logical, accurate, and convenient, than Locke, Stewart, and other writers of their schools." Now, the nomenclature, that is, the classification of the faculties, comprehends the whole metaphysics of the phrenological system.

It is observed by Professor Jardine of Glasgow, in his "Outlines of Philosophical Education," that every rational system of Logic must be based on a philosophy of mind, of one kind or another; and the question for the Council is, not whether Phrenology is a perfect system, but whe-



ther it does not explain the phenomena of mind better than any of the systems presently known. Of the three candidates we would say, that Sir William represents opinions, which, though sanctioned by great names, are rapidly passing into oblivion; Mr Taylor condemns the old systems, but has not yet, by his own confession, laid the foundations of another; Mr Combe comes forward provided with a system whose popularity is a strong presumption of its truth, and which already fills such a space in the intellectual world, that the Council could not be justified if they made it a pretext for excluding from the Chair a man otherwise admirably qualified to fill it.

We dwell upon this point because we know the desire of the Council to do their duty faithfully, and to satisfy the just expectations of the public, for whom they act; and we only fear that many of the members may not be aware how deeply Mr Combe's mental philosophy has struck its roots in the public mind, and how rapidly it is gaining ground in all circles.

No one can read Mr Combe's work on "The Constitution of Man," without perceiving that he has a logical understanding of the first order. He has the power of dissecting purely ethical and philosophical questions into their elements, perhaps beyond any other living man. Now this is exactly the talent which the Chair requires. Of the eminently practical character of his philosophy, we have striking evidence in the light which it throws on the causes of insanity, and of its application, with the happiest success, by many teachers to the business of education.

To all this we should add, that Mr Combe is a successful lecturer, and that he is a man not only of the strictest probity, but of great prudence. He well understands the warfare to which the doctrines he advocates are exposed; and, without bating one iota of what he regards as the truth, is careful to avoid all unnecessary collisions with opinions, which, though erroneous, are honestly entertained.

#### FROM THE BATH HERALD.

Intense interest has been, and continues to be, excited, by the pretensions of Mr George Combe, the well known author of the 'Constitution of Man,' 'System of Phrenology,' and other works, as a candidate for the Chair of Logic in the above celebrated University. The profound and extensive labours of this gentleman in the cause of Phrenology, during the last seventeen years, have very justly made him the champion of the system he so ably professes, and his pretensions to a Chair, which involves instruction in the first elements of intellectual philosophy, and which, if obtained, would be a public triumph of a system opposed to all previous methods of mental investigation, naturally creates great activity, both among the friends and opponents of Phrenology. Indeed the struggle cannot be regarded with indifference by any whose philanthropy is not purely individual, since the possession of a true or false system of moral and intellectual science involves questions indissolubly associated with the best interests and truest happiness of mankind.

In consequence of the peculiar nature of Mr Combe's claims as a Candidate, and with the view of diminishing the responsibility of the Town Council of Edinburgh, on whose decision the choice of a future

Professor depends, that gentleman has requested the friends of Phrenology, both in Great Britain and on the Continent, to express their opinions of his qualifications as a Lecturer, and more especially their conclusions as to the truth and practical utility of the system he would make the basis of instruction.

These Testimonials are now published in the form of a *small volume* rather than a pamphlet; and, from their number and importance, cannot but surprise both the advocates and opponents of Phrenology. Probably an equivalent amount of evidence has never been collected, in so short a time, in favour of any individual or of any subject whatever; and while Mr Combe has just reason to be proud of such a monument to his talents and character, he must be still more gratified with the demonstrative proof it affords of the rapid progress which Phrenology has made, and of the high estimation in which it is now held by many of the most distinguished individuals both of this country and of the Continent. The most virulent of its opponents must pause before such collective evidence of its truth and vast practical importance, and the Town Council, in the opinion of impartial judges, would be more than fully justified, should they found their decision upon testimonials, which, for number and importance, we do not hesitate to predict, will be unrivalled, and which we would defy any candidate to bring forward in support of any other psychological system whatever.

A convincing proof of the public estimation of Mr Combe's writings is the fact of more than 35,000 copies having been sold since 1819—besides numerous editions in America, and in some of the European languages. Of the cheap edition of the 'Constitution of Man,' published by the Messrs Chambers of Edinburgh, the astonishing number of 14,655 copies were sold in less than *seven months*.

Mr Combe's testimonials are bound up with others nearly equally numerous and quite as important as regards the evidence in favour of Phrenology, addressed by Sir G. S. Mackenzie to the Right Hon. Lord Glenelg, Secretary for the Colonies, with the hope of influencing the Government to apply the principles of Phrenology to the selection of criminals for transportation to New South Wales. Very serious evils have arisen from their being indiscriminately sent out, without the least regard to their previous character or history; and it is proposed that only the more favourably organized should be distributed among the settlers, while the more untractable and vicious are superintended in our establishments at home.

Phrenology is boldly offered as the means of effecting this very desirable distinction, and the proposed conditions are such, that the experiment must be inevitably fatal to the pretensions of any system not founded upon the laws of immutable truth. Should it, however, prove successful, it must silence every conscientious objector, and prove that the practical capabilities of Phrenology infinitely surpass even the theoretical pretensions of any metaphysical system with which mankind has hitherto been familiar.

Every lover of truth, and of his fellow-man, must be anxious for such an experiment to be impartially tried; the advantages it holds out are incalculable, and, should it fail, it will only accelerate the discovery of error.

We shall conclude this notice of the subject, not by any selections from the evidence adduced, but by recommending our readers to peruse the pamphlet for themselves.

FROM THE EDINBURGH CHRONICLE.

"Authority scowled upon it, and taste was disgusted by it, and fashion was ashamed of it, and all the beauteous speculation of former days was cruelly broken up by this new announcement of the better philosophy, and scattered like the fragments of an aerial vision, over which the past generations of the world had been slumbering their profound and their pleasing reverie."—*Chalmers' Astronomical Discourses*, Disc. II.

It will be readily admitted that very few vacancies indeed have occurred in our University, which have called forth candidates of higher eminence, given rise to greater anxiety in the public mind, or involved principles of such paramount importance to all classes of the community. Under ordinary circumstances, the natural talents and acquired attainments of candidates have alone to be considered. The subject or system of instruction peculiar to the vacant chair, is pretty generally understood, and its utility recognised by the public. Hence the Patrons are called upon to judge merely of the comparative abilities of the respective competitors. But in the present instance, the question is widely different. The whole *system* of instruction hitherto adopted in this and similar Chairs, is very generally and loudly denounced, as "unintelligible," "barren," and "useless," by unquestionable authority, while not one word is uttered in its defence. On the other hand, an improved system of Mental Philosophy has been adduced, certified by a cloud of witnesses from all quarters of Europe and America, to be based, not on metaphysical speculation, but on positive facts in nature,—capable of being easily understood, pregnant with the most beneficial consequences to morals and religion, and applicable to all the educational and other practical purposes of life.

The primary question for consideration then is, Would the Patrons be justifiable in adopting the ordinary course of procedure under such extraordinary circumstances? that is, to have regard alone to the learning or other qualifications of the candidates, without taking at all into view the merits or utility of the *system*, if any, which they respectively profess to teach. And in answering this question, let it be considered what course would most probably be adopted by a judge or jury in analogous circumstances. Most assuredly they would never throw out of view the real merits of the case, nor totally discard the evidence laid before them, but would, regardless of individual claims or popular prejudice, sift the matter to the bottom, and ultimately give judgment according to the sterling principles of justice and truth. Now, it is obvious, that such is exactly the course which should be taken on the present occasion. Neither private influence, nor ignorant clamour, nor imaginary fears, ought to have any weight in investigating the real merits of the old or new systems of Mental Philosophy. Whatever system is most satisfactorily proven to have simplicity and general utility on its side, ought by all means to be adopted; or if sufficient evidence be not produced in favour of either the one system or the other, then let more be called for,

and the Chair be fixed on a rational and firm basis, before any one be appointed to occupy it.

It is almost unnecessary to remark, that the candidates who have excited the greatest attention are Sir William Hamilton, Mr George Combe, and Mr Isaac Taylor. The first of these is celebrated for his great learning in ancient metaphysics, and for other literary attainments; the second is famed as an eminent phrenologist, able lecturer, and ardent advocate of popular education; and the third is pretty well known by his works, particularly those entitled "The Natural History of Enthusiasm," and "The Physical Theory of Another Life." The testimonials in favour of Sir William Hamilton are totally silent on every thing but his own acquirements; and the letter circulated by Mr Taylor (for he has given no testimonials) is almost wholly occupied with promises of improvement in the department of the Logic Chair should he be appointed Professor, but without any proof whatever of his own abilities as a teacher, or notice of the system he would pursue. The testimonials in favour of Mr Combe, however, speak directly and in an undeniable manner to the truth of the system of mental philosophy which he espouses, to its great utility in every department of life, and to his own unrivalled abilities as a public teacher. He comes forward as the representative of a new philosophy of mind, and claims for it a fair trial.

Our limits will not admit of entering into minute details regarding the individual merits of any of the candidates; nor is this necessary, because, as already stated, it is the system and not the men which should decide the question. If the old method of teaching Logic is to be preferred, then, by all means, let Sir William Hamilton be appointed Professor; but if the weighty evidence in favour of the new system remain uncontroverted, it is difficult to conceive on what rational grounds it can be rejected. We are aware of the objection as to popular prejudice, but we are also aware that this prejudice has been vastly overrated, and that it is rapidly vanishing. In evidence of the truth of this statement, and independently of the host of witnesses, we have only to appeal to the fact that upwards of forty thousand copies of Mr Combe's books alone have been sold within the last eight years in Britain, and about the same number in America; besides editions in France and Germany. Moreover, wherever lectures on the new Philosophy of Mind are announced, *they are uniformly attended by crowded audiences of all ranks*; and this not once only, out of mere curiosity, but for season after season. Mr Combe stands in his present influential position, after the most powerful efforts, by men of the highest talents, have long been exerted in vain to put him down. It is therefore a great mistake to suppose that were he appointed to the Logic Chair fewer students than hitherto would attend the University. The result would be quite the reverse; for it is evident, that, independently of the more intelligible and useful course of Logic which could and would be given on the new plan, the very circumstance of so celebrated a teacher as Mr Combe being within the College would draw far more students to his class than would compensate for such as might for a short time go elsewhere. It has been argued that the abilities of private teachers without the walls of Universities have always compensated for any deficiencies that must, from obvious causes, more or less ever exist within them. But although there may be an excuse for the decay of

energies which have been exhausted in the course of nature, and although the loss may be supplied in the way referred to, these are no legitimate reasons why the active and experienced teachers should be debarred the precincts of Universities when vacancies occur. They may continue to teach for a season as private instructors in Edinburgh, but when they perceive that their abilities are depreciated and publicly contemned, they will undoubtedly betake themselves to places where they will be duly appreciated, and the city which they would have honoured will be thus deprived of their talents and their fame.

Logic, as hitherto taught, has been of no earthly utility, except perhaps to a very few subtle and wrangling minds—those who delight in shadows rather than in realities. Logic, as it would be taught by the aid of the new Philosophy of Mind, would be quite the reverse; it would give a rational and practical analysis of the human faculties, explain their relation to God, to man, and to external nature; and expound the individual and combined legitimate application of one and all of these faculties to religion, morals, and all the other duties of life. It would, in short, give a direction to education, calculated, in time, to communicate an improved character to society at large; and, instead of the Professor of Logic lecturing on metaphysical abstractions, or rather absurdities, to 100 or 150 Divinity students, who are compelled by antiquated academical regulations to squander their time and their money on this totally useless class, he would be eagerly listened to by crowds of all ranks and professions, while they again would derive solid, lasting, and profitable instruction.

We say nothing of Mr Taylor's claims, because his writings seem to us any thing but clear or intelligible, and we should be sorry were a candidate to be preferred who is confessedly a stranger to public teaching, and who has resolved on no fixed principles to guide him in the discharge of such important duties. Too long has it been the opprobrium of the art of teaching, and baneful have been its effects on intellectual and moral improvement, that almost every one considered himself qualified for the office. No sooner had the village tailor failed in his own vocation than he became "dominie"—no sooner had the town mechanic acquired a little arithmetic, and a smattering of English grammar, than he commenced teacher—no sooner had the man of literature or science acquired a little fame by his closet studies, than he looked after a professorship—and no sooner did a divine become unpopular or incapable of discharging his proper duties, than he had an eye to an easy chair in some of the "drowsy shops" of divinity or metaphysics. But, all the while, one grand requisite for successful teaching was totally overlooked—that of regular training or *experience* in the art, the great and indispensable qualification for this as for every other profession. Truly has it been said, that thousands can acquire knowledge, but very few can impart it; numbers can become authors, but not many of them public speakers; and, unless a candidate for a professorship of either mental or physical science has not only acquired, but with facility can impart, knowledge as well by speaking as by writing, he is by no means possessed of the requisite talents for a Chair in any University.

On the whole, we must candidly confess, that we shall ever regret, for the sake of Edinburgh, for the fame of the University, and for the

honour of Scotland, should the evidence which Mr Combe has adduced in support of his claims be disregarded, and another candidate be chosen. Not that we fear the loss of his talents in the great cause of public instruction, for while he has health and strength, we know that he will be now more devoted to it than before, and most assuredly will not allow his opponents to repose on beds of roses—but because a stain will be indelibly fixed on the character of our citizens through their municipal representatives, for having thus excluded a man from their University whose talents and exertions have done so much for his native city, have effected such great improvements in education, and whose works are second in popularity only to those of the Great Unknown.

---

### ELECTION.

*July 15. 1836.*—A special meeting of the Town Council was held this day, in order to appoint a Professor to the Chair of Logic. The Lord Provost was in the chair.

The Lord Provost, in reference to this appointment, said, if several candidates were proposed, he thought the best course was to take the vote with regard to the whole, and then to strike off the lowest on the list, and in the same manner take the sense of the Council with regard to the remainder, always striking off the lowest, until the contest should lie between two.

The Clerk then read the list of the candidates, who were Sir William Hamilton, Mr P. C. McDougall, Mr Combe, Mr Isaac Taylor, Dr Memes, Lieutenant-Colonel James Stewart, Mr Dunlop, the Rev. Mr Muston, the Rev. Mr Rae, and Dr R. Poole.

Mr H. G. Bell and Mr Spalding, advocates, had previously withdrawn their names as candidates.

Mr Banks intimated, that he was ready to propose Dr Memes, but from the mode in which it had been resolved the votes should be taken, he felt himself bound, in the exercise of the discretionary power with which that gentleman had entrusted him, to tender a letter of resignation as a candidate.

Two letters were then read by the Clerk, from Professor Mylne of Glasgow, and the Lord Provost of Glasgow in favour of Mr Muston; as also a letter from Professor Hampden of Oxford in favour of Mr Taylor. A letter was next read from the Rev. J. Sinclair, George Street, bearing testimony to Sir William Hamilton's knowledge of theology and his religious belief.

The Lord Provost said, that he felt quite inadequate to do justice to the candidate he was about to propose, but in proposing candidates he trusted, in the first place, that a degree of calmness and absence of asperity would be shewn by all the Members of Council in the arduous duty they were about to propose—(Hear, hear.) Gentlemen might say what they pleased in favour of those they were to propose, but he trusted as little as possible against the others who were put in competition, for such a constellation of talent had not yet appeared as candidates for any office the Council had at their disposal. In proposing Sir William Hamilton

he would say, that in the first place he did not feel himself qualified to give an opinion with regard to the qualifications necessary for the Logic Chair, and it would not be expected in an unlettered person like himself to make the attempt. Therefore he considered himself in the situation of a person sitting in the jury-box to decide on evidence he had never heard before; and, from the inquiries he had made, he felt perfectly satisfied, that if Sir William Hamilton was the successful candidate, the Council would do credit to themselves, and honour to the University, by the selection.

Mr Bruce had great satisfaction in seconding the nomination. He might say, that not only were the eyes of the citizens fixed upon them, but the eyes of all England who were interested in the advancement of science—nay, he might go further, and say, that the attention of the most distinguished philosophers both in Europe and in America was fixed on the decision of this day. It behoved them to judge calmly, and dispassionately, and conscientiously, on whom the election ought to fall, because they must feel satisfied that they were at the bar of public opinion, and were more on their trial than the different candidates. On their choice depended the opinion which men would form of the propriety of depositing the patronage of the University in their hands. He (Mr Bruce) was one of those who thought, that there were few chairs respecting the qualifications of whose professors the electors could form a personal judgment. Who among them would pretend to fathom the philosophy of a Newton or a Herschel? and, with respect to mental philosophy, they must be blind indeed if they did not see, that without evidence it was impossible for them to form an unassisted judgment. Their constituents had sent them there as honest, upright, and intelligent men; not as competent to judge of excellence in the higher walks of philosophy or literature, but as men who could sift evidence, who could weigh the testimony, the character, and the credibility of the various witnesses. Were they then to choose upon evidence; or would they choose one who placed his works before them without any evidence, except one testimony from Professor Hampden of Oxford, and the testimony of Dr Chalmers, which could not be considered testimony, as he preferred another candidate? Mr Bruce then referred at great length to the series of splendid names which bore testimony to the European reputation of Sir William Hamilton as a metaphysician; and to the testimony from Oxford, stating, that, on his examination there, no one, even among the professors, was found to compete with him—that his examination stood unrivalled in their records, and that the impression it made at the time was not yet effaced. He then compared his qualifications with the other candidates, and stated, that of the splendour of Mr Taylor's talents there could be no doubt; but of his fitness as a teacher of logic there was no evidence. Some time ago he had the honour to be introduced to Mr Taylor, when he stated to that gentleman, that, in his mind, testimonials from eminent men were essential to his success. Mr Taylor said, that he had applied to several gentlemen whose names were familiar to them all. None had come, however, except one from Dr Hampden. Why was this? Could he not get them? They had been told that Mr Taylor was an anonymous writer—was he also a hermit—had he no intercourse with the world of living men? If they elected Sir William Hamilton, and that appointment should not prove satisfactory, they could refer to his testi-

monials as the ground of their choice ; if they chose Mr Taylor with the same result, they had no such testimonials under which to shelter themselves. With respect to his eminent friend Mr Combe—for he delighted to call him so—his supereminent talent had brought the science of Phrenology to its present state in this country ; but it was a science in which he (Mr B.) was not prepared to say he fully concurred. That it had a foundation he believed, but that it had so extensive influence on the human character as Mr Combe stated, he had great doubts. Under these circumstances, then, he could not bring his mind to support Mr Combe. For the sake therefore of the University—for the credit of the Council—and to meet the expectations of all men of science, he trusted Sir William Hamilton would be their choice on this occasion.

DR NEILL said, The candidate I am about to propose has already been complimented by my friend Mr Bruce for his supereminent talents—I mean Mr Combe. He stands at this moment in a most influential position, both with regard to education and mental philosophy ; and he has attained this influential position notwithstanding the most powerful and persevering efforts of men of the greatest talents to put him down. Indeed, I believe it would be pretty generally admitted that Mr Combe's claims are paramount, had he not been the great champion of Phrenology. It seems to be feared by one set of the gentlemen around this Board, that Mr Combe would teach Phrenology in the Logic class, and that the prejudice against Phrenology is still so strong in this city, that Mr Combe would neither be acceptable to the Senatus nor to the public. I have no fear on either of these points. Mr Combe would undoubtedly teach Logic on phrenological principles ; so would Dr Welsh had he been invited to the Chair ; so would Dr Poole were he to be elected to it. I may add I am deeply persuaded that Logic will never make sure progress till it be taught on those principles, and it is quite possible to teach Logic on phrenological principles, without giving offence—nay, almost without using phrenological language. In one instance, indeed, an essay was published, treating a medical subject on phrenological principles, but without using phrenological terms. The essay was an excellent one, and was highly praised by anti-phrenological doctors, whose prejudices would certainly have induced them to withhold their meed of praise, had phrenological language been employed. As to the prejudices, I believe they would soon die away. Mr Combe's lectures would be numerous attended ; and when the old Professors came in close contact with the new one, they would, I am sure, be agreeably surprised : they would find an accomplished scholar and an accomplished gentleman, with a very clear head and very kind heart,—a man quite disinclined to giving offence. "In case (says Mr Combe in a private note, and he has stated the same thing in substance in the last series of his printed testimonials)—in case I shall be placed in the Chair, I shall consider it a duty equally to the Patrons, to Phrenology, and to myself, to use every means of avoiding offence to old feelings and prejudices." A great change has of late years taken place in the public mind regarding the discoveries and doctrines of Gall. Ten years ago they were treated with contempt and ridicule by the Edinburgh Reviewers ; but now these learned gentlemen maintain a most respectful silence. The day for twitting about bumps has gone by. "Where be all their gibes now ?" Really the Reviewers seem quite "chopfallen ;" and assuredly Mr Combe's



testimonials must put a final extinguisher on their anti-phrenological wit, for many of those testimonials proceed from the friends of the Reviewers. They now seem only to object that Phrenology is not one of the exact sciences,—an objection equally applicable to Medicine. I call upon the Council to act as a jury; and I am bold to say, that Mr Combe's witnesses are many of them on a par with those brought forward by Sir William Hamilton. Again, it is thought that some of Mr Combe's views are at variance with certain fundamental doctrines of our religion. Although no letters of mine are produced, yet some addressed to me, and circulated along with Mr Combe's testimonials, bear intrinsic evidence of my readiness to sympathise with such fears. I am glad to have been the means of making it appear, from the testimony of an eminent Professor of Divinity in the Secession Church, that the doctrines of Phrenology are nowise inconsistent with the truths of Christianity; and, from Mr Combe's explanations, that he is not nearly so heterodox in his views as some appear to have taken for granted. I have reason to hope that the nomination of Mr Combe will be seconded; but I confess I have also reason to fear that his supporters will be sadly in the minority. This I shall regret, for I am convinced that Mr Combe's appointment would at once benefit the University, do credit to the City, and honour to this Council, who would thus anticipate by a score of years the sure verdict of our successors in favour of the new system of Mental Philosophy. May I be permitted at present to mention to whom I shall give my second vote, if we come to one? (Here some demur was expressed, but at length the Doctor was allowed to proceed.) I have felt some difficulty on this point, and am by no means surprised at a variety of opinions existing. Dr Memes, who has withdrawn, is a first-rate scholar, and a tried and indefatigable teacher. Of Mr Muston of Rotterdam, I have a high opinion, from his work on Recognition in the Next World, which I have been reading with delight. It now appears, however, that the contest lies between Sir William Hamilton, Mr M'Dougall, and Mr Taylor. In one respect, they are all objectionable to me. They will all teach more or less on the old system; they are all anti-phrenologists. But the last-named will, I think, be less afraid of change; indeed, he is pledged to change; and from all that I have seen and heard of him, he will not shut his eyes to the evidence of Phrenology, but will be open to conviction. Sir William Hamilton has, I admit, the fame of profound erudition; but him we already possess, both as a Professor and as Secretary to the Senatus; and I should be glad to see him better rewarded (which may be done if we get £2500 a-year for the College). Mr M'Dougall is of the highest promise; but he has yet his fame to create, and I am sure he will not fail to realise it. If to-day we choose Mr Taylor, we shall incidentally do away with the reproach (if reproach it be, for I think it none), that we select only Scotsmen, and we shall directly add a distinguished name to our University. I shall therefore give my second vote for Mr Taylor.

Mr MILNE seconded the nomination of Mr Combe.

Mr MACKAY then rose and said, that on the best of all evidence, an intimate personal acquaintance, Dr Chalmers had recommended to their notice a countryman of their own, distinguished by his attainments in literature and science, whose moral and religious character eminently qualified him for being a teacher of youth. In a case of such importance,

B

they certainly should prefer evidence at home to foreign testimony ; and he might add, was there an individual at home or abroad, better qualified than Dr Chalmers to give an opinion and advice as to the fittest person to fill this chair ? Could they suppose that in doing so he would be swayed by any other motive than a conscientious desire for the public good ? Would he, so deliberately as he had done, have thrown the weight of his name into this scale, if he had not, from the deepest conviction, thought he was performing a public duty ? Having completely entered into his views, and being fortified in that opinion by every inquiry he (Mr M.) had made, he had great pleasure in proposing that Mr Patrick Campbell Macdougall be the Professor, and he entreated the Council to give effect to the nomination.

Mr G. GRAHAM seconded the motion.

Bailie MACFARLAN agreed with Mr Bruce as to the importance of the duty they had to perform, and that the eyes of their countrymen were upon them. They were assembled to be tried at the bar of public opinion, and upon this he was quite willing to rest the result on this election, for, as the Lord Provost had said, there was a constellation of talent before them. The candidates were all men of splendid abilities, and great personal reputation. But being thus at the bar of public opinion, he believed that whatever they did would be condemned ; because all those who supported the unsuccessful candidates, and who were so uncandid as not to concede to others what they took to themselves, viz. the right of judging, would say that the Council had made a bad choice. But they had a higher authority to whom they ought to look. They ought to lay their hands on their hearts, and declare that, as they had appealed to a higher power, they had exercised their patronage to the best of their abilities for the interests of the University. He felt satisfied that the choice could fall on no man who was not eminently qualified to discharge the duties of that Chair. He had read several of the Edinburgh Review articles of Sir William Hamilton, for whom he had the highest respect ; and while he thought those articles displayed a great deal of profound knowledge, he still conceived they did not appear to carry out the high reputation wherewith Sir William Hamilton had started ; and to this day he thought the appearance of Sir William Hamilton at Oxford was the highest testimonial that has been produced in his favour. After the fact that there was not a single one of all the Professors of that distinguished University that could compete with him, he must say, that he would have expected that the bright star of the morning should have been the harbinger of the noon-day sun ; and they ought to have had writings that would have distinguished his name. They had writings, to be sure, but still only in the shape of articles in the Edinburgh Review, and it was well known that reviewers had a freedom in their writing which was not taken in other works of a more elaborate character. Sir William had also been a Professor in this University, and for a considerable number of years in a Chair affording the most ample scope for the display of learning, and yet had never attracted any particular notice in that Chair. He was also struck by the circumstance, that, from the testimonials produced by Sir William Hamilton, it appeared as if he had left Oxford yesterday. They were all given on the idea that when Sir William was placed in an academical chair, he would shine forth as a clear and eloquent expounder of science. But he confessed that he liked

to see evidence not of "what he will be," but of "what he has been." And it was strange that his acquirements had not excited more general attention than the wonder of a few French philosophers. They were no doubt sitting here as a jury, but he had yet to learn that a jury on deciding upon their verdict did so only on a statement upon one side, and were not accustomed to look at every side of the question. No doubt testimonials were important, but at the same time there was another kind of testimonials of which every man of common sense was able to form an opinion. These were the works of the individual, and these works they might judge of with as great freedom and perspicuity as they could the testimonials of the most learned. He then referred to Mr Combe and Mr M'Dougall, and said, that if testimonials were to decide the question, none of the candidates could come up to Mr Combe in that respect; and with regard to Mr M'Dougall, he might say, that a Review written by him, he (Bailie Macfarlan) considered at least equal to those of Sir William Hamilton. But in Mr Taylor he thought they had a candidate still more eminent. Bailie Macfarlan then referred to several works to shew the high estimation in which Mr Taylor's talents were held, and particularly alluded to one review which was written by Mr Taylor, which so called forth the admiration of an eminent literary character, that he declared, "that there was but one man in England who could have written this review, and that was Robert Hall." He might also remind the Council, that the Chair of Logic was situated at the very threshold of the study of divinity, and therefore it was all important that the divinity students should listen to the prelections of a man of that deep piety, enlightened understanding, and powerful eloquence which Mr Taylor's numerous writings prove him to be. Some of these works manifested his peculiar fitness for the Logic Chair, in particular his *Elements of Thought*, of which Mr Warren of the Inner Temple spoke in the most favourable way. Bailie Macfarlan also referred to his "*Process of Historical Proofs*," as one of the most beautiful and logical works in the English language. Mr Taylor was one of the noblest sons of English literature. He had already distinguished himself by his works, and he had several at present in progress, and many more he (Bailie M.) trusted would yet appear, whether Mr Taylor was successful this day or not. He concluded by nominating Mr Isaac Taylor.

Bailie SAWERS seconded the motion.

(Here there were cries of "vote, vote," but Mr Deuchar insisted on being heard.)

Mr DEUCHAR stated he felt deeply the responsibility which attached to him as an individual on this occasion, and it was with much diffidence that he ventured to give an opinion on a subject which involved the best interests of our University. But when he considered the mighty influence which a professor of Logic would undoubtedly have on the thousands of youthful minds who should successively be placed under his charge, it was of the highest importance that they selected a person not only distinguished for his talents, and whose literary fame would shed a lustre on our University, but whose pious and religious character was such as to afford the stronger guarantee to parents that their sons would be in no danger while listening to their teacher, of imbibing the insidious poison of scepticism which so abounded in the works of many eminent men who

had written on mental philosophy. Mr D. observed, that although all the candidates who had been named were men of high literary attainments, he would only direct attention to three of them. First, Mr Combe. No one could deny Mr Combe's abilities and great scientific attainments; but he was the teacher of a new philosophy of mind, which, even were it true in theory, had not been satisfactorily tested by experience; and while the great majority of learned men are opposed to the doctrine, it would be great presumption in this Council of thirty-three, and indeed a gross dereliction of duty, were they to suppose that by joining the minority they could turn the scale of opinion, and thereby establish Phrenology. In this view of the subject, he (Mr Deuchar) was saved the necessity of giving any opinion on the merits of Mr Combe's celebrated work on the Constitution of Man; but he could not help expressing his decided opinion that many of the doctrines therein promulgated tended to subvert revelation, and were consequently injurious to the best interest of man. Second, Sir William Hamilton. He at once admitted that this gentleman's testimonials were of the first order, and Mr D.'s only surprise was, that a man so eminent for talent, so full of mental power, and so acute as a philosopher, had not made greater efforts to supply a text-book on logic, or to favour the public with an enlarged or connected system of mental philosophy. He might write well for the few, and that was admitted; but he had not written for the many, which would be the duty of the logic professor. On the point of religion Mr D. was bound to say a few words. What were Sir William's sentiments? He might be a religious man. Mr Sinclair's testimony was only a statement of vague belief that he was. No direct testimony, however, was given, and the Council was entitled to have the fullest evidence on this subject. Mr D. next adverted to Mr Taylor, and submitted, in addition to what Bailie Macfarlan had so eloquently stated, various quotations from the London Reviews on Mr Taylor's works, which bore testimony in the strongest manner to Mr Taylor's splendid talents and powerful mind. Mr D. concluded by mentioning, that Mr Taylor, by his able and valuable works, had gained a name in the literary world which would, if he were elected, shed a lustre on our University, and reflect the highest honour on the Council.

(An attempt was here again made to close the debate. Reference was made to the delicate health of the Lord Provost; and Mr Robertson stated that he had intended to speak, but in tenderness to his Lordship he would forbear. Mr Johnston and Mr Jameson, however, both opposed this course; and his Lordship stated that he felt quite equal to sitting out the debate.)

Mr JAMESON then proceeded to speak at great length in support of the claims of Mr Taylor, and said that, after what he (Mr Jameson) had seen at this election, he had lost much of that enthusiasm with which he had once contended for the Council being the best depository of the University patronage. From the mode in which this election had been conducted, and from what he had heard of the canvassing going on, he was not now prepared to say, that as a body, they ought to be allowed unchecked to retain their right of patronage. He was about to vote for Mr Taylor, a gentleman for whom he had unquestionably been exerting himself, or rather for a principle; for, without denying the eminent qua-

lifications of Sir W. Hamilton, he (Mr J.) considered Mr Taylor the superior man, especially on religious grounds. On this subject he wished to speak with reverence; he wished that he was more under its influence; but he trusted that all the Council recognised its importance. They would not forget the fervent and pious sentiments in the prayer of the eloquent clergyman (Dr Muir) who had opened their meeting, that they would remember they were in the presence of God discharging a most important duty—a prayer which had touched his heart, as he trusted it had done the hearts of his brother Councillors: It had been said that there was a constellation of talent competing for this chair. He suspected that a good deal of the refulgence which struck gentlemen so forcibly, was in consequence of the nearness of some of the objects, and that what was distant was not so brilliant. Mr J. then referred to the obscurity of Sir W. Hamilton's style of writing as an objection; and, after reading several of the testimonials in favour of that gentleman (which he contended, however, had all been given previous to Mr Taylor coming forward, so that he was justified in presuming that had they been written subsequently they would have been a good deal modified), he proceeded to remark, that had the splendid abilities for which in his testimonials he got credit been available, they would have exhibited themselves in his present Chair. But had they done so? It was well known they had not. Sir W. Hamilton, he contended, was not known except from his connection with the *Edinburgh Review*, and it was well known that the theological philosophy of that journal was not in high repute. He (Mr J.) was unwilling to say any thing for which Mr Black might drag him into the Court of Session, as he sometimes attempted to do to others; but he would not hesitate to repeat, that, as a religious journal, the *Edinburgh Review* did not stand very high—that its religious principles were generally regarded with suspicion. (Mr Black, "trash.") Perhaps any thing he (Mr J.) could say on the subject of religion, would seem trash in the eyes of some people—(here there was considerable impatience manifested in the Council.)

The Lord Provost called Mr Jameson to order. Such language could not be permitted.

Mr JOHNSTON contended that when candidates came forward, their whole character was before the public; and that Mr Jameson was quite in order in discussing Sir W. Hamilton's religious qualifications.

Mr BRUCE put it to Mr Jameson whether the fact of having written a few articles for the *Edinburgh Review* made Sir W. Hamilton responsible for the religious opinions of that journal.

Mr JAMESON, after a pause, again proceeded to address the meeting, and concluded by again declaring himself decidedly in favour of Mr Taylor.

Treasurer BLACK said, that before Mr Jameson spoke, he did not see any necessity for further speaking on the subject; but there was one part of that most extraordinary speech which he could not but notice. It was one of the unpleasant signs of the times that they found men, whenever they had an object to carry, making a stalking-horse of religion (hear, hear.) Whatever matter was under discussion, one party was sure to raise the cry of heresy against the other—a cry which has done more mischief, since first it was raised to the present moment, than any thing

else in the world. He believed there had been men who had joined the holy office of the Inquisition, and burned their fellow-creatures, thinking they did God service; and that there were many persons in modern times who carried their principles to the extreme, under the idea that they were promoting God's glory. But there was another class of men, who, while they were in the constant habit of taking the name of God in vain, while they took no active interest in the promotion of real religion in the world, did yet come forward with hypocritical, canting, whining speeches on religion when they had a point to carry, (hear.) When he (Mr B.) met with such men, he was filled with infinite disgust. He could excuse those who through their whole life had manifested strong and ardent zeal in promoting their own religious principles, and who, in their ordinary conduct, were apt to carry their zeal too far; but when individuals who had never shown themselves to be influenced by religious zeal, and who yet came forward under the semblance of it to carry their point—who could help feeling the utmost disgust?—(Mr Howden, "To be sure.") He (Mr Black) thought the last speech had let out a great deal of the influence which had been used against Sir W. Hamilton. He had no doubt that there had been much talking about the German philosophy being contrary to sound theology. They did not perhaps say that Sir William was an infidel; they dared not do that; but in a calm, quiet, serpent-like, creeping way, insinuated and left the inference to be deduced that he was an infidel. But let that charge be publicly made. Sir William had written many articles, in which his infidel opinions, if he had any such, would naturally have shown themselves. Let his opponents turn up those, and put their fingers on passages from which such an inference could be made. But how was it argued that he was not favourable to religion? Why, because he had written some articles in the *Edinburgh Review*. Was it then to be said that the religious opinions of all who had written in the *Edinburgh Review* were to be suspected? Dr Chalmers, it was well known, had written in the *Edinburgh Review*, and in that case it would follow that he was not favourable to religion, (hear.) But why should either of these writers be made responsible for errors committed by other writers in the *Edinburgh Review*? In all works written by various persons, every man should be made responsible for his own writings only; and in this way let a charge of infidelity be brought against Sir William Hamilton if they could. He (Mr B.) was satisfied that this was the grand objection that had been brought against Sir W. Hamilton—brought forward too in the most unworthy manner. He (Mr B.) had taken as much interest in promoting religious societies as most of those gentlemen who opposed Sir W. Hamilton on religious grounds; but he had not found those who were so eloquent on the fear of religion being injured by Sir W. Hamilton, take the same interest in promoting religion, but had stood aloof, leaving it to others. Several reviews had been quoted in favour of Mr Taylor. But what said the leading reviews in his favour? What said the *Quarterly Review*? Not a word. The writers of it then did not seem to be so deeply impressed with the writings of Mr Taylor as his supporters would have people believe. What said the *Edinburgh Review*? He found a review of Mr Taylor's work on *Fanaticism*, written in 1834, without any reference to the present contest, and the opinion then entertained of Mr Taylor was

not very flattering.—(Here Mr Black quoted several passages of that Review.) He (Mr B.) was willing to admit that the literary merits of Mr Taylor were of a high order of their own kind—he was very imaginative and very eloquent, but that he was a proper person to fill the Logic Chair he (Mr B.) could not acknowledge, especially when they had such favourable testimony in favour of another individual. After remarking upon the principle upon which the Council should receive evidence, Mr B. proceeded to say that it had been objected to Sir W. Hamilton, that in his present chair of Universal History, he had never been able to raise a class. His (Mr B.'s) opinion was, that nobody ever would raise a class of Universal History. No one ever had done it, and no man, however eminent, would do it. But he had heard a gentleman declare that Sir William's lectures on that branch of study were of the most eloquent and useful kind, but that, from the nature of the chair itself, it was impossible to draw large bodies of students towards it. Mr B. concluded by declaring himself cordially in favour of Sir W. Hamilton.

Mr RUSSELL read extracts from the writings of Dr Chalmers, Dr Wardlaw, and Mr Buchanan of Leith, to show that it was of great consequence to unite religion with the teaching of philosophy. He considered Mr Taylor best qualified to do this, and therefore he should vote for him.

Mr JOHNSTON wished to have a guarantee that Sir William was sound in regard to religion; and he asked if it would be proper in the Council to elect a person to the Chair of Logic whose principles in that respect were not guaranteed even by his stoutest advocates. He (Mr J.) also wished for evidence of his qualities as a teacher. They had ample evidence, he admitted, of his philosophical talents; but it was to be kept in mind that it was not to Lord Jeffrey, Sir David Brewster, Mr Macvey Napier, and such profound philosophers, that Sir W. Hamilton was to lecture, but to boys of fifteen years of age. The learned Councillor, therefore, argued, that the testimonials of such men as he had named ought to have no weight in this case. Mr M'Dougall, he argued, had produced abundant evidence of his fitness in every respect to fill the Chair; but as he saw the contest would be between Sir W. Hamilton and Mr Taylor, he would, after Mr M'Dougall, certainly vote for the latter.

Mr GIFFORD also contended for the superior claims of Mr Taylor in a religious point of view.

After a few remarks from Mr WHITE and Mr LAING, the latter of whom said the argument was all on his side,

Mr M'LAREN said, that Mr Johnston had called particularly upon him for evidence of Sir W. Hamilton's Christianity, and said, that if he could assure him (Mr J.) of this, and quiet his conscience upon that point, he would be satisfied. It was, he said, a very unlikely thing that he (Mr M'Laren) would guarantee the religion of Sir William Hamilton, a gentleman whom he had never seen, and whom he would not know if he were then present. He had never been asked to vote for Sir William Hamilton, except by an elder of the Church, who was now present, Dr Macaulay. It was ludicrous to call on him to guarantee Sir William Hamilton's religion. He would not guarantee the religion even of Mr Johnston (a laugh). He knew nothing of any man's religion except oc-

casional by his works, which was the best criterion that he knew to judge by. Had Sir William Hamilton gone to his parish minister for a certificate of his religious character, he (Mr M'Laren) would have thought such a proceeding pitiful and contemptible, and if he did not choose to stand upon his character, he deserved to lose his situation. He held it was the duty of those who threw out unworthy insinuations regarding Sir William's character, to bring forward some proofs to support them. It had been stated by Mr Jameson, that in this instance the evangelical dissenters were united with the more religious part of the members of the church to return Mr Taylor in opposition to Sir William Hamilton. He did not know on what authority Mr Jameson had spoken, or how he should have known of such a union, if it had taken place. He (Mr M'Laren) did not know what were the sentiments of the great body of dissenters on this subject, and therefore could express no opinion. He had never heard of any such union as had been stated to have taken place. He knew several dissenting clergymen both in the town and country, who thought that Sir William Hamilton would be infinitely superior to Mr Taylor in the Chair of Logic, and he did not know one clergyman who held the reverse of this opinion. He knew many who looked with disgust upon the circumstance of religion being so frequently made a stalking-horse of in cases where it ought not to be introduced; and he must say that to-day he had heard no sneering against religion but against its being used in this way.

Dr MACAULAY said, it was quite true that he had asked Mr M'Laren to vote for Sir William Hamilton, and that he had intended to do so himself up to Monday last, when he had learned, on returning from London, that Mr Taylor was positively a candidate. On reconsidering the question, he had since become satisfied in his mind, that, on the score of religion, Mr Taylor was the fittest of the two candidates, and in voting for him as he intended to do, he was quite willing to take the responsibility attaching to his change of opinion.

Convener DICK stated, that in voting in favour of Mr Combe, he did not pledge himself to Phrenology, but he supported him because he knew him to be a successful teacher, and an acute and logical reasoner.

Mr DUNCAN gave his reasons for preferring Sir William Hamilton, which were, that, upon a strict inquiry, he was satisfied of his qualification, both as a moral man and a Christian.

The Council then proceeded to vote upon the whole list of candidates:—

For Sir William Hamilton—The Lord Provost, Bailie Donaldson, Bailie Stodart, Treasurer Black, Councillors Watson, Howden, M'Laren, Ponton, Baird, Duncan, Robertson, Grainger, Grant, and Bruce—14.

For Mr Taylor—Bailie Macfarlan, Bailie Sawers, Councillors Deuchar, Jameson, Russell, Gifford, Banks, Whyte, Laing, and Macaulay—10.

For Mr M'Dougall—Dean of Guild Lamond, Councillors Johnston, Mackay, Gillespie Graham, and MacLagan—5.

For Mr Combe—Convener Dick, Councillors Neill and Milne—3.

At the close of this vote, the proposers of the two last named candidates agreed to withdraw them, when another vote was taken for Sir



William Hamilton and Mr Taylor, and, in addition to those we have already named, there voted,

For Sir William Hamilton—The Dean of Guild, the Convener, Councillors Gillespie Graham and Milne, giving a total number of 18.

For Mr Taylor—Councillors Johnston, Mackay, MacLagan, and Neill, total 14.

#### FROM THE SCOTSMAN.

Sir William Hamilton was elected yesterday by a narrow majority over Mr Taylor. The election has excited an extraordinary interest, and we have reported the proceedings at great length. In recommending Mr Combe, we were well aware that his chance of success was extremely small; and we stated this distinctly when we first adverted to his being a candidate. But though we could scarcely indulge the hope of seeing him elected, we did not think our advocacy of his claims useless. Something has been done to remove prejudices, which obscured the talents of a very able man, and prevented philosophical opinions of great importance from receiving the fair and impartial hearing to which they are now shown to be well entitled. The support which Mr Combe received in the Council, if small, was highly respectable. It is not what we think due to him, but it is more than he would have received a few years ago.

#### FROM THE EDINBURGH CHRONICLE.

We refer to the "Town-Council Proceedings" of yesterday for an account of the election to the Logic Chair. In our last publication our views were fully stated on this important election. These were, that, to do justice to the University, the candidates, and the public, the Council should, from the evidence laid before them, consider, first, the claims of the old and new systems of Mental Philosophy; and, secondly, the individual merits of the candidates. If the old system were to be preferred, then we thought there was no choice but to elect Sir William Hamilton,—and if the new, Mr Combe. The Lord Provost, in opening the business, said, he certainly considered himself in the light of a jurymen, and that he could only look to the evidence laid before them; but in doing so he preferred Sir William Hamilton. A majority of the Council have also approved of his Lordship's choice, and have thereby proclaimed to the world that a system totally unsupported by one word in the evidence before them, and all but universally acknowledged to be totally useless, should still be retained in the imperative curriculum of our University. We were highly gratified, however, to find the new system of mental philosophy, and its talented advocate Mr Combe, so ably supported by Dr Neill, an educated pupil of the old school, and therefore well qualified to judge; as also by Mr Milne, and Convener Dick,—the latter likewise an undoubted judge of physiological science, and the representative of the Trades of Edinburgh. We refrain at present from saying more; but are confident that a very short time will convince the Council of the error they have committed, and will shew that the efforts of blind authority and religious fanaticism will be directed in vain to obstruct the progress of true philosophy and the advancement of useful knowledge.

## FROM THE SPECTATOR.

The Edinburgh Town-Council have filled up the vacancy in the University, by electing Sir William Hamilton. It is one thing to grudge the amount of the reward, and another to question the propriety of the choice. If intellectual labour, disinterested and unwearied, can merit distinction, Sir William Hamilton has fairly earned it; but it is unfortunate that his recompence should have been conferred in circumstances under which, by the vote of a popular body, erudition has been exalted over rare talent—industry, with moderate acuteness, over elevated perseverance accompanied by the highest originality—and in which a thorough acquaintance with the works of the inquirers of past time, came into contest with a power to benefit society by the discovery of new truths, and seemed to bear away the palm. Had an Edinburgh Town-Council of those days bestowed approbation on the old astronomer TYCHO, no one would have quarrelled with them; but had the reward involved his preference to the youthful NEWTON, mankind would long ago have reversed the verdict. It is, however, at least satisfactory, that the result has not given victory to a mere rhetorician, and, through him, to a clique of noxious intriguers.

A short debate preceded the vote; demanding especial notice on account of one important feature. It must sincerely gratify the friends of liberty of thought, that such men as Mr Black and Mr D. Maclaren, (individuals on whose religious belief not one shadow of implication can be cast by the most straitly orthodox—who are, indeed, themselves of the very straitest sect,) utterly scouted and spurned the use attempted to be made of the name of religion—that old stalking-horse argument ever at command of the base, the hypocritical, and the ignorant. It is not for us, at this distance, to decide and appropriate the motives inciting to the utterance of the slang referred to, but it is allowable to express the hope, that if the people of Edinburgh have reason to apply to any of its authors the castigation of Mr Black, supported and enforced by the brief address of Mr Maclaren,—if they know that the forward and blustering advocacy of what is termed Christian doctrine, is, in any case, not supported by Christian life,—if this noisy assertion of the authority of stringent dogmas be not proved to be sincere by the practice of austerities commanded by such dogmas,—or if there is reason to assume in their case, as in similar ones, that vain and empty and ambitious adventurers, who have attained some notoriety by their talking adherence to one party, are now employing that notoriety by way of raising their purchase price with another,—it is allowable, we repeat, to express the hope that the electors of Edinburgh will have seen enough to give application to the penalty they can inflict, by consigning that alone which in all nature is contemptible—viz. *insincerity*—to the contempt and worst obscurity it has earned. There were persons, however, figuring in these discussions, to whom it is impossible to lay charges of this description; but no amount or degree of orthodoxy should authorize the committal of duties like those just discharged to individuals with whom orthodoxy is not, through effect of their ignorance, the slightest guarantee against uncharitable, intolerant, and tyrannical action. It seemed good, for instance, to Messrs

Deuchar and Russell, to state broadly before the Council, that certain passages in Mr Combe's *Constitution of Man* demonstrated his "hostility to Christianity." These persons are sound men, we doubt not, and impregnable in the faith of Calvin; but a trifling increment of modesty and a due augmentation of that charity which is the most prominent characteristic of a fallible mind, feeling the presence of its great and pure Maker, would certainly not be superfluous in proof of their own Christianity. The merits of this question should be fairly laid before the public. Mr Combe's work is a *positive*. It contains a statement of much that is *positive* and *new* in reference to the condition of man and the elements of his happiness; and in this it is altogether contradistinguished from the works of theologians, who for the last two hundred years have done nothing but brow-beat and abuse each other, and in the assumed name of the Almighty browbeat their flocks. Now in this whole treatise there is not one statement in opposition to those fundamental facts regarding man which Christianity brings into strong relief; although the novelties, the discoveries of the work, seem to compel modification in the philosophies which theologians have constructed on the basis of these facts. Is it because of this that Mr Combe's work has been at once abused, hated, and unanswered. It has disturbed the theologians, simply as discoveries always disturb them; but in consequence of its strict fundamental correspondence with the essential elements of Christianity, and its manifest foundation in nature, not one theologian of note has ventured, notwithstanding its celebrity and success, to stake his reputation by opposing it. Is it not, in such circumstances, somewhat too much for a Mr Deuchar or a Mr Russell to pronounce *ex cathedra* as to its opposition to Christianity? The statement comes only to this—that *their* view of Christianity does not comprehend truths which Mr Combe unfolds; and a man even of ordinary modesty, or ordinary diffidence in his own powers, and inclined even in an ordinary degree to that respect for talent and for the labour of the conscientious inquirer, which is the very first moral constituent of a judge in such a matter,—a man of this kind, on seeing, or seeming to see a contradiction between his own views and the new ones, would have said without hesitation, "Perhaps my views of Christianity are imperfect: these new doctrines appear to rest on strong substantive foundations: let me beware of rejecting them simply because of their contrariety to my preconceived views: when I have read more, and thought more deeply, I may perceive the agreement." Let it be well understood *what is intolerance*. Mr Russell, who went to gaol rather than pay the Annuity-tax, and who, perhaps, on the ground of that achievement, reckons himself a sort of a martyr, clearly requires to be informed, that the levying of a shilling or two out of a man's income in support of a strange creed, is just the most insignificant and least important way possible in which persecution can be rendered effective. The root of the persecuting spirit is in that disposition (and a pestiferous one it is) which disposes us to believe that our neighbour cannot be right simply because he differs from us; and which, because of difference of opinion, will blast his character or deprive him of merited station, without one feeling of reluctance, all as in the service of God! We shall think ill of our old friends of Edinburgh, if, after manifestations of this mischievous kind, silly and ignorant men be permitted longer to share in the conduct of University affairs

These remarks have been hazarded not so much in particular reference to the present case, as by way of warning against the action of a bad and dangerous, and prevalent disposition ; but there is another point, and a serious one, with respect to Mr Combe's rejection, to which we feel it a duty to solicit attention. The advancement of society must ever come from within, not from without. Its elevation of character, and the breadth and permanence of its institutions, depend on the condition of its people as to enlightenment and their sound views of morals. One kind of Reformers—nor let merit be refused them—keep their eye only on outward influences, and strive, or seem to strive, to obtain for society certain forms of law, without ever imagining the necessity of cultivating or cherishing those internal agencies which, if well developed, will of themselves always procure for a people every beneficial result. Lord Melbourne knows very well that Reformers of this sort are the most vulgar of all ; and in his best speeches—those which do him most credit, and which will live—he has well lamented the strength of social or internal obstacles to the progress of civilization in the British empire. It is sufficiently strange, then, that the individual who more than any other man in Great Britain has laboured with effect in the clearing of the public mind,—who has founded and propagated a philosophy with signal success, which will in the end teach men their true nature, and destroy superstition,—it is strange that Mr Combe should have been only scowled on by the influential Whigs of Scotland ! Attachment to old schools and old systems and old masters, is all laudable ; but the bestowal of Government influence in subjection to such feelings, is what in these days we can hardly well afford. The vacation is approaching ; and we request Lord Melbourne, not as a favour, but in performance of a public duty, to peruse the *Constitution of Man* : and, after he has satisfied himself by how much his best Bishop—even the Hierarch of Durham—has been excelled by Mr Combe in contributions to sound sense, in metaphysics, or in works of public utility, he may perhaps be inclined to ask why the representatives of his Ministry in Edinburgh did, with one consent, contrive to keep the author of that work from one of the few positions attainable by him in Scotland, from the elevation of which his already recognised authority would have been more visible and doubly influential.

Mr Combe requires no condolence because of his defeat. Probably, he never looked for success ; and if many of the Edinburgh Council are like Messrs Deuchar and Russel, he must have known from the beginning that success was hopeless. But he has established a fresh claim on the grateful notice of posterity,—daring a position which no man in that line will again rejoice to occupy, offering himself as a first sacrifice to the high priests of Old Philosophies, and maintaining with the dignity of a philosopher the interests of truth.

12

0

# DOCUMENTS

LAID BEFORE

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE LORD GLENELG,

BY

SIR GEORGE S. MACKENZIE, BART.,

RELATIVE TO

THE CONVICTS SENT TO NEW SOUTH WALES.

---

APRIL 1836.

- Medical Society of Edinburgh, and Secretary to the  
Phrenological Society of Portsmouth, . . . . . 9
9. From Dr JAMES INGLIS, M.R.C.S.E., and Soc. Ed. Med.  
Reg. Soc. Ed.; SAMUEL M'KEUR, Esq. Surgeon, Castle  
Douglas; the Rev. WILLIAM GLOVER, A.M. Minister of  
Crossmichael; Dr JOHN COLVIN, Bengal Establishment,  
M.R.C.S. Lond. and Mem. Med. and Phys. Soc. Calcutta, 10
10. From S. HARE, Esq. Proprietor and Medical Attendant of  
the Retreat for the Insane in Leeds, . . . . . 11
11. From Dr JAMES STEWART (A), Surgeon, Royal Navy, and  
Physician Extraordinary to His Royal Highness the Duke  
of SUSSEX, . . . . . 12
12. From Dr JAMES SCOTT, LL.B., Surgeon and Lecturer to the  
Royal Hospital at Haslar; Licentiate of the Royal Col-  
lege of Physicians of London; Surgeon and Medical  
Superintendent of the Royal Naval Lunatic Asylum;  
President of the Hampshire Phrenological Society, &c.  
&c. . . . . 13
13. From HEWETT COTTRELL WATSON, Esq. F.L.S., late Presi-  
dent of the Royal Medical Society of Edinburgh; Author  
of the "Geography of British Plants," and other works, 15
14. From Sir WILLIAM C. ELLIS, M.D. Superintendent of the  
Lunatic Asylum for the County of Middlesex, at Han-  
well, . . . . . 16
15. From Dr DISNEY ALEXANDER, late one of the Physicians to  
the Wakefield Dispensary and the Pauper Lunatic Asylum,  
Lecturer on Phrenology, Author of an Essay on the best  
Means of preserving Health, of a Treatise on the Croup,  
and of Lectures on the Internal Evidences of Christianity, 17
16. From GEORGE MARTELL, Esq. Member of the College of Sur-  
geons, London, Surgeon to the Jail of Portsmouth, and  
Senior Surgeon to the Dispensary, &c. &c. . . . . 17
17. From JAMES SIMPSON, Esq. Advocate, City Assessor of Edin-  
burgh, and author of "Necessity of Popular Education  
as a National Object," . . . . . 18
18. From HENRY WITHAM, Esq. of Lartington, Yorkshire, Mem-  
ber of the Geological Society of London, and Royal So-  
ciety of Edinburgh, &c. &c.; and Author of a Work on  
"The Internal Structure of Fossil Vegetables," . . . . . 18
19. From Dr FRANCIS FARQUHARSON, Fellow of the Royal College  
of Surgeons of Edinburgh, and Vice-President of the  
Phrenological Society, . . . . . 19

20. From Dr S. E. HIRSCHFELD, Bremen, . . . . .	19
21. From the SURGEONS to the NEWCASTLE INFIRMARY, and Fifteen other Gentlemen of that Town, . . . . .	20
22. From W. A. F. BROWNE, Esq. Medical Superintendent of Montrose Lunatic Asylum, . . . . .	22
23. From Dr C. OTTO, Professor of Materia Medica and Forensic Medicine in the University of Copenhagen; Physician to the Civil Penitentiary; Member of the Royal Board of Health, the Royal Medical Society of Copenhagen, and thirteen other Medical Societies abroad; Editor of the Danish medical journal "Bibliothek for Lieger," &c. &c.	23
24. From the Honourable DOUGLAS GORDON HALLYBURTON, M. P. for Forfarshire, . . . . .	24
25. From Dr PATRICK NEILL, F. R. S. E. & F. L. S. London, . .	29
26. From Dr JOHN ELLIOTSON, F. R. S., President of the Royal Medical and Chirurgical, and of the London Phrenologi- cal Societies; Professor of the Principles and Practice of Medicine and of Clinical Medicine, and Dean of Faculty, in the University of London; Senior Physician of the North London Hospital; Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of London; formerly Physician to St Thomas's Hospital, and President of the Royal Medical Society of Edinburgh, &c. &c. &c. . . . .	30
27. From Dr JOHN SCOTT, Fellow of the Royal College of Sur- geons, Edinburgh, . . . . .	31
28. From JOSEPH VIMONT, M. D., of the Faculty of Paris, Hono- rary Member of the Phrenological Societies of Paris, Lon- don, Edinburgh, Boston, &c. . . . .	32
29. From Dr WILLIAM GREGORY, F. R. S. E., Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh, Member and for- merly President of the Royal Medical Society, Corres- ponding Member of the Société de Pharmacie and of the Phrenological Society of Paris, and Secretary to the Phrenological Society of Edinburgh, . . . . .	33
30. From Dr ROBERT HUNTER, Professor of Anatomy, &c. in the Andersonian University, Glasgow, . . . . .	34
31. From ROBERT MACNISH, Esq. Member of the Faculty of Physicians and Surgeons of Glasgow, and Author of "The Philosophy of Sleep," &c. . . . .	35
32. From RICHARD POOLE, M. D., Fellow and Joint Librarian of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh; Author of various Articles in Periodical Journals and the Ency-	

- clopædia Edinensis,—as *Language, Philology, Mathematics, Mind, Philosophy, and Education*, the last of which has been republished separately, . . . . . 36
33. From CHARLES MACLAREN, Esq. Editor of the *Scotsman*, . . . . . 37
34. From WILLIAM WILDSMITH, Esq. Member of the Royal College of Surgeons, London, and of the Council of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society; and Author of “An Inquiry concerning the relative Connexion which subsists between the Mind and the Brain,” . . . . . 38
35. From Mr WILLIAM BREBNER, Governor of the County and City Bridewell, Glasgow, . . . . . 39
36. From H. A. GALBRAITH, Esq. Surgeon to the Glasgow Royal Lunatic Asylum, . . . . . 39
37. From GEORGE SALMOND, Esq. Procurator-Fiscal of Lanarkshire; WALTER MOIR, Esq. Sheriff-substitute of Lanarkshire; and Mr D. M’Coll, Governor of Glasgow Jail, . . . . . 41
38. Account of Mr COMBE’s Phrenological Examination of Heads of Criminals in the Jail of Newcastle-on-Tyne, October 1835, . . . . . 44
39. From Dr JOHN MACKINTOSH, Surgeon to the Ordnance Department in North Britain; Lecturer on the Principles of Pathology and Practice of Physic; Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh; Member of the Medico-Chirurgical and Wernerian Natural History Societies of Edinburgh, Montreal, Heidelberg, and Brussels, . . . . . 47
40. Certificate from HENRY MARSH, Esq. M.D., M.R.I.A., one of the Physicians to Steven’s Hospital, Consulting Physician to the Dublin General Hospital, St Vincent’s Hospital, and the Institution for the Diseases of Children; ROBERT HARRISON, Esq. M.D., M.R.I.A., Professor of Anatomy and Physiology, Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland; RICHARD TONSON EVANSON, Esq. M.D., M.R.I.A., Professor of the Practice of Physic, Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland; JAMES ARMSTRONG, D.D., M.R.I.A.; FRANCIS WHITE, Esq. President of the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland; W. F. MONTGOMERY, Esq. M.D., Professor of Midwifery to the King and Queen’s College of Physicians in Ireland; WM. W. CAMPBELL, Esq. M.R.I.A., Demonstrator of Anatomy to the College of Surgeons in Ireland, Resident Assistant Physician to the Dublin Lying-in Hospital; ANDREW BOURNE, Esq. Barrister; THOMAS EDWARD BEATTY, Esq. M.D., late Professor of Medical



Jurisprudence, Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland ; ARTHUR EDWARD GAYER, Esq. LL.D., Barrister ; ANDREW CARMICHAEL, Esq. M.R.I.A. ; JOHN HOUSTON, Esq. M.D., Curator of the Museum, Royal College of Surgeons, Ire- land, Surgeon to the City Dublin Hospital, Surgeon to the Charter Schools of Ireland, and to the Deaf and Dumb Institution for Ireland ; H. MAUNSELL, Esq. M.D., Profes- sor of Midwifery to the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland, and Member of the Medical Society of Leipzig,		48
41. From His Grace the ARCHBISHOP of DUBLIN, . . . .		50
42. From the PROVOST of TRINITY COLLEGE, . . . .		50
43. From H. LLOYD, Esq. F.T.C.D., Professor of Natural Phi- losophy, Dublin, . . . . .		50
44. From MOUNTIFORT LONGFIELD, Esq. F.T.C.D., Whayleaw, Professor of Political Economy, . . . . .		50
45. From PHILIP CRAMPTON, Esq. Surgeon-General, Dublin,		51
46. From AR. JACOB, Esq. M.D., Professor of Anatomy, Royal College of Surgeons, Dublin, . . . . .		51



REPRESENTATION sent by Sir GEORGE S. MACKENZIE, Bart. to the Right Honourable Lord GLENELG, Secretary for the Colonies,—in reference to Convicts sent to New South Wales. February 1836.

THE recent atrocities that have occurred in New South Wales, are proof that there is mismanagement somewhere, and that caution is indispensable for the future. But the manner in which that caution is to be exercised, involves questions of much importance, perhaps of difficulty. It is, however, obvious that caution must, in the first place, be directed to the convicts. At present they are shipped off, and distributed to the settlers, without the least regard to their characters or history. A man or a woman found guilty of an offence, is deemed an object of punishment, whether the individual have spent previous life in crime, or has been driven by hard necessity unwillingly to commit it. To bring back a person condemned by the law to a course of industrious and honest habits, by means suited to the natural character and dispositions, is a thing never thought of. Punishment is most ignorantly deemed a universal panacea for criminal propensities, and degradation is esteemed the fitting means to restore a human being to self-respect, and to inspire an inclination towards good conduct. Such ideas, though they lead to practice that has for ages been condemned by its results, arise out of ignorance of the

b

human constitution ; and until that ignorance shall have been dispelled from the minds of rulers, and its place filled up by an extended view of the actual constitution of man, error must continue to direct their measures in the highway to evil. To be able to legislate for man implies a knowledge of man. But in the case which is now specially adverted to, that knowledge is entirely absent. In a short address, as this must be, it is impossible to point out the means of acquiring a knowledge of the true mental constitution of man. It can only be stated that it has been discovered, has been neglected, but still is making rapid progress in enlightening the British people.

It is therefore submitted,

*1st*, That when the importance of the colony of New South Wales is considered, convicts should not be sent out indiscriminately. Their individual history and characters should be inquired into, and the best selected for the colony, and the worst kept for discipline at home. But, with every exertion, the selection cannot be accurately made without the assistance of some one acquainted with the true Philosophy of Man.

*2d*, It is conceived that the management of convicts should be a special department of Colonial Government, to which undivided attention ought to be given. At home the convicts are not under the superintendence of the Colonial Secretary ; but when they are to be sent abroad, he ought to have the power to select such as are the fittest for the purposes of his department, and in which there ought to be an officer qualified to investigate the history of convicts, and to select them on phrenological principles.

That such principles are the only secure grounds on which the treatment of convicts can be founded, proof may be demanded, and it is ready for production. I now unhesitatingly offer to your Lordship the following public test of their truth and efficacy, your acceptance of which, whatever may be your notions of what the result will be, will at all events do you honour. It is this :

Let your Lordship direct inquiry to be made into the circumstances which brought a given number of convicts to trial and punishment, and if possible let so much of their previous history as can be got at, be stated. Suppose the number to be fifty. Let these be numbered, and their history, trial, and crimes inserted in a catalogue—of course I trust that this shall be as correctly done as possible, and in strict good faith. Let this catalogue be laid aside. On being informed that this has been done, I will go to London and take with me an experienced Phrenologist. Let the convicts be brought to us one by one, and we will make a catalogue of our own in the same order, and in it we will enter what we deem the characters of the individuals to be, and what were the crimes they probably had committed; and likewise, we will state, in particular cases, what employment, or at least the nature of the employment, they had probably been engaged in, and that in which they are likely to be useful. The only information we will desire is, whether the individual has or has not been educated. We will examine the individuals in the presence of whom your Lordship pleases. When our catalogue shall be completed, we will then request a meeting with your Lordship and such friends as you may wish to be present, and that the cata-

logues shall be publicly compared; reserving only this, that if any discrepancy of importance shall appear, we shall be permitted to question the subject, and to make inquiry into the case ourselves, attended by those who made the previous inquiry.

The result of such an experiment as this, will, I venture to predict, satisfy your Lordship that means do exist for the selection of convicts for the Colonies, and for their classification for treatment. I refer your Lordship to the fact of my friend Mr Combe having actually done what is here proposed at Newcastle in October 1835, as narrated in the *Phrenological Journal*, No. 46, page 524, of which a copy accompanies this communication. If I can prevail on you to make this experiment, I shall ever feel deeply grateful, and your Lordship will gain the gratitude of all truly wise patriots, and lay the foundation of a benefit to your country such as no ruler has yet conferred either for effect or extent.

---

LETTER—SIR GEORGE MACKENZIE.

To the Right Honourable LORD GLENELG, Secretary of State for the Colonial Department.

MY DEAR LORD,

I now put into your hands a number of Certificates from eminent men, confirming my former assertion, that it is possible to classify convicts destined for our penal settlements, so that the Colonists may be freed from the risk of having atrocious and incorrigible characters allotted to

them, and the Colonial public from the evils arising out of the escape of such characters. Allow me to take this opportunity to state, that, unless punishment shall be awarded not only proportionally to the crime committed, but to the actual moral character and degree of enlightenment of the culprit, it cannot have the effect expected from it, and may even render criminals more wicked. The power to punish ought to be in the hands of those who have charge of convicted persons, not to be positively inflicted under an imperative law, but to be used in the business of reform only when, to a sound and philosophical judgment, it may appear necessary. The experience of penal settlements teaches us that, while all criminals condemned to transportation are regarded as *equally* deserving of punishment, however various their degrees of guilt, they are not by any means equally prone to continue in a course of crime ; for we find that some, with the certainty of the severest punishment before them, do continue to manifest propensity to crime, and do commit it whenever opportunity offers ; while others become, of their own accord, sensible of their errors, (though condemned as equally guilty with the others), exert themselves to overcome their evil tendencies, and arrive at the station of peaceable, industrious, and respectable members of the community. These facts, though perfectly and long notorious, have not attracted the notice of either the Colonial Government, or the Government at home ; but they prove incontestibly, that there is a very great difference in the moral constitution of criminals condemned to transportation, a fact of which philosophy may make the most important use. The horrid slaughter of the people on my sons'

property would not have happened, I am bold enough to say, had the Government been in possession of means to classify the convicts, and to keep the most atrocious in restraint at home, sending to New South Wales only the better disposed among them.

Such means I am now the instrument of placing in the hands of a liberal Government, whether it shall be regarded or not ; and your Lordship, I trust, will not think me tedious, while I very briefly set before you the general facts which have brought men of philosophical understanding and habits of investigation, to perceive, that a discovery of the true mental constitution of man has been made, and that it furnishes us with an all-powerful means to improve our race,—and that the more rapidly, if those in whose hands the government of our country is placed will only listen to facts, look at their verification, and attend to philosophical induction from them.

Your Lordship must be aware of the fact, that, independently of rank, education, or wealth, men differ from each other very widely in the amount and kind of their intellectual power, in moral feeling, and in their tendencies to indulge their propensities. It is too well known that titled, intelligent, wealthy blackguards exist, guilty of the grossest violation of moral law, while they contrive to escape the penalties of statutes, which, however, occasionally reach their enormities. That such are rather encouraged by what is called high society, is notorious ; and surely a titled gambler, or cheat, or seducer, cannot be reckoned less guilty than a poor, ignorant wretch, who steals perhaps to sustain life, and not from a depraved propensity.



It is, however, to the fact of difference of character and talent among men of all stations of society to which I anxiously desire your Lordship's attention. This difference must clearly be the effect of something. There have been philosophers who taught that man is a *tubula rasa*, on which we may stamp what talent and what character we please. This, however, has long been demonstrated, by thousands of facts of daily occurrence, to be a mere delusion. Differences in talent, intelligence, and moral character, are now ascertained to be the effects of differences in organization. The brain has been long regarded by physiologists as the organ by which the mind is connected with the body, and by means of which the mental faculties are manifested. To this conclusion, the result of a vast amount of observation and experiment has conducted them. After this fact had been universally admitted, a similar amount of observation and experiment led to the demonstration, by the celebrated Gall, of different portions of the brain being allotted to the power of manifesting different mental faculties. In those who exhibit the manifestation of any particular faculty strongly, the organ in the brain is proportionally large. The differences of organization are, as the certificates which accompany this shew, sufficient to indicate *externally* general dispositions, as they are proportioned among one another. Hence, we have the means of estimating, with something like precision, the actual natural characters of convicts, (as of all human beings,) so that we may at once determine the means best adapted for their reformation, or discover their incapacity of improvement, and their being

ing power in perfecting human institutions, and bringing about universal good order, peace, prosperity, and happiness.

Believe me, my dear Lord, very truly yours,

G. S. MACKENZIE.

## CERTIFICATES.

---

I. From Dr WILLIAM WEIR, Lecturer on the Practice of Medicine, formerly Surgeon to the Royal Infirmary of Glasgow, and joint Editor of the Glasgow Medical Journal.

To the Right Hon. Lord GLENELG.

MY LORD,

BUCHANAN STREET, GLASGOW,  
March 14. 1836.

At the request of Sir Geo. S. Mackenzie, Bart. and in reference to a correspondence which has passed between your Lordship and that gentleman, concerning the evils which the colony of New South Wales suffers from desperate characters being sent out as convicts, and let to the settlers as servants, I beg leave to make the following statement.

I have paid much attention, during the last twenty years, to human physiology in general, and to the science of Phrenology in particular, and have had many opportunities of comparing the form and size of the head in living individuals with their talents and mental character. I have also been in the constant practice of examining the skulls and casts from the heads of deceased persons, and comparing these with their known mental characters and their actions exhibited during life ; and I have found a constant and

A

uniform connexion between the talents and natural dispositions, and the form and size of the head.

I have no hesitation, therefore, in stating it as my firm conviction, drawn from these sources, and from long study and observation, that the natural dispositions of man are indicated by the form and size of the brain, to such an extent as to render it quite possible for persons who have had practice in such manipulations, to distinguish during life men of desperate and dangerous tendencies from those of good dispositions.

I have the honour to be, my Lord, your Lordship's most obedient Servant,

WILLIAM WEIR, M.D.

II. From ALEXANDER HOOD, Esq. Surgeon, Kilmarnock.

To the Right Hon. Lord GLENELG.

KILMARNOCK,

MY LORD,

March 14. 1836.

I take the liberty of addressing your Lordship in consequence of having received a letter on the part of Sir George S. Mackenzie, Bart., whose sons are settled in the colony of New South Wales, respecting the great evils which the colonists there sustain from desperate characters being sent out as convicts, and let out to the settlers as servants. Sir George suggests that Phrenology might be beneficially applied in pointing out the natural dispositions of convicts, and employed as a means of draughting from among them the most desperate and incorrigible characters, previous to transportation.

Having for many years devoted a considerable time to the study of Phrenology, and tested the truth of its principles by the most severe and conclusive experiments, the

result has been a gradual but thorough belief in the truth of the doctrines which it promulgates, and that it is susceptible of being applied with much advantage to the community in the manner suggested by Sir George Mackenzie. My daily observation as a medical man confirms me in this belief, and I conceive that a skilful Phrenologist is capable, by an examination of the human head, of detecting any defective or predominant intellectual faculty, moral feeling, or animal propensity, nearly with as much accuracy as a physician can discover the healthy or diseased condition of the heart, lungs, liver, or spine.

I have the honour to be, my Lord, your Lordship's most obedient humble servant,

ALEX. HOOD, Surgeon.

---

III. From RICHARD CARMICHAEL, Esq. M. R. I. A., Corresponding Member Royal Academy of Medicine of France, Honorary Member of several Medical Societies; Consulting Surgeon of the Richmond Surgical Hospital, and Author of several Works on Surgery.

To the Right Hon. Lord GLENELG,  
Secretary for the Colonies, &c. &c. &c.

RUTLAND SQUARE, DUBLIN,

MY LORD,

March 15. 1836.

Having received a letter at the instance of Sir George Mackenzie, desiring to know whether it is my opinion and belief that "the natural dispositions are indicated by the form and size of the brain, to such an extent as to render it quite possible, during life, to distinguish men of desperate and dangerous tendencies from those of good dispositions," and to lay such opinion before your Lordship :

I have no hesitation in certifying that such is my belief, and that I consider this mode of discriminating persons of good from those of bad dispositions, may be most usefully employed for various purposes advantageous to society.

I have the honour to be your Lordship's very obedient servant,

RICH<sup>d</sup>. CARMICHAEL.

IV. From EDWARD BARLOW, M. D. of the University of Edinburgh ; Member of the Royal College of Surgeons of Ireland ; Senior Physician to the Bath Hospital, and the Bath United Hospital ; Fellow of the Royal Medical and Chirurgical Society of London, &c. &c.

To the Right Hon. Lord GLENELG,

Secretary of State for the Colonies, &c. &c. &c.

MY LORD,

BATH, SYDNEY PLACE,

March 15. 1836.

At the desire of Sir George Mackenzie, I willingly offer my testimony in favour of the application of Phrenology to the examination of convicts, which he has suggested to your Lordship. Deeply interested in the science, from a thorough conviction of its truth, I have, for upwards of twenty years, watched its progress ; and I have no hesitation in expressing my firm belief, that all mental functions are dependent for the manifestations on the conformation of the brain ; and that the natural dispositions are indicated by its form and size to such an extent, as to render it quite possible, during life, to distinguish men of desperate and dangerous tendencies from those of good dispositions.

In early life, my Lord, I, through ignorance and inconsiderateness, joined in the doubts respecting Phrenology, that then prevailed; and mine was afterwards no sudden conversion resulting from raised imagination, but the clear conviction produced by calm and patient inquiry. The grounds of my present faith it would be out of place here to display; but I may remark, that the application of Phrenology which Sir George Mackenzie now advocates, was actually and most successfully made ten years ago, in the examination, by Mr De Ville of London, of one hundred and forty-eight convicts, transported in the ship *England* to New South Wales, and that the safe completion of the voyage was owing to the information respecting individual character that Mr De Ville had supplied. The facts here referred to are matter of public record, as they were reported officially to Dr Burnett, by Mr G. Thomson, the surgeon of the ship. The history of the voyage, as detailed by Mr Thomson, is deposited in the Victualling Office.

I consider the truths of Phrenology to be as well established as are those of any other branch of natural science; being throughout, not fanciful nor hypothetical assumptions, but rigid inductions from numerous and accurately observed facts. By such course of observation and reasoning alone can natural truths ever be developed; by it has the philosophy of matter attained its present advancement; and to it are we indebted for the only sound and rational philosophy of mind that has yet been produced, namely, that which Phrenology teaches. The applications of this science to the affairs of human life are sure to extend as its principles become known and appreciated; and eventually they cannot fail to prove of the very highest importance to the welfare and happiness of the human race. The application of it which Sir George Mackenzie has proposed

to your Lordship, has my cordial approval, and the full sanction of my unbiassed judgment.

I have the honour to be, my Lord, your Lordship's faithful and obedient servant,

E. BARLOW, M. D.

---

V. From Messrs ALEXANDER HOOD, JOHN CROOKS, and JOHN MILLER, Surgeons, and Dr ROBERT WALKER, Kilmarnock.

The Right Hon. LORD GLENELG.

MY LORD,

KILMARNOCK, 16th March 1836.

OUR attention having been directed to Sir G. S. Mackenzie's communication to your Lordship, respecting the applicability of Phrenology to the discrimination of the character of convicts transported to the British Colonies, we, whose names are subscribed, beg, with all submission, to offer our united and unqualified testimony in corroboration of his opinion.

We are led to do so, my Lord, from a decided conviction, that Phrenology is the *true* science of the mind—that the natural dispositions are so accurately indicated by the form and size of the brain, as to render it perfectly practicable, for properly qualified persons to distinguish, by examination of the head, individuals possessing such as are dangerous to the peace and safety of society, from those who are differently constituted; and farther, that the bringing the doctrines of Phrenology to bear, not only upon the matter in question, but our social institutions in general,—upon education, and other means of *preventing* crime, as well as upon the *punishment* of it, and the proper disposal of the perpetrators,—would, besides its being an important advance in philosophy, be attended with great *practical* advantage to the community.



With the highest esteem for your Lordship's public and private character, we have the honour to be, My Lord, your Lordship's obedient humble servants,

ALEX. HOOD, Surgeon.  
JOHN CROOKS, Surgeon.  
JOHN MILLER, Surgeon.  
ROBERT WALKER, M. D.

VI. From ROBERT FERGUSON, Esq. M. P. for Haddingtonshire.

To GEORGE COMBE, Esq. Edinburgh.

18. PORTMAN SQUARE,  
17th March 1836.

MY DEAR SIR,

I HAVE no hesitation in declaring it as my belief, that the science of Phrenology enables those who have made themselves master of it, to decide on any prominent and marked mental faculty or propensity of an individual. And, in more directly answering your circular, I think it would be attended with the greatest advantage to society, if the heads of such convicts who have been guilty of the crimes of murder and such atrocious acts, should be examined.

For it is certain, and can be proved from innumerable examples, that such an investigation, by practical persons, could easily pronounce whether they were likely to be incurable in their propensities, or whether other dispositions in their intellectual constitution might, if properly cultivated, restore them to the rank of respectable citizens.

The first should be prevented from having any intercourse with society, or hope of future freedom whatever.

I see many difficulties yet in having a Board for this important investigation; but means might be fallen upon to be enabled to come to such conclusions as might guide to

the necessary character of the punishment, for the future safety of society.

I remain very truly yours,

ROBT. FERGUSON.

VII. From JOHN FIFE, Esq., one of his Majesty's Justices of the Peace for the Borough of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Member of the Royal College of Surgeons of London, Member of the Medico-Chirurgical Society of Manchester, and of the Royal Medical Society of Edinburgh, Lecturer on Surgery in the Newcastle School of Medicine, &c. &c. &c.

To the Right Honourable Lord GLENELG,  
Secretary for the Colonies.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE,  
March 19. 1836.

MY LORD,

Having received a communication from Mr Combe, at the request of Sir George S. Mackenzie, Bart., stating your Lordship's disinclination to select convicts for New South Wales by phrenological signs, and requesting me to express my opinion upon the proposal, accompanying the statement of such opinion by an account of my claims to moral influence and to some share of your Lordship's attention, I hereby assert my conviction that the natural dispositions are indicated by the form and size of the brain, to such an extent as to render it quite possible, during life, to distinguish men of desperate and dangerous tendencies from those of good dispositions.

With reference to my position as a professional man, I beg to refer your Lordship to the representatives in Parliament of this town or of the adjacent counties.

I have the honour to be, my Lord, your most obedient servant,

JOHN FIFE.

VIII. From Dr W. C. ENGLUEDUE, late President of the Royal Medical Society of Edinburgh, and Secretary to the Phrenological Society of Portsmouth.

To the Right Honourable Lord GLENELG,  
Secretary for the Colonies, &c. &c. &c.

PORTSMOUTH, 24 SANDPORT TERRACE,

MY LORD,

March 23. 1836.

Having been requested to state to your Lordship my opinion regarding the subject of Sir George Mackenzie's communication, I do so with considerable pleasure, being convinced both of its benefit and *applicability*. On the latter point I can speak with some degree of certainty, having numerous opportunities of testing the truth and application of the science in that division of the Convict Establishment situated at Portsmouth. It would be impossible, in the present instance, either to enter into minutiae or bring forward proofs; but I can assure your Lordship that, as far as my experience extends, I unhesitatingly assert, that phrenologists can detect and choose from a body of criminals those of decidedly bad character, whom it would be almost impossible to retrieve, and those who, perhaps for some trivial offence, are doomed to associate with the former, and who could not only be retrieved, but, by care and better example, become valuable members of society.

This is a fact which has almost entirely escaped the observation of those legislating upon this important subject. Convicts are now almost indiscriminately embarked for the Colonies, without any regard to natural dispositions, or the effects which examples produce. They are huddled to

gether, good, bad, and indifferent ; and, after disembarkation, portioned out to the settlers, too often, as incontrovertible evidence proves, to have recourse to, if not exceed, their former depredations.

Viewing these Colonies as young communities, where it is desirable to assemble individuals of the best character, it cannot be right to inundate them with the worst of beings—those which a country protected by the justice and vigour of its laws found it impossible to control.

I could enlarge upon the ulterior effects likely to ensue upon a continuation of the present system, but the limits of a certificate forbid it.

After the preceding, I need hardly repeat that Sir G. Mackenzie's Memorial meets with my most cordial approbation ; and feeling assured that your Lordship will bestow on it your serious consideration,

I have the honour to remain your Lordship's most obedient servant,

(Signed) W. C. ENGLEDDUE, M. D.

IX. From Dr JAMES INGLIS, M. R. C. S. E., and Soc. Ed. Med. Reg. Soc. Ed. ; SAMUEL M'KEUR, Esq. Surgeon, Castle Douglas ; the Rev. WILLIAM GLOVER, A. M. Minister of Cross-michael ; Dr JOHN COLVIN, Bengal Establishment, M. R. C. S. Lond. and Mem. Med. and Phys. Soc. Calcutta.

To the Right Honourable Lord GLENELG,  
Secretary for the Colonies.

MY LORD,

CASTLE DOUGLAS, KIRKCUDBRIGHT,  
March 22. 1836.

IF to the truth of Phrenology as a science based on observation, and borne out by facts, our testimony can be of any use, either regarding its propagation, or, through

it, the furtherance of the common good of mankind, and the lessening of human crime and misery, we unhesitatingly give it as our opinion, that the *tendencies* of the mind as it exists in this world, to cause actions either virtuous or vicious, can be discovered by the cranial development—and that whilst this holds in *every* case, it does so with much more *evident* certainty in the man of a desperate and dangerous character,—who, uneducated and unrestrained, has allowed for a length of time the lower feelings to reign over the higher faculties of his mind. Believing this, we consider that Sir George Mackenzie's proposition regarding the practical application of Phrenology in discriminating the natural dispositions of convicts, may become of the highest possible advantage to the proprietors and cultivators in the Australian colonies.

We have the honour to be, My LORD, your obedient servants,

JAMES INGLIS,  
SAM<sup>L</sup>. McKEUR,  
WILLIAM GLOVER,  
JOHN COLVIN.

---

X. From S. HARE, Esq. Proprietor and Medical Attendant of the  
Retreat for the Insane in Leeds.

To the Right Honourable Lord GLENELG.  
Secretary for the Colonies.

MY LORD,

LEEDS, 23d March 1836.

HAVING received a communication to the purport that Sir G. S. Mackenzie has lately presented a memorial to your Lordship, representing that "Phrenology might be

beneficially applied in discriminating the natural dispositions of convicts, before being chosen for transportation," and requesting my opinion on the subject; I gladly avail myself of the opportunity of stating to your Lordship, that I have repeatedly ascertained the characters of individuals through the medium of the principles of Phrenology, and believe that very great advantages will result to the nation, from a proper application of those principles in the classification of convicts, and the improvement of prison-discipline generally.

Having occasion to employ a number of servants, I beg to be permitted to state, that I prefer choosing them by their temperaments and phrenological developments, to taking them on the characters given with them.

Ardently hoping that these views will ere long be made available, as regards the enactment of laws for the prevention and punishment of crime, both in our own and other countries, I have the honour to subscribe myself, my Lord, your Lordship's most obedient servant,

S. HARE.

---

XI. From Dr JAMES STEWART (A), Surgeon, Royal Navy, and Physician Extraordinary to His Royal Highness the Duke of SUSSEX.

The Right Honourable Lord GLENELG, &c. &c.

MY LORD,

PORTSMOUTH, 22d March 1836.

FOR some years past I have paid much attention to the science of Phrenology, and I am firmly of opinion that the natural dispositions are indicated by the form and

size of the brain, to such an extent as to render it quite possible, during life, to distinguish men of desperate and dangerous tendencies from those of good dispositions.

JAS. STEWART, M.D.

---

XII. From Dr JAMES SCOTT, LL. B., Surgeon and Lecturer to the Royal Hospital at Haslar ; Licentiate of the Royal College of Physicians of London ; Surgeon and Medical Superintendent of the Royal Naval Lunatic Asylum ; President of the Hampshire Phrenological Society, &c. &c.

The Right Honourable Lord GLENELG,  
Principal Secretary of State for His  
Majesty's Colonial Department, &c.  
&c. &c.

ROYAL HOSPITAL AT HASLAR,  
22d March 1836.

MY LORD,

I HAVE just received a circular letter from Mr Combe of Edinburgh, in consequence of a communication made to your Lordship by Sir George Mackenzie respecting the allotment of convict servants to settlers in Van Diemen's Land, in which communication Sir George recommended to your Lordship that convicts should be phrenologically examined previously to their being sent out of this country ; and, as it appears that your Lordship does not believe in the truth of Phrenology, Mr Combe is desirous of laying before you as many certificates as he can procure from medical men regarding their opinion of the science, requesting me to state in what estimation I hold it.

I therefore beg to say, that, after having for many years viewed it unfavourably by the false light of prejudice, chiefly from having read a most illogical and witty, but virulent, attack on the system, published in the Edinburgh

Review; now well known as the production of the late Dr John Gordon, who assailed it anonymously with all the shafts of ridicule, my attention was powerfully arrested by attending a course of lectures on the subject by the late amiable and highly gifted Dr Spurzheim, at Paris, and by another course of Lectures delivered by Mr Combe, in Edinburgh; and after some more years spent in careful study and observation, I became a sincere convert to the doctrines of Gall and Spurzheim.

I beg to assure your Lordship that my conversion is the result of an honest and careful examination; and as I have been for nearly ten years the medical attendant of the Lunatic Asylum in this great Hospital, my opportunities, at least, of observing have been great indeed; and a daily intercourse with the unfortunate individuals entrusted to my care and management (whose number has never been less than one hundred and thirty persons, and often many more), has firmly, because experimentally, convinced me that mental disorder and moral delinquency can be rationally combated *only* by the application of Phrenology; and that the man who treats them on any other system will much oftener be disappointed, than he who studies the manifestations of mind, and traces effects to their secondary causes, by the almost infallible beacon of Phrenology.

On this subject I could add much; but, at present, I have rather to apologize to your Lordship for having so long occupied your truly valuable time.

I have not yet published any thing, except an Inaugural Dissertation on Pneumonia, and some medical and surgical cases in various periodical journals—which I mention only in compliance with a request made in Mr COMBE's circular above referred to; but I have a mass of facts and observations bearing upon practical points.



Permit me, my Lord, to conclude, by assuring your Lordship, that, viewing you as a statesman whose acknowledged political talents and consistency shed an additional lustre over those virtues by which you are distinguished in private life, I have the honour to be, with profound respect, your Lordship's most obedient humble servant,

JAMES SCOTT.

---

XIII. From HEWETT COTTRELL WATSON, Esq. F. L. S., late President of the Royal Medical Society of Edinburgh; Author of the "Geography of British Plants," and other works.

To the Right Hon. Lord GLENELG,  
Secretary for the Colonies.

THAMES DITTON, SURREY,  
March 18. 1836.

MY LORD,

AT the request of Sir George Mackenzie, I have the honour to offer to your Lordship my humble testimony in support of the science of Phrenology; being convinced, after several years of careful attention to the subject, that it is quite possible to determine the dispositions of men by an inspection of their heads, with so much precision as to render a knowledge of Phrenology of the utmost importance to persons whose duties involve the care and management of criminals.

I have the honour to subscribe myself, your Lordship's most obedient and humble servant,

HEWETT COTTRELL WATSON.

XIV. From Sir WILLIAM C. ELLIS, M. D. Superintendent of the  
Lunatic Asylum for the County of Middlesex, at Hanwell.

To the Right Hon. Lord GLENEIG,  
Secretary for the Colonies.

LUNATIC ASYLUM FOR THE  
COUNTY OF MIDDLESEX,  
19th March 1836.

MY LORD,

I AM requested by Mr George Combe to address a letter to your Lordship on the utility of Phrenology. I cannot for one moment hesitate to comply with his request, and to give my strongest testimonial that, after many years' experience, I am fully convinced the dispositions of man are indicated by the form and size of the brain, and to such an extent as to render it quite possible to distinguish men of desperate and dangerous tendencies from those of good dispositions. I have been the resident physician in this establishment, where we have upwards of six hundred patients, for five years, and for thirteen years previous held a similar situation in Yorkshire, where we had two hundred and fifty. If it was necessary, I could mention a great variety of cases in the treatment of which I have found the little knowledge I possess of this interesting science of the greatest utility; and I am fully persuaded that when it is more known, and acted upon, very great advantages will result to society. I have the honour to be, My Lord, your Lordship's very obedient and humble servant,

WM. C. ELLIS.

*Note by Sir W. C. Ellis to Mr Combe.*—"Sir William is quite convinced that it is unnecessary for him to inform Mr Combe himself, that, residing amidst 600 lunatics, no day passes over in which the truth of Phrenology is not exemplified."

XV. From Dr DISNEY ALEXANDER, late one of the Physicians to the Wakefield Dispensary and the Pauper Lunatic Asylum, Lecturer on Phrenology, Author of an Essay on the best Means of preserving Health, of a Treatise on the Croup, and of Lectures on the Internal Evidences of Christianity.

LUPSET COTTAGE, WAKEFIELD,  
March 20. 1836.

I hereby certify, that I consider it as proved beyond all reasonable contradiction, that "the natural dispositions are indicated by the form and size of the brain, to such an extent as to render it quite possible, during life, to distinguish men of desperate and dangerous tendencies from those of good dispositions;" and that Phrenology might be beneficially applied in discriminating the natural dispositions of convicts, before their being chosen for transportation.

DISNEY ALEXANDER, M. D.

XVI. From GEORGE MARTELL, Esq. Member of the College of Surgeons, London, Surgeon to the Jail of Portsmouth, and Senior Surgeon to the Dispensary, &c. &c.

To the Right Hon. Lord GLENELG,  
Secretary for the Colonies, &c. &c. &c.

MY LORD,

PORTSMOUTH, March 24. 1836.

Having had frequent opportunities of seeing the examination of individuals phrenologically, I am of opinion that their dispositions may be fully known by external configuration, size, &c ; and that such examinations would greatly facilitate the classification of prisoners.

I remain, your Lordship's most obedient servant,

GEORGE MARTELL.

B

XVII. From JAMES SIMPSON, Esq. Advocate, City Assessor of Edinburgh, and Author of "Necessity of Popular Education as a National Object."

The Right Hon. Lord GLENELG.

MY LORD,

EDINBURGH, 25th March 1836.

Referring to the experiment on phrenological principles proposed by Sir George Mackenzie, for ascertaining the distinctive characters of a number of convicts, I respectfully beg to offer to your Lordship my humble opinion, founded on fifteen years' experience, that the test will be entirely satisfactory, and shew that character may be ascertained from cerebral development, as indicated externally on the head.

I have the honour to be, my Lord, your obedient servant,

JAMES SIMPSON.

XVIII. From HENRY WITHAM, Esq. of Lartington, Yorkshire, Member of the Geological Society of London, and Royal Society of Edinburgh, &c. &c.; and Author of a Work on "The Internal Structure of Fossil Vegetables."

The Right Hon. Lord GLENELG.

MY LORD,

LARTINGTON, CO. YORK, 27th March 1836.

With reference to Sir Geo. Mackenzie's suggestion, that the heads of convicts should be examined, with a view to ascertaining their natural dispositions before transporting them to New South Wales, I beg leave to certify, that, from having studied the science of Phrenology during several years of my residence in Edinburgh, I am convinced of the practicability of accomplishing, by means of Phrenology, the object in view. The differences in point

of form between the brains of men of naturally good and men of naturally bad dispositions, are so palpable, even during life, that a moderate share of attention is sufficient to discover them.

I have the honor to be, my Lord, your obedient humble servant,

HENRY THORNTON MAIRE WITHAM.

---

XIX. From Dr FRANCIS FARQUHARSON, Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh, and Vice-President of the Phrenological Society.

The Right Hon. Lord GLENELG.

MY LORD,

EDINBURGH, 28th March 1836.

In consequence of a communication from Sir G. S. Mackenzie, Bart., regarding the phrenological experiment proposed by him in a memorial to your Lordship, I beg to state my firm conviction that it would completely answer the object in view. This belief does not rest upon theoretical grounds, but is the result of an extensive experience during the last ten or twelve years.

I have the honour to be, my Lord, your faithful and obedient servant,

FRA<sup>s</sup>. FARQUHARSON, M. D.

---

XX. From Dr S. E. HIRSCHFELD, Bremen.

To the Right Hon. Lord GLENELG, &c. &c.

BREMEN, 22d March 1836.

I hereby certify, that I consider it practicable to distinguish between men of desperately bad dispositions, and men of good dispositions, by examining their heads during life; and that such knowledge may be successfully em-

ployed in discriminating dangerous criminals from those who are not destructive or blood-thirsty.

I state this opinion from my own experience.

S. ED. HIRSCHFELD, M. D.

---

XXI. From the SURGEONS to the NEWCASTLE INFIRMARY, and  
Fifteen other Gentlemen of that Town.

To the Right Hon. Lord GLENELG,  
Secretary for the Colonies.

NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE, 17<sup>th</sup> March 1836.

WE the undersigned take the liberty of addressing this communication to your Lordship, for the purpose of explaining that we are of opinion that the natural dispositions are indicated by the form and size of the brain, to such an extent as to render it possible, during life, to distinguish men of desperate and dangerous tendencies from those of ordinary dispositions: That if this opinion be correct, it would be highly beneficial to use this means of discriminating the natural dispositions of convicts sent out to the colonies, and many of whom are let to the cultivators as servants: That with the view of ascertaining the possibility of employing these means with advantage, it would be very desirable that a given number of convicts of marked characters be selected, and their dispositions put down in writing by the governor and chaplain of one or two of the public penitentiaries or prisons; that their heads be submitted to the inspection of two or three experienced Phrenologists, who should write down inferences concerning their mental qualities; and that, in presence of competent judges, the two written accounts should be compared: That if the result should be found to accord with the opinion we have

taken the liberty of laying before your Lordship, we conceive a valuable service might be conferred on the colonists, by paying attention to this means of regulating the selection of servants.

**JOHN BAIRD**, Senior Surgeon to the Newcastle Infirmary.

**T. M. GREENHOW**, Surgeon to the Newcastle Infirmary, &c.

**WM. HUTTON**, F. G. S., Member of the Geological Society of France, &c. &c., and Secretary of the Natural History Society of Northumberland, Durham, and Newcastle-on-Tyne.

**JN<sup>o</sup>. BUDDLE**, V. P. of the Natural History Society of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, F. G. S., &c.

**ROBT. WM. SWAN**.

**J. CARGILL**, M. D.

**WILLIAM MORRISON**, Member of the Royal College of Surgeons of London, &c.

**ANTHY. NICHOL**.

**WILLIAM NEIHAM**, Member of the Royal College of Surgeons, London, of the Royal Medical Society, Edinburgh, &c. &c. &c.

**JOHN THOMSON**, C. M., Member of the University of Glasgow.

**D. MACKINTOSH**, Surgeon to the Newcastle Lunatic Asylum, &c.

**J. C. BRUCE**, A. M.

**ROBERT CURRIE**.

**JOHN FENWICK**, Alderman of Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

**R. B. BOWMAN**.

**M. H. RANKIN**, Solicitor, Newcastle, Author of "Present State of Representation in England and Wales."

**WM. CARGILL**.

XXII. From W. A. F. BROWNE, Esq. Medical Superintendent  
of Montrose Lunatic Asylum.

MONTROSE, March 15. 1836.

I hereby certify, on soul and conscience, that I have been acquainted with the principles of Phrenology for upwards of ten years ; that from proofs based upon physiology and observation, I believe these to be a true exposition of the laws and phenomena of the human mind ; that during the whole of the period mentioned I have acted on these principles, applied them practically in the ordinary concerns of life, in determining and analyzing the characters of all individuals with whom I became acquainted or connected, and that I have derived the greatest benefit from the assistance thus obtained. But although the utility of the science be most apparent in the discrimination of the good from the bad, those of virtuous and intellectual capabilities from the brutal and imbecile, it is not confined to this. In the exercise of my profession, I have been enabled, by the aid of Phrenology, to be of essential service in directing the education of the young as a protection against nervous disease, and in removing or alleviating the various forms assumed by insanity in the mature. For several years I have devoted myself to the study of mental diseases, and the care of the insane. During my studies at Salpêtrière, Charenton, &c. in Paris, I was able to derive great additional information from my previous knowledge of Phrenology ; and now that I have been entrusted with a large asylum, I am inclined to attribute any little success that may have attended my efforts to ameliorate the condition of those confided to my charge, to the same cause. I may add, that I was *converted* from a confidence in the accuracy of the philosophy of the schools to a belief in Phrenology ; that I did



not adopt its doctrines on the authority of my teachers, but tested their truth by repeated experiment; that I have since taught them to large bodies of my countrymen, and feel fully convinced that until they be recognised and acted upon generally, no just conclusion can be drawn as to human character, nor as to the administration of punishments for the improvement or rewards for the encouragement of mankind.

W. A. F. BROWNE, Surgeon.

---

XXIII.—From Dr C. OTTO, Professor of *Materia Medica* and Forensic Medicine in the University of Copenhagen; Physician to the Civil Penitentiary; Member of the Royal Board of Health, the Royal Medical Society at Copenhagen, and thirteen other Medical Societies abroad; Editor of the Danish medical journal "*Bibliothek for Lieger,*" &c. &c.

To the Right Hon. Lord GLENELG,  
Secretary for the Colonies, &c. &c.

COPENHAGEN, *March 25. 1836.*

I hereby certify, that, from my own observation and experience, I consider it quite possible to distinguish men of strong animal propensities, who, when left uncontrolled by authority, or when excited by intoxication, would be dangerous to society, from men of mild dispositions, by examining their heads during life. I farther certify, that I have practically applied this method of distinguishing the natural dispositions of men, and found it uniformly successful.

C. OTTO, M. D.

Dr Otto adds, in a letter to Mr Combe, inclosing the above:—"As physician to the penitentiary, nobody can be

more convinced than I of the truth of the certificate. In fact I reap the greatest advantage from Phrenology in treating the criminals in my hospital, as I vary my moral treatment of them according to the form of their heads—some ones necessarily requiring severity, others mildness; and I have often, without any failure, told the inspector beforehand which criminal was to be considered as dangerous, and which one might be trusted as quiet and benevolent. The examination of the organs of Secretiveness and Conscientiousness aids me extremely much in detecting simulations of diseases."

---

XXIV. From the Honourable DOUGLAS GORDON HALYBURTON,  
M. P. for Forfarshire, to George Combe, Esq.

MY DEAR SIR,

LONDON, March 26. 1836.

You will, I know, excuse my not having, four or five days ago, sent an acknowledgment of the favour of your letter of the 14th instant, covering a copy of your printed circular of the 10th, on the subject of Sir George Mackenzie's communications to Lord Glenelg respecting *Australian convicts*, and his Lordship's remarks on the same.

I am afraid that, in asking *my* testimony on this phrenological question, yourself and Sir George attribute an importance to it, which it can scarcely deserve, as adding sensibly to the weight of phrenological authority, of which your circular must long since have put you in possession. However, if the attention which I have given to this most important and interesting science, during a period now of twenty years—the personal acquaintance I had with Drs Gall and Spurzheim on the Continent—the friendship with

which our latter departed friend was pleased to honour me—and my having let slip no opportunity, whether in Paris, London, Edinburgh, or Glasgow, to derive pleasure and instruction from his writings, lectures, and private conversation—and, lastly, let me add with no intention whatever to flatter, the instruction and improvement I have derived from your own writings, lectures, and conversation, combined with those of your brother Dr Andrew Combe—if these circumstances, all well known to you, should lead yourself or Sir George Mackenzie to believe that my authority upon this subject ought at least to carry some weight with it, then my testimony, such as it may be, is entirely at your service.

The point, I think, in your circular letter, upon which you desire the opinion of competent judges is this,—“Whether the natural dispositions are indicated by the form and size of the brain, to such an extent as to render it quite possible, during life, to distinguish men of desperate and dangerous tendencies from those of good dispositions.”

Before I give *my* answer to this question, allow me, dear Sir, to prefix a few remarks. It is well known, I am sure, to us, that the skill of the well-instructed and *practised* phrenologist, might safely be put to a much more severe test than any that is implied in the above question. Instead of taking the *extremes* of human character, he might be required to read and to discriminate amongst that intermediate class which makes up the great bulk of mankind in civilized life; where the qualities of the *animal man* and the *moral and religious man* are mixed up together, in all sorts of proportions,—the combination in nineteen cases out of twenty in civilized life, (and in various *grades* of society), being such as to give rise to those *apparent* contradictions in men's characters, which are perpetually ob-

truding themselves upon every one's notice; so that it is no exaggeration to say, that the great mass of society whom one meets at every turn, including *all ranks*, spend their whole lives in a sort of *rotation* (palpable or more covert) of sinning and repenting—now obeying all or any of their propensities—the animal man,—now listening to—checked—brought up, by their moral and religious nature. *We* know how all this can be most satisfactorily explained by the demonstrated truths and doctrines of Phrenology. But in truth, they are the same phenomena which are pointed at by moral and religious writers and preachers (the latter too often in language unnecessarily quaint, and a misplaced adoption of Scriptural terms), when they talk of men “walking after the flesh, or after the spirit,”—that “the *natural* man cannot please God,” &c. &c. &c. All this, I take it, merely means that the lower part of man's nature, the animal (which God and religion intended, and I doubt not have provided for the ultimate fulfilment of the intention); should serve and obey the higher, the moral and spiritual part,—takes the lead, and, instead of *serving*, presumes to dictate and domineer; thus producing all the confusion, and much of the misery, of a true *servile war*. Now, I would ask *you* the question, Can the skilful phrenologist, in such *mixed* cases as I have described, point out, from an inspection of the brain, as indicated by the exterior head, the *character* of the individual? I think you will answer *that he can*. At least he can enumerate the *forces* which are enlisted on either side, though, being no charlatan, and not pretending that he is a *prophet*, he will not venture to predict what specific *action*, or *course of action* for a time, will result, under certain circumstances, from the antagonist motives which the man carries within him. In illustration of what I have hurriedly above been intending to

say, I would ask you again, whether there are not *scores* of examples in all the *phrenological capitals* of Europe, where (let us take one example) parents have hesitatingly, tremblingly, half believing, half afraid, taken their children to be examined (for their characters, &c. &c. &c.) by the most reputed phrenologist they could hear of,—submitting the heads of the little creatures to the eyes and fingers—the *wand* of the *conjurer*. If he be really an expert and well-instructed *conjurer*, he immediately detects the general outlines of the children's (not infants') characters. But he goes much farther than this,—he examines and *weighs*, he balances the *forces* of the different qualities, intellectual, moral and animal; and in almost every instance (supposing him always to be a *good conjurer*), he fairly and fully delineates the *character*. So the poor parents *stand aghast*; propensities, sentiments, passions, virtues and vices, which they vainly imagined could be known only to themselves, or the immediate inmates of the house or the nursery, are brought to the surface, under the wicked scrutiny of the phrenological *doctor*. The sequel of this proceeding very commonly is, that he is consulted by the anxious parents respecting the education, the general management, and ultimately the choice of *professions*, for the several children; and undoubtedly it would be well for the family, if the counsels of a really *judicious* phrenological adviser, regarding the above mentioned points, were attended to and acted upon. If the statements I have been making, and the opinion I have given respecting those classes (far removed from the two *extremes*), which make up the great mass of human society, be true, there can be no doubt how I must answer the query transcribed above from your circular letter. I consider it as proved to demonstration, that “the natural dispositions are indicated by the form and size of

the brain to such an extent, as to render it quite possible during life, to distinguish men of desperate and dangerous tendencies from those of good dispositions."

I shall conclude this letter with a few observations, naturally arising out of the subject. We know that phrenological knowledge and skill, have in very many instances been rendered most useful in the business of education, as respects both private families and public schools, where happily the masters or directors could avail themselves of such assistances, in conducting the moral and the intellectual discipline of the pupils. We know further, that medical science and art have been much indebted to Phrenology, in the case more especially of several institutions for the reception and treatment of patients labouring under various forms and degrees of mental alienation. Of the latter, the instances of the Lancasterian Asylum, and that for the reception of paupers of the County of Middlesex, near the metropolis, at present occur to me, and I believe there are many similar examples both in England and Scotland. Can it be doubted, then, that Phrenology is capable of furnishing resources of equal magnitude, and to an extent not easily appreciated, in the classification and the discipline of those unhappy persons, whose crimes, in various degrees, have brought them under the dominion of criminal jurisprudence?

I might, my dear Sir, have answered your letter much more laconically than I have done, and possibly an apology is due from me, for having been too *diffuse*; but the subject is one in which I take a great interest, and I trust I shall be forgiven.

I remain, with much respect, yours faithfully,

D. G. HALLYBURTON, M. P.

XXV. From Dr PATRICK NEILL, F.R.S.E. & F.L.S. London.

Right Hon. Lord GLENELG.

MY LORD,

CANONMILLS COTTAGE,  
31st March 1836.

IN consequence of a suggestion by Sir George Mackenzie, I beg leave to mention to your Lordship, that even before the first visit of Dr Spurzheim to Edinburgh, I was satisfied that the leading doctrines of Gall were founded in truth, because the conviction was forced upon me by my own observations made before that visit: I mean that certain convolutions or portions of the brain are peculiarly the organs of certain faculties and propensities; that size is generally indicative of vigour; and that, in many cases, the relative size of the organs can be distinguished by external examination.

Knowing the powerful influence of surrounding society in encouraging or restraining, I have never given an opinion as to the probable actions of an educated individual, and indeed have uniformly declined examining heads among my friends, even when pressed to do so. But I have, on various occasions, been influenced by my private observations of development, and can most conscientiously say that I have constantly seen more and more reason to trust, with confidence, to such observations. My abstaining from any public practice of Phrenology ought not, therefore, to lessen the weight of my testimony.

The organs of some faculties and propensities are much more easily recognised externally than those of others; and when they are *strongly* marked, no Phrenologist (I would say no one who has ever attended to the subject, although no adept), can possibly be mistaken in drawing useful conclusions. In the case of convicts ordered for transportation, for example, he could undoubtedly point out the probably

treacherous and the probably mischievous;—so that, during the voyage, these might be more strictly guarded, and separated as much as possible from those who were likely to prove conscientious and benevolent; and, on arrival at their place of destination, that the former might be kept at work under public surveillance, and only the latter hired out to settlers.

To shew that I ought not to be entirely unqualified for giving an opinion, your Lordship will excuse me for mentioning that in my youth I studied for three years with a view to the medical profession; that I attended especially to Anatomy, and saw the human brain *dissected* by Monro secundus, and *developed* by Spurzheim (for the latter scarcely used the scalpel); that I have for upwards of twenty years been Secretary to the Wernerian Natural History Society; and that I have, all my life, been attached to the study of natural history.

I am, my Lord, your Lordship's very obedient servant,  
PAT. NEILL.

---

XXVI. From Dr JOHN ELLIOTSON, F. R. S., President of the Royal Medical and Chirurgical, and of the London Phrenological Societies; Professor of the Principles and Practice of Medicine and of Clinical Medicine, and Dean of Faculty, in the University of London; Senior Physician of the North London Hospital; Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of London; formerly Physician to St Thomas's Hospital, and President of the Royal Medical Society of Edinburgh, &c. &c. &c.

CONDUIT STREET, LONDON,

To the Right Hon. Lord GLENELG.

April 7. 1836.

Dr ELLIOTSON presents his compliments to Lord Glenelg, and begs to say, that, at the desire of Sir George



Mackenzie, he takes the liberty of communicating to his Lordship his thorough conviction of the truth of Phrenology. He has not passed a day for the last twenty years, without bestowing at least some thought upon it; and the vast number of facts which he has witnessed, without any certain exception as to any of the chief points, convince him that it is as real a science as Astronomy or Chemistry. Nor does he know any branch of science more important, as it is interwoven with morals, religion, government, education, and in short with every thing that regards human or brute nature.

---

XXVII. From Dr JOHN SCOTT, Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons, Edinburgh.

To Sir GEORGE MACKENZIE, Bart.

EDINBURGH,

31. NORTHUMBERLAND STREET,

DEAR SIR GEORGE,

10th April 1836.

HAVING been informed by Mr Combe of the nature of your correspondence with Lord Glenelg, relative to the proposed experiment as to a number of convicts to be sent to New South Wales, I have much satisfaction in stating my conviction of the very important advantages to be derived from it, in shewing the practical usefulness of the science of Phrenology; of the truth of which I have been fully satisfied, from the period in which I studied it under Dr Spurzheim in Paris, fifteen years since.

With sincere hopes that Lord Glenelg may be induced to accede to your benevolent wishes, I remain your obedient servant,

JOHN SCOTT, M. D.

XXVIII. From JOSEPH VIMONT, M. D., of the Faculty of Paris,  
Honorary Member of the Phrenological Societies of Paris,  
London, Edinburgh, Boston, &c.

To the Right Hon. Lord GLENELG,  
Secretary for the Colonies.

MY LORD,

PARIS, 30th March 1836.

Sir G. S. Mackenzie, Bart., in applying to your Lordship for permission to examine the heads of a number of convicts, in order to appreciate their mental faculties, might have dispensed with having recourse to the testimony of foreign physiologists. In the case proposed by the honourable Baronet, the experiment cannot fail of being crowned with success, if made (as I do not doubt it will be), by phrenologists deeply versed in the theory and practice of Phrenology. The observations made by the founder of the science, Dr Gall, in the prisons of Berlin and Spandau, those which have been repeated in all the civilized world, to which I may add those which I have made in three of the principal prisons of France, viz. Caen in Normandy, Bicêtre near Paris, and Melun twelve leagues from Paris, have convinced me that it is not only possible to appreciate the relation existing between the volume of the head and the energy of the mental faculties, but that one may still, by their examination, be able to establish among the convicts several classes, the discrimination of which would be very advantageous to society and for the convicts themselves. The work of Dr Gall, the Phrenological Journal of Edinburgh, the large work which I have lately published, finally, the phrenological museums, abound with incontestible facts proving that the mental faculties of men may be appreciated in a healthy state by the examination of

their heads. To deny the truth of those facts, is to put in doubt the existence of the best established phenomena.

I have, my Lord, the honour to be your humble servant,

J. VIMONT.

---

XXIX. From Dr WILLIAM GREGORY, F. R. S. E., Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh, Member and formerly President of the Royal Medical Society, Corresponding Member of the Société de Pharmacie and of the Phrenological Society of Paris, and Secretary to the Phrenological Society of Edinburgh.

To the Right Honourable

Lord GLENELG, &c. &c. &c.

MY LORD,

EDINBURGH, 11th April 1836.

Having been requested to state my opinion of the proposition made to your Lordship by Sir G. S. Mackenzie, Bart., in reference to a phrenological examination of convicts about to be transported, with a view to their classification according to their natural dispositions, so as to avoid many inconveniences to which their masters in the penal settlements are now liable, I beg to state to your Lordship, that, for some years past, I have studied the science of Phrenology, and have the firm conviction that, in the hands of properly qualified observers, this science affords the means of ascertaining with certainty the natural dispositions and talents of such individuals as possess healthy brains.

My conviction is founded on a careful study of the works of the most distinguished phrenologists, confirmed by the repeated examination of several extensive collections, in which are deposited the heads of very numerous criminals of all shades of character. I have also had very frequent

C

opportunities of witnessing the facility and certainty with which character is discriminated by practised phrenologists in the case of living persons. It would be superfluous to point out the advantage of such a power, especially in the case of convicts.

Your Lordship's official avocations have probably prevented you from devoting your attention to the subject of Phrenology ; but I may be permitted to express my belief that your Lordship could not examine it carefully without being satisfied of its importance to mankind, as being the only consistent and practical philosophy of mind yet offered to the world.

And when those who have carefully studied Phrenology, and become convinced of its truth, offer, as Sir G. S. Mackenzie has done, to put it to a practical test, which may be highly advantageous, and cannot possibly be hurtful, it is the duty of your Lordship, and of all those who have it in their power to authorize the experiment, not to pass by or neglect a proposition so important, merely for want of that faith in the truth of Phrenology, which no one can reasonably expect to possess, unless he have made himself acquainted with the science, and the evidence on which it is supported.

I have the honour to be, my Lord, your Lordship's most obedient servant,

WILLIAM GREGORY.

---

XXX. From Dr ROBERT HUNTER, Professor of Anatomy, &c. in the Andersonian University, Glasgow.

To the Right Honourable Lord GLENELG.

MY LORD,

GLASGOW, 11th April 1836.

At the request of Mr Combe, I have taken the liberty of addressing your Lordship on the subject of

**Phrenology.** For more than thirteen years I have paid some attention to the subject, and I beg to state, that the more deeply I investigate it, the more I am convinced in the truth of the science. I have examined it in connection with the anatomy of the brain, and find it beautifully to harmonise. I have tested the truth of it on numerous individuals, whose characters it unfolded with accuracy and precision. For the last ten years I have taught Phrenology publicly in connection with Anatomy and Physiology, and have no hesitation in stating, that, in my opinion, it is a science founded on truth, and capable of being applied to many practical and useful purposes.

I have the honour to be, my Lord, your Lordship's very obedient servant,

ROBERT HUNTER, M. D.

XXXI. From ROBERT MACNISH, Esq. Member of the Faculty of Physicians and Surgeons of Glasgow, and Author of "The Philosophy of Sleep," &c.

To the Right Honourable Lord GLENELG.

MY LORD,

GLASGOW, 11th April 1836.

HAVING been applied to, by Sir GEORGE MACKENZIE, to state my opinion with respect to the possibility of detecting the characters of convicts by an examination of their heads on Phrenological principles, I have no hesitation in declaring my perfect conviction, that, in very many cases, the dispositions of these individuals may, by such a process, be discriminated with remarkable accuracy.

The form of head possessed by all dangerous and inveterate criminals is peculiar. There is an enormous mass of brain behind the ear, and a comparatively small portion

c 2

in the frontal and coronal regions. Such a conformation always characterizes the worst class of malefactors; and wherever it exists we find an excessive tendency to crime. This fact I have had ample opportunities of verifying; and, indeed, no person who compares criminal heads with those of persons whose natural dispositions are towards virtue, can entertain the slightest doubt upon the subject.

I have the honour to be, my Lord, your Lordship's most obedient servant,

R. MACNISH.

---

XXXII. From RICHARD POOLE, M. D., Fellow and Joint Librarian of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh; Author of various Articles in Periodical Journals and the Encyclopædia Edinensis,—as *Language, Philology, Mathematics, Mind, Philosophy*, and *Education*, the last of which has been republished separately.

EDINBURGH, 12th April 1836.

During several years, actively employed, I have found the principles of Phrenology available in very important duties,—more especially in the treatment of Insanity, to which, as a professional man, my attention has been greatly directed; and I feel warranted, by long study and observation, in maintaining the opinion, that it is practicable to distinguish individuals having naturally very low and dangerous characters, from others who are naturally well constituted and disposed,—by examining and comparing their heads during life, according to the principles of Phrenology.

RICH<sup>d</sup>. POOLE.

XXXIII. From CHARLES MACLAREN, Esq. Editor of the *Scotsman*.

To the Right Honourable Lord GLENELG,  
Secretary for the Colonies, &c.

EDINBURGH, 9th April 1836.

IN reference to a correspondence between your Lordship and Sir George Mackenzie, on the propriety of subjecting convicts to a phrenological examination, I beg leave to state, that I have paid some attention to Phrenology during the last seven years—that I believe its principles to be substantially true, and am convinced that the natural dispositions are indicated by the form and size of the brain to such an extent as to render it quite possible, during life, to distinguish men of desperate and dangerous tendencies from those of good dispositions.

Perhaps I may be allowed to add, that my first impressions in favour of Phrenology were produced by the explanation which its doctrines afford of the phenomena of mind, and the relations of man to the external world—an explanation more clear, consistent, and satisfactory, in my opinion, than can be derived from any system of philosophy now taught in this country.

I have the honour to be, my Lord, your Lordship's most obedient servant,

CHARLES MACLAREN,  
Editor of the Scotsman Newspaper.

XXXIV. From WILLIAM WILDSMITH, Esq. Member of the Royal College of Surgeons, London, and of the Council of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society; and Author of "An Inquiry concerning the relative Connexion which subsists between the Mind and the Brain."

To the Right Honourable Lord GLENELG.

MY LORD,

LEEDS, *April 16. 1836.*

HAVING been informed that Sir G. S. Mackenzie, Bart. has made proposals for applying the tests afforded by Phrenology for the discrimination of individual character in convicts subject to transportation, with a view to their better classification, I beg most sincerely to add my humble testimony in approval of the plan suggested, with the confident assurance that the result will prove highly valuable to the parties most interested, and prove to the entire satisfaction of any who may doubt it, the practical application of Phrenology to the common affairs of life. Nothing, I am convinced, can be easier than the discrimination of the naturally and the casually vicious, by the aid of Phrenology; and, in the case in question, I doubt not of its complete success if a trial be permitted.

I have the honour to remain, your Lordship's most obedient servant,

WM. WILDSMITH.



XXXV. From Mr WILLIAM BREBNER, Governor of the County and City Bridewell, Glasgow.

To GEORGE COMBE, Esq.

COUNTY AND CITY BRIDEWELL,  
*Glasgow, 18th April 1836.*

DEAR SIR,

ABOUT two thousand persons pass through this establishment yearly, and I have had the charge for upwards of twenty-five years. During that period, and long before I heard any thing of Phrenology, I was often struck with the extraordinary shape of the heads of most of the criminals. When Dr Spurzheim visited this city, I attended his lectures; and although I do not yet pretend to have any thing like phrenological knowledge, I have no hesitation in saying, that the most notoriously bad characters have a conformation of head very different from those of the common run of mankind.

I may be allowed to add, that Dr Spurzheim, yourself, and many others, professing and believing in the science, who have visited this prison, have described the character, and told the leading propensities of the inmates, in a very remarkable manner. I am, &c.

WILLIAM BREBNER, Governor.

---

XXXVI. From H. A. GALBRAITH, Esq. Surgeon to the Glasgow Royal Lunatic Asylum.

GLASGOW ROYAL LUNATIC ASYLUM,  
*19th April 1836.*

MY DEAR SIR,

SITUATED as I am in the midst of a wide field for observation, more particularly in regard to disordered

mental manifestations, I have been for several years past led to compare these with the phrenological development of the individuals in whom they appeared ; and from the result of numerous and well-marked instances, which have not only been known to me during a state of morbid activity, but from authentic accounts of the previous mental indications, I have not the least hesitation in declaring my firm belief in the general doctrines of Phrenology.

It gives me much pleasure on this occasion, and is but an act of justice, to add, that when Dr Spurzheim was in this city some years ago, he visited this Institution, and examined several of the most remarkable heads of the then inmates ; and, had I been more careless and sceptical than I really was, the correctness and facility with which his inductions were made from cerebral development, must have arrested my attention, and convinced me of the reality of the science he professed. It is also no small confirmation of the doctrine, as well as proof of its utility, that exactly the same conclusions were drawn from the same heads, when submitted to you a few days ago at your visit here. It therefore can be no chance or random opinion, but one evidently founded on a common principle, that enables the experienced Phrenologist, at the distance of years, not only correctly to delineate the character and conduct of individuals, but strictly to coincide with that formerly given. Although I have as yet no pretension to the name of an experienced Phrenologist, yet be assured my faith in the verity of Phrenology is such as to induce me to cultivate it with more care than I have hitherto done, and it will be no small gratification if I can add with benefit to those under my charge. I am, My Dear Sir, yours very faithfully,

H. A. GALBRAITH.

GEORGE COMBE, Esq.

XXXVII. From GEORGE SALMOND, Esq. Procurator-Fiscal of Lanarkshire ; WALTER MOIR, Esq. Sheriff-Substitute of Lanarkshire ; and Mr D. M'COLL, Governor of Glasgow Jail.

To GEORGE COMBE, Esq.

SHERIFF'S CHAMBERS,  
GLASGOW, 22d April 1836.

DEAR SIR,

A FEW days ago Sheriff Moir having told me of your intention to examine phrenologically some of the criminals in Glasgow jail, I expressed a wish to be present, in order that I might have a practical test of the system, and ascertain whether your inferences of character should accord with what was privately and officially known of them by myself ; and Mr Moir having kindly honoured me with an introduction to you, I had the gratification of attending your examination of a number of these persons, and of hearing with sincere interest the accurate conclusions you arrived at on each of them.

Never before having witnessed such an operation, and expecting that, after a tedious process of examination, taking notes, and comparing and calculating results, something of an oracular generality of character should be announced, I was very much pleased to observe, that while your examination of each did not average a minute, you instantly, and without hesitation, stated the character, not generally, but with specialties of feelings and propensities, surprisingly justified by what I knew of them ; and being aware that you had no access to them, nor means of knowing them previously, as they were taken at the moment promiscuously from numbers of the other criminals, I was at once led to a conviction of the truth of the science, and to see eminent advantages of such knowledge to society, and more immediately in regard to criminal jurisprudence and practice.

Of the instances of your observation, suffer me to men-

tion a few, which at the time occurred to me as peculiarly convincing.

The first man you examined you pronounced "a thief, reckless and dangerous, who, for instance, if under the influence of liquor, would not hesitate to murder or destroy all around him." Now this fellow has for years travelled about the country with a horse and cart, selling salt and trifling articles, and has acquired the character of a masterful thief, and just now stands indicted with a cruel assault on, and highway robbery of, a poor labourer, of all his hard earnings last harvest.

Another, you observed, had "a fine intellect, and was likely to have been guilty of swindling;" and the accuracy of this observation on a *painter*, who is indicted for *falsehood, fraud, and wilful imposition, or swindling*, is self-evident.

A third, whom you pronounced "a cunning, *daring*, and decided thief," is an incorrigible thief, who for years has, in the most concealed and adroit manner, headed a gang of housebreakers, and is at present indicted for highway robbery, committed by his savagely knocking down with a heavy stob a poor man, who was almost killed on the spot. Private information leads me to understand that he has been party to another crime, of a nature equally, if not more, *daring* and *cruel*.

A fourth you described to be "a depraved and most dangerous man." He is a crony of the man last noticed; has long been a thief, and one of the most noted corpse-lifters while subjects were bought by the medical schools; and he is said to have been concerned with the man last mentioned in the atrocious crime alluded to at the close of the observations as to him.

A fifth, whom you judged to be "a sly thief, who, with a meek and specious aspect, possessed daring even to cruelty," is a fellow who is by trade a thief, adroit and cun-

ning, and who has often attacked and escaped from the officers of justice. He lately stole in broad day-light on the streets of Glasgow a handkerchief from a gentleman's pocket, and ran off. Being promptly pursued, he, as a decoy, threw from him the napkin. Being after a race overtaken, he leapt into a dung-pit, whither the gentleman could not think of following him, but stood watching him till police he sent for arrived. On this the fellow in the most fawning manner craved sympathy, and finding this did not move the gentleman's purpose, he suddenly sprung out, and, on being seized, made a desperate struggle, bit severely the gentleman's hand, and, by his force and violence, might soon have got off had not the police arrived.

The accuracy of your conclusions has deeply impressed me with the benefit which would accrue to society from the application of such investigations towards the better classification of criminals confined before and after trial, to the selection and treatment of convicts, and even to the more certain identification of such criminals as might effect their escape from justice or confinement.

With much regard, believe me to be, dear Sir, yours most faithfully,

GEO. SALMOND,  
Pror.-Fiscal of Lanarkshire.

We were present on the occasion of Mr Combe's visit to the Jail of Glasgow, and testify to the perfect accuracy of Mr Salmond's representation of what happened. Mr Combe's inferences of the characters of such prisoners as he then examined, were most accurate, and never could have been the result of chance.

WALTER MOIR,  
Sheriff Subst. of Lanarkshire.

D. M'COLL,  
Governor of Glasgow Jail.

XXXVIII. Account of Mr COMBE's Phrenological Examination of Heads of Criminals in the Jail of Newcastle-on-Tyne, October 1835. Extracted from the Phrenological Journal, vol. ix. p. 524.

On Wednesday 28th October, Mr Combe, accompanied by the following gentlemen, visited the jail : viz. Dr George Fife, assistant-surgeon to the jail (who is not a phrenologist) ; Benjamin Sorsbie, Esq., alderman ; Dr D. B. White ; Mr T. M. Greenhow, surgeon ; Mr John Baird, surgeon ; Mr George C. Atkinson ; Mr Edward Richardson ; Mr Thomas Richardson ; Mr Wm. Hutton ; and Captain Hooke.

Mr Combe mentioned, that his chief object was to shew to such of the gentlemen present as had attended his lectures in Newcastle, the reality of the fact which he had frequently stated, that there is a marked difference between the development of the brain in men of virtuous dispositions, and its development in decidedly vicious characters, such as criminals usually are ; and that the moral organs generally are larger in proportion to the organs of the animal propensities, in the former than in the latter : and he requested that a few striking cases of crime might be presented, and that the heads of the criminals should be compared with those of any of the gentlemen present indiscriminately.

This was done ; and Dr Fife suggested that it would be further desirable that Mr Combe should write down his own remarks on the cases, before any account of them was given, while he himself should, at the other side of the table, write down an account of their characters according to his knowledge of them ; and that the two statements should then be compared. Mr Combe agreed to this request ; and the following individuals were examined.

P. S., aged about 20.—*Mr Combe* wrote as follows : Anterior lobe well developed ; intellectual powers are considerable. The organ of Imitation is large, also Secretiveness ; Acquisitiveness is rather large. The most defective organ is Conscientiousness. Benevolence and Veneration are large. The lower animal organs are not inordinate. My inference is, that this boy is not accused of violence ; his dispositions are not ferocious, or cruel, or violent : he has a talent for deception, and a desire for property not regulated by justice. His desires may have appeared in swindling or theft. It is most probable that he has swindled : he has the combination which contributes to the talents of an actor.—*Dr Fife's Remarks* : A confirmed thief ; he has been twice convicted of theft. He has never shewn brutality ; but he has no sense of honesty. He has frequently attempted to impose on Dr Fife ; he has considerable talent ; he attended school, and is quick and apt ; he has a talent for imitation.

T. S., aged 18.—*Mr Combe* wrote : Destructiveness is very large ; Combativeness, Secretiveness, and Acquisitiveness, are large ; intellectual organs fairly developed ; Amativeness is large ; Conscientiousness rather moderate ; Benevolence is full, and Veneration rather large. This boy is considerably different from the last. He is more violent in his dispositions ; he has probably been committed for assault connected with women. He has also large Secretiveness and Acquisitiveness, and may have stolen, although I think this less probable. He has fair intellectual talents, and is an improveable subject.—*Dr Fife's Remarks* : Crime, rape \* \* \* \* No striking features in his general character ; mild disposition ; has never shewn actual vice.

J. W., aged 73.—*Mr Combe's Observations* : The coro-

\* The particular observations are not proper for publication.

nal region is very defective ; Veneration and Firmness are the best developed ; but all are deficient. Cautiousness is enormously large ; the organ of Combateness is considerable, and Amativeness is large ; there are no other leading organs of the propensities inordinate in development ; the intellect is very moderate. I would have expected to find this case in a lunatic asylum rather than in a jail ; and I cannot fix upon any particular feature of crime. His moral dispositions generally are very defective ; but he has much caution. Except in connection with his Amativeness and Combateness, I cannot specify the precise crime of which he has been convicted. Great deficiency in the moral organs is the characteristic feature, which leaves the lower propensities to act without control.—*Dr Fife's Remarks :* A thief ; void of every principle of honesty ; obstinate ; insolent ; ungrateful for any kindness. In short, one of the most depraved characters with which I have been acquainted.—*Note by Mr Combe :* I have long maintained, that where the moral organs are extremely deficient, as in this case, the individual is a moral lunatic, and ought to be treated as such. Individuals in whom one organ is so large as Cautiousness is in this old man, and in whom the regulating organs of the moral sentiments are so deficient, are liable to fall into insanity, if strongly excited, owing to the disproportion in the cerebral organs. It is common to meet with such cases in lunatic asylums ; and as the criminal law has gone on punishing this individual during a long life (for he has been twice transported), and met with no success in reclaiming him, but left him in jail, under sentence for theft, at seventy years of age, I consider these facts a strong confirmation of my opinion that he ought to have been treated as a moral patient from the first.



XXXIX. From Dr JOHN MACKINTOSH, Surgeon to the Ordnance Department in North Britain; Lecturer on the Principles of Pathology and Practice of Physic; Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh; Member of the Medico-Chirurgical and Wernerian Natural History Societies of Edinburgh, Montreal, Heidelberg, and Brussels.

TO GEORGE COMBE, Esq.

MY DEAR SIR,

EDINBURGH, 27th April 1836.

IN reply to your letter of the 16th March, requesting me to state whether the natural dispositions are indicated by the size and form of the brain, so as to render it possible during life to distinguish men of desperate and dangerous tendencies from those of good dispositions, I have much pleasure in being able to offer my unqualified testimony as to the fact.

I was formerly not only an unbeliever in Phrenology, but a determined scoffer, and my conversion was slowly produced by the occurrence of individual cases that were accidentally brought before me; and I would now risk all I possess upon the general results drawn from the examination of the heads of one hundred convicts, by qualified persons I could name.

It would be well for society in the countries to which convicts are sent, if the plan proposed by Sir George Mackenzie to the Right Honourable Lord Glenelg were adopted. If any expense be occasioned by the investigation, I shall willingly contribute a share, because the interests of science will be advanced, and a great service will be rendered to the unfortunate convicts themselves.

I may add, that a great revolution has taken place within these few years, not only in this country, but also on the Continent, in favour of Phrenological doctrines; the number of opponents has diminished, and the disciples have in-

creased in a remarkable manner ;—so much so, that in Paris there is scarcely an illustrious name connected with Medicine, or any of the sciences, that is not found enrolled in the list of Members of the Phrenological Society. You may make whatever use you please of this letter ; and with much respect towards you, for the great share you have had in advancing our knowledge of the true science of mind, and placing it on a wider and more substantial basis,

I am, my dear Sir, yours very faithfully,

JOHN MACKINTOSH, M. D.

**XL.** Certificate from **HENRY MARSH, Esq. M.D., M.I.R.A.**, one of the Physicians to Steven's Hospital, Consulting Physician to the Dublin General Hospital, St Vincent's Hospital, and the Institution for the Diseases of Children ; **ROBERT HARRISON, Esq. M.D., M.R.I.A.**, Professor of Anatomy and Physiology, Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland ; **RICHARD TONSON EVANSON, Esq. M.D., M.R.I.A.**, Professor of the Practice of Physic, Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland ; **JAMES ARMSTRONG, D.D., M.R.I.A.** ; **FRANCIS WHITE, Esq.** President of the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland ; **W. F. MONTGOMERY, Esq. M.D.**, Professor of Midwifery to the King and Queen's College of Physicians in Ireland ; **WM. W. CAMPBELL, Esq. M.R.I.A.**, Demonstrator of Anatomy to the College of Surgeons in Ireland, Resident Assistant Physician to the Dublin Lying-in Hospital ; **ANDREW BOURNE, Esq. Barrister** ; **THOMAS EDWARD BEATTY, Esq. M.D.**, late Professor of Medical Jurisprudence, Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland ; **ARTHUR EDWARD GAYER, Esq. LL.D.**, Barrister ; **ANDREW CARMICHAEL, Esq. M.R.I.A.** ; **JOHN HOUSTON, Esq. M.D.**, Curator of the Museum, Royal College of Surgeons, Ireland, Surgeon to the City Dublin Hospital, Surgeon to the Charter Schools of Ireland, and to the Deaf and Dumb Institution for Ireland ; **H. MAUNSELL, Esq. M.D.**, Professor of Midwifery to the

Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland, and Member of the Medical Society of Leipzig.

DUBLIN, *March 25. 1836.*

WE the undersigned declare our belief, from what we know or have seen of the science of Phrenology, "that the natural dispositions are indicated by the size and form of the brain to such an extent, as to render it quite possible during life to distinguish men of desperate tendencies from those of good dispositions;" and we feel no hesitation in recommending, that trial should be made of the experiment proposed by Sir George Mackenzie, to prove the possibility of this application of Phrenology.

We conceive that, in affording this opportunity for putting publicly to the test the degree of accuracy to which Phrenology has been brought, as a scientific method of determining character, and so discriminating between the natural dispositions of criminals, the Secretary for the Colonies will but act the part of an enlightened statesman, willing to keep pace with the advance of knowledge, to do justice to science, and afford the Government opportunity for availing itself of all aid to be derived from the lights of philosophy, in fulfilling the arduous and responsible duties connected with criminal legislation.

HENRY MARSH.  
ROBERT HARRISON.  
RICHARD TONSON EVANSON.  
JAMES ARMSTRONG.  
FRANCIS WHITE.  
W. F. MONTGOMERY.  
WM. W. CAMPBELL.  
ANDREW BOURNE.  
THOMAS EDW<sup>d</sup>. BEATTY.  
ARTHUR EDW<sup>d</sup>. GAYER.  
ANDREW CARMICHAEL.  
JOHN HOUSTON.  
H. MAUNSELL.

*d*

## XLI. From His Grace the ARCHBISHOP of DUBLIN.

I am fully convinced that the proposed phrenological experiment of Sir G. Mackenzie, Bart., is amply entitled to a fair trial.

RD. DUBLIN.

---

## XLII. From the PROVOST of TRINITY COLLEGE.

PROVOST HOUSE, *April 18. 1836.*

I AM decidedly of opinion that the experiment proposed by Sir Geo. Mackenzie should be made, especially when I consider that it can be made without difficulty or expense.

BAR. LLOYD, Provost T. C. D.

---

## XLIII. From H. LLOYD, Esq. F.T.C.D., Professor of Natural Philosophy, Dublin.

TRINITY COLLEGE, *April 8. 1836.*

HAVING seen a paper signed by Mr Combe, relating to a phrenological experiment proposed by Sir George Mackenzie, I am of opinion that such experiment is deserving of a trial.

H. LLOYD.

---

XLIV. From MOUNTIFORT LONGFIELD, Esq. F. T. C. D.,  
Whayleaw, Professor of Political Economy.

I HAVE been informed of the experiment proposed by Sir G. Mackenzie, and am of opinion that very important results may be obtained, if the State will in that manner lend its assistance to make the science of Phrenology

available for purposes of public utility. I am altogether unacquainted with the details of phrenological practice, but from what I have read upon the subject, I am convinced that the science is founded on true principles, and that to writers on Phrenology we owe much of the light that has been thrown upon the philosophy of the human mind. Their metaphysics appear to me in general correct, with as small a proportion of error as could be expected on works written upon a subject which has not yet been made a branch of public education, nor converted into a source of profit to individuals.

MOUNTIFORT LONGFIELD.

---

XLV. From PHILIP CRAMPTON, Esq. Surgeon-General, Dublin.

DUBLIN, *April 12. 1836.*

I AM of opinion that the experiment proposed by Sir Geo. Mackenzie, with a view to ascertain whether or not "the natural dispositions are indicated by the form and size of the brain," is worthy of a trial.

PHILIP CRAMPTON.

---

XLVI. From AR. JACOB, Esq. M.D., Professor of Anatomy,  
Royal College of Surgeons, Dublin.

DUBLIN, *April 27. 1836.*

I HAVE not paid sufficient attention to the study of Phrenology, to justify me in giving a decided opinion respecting its value, or the importance of its results; but I cannot hesitate to say, that such a case has been made out, (to prove "that the natural dispositions are indicated by the form and size of the brain, to such an extent as to ren-

der it quite possible during life to distinguish men of desperate and dangerous tendencies from those of good disposition,") as warrants the experiment proposed by Sir G. Mackenzie.

AR. JACOB.

**CORRESPONDENCE**

**BETWEEN**

**ACADEMICUS AND CONSILIARIUS,**

**ON THE COMPARATIVE MERITS OF**

**PHRENOLOGY,**

**AND THE**

**MENTAL PHILOSOPHY OF REID  
AND STEWART.**

---

**FROM THE PHRENOLOGICAL JOURNAL, VOL. X. NO. 50. DECEMBER 1836.**

---

**EDINBURGH:**

**PRINTED BY NEILL & COMPANY.**

**1836.**





## CORRESPONDENCE, &c.

---

It were needless to attempt to conceal, for the reader could not fail to perceive, that the following letters regarding the comparative merits of the Mental Philosophy of Reid and Stewart, and of Gall, Spurzheim, and Combe, passed between *Academicus* and *Consiliarius* on occasion of the election to the Chair of Logic in the University of Edinburgh in July 1836; when the claims of Sir WILLIAM HAMILTON were rested on the former, and those of Mr COMBE on the latter philosophy.

ACADEMICUS TO CONSILIARIUS.

12th July 1836.

. . . . . My anxiety in the matter is not for any individual, but for the credit of the University, and especially for the support and extension of the mental philosophy of Reid and Stewart, of which I am a sincere admirer, and a zealous though humble disciple, and which I have done my best to study carefully, and think I understand, although I have no pretensions to extensive metaphysical reading: I believe M. Cousin to be quite correct in asserting two things, 1. That the doctrines of Reid and Stewart, or what is called the Scotch system of mental philosophy, is now generally known and highly esteemed, and widely extending its reputation, abroad; and that, in fact, there is little or no dispute on the Continent about the truth and importance of the leading principles of that philosophy, the only question being, whether or not the analysis of our mental constitution can be carried farther than it has been by them. 2. That Sir William Hamilton appears, from his

A

writings, to be a learned, able, and zealous disciple of that school, well qualified to compare its doctrines with, and to defend them against, all other metaphysical systems, ancient and modern.

It is my own sincere conviction, that the leading principles of Reid and Stewart are the only safe and sure foundation on which the study of mental philosophy can be conducted, that they must be the guide of all truly scientific inquirers in this branch of philosophy in all time coming,—and that they constitute the highest claim to scientific distinction, of which Scotland can boast. Although I know you to be an admirer of Phrenology, I will take the liberty of saying, that if the whole extent of the doctrines of phrenological writers were established, they would merely *take their place* as a part of the system of mental philosophy of which those authors, if not the original founders, are the chief supporters; and that the idea of Phrenology being a *substitute* for their philosophy, is quite a delusion. Their philosophy is strictly the Inductive Logic applied to the human mind, and limited in the extent to which it leads, by the constitution of the mind itself. If Phrenology can be established, it must be by facts and induction from them, and will be simply an *addition* to the facts which have been already observed and generalized; it may render advisable some alteration of their arrangement, but cannot affect their truth or value.

I believe that among those who have really studied metaphysics of late years (and who are more numerous on the Continent than in this country), these opinions of the merits of Reid and Stewart, and of the service which they did to science, by placing mental philosophy on its true basis, and clearing away the incumbrance of former theories and sophistries, will not be thought to be exaggerated. I think it is also generally admitted, that Dr Brown, able and amiable as he was, is not so sound or safe a guide in *metaphysics*, and that when he differed from them (particularly from Reid), he has retarded rather than advanced the progress of the science. One of Sir William Hamilton's papers in the Edinburgh Review seems to me to make this point pretty clear.

CONSILIARIUS TO ACADEMICUS.

14th July 1836.

I am satisfied that your letter proceeds only from the most amiable motives. It needs no apology: it does me honour. Indeed, had you not condescended to argue against my opi-

nions, I would have kept them to myself. But I assure you, that, although not without the feelings of attachment natural to an old disciple of the Edinburgh School, I am convinced that the philosophy of Reid must give way before the discoveries of Gall, and that a stable mental philosophy can only be based on phrenological principles—on the analysis of mind sketched out by him—since improved—and still in the course of being improved. I shall put my reasons on paper at greater length, but must take a little time.

19<sup>th</sup> July 1836.

According to promise, I shall now, as briefly as possible, yet I trust intelligibly, state my reasons for differing from you in regard to Reid and Stewart's philosophy, and for thinking that the credit of our University is so far from being bound up with that system, that it would, on the contrary, be signally promoted by adopting a mental philosophy founded on the discoveries of Gall. It may appear bold in a person situate as I am to venture to differ on such a subject from you; but after having been rather an attentive pupil of Finlayson and Stewart in 1799 and 1800, and after reading the best treatises in our language, I was led many years ago, by intimacy with Mr Forster, Dr Leach, and Dr Spurzheim, to examine Gall's system with considerable care; and I have also availed myself of the admirable writings and lectures of Mr Combe. Now, if it so happen that you have not bestowed attention on the new doctrines, and have not examined the evidence on which they are founded (which I suspect is the case), then, inferior as I feel myself in all other respects, I have here the advantage of you.

In my humble opinion, then, Reid and Stewart's philosophy is altogether unsound in its basis. It rests on observations made by each individual on his own consciousness. Now, consciousness gives us no intimation of any thing in mental philosophy, except the *state* of our *own* minds at the moment when we attend to our inward condition. Some of the consequences of this important fact may here be traced.

1. We cannot thus discover the existence and functions of the mental organs, because Consciousness does not indicate their presence in mental operations.

2. We cannot thus distinguish primitive faculties from mere modes of action of the faculties; *i. e.* if we had only Consciousness to guide us in regard to the philosophy of the external senses, we should be led to describe Taste, Smell, Sight, Hearing, and Touch, all as modes of action, or modes of impression, of the mind generally, and should never discover that they are sepa-

rate and distinct senses. In like manner, in regard to the internal faculties, the school of Reid mistakes Memory, Imagination, Conception, and Perception for primitive powers; while the most indisputable facts prove that these are only modes of action of the real faculties, ascertained by the school of Gall, and called in phrenological language Locality, Colouring, Individuality, &c.; each having a distinct organ, and there being, of course, many kinds of memory.

3. In consequence of this radical defect in the basis of Reid's philosophy, it can never, I apprehend, become useful, or afford the foundation for any sound logic. For example, if a metaphysician of the Reid school were rather deficient in organs of Conscientiousness, he might be apt to deny the existence of a moral sense; and so of others. Further, in consequence of reflecting merely on his own consciousness, he must remain totally ignorant of many of the active impulses, such as (if you will excuse me for again using phrenological language, which I find the most precise), Combativeness, Destructiveness, Acquisitiveness, Secretiveness, which strongly prevail in the world of real life, but which may possibly never indicate themselves to the philosopher in the calm retirement of the closet. Hence, such metaphysicians can never, by their mode of investigation, arrive at a correct knowledge of all the faculties; for each philosopher will naturally be inclined to deny the existence of faculties in the organs of which he may himself happen to be rather deficient.

4. Reid's philosophy never can give an explanation of the differences between the mental capacity of one man and that of another, because it is confined in its basis to the mind of *the individual* who studies it.

5. It cannot possibly explain the phenomena of insanity, because it totally overlooks the organs, by the diseases of which insanity is occasioned, as now admitted by many eminent physicians and physiologists of the greatest experience in asylums.

6. It cannot be applied to the elucidation of the causes of the tendency of some individuals to one pursuit and of others to other pursuits; of some to mathematics and others to painting, of some to hoarding and others to profuseness, &c.; because these differences depend on differences in the relative size and on the activity of certain organs, of which that philosophy takes no cognizance.

7. A sound logic ought to expound the whole faculties of man, both affective and intellectual, the relations subsisting between them and the external world, physical and mental, and the method by which they may be best applied in the attainment of good, morally,—and of truth, intellectually. The

philosophy of Reid can never accomplish these ends ; because it never reaches the primitive faculties at all, but deals in mere generalities about their modes of action.

In consequence of the imperfect analysis of the mind thus presented by this philosophy, we would never have been led to think of *educating* the faculties, feelings, and affections, as is now, by the lights of Phrenology, successfully done from the earliest ages in infant schools, up to grammar schools where the teachers have had the good fortune to become acquainted with Phrenology.

I entirely dissent from your conclusion, therefore, that Phrenology will merely enlarge the sphere of the philosophy of Reid and Stewart. According to my views, Phrenology will rather sweep that philosophy away ; and if we get something more useful, why should we deplore its being so swept away ? It will now,\* however, get trial for a few years longer in our University ; but it will be “ weighed ” by the students of each successive season, and more and more “ found wanting.” When I consider the light which phrenological books are throwing on the causes and cure of the malady above alluded to (so interesting in any discussion about Mind), on education, on criminal legislation, I clearly perceive the superiority of the new philosophy, and wish it all success. It is perhaps rather a low consideration, but it is an important one, that the writings of Dr Reid and Mr Dugald Stewart are no longer in demand in this country, while new editions, of thousands, of Mr Combe’s works are in constant request.

A friend lately called my attention to a clever article in the third volume of the Edinburgh Review, the style of which seems to indicate the then editor as the author. It exposes in a happy strain the futility of that very philosophy which Lord Jeffrey, Professor Napier, and you, seem now so anxious to maintain in the University. At page 269 he says, “ In metaphysics, certainly, knowledge is not power, and, instead of producing new phenomena to elucidate the old, by well combined and well conducted experiments, the most diligent inquirer can do no more than register and arrange the appearances, which he can neither account for nor control. We feel and perceive and remember without any purpose or contrivance of ours, and have evidently no power over the mechanism by which those functions are performed. We may describe and distinguish these operations of mind, indeed, with more or less attention or exactness, but we cannot subject them to experiment, nor alter their nature by any process of investigation. We cannot de-

\* Sir William Hamilton having been elected to the Logic Chair on the 15th July.

compose our perceptions in a crucible, nor divide our sensations with a prism ; nor can we, by art and contrivance, produce any combination of thoughts or emotions, besides those with which all men are provided by nature. No metaphysician expects by analysis to discover a new power or create a new sensation in the mind, as a chemist discovers a new earth or a new metal ; nor can we hope, by any process of synthesis, to exhibit a mental combination different from any that nature has produced in the minds of other persons."

Mr Stewart endeavoured to answer this in the Dissertation preliminary to the Philosophical Essays ; but he failed : for such objections are insuperable against him. When, however, we study the mind by means of the organs, not one of the objections applies. By observing organs (as was suggested to me by the friend who pointed out the passage) we really do discover new faculties ; and, by ascertaining their spheres of activity, and bringing several of them to act together in a new direction and in a new combination, we may be said actually to give rise to new products in mental manifestation.

Allow me only to add, that, in spite of Sir William Hamilton's review, my late esteemed friend Dr Thomas Brown seems to be admitted by all who are not absolute devotees to Reid and Stewart, to be superior to both these authors. To descend once more to the shop (for really the sale of a work is the experimentum crucis of successful authorship), you will find that Brown's posthumous Lectures are vastly more in request than Reid's Intellectual and Active Powers and Stewart's Philosophical Essays.

ACADEMICUS TO CONSILIARIUS.

26th September 1836.

I have not forgotten my promise to state to you my reasons for the opinion, in regard to the pretensions of Phrenology, which I formerly took the liberty of expressing to you ; but different circumstances have hitherto prevented my performing it. Fortunately we can now consider the question independently of any practical application, and therefore with a philosophical coolness and composure.

I presume I need hardly say, that I do not regard the propositions—that the brain is the organ of thought,—that all manifestations of the human mind, in this state of our existence, depend on certain conditions in the state of the brain,—and that all physical causes which influence the mind, do so by affecting the condition of the brain,—as Phrenology. These propositions are a part of *physiology*. They formed part of

the physiology of Haller, before Gall, or Phrenology, was heard of; and the additions, and more precise form, given to them of late years,—the restriction of the office of the brain proper to the simply mental acts,—of the medulla oblongata to sensation, and to the excitement of voluntary muscles,—and the discovery of the office of the cerebellum in regulating muscular motions,—have been the work of physiologists, of Le Gallois, Wilson Philip, Magendie, Flourens, &c., not of phrenologists.

The peculiar doctrine of the phrenologists I take to be this: That the brain and cerebellum (chiefly, however, the former) consist of a congeries of organs, to each of which is assigned the office of supplying the material conditions necessary, either for some particular mental act, or frequently for the mental acts which relate to some particular object of thought; and that the offices thus assigned to the different organs composing the brain have been, for the most part, ascertained, chiefly by observations on the forms of the head of different persons, and corresponding peculiarities of characters.

That the different portions of the brain have different offices assigned them in connection with the different mental acts, seems to me highly probable, and the inquiry into these I think very laudable, and strictly philosophical: it is distinctly recommended by Lord Bacon, and has been attempted by different physiologists and pathologists, but with little success. It seems to me, that there is strong probability in favour of the general opinion, that the strictly intellectual acts are connected with the fore part of the brain, and the sentiments and feelings, and propensities to action, rather with the upper and back parts of it. As to the more minute appropriation of the different parts of the brain, either to different mental acts, or to mental acts on different subjects, I confess that I have not studied the evidence adduced on that subject by Gall and Spurzheim, and their followers, so carefully as, perhaps, I ought to have done—on this account, that all observations made in the way to which they chiefly trust, viz. by measurement of skulls, and comparison of these with the known characters of their owners, have always appeared to me to be liable to *very considerable fallacies*, affecting both the *physical* and the *mental* parts of these observations; and, therefore, to be inadequate to the purpose of fixing the use of the different portions of the brain, *unless supported and confirmed by other observations*. I can conceive them to derive that support and confirmation from three sources,—from comparative anatomy,—from the results of experiments on animals,—and from the effects of injury or disease of individual portions of the brain in the human body.

But, after taking some pains in the inquiry, I have come to the conclusion, that *from none of these sources of information is there any confirmation* of the special appropriation of the different parts of the brain to the different acts of mind which the phrenologists consider as ascertained. Indeed, as to comparative anatomy, you must probably be aware, that the result of observations in that science goes completely to disprove the idea, that any fixed relation exists in the different tribes of animals, between the degree of intelligence that can be observed in them, and the size, or complexity of structure, or indeed any circumstance of structure, that has yet been pointed out of their brains. These things being so, I think I have come fairly and philosophically to the same conclusion as Magendie on the merits of Phrenology; viz. that this study, perfectly innocent, and highly laudable, has, nevertheless, *as yet*, yielded no results as to the office of the different portions of the brain, on which reliance can be placed.

I have repeatedly proposed to myself a farther question, which is, in fact, that in which I have the misfortune to differ from you, and which is quite separate from the question as to the merits of Phrenology, viz. Taking for granted that the offices of the different portions of the brain, as laid down by the phrenologists, are all correctly stated, are they entitled, by having established these facts, to assume to themselves the credit of sweeping away the old Science of Mind as taught by Reid and Stewart and others,—or are their pretensions, even on that supposition, inadmissible? On this question I have formed a decided opinion, and shall endeavour, in a few words, to give you my reasons.

The leading principles of the Mental Philosophy of Reid and Stewart, so far as I understand them, are just these:—1. That the constitution and powers of the human mind can only be ascertained by attentive observation of its actual operations, which observation must be, for the most part, made by each individual studying the subject on the acts of his own mind, and the results of which must be generalized and reduced to laws of nature, on the same principles on which the determination of the physical laws of nature, by the process of induction, is conducted; and, 2. That in thus generalizing the facts of which we are conscious in our own minds, and which we infer from observation of the actions prompted by other minds, we must necessarily arrive at certain ultimate facts, of which we can give no other account than that they are the will of the Author of our nature, and which stand in the same relation to mental science as the laws of motion or the laws of chemical affinity to physical science; and particularly, that among those ultimate facts in the human constitution, we must admit the existence, and recognise the authority, of certain fundamental laws



of belief, of which we can give no other account than that they are a part of our mental constitution, always present and active in any individual of sound mind, and leading us to believe certain things only "because we cannot help it."

These being the objects and limits, and, as it seems to me, the rational and philosophical general view or outline of the science of Mind as laid down by Reid and Stewart (and indeed by many previous authors, but I believe more cautiously and correctly by them than any others), you assert, that all the principles which can be ascertained and established in this way, must be superseded and "swept away" if the system of Phrenology is established; that is, if it be ascertained that every act of mind, or that all the acts of mind which relate to any particular object of thought, have their residence in a particular portion of the brain.

I assert, on the other hand, that this discovery would be merely an addition to our knowledge of the mind, rendering advisable, probably, a change in the arrangement by which a part of the science is taught, but that the science would still consist of facts, ascertained by the methods laid down by Reid and Stewart, and generalized, and their investigation limited according to their principles, and would therefore be substantially the same science, with such additions only as were clearly within their contemplation.

As the simplest way of illustrating this position, I shall take, in succession, the different arguments against the system of Reid and Stewart with which you have favoured me.

You say, in general, that the system of Reid and Stewart "rests on observations made by each individual on his own consciousness. Now consciousness gives us no intimation of any thing in mental philosophy except the state of our own minds at the moment when we attend to our inward condition."

Here I would observe, 1st, That although it is true, as I stated above, that facts in the philosophy of mind must be ascertained, *for the most part*, by observations of each individual on his own mind, *i. e.* by attention to his own consciousness; and although all other observations, applicable to the subject at all, must always bear reference to the intimations of consciousness, and are admissible as a part of the science, only inasmuch as they indicate what must be the consciousness of *some mind*,—yet it is quite a mistake to suppose that the mental philosopher, according to Reid and Stewart, is *confined to observations on his own mind*. And to prove this I need go no farther than to a few sentences in Mr Stewart's Preliminary Dissertation, to which you have yourself referred.

"To counterbalance the disadvantages which the philosophy of mind lies under, in consequence of its slender stock of expe-

riments, made directly and intentionally on the minds of our fellow-creatures, *human life exhibits to our observation a boundless variety, both of intellectual and moral phenomena, by a diligent study of which we may ascertain almost every point that we could wish to investigate, if we had experiments at our command.* “Hardly, indeed, can any experiment be imagined which has not already been tried by the hand of nature,—displaying, in the infinite varieties of human genius and pursuits, the astonishingly diversified effects resulting from the possible combinations of those elementary faculties and principles, of which every man is conscious in himself. Savage society, and all the different modes of civilization,—the different callings and professions of individuals, liberal or mechanical,—the prejudiced clown,—the factitious man of fashion,—the varying phases of characters from infancy to old age,—the prodigies effected by human art in all the objects around us, laws, government, commerce, religion,—but, above all, the records of thought preserved in the volumes which fill our libraries,—what are they but experiments by which Nature illustrates, for our instruction, on her own grand scale, the varied range of man’s intellectual faculties?”—*Preliminary Dissertation to Phil. Essays*, p. 45. It appears clearly from this, that in Mr Stewart’s view of the subject (and the same is as easily proved as to Dr Reid), although the foundation of the science, and the standard to which all other observations must be referred, are to be found only in the study of our own minds; yet, by the simple process of inferring, from the conduct or language of another man, what must bethe intimations of his consciousness, the whole book of human life is laid open for the instruction of the student of mental philosophy, and, therefore, that your arguments, in so far as they are founded on the supposition of his being restricted to the study of his own mind, fall to the ground.

2d, It being understood that inferences as to the mental acts of others, as well as consciousness of mental acts in ourselves, are the legitimate foundations of mental science, according to Reid and Stewart; I beg to ask, what other foundations has, or can have, the mental science of the phrenologists? Such consciousness, and such inferences, must be, I apprehend, the very essence of all the evidence by which they establish that any kind, or any direction, of mental acts is connected with any part of the brain; without such mental evidence, the mere inspection of the brain would be, I apprehend, a very barren study. With such mental evidence (where truly obtained), the study of the offices of different parts of the brain becomes a part of the study of the mind, according to the methods of Reid and Stewart; and, if successful, an *addition* to their system, formed on their principles,—not a substitution of another.

I shall now notice in succession your more specific arguments.

1. You say That we cannot, by observations made by each individual on his own consciousness, discover the existence and functions of the mental organs, *i. e.* of the portions of brain concerned in the different mental acts. This is answered by what I have already said, that the mental philosophy of Reid and Stewart is not, by any means, confined to those observations. And I freely admit, that, if the connexion of individual portions of brain with particular acts of mind were ascertained, (which can only be by observations partly made, not indeed on our own consciousness, but on the consciousness of others, inferred from their words or actions,) we should have a manifest addition to our knowledge of the mind, but an addition as *strictly within the province of the mental philosophy of Reid and Stewart* as are the long discussions (particularly in the works of Reid) on the material conditions necessary for vision, and for the other senses.

2. You say, That we cannot, by the methods of Reid and Stewart, “distinguish primitive faculties from mere modes of action of the faculties,” *e. g.* that “the school of Reid mistakes Memory, Imagination, Conception, and Perception for primitive powers; whereas the most indisputable facts prove that these are only modes of action of the real faculties, ascertained by the school of Gall, and called Locality, Colouring, Individuality, &c.; each having a distinct organ, and there being, of course, many kinds of memory.”

Now, this appears to me a mere verbal misapprehension. Supposing it ascertained, that portions of the brain are appropriated to each of the objects of thought,—one to Forms, one to Colours, one to Weights, one to Measures, &c.—and that each of these portions furnishes all the conditions necessary in order that forms, or colours, or positions, &c. may be *observed*, may be *recollected*, may be *imagined*, &c., you may, no doubt, apply to each of these portions of the brain, or to all the acts of mind connected with it, and exerted upon any such object of thought, the name of a Faculty. But, in so doing, you must be aware, that you use the term in a sense considerably different from that in which it is used by Reid and Stewart, and other authors. The term Faculty, as applied to perception, conception, memory, imagination, does not mean separate tangible existences, and is not applied to the objects of thought; it is the expression of general facts or laws of mind observed, distinguished, and generalized, in regard to the actual *operations* of our minds. By taking the term and applying it to another use, to designate a different thing, you merely make an *innovation in language*, (and such innovations are always to be deprecated in

science). You do not invalidate the observations on which the previous generalizations were founded, nor shew that these generalizations were wrong, and therefore you do not become entitled to sweep away these and substitute others.

It may be quite true, for example, that there is a portion of the brain assigned for Forms, and that, when that portion is alive and healthy, it enables us not only to perceive and distinguish forms, but to remember them, to imagine them, &c. ; and you may, if you please, give to that portion of the brain, or to all the exertions of the mind, dependent on it, and applied to the subject of Forms, the name of the Faculty of Form. But it is not the less true, that the act of mind which perceives forms, is palpably distinct from that which remembers forms or imagines forms ; and that each of these acts is just similar to acts performed by the mind in regard to other objects of thought ;—that we perceive, remember, and imagine colours, sounds, numbers, and many other objects of thought, as well as forms. You do not study the constitution of the mind, unless you attend to those obvious distinctions *among the acts of mind themselves*, as well as to those *among the objects* on which they are performed. Whether we are to arrange the study of the mind according to the different kinds of acts it performs, or (as the phrenologists in many, not in all cases, do), according to the objects to which these are directed,—whether we are to treat, *e. g.*, of memory as an act of mind, which may be applied to many different objects, or of “many different kinds of memory” under the different objects to which it may be applied,—is a question of arrangement, or of taste in individuals, or of convenience for other purposes ; but those who follow the one arrangement are strangely mistaken, as it seems to me, if they suppose that in so doing, they sweep away the distinctions on which the other is founded, or the generalizations to which it leads. In my humble opinion, they might just as well talk of sweeping away the facts by which these obvious distinctions are suggested.

3. You say, that a philosopher of the school of Reid cannot have a comprehensive view of the human mind, because he will be inclined to deny the existence of faculties in the organs of which he may chance to be deficient ; and your instance particularly Conscientiousness, Combativeness, Destructiveness, &c. I believe, that no philosopher, whether of the school of Reid or of any other, can have just views of the constitution of the mind, who is not conscious of these and other motives to action existing occasionally in himself ; but I have already shewn, that the philosopher of this school is not restricted, any more than any others, to the facts made known to him by *his own* consciousness, and thus set aside this argument.

4. The same answer applies to your next argument, that Reid's philosophy gives no explanation of the differences between men in mental capacity, because it is confined in its basis to the mind of the individual who studies it. That this is a mistaken notion of the basis of Reid's philosophy, I have already shewn. At the same time I willingly admit, that the differences of mental constitution in different individuals, form a branch of the study of the mind which has been more fully illustrated by some phrenologists than I believe it ever was before. But it was not overlooked by Reid or Stewart; it is illustrated and is susceptible of illustration, only by observation of facts which imply the consciousness of individual minds; it is therefore strictly within the province of the mental philosophy of these authors, and any advances made in this branch of the science are made clearly in the way of *addition*, not of *substitution*.

5. You say, that the philosophy of Reid "cannot possibly explain the phenomena of insanity, because it overlooks the organs, by the diseases of which insanity is occasioned." If you mean, the phenomena of general insanity, or delirium, of which the chief characteristic is the faith reposed by the mind in whatever it conceives or imagines, as if it were a reality, I am really not aware of any *explanation* of that aberration of the mind which Phrenology offers. The only explanation I have ever seen of it is that given by Mr Stewart, who shews its dependence on the same mental law by which we put temporary faith in our dreams, or in fancied scenes conjured up by poetry or romance; which, so far as it goes, seems to me quite satisfactory, although not at all phrenological. But I presume you mean to refer to cases of *partial* insanity, which certainly often affects the acts of the mind on particular objects of thought only; and I willingly admit, that if it were ascertained that particular portions of brain are concerned in the mental acts which relate to such objects, and that these portions are diseased in cases of partial insanity on these subjects,—we should have a very fair explanation, not properly speaking of the nature of the change in the mental acts which constitutes the insanity, but of the circumstance of the insanity being partial. I am sorry to say that, after taking some pains on the subject, I cannot agree with you in thinking, that the cases on record of partial insanity with partial disease of the brain, afford any confirmation of the phrenological division and allocation of the mental faculties. But if it did, it would only furnish an *addition* to our knowledge of the mind, studied according to the methods of Reid; and I cannot see that it would invalidate any one fact in our mental constitution, which he has observed, nor one inference which he has drawn.

6. You say that the philosophy of Reid "cannot be applied to the elucidation of the causes of the tendency of some individuals to one pursuit, and of others to another." I answer, this difference is *a fact* in the constitution of the mind, open to the observation of all, made known by the methods of inquiry followed by Reid and recognised by him and his followers; although, as I have stated, not so fully illustrated by them as perhaps it might have been. Any additional illustration of this fact, or any explanation of it, *if obtained by the method of induction*, will necessarily be an addition to the philosophy of Reid on the subject, and an *addition* of the kind which he continually says he expects his philosophy to receive, in the progress of time; but how it should ever be a substitute for it, I confess myself unable to comprehend. All the facts which he has observed, or which any one else has observed, as to differences in the propensities, or sentiments, or capacities of individuals, will remain untouched by the establishment of the additional fact (supposing it established), that each peculiarity of disposition is connected with, and dependent upon, the development of a particular portion of the brain.

7. Your last statement, that the philosophy of Reid "never can expound the whole faculties of man, their relations and their applications, because it never reaches the primitive faculties at all," turns on the same ambiguity in the use of the word *faculties*, which I have already remarked. If you use the word in a new sense, certainly the facts which he had collected and arranged under the word, as in the case of Perception, Conception, Memory, &c., will not come under it in that new sense; but they are still facts, and unless you can shew that they have been inaccurately observed, or erroneously classed together, you cannot prevent them from forming a part of the philosophy of mind.

This applies to those faculties, described by the phrenologists, which are not to be found in the description of our mental constitution, given by Reid and Stewart, and which are distinguished, not by the nature of the mental acts, but by the objects to which they are applied. But many of the faculties of the phrenologists, (particularly of those which have the title of Sentiments), are the same mental acts or feelings which are described by Reid and Stewart, chiefly under the head of Active and Moral powers; *i. e.* the Self-Esteem of the former, is the Self-Love of the latter,—the Love of Approbation of the former, is the Desire of Esteem of the latter, &c. Now, in such a case, how you should "sweep away" all that had been formerly ascertained, by consciousness in ourselves, and by observation of the conduct, and inference as to the feelings, of other men, in regard to any such sentiment, merely by making the *additional*

observation, that its intensity is proportional to the size of a certain portion of the brain—I own exceeds my comprehension.

Considering the principles of Phrenology, if they shall be established, simply as *additional facts* in the natural history of the human mind, I should rejoice if I could anticipate as much benefit to our species from them as you do; and I can easily see that some benefits would result. But I think these would be, chiefly from their leading to careful discrimination of characters; which discrimination is in our power independently of Phrenology (*i. e.* independently of any examination of heads and of any inferences as to the portions of brain concerned in them): it is daily practised in the world; and, indeed, its being practised is quite essential to any evidence being obtained in favour of any one principle in Phrenology; and, therefore, I cannot help indulging a little in the philosophical state of doubt, whether any such *peculiar* advantages as you and many others expect, will ever be derived from combining the discrimination of characters, as made known to us by language and action, with the measurement of organs, by examination of skulls. And although I am aware that phrenologists suppose that the schoolmasters, and the keepers of lunatic asylums, who have been educated by them, are superior to all other men of their professions; yet, I do not think this is by any means so generally admitted as to furnish decisive evidence of the practical usefulness of the study.

Neither can I agree with your friend who thinks, that “by observing organs we really do discover new faculties.” On the contrary, I doubt very much whether you can know what is an organ (phrenologically speaking,) otherwise than by observing the coincidence of its external sign with some mental faculty, propensity, or sentiment, already known.

I beg to say farther, that I do not consider the present popularity of phrenological books, and the greatly diminished demand for the works of Reid and Stewart, any evidence of the scientific merit and demerit of either. In the first place, you mention that Dr Brown’s book is at present popular; and the same is true of Dr Abercrombie’s book. Now, much of the best parts of Reid and Stewart are incorporated into them; and if they had not preceded these authors, their works could not have been written. Their general view of the objects of mental science is just the same as that of Reid and Stewart; and although I believe Dr Brown was right in some speculations when he differs from Stewart, I doubt much whether he has in any place, in point of doctrine, improved upon Reid. That he did not, in some important points where he differed



from Reid, I think Sir William Hamilton distinctly shewed in one of his articles in the *Edinburgh Review*.

Secondly, a very great part of the writings both of Reid and Stewart, is occupied in refuting the errors of former metaphysical authors, and so putting the study on its right basis. This was indispensable for the future progress of mental philosophy ; but when the refutation and correction of former errors is generally regarded as satisfactory, the interest of the work containing it is of course greatly diminished.

Lastly, it is only a small number of men, in any age, who have a taste for mental philosophy, or indeed for any works of abstruse science. No great number of editions of Bacon's *Novum Organon*, or of Newton's *Principia*, are necessary, to maintain these works in their station at the head of modern science. Excepting in the case of a literary controversy, attracting public attention, I apprehend that a book on intellectual or moral philosophy going in a few years through many editions, may be safely set down as a very superficial book. Of a class of 100, either in Greek, Logic or Mathematics, how few turn out to be zealous or eminent in any of these studies ; but the mental labour which they undergo is useful for all, and for the few who understand to turn their elementary instruction to account, it is of the utmost importance that the teacher should be thoroughly master of the subject, and qualified to guide them through the difficulties, and warn them of the dangers, in their way ;—and in mental science I am thoroughly persuaded that no man is so qualified who is not imbued with the spirit of the philosophy of Reid and Stewart.

It was this conviction which made me feel justified in exerting such little influence as I was told I might chance to possess, in favour of the candidate for the Logic Chair who had given the best evidence of being thoroughly instructed in these principles ; and the same feeling will always prompt me to oppose by all fair means (when any may be in my power) the introduction into the University of any men, (however much, individually, I may respect them or their supporters,) who profess that they have a *new method* of studying and teaching mental science, and that they are to “ sweep away ” the philosophy of Reid and Stewart. The pretensions of phrenologists in this respect have probably attracted to their system a greater share of public attention than it would otherwise have obtained ; but I am convinced they have been a main cause of the suspicion and distrust with which it is regarded by a very large proportion of the men of science and learning in this country. In the end, such portions of truth as may be ascertained to belong to Phrenology, will make their way, notwithstanding the difficulties which the injudicious pretensions of its present sup-



porters have raised in the minds of many well-informed and truly scientific men ; but I much suspect that these pretensions will ultimately be fatal to the personal reputation of most of our present phrenological authors.

I must apologize for this unconscionably long letter. I cannot expect that it will shake any of your opinions ; but I hope it will shew you, that I did not interfere in the affairs of the Logic class, without having thought repeatedly on the subject, and formed a deliberate and conscientious, even though it may be thought a mistaken, opinion.

## CONSILIARIUS TO ACADEMICUS.

30th September 1836.

I have received your letter of twenty-six 4to pages, and return you many thanks for it. From the introductory paragraph, I presume that you intend it for the public ; indeed I am not so vain as to imagine that you can have bestowed so much pains merely for my private edification. I am convinced, however, that no publication of our correspondence can possibly take place, without a "practical application" to a recent election, although you seem to think otherwise. I am ready to lay the *whole* correspondence before the world. . . . If you object to the printing of the whole, then, let it be understood that I am at liberty to publish (on the general doctrines, without practical application) your first and second series of remarks, fairly quoted, with answers and farther commentaries ; and that in such form, and at such time, as may best suit myself.

## ACADEMICUS TO CONSILIARIUS.

6th October 1836.

I bored you with so long a letter, that I am not surprised at your supposing I intended to print it ; but I beg to assure you that I have no such intention. I have kept a copy of it, which I intend to avail myself of in lectures.

## CONSILIARIUS TO ACADEMICUS.

12th October 1836.

I regret that you are not to publish your letter against Phrenology ; for it contains, I verily believe, all that can well be said on that side, and is expressed in language nowise calculated to offend. I must now devise some mode of replying, without incurring the imputation of drawing you into a controversy, particularly as you state your intention to use that letter in lectures, in which way, of course, I cannot reply to your remarks. The introduction of the subject into lectures will do

B

good ; for some University students will also attend Mr Combe's lectures in Argyle Square, and will thus be led to think, observe, and judge for themselves, which is all that the phrenologists desire. By such means, I trust, it will soon be perceived to which system most credit is due for improvements in education, in the treatment of insanity, in the prevention of crime,—all objects of the first importance. It is pleasing to find that you now freely admit, and even specify, “additions” made to the Reid and Stewart philosophy by the phrenologists. I hope the new Professor of Logic may prove equally ingenious.

10th November 1836.

I have resolved, in compliance with your wishes, to avoid taking any farther notice of the implied censure contained in Sir W. Hamilton's letter to the Council,—of canvassing, &c. I shall likewise leave out every allusion to Mr Taylor, and confine myself to your remarks on Phrenology. I am preparing the article for the Phrenological Journal : I shall quote fairly, the only changes being verbal ones rendered unavoidable.

The general candour of your long letter I acknowledge. But you are perhaps hypercritical in one or two instances : for example, you put more stress on my expression “sweep away,” than my use of it warranted ; for I used it antithetically ; you having alleged that Phrenology could only *add* to Reid and Stewart's philosophy, and I having rejoined that it would “*rather* sweep it away.” Again, when I said that there are “many kinds of memory,” I could not mean that every organ had its distinct “memory” attached to it ; for this would have been like constituting memory an original or separate power, the very thing I was denying.

If the Editors choose to add notes or comments, I shall willingly remain silent, satisfied that the discussion will be conducted by abler hands.

I shall call you Academicus and myself Consiliarius. But any one who has read Mr Hewett Watson's little work, will not fail to perceive who is the Professor alluded to.

17th November 1836.

The editorial remarks have assumed the shape of a Letter from Mr Combe to Consiliarius. Mr C. gives his own name, and he evidently alludes to you, although without naming you. Your reasonings are, I think, completely answered ; but I need scarcely add, that the argument is conducted in a gentleman-like style.

MR G. COMBE TO CONSILIARIUS.

MY DEAR SIR,

EDINBURGH, 15th November 1836.

I have perused, with much interest, the correspondence between you and Academicus, and particularly his letter to you dated 26th September. As he holds the office of a public teacher of Physiology, and has announced his intention of using, in his lectures, the observations on Phrenology contained in that letter; and as I perceive that these observations go deeply into the merits both of the phrenological doctrines themselves, and of the authors who now maintain them; I hope that I may be allowed, without being guilty of presumption, to offer for your consideration some remarks, in answer to the objections and arguments of your friend.

Academicus commences by stating, that he has not studied the evidence adduced by Gall and Spurzheim, and their followers, in regard to the appropriation of different parts of the brain to different faculties, so carefully as perhaps he ought to have done, and he assigns various reasons for this omission. I shall examine these reasons in detail, after having discussed two other points, which he also introduces, and which have more of a preliminary character.

Academicus quotes from Mr Stewart's Preliminary Dissertation a passage, in which that author refers to observations on the intellectual and moral phenomena presented by the minds of our fellow creatures, as sources of instruction to the student of mental philosophy; but Mr Stewart, both professedly and dractically, confines himself essentially to observations on his own consciousness as the basis of his philosophy. In the same Dissertation we find the following sentences: "I have attempted to shew," says Mr Stewart, "that the legitimate province of this department of philosophy extends no farther than to conclusions resting on the solid basis of observation and experiment; and 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 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." (P. 2.) His observations on the minds of others are professedly merely incidental and accessory. He says, "The whole of a philosopher's life, indeed, if he spends it to any purpose, is one continued series of experiments *on his own faculties and powers*; and the superiority he possesses over others, arises chiefly from the

\* These italics are Mr Stewart's own.

general rules (never, perhaps, expressed verbally even to himself) which he has deduced from these experiments." (P. 40.) He proceeds, "As to the minds of *others*, it is undoubtedly but seldom that we have the means of subjecting them to formal and premeditated experiments. But even here, many exceptions occur to the general assertion which I am now combating." (Ibid.) That this is a correct representation of Mr Stewart's opinions admits of abundant proof. In his *Elements of the Philosophy of the Human Mind*, he says: "By confining their attention to the sensible qualities of body, and to the sensible phenomena it exhibits, we know what discoveries natural philosophers have made; and if the labours of metaphysicians shall ever be rewarded with similar success, *it can only be by attentive and patient reflection on the subjects of their own consciousness.*" (P. 8.) Again, in the same work, he says, "My leading object is to ascertain the principles of our nature, in so far as they can be discovered by attention to the subjects of our own consciousness; and to apply these principles to explain the phenomena arising from them." (P. 12.) I therefore regard the observation in your letter to Academicus on this subject as amply borne out by these authorities. Mr Stewart is one of the most inconsistent authors that ever published on the philosophy of mind. In his works a constant conflict is obvious between the results of his vicious system of philosophising and the plain dictates of common observation and reason. In one page his speculative philosophy prevails; while in the next some judicious remarks, obviously drawn from observations on other men, intrude themselves. From this circumstance, Academicus may easily select particular passages in support of his assertion that Mr Stewart's philosophy is not confined to reflection on consciousness as its basis; but not only the passages which I have now quoted, but the general tenor of his writings, and the conclusions at which he arrives, prove the reverse.

Academicus admits, that if the connexion of individual portions of the brain with particular mental acts were ascertained, we should have a manifest addition to our knowledge of the mind, but an addition strictly within the province of the philosophy of Reid and Stewart; and he is particularly anxious to shew that Phrenology, in so far as it shall prove to be true, will be nothing more than an "*addition to their system, formed on their principles,—not a substitution of another.*"

This point is perhaps not very much worth contending about; but my opinion is, that, as the philosophy of Newton swept away the philosophy of Descartes, in the same sense will Phrenology supersede the doctrines of Reid and Stewart, as systems of mental philosophy. So far as the hypothesis of Descartes assumed the

existence and motions of the heavenly bodies, it was not overturned by Newton, whose philosophy was founded on the same physical phenomena; and, in like manner, so far as Dr Reid and Mr Stewart have correctly observed and recorded the phenomena of mind, their observations will preserve their value. But they will be valuable in the same sense and for the same reason that the observations of Shakspeare and Sir Walter Scott on human nature are so—because they are descriptions of real phenomena, and not because they give a true and satisfactory view of the principles and relations of the phenomena, which alone constitutes a science. Academicus reminds me of the Buddhist priests in Ceylon: the missionaries frequently found no great difficulty in convincing them of the excellencies of the Christian religion, which they were willing to engraft upon their own; but they never could be made to admit that Christianity should “sweep away” the doctrines of Buddhu.

Dr Reid and Mr Stewart admitted in general terms, as Academicus does, that a connexion subsists between the mind and the brain; but in their whole doctrines the following considerations are overlooked:—

1. The influence of the condition of the brain, as to age, size, health, and temperament, on the mental manifestations.

2. The connexion of particular parts of the brain with particular mental faculties.

3. The influence of the size and condition of each particular part on the mental faculty which it serves to manifest.

A description of the phenomena of mind, omitting these considerations, bears the same relation to mental science which a detail of the phenomena of vision, omitting all notice of the structure of the eye and its laws of action, would bear to optics. Science is perfect only in proportion as it embraces and elucidates the causes and relations of the phenomena of which it treats. Tried by this test, the philosophy of Reid and Stewart is extremely defective; for it omits all practical consideration of the material organs of the mind, on the condition of which depend its power of acting in this life, the degree of its vigour, the soundness of its perceptions, and the strength of its different functions.

Not only is it chargeable with these actual deficiencies, but its methods do not admit of their being supplied. Mr Stewart, as I have said, repeatedly refers to our own consciousness as the grand source of information in mental philosophy, to which Academicus adds “inferences as to the mental acts of others;” but neither reflection on consciousness, nor inferences regarding the mental acts of others, will enable us to discover the influence of the brain on the mental faculties. We are not conscious of the influence of the organs on the faculties, and, in observing the actions of other

men, we do not perceive indications of the influence of their brains. We must go a step farther. We must compare the condition, as to size, health, age, and temperament of their brains, and of each particular part of them, with their powers of manifesting the mind and its particular faculties; and, whatever "fallacies" this method may be liable to, no progress can possibly be made in discovering the influence of the organization until this shall be done.

Academicus is disposed to admit the connection of the fore part of the brain with the strictly intellectual acts, and of the propensities and sentiments with the upper and back parts of it. This connection, in favour of which he thinks there is a strong probability, could not be discovered except by comparing the power of manifesting those mental powers with the condition of those parts of the brain; and why not pursue the same method into its more minute details? This is like a naturalist who should admit orders and genera, but refuse to inquire into the characteristics of species and varieties, on the ground that this last investigation (although identical in its principles with that which had led him to make these admissions) appeared to him "to be liable to very considerable fallacies."

The imperfect and erroneous nature of the methods pursued in Reid and Stewart's philosophy becomes apparent when contemplated in their results.

*First*, In regard to the *feelings*.—Phrenologists admit that Reid and Stewart, and other metaphysical authors, have enumerated, under the head of the "active powers," a number of primitive desires and emotions, which are found to have organs in the brain; for instance the love of offspring, the love of fame, the desire of society, and some others: But they observe, *1st*, That no notice is taken by these authors of the influence of the condition of particular parts of the brain, on the vigour with which these and the other desires are experienced, and that this influence is so important, that the mere enumeration of the emotions, without adverting to the organs, is no more entitled to be regarded as the science of mind, than observations on the revolutions of the planets considered apart from the laws of motion and gravitation are entitled to be called the science of astronomy; *2dly*, That many desires and emotions are altogether omitted in their enumerations, such as the inclination to destroy, the tendency to conceal, the tendency to construct, the tendency to venerate, and others; *3dly*, That the existence of the most important tendencies and emotions is a subject of dispute among them, while their principles of investigation afford no satisfactory means of settling the differences of opinion: for example, Mr Stewart denies that the love of property is a primitive faculty of the mind, and ascribes avarice to association; he and

Reid admit a benevolent affection, while Hobbes and others deny it; he and Brown admit a native sentiment of justice, while Mandeville, Hume, and Paley reject it, and Sir James Mackintosh considers conscience as a compound result of many affections. While philosophers refer only to their own consciousness, they cannot settle these disputes satisfactorily; because some men are conscious, and others are not conscious, of the emotions. Even when they call in the aid of observation on the acts of other men, they fail to arrive at certainty; because if the observer be deficient in the feeling himself, he does not easily recognise it in the acts of others, but is apt to ascribe their manifestations of it to other affections better known to himself: and, moreover, some men do, while others do not, manifest these feelings, so that two observers might report different results, and each adduce real instances in support of his conclusion.

By the phrenological method of observation, these difficulties are greatly diminished. Each student is informed that he has the strongest consciousness of those inclinations and emotions, the organs of which are largest in his own brain. If he be very deficient in the organ of Conscientiousness, he is warned that his own consciousness is not a trustworthy index of the existence and strength of the feeling in other men. If he possess that organ large, then he is acquainted with the emotion, and he is capable of observing the presence or absence of its manifestations in other men. By comparing the size of a certain part of the brain with the vigour of this emotion, he may obtain demonstrative evidence of its existence. Cases of imperfect manifestation of it by some individuals, if found in connection with a deficiency in the organ, will become additional proofs of its existence, instead of operating as facts negative of its reality.

*Secondly, in regard to the intellectual faculties.*—Academicus affirms, that the phrenologists, in contending for the existence of different faculties of Form, Colouring, and others, merely use the term *faculty* in a different sense from that in which it is employed by Reid and Stewart. He says that Reid and Stewart described “distinctions among the acts of the mind themselves;” while the phrenologists, in the instances now mentioned, arrange the study according to the *objects* to which these acts are directed. There are much greater differences than these,—the extent of which will again appear by the results. The phrenologists admit Perception, Conception, Memory, Imagination, and Judgment, to be *acts* of the mind, but not faculties. What they mean by a faculty will be understood by taking the example of an organ. There is an organ of Colouring, for instance. When it is large and active, the individual is capable of perceiving, conceiving, remembering, and imagining colours, with vigour and facility;

when it is slightly deficient, he is capable of perceiving and remembering them, but has little power of imagination in regard to them—he could not, for instance, invent new combinations of them to enable him to paint unwonted appearances of colours in nature; when more deficient, he is capable only of perceiving, but not of remembering them; and when very deficient, he cannot even perceive them distinctly. When the organ is spontaneously active, he conceives colours vividly; when it is stimulated by disease, he sees colours that have no outward existence. The same illustrations might be given in regard to the organs and faculties of Form, Number, and others. Now, what Reid and Stewart did was to describe the acts of perception, conception, memory, imagination, and judgment, in general, and to call these *faculties*. The extent of difference between this and the phrenological method of expounding the science of mind, admits of easy illustration.

Imagine one physiologist, when treating of secretion, to describe its mere general phenomena, and to mention that these are performed by the body in general; and another to proceed to an exposition of the stomach, as the organ which secretes the gastric juice, of the liver as that which secretes bile, and of the salivary glands as those which secrete saliva. Suppose the latter farther to point out the structure, modes of action, and relations of each of these organs, and to explain the effects of the state of it on its own peculiar secretions; suppose him also to describe the phenomena which are common to all these secreting organs, and to deduce general laws applicable to them all, but still to discriminate the peculiar functions, modes of action, and laws of each—which would have best unfolded the *science* of secretion? Undoubtedly the latter.

Again, suppose one philosopher to describe *sensation* as a general mental power, and the body as its organ; and another to distinguish each variety of sensation, to ascribe it to its own peculiar organ, and to expound the effect which the state of that organ had on the sensations connected with it—which of them would deserve the credit of having taught the *philosophy* of sensation? Assuredly the one who had expounded the particular organs. And would it not be more correct to apply the term *faculty* to each of the senses, than to use that word in reference to some general act performed alike by them all?

These cases are illustrations of the differences between the philosophy of the intellectual faculties taught by Reid and Stewart, and that expounded by Gall and Spurzheim, and their followers.

Farther, what opinion should we form of the physiologist who, having announced that secretion in general is performed by the body in general, should affirm that those who opposed



this notion, and who had established distinct organs of secretion, with distinct products, had merely classified the phenomena of secretion *according to their products*, and made *additions to his system*? We should admire his confidence more than his discrimination; yet this is parallel to the statement of Academicus, that Drs Gall and Spurzheim have only classified the mental phenomena *according to their objects*, and made additions to the philosophy of Reid and Stewart. It would be necessary to "sweep away" the whole doctrine of secretion being one general function, and of its being performed by one general organ, before a single step could be made in establishing the sound philosophy of that function; and the same conclusion holds good in regard to the intellectual philosophy of Reid and Stewart.

The organs of the different faculties exist and produce their natural effects, and common language is full of expressions indicative of the existence and activity of the related faculties. For example, men speak of individuals as being addicted to pride, to avarice, or to vanity; of others, as having talents for drawing, or for painting, or for mechanics, and so on; while other individuals are mentioned as being deficient in these powers. These facts have intruded themselves as it were into the writings of Dr Reid and Mr Stewart, but they form no part of their philosophy. Indeed, they are excluded by that of Mr Stewart. After enumerating Consciousness, Perception, Attention, Conception, &c. as intellectual powers, he adds: "Besides these intellectual faculties, 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 intellectual *habits* acquired in the different professions of life."—(Outlines of Mor. Phil. p. 16.)

According to the phrenological system, a genius for poetry depends on a fine temperament, combined with a large development of certain parts of the brain. A genius for music depends on certain *other* parts being highly developed; and a genius for mathematics on still *other* parts being largely possessed; high temperament being always added. According to Mr Stewart's philosophy, these powers are not the gifts of nature, but are gradually formed by particular habits of study or of business. Nothing can be more dissimilar than these results, and the cause of the dissimilarity is to be found in the difference of the modes of philosophizing adopted by him and the phrenologists. He mistook mere general acts of all the intellectual faculties for faculties themselves. Perception, for instance, is

the result of the lowest degree of activity in each of the phrenological organs devoted to Intellect, such as Form, Colouring, Number, &c. Conception results from another mode of action in each of these; and Imagination from a third mode of action. But there is the same difference between these modes of action and the primitive faculties themselves that there is between Sensation, regarded as a general power, and Vision, Smell, and Hearing, as particular faculties of sensation.

In point of fact, the philosophy of Conception, Perception, Memory, and Imagination, was not known until it was explained by phrenologists; and so far was Mr Stewart from being acquainted with it, that in his philosophical writings there is a confounding of primitive faculties with modes of action, and with the laws of their action, which proves that he had not attained to systematic views on the subject. The following sentence, which occurs in the very threshold of his Elements, affords a striking illustration of this remark:—"Upon a slight attention to the operations of our own mind," says he, "they appear to be so complicated, and so infinitely diversified, that it seems to be impossible to reduce them to any general laws. In consequence, however, of a more accurate examination, the prospect clears up; and the phenomena which appeared at first to be too various for our comprehension, are found to be the result of a comparatively small number of simple and uncompounded faculties, or of simple and uncompounded principles of action." It is extremely difficult to comprehend the *distinction* between "*faculties*" and "*principles of action*," which is obviously implied in the terms of this sentence. Mr Stewart proceeds: "*These faculties and principles are the GENERAL LAWS of our constitution*, and hold the same place in the philosophy of mind, that the general laws we investigate in physics hold in that branch of science." This is evidently erroneous. The propensity of Destructiveness, for example, is a primitive faculty, and it acts according to certain laws. One of these laws is, that it is excited by injury or provocation; and that it lies dormant when its possessor is gratified. Under certain influences it may become diseased, and then it is a law of its constitution that it becomes extremely vigorous, and ungovernable by the other faculties, and that it adds greatly to the energy of muscular action. The propensity itself is a primitive faculty of our nature, and the phenomena which it exhibits take place regularly, and this regularity is metaphorically expressed by saying that it acts according to certain laws, which are called laws of our constitution; but there is a want of discrimination in mistaking the laws which the propensity observes, or its mode of action, for the propensity itself, which Mr Stewart here obviously does. The same want of penetration is apparent in his remark in re-

gard to the objects of our investigation in physical science. It is true, that in astronomy, the objects of our investigation are the *laws* which the principle of gravitation obeys; but in chemistry, which is equally a physical science, the elements and the inherent properties or qualities of substances, whatever these may be, are the ultimate object of investigation, just as the primitive faculties are in mind. The modes of action of chemical substances, and the laws which they obey, are obviously distinct objects of study from the substances themselves. The mineralogist, for instance, studies the diamond, simply as it exists; while the chemist investigates its elements, and its modes of action when exposed to heat and other external influences. Again, it has long been disputed, what *caloric* is in itself, whether it be a *substance*, or a *state* merely arising from certain modes of action in matter. But the laws which it obeys in being radiated, in being reflected, and in being concentrated, are clearly distinct objects of consideration from its substance, and yet Mr Stewart confounds them. This incapacity to discriminate between primitive faculties and their modes of action, runs through almost all his writings. Sometimes he recognises original principles distinctly, as in pp. 367, 371, 372. On other occasions, he loses sight of the distinction between them and modes of action.

Having thus stated the extent to which the philosophy of Dr Gall will "sweep away" that of Reid and Stewart, and the differences between them, I revert to the reasons of Academicus "for not studying so carefully as perhaps he ought to have done," the evidence adduced by the phrenologists. He says, "Measurement of skulls, and comparison of these with the known characters of their owners, have always appeared to me to be liable to *very considerable fallacies*, affecting both the *physical* and the *mental* parts of these observations; and, therefore, to be inadequate to the purpose of fixing the size of the different portions of the brain, *unless supported and confirmed by other observations*. I can conceive them to derive that support and confirmation from three sources,—from comparative anatomy,—from the results of experiments on animals,—and from the effects of injury or disease of individual portions of the brain in the human body. But, after taking some pains in the inquiry, I have come to the conclusion, that *from none of these sources of information is there any confirmation* of the special appropriation of the different parts of the brain to the different acts of mind, which the phrenologists consider as ascertained."

These reasons are not philosophical. It must either be, or not be, possible to compare the size and condition of different parts of the brain with the mental powers and dispositions ma-

nifested by individuals. If it be *possible*, the thing should be done, without regard to its deriving support and confirmation from any other source. Difficulty offers no apology for not doing it. Academicus, standing in the situation of a public teacher, seems bound, in duty to his pupils, to make reasonable efforts in order to ascertain whether so great an addition to human knowledge in his department as the discovery of the functions of different parts of the brain has in reality been made.

Phrenology is a science of observation, and the most rational, the most certain, and the most speedy way of ascertaining the real merits of its pretensions is, for the inquirer to repeat the observations in the manner pointed out, after duly qualifying himself to do so. It is strange that there should be so great an aversion to follow this plain course in regard to Phrenology. Dr Roget proposed to inquire into the competency of Drs Gall and Spurzheim to make their alleged discoveries, before he would put them to the test of observation; and now, Academicus abstains from studying the evidence, because it appears to him to be liable to "very considerable fallacies," unless supported by other observations. Phrenologists have never asked any one to admit their doctrines on the faith of their recorded cases, but have constantly said,—Appeal to nature. Academicus would have ascertained the truth of Phrenology by appealing to Nature in half the time that he has spent in arguing the question whether he should do so or not.

But I shall advert to the alleged sources of fallacy themselves.

The *first* element in the evidence in favour of phrenology is, that the size of the different parts of the brain (the functions of which are described as ascertained), may be discovered during life. This, I presume, is the physical part of the fallacies. On this point I refer to the following authorities.

Magendie, in his *Compendium of Physiology*, says, that "the only way of estimating the *volume of the brain* in a living person, is to *measure the dimensions of the skull*; every other means, even that proposed by Camper, is uncertain."

Sir Charles Bell also observes, "that the bones of the head are moulded to the brain, and the peculiar shapes of the bones of the head are determined by the original peculiarity in the shape of the brain." Dr Gordon likewise, in the 49th number of the *Edinburgh Review*, has the following words: "But we will acquiesce implicitly for the present in the proposition (familiar to physiologists long before the age of Gall and Spurzheim), that there is, in most instances, a general correspondence between the size of the cranium and the quantity of cerebrum; that large heads usually contain large brains, and small heads small brains."—(P. 246.)

If the whole skull indicate correctly the size of the whole brain, it is not unreasonable to believe that the development of different parts of it, with certain exceptions (which are stated by phrenologists), will indicate the size of different parts of the brain.

2dly, As to the *mental* fallacies, by which I presume Academicus means the difficulty of ascertaining the real character of the individual observed. I have discussed this subject in my *System of Phrenology*, 4th edition, p. 85-7. But there is another answer, which Academicus will perhaps find more constringent. In the second paragraph of his letter he says, that the foundations of the philosophy of Reid and Stewart are "*inferences as to the mental acts of others*," as well as consciousness of mental actions in ourselves." The words here in Italics must mean, that the philosophy of Reid and Stewart is founded partly on observations made on the mental acts of other men. If such observations be competent to afford a foundation for their philosophy, why is the same practice liable to very considerable fallacies when resorted to by phrenologists?

Academicus states, however, as a further apology for not studying the evidence, that the conclusions drawn by the phrenologists derive no support or confirmation "from comparative anatomy,—from the results of experiments on animals,—from the effects of injury or disease of individual portions of the brain." I beg leave to offer a few observations on each of these topics.

1st, As to Comparative Anatomy. Cuvier, speaking of the cerebral lobes being the place "where all the sensations take a distinct form, and leave durable impressions;" 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."—(Report to the French Institute in 1822 on the Experiments of Flourens.) And it is elsewhere stated by the same eminent naturalist, that "*certain parts* of the brain, in all classes of animals, are *large or small* according to *certain qualities* of the animals."—(Anat. Comp. tom. ii) This is pretty strong authority; to which more might be added. The general conclusions from the comparative anatomy of the brain are ably stated in the 94th number of the *Edinburgh Review*: "It is in the nervous system alone that we can trace a gradual progress in the provision for the subordination of one (animal) to another, and of all to man; and are enabled to associate every faculty which gives superiority with some addition to the nervous mass, even from the smallest indications of sensation and will, up to the highest degree of sensibility, judgment, and expression. The brain is observed progressively to be improved in its structure, and, with reference to the spinal mar-

row and nerves, augmented in volume more and more, until we reach the human brain, each addition being marked by some addition to, or amplification of, the powers of the animal,—until in man we behold it possessing some parts of which animals are destitute, and wanting none which theirs possess.”

Is Academicus acquainted with Dr Vimont’s “Treatise on Human and Comparative Phrenology?” In that work Dr Vimont delineates, in plates possessing the highest qualities of fidelity and beauty, the brains and skulls of a variety of animals, and points out the connexion between particular parts and particular instincts or powers. Academicus will probably treat this work with contempt, because Dr Vimont is a phrenologist. Dr Vimont, however, was an antiphrenologist until he made the investigations which he has now published; and it was Nature that forced him to change his opinions. Further, his plates are visible and tangible; the brains and skulls of the animals delineated are easily accessible; and their instincts are, in many particulars, generally acknowledged. On what principle of reason, then, is Academicus entitled to avert his eyes and his understanding from such facts; and, without being able to affirm that they are erroneous, to allege that they afford no confirmation of the appropriation of different faculties to different parts of the brain?

Academicus proceeds: “Indeed, as to comparative anatomy, you must probably be aware, that the result of observations in that science goes completely to disprove the idea, that any fixed relation exists in the different tribes of animals, between the degree of intelligence that can be observed in them, and the size or complexity of structure, or *indeed any circumstance of structure* that has yet been pointed out in their brains.”

My information on this subject is very different. Desmoulins and Magendie state (*Anatomie des Systèmes Nerveux des Animaux vertébrés*, p. 620), that in numerous examinations of the brains of almost every genus of the mammalia, they found a nearly constant relation between the extent of surface presented by the brain in each genus, and the amount of intelligence displayed by it. Where differences occur in one of these points, differences are stated to be usually found in the other, not only between different genera, but between different species of the same genus, and also between different individuals of the same species. Professor Tiedemann of Heidelberg, in his work on the Brains of Apes and of some other animals, has accurately delineated and described the progressive diminution and final disappearance of the folds of the brain in the mammalia, from the Apes down to the Rodentia; and, according to Desmoulins (p. 602), this progression corresponds exactly with the diminution of intelligence. The most striking difference

exists between the apes of the old world and those of the new. Many of the former are capable of being trained and employed for useful purposes, while the latter are incapable of instruction, and scarcely exceed squirrels in the degree of their intelligence. This corresponds with the state of the convolutions. In some dogs, especially those employed in hunting, the convolutions are scarcely less numerous and deep than in the higher tribes of apes; while in the less intelligent species, and in wolves, they exist in a much inferior degree of development. Every one must have been struck by the great difference as to docility observable between dogs and cats; an equally striking difference is found in the appearances presented by the number and depth of the convolutions of their brains—a difference so great, that Desmoulins estimates the convolutions of the dog to exceed by six or eight times those of the cat. The paucity of convolutions found in the cat prevails throughout the entire genus to which it belongs. That genus, *Felis*, which includes the cat, lion, tiger, panther, and other animals of a similar nature, is likewise remarkable for the *uniformity* observed in the number and arrangement of the convolutions in the different species; and in no genus are the species more distinguished for similarity of disposition, for through none do the faculties of Secretiveness and Destructiveness prevail in so extreme a degree of strength.

Sir Charles Bell observes: “When we compare the structure of the brain in different animals, we find that in certain lower classes there are no convolutions; the surface of the cineritious matter is uniform. As we ascend in the scale of beings, we find the extent of the cineritious matter increased. To admit of this, it is convoluted, and the depth of the sulci is the consequence of the extension of the great cineritious mass; and in man above all other animals are the convolutions numerous and the sulci deep, and consequently the cineritious mass, and its extension of surface, far beyond that of all other creatures.” (*Anatomy*, vol. ii. p. 385.)

Farther, I have pointed out to hundreds of students the difference between the skulls of carnivorous and herbivorous animals; between the tiger and the sheep; between the cat, dog, and fox, and the doe; and between the cat and the hare, in the region immediately above and behind the ear, the situation of the organs of Destructiveness and Secretiveness. The parts are so much larger in the carnivorous than the herbivorous animals, that it is impossible to fail in perceiving the difference, unless the eyes be utterly blinded by prejudice. I have exhibited also the difference between the skull of the beaver and that of the dog and fox in the region of Constructiveness. Does Academicus deny these facts; or has he only not attend-



ed to them? They assuredly afford some confirmation of the appropriation of different parts of the brain to different instincts in these animals.

Finally on this topic: Academicus admits that there are reasonable grounds for ascribing the intellect to the anterior lobe, and the feelings to the posterior and upper regions of the brain. *Quæritur*, Where did he find the evidence for this opinion? The method of direct comparison of size with manifestations is liable, he says, to "very considerable fallacies," and he has never practised it; while comparative anatomy, according to him, "goes completely to disprove the idea that any relation exists between the degree of intelligence and any circumstance of size or structure in the brain." If these sources of information be excluded, it will be difficult for him to shew the reasonableness of the admissions which he is disposed to make.

*3dly*, The next reason assigned by Academicus for not studying the evidence adduced by Gall and Spurzheim and their followers is, that their conclusions are not supported by "the results of experiments on animals." On this topic I shall simply refer you to the following report of a discourse delivered by Sir Charles Bell before the Anatomical Section of the British Association, which appeared in the Scotsman newspaper of the 13th September 1834.

"On Thursday and Friday, there was a numerous attendance in the Anatomical Section, when Sir Charles Bell gave an interesting exposition of his views of the nervous system. He was the first to demonstrate what other physiologists had previously conjectured to be probable, viz. the existence of separate nerves of motion and of sensation. His statement was a recapitulation of his publications, and we did not observe that he added any new facts. In several particulars we were gratified by his exposition, as marking the certain, although slow, progress of truth. Dr Spurzheim, when he visited Edinburgh in 1816, maintained that the uses of the brain could not be philosophically ascertained by mutilations of the brains of animals; but he was ridiculed for saying so, and it was asserted that this was one of his numerous back-doors for escaping from adverse evidence. Flourens and Magendie in France, Sir William Hamilton here, and various other individuals, have, in the interval, performed numerous experiments on the brains of the lower creatures, and published results which have been extensively cited as evidence against Phrenology. Yesterday, Sir Charles Bell explicitly stated, that he also had made such experiments, and had obtained no satisfactory results; and he then shewed why he had failed, and why all other experimenters must fail who pursue this method of inquiry. These experiments always, and necessarily, involve a great shock to the



niervous system in general, and cannot be confined in their effects to the part cut out. We may add,—If we do not know what office the part performs in health, how can we know whether the function has ceased *in consequence of* the ablation or not? It may be true, that if we were to cut out the organ of Tune from the brain of a canary, the bird would never sing again; but if, in ignorance of what part is that organ, we were to cut out any other portion of the brain, with a view to discover it, we should be disappointed; because, whatever part we injured, the effect on its singing would always be the same; it would cease to sing, for the obvious reason that singing and a mangled brain are not compatible in nature. We rejoiced to hear this method of investigation renounced and condemned by so great an authority."

*4thly*, The last reason of Academicus for not studying the evidence is, that the results derive no support or confirmation from "the effects of injury or disease of individual portions of the brain." Such a statement could proceed only from a person who had confined his reading to the reports of non-phrenological or of anti-phrenological authors. In the Phrenological Journal, as well as in other phrenological publications, there are many well authenticated cases, shewing that these results receive the strongest confirmation and support from the effects of disease or injury of individual portions of the brain. Among the testimonials which I had the honour of presenting to the Town Council of Edinburgh in June and July 1836, when I became a candidate for the Logic Chair, are several from physicians to lunatic asylums, who testify in direct opposition to the assumption made by Academicus. Sir W. C. Ellis, superintendent of the Asylum at Hanwell, says: "It is unnecessary for him to inform Mr Combe that, residing amidst 600 lunatics, no day passes over in which the truth of Phrenology is not exemplified." Dr James Scott, surgeon to the Royal Hospital at Haslar, and medical superintendent of the Royal Naval Lunatic Asylum, says: "As I have been for nearly ten years the medical attendant of the Lunatic Asylum in this great hospital, my opportunities, at least, of observing have been great indeed; and a daily intercourse with the unfortunate individuals entrusted to my care and management (whose number has never been less than one hundred and thirty persons, and often many more), has firmly, because experimentally, convinced me that mental disorder and moral delinquency can be rationally combated *only* by the application of Phrenology." H. A. Galbraith, Esq., surgeon to the Glasgow Royal Lunatic Asylum, says: "Situated as I am in the midst of a wide field for observation, more particularly in regard to disordered mental manifestations, I have been for several years past led to compare these with the phre-

nological development of the individuals in whom they appeared ; and from the result of numerous and well-marked instances, which have not only been known to me during a state of morbid activity, but from authentic accounts of the previous mental indications, I have not the least hesitation in declaring my firm belief in the general doctrines of Phrenology." Many other certificates to a similar purport were brought forward by me on that occasion, and copies of the whole of them were presented by me to Academicus. I do not say that he was bound on that evidence to embrace Phrenology ; but, with all deference, these testimonials render his statement that the results of Drs Gall and Spurzheim's investigations derive *no* confirmation from " the effects of injury or *disease* of individual portions of the brain," not entirely credible, and scarcely leave him an adequate apology on this ground for delaying to " study the evidence" by a direct appeal to nature.

While, however, Academicus practises a boundless caution and incredulity in regard to every fact, argument, and doctrine brought forward by phrenologists, these mental qualities appear to forsake him when he considers facts, doctrines, or experiments brought forward by persons adverse to the science. He disbelieves in the cerebellum being the organ of Amativeness, because this is affirmed by Dr Gall, and he believes in its office being to regulate " muscular motions," because this is asserted by Magendie and Flourens. I venture to ask him, whether, in forming these opinions, he has read and candidly weighed the evidence adduced by Dr Gall in his " *Physiologie du Cerveau*" on this point, and given due weight to the observations of Sir Charles Bell on the effects of mutilations of the brain, in considering the experiments of Flourens and Magendie ? He knows that the nature of the details given by Gall prevents the phrenologists from printing them in merely popular works ; but as a scientific inquirer he was bound to consider them in their original records. My suspicion is, that he has omitted " to study the evidence adduced by Gall and Spurzheim and their followers on this subject so carefully as perhaps he ought to have done," and by this supposition alone is it possible to account for his rejecting the one and embracing the other opinion. Dr Broussais, in his lecture on the functions of the cerebellum, reported in the *Lancet* of 30th July 1836, accounts in a manner that appears to me satisfactory, for the effects of mutilations of the cerebellum on muscular motion, in perfect consistency with the functions ascribed to that organ by Dr Gall.

Academicus remarks, that " a book on intellectual or moral philosophy going in a few years through many editions, may be safely set down as a very superficial book." The same might be said of a book on any other science ; yet Sir John

Herschel's Discourse on Natural Philosophy has gone through many editions in a few years, and it is generally regarded as being a very profound and able work. Superficiality alone will not render a book on any subject acceptable to numerous readers: there must be something more. If the work address itself to strong existing prejudices, it may be temporarily successful and yet superficial. Beattie's Essay on Truth, as contrasted with Hume's Essays, is an example in point. But if a work oppose public opinion, if its author enjoyed no previous or extrinsic reputation, if it have been combated and dissected by men of the first talents, and if, nevertheless, it have constantly advanced in estimation and circulation, the conclusion does not inevitably follow that its success has been owing entirely to its superficiality. It *may* have advocated important truths in so clear and forcible a manner as to have interested numerous reflecting men, and on this account have been successful.

Academicus is pleased to conclude by expressing his opinion, that "the injudicious pretensions of the present supporters of Phrenology will ultimately be fatal to the personal reputation of most of our present phrenological authors." As I have the misfortune to be one of these authors, my remarks on this sentence must be received with due qualification; but as he has raised a question of *pretensions*, I leave the public to judge whether his condemnation, uttered avowedly without having studied the evidence, betokens greater or less modesty than my asseverations in favour of certain propositions, *after* having examined the proofs. Allowing for a great superiority in genius, perspicacity, and learning, on the side of Academicus, the study of the *evidence* may be reasonably allowed to add *something* to the probabilities of my assertions being true. This point, however, the public alone are competent to settle. It is probable that the contests which are now maintained on this subject may ultimately prove fatal to the reputation either of the phrenological authors or of their opponents:—*which* is more likely to suffer, it is not my province to decide. If I look forward with confidence to the ultimate decision, it is, *first*, because I *have*, in all humility and with all assiduity, *studied the evidence* adduced on the subject, and have endeavoured, so far as in me lay, to advance no opinions which are not warranted by evidence; and, *secondly*, because I find that the more narrowly intelligent inquirers have examined into the facts, they are disposed to recognize the greater extent of truth in the doctrines which I advocate. You, for instance, who have examined them, entertain a more favourable opinion of these arguments than Academicus, who has not seen reason to do so. The history of science has presented some examples of men opposing great

and important discoveries, whose reputations were not advanced in the estimation of posterity by such applications of their talents. A writer in the 94th Number of the *Edinburgh Review*, alluding to the opponents of Harvey, says: "The discoverer of the circulation of the blood,—a discovery which, if measured by its consequences on physiology and medicine, was the greatest ever made since physic was cultivated,—suffers no diminution of his reputation in our day, from the incredulity with which his doctrine was received by some, the effrontery with which it was claimed by others, or the knavery with which it was attributed to former physiologists, by those who could not deny, and would not praise it. The very names of these envious and dishonest enemies of Harvey are scarcely remembered; and the honour of this great discovery now rests, beyond all dispute, with the great philosopher who made it." If the great doctrines of Phrenology as now taught shall be ultimately approved of by competent judges who *have* studied the evidence, posterity will probably be disposed to pronounce a similar judgment on the merits of those who have rejected and opposed them. If the doctrines, when thus tried, shall be found at variance with Nature, the reputation of all phrenological authors will most deservedly vanish.

Finally; in judging of the merits of living phrenological authors, it is necessary to keep in view to what their pretensions relate. They maintain that Dr Gall has discovered the functions of many particular parts of the brain, and that this discovery is of great importance in medicine and mental science. They offer to his memory the homage of a profound and sincere admiration, on account of his having made this valuable addition to human knowledge; and affirm that those individuals whose duty it is to study the evidence of his discovery and apply it, but who neglect to do so, are not deserving of esteem for this omission; but here their pretensions stop. They claim no merit in the discovery for themselves, they boast of no superiority of talents or of general learning over their adversaries; on the contrary, they allow to them every possible advantage on these points, and limit their own pretensions to the humble merit of having observed and interrogated Nature on this subject, while their more gifted opponents, in the pride of their own greatness, have closed their understandings against "evidence" which obtrudes on their attention. To have pretended to less, would have been to prove traitors to the cause of truth; that they have pretended to more, is an unjust accusation against them.—I am, my dear Sir, yours very sincerely,

GEO. COMBE.

Since this article was in the press, a communication from Academicus has been received by Consiliarius, and transmitted to us. We shall give it in the exact words of Academicus.

17th November 1836.

As to the publication of the substance of my letter to you in the Phrenological Journal, I beg to express only two wishes—1. That it may be stated that it was not at my desire that it was published; and 2. That it may appear from what is published, as I think it must from the letter itself,\* that I give no farther opinion as to the *truth* of the peculiar doctrines of Phrenology than this—that the evidence does not appear to me satisfactory. It *may* be all true for any thing I know; and if I shall see evidence which shall seem to me conclusive, I shall be most happy to adopt it all; for I think I can truly say, that in matters of science I care for nothing earthly but the truth. It is to the *pretensions* of Phrenology—supposing all that they assume to be established—to supersede or set aside, or *sweep away* (I still think your own phrase accurately expresses the usual opinion of phrenologists on the scope and bearing of their science), all the old Philosophy of Mind, that I set myself in opposition.

That my arguments will be completely answered to the satisfaction of the readers of the Phrenological Journal (who, I presume, are all phrenologists), I have no doubt. That they will be so to the satisfaction of the rest of the world, or that the rest of the world will know or care whether they are answered or not, is perhaps more doubtful.

As you mention the work of Mr Hewett Watson, which he was so good as to send me, I trouble you with an observation on a passage in it, criticizing a sentence of mine. I had said, that the brain proper appears, from experiments and morbid appearances, to be the residence of *thought*; and he accuses me of not knowing that many of the *propensities* and *sentiments* are placed by Gall and Spurzheim in the brain,—supposing that I exclude them when I speak of *thought*. Now I used the word as a general one, to express *all* strictly *mental acts*, as distinguished from sensations, and from voluntary muscular efforts. Probably I should have used the general term *mental acts*. But if I had meant to restrict the term to the intellectual powers, as he supposes I did, I should have used the term *intellect*. This explanation shews that his criticism of my observation is founded on misapprehension of my meaning.

---

\* The letter itself is published entire, as far as Phrenology is concerned.—  
EDIT.