

Hence the attractive affections are far more easy to be expressed by the painter than by the poet, and fall immediately within the range of classical sculpture, which limits itself to the calm and the dignified, and has rarely been known to wander into the regions of intensity, distortion, or violence.

The poet, incapable of catching those transient lights and shades, that unutterable play of feature into feature, by which the passions of this class are chiefly distinguished from each other, is compelled to have recourse to collateral imagery, complex personification, or allegorical accompaniments. To this remark it will be difficult to find an exception in any writer. Let us take Collins as an example, who is one of the best and boldest of our lyric bards. His description of Hope, in his celebrated Ode to the Passions, is exquisitely fine, but, after all, somewhat indefinite; the whole of its figure being that of a beautiful nymph, with fair eyes, an enchanting smile, and wavy golden hair, accompanied with a lyre or some other instrument, for we are not told what, which she strikes to a song of future or prospective pleasure, amid the echo of surrounding and responsive rocks, and woods, and valleys.

But thou, O Hope, with eyes so fair,
What was thy delighted measure?
Still it whisper'd promised pleasure,
And bade the lovely scenes at distance hail.
Still would her touch the strain prolong,
And from the rocks, the woods, the vale,
She call'd on Echo still through all the song,
And where her sweetest theme she chose,
A soft responsive voice was heard at every close,
And Hope enchanted smiled, and waved her golden hair.

The portrait is graceful, elegant, and animated; but I may venture to say, that the only real expression of the character of Hope, is derived, not from the features of her person, but from the subject of her song, the whisper of promised pleasure, the hail of distant scenes. I say not this, however, as a proof of the imperfection of the artists, but of the art itself.

Let us try another description from the same captivating production. The *mellow horn* having just been sounded and laid down by MELANCHOLY, the poet proceeds as follows:—

But O how alter'd was its sprightlier tone
When CHEERFULNESS, a nymph of healthiest hue,
Her bow across her shoulders slung,
Her buskins gemm'd with morning dew,
Blew an inspiring air, that dale and thicket rung,
The hunter's call, to Faun and Dryad known.
The oak-crown'd sisters and their chaste-eyed queen,
Satyrs and sylvan boys were seen
Peeping from forth their alleys green;
Brown Exercise rejoiced to hear,
And Sport leap'd up, and seized his beechen spear.

The remark I have just made will apply to the whole of this admirable group, than which a finer or more correct and accordant was never offered to the world. The passion of CHEERFULNESS gives, indeed, a specific expression and character to the countenance that sufficiently identifies it to the beholder, and is sufficiently capable of being seized and fixed by the painter; but it is not calculated for poetry, and the only feature Mr. Collins has copied into his description is that of a *healthy hue*. But he has admirably atoned for this poverty of his art by the picturesque scenery and associates with which he has surrounded her, and in which the province of poetry has an inexhaustible mine of wealth: and as much exceeds that of painting as painting exceeds poetry in the delineation of specific features and attitudes. Cheerfulness, though not distinguishable by the features of her person, is sufficiently made known to us by the company she keeps, by her attire, her manner, and her accoutrements.

One of the finest pictures and sweetest groupings of this allegorical kind to be met with in our own language, is contained in the following verses of Dr. Darwin's Ode to May in his Botanic Garden. They are worthy of Anacreon or Pindar.

Born in yon blaze of orient sky,
Sweet May, thy radiant form unfold;
Unclose thy blue, voluptuous eye,
And wave thy shadowy locks of gold.
For thee the fragrant zephyrus blow;
For thee descends the sunny shower;
The rills in softer murmurs flow,
And brighter blossoms gem the bower.
Light Graces, dress'd in flowry wreaths,
And tip-toe joys their hands combine;
While Love the fond contagion breathes,
And, laughing, dances round thy shrine.

This subject is a pleasing one; but it swells before me to infinity, and I must drop it. In the lecture for next week, we shall enter upon the doctrine of physiognomy, or the permanent influence of the mind upon the exterior of the body.

LECTURE XIII.

ON PHYSIOGNOMY AND CRANIOGNOMY, OR THE EXPRESSION OF THE TEMPER AND TALENTS.

The ingenuity of man is never satisfied with research. In tracing out the disposition of the mind by the variable features of the face, it has been discovered that this last, though a general criterion, is not always an infallible sign. It does not in every instance, it is said, disclose even the present and acting emotion; for, in some persons, the symbols are naturally slight and evanescent; while in others, from a long and skilful course of hypocrisy and dissimulation, they are repressed, or even fraudulently exchanged, for symbols representative of affections which have no real existence. But still less do they manifest the fixed and permanent propensity of the mind, which is ever pursuing its specific drift, whatever be the transition of the passions or of the features from one character to another. And it has hence been inquired whether there may not be some soberer and less variable index by which the natural bent and tendency of the mind may be detected; a something that no art can imitate, no dissimulation conceal, inwoven in the toughest and hardest, as well as in the softer and more flexible parts of the body—in the very tissue and figure of the bones; and, consequently, which

Grows with our growth, and strengthens with our strength.

From such inquiries has arisen the study, for it can scarcely be called the science, of *PHYSIOGNOMY*,—*Temper-indication*, or *Temper-dialling*,—for such is the meaning of physiognomy, when strictly translated. It is a figurative term, which supposes the body to be a dial-plate on which the habitual turn or bearing of the mind is shadowed by means of the index or gnomon of some fixed and prominent external distinction, which retains its power and purpose amid all the fleeting changes of the passions, and the mask of made-up smiles and serenity.

This study is of early date, and in its descent to our own day has met with a perpetual alternation of evil report and good report, in proportion as it has acquired the favouritism or encountered the rejection of public opinion. Aristotle appears to have been the first philosopher who attempted to reduce it to any thing like a scientific pursuit, and to fix it upon any thing like permanent and undeniable principles. His definition of it is excellent: "It is the science," says he, "by which the dispositions of mankind are discoverable by the features of the body, and especially by those of the countenance." And in the development of this pursuit he advanced it as a leading doctrine, that a peculiar form of body is invariably accompanied by a peculiar dispo-

sition of mind; that a human intellect is never found in the corporeal form of a beast; and that the mind and body exercise a reciprocal influence over each other: referring us for examples of the former to delirium and intoxication, in which the mental follows upon the corporeal derangement; and, for examples of the latter, to the passions of fear and joy, in which the body inversely displays the affections of the mind.

As the result of this principle and illustration, he argues, and no modern writer upon the subject has ever argued more clearly, that whenever among mankind a certain bodily character appears, which by prior experience and observation has been found uniformly accompanied by a certain mental disposition, we have a right to infer that it is necessarily connected with it; and we may fairly and legitimately ascribe it to the individual that exhibits such character. And, pursuing this line of application, he tells us farther, that our observations may be drawn from other animals as well as from men; for, as a lion possesses one bodily form and mental character, and a hare another, the corporeal characteristics of the lion, such as strong hair, deep voice, large extremities, when discernible in a human being, cannot fail to raise in the mind an idea of the strength and courage of that noble animal; while the slender limbs, soft down, and other features of the hare, whenever visible, or approximated among mankind, betray the mental character of that pusillanimous quadruped.

It is impossible to refuse our assent to sentiments so just and obvious; and to this extent almost every one is a physiognomist by nature; for no man can walk the streets without noticing, in the first place, a marked and striking difference between one face and another face, one form and another form; and, in the second place, without ascribing, in consequence of such difference, the possession of vigour to one person that passes by, wisdom to a second, magnanimity to a third, folly to a fourth, debility to a fifth, and meanness to a sixth.

Physiognomy, therefore, as to its general principles, has perhaps never been altogether neglected; it seems in almost every age to have influenced men's opinion and conduct in first associating with strangers; and has not unfrequently excited a favourable or an unfavourable prepossession before a word has been spoken or an action performed. As a science, though an imperfect one, it was pursued, upon the general doctrines of Aristotle, among the Greeks and Romans, till the downfall of all the sciences upon the irruption of the northern barbarians into Europe, towards the close of the fifth century; and was for a long time so systematically cultivated at Rome, that Cicero was in the habit of publicly availing himself of its force whenever, by employing it so as to excite contempt or hatred, it could be turned to the advantage of his client; of which we have striking examples in his orations against Piso, and in favour of Roscius; while we learn from Suetonius that the emperor Titus engaged a professed physiognomist, of the name of Narcissus, to examine the features of Britannicus as to his character and chance of success in his claims upon the empire against himself; who, it appears, gave an opinion in favour of Titus, and declared, and, according to the event, declared truly, that Britannicus would never live to assume the imperial purple.

In this curious fact of history we find physiognomy united at an early period of the Roman empire with magic or judicial astrology; and we also find that upon its revival, on the general resurrection of science about the middle of the fifteenth century, one of its first and most unfortunate occurrences was a connexion of the same kind; from which it only separated to form other and successive alliances with metaphysical theology, alchemy, the doctrine of signatures and sympathies, and the theosophy of the Mystics and Rosicrucians. So that it again fell into contempt with the most liberal and enlightened part of mankind; who, however, did not give themselves the trouble to sift the wheat from the chaff. And though occasionally started afresh in literary journals, and other publications of considerable merit and authority, as, for example, by Dr. Gwyther and Dr. Parsons in our own Philosophical Transactions; by Perneti and Le Cat, in the Transactions of the Berlin

Academy; and in the separate writings of Lancisi, Haller, and Buffon; it was not till the appearance of the elegant and popular work of M. Lavater, the well-known dean of Zurich, that physiognomy was again able to establish itself as a scientific pursuit in the good opinion of mankind.

The two grand objects of M. Lavater were to clear physiognomy of its mystical and other adventitious connexions, and to advance it to the rank of an exact and demonstrable science. The first of these was as judicious as the second was absurd: for he himself was at the time in possession of nothing more than a certain number of detached facts or fragments, which he did not venture to communicate to the world in any higher form than that of essays. His work is chiefly distinguished by a spirit of analysis, and at times of anatomy, to which no other work on the subject had hitherto pretended. Instead of generalizing the human form, and taking the features by the group, as was the case with Aristotle, and is the case with mankind at large, he aimed at separating the features from each other, and endeavoured to assign to each its peculiar bearing. And, fully believing that the general character of the mental disposition runs with a uniform and uninterrupted harmony through every feature and every organ, he frequently trusted to a single feature or a single organ for its development. In doing which he usually selected such as were least flexible, and by the mass of mankind least suspected; as the form of the bones, particularly those of the head or face; the shape of the ears, hands, feet, or even of the nails; and he hereby endeavoured to baffle all dissimulation, and to avoid confounding the permanent temper with those occasional flights of passion by which the flexible features are disturbed and varied.

We have not time to follow up M. Lavater's hypothesis into these points of detail, nor would it be altogether worth our while if we had. The author was a learned and most excellent man, but at the same time a man of a warm and enthusiastic imagination; and notwithstanding that his remarks are in many respects precise, and his distinctions acute, and afford evident proof of their being the result of actual observation; and notwithstanding, moreover, that they are richly illustrated, after the laudable example of Baptista Porta, by expressive and elegant engravings,—the declamatory tenor of his style, the singularity and extravagance of many of his opinions, his peremptory and decisive tone upon the most vague and disputable topics, his puffing up trifles into matters of magnitude, and the absurd extreme to which he pushed his hypothesis, so as to make it embrace and exemplify the face and features of all nature as well as those of man and the higher ranks of quadrupeds;—these and various other sproutings of the warm and luxuriant fancy I have just referred to, prevented his work from obtaining more than a transient popularity; and it sunk beneath the attacks of M. Forney and other continental writers, who laboured, and some of them perhaps disingenuously, to point out its defects and extravagances.

Perhaps one of the most whimsical of M. Lavater's opinions is, that no person can make a good physiognomist unless he is a well-proportioned and handsome man; a position which seems to be altogether at variance with his own progress in the study, for the dean of Zurich had few pretensions to such a figure. Another singularity of opinion was that of his extending his physiognomic characters to the peculiarity of the handwriting; and in this instance reviving the reveries of many of the ancient mystics, who pretended to confide in the same mark; while by interweaving into the body of this science a belief in apparitions, and this, too, upon very peculiar and fanciful principles, he has indirectly connected it with the dark and exploded study of divination, from which it was one of his first and most prominent objects to separate it.

I will only farther observe, that in the wide extent to which he carried this favourite and fascinating science of his heart, he describes the whole material world as subject to its dominion; amuses us with a development of the propensities, partialities, and ruling passions, not only of men and quadrupeds, but of birds, fishes, reptiles, and insects, from the unequivocal language of

their external expression; and makes the reputable class of tradesmen, probably without their knowledge, the deepest physiognomists in the world; for the trader, says he, when in the act of dealing, not only at once decides that his customer has an honest look, a pleasing or forbidding countenance, and trusts or forbears to trust him accordingly; but determines by its colour, its fineness, its exterior, the physiognomy of every article of traffic. How far the former part of this last remark may apply to M. Lavater's own countrymen, the honest and enlightened traders of Zurich, I will not pretend to say; but it is highly probable that there are some before me who have not always felt themselves able to read the characters of the countenance quite so well as is here supposed of them, and to whom a few additional lessons from the Zurich counting-house, or the Zurich professor, might have been every now and then of no small service in the transactions of buying and selling; and have saved them, in various instances, from bad debts and impositions.

Having pointed out these defects, it becomes me to observe, that, with all its blemishes, M. Lavater's Essays form the best and fullest book on the subject we at present possess. To say nothing of its language, which, though far too florid, is animated, and often elegant, it is a rich repository of isolated facts, shrewd remarks, and ingenious suggestions; and with less fancy, and more judgment, would have been, and must have been, the favourite text-book of every physiologist in this branch of natural philosophy. Nor, even as it is, can it ever be neglected by any one who is desirous of establishing physiognomy upon a permanent and sober basis; and of analyzing the causes, and determining the real principles, upon which every one pretends to judge, whether rightly or wrongly, of the internal qualities of the mind, by the external features of the body; and, consequently, as in the case of astronomy, gives proof that the study is founded in nature, although its specific laws have not had the good fortune, like those of gravitation, to be systematically sought out and exemplified.

It is from this last circumstance, in connexion with M. Lavater's desultory and erratic mode of handling his subject, that other philosophers have been induced to abandon altogether the common ground of the general form and features, upon which mankind in all ages, whether learned or unlearned, have hitherto reasoned, and to inquire whether there may not be some less sensible and obvious, but at the same time more fixed and scientific, more exact and immediate, index in some part of the human figure, which may infallibly direct us to the same ends. No minister has hence devised more schemes for taxation, no insurance-broker more modifications for a lottery, than this general research has given rise to—this philosophical rage

T' expatiate free o'er all this scene of man,
This mighty maze, but not without a plan;
This wild where weeds and flowers promiscuous shoot;
This garden, tempting with forbidden fruit.

Of all these attempts, however, there is but one that is in any degree worthy of notice, or that has acquired any considerable degree even of transitory popularity; and this is the hypothesis of Dr. Gall of Jena, who has been greatly indebted to his friend Dr. Spurzheim for a popular diffusion of his doctrine over most parts of Europe. This learned philosopher, being determined to deviate as far as possible from the beaten path, left the face or front of the head to the rest of the world, and took the crown and back part for his own use. He conceived, first, that as all the faculties of the mind are limited to the common sensory or organ of the brain, nature, like a skilful general, instead of confounding every part with every part, and every faculty with every faculty, has marshalled this important organ into a definite number of divisions, and has given to every faculty the command of a separate post. He conceived, secondly, as the general mass of the brain lies immediately under the cranium or skull-bone, and is impacted into its cavity with the utmost exactness, that if any one or more of the aforesaid faculties, or, which is the same thing, any one or more of the aforesaid divisions of the brain

allotted to their control, should be peculiarly forward and active, such divisions must necessarily grow more abundant, and give some external token of such abundance by a constant pressure against those particular portions of the cranium under which they are immediately seated, and which, by uninterrupted perseverance, and especially in infancy and early life, when the bones of the cranium yield or are absorbed easily, they must elevate and render more prominent than any other part.* And, thirdly, he conceived, that every man having some faculty or other more marked or active than the rest, or, in his own phraseology, more sensibly manifested, from which, indeed, his peculiar disposition or propensity takes its cast, must necessarily also have some peculiar prominence, some characteristic bump or embossment, by which his head is distinguishable from all others, or at least from all others of a different temper, or attracted by different objects of pursuit; and that nothing more is necessary than to determine the respective regions of the different faculties which belong to the brain, in order to determine, at the same time, from the external bump or prominence, the internal propensity or character.

These premises being in his own mind satisfactorily established, Dr. Gall next set to work with a view of deciding the relative parts of the brain possessed by the different faculties or their respective sentient organs. And having settled this important point to his own thorough conviction, he immediately made a map of the outside of the head, divided it into corresponding regions, and was able, in his own opinion, to indicate to a demonstration the characteristic temper or tendency of every man presented to him by a mere glance of the eye, or a mere touch of the finger. For, in the language of Dr. Spurzheim, "in order to distinguish the development of the organs, it is not always necessary to touch the head; in many cases the eye is sufficient."†

Let me not, however, do injustice to the talents of the inventor of this hypothesis. For he is not only possessed of a lively ingenuity and fancy, as his speculation, thus far unfolded, must suggest to every one, but he is also a man of learning, and of patient and indefatigable research. And such is the plausibility of his scheme, that he has contrived to enlist under his banners not a few philosophers and physiologists of considerable eminence and merit, among whom I may especially mention Dr. Bojames, who was one of the first to publish an account of this singular line of study to the world, and, as already observed, Dr. Spurzheim, who is at this moment lecturing upon the subject in this metropolis.‡

The allotments of the different parts of the brain, and the consequent laying down of the outside of the cranium into a superficial map of mental qualities or sensations, was a work of great patience and investigation. To accomplish it, hundreds, perhaps thousands, of human skulls, of known characters and propensities, were examined, and their peculiar impressions, whether prominences or indentations, were noticed and arranged. These were afterward compared with the respective tempers and inclinations of the particular subjects while alive; and the whole tried by the craniognomy, as it was called, of other animals celebrated, in common language, for the acute-

* "It seems to me, that at least a great part of every organ lies at the surface; and that if the part of any organ be well developed, the whole participates of this development." Spurzheim, *Physiognom. System*, p. 264.—In p. 240, he admits, however, "that the organs are not confined to the surface."

† *Physiogn. System*, p. 261.

‡ This lecture was delivered at the time of Dr. Spurzheim's first visit to England, for the purpose of illustrating his hypothesis, which has certainly possessed every advantage of which it is susceptible from his exertions and talents. Yet it is well known, that scarcely an individual among the more distinguished anatomists or physiologists of our own country have been led to adopt his views. To the discrepancy of Sir Everard Home's conceptions the author will have occasion to advert in a subsequent note. The following is the opinion of Mr. Charles Bell in his very excellent paper on the nerves of the orbit of the eye, as contained in the *Philosophical Transactions* for 1823, p. 306:—"But the most extravagant departure from all the legitimate modes of reasoning, though still under the colour of anatomical investigation, is the system of Dr. Gall. It is sufficient to say, that, without comprehending the grand divisions of the nervous system; without a notion of the distinct properties of the individual nerves; or, without having made any distinction of the columns of the spinal marrow; without even having ascertained the difference of cerebrum and cerebellum, Gall proceeded to describe the brain as composed of many particular and independent organs, and to assign to each the residence of some special faculty."

ness of their respective instincts; but, in the language of Dr. Gall, for the acuteness of their predominant organs of sensation; in whose skulls correspondent symbols were observed, or supposed to be observed.

The whole was hence reduced to one regular system: the brain was found to consist of thirty-three separate parts or chambers, and, consequently, the superincumbent cranium was divided into as many sections, from the lowest part of the back of the head, over the crown, to the orbits of the eyes. It is not my intention to dwell upon any of these chambers or superficial sections. To enumerate them, with a few explanatory hints, is all we can find space for; and even this, I am afraid, cannot be done without an occasional verification of the poet's remark, that there may be situations in which, although

To laugh is want of goodness and grace,
Yet to be grave exceeds all power of face.

The following is the classification of the different mental powers of the brain, and the order in which they lie, according to the table of Dr. Bojames, one of Dr. Gall's earliest and most assiduous pupils, commencing, as I have already observed, at the lowest part of the back of the head:—I. Organ of tenacity of life. II. Of self-preservation. III. Selection of food. IV. Organ of the external senses. V. Instinctive sexual union. VI. Organ of the mutual love of parents and their offspring. VII. Organ of friendship. VIII. Organ of courage. IX. Organ of murder or assassination. X. Of cunning. XI. Circumspection. XII. Vanity, conceit, or self-love. XIII. Love of glory. XIV. Love of truth. XV. General memory, otherwise called sense of places and things. XVI. Painting, or sense of colours. XVII. Sense of numbers. XVIII. Musical sense. XIX. Sense for mechanics. XX. Verbal memory. XXI. Sense for languages. XXII. Memory of persons. XXIII. Liberality. XXIV. Talent for satire. XXV. Talent for comparing things. XXVI. Metaphysical talent. XXVII. Talent for observation. XXVIII. Goodness. XXIX. Theatrical talent. XXX. Theosophy. XXXI. Perseverance. The remaining two, to complete the thirty-three, being, at the time Dr. Bojames wrote, unappropriated; a sort of terra incognita, which the master of the system had not yet sufficiently explored, but one of which he subsequently discovered to be, the natural organ for theft or stealing.* A few alterations have since been made in the general arrangement, both by Dr. Gall himself and by several of his pupils, especially by Dr. Spurzheim, but of no essential moment in a cursory survey.†

It is not a little singular that men should be supposed to be provided by nature with express organs for the cultivation of murder and theft; terms which are softened down by Dr. Spurzheim, in his own catalogue, into the words DESTRUCTIVENESS and COVETISENESS: but which, in the body of his work, he treats of under the common and more intelligible names.

The proofs of these organs have been laboured with peculiar force, and not without some apology for their formation. "Our opponents," says Dr. Spurzheim, "maintain that such a doctrine is both ridiculous and dangerous; ridiculous, because nature could not produce any faculty absolutely hurtful to man; dangerous, because it would permit what is punished as a crime by the laws. Gall was accustomed to answer, nobody can deny the facts which prove that theft exists; and as it exists, it is *not* against the will of the Creator; and there are very few persons who have never stolen any thing. The organ is, moreover, very considerable in inveterate thieves."‡

The morality here offered is certainly not of the purest kind. It directly

* The Physiognomical System of Drs. Gall and Spurzheim, &c. p. 290, 8vo. Lond. 1815.

† The table, as modified by Dr. Spurzheim, gives us the following arrangement:—1. Order of amativity. 2. Philoprogenitiveness. 3. Inhabitiveness. 4. Adhesiveness. 5. Combativeness. 6. Destructiveness. 7. Constructiveness. 8. Covetisiveness. 9. Secretiveness. 10. Self-love. 11. Approbation. 12. Cautiousness. 13. Benevolence. 14. Veneration. 15. Hope. 16. Ideality. 17. Consciousness. 18. Firmness. 19. Individuality. 20. Form. 21. Size. 22. Weight. 23. Colour. 24. Space. 25. Order. 26. Time. 27. Number. 28. Tune. 29. Language. 30. Comparison. 31. Causality. 32. Wit. 33. Imitation.

‡ Physiolog. System, &c. p. 398, 8vo. Lond. 1815.

avows that the Creator has given an express sanction and countenance to robbery and murder by the construction both of the body and mind; by natural organs and propensities for the commission of these crimes. It cannot, indeed, be denied, that God has *willed* them, for nothing can take place contrary to his will. But there is a little logical nicety or special pleading in this assertion, and it is necessary to recall to our recollection what I endeavoured to prove in a late lecture,* that the *WILL* and the *DESIRE* are two distinct attributes; though in ordinary language confounded and used synonymously. It is true, then, that God has willed robbery and murder; but it is equally true that he has not desired them: it is equally true, that he has most positively expressed his desire upon the subject, and has forbidden them under the severest threats. Our duty, therefore, is to attend to the prohibition: our moral conduct is to be collected from his desire, and not from his will, excepting where the word will is employed in its popular sense, and synonymously with desire. The professors of this new physiognomy, however, having thus advanced their peculiar doctrine upon the subject before us, endeavour to illustrate it by copious examples of persons, who, from being endowed with the stealing bump and stealing organ, had a peculiar and irresistible propensity to rob and plunder. Among these, Dr. Spurzheim introduces various characters whom we should not very readily have suspected of belonging to a gang of thieves. He tells us of a chaplain in a Prussian regiment, a man of great intelligence and ability, who *could not avoid* (for these are his words) stealing handkerchiefs from the officers at the parade. He informs us, that Victor Amadeus I., king of Sardinia, took every where objects of little importance; and, what will still more astonish the audience before me, that M. Saurin, the Genevese pastor, though acquainted with the best principles of reason and religion, was overcome continually by this propensity to steal. He has given us, however, no authority for this last assertion; and no such calumny should be believed without full proof.

There is, indeed, an endeavour, on the part of Dr. Spurzheim, though I do not find he is supported by any of his colleagues, to let down, in some degree, this charge against nature and the Author of nature, by telling us, that though the organs exist that bear these names and produce a specific propensity, they do not urge on the individual to the actual commission of great crimes of this kind till they are very largely developed, and the development has not been controlled by other faculties, which he seems to intimate may have an influence upon them. "These functions," says he, "are ABUSES, which result from the highest degree of activity of certain organs, which are not directed by other faculties." Now, in the first place, it should seem, by his own examples, that other faculties have very little control over the master-organ or propensity at any time: for even admitting the truth of his extraordinary anecdote concerning M. de Saurin, there can be no doubt that all his faculties of morality and religion were habitually at work in repugnancy to his faculty of thieving, and yet, according to Dr. Spurzheim, to no purpose. But, secondly, the learned writer exhibits a strange inconsistency, in regarding the full development of a function "as the abuse of a function." The function is a natural power; its growth is a natural power; and hence its full development, or "the highest activity of the organ," instead of being an ABUSE of such organ or function, ought only to be regarded as its NATURAL PERFECTION. And, lastly, let the matter be how it may, the man, even in his moral character, is passive under every stage of its progress; or, in the more tangible and explicit language of M. Magendie, "Il est impossible de se changer à cet égard. Nous RESTONS TELS QUE LA NATURE NOUS A FAITS."†

Not a few persons will, perhaps, be surprised at finding, that nature has likewise kindly provided us with an impulsive organ for theatrical amusements; and that she thus seems satisfactorily to have settled the lawfulness and expediency, so eloquently and forcibly controverted by the learned Bossuet, about a century ago, of frequenting theatres and encouraging the drama.

* Series III. Lecture viii.

† Précis Élémentaire, 2 toms. 8vo. Paris, 1816, 1817.

The relative position, moreover, of the different organs I have thus far noticed, is an object of no small curiosity. In the map of the skull those of murder and thieving lie immediately next to those of friendship and courage; while the region for comedies and farces lies directly between the boundaries of moral goodness and theosophy or religion: concerning which last Dr. Bojames expresses himself as follows: "The organ of theosophy occupies the most elevated part of the os frontis. All the portraits of saints which have been preserved from former ages afford very instructive examples; and, if this character be wanting in any one of them, it will certainly be destitute of expression. It is excessively developed in *religious fanatics*, and in *men who have become recluse through superstition* and religious motives. It is the seat of this organ," continues he, with a subtlety of reasoning worthy of Aquinas, "which, according to Dr. Gall, has induced men to consider their gods as above them, or in a more elevated part of the heavens; for otherwise," he adds, "there is no more reason for supposing that God exists above the world than below it."

The theological world cannot but be infinitely obliged to Dr. Gall and Dr. Bojames for this new and unanswerable proof of the divine existence. God, it seems, exists, and must exist, because many men have a bump upon the crown of the head which these philosophers choose to call a religious bump. Dr. Gall, indeed, contends openly that this organ "IS THE MOST EVIDENT PROOF OF THE EXISTENCE OF GOD." I quote the words of his learned colleague, Dr. Spurzheim,* who is perpetually using the word proof in the vaguest manner possible, though a manner common to the school. "In general," says Gall, in continuation, "every other faculty of man and animals has an object which it may accomplish. Can it, then, be probable that God does not exist, while there is an organ of religion? HENCE, GOD EXISTS."

The next benefit we obtain from the discovery of this important organ and embossment is, that it settles the long-contested question concerning the nature and extent of the divine residence—the locality or ubiquity of the Deity. God, it seems, must exist *above* us, for the religious bump is on the top of the skull; and he cannot exist any where else than above us, because there is no religious bump in any other direction.

The noble catholicism, moreover, of this incontrovertible proof cannot fail to be matter of the highest gratification; a catholicism that puts that of Christianity to the blush, at the thought of its own narrowness; for the demonstration before us extends equally to all gods, and to all religions: it is *found*, we are told, in the portraits of *saints*; but it is most *highly developed* in *religious fanatics*, and in men who have become recluse through *superstition*. Surely, if Dr. Gall or Dr. Bojames had looked a little more closely, they might have discovered that the still vacant region (vacant, at least, at that time) is the seat of absurdity or folly, and that some heads they are acquainted with are not without its mental manifestation. There is not quite so much, perhaps, to condemn in Dr. Spurzheim's remarks upon the same organ; for this most able advocate of the school thinks more clearly, and writes more cautiously in the main: but he also very closely touches, at times, upon the region of absurdity, if he do not absolutely fall into its boundary; and, in uniting the name of our Saviour with that of Jupiter, seems to show, that the same cast of religion, as well as of moral philosophy, is common to the school. His remarks are as follows:—"The pictures of the saints show the very configuration of those pious men whom Gall had first observed. It is also in this respect remarkable that the head of Christ is always represented as very elevated. *Have we the real picture of Christ?* Have artists given to the head of Christ a configuration which they have observed in religious persons, or have they composed this figure from internal inspiration. Has the same sentiment among modern artists given to Christ an elevation of head, as among the ancient it conferred a prominence of the forehead upon JUPITER? At all events, the shape of the head of Christ contributes to prove this organization."¹⁸

* Physiolog. System, ut supra, p. 414.

† Ibid. p. 412.

Now, in this very singular passage there are three propositions, concerning which, it is difficult to say which is to be admired most; a *proof* deduced from queries, which the author is incapable of answering; the idea that our Saviour possibly sat for his picture; and the idea that modern artists are possibly *inspired* when they paint his image from their own conceptions. I must leave the reader to make his own comments (for I dare not trust myself upon the subject) concerning the edifying resemblance which is here pointed out between the head of the Saviour of the world and that of the JUPITER of the Greek poets; and the unity of SENTIMENT which has ever, it seems, prevailed between ancient and modern artists, when engaged in studying these *sacred* models.*

In seriousness and sobriety, however, it is not a little extraordinary, not only that folly or absurdity, but that wisdom, hypocrisy, gluttony, drunkenness, sensuality, mirth, melancholy, and some dozens of other powers and faculties of the most common kind, should have no chamber allotted to them, no protuberance or manifestation, in the hypothesis before us. During an interview I had some months ago with Dr. Spurzheim, I started this difficulty for explanation; but his reply was at least not satisfactory to myself. It may be sufficient to observe, as a single example, that for the organ of gluttony he referred us to the stomach; but this is rather to evade than to meet the difficulty. The stomach is unquestionably the organ of hunger, as the eye is of sight, and the ear of hearing; but if the painter, who derives a pleasure of a peculiar nature from the eye, as in the case of colours; or the musician, who derives a pleasure of a peculiar nature from the ear, as in the case of sounds, have an express chamber in the brain, by which such peculiar pleasure is alone excited, and on which it alone depends, so ought the glutton, who derives a pleasure of a peculiar nature from the stomach. While, if there be no such cerebral region or chamber in the brain, and, consequently, no external development or manifestation of gluttony, or any of the other feelings or sentiments I have just glanced at, the system itself, even admitting its general truth, must be so far imperfect and unavailing: it must dwindle into a half science, and be more liable to lead us astray than aright.

There is also another powerful objection, which I will beg leave to state, as I stated it at the same time to the learned lecturer I have just alluded to, though, so far as appeared to myself, without a successful solution. It is this. The strictly obvious or natural divisions of the brain are but three; for we meet with three, and only three, distinct masses,—the cerebrum or brain properly so called, the cerebel or little brain, and the oblongated marrow. The first, as we have formerly observed, constitutes the largest and uppermost part; the second lies below and behind; the third level with the second, and in front of it; it appears to be a projection issuing equally from the two other parts, and gives birth to the spinal marrow, which is thus proved to be a continuation of the brain extended through the whole chain of the spine or back-bone.

Now, as the brain consists naturally of three, and only three, distinct parts, it may be allowable and pertinent to suppose that each of these parts is

* It is always amusing, and sometimes instructive, to trace the learned roving of different philosophical imaginations, when indulging in a like pursuit; to mark the point from which they set out, and follow up the parallelism or divergency of their respective courses, when aiming at a common goal. Sir Everard Home, whom every one will allow to be as deeply versed in the internal structure and the external mapping of the brain as either Dr. Gall or Dr. Spurzheim, seems also, from a late article in the Philosophical Transactions (1821, p. 31), to have felt a tendency to the study of phrenology. But from the only two regions he appears yet to have visited in his new voyage of discovery, his bearings are likely to be in every respect widely different from those of the German navigators, and calculated to lead to very different results. These regions are the supposed natural seats of MEMORY and CONSCIOUSNESS. While Dr. Gall and Dr. Spurzheim fix the first of these, as far as they are able to ascertain its dominion, between the nose and the forehead (Spurz. p. 427), Sir Everard has had to pursue his course into a far higher latitude, and did not reach it till he arrived at the vertex of the skull, that very region which the German craniologists have already taken possession of for the faculty of *religious veneration*, as just noticed in the text: at the same time, that while these skillful explorers have decidedly fixed the organ of CONSCIOUSNESS at the nape of the neck, the *ultima Thule*, or lowermost extremity of the cranial sphere (p. 344), Sir Everard has found it at its sinuiput or highest point of the forehead; bordering, indeed, where we should little have expected it, upon the region of memory or religious veneration, according to Dr. Gall's hypothesis.