

fact, the retaliation of the free subject against the cruelties of the Spaniard. Thomas Cobham, the son of Lord Cobham, was one of these—one of a thousand—who, like him, scoured the ocean far and near, and made his name as terrible to Spain as the Inquisition was terrible to the world. Then there was a baser order of marauders—water-thieves, hanging about the mouth of the river and making a handsome harvest. Then rose Sir John Hawkins—chief of pirates and privateersmen—making his golden gains by his charter for carrying on an extensive Negro slave-trade; and thus England ventured forth from her ports and coasts, and while she had always manifested seafaring aptitudes, now held aloft her trident and standard of maritime dominion and power. Here we must close, and lay down these volumes, full of striking incident and writing; displaying genius, at home in the knowledge of human nature, and in the mastery of language by which such knowledge is best conveyed. We cannot too highly pronounce upon the carefulness, the great reading and patience these volumes evidence, and have no doubt that they, and the volumes succeeding them, will give the most complete and magnificent picture of that period of our history, which, while it awakens within us perhaps a greater, certainly an equal, pride than any other, leaves less, than any other, as a subject for regret.

III.

NOSES: WHAT THEY MEAN, AND HOW TO USE THEM.*

“In Nature’s infinite book of secrecy
A little can I read.”

Antony and Cleopatra, i. 2.

“Homines enim ad Deos nullâ re proprius accedunt, quam salutem hominibus dando.”—*Cicero pro Ligario, c. 38.*

“ALL things are double one against another,” says the wisdom of the Son of Sirach. All things stand not only for themselves, but as signs of something else. It is upon this axiom that physiognomy rests. There is a quality throughout the universe whereby the nature of things may be interpreted from their form, so that the external appearance is a sign or

* *Nasology; or, Hints towards a Classification of Noses.* By Eden Warwick. Richard Bentley. 1848.

symbol of the internal constitution and quality. The stag is not born with the disposition of the tiger, nor the sheep with that of the wolf. In the animal creation similarity of form implies community of nature. A simple glance satisfies us that a certain animal is a horse ; but what a mass of possible knowledge, and what a complication of inscrutable mysteries is affiliated to that simple glance, and comprised in that simple term. A child can seize the formal idea, as swift as light can impress the retina. But fifty years of study will not teach the huntsman, the anatomist, or the philosopher, one tithe of what is symbolized by that phenomenon, even so far as it may be known by the human intellect, leaving out of the question altogether those secrets that cannot be penetrated, though they, too, are symbolized in the phenomenal appearance. Well may the subtle Hamlet cry, "There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio, than are dreamt of in your philosophy." The crowd of men are always hankering after signs and wonders, but the wise and perceptive feel themselves beset with signs of so difficult interpretation, that the signs to them are wonders. Wonderment betokens ignorance. "Not to admire," Horace wrote, "is all the art I know to make men happy," it may be so, but wonderment is a sign of philosophy also. There is a certain enthusiasm of admiration that constitutes the true temper of the philosophical mind. The wonderment of ignorance is mental stupefaction before a great object ; the wonderment of philosophy is not bestowed upon things, but upon the fecundity of signification that lies wrapped up in them.

So far, then, from physiognomy not being a science, almost everything in science is physiognomy. All advancement of science depends on the reading of signs, and in every age the best interpreter of symbols is king of the epoch. Columbus, as he stood upon the beach, saw a sugar-cane washed up, and, as its structure tallied with no known plant of the Old World, he concluded a New World from it, and found in it a corroboration of the Pythagorean tradition, that the world was round,—an idea that he had long meditated. What was this, but a great mind reading a little sign ? Lord Bacon observed the sterility of the Aristotelian philosophy, as practised by the men of his time. He also saw that what we call antiquity was the youth of the world, and therefore, that "the authority of antiquity" was to be exploded, because the most ancient time is the present, and *ought* to be the wisest. Let us, he would say, use the past wisely, extracting that which is good, but never rest in it in a sterile manner ; and so he preached utility and the doctrine of experiment, which is nothing else than an attempt to make

signs teach—the mustard-seed, growing up to a great tree. Newton, in the falling body, built up a theory of the firmament on that little sign. Every grand discovery springs from some little sign that a great seer reads, though nobody was able to interpret it before. The interpretation of things unseen from things seen, the reading of insides from outsides is the sole way of advancing science, and this is physiognomy.

Physiognomy, however, is now restricted to the interpretation of human character from the conformation of the body; but especially from the features of the face, as no other part is now ever seen; and in this sense, every man and woman of average intellect and discrimination is a sort of physiognomist. Every human face that we meet is raying out all manner of influences upon us, sufficient to move us to action, or to incite us to reflection, though we do not consciously analyse the motives so excited in us. A stranger enters a railway carriage with beaming face, cheery voice, and open manners, and the inmates who have travelled twenty miles, without a word, suddenly find themselves in a hubbub of conversation, in which all are talkers and none listeners. Even silent men become infected with the mania at such moments; perhaps for the very reason that there is nobody to pay attention. Physiognomy commenced all this excitement, the company were put into good humour by the phenomenon of the cheery face, which some happy first word perhaps confirmed, and the strong social faculties of garrulity and imitation easily did the rest.

This strange magnetism of feature and bodily development is seen to exist in children, in dogs, cats, and all domestic animals, as well as in adults, and perhaps, in children, even in a much higher degree, for it seems to be a part of modern social education to eradicate all instinctive manifestations as a point of good-breeding; upon the principle, probably, that education is to correct nature and not to evolve it,—with the sagacious corollary, that what you cannot correct you must conceal. But, though all men, women, and even dogs and children are physiognomists by nature, no philosopher, from Aristotle to Lavater, has recorded anything universal or systematic on the subject. Physiognomy was a favourite and fashionable study in Rome in the time of the Empire, but yet nobody put on record any solid observations, out of which a constructive genius might build up a system, and we may still say with the melancholy Duncan, “There’s no art to find the mind’s construction in the face.” A man of infinite tact, like Lavater, can read a great deal more in a face, or in a movement, than others can; but it seems that this is an incommunicable gift, and that such signs are only

interpretable by those in some sympathy with them. Certainly there are many natural languages spoken in the earth, which to most human beings are quite dead and silent ones. For instance, all the talk that beasts hold with each other: the neighing and the braying of the horse and ass; the bellowing of the bull, or the lowing of the cow, fill up indeed the landscape of our ear, and with the eye affect the mind most delicately with "each rural sight, each rural sound," but convey not that definite idea which the brutes in their modest oratory intend. These natural languages, then, are not understood by man, though in the East, from time immemorial, certain cunning men and magi have professed the interpretation. Some have supposed that Adam could converse with the beasts and birds of Paradise, and the remarkable fact of the serpent's addressing Eve with miraculous organ of speech, seems to excite no surprise whatever in her mind. Dim footprints of this, travelling down the lapse of time, in the patriarchal and impressionable East, may account for the still circulating tradition. Even in the East, however, these beliefs or living poetries are growing shadowy, and curling the corners of men's lips as they are pushed farther towards the region of mythological fiction. We always refuse to believe what we have not sufficient dignity to conceive, and it has yet to be learned that a man's true intellectual stature consists, not in his knowledge and reason, but in the breadth of his Divine faith above and beyond these.

Perhaps the best physiognomical *attempt* that has recently been made is that which was set on foot by Gall and Spurzheim, early in this century. It had everything to captivate the fancy of novelty-mongers as it presented a sufficient display of reasoning to make it acceptable to an epoch which pretended to conduct science upon the Baconian method of experiment. The mania has now nearly died out, and it is remarkable that no European physiologist of any reputation has given in his adhesion to the bases on which it professed to be grounded. Phrenology has not grown into science, but, on the contrary, has receded from the position in which Gall left it. Gall was a man of real genius, as any one may see who takes the trouble to read Dr. Elliotson's *Human Physiology*, from which it appears that, with keen intuition, he struck out many new thoughts, and knew exactly how far to carry them, and when to drop them. Spurzheim was merely his hired assistant, and unfortunately plagiarised his master, and has managed here, in England, to shut him out of his just reputation. The dissection of the brain, by following the thread of the nerves instead of absurdly cutting transverse slices (which was a step in advance of all the anat-

mists of that day) was a brilliant discovery, and most important in its effects; but it is Gall's discovery and not Spurzheim's. Spurzheim's books show that he was dominated by an idea, and so far he is respectable; but that idea belonged to Gall. Spurzheim suppressed the fact, and so far he is not respectable.

That there are organs in the brain for every faculty is a gratuitous and, some say, a ridiculous supposition. That every one of these organs has a surface reaching to the skull, and that none of these special organs lie in the centre. That the one exposed surface corresponds exactly to the exterior surface or outward bump on the skull, and by which alone, during life, it can be judged of by experimentalists, and that even supposing all the foregoing to be true), a single surface could give any sufficient index to the general development of the embedded parts of the organ, form together so many doubtful and improbable postulates, that any reasoning founded upon them must be deemed futile and inconclusive.

Still there remains to phrenology that which physiognomy always discerned in it, a general signature, betokening the qualities and powers of the brain working under its bony case; and *craniology*, not phrenology, was the right name to call it by. No doubt the forehead partially shows the æsthetical faculties, the temples and mid region the intellectual and ideal faculties, and the top of the head the will and the conscientious faculties, and the back and under part the animal appetites. But in so partial and unsure a manner, that the greatest tact and study can only render 1 man in 10,000 at all a competent *guesser*. A good and shrewd guess is the highest point to be reached, until a very great deal more has been done than we have yet done, or dreamt of doing.

The popular mind has a singular faculty of adopting and cherishing any error of false philosophy that it can seize without study or reasoning, by an act of simple apprehension. In this sense, phrenology has done most serious injury. Every vulgarian with two eyes can tell whether a man's head is large or small, and, upon the strength of this contemptible act of observation, takes upon him to pronounce on the capacity of everybody he meets in society or business. Perhaps the most injurious exercise of this fallacy is seen in families, and in schools, where one child is esteemed wiser and more naturally gifted than another, because its head measures half-an-inch more across the forehead than another; and a boy of ten is told that his brother of eight will always be before him, because he has a larger brain; or Papa is looked down upon, because Master George, his mother's son and image, at fifteen can wear his hat.

This is studying human idiosyncrasies with a vengeance, when Gall's craniology, instead of founding a collegiate truth is, thanks to an all disseminating and farthing press, popularised into "a science of hatting." Let these measurers take a little anecdote, and chew the cud of the lesson it contains: Medwin, in his "Conversations of Lord Byron," relates, that when a gentleman's dinner-party of twelve or thirteen broke up, and was separating for home, in the hall they began for amusement, such as delights some people after dinner, to try each other's hats, and none of the party could get Byron's hat on—yes, cries the phrenologist, but poetical heads are lofty, not broad. Is that so? or is the assertion only broad and not lofty?

In this matter take a few words of good sense out of Polemon, who, if not the pupil of Xenocrates, at any rate lived before Origen, because he is named by him in his book against Celsus. Polemon says, in his chapter on the Head—"A *very* "small head argues a man deficient in sensibility and without "intelligence. A head larger than true symmetry allows, indicates "quick sensibility, accompanied with cowardice and an illiberal "disposition. A *very large* head shows want of sensibility and "extreme intractability (now this is what the scientific hatter "delights in). An oblique (*λοξότης*) head argues impudence "or shamelessness. Those who have very *very lofty* heads are "presumptuous and self-willed (*αὐθάδεις*). Those who have "the parts behind the temples low, are spiritless men. Those "who have the parts behind the temples on both sides of the "head low, are deceitful and vindictive. But the middle of "the head (*κεφαλή μέση*), when gently lowered or rounded, "*(χθαμαλή ἤρέμα)*, the head being in other respects well propor- "tioned and erect (i.e. having the line of the face nearly parallel "to the line of the spine), is the *best of all the heads* whether for "sensibility or great intellectual power (*μεγαλόνοια*)."

If one might hazard a conjecture without knowledge, this chapter upon the head, of which the above is the whole, would show that the writer, Polemon, was the pupil of Xenocrates. It embodies in a loose popular manner the result of that wonderful Greek philosophy, which prevailed from the time of Pythagoras down to a few of the successors of Plato, by which mathematical principles of harmonic proportion were brought to bear upon all æsthetic productions, — painting, sculpture, architecture, &c. Art, then (and never since then), was wedded, as it should be, to the absolute reason with a success that Europe rings with even to this hour, and hopes again to attain to, without any study of principles, by the mere servility of imitation. The *oblique* head, observe, is shameless,

impudent, that is to say, it has no fine qualities. Whatever wit or faculty it has, it puts to the immediate service of its own base, carnal, and selfish ends. Its perceptive faculties, if so strong an expression may be permitted where so little is known, operate directly upon the cerebellum—as commonly they do in the brute creation. The front presses upon the back, with no space left for the intervention of the glorious middle-God of reason.* Therefore the oblique head is impudence, which (oh ye vulgar, listen with “attent ear!”) is only another word for worthlessness. But the *erect* head, εὖ μεγέθους ἔχουσα καὶ ὀρθότῃς, is of all others the most perceptive and high-minded. The physiognomical value, therefore, of phrenology must give way before the broader and more commanding law of harmonical proportion; and the organs that have been mapped out by Dr. Gall and George Combe must be regarded as a chimerical attempt to account for mental operations by partitioning off special localities in the brain as the centres of action apportioned to the special faculties. We can separate sensations, perceptions, and reason, as being mental operations essentially differing from each other in their nature. We can discern in some degree by what we feel, that animal sensations lie at the back, and have a more immediate connexion with the spine; that perception is placed in front, and that the brain is blind in the rear just as much as the skull is, and that over-exertion causes tightness and pain across the brow. We can also perceive, with some approach to distinctness, that mathematical and metaphysical reasoning, in fact every species of hard thinking, if continued too long, causes pain in the upper region of the brain. But anything more special than this we can scarcely arrive at—as far as we can judge from watching attentively our own feelings immediately consequent upon efforts of thought, we must candidly allow that such efforts appear quite consentaneous, single, homogeneous, and collective, an act of the whole brain-substance, and by no means an act of any one point or corner of the brain. You can separate the cerebrum from the cerebellum; and if there were organs, it is analogically probable that dissection would show their existence, and that an anatomist could do what Coleridge condemns Spurzheim for pretending to do, namely, to distinguish a bit of Benevolence from a bit of Veneration. So far, however, is this from being the case, that comparative anatomy can detect no difference between the brain-substance of man’s brain and that of other animals, sufficient to prove reason to be an appanage of one and not of the other, beyond

* *Medio tutissimus ibis*, because the most *reasonable* course generally.

what we have specified above—the larger development in the human species of the central and upper portions of the brain, that stand between and separate the sensitive portion at the back from the perceptive portion in front. This does not at all affect the value of any really well-observed physiognomical signs that craniologists have found ; such as that a wall-sided head is calculative, that a horizontal line across the forehead, as in Milton and Beethoven, denotes musical faculty. That a prominent eye depressed downward, so that the under eyelid seems swollen, betokens language. That a projection in the centre of the forehead is noticeable in popular preachers, who illustrate by similitudes and analogy rather than by reasoning, and so on. These *may be* perfectly true signs, and yet not at all prove the existence of an organ appropriate to them, or rather an organ of which they are the physical result. For it is quite natural to suppose that the operations of the brain are accompanied by peculiar motions, each distinct species of mental operation having its own motion. We may also further suppose that all natural gifts and endowments of the essential soul enable it to communicate, from the earliest brain-formation, that peculiar cerebral motion, which will, at ripeness, have shaped the brain into a fitting instrument for the enunciation of the gift.

“ Spiritus intus alit, totamque infusa per artus,
Mens agitat molem et magno se corpore miscet.”

Æneid, vi., 726, 7.

If so, it will thus have made the cave of the skull plastically suitable, and you may read the external sign as phrenological observers have read it, notwithstanding that you repudiate the doctrine of special organs, by which they, as we think vainly, attempt to explain it.

The doctrine thus put forth accounts for many psychological phenomena which phrenology could never touch in the way of explanation. It also stands in a very remarkable manner as an exponent of the finite nature of the human understanding. It fixes the boundary beyond which no strength of human genius can carry us one step. It encourages inquiry into the physical formation and structure of the cerebral mass, the laws which regulate its growth, and the external circumstances most conducive to its perfection as a stable and sensitive instrument and organ for the use of the soul. But whilst it helps to explain the phenomena of life, it asserts the existence of an imperishable something, utterly deperated from, and antecedent to all matter, and manifestations of matter : and it sets up this stupendous *à priori* secret, writing up at the portal of its terrible postern, “ Thus

far shalt thou go, and no farther." Call it vital principle, soul, or spirit—your terminology is of no consequence. On the hither side all is composed of matter, and though much is hidden, nothing is either hopeless or unintelligible to a genuine investigator. All on the further side is secret and silent, except to faith, which is impressed by it, "as a substance of things hoped for," though without knowledge. All but this is a riddle, with a solution, if we can only find it. This, itself, is a mystery that we never can find till death; a mystery without a solution. Modern anthropologists are proudly preaching the reverse of this just now, and holding out the vain hope that all things dark will one day become illuminated by the lamp of science. Much that is dark may become light, how much who shall say? But human science will not be all light till it sets up a lamp in place of the sun, and can abolish night-time totally. At present we burn daylight and admonish the wise man—poor forked-radish and screaming mandrake as we think him—of his birth, naked as that of the desert colt of the wild ass; of the pitiful draff of his diurnal digestion; of the passage of filth from every invisible pore in his whole body; and of death, close at hand, to take him, stripping him as at birth, to the ass's colt again—of naked skin, and of knowledge not much better clad. A little modesty in radishes were a commendable quality. *Humility* is appropriate to vegetables growing on the ground.

We are not anxious to enter into the psychological aspects of this doctrine, yet it is quite obvious that it bears profoundly upon the vexed questions of madness and sleep, delirium and sanity, disease and health. If it be true, the very spirit of the philosophy and science of the day which is materialistic must be untrue. To us, at present, all this is nothing. We take it merely for a physiognomical postulate, that the soul builds its own house; and if so, the tenement will describe the tenant, and every feature betray to him who can well read signs, the quality of the indwelling artificer.

"Throw (meta)physic to the dogs,"—we were to speak of noses and so we will, for what, in a world entirely made up of appearances, or, as scientific people call it, phenomena, is the use of attending to the unseen, or, to anything whatever that does not show. We know many men, quite excellent people in their way, of whom we are persuaded, that they would never brush their hair, or put on a clean shirt, if, like Perseus, they carried a Gorgon's head that rendered them invisible, and yet, who but they, scented and civeted in St. James's Street on a Court day, with Poole's coat and kid gloves *point device*? If there is one thing more than another that is expensive in this world, it

is the eyes of other people. Most of us would sit still, such is the indolent propensity of man, were it not that we should be *seen* to be idle. The unseen and the remote are as nothing to these wise men—the very stars are a nuisance to him who wants his dinner. Did not M. Henrion de Pensey say to Laplace, Chaptal, and Berthollet, scientific lights all three, “I regard the discovery of a dish as a far more interesting event than the discovery of a star, for we have always stars enough, but it is not so with dishes.”

Therefore, as we cannot see the brain, and much less the spirit, soul, ghost, thinking principle, essence, or Divine particle, whose business is that of dancing-master to the *pericranium* or academy, therefore let us give up thinking about them altogether, and come down to the nose, which, as Lavater says, is “the foundation or abutment of the brain, upon this the whole arch of the forehead rests, and without it the mouth and cheeks would be oppressed by miserable ruins.” A great fact is here recorded by this celebrated physiognomist, and we could make great profit of it if we could only bring ourselves to interpret it, as accomplished critics usually do, clean contrary to the author’s intention. For would it not become immediately apparent that Lavater considered the nose as the understanding itself, as that which renders a brain possible, for you cannot build anything without a foundation. The only difference between this and every other foundation is, that the superstructure is invisible, and the foundation itself seen. But then, the principle of life reverses physical laws, so this is just as it should be, and the nose is the efficient cause of the brain. This may suffice to show what a little ingenuity might effect.

He says very well, however, that there are thousands of beautiful eyes for one beautiful nose, and that a grand nose *always* denotes an extraordinary character. He then runs on to describe this talismanic and charm-bearing nose, and some of these notifications are very indistinct indeed. It should be of equal length with the forehead. This is as old as Ficinus, who says that three noses on end should make the length of the face; but erroneously, for they make no distinction of sex. Yet an attentive reader will see that Lavater (iii. p. 185) is speaking of the masculine nose, and it is very nearly the true proportion. But the female nose, of correct symmetry, is longer in proportion than the male (though the reverse is generally held to be the case), because the mass of the man’s head should be larger and squarer than that of the woman: and as the nose does not vary in the same degree as the mass of the head, the woman’s is larger in proportion than the man’s. “This nose then,” says

Lavater, "should have a broad back or spine, the edges being parallel, but somewhat broader above the centre. At the bottom it should stand out a third of its length from the face; near the eye it *must* have at least half-an-inch in breadth." Has not Martial said well, "Non cuicumque datum est habere nasum?" Lavater adds, "such a nose is of more worth than a kingdom." It should be recollected that he had seen the French revolution and some of the desolations of Napoleon, so that kingdoms just at that time were not remarkably valuable. Small-nosed people, even with a hollow profile, may be very good souls, he admits, but their worth consists in suffering, and learning, and in the enjoyment of poetry. But the arched noses they can command and destroy. Your straight noses are a mean between the two, and can act and suffer equally. Do not despair ye ugly-nosed ambitious, for he adds that Boerhaave and Socrates were as to this ugly, more or less, and yet great, only their character was of fortitude and gentleness. But if your ambition is for cutting throats and trampling upon your fellow-creatures, do not attempt it unless your nose is curved like Solyman's scimitar, and as broad as the bill of a duck.

It is clear, however, although the above remark may appear to be more amusing than solid, that the nervous masses, whether as marrow or as brain, possess a bone-forming faculty. Naturally we might expect that the most delicate modification of matter to be found amongst all the corporeal substances would be found connected with, if not creative of, the firmest and most solid, so that the nervous masses not only do create bone, but, *à priori*, might be expected to do so. The next step, then, is to ascertain which feature of the face is in closest connexion with the brain, and has the most bony formation. Certainly not the eyes, the ears, nor the mouth, but the nose. The nose is half bone, the other half is of gristle. This renders it by structure the most solid, immovable, and, in one sense, inexpressive of the features. The eyes and mouth wave and move to every transient gust of feeling and passion like a tall corn-stalk in the wind. But the upper and bony region of the nose is a stoic, and quite contemns human passion. This emotional inexpressiveness and exemption from the infirmities of joy and sorrow, and the troublesome proclivities that "*flesh* is heir to," gives it another kind of expression, which is unique, namely, the character of the brain. Marvellous bony monument and gnomon of intellect, which reverses other signatures in the world, where the hard gives its impress to that which is not hard. Here is a mystery; that which is soft sets its stamp and seal upon that which is not soft.

The nose is the only feature in the face which is compounded of solid bone and cartilage; the two substances combining together to form a complete and continuous whole. The upper or bony structure indicates the natural character of the intellect; the lower or cartilaginous structure indicates the quality, culture, and activity of the intellect. The upper part is made for us; the lower part we may to a great extent make or mar for ourselves.

Having reached this point, it may now be desirable to attempt some classification of noses, and in order to do so we propose to avail ourselves of certain hints set down in a remarkably clever little book, by Eden Warwick, under the title given at the commencement of this Paper. There are, it seems, only six kinds of noses that are distinctly marked, and this classification is well known and of long standing; for an antique gem in the Florentine Museum gives us five out of the six. There are, however, in nature very few pure specimens of any class; almost all the noses one meets with are of a composite character, and are all naturally accompanied with equally composite mental characteristics.

- Class I. The Roman Nose.
- II. The Grecian Nose.
- III. The Cogitative or wide-nostrilled Nose.
- IV. The Jewish Nose.
- V. The Snub Nose.
- VI. The Turn-up Nose, or Celestial.

The first three classes are the noble type of nose, the latter three are of the sordid and contemptible type. The noble classification was observed physiognomically from the very earliest times, for we have them distinctly portrayed in the Hindoo Trimurti in the caves of Elephanta. In this three-headed deity the profile of Vishnu, the "Preserver," is of a purely Greek model; whilst that of Siva, "the Destroyer," has a rough and energetic Roman nose. But Brahma, "the Creator," has a broad cogitative nostril, betokening wisdom and thought of the profoundest order. This is very remarkable as showing that in the early ages of the world; although there was much less of what we call philosophy, there was a much more accurate intuition of truth than, in these latter times, we are ready to allow. Indeed, in many things so far are we from progressing, that we have actually retrograded. All must admit that the human race in 6000 years ought to have progressed; few, except the very reckless and the very ignorant, will assert that it actually has not. Two reasons chiefly conduce to neutralise human advancement. The vices of mankind, and the natural tendency of thought to destroy the faculty of observation. To elaborate the proof of

this lies out of our province, and for the present it will suffice to indicate the circle.

For clear observation the mind must be unsophisticated, but the natural tendency of thought is to sophisticate. Active men despise contemplative men, and *vice versâ*. Great activity of the senses dims the internal light of thought. From Scaliger's collection, it appears that the Arabs have a proverb—"Wall up your five windows" (*i.e.* the five senses) "that your house and its tenant may have light." Thought is internal, and is best pursued by a withdrawal from external nature, whilst observation is the minute scrutiny of it. This is an almost irremediable defect, and coupled with our vices effectually puts a stop to any continuous progress of the race. If you had asked the Royal Academy to furnish a fitting conception of a three-headed symbol of deity, can you persuade yourself it would have approached the physiognomical significance of the Hindoo Trimurti. No. The mind had an intuition, then, of simplicity, and was free "from philosophy and vain deceit." If we wish to progress, we must "try back" many steps and weary. For the sophisticated to unlearn error, is harder than to the unsophisticated the invention of truth. Let us pass away, however, from the wonderful vision of old time, lest the noses of the present day begin to snore, which is a bad habit, as we propose to show before we have done.

The Roman nose is indicative of the highest energy of character, especially when the nose is coarse and rugged, which the Roman commonly is. Nature is very chary in supplying rulers, dukes, and leaders to mankind, yet man is so exceedingly proud, that he cannot be brought to a heartfelt acknowledgment of this great fact. Hence spring all the diverse schemes and forms by which philosophers, statesmen, and quacks, have tried to bring about good government. Their object has been to contrive a system in spite of nature, to say in fact, "Beldam, you are slow to produce real kings, so slow that we must for market purposes set up sham ones; and if possible get rid of your troublesome royal man, when you *do* send him, as a nuisance; for we cannot give up our sham one, systematically crutched up in dignity and unapproachableness as we have made him." Political-mongery would all dissipate into thin air, if instead of talking about forms, men had discretion and virtue enough to pick out by election Nature's born-commanders for every State-post throughout a Commonwealth. Some people say gold is the king, some say intellect, some say education, and so on, but none of these is king. The king is born, not made, just as the poet is, only the corn-eating multitude cannot re-

cognise him, as he walks untitled amongst them. *Nos numeri sumus et fruges consumere nati.*

The Roman nose is energetic and fit for command, it delights in action, it disregards opposition, it takes no counsel of its fears, but steadily pursues its object by the means and instruments most likely to accomplish it. It has a great self-reliance, is not fond of talking, is "little blessed with the set phrase of peace," it is sententious, brief, puts much in a little, knows precisely the value of words, and gets a rhythm out of fitness; never seeks rich melody, and would reject the elegance of Isocrates, if even it might be had. This is the spirit that breathes through a Roman nose; it is strong, is sagacious, not self-willed, but large-willed, swift, eagle-sighted, for an adequate object ready to sacrifice all the world, not sparing itself; ready in the sternest way to embody in act the dictates of its boldest reason, undazzled by any phantom of the imagination, not unconscientious, as acute and peaked moralists pronounce it, but never dreaming that its conscience and its reason can by possibility stand asunder, or be twain.

Such a spirit as this must rule all that come in contact with it, only as it is taciturn, not eloquent,—rather impotent in drawing-rooms, and not very studious of the steps of the backstairs,—it may never come in contact with the public, and so never become as the Homeric phrase has it, *ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν*—king of men. Such a spirit has a Roman nose, and probably no other can have it. This is not new in the world, it is only forgotten. Suetonius, in his life of Titus, says that Titus, and Britannicus, the son of the Emperor Claudius, were brought up together under the same masters, and in the same manner. Narcissus, a freed man, introduced a metascopist, or diviner by physiognomy, that he should examine Britannicus, and he constantly affirmed of Titus standing by, that he, and not Britannicus should reign. Titus, we know, had a nose between Roman and Jewish; and, no doubt if we could ascertain it, Britannicus had a pug, and therefore was unfit for the throne of the Cæsars, which rendered the divination very simple. Had he, however, lived in these days, routine would have set Britannicus on the throne. Pug-royals are dominant everywhere. Suetonius is also careful to describe the physiognomy of Augustus, as having wavy hair, eyebrows that meet, well-proportioned ears, brilliant eyes, and a nose rising eminently at the top, and depressed a little towards the bottom, which Casaubon interprets as pure aquiline. Plato had an inkling of this, for he calls the Roman "the Royal nose." To take men for governors and generals by the nose, is not so ridiculous after all,

though it implies the reversal of present practice, wherein it is necessary that the elected should first take the people by the nose. In this case, it is the folly of the people that constitutes the candidate's best qualification. In that there is at least something generic in the individual himself.

One fact, that can never be got over by any amount of sceptical analysis, is that the race, which for a good thousand years held the dominion of the western world, has bequeathed its name to this peculiar nose; which we are now representing as typical of practicalness, energy of will, and rude power. The Roman nose, the aquiline nose of the great people, whose eagle standard seldom appeared upon a battlefield, except to claim a victory. Even to this day, there is energy in the Italian face; and foolish as many will think it, nothing better indicates the possibility of a regenerated Italy, than the abundant Roman noses still abiding there. Lavater notes, that the nose of the Italian is large and energetic.

All the warriors have this nose—

Julius Cæsar.

William the Conqueror.

Edward the First.

Henri Quatre.

Henry VII.

Bruce.

Wellington.

Gen. Sir C. Napier.

Zumalacarregui, the terrible

Carlist General;

and many others that cannot be recapitulated.

Then there are noses that are partly Greek and partly Roman, noses of less energy than the pure Roman, but of larger capacity :—

Alexander the Great.

Constantine.

Napoleon.

Here is a case quite in point. Napoleon was a statesman of stupendous purposes and designs, abler in the administration of the physical forces of an empire than even in the field. He is dominated by furious and passionate ambition; is rejoiced like a child to think that when other men can only get a paragraph, he shall have a page of history all to himself. He is busy with fine arts, loves to talk about music with composers, and bids them to introduce more airs into their writings; revels in abstract speculation, and boasts that as there could not be two Newtons, Napoleon must take the sword. Wellington had none of this false glare and brilliancy about him. His brain was sober, and he saw more clearly into the nothingness of life. He could not move mankind by operating upon their imagination, and he fell back upon the stern laws of duty strictly fulfilled by himself, and strictly exacted of others. When the two men

came to Waterloo, the Græco-Roman nose fell to pieces before the Roman nose. And in exile, though truth was by no means a family failing with the Napoleons, Napoleon admitted that the fate of Waterloo was not an accident. "Wellington," he said, "has all my *coup d'œil*, with greater coolness." For the same reasons precisely, Cæsar would have assuredly defeated Alexander, could they have met in a fair field, chronology permitting. It is mentioned in the capital little book before us, that Napoleon was himself a judge of noses; "Give me," he said, "a man with a good allowance of nose. Strange as it may appear, whenever I want any good head-work done, I choose a man—provided his education has been suitable—with a large nose."

Almost all the poets and painters have Greek noses. Writers, philosophers, thinkers, sculptors, have Greek noses, or Romano-Greek, and these are generally expressive of delicacy; they may look aggressive and combative, but they will not often show a strong, practical, unconscious force of will. These people are impressive—they could not be that if they had a will. They are feminine, take after their mothers, and play shuttlecock to fortune's battledore. We do not mean that many of them are not obstinate, but obstinacy implies a stupid want of will, and where there is capacity it springs from the consciousness of a weak will. The firm man is never obstinate, he knows he can never be compromised, but can always exert his will at the right moment. It would be well if the truth of these remarks could be thoroughly recognised, so that the great capacities might enrich the strong wills, and the mighty wills respect, consult, and fortify the great capacities; wed each other, as it were, to fructify in the world. Whilst they stand asunder, we must expect to see Augustan, Cromwellian, or Napoleonic despotisms, sapping the foundation of all true liberty as often as the combination of a high type of the Romano-Greek meets in one individual.

The third class which our guide, in his *Hints*, sets down, is what he calls the cogitative nose. It may be found in men of all tastes, gifts, and callings, and it depends on breadth; of this he says ingeniously:—

"It would be wrong to regard it as a mere coincidence, that after having, from deduction *à posteriori*, learnt that the common property is exhibited in the *breadth* of the nose, we find that if we were, *à priori*, to consider in which part of the nose a common property was to be looked for, we must decide to take in the *breadth*, for the profile is already in every part mapped out, and appropriated to *special* properties."

We have no objection to all this, for, as a matter of fact, it tallies quite with our own view, as will be seen hereafter, perhaps. But we object to the classification of a property, namely, cogitateness, common to all profiles of whatever stamp, as a class in itself. It involves a cross division—a Roman nose, a Greek nose, a Jewish nose, or any of their compounds may possess this characteristic, it does not show mental character, which this nasal classification is especially intended to show; it only shows the quality and quantity, or the intensity of thought that has been brought to bear in the development of a character. The author himself seems to be instinctively aware of this, for he devotes a whole chapter as a receipt “How to get a cogitative nose.” Now, if we can make our own nose, it can be no more an index to the natural character than were those “supplemental noses,” and “sympathetic snouts” of Taliacotius, mentioned in ‘Hudibras.’

Setting aside the classification, there is no doubt much that is very true contained in the observation. You will never be able to find a man of intense reflective powers having a nose thin and sharp at the nostril. The grand nose of Lavater, we have already described, but the cogitative nose is something quite different from it. It only refers to the gristly parts below the bridge of the nose. It may, or may not, be found in connexion with beauty. Oliver Cromwell’s is truly ugly, but so indicative of vigour and portentous energy that a sensitive man might throw himself into a fit of terror by mere dint of gazing on its dropping, flesh-point, rostrated, and broadly incurved, like the adze of a shipwright. Coleridge’s forms a remarkable contrast to Cromwell’s. It has the broad thoughtful character in a very large degree, but in other respects it is a weak, a lamentably weak nose, only a quarter of the length of the face, whilst Cromwell’s exceeds a third. There is no physiognomy in all picture galleries, sculptor’s chisel-work, or numismatic record, since kings first struck their type in metal, that stands out like terrible old Noll’s, for a man to govern, lead a fight, yet on the whole do justice. There is a wavy beautifulness about Philip’s head of Coleridge—but we are upon noses, and must say, “alas, that nose!” There is nothing commoner than the defect of that nose. Every tenth man you meet is Lilliputian-Roman; and whilst such superlative energy belongs to the genuine eagle-beak, that the sagacious Greeks bestowed it on Jupiter himself, this Lilliput-Roman is the very antithesis of will. Embellish it prodigally as you will with gifts, it has no power. It is weaker than a ‘snub.’ It is at the opposite pole to Roman energy. Beware of trusting business to a Lilliput

Roman. Yet we have seen these noses pretending to authority, to be fathers of a family, and to have a wife in subjection to them. Subjection! why, nothing could make anything on earth submit to them, but another inch in length tacked on to them!

Another characteristic connected with these noses is their epochal occurrence, when great intellectual and political events have stirred the passions and the minds of men. In the time of Charles the First and the Protectorate, the cogitative Roman nose distinguishes almost all the leading characters. Look at Samuel Butler's nose, immortal in wit and profound good sense, what a curved proboscis it is, and of what cogitative breadth. Even Milton's, though of Grecian type, in earlier life, when he threw himself into politics, grew broad and large. But this distinction disappeared in the butterfly race that succeeded on the accession of Charles II. Though he himself, nurtured as he was in the stormy time, retained in all his levity the latent power and outward development of the large proboscis. And so did Waller.

The difference is startling when you turn from this period to the noses of the French Revolution, and the general expression of the countenance. Prettiness distinguishes the nose, and cruelty the face of these men. One sees distinctly in the French countenances, what history demonstrates, that those men were leaders by accident, rapidly succeeded each other, and were the product or scum of chaos and anarchy. It was not their individual will shaping events, and grandly directing, that raised them to that eminence, but a volcanic eruption that tosses out stones in showers, which quickly drop, yet leaves a cloud of ashes, and lightest dross, floating for a time, until blown away miles to seaward. It has been said that words etymologically considered are "fossil history," and so the noses of an epoch are a synopsis of its history.

There are difficulties in the way of determining what is and what is not a cogitative nose, for there are many broad noses and very few cogitative, and the cogitative nose in youth is not much expanded, just as infants may be said to have no noses, but only a perforated cartilage. Then, as age increases, the nose spreads generally. Still it holds that broad nostrils and a broad base, when the rest of the nose gives corresponding signs of strength, are indicative of reflective exercise and consequent brain power. We read that the breath of life was breathed into man's nostrils, and it is very natural to gather thence that the man of fine breathing faculty should possess a greater or at least a more awakened vital principle, and possess a spirit or breath of higher worth and strain.

The Jewish nose comes next : it is like the bill of a hawk, and bows out with an equal convexity from the root to the tip. It is a shrewd and useful arch, possessing much practical sagacity, knowledge of men's character, and knowing well the practical and profitable application of that knowledge. In the *Hints* it is very justly said that it should be called the Syrian nose, for they all have it. All Phœnicia, Tyre and Sidon, Carthage, Carthagena, and the old trade to the British Isles, if not to Mexico, testify to the commercial shrewdness of these mid-sea traffickers, and to enlarge upon the present Jewish faculty throughout Europe would certainly be quite superfluous. But, on the other hand, no better reply to the claim set up by Disraeli and others, for the superiority of the Jewish mind in intellectual feats can possibly be made than to assert their intense commercial shrewdness : splendid metaphysic and æsthetic or even scientific brain, cannot be combined with this astonishing practicalness. Take one or the other, but not both. Adam Smith had this nose, and he, first of all men, deified the vice of society, making an absurd wealth the test of nations, as men of the world make it the test of individuals. Corregio had it, and was the most miserly of mankind. Vespasian and Titus both had this nose, and both were avaricious to a degree. The Jewish nose, therefore, seems to indicate commercial faculty or great avarice. In commerce, where it meets with opportunities of freely satisfying its acquisitiveness, it is simply shrewd and unscrupulous, but when it is shut away from these opportunities, it tries to amass by penurious saving. Commonly we find that men of business are much freer of their purse when engaged in business than when they have quitted it. It should be recollected, that few persons are born with true magnanimity, which seems, after all, to be little else than a fine balance of mind,—they are therefore naturally, either prodigally disposed, or misers. Those of the latter class when funds are coming in daily, are less tempted to hoard, but the moment their income is fixed, however large the amount, they will not willingly disburse a shilling. Women are generally more penurious than men, for this simple reason, that as they have fewer means than men have of making money, the acquisitiveness which is common to ordinary minds of both sexes takes in them the avaricious form.

There remain the snub nose and the turn-up nose. Few are the illustrious who have ever carried either. But if illustrious, they are only so as Boswell was, by an accidental ray of light falling on them. It only illustrates the wearer as a snub and a

snob, and stands as a warning to others, that oblivion and multitudinous herding is the alone safe station for such men to dwell in. Let them be where no light is, for history permits no favourable paragraph to be recorded of a snob. Thou didst wisely and well, Richard Cromwell, with that nose of thine, to resign the Protectorate for a life of obscurity, and "to retire," as Carlyle has it, "to Arcadian felicity, and wedded life in the "country," and die, as was most fit, exceedingly old and unnoteworthy, down away at Cheshunt, eleven miles from Shore-ditch Church, as we reckon them on the great North road. It happened, as the parish register alone knows, just two years before the House of Hanover came in. Placid old man, why not have lived two years more, and so have seen England ruled, by three distinct, not kings, but families.

It would be pleasant to enter now into national physiognomy, at least as to the nasal branch of it. To speak of all types, from a grand Caucasian down to the gross broad pug of a negro. To trace the Syrian nose and Arab, and the bulbous round nose of England. To see how noses have sometimes been held in estimation, and sometimes in abhorrence. Odd views are to be found indeed: why not? when Cicero has said, that "there was "never yet a foolish thing, but some philosopher has said it?" In Asia and Africa for instance, the Crim Tartars and the Hottentots used to break their children's noses, accounting it a most remarkable piece of folly that their noses should stand in the way of their eyes. Here, in Europe, we have always venerated the nose, and have considered that the character of a man was contained in it. As we gather from the old practice of cutting off the nose, or slitting it as a punishment and symbol of a lost character. The Frankish Ripuary laws (the oldest code of French laws extant, older than the Salic, which latter Montesquieu has talked about, and so few have read) valued a *freeman's* nose, if mutilated, at one hundred sous of gold, or about £64! sterling of our money—and the test of the mutilation was to be if he could not wipe it, *ut mucare non posset*; but if he could wipe it, 50 sous was thought a sufficient compensation. An assault, it seems, was not then so cheap as it is now, for we may now break every bone in a man's body, including his Roman bridge, for £5! but then we are civilised highly, and you will observe that all highly-cultivated people are very delicate about punishing, though they are not particular about committing crimes. There is no place in the world in which you can sin so cheap, nor do wrong with so much impunity, as in the metropolis of England. First, because vice abounds, and rarity keeps up prices; se-

condly, because observation is often eluded ; and lastly, because, if you are found out, a highly-civilised race is sympathising and does not punish.

But, to follow our noses, the wife of Jenghis Khan was a celebrated beauty, for she had only two holes for a nose, and probably a space of perhaps three or four inches, though some say five or six between the eyes. The Calmuck rule is, that the less the nose is, the greater the beauty. Accordingly if there should be any appearance of it budding, they knock it in. There the nose goes for nothing ; but in Rome they thought so much of a nose, that everything else went for nothing. For Martial puts the nose for the whole statue (Lib. v., Epig. 26), which is one of the boldest figures of synecdoche ever ventured on.

Although it has been very hotly disputed, true and earnest students find that there is an absolute ideal of beauty, but in the present state of things great latitude must be given to varying tastes. Goldsmith says, that the Roman ladies are praised for little else than the redness of their hair ; and adds, that the nose of the Grecian Venus presents an actual deformity, as it falls in a straight line from the forehead. It is singular that he should take this to illustrate the difference of taste, for it is precisely that which Mr. Hay,* in the most convincing manner, proves to result from the Greek knowledge of absolute beauty ; the completion by highest art of that which Nature in her finest types strives towards or shadows out, though she has accomplished it, perhaps in no one instance, since the world began.

One thing is very well established, that however much the nose of civilised races may excel in beauty of form those of less advanced races, the noses of the latter perform their office much better. For White, of Manchester, out of Pallas, says, " that the Calmuck, by applying his nose to the hole of a fox " or other animal, can tell whether he be at home or not." We read too, that the negroes of the Antilles can distinguish by the mere smell between the footsteps of a Frenchman and a negro. Of course the Frenchman smells much the worse, as the dirtiest negro is cleaner than the man who wears boots.

There is, however, another use of the nose besides the sense of smell, which is commonly lost sight of amongst us. It is this which we propose to point out to our readers. In the foregoing remarks we have tried to show the symbolisation of noses, let us now go a step further and teach the elementary lesson of how to use such noses as we have. Let no reader exclaim against

* *Science of the Proportion of the Human Head.* By D. R. Hay. 1849.

the folly of teaching men, in a world six thousand years old, how to use the nostrils, an apparatus they are supposed to have been using ever since the world began. It is not because a thing is absurd that it is less true, far from it, everything seems absurd that is true—and every true man seems to be ridiculous. The witty Athenians it has been said, with Xantippe—his wife—made fun of Socrates. And the Roman ladies in polite society told many amusing tales of Cato. But Socrates was Socrates, and Cato Cato for all that. Laughter in some sense depends upon a perversion of reason, and the only laughing animal is man. So it would be a good rule if, when we have enjoyed a hearty laugh, we would remember, that the perversion lies much oftener in the laugher, than in the object laughed at.

We are going now to teach our readers to use their nose, and when they have had a most excellent laugh at the proposition, and at our expense, we request them, by the help of the above axiom, to go through what follows with attention, and to endeavour to find out on which side the perversion lies. But first, by way of reprisal in the shape of laughter, let us relate from Southey's 'Omniaria,' a little anecdote of scientific wisdom, after which much eccentricity may be pardoned to any individual. "I have seen," he says, "the pineal gland handed round upon a saucer, at an anatomical lecture, as the seat of the soul:—'Seat of the soul, gentlemen; that is supposed to be the seat of the soul.'" If, after this, we should assert, as we have no intention of asserting, that "the nostrils are the seat of the soul, gentlemen," it would not be folly that would keep us without company.

The exciting cause of the following remarks is an extraordinary little work* lately published, from the pen of Mr. George Catlin, the well-known artist, who lived and travelled amongst the Red Indian tribes of America. All who know him personally recognise him for a man of shrewd observation and patient habit. This quaint book of his will stand as a monument of the value of simple observation and truth-seeking, when many clamorous works of scientific ambition, now enjoying great reputation, have perished from the shelves of all positive and practical readers, and have retired to that large grave of the bookstall, the literary bookworm's library, or the literal bookworm's tooth of oblivion.

In his intercourse with the American tribes, Catlin was struck with their surprising immunity from the diseases incident to man in civilized society. But that which chiefly struck him

* *The Breath of Life*, by Geo. Catlin. Trübner and Co. London, 1862.

(p. 5) was the undeviating regularity, whiteness, and soundness of their teeth, which commonly last them to the end of their days, and to the most advanced age. He thinks that civilized man, better sheltered, less exposed, better fed, and enjoying the auxiliary of medical skill (?) ought to preserve a better sanitary condition than his apparently less fortunate brother ; but he distinctly tells us that the reverse is the case. We accept this decision as perfectly well-founded, and beg such of our readers as are well up in the books of American travel to suspend their ready objection—"How then are the tribes dying out so fast?" Wait a while, and in due time an answer shall be given.

First, let us remark that the laws of health are so ill understood, that it is difficult to say where they are best or where they worst attended to. The only way of judging is by the negative test, namely, where there is least disease. If the Greeks have more diseases and the barbarians less, we may be sure that barbarians live most conformably to the laws of health. But we do not understand enough of Hygiene to say that they do so and so, and that they therefore, have health. The modern study of medicine is the study of disease not health. Health is nothing to the medical man, he cannot live by health, that is, what other men live by ; when they lose it they go to him, and not till then. It is true there are abundant codes and treatises upon health, but in almost the whole of them you discover that the author has passed his life, not in severely studying how to preserve health, but how to restore it when lost. Generally speaking, such works as there are upon the subject, are from the pens of practitioners who have retired with a competency, but who, all the while they were observing, were observing from the wrong point of view. Deny it as people may, the feature of ancient books, Galen, Hippocrates, Paulus Ægineta, Celsus and the rest, is the large space devoted to the *de sanitate tuendâ*—the preservation of health. The feature of modern medical books is, the one view—how to treat disease. This simple fact is pregnant, but of course, ten thousand optimists are ready to show why this is, and to prove that it is just as it ought to be. We are content to record that *it is*.

Having alleged ignorance of the laws of health considered as a science, we may still compare the civilized condition of man with the savage, and say, whether it *seems* that the civilized must needs be less healthful. The evils of savage life consist in occasional want of food, too great exposure to the inclemencies of weather, the want of proper exercise of the mental faculties, and the sudden violence of enemies. The evils of civilized life on the other hand, form a much more extensive list. An over-

supply of provision leads to an over-indulgence of every sensual appetite. The pampered and cloyed stomach and palate grow luxurious and critical, and the cook is called in to supply by art the defects of a vitiated digestion. Stimulants, wine, beer, tea, coffee, become a part of the daily and habitual food of the masses, and are called in the false language of those who use them, the "simple necessaries of life." Spirits are next resorted to, as being cheaper and more condensed in form, and these too are taken up into the daily dietary of the population. Can it be supposed that the blood of the masses, nourished daily upon such exciting fluids, and that too from childhood, can ever attain to the cool, well-concocted healthy blood, that, in less luxurious times, went to make bone, and springy fibre, elastic veins and electrical nerves? Again, the vocations by which men obtain their daily bread in civilized life, are, with a few exceptions, all unhealthy. Men tend to curdle into centres, and cities grow, then unhealthiness of residence is added. Poverty and profuse wealth meet—unhealthy poverty reacts upon unhealthy stimulants. Then the poor starve the rich out in the matter of health, for the rich never were robustly healthy, and the poor cannot now recruit them with health. At last, the whole mass, high and low festers with ill-health. Hospitals, madhouses, dentists, medical practitioners, sanatoriums, benevolent institutions abound everywhere. Do they mean charity or science? No. They mean decomposition of the masses, and the signification of all this building of bricks, and press activity in reporting of cases, lies in two words "bad blood."—It means that we have lost the art of concocting a cool juice.

Besides all this, what we call education, circulation of knowledge, elevation of the masses consists, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, in over-stimulating the brain by cruelly stimulating its intellectual volitions, as we have already over-stimulated the body. The stamina of a people is broken down by what we style civilization. Let not the reader point with pride to the fine grown young men that some aristocratic and middle-class families produce, or to what men of this stamp did in the Crimea, and the "pluck" (oh that word!) which they showed. Why should we deceive ourselves—*pluck* is not stamina. Nobody will dare to say that these men were or are any of them equal to cope in hardship and privation, or even in a momentary trial of strength with the yeomanry of two centuries ago, nor yet with the bare-legged Highland regiments of last century; if not, what is *pluck* but an euphonic phrase, simulating old heroism and prowess, whilst what it really stands for is a sort of dare-devil galvanic action under excitement. Ask, ten years hence,

for the Oxford boat-crew of this year, and five shall be dead or suffering from disease of the heart. Yet "pluck" won the boat-race.

Taking these things into account in all their infinite ramifications—which we cannot even hint at here—it is pretty clear that in the matter of health the *savage has the best of it*. Whether that advantage is a necessary one is another question altogether.

It has been the fashion, Catlin says, with most travellers to assert that the mortality is greater amongst the savage races than amongst the civilized. If this were true, it would prevent us from referring to the savages for a hint in practice, though it would not justify us in continuing as we are. But it is not true. Modern travellers compile from previous travellers, and see very little of what they write about with their own eyes. In this Catlin differs from them; he has spent years with the Red Skins, has lived with them, travelled with them, come to Europe with them; has gone again and again into their central districts, and has lived alone in the interior and upon their borders, and he stoutly denies their premature mortality.

Excepting amongst those communities of savages which had been corrupted by the dissipations and vices introduced amongst them by the civilized people.

He says that fear has deterred most writers from venturing amongst them; but that if they had done as he had done they would have found.

That there always exists a broad and moving barrier between savage and civilized communities, when the first shaking of hands and acquaintance takes place, and over which the demoralizing and deadly effects of dissipation are taught and practised; and from which, unfortunately, both for the character of the barbarous races, and the benefit of science, the customs and the personal appearance of the savage are gathered and portrayed to the world.

Amongst a people who have no bills of mortality and no statistics, it is not easy to procure exact accounts; but Catlin was at great pains to inquire of the chiefs and medical men what was the mortality of children under ten years, for the ten years previous to the time of asking the question, and he generally received for reply, none, or three; one from a kick, one from a rattlesnake, and one drowned. All from causes that might have killed adults. He visited the burial-places, where they place the skulls after the biers have fallen down, in circles, and the proportion of the crania of children was incredibly small. In this country nearly half the human race die under the age

of five. Setting all controversial points aside, Mr. Catlin was quite convinced by personal observation that the growth, development, and general health of the Red Skins was immeasurably superior to that of the white races, and he devoted his whole attention to discover if possible some cause that might account for the disease of the one and the immunity of the other race.

The perfection of the teeth of all these barbarous tribes, their beautiful whiteness and regularity struck his attention very forcibly. At last, after much pondering to very little purpose, he observed that the Indian mothers sit carefully watching by the cradle of their infants as the child falls to sleep for the purpose of pressing the lips together closely. A wild or natural child almost instinctively contracts this habit; but if not, the watchful mother enforces it, even exercising great severity, if necessary, to establish it. Of course, when once the habit is formed, it is fixed for life. The curious part of this is that the Indians are perfectly well acquainted with the concomitant advantages which belong to the practice, for when Catlin asked the reason of this so, to him, strange custom of the mothers and the medicine men, they replied promptly that it was done "to ensure their good looks, and to prolong their lives."

Mr. Catlin relates of himself that for three years he had devoted his time to the study of the law, and for three years more he had practised it, but he found it dry and crabbed. He relinquished it for the still more sedentary employment of portrait painting. This mode of life he pursued for eight years with terrible detriment to his health. At thirty-four he set out, strangely impelled, for the wilderness, canvass and brushes in hand, determined to come back with rich treasures in the shape of ethnographic records, or to perish in the attempt. His health was very feeble at this time: he himself attributed his ill-health to the sedentary habits of life; but his physician pronounced it to be disease of the lungs. He determined to take his own course, and set out on his hazardous enterprise. Of necessity he soon found himself lying out shelterless at night between a couple of buffalo-skins spread on the wet grass, where he had to breathe the dew and fog and chilly airs of night.

At first he woke constantly in great pain, suffering much from disorder of the lungs, sometimes even spitting blood. On the day following a night of such exposure, he suffered considerably from the state of his lungs. He became conscious that he was drawing in malaria through the open mouth, and he determined, cost what effort it might, to keep his lips and teeth firmly closed during the day, and up to the last moment of consciousness before sleep. He immediately felt some relief, and by constant and

unwearied efforts he at last acquired the desired habit. He overcame the disease of the lungs, and during all subsequent exposure found himself freer from aches and pains than he had ever been in his previous life.

One cannot quite go the length of our amiable enthusiast in attributing the whole of the grand effect achieved, to the simple fact of closing the mouth : though it seems very probable that if he had not acquired the habit, he would have lost his life. But we must bear in mind, that he put away at the same time the sedentary habit, the late hours, the hard head-work, the bad air, and stimulating diet of civilized life, and substituted for them, active exercise, simple food and rough, and, during the daytime, at least, a perpetual supply of fresh air. The exercise helped digestion and muscular development, the diet was cooling, and suppressed the low fever under which he suffered, whilst the oxygenating air vitalised the blood. Thirty-five is a climacterical period, and if a right impulse be given to the system then, the general health often becomes better than it ever was before. To this radical and constitutional change he superadded the excellent habit of breathing perpetually through the nostrils, sleeping and waking, and thereby capped the arch of health.

What may be the amount of advantage to be derived from this particular habit, we cannot, with our limited experience, be expected to determine, but that it must be very great, should be apparent almost at a glance to every man of average intelligence the moment it is pointed out to him. Say that we inhale and exhale breath only twenty times in a minute—if we inhale cold air directly into the lungs, instead of circuitously, as nature intended (by going which circuit it would have reached them several degrees warmer than it actually does reach them), is it not easy to see what the aggregate of wrong-doing twenty times every minute must amount to, when extended over the greater part of the twenty-four hours. The whole temperature of the body must be affected, and the lungs become congested, or even inflamed, and thus cease to perform their proper functions. The rate of breathing greatly affects the operations of the whole system—the circulation of the blood, the pulsation of the heart—in fact, the regular and uniform working of the whole body depend upon it. If this be disturbed, the proper nervous tension is disturbed with it, and the brain itself, disturbed in its presidency, reacts in disease upon the whole circle of the organs and their functions. It is not therefore by any means so small a matter as to some it may at first sight appear, whether they breathe in one way or in the other ;

since breathing through the mouth may at once, and *must, at last*, disturb the temperature of the whole system, and its periodical functions. Breathing communicates motion to the body; and we have shown above how probable it is that the brain actually owes its configuration to certain spirals of motion appertaining to the life-germ. If so, how close the link must be between healthy breathing and perfect cerebral development. The physical and spiritual touch at this point—and current language hits this mark, in the phrase which designates a man of remarkable character as “a great *spirit*,” or “a master spirit.”

As wise men, we ought not to be ashamed to learn from the primitive races such things as they are able to teach us, especially when Catlin throws out the consoling remark, that their advantage over us consists not in their being *ahead* of us but *behind* us, and “consequently not so far departed from Nature’s wise and provident regulations as to lose the benefit “of them.” Yet, strange to say, the greatest philosopher that Germany has produced—the celebrated and immortal Kant—originated the self-same hint. He has left a record of it in his paper on “The Power of Resolution over Disease.”

In that paper he tells us that his chest was flat and narrow, leaving but very little play to the heart and lungs. This was a structural evil, but he goes on to add, and we must give it in his own words, for it is most original, and must not be injured, that:—

Some years ago I was at times afflicted with cold in my head, and a cough, which became so much the more unpleasant, as they generally made their appearance at night when I went to bed.

Having become impatient at being thus prevented from sleeping, I resolved, in order if possible to remedy the former disease, to draw breath through my nose, with my lips closed. This I did at first with some difficulty, but by perseverance the pipe became always clearer, and I at last succeeded in performing this operation with perfect ease, and immediately fell asleep.

It is certainly a very important dietetic prescription to endeavour to acquire a habit of drawing breath through the nose, so as to perform this operation in the same manner, even in the most profound sleep. One who has acquired this custom will awake immediately as soon as he opens his mouth; at first a little frightened, as was the case with myself, before I became properly habituated. When one is obliged to walk fast, or to move uphill, a still greater degree of resolution is requisite; but in every case it would be better to moderate the exertion than to make an exception from the rule. This principle may, in like manner, be applied to every kind of severe exercise.

He adds that his young friends and pupils praised this maxim as salutary. He then says:—

It deserves notice, that, although, in speaking for any length of time the act of breathing would appear to be performed through the mouth, which is so often opened; and, of course, this rule transgressed with impunity; yet this is by no means the case. The operation is performed likewise through the nose; for, were the nose stuffed at the time we should say of the orator, "he speaks through the nose;" whereas, in reality, he does not: and, on the other hand, if the nose is clear, we say, "he does not speak through the nose," while, in fact, he does. A singular contradiction in terms, indeed, as Professor Lichtenberg humorously, but very justly, observes.

He remarks that the unpleasant sensation of thirst, when no other means are at hand, may be allayed by means of several strong draughts of breath through the nose. In connexion with this latter remark, though not in connexion with our subject, it has been found that bathing the nose with water, or even moistening it, will remove thirst. Captain Shaw found that moistening the calves of the legs, removed thirst occasioned by walking in hot weather. This would seem to show, that thirst is more a nervous sensation than an appetite of the body.

Little doubt can be entertained that that is a right practice, which is alike supported by the induction of a cultivated philosopher, and the instinctive usage of a primitive race. If we had only this to advance, it ought to convince every reflective mind. But some few points still remain to be touched upon before we have quite done. One is that on mentioning the curious observation of Mr. Catlin to any one, and recommending its adoption, you will, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, meet with; "Oh yes, no doubt it is a very good thing, and *I always* do keep "my mouth closed." It is not according to the custom prevalent in civilized society to set men right in any statement, still less, of course, to prove that they are wrong; on the contrary, politeness demands that you appear to believe them until they turn their back, and then you laugh at them for their absurdity. Did we, or did we not, remark above that there is perversion in laughter? However we look at the teeth of this man who says that he *always* keeps the mouth closed, and perceive that his teeth are of a rusty colour, that some are black with metallic plugging, that some have dropped out like the paling of a sluggard's garden; the lower eyelids are drawn down, there is a pleat at the side of the nose, and no indication of firmness in the midline of the lips. You meet him in the East wind, and he has a proverb that it blows in his teeth,—how could it if he shut his mouth? He runs fifty yards to catch the omnibus, and you see the hot steam puffing out between the lips, and you think that where that comes out the cold goes in. You have

tried him on circumstantial evidence, and you bring him in open-mouthed. In the same way nobody will admit that he snores. But it is an infallible rule that he whose mouth is open during the day whilst he is conscious, cannot keep it closed during the night when he is unconscious. Catlin gives faces which can be seen nowhere but in so-called civilized communities. Civilized man he says is an open-mouthed animal, and the American Indians call the white men "pale faces" and "black mouths." He asked an Ioway Indian how he liked the white people. "Well," he replied, "suppose, mouth shut, pretty coot—mouth open, no coot—me no like um, not much;" the rest of the party laughed, and said that all the Indians were struck with the teeth of the white people, their derangement, blackness, deformity, and the number which are lost, and they philosophically added, that they believed them to be destroyed by the number of lies that passed over them.

Observe that these so-called savages have no dentist, and use no dentifrice, and no toothbrush, yet their teeth are perfect. The teeth and the eyes are, as Catlin remarks, immersed in liquids which nourish and protect them. By opening the mouth the saliva is evaporated, and dryness of the mouth, is a necessary consequence. The mucous membrane, with its perpetually moistened surface, cannot be subjected to the direct action of the caustic air, without manifest injury to its function. No wood can resist alternate drying and wetting, but decays at once, and so do the teeth, though not so quickly, as possessing in themselves a reparative power. Especially when you add to this unnatural evaporation, an alternate current of hot and cold air passing outwards and inwards twenty times in the course of a minute. So that the dental art and science, beautiful as it may be considered as an ingenious adaptation of means to an end, is not to be regarded as an advantage which we enjoy over the savage, for Nature renders him altogether independent of it, and therefore superior to it.

The regularity of the teeth of an Indian child, is in a great measure, the result of having the mouth constantly kept shut by the care of the mother. The teeth, like all the other members of the body, have an individual as well as a corporate life dependent upon the vital principle, but independent of the general organisation, and that to a much greater extent than is commonly supposed, each tooth has a separate power of growth which it exercises without limit until it meets with opposition. When the mouth is closed, the under teeth press gently against the upper, and the mutual antagonism keeps them all of one length and height; but if an opposing tooth

drops out, the remaining one immediately grows up into the vacant space in an irregular and unguided fashion and becomes a tusk frightful to look upon, still spending its strength in riotous overgrowth, it drops out as its partner did before. To attain regularity, the teeth ordinarily require merely to meet and *feel* each other constantly.

Mr. Catlin gives the position of an Indian's head when he is lying asleep, whether on the face or on the back ; in both cases the mouth is firmly closed. The arrangement of the pillow must be such as to throw the head forward, so that the chin is supported by the bedclothes, which rest upon the breastbone ; the mouth cannot then drop in sleep. Especial care, however, is to be taken that no part of the pillow gets *under the shoulder*, which in our beds it invariably does, and thereby destroys the whole use of a pillow. For then the shoulders are raised and the head falls back, the neck is painfully stretched, and the jaws *must* be drawn asunder.

There is a further observation on this point, which Mr. Catlin has not recorded. It is the attitude in which men of the higher orders of society hold themselves in standing or walking, and which is commonly supposed by these people themselves, and by dancing-masters universally, to constitute a "commanding carriage." It consists in being preternaturally erect, as very stout men are, who are compelled to hollow the back like a bow, in order that they may be able to hold up the convexity in front. With this excessive erectness, they throw the head up, so that the chin stands out, and the eyes look as if they scorned the ground. This is a very common attitude with them when standing. When they walk they still endeavour to retain the air of command, and the consequence is that they cannot walk fast, which is very undignified—"all haste is vulgar"—but with a stately step must go upon their heels, and scarcely make any use whatever of their toes. Indeed, the bootmaker has generally taken care that they shall not commit that breach of good manners. This is perfectly absurd, for the proper position for walking renders a forward inclination necessary. Captain Barclay, who walked 1000 miles in 1000 successive hours, used to bend forward the body, and to throw the weight on the knees ; he took a short step and raised his feet only a few inches from the ground. This is the proper attitude for all quick walking ; and leisurely walking only differs from it in requiring a less angle of inclination.

Our objection to the "air of command" is confined to the act of throwing back the head, and thereby stretching the forepart of the neck too much. This stretching of the neck, slight

as it seems to be, is unnatural and unhealthy ; it causes rigidity, it exposes the tightened skin too much to the action of the air ; it creates a tendency to bronchitis, causes the mouth to open, and places the nostrils in an upward position, very unfavourable to respiration, it also damages the parallel between the line of the face and that of the spine, which ought always to be preserved as much as possible, whether for the sake of health or the Greek ideal of beauty. It may be judged trifling to discuss matters apparently so minute and unimportant. We quite admit that there is no grandeur about them, and that they do not in any way recommend themselves to the poetical imagination. But to breathe freely is no trifle, it is a matter of life and death, and those who condescend to observe these trifles will be little troubled with diseases of the throat or chest.

Some will reply, as we have said before, that it is rather late in the 6000th year of the World to commence teaching us how to use our noses. No doubt it is so. But the question is not whether the lesson comes late or early, so much as whether the lesson is needed now that it does come. Walk from Fulham to Whitechapel, or from Brixton to the Swiss Cottage, and count amongst the thousands how many keep the mouth closed, or hold the head in a good position for respiration ; a day's walk will not yield you two hundred examples. The true reason why the lesson seems to come late is, that in civilized life natural instincts are lost. Artificial habits bring ill-health in their train, and then study and slow reasoning upon the fragmentary experience of successive generations, have to piece together in the form of systematic rules that which the instinct of a savage would, without any reflection whatever, have led him at once to practise. Does anyone still doubt that the science of the time is utterly ignorant of the use of the nose ? Look at the respirators ; the printed directions which accompany them enjoin upon the wearer the necessity of learning to *breathe through the mouth !* and to persons with delicate lungs they even recommend *sleeping* in them.

What plainer proof can be given that science needs to be taught how to use the nose ? The nose is a natural respirator, acts in fact, precisely in the same way in warming the air inhaled, as the respirator does, only it directs it through the right channel instead of through the wrong. But the nose can do more than this by its delicate membranes, and by its peculiar nervous developments ; it can actually purify the air, as a filter purifies water. Nowhere is the atmosphere pure enough to be breathed without first passing through this natural strainer. A man at the bottom of a well may breathe mephitic air for some time, but if he open his mouth, or call for help, he is struck down at

once. Many poisons, vegetable and mineral, may be inhaled through the nose with perfect impunity, which kill if inhaled at the mouth. When one man kills a rattlesnake, keeping his mouth shut he experiences no ill effect, but if he talk to his comrades or call to them, the effluvium causes a deadly sickness, and sometimes even death.

Catlin tells a strange tale of a passage he made in 1857 in the mail steamer from Monte Video to Pernambuco, having on board eighty passengers, thirty of whom died of yellow fever. He quietly scanned the faces of those he met at table and on deck, and he noted six or seven more open-mouthed than the rest, these he set down for lost in his own mind; in a day or more their seats were vacated, and he afterwards recognised their faces when they were brought on deck, before being committed to their final resting-place, if rest be to be had in the deep sea—that fittest sepulchre of all sepulchres, as being an emblem of Eternity. He adds, as his firm conviction with regard to cholera, that if all the open-mouthed would quit a city, the cholera would commit no ravages amongst those who remained. This might be true in more ways than one, for when all the open-mouthed had departed many a large town would not muster a hundred inhabitants!

One more anecdote, and we have done. When Catlin resided in one of the Sioux villages, on the upper Missouri, a quarrel arose between one of the Fur Company's men and a Sioux. The Indian gave a challenge. The two were to fight in the prairie, stripped to the skin and unattended, their own knives were to be the weapons. Before the conflict took place, whilst both parties, perfectly prepared, were seated on the ground, Catlin and the factor succeeded in effecting a reconciliation, and finally, "a shaking of hands." Catlin, when alone with the Indian, asked him if he had not felt afraid of his antagonist, who was a more athletic and larger man. "Not a bit," was the prompt answer. "I never fear harm from a man who can't shut his mouth, no matter how large or strong he may be." Catlin was struck with this, for he too had felt that if they had fought the white man must have fallen. The closed mouth means firmness as well as health; is a symbol of character as well as of physique.

We have now tried to bring before the world the importance of *properly* using the nose, with what effect time only can show; we have also put together a few straggling hints upon the interpretation of noses. It now remains that those who may imagine that our remarks are irrelevant, or inconsequent, should open their mouths vociferously in denunciation,

and whilst they blacken us, blacken their own teeth also, for thus they will be truly civilized, and the savages will acknowledge them for genuine "black mouths." But from such as agree with us, we ask no praise, no waste of breath, for breath is Divine; we say to them as, thanks to Catlin and to Kant, we say to all, "Shut your mouth."

IV.

ROBERTSON'S SERMONS.—FOURTH SERIES.*

WE believe this volume will be found to contain, in average proportion, those various remarkable excellencies which characterised the three preceding series of the lamented and, now, so widely-beloved Frederick Robertson. Upon the publication of the first series, the *Eclectic* spoke warmly of the merits of these most individual and distinctive sermons; and it is not long since we attempted some analysis of those phases of the preacher's thought, which we deem unhappy, and even dangerous. In this notice, therefore, we need do little more than introduce the volume to the notice of our readers. That power of genius, which made Mr. Robertson so remarkable, and gives to his sermons so lofty and foremost a place among the pulpit teachings of his time, pervades the volume. Delightful reading not less than preaching, because, being a man of genius, so free and tender, and truth-loving, his sermons are entirely exempt from that mannerism which not only seems to be the property of particular preachers, but of sermons in general. Had this not been the case, they could not have had so amazing a share of posthumous popularity. As specimens of preparation for the pulpit, the sermons of Mr. Robertson are very instructive to preachers. We understand none of them to have been prepared for the press, perhaps few prepared with any idea to another eye than that of the preacher. Some are recollections, notes taken down by friends. The volume before us is more fragmentary and incomplete than either of its predecessors, yet it has all its author's directness, earnest practicalness of aim, and, for the most part, unmistakable transparency of meaning. Now, we suspect, had Mr. Robertson prepared more elaborately, with a nice eye to finish; had he brought his cultured and

* *Sermons, Preached at Trinity Chapel, Brighton.* By the Rev. Frederick W. Robertson, M.A. Fourth Series. Smith, Elder and Co.