

BF
C147p
1838


ETHNOLOGY
OF THE
INDIAN
NATIONS



Medicine

1811

ELAM P. OSBORN,
Camden, N. Y.
Cost \$ *0.25*



Frontal Sinuses

PHRENOLOGY VINDICATED,

AND

ANTIPHRENOLOGY UNMASKED.

BY

CHARLES CALDWELL, M. D.

NEW-YORK:

SAMUEL COLMAN, No. 114 FULTON-STREET,

1838.

BF
C147P
1838

Entered according to the Act of Congress, in the year 1838, by
SAMUEL COLMAN,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States, for the
Southern District of New-York.

G. F. HOPKINS & SON, Printers.

23-1-190

EXTRACTS

*From the minutes of the New-York Phrenological Society, April 4,
1838.*

Resolved, that we have heard with much pleasure of the arrival in this City of Professor Charles Caldwell, the accomplished expounder and able defender of Phrenological Science, and that we respectfully invite him to deliver a Course of Lectures on that subject before this Society and our fellow-citizens generally.

Resolved, that we have also heard with like satisfaction that Doctor Caldwell has prepared a reply to two published Lectures of Doctor Sewall, and to other antiphrenologists, and that we respectfully solicit of him the manuscript of the same for publication.

Resolved, that a committee of five be appointed from this Society to convey to Professor Caldwell the foregoing resolutions, and to express to him, in behalf of this Society, the high respect we entertain for him as a gentleman, a scholar, and a phrenologist.

Resolved, that a committee of three from this Society be appointed to superintend the publication of the before-mentioned manuscript, and to make suitable arrangements for the delivery of the proposed Course of Lectures.

JOHN B. SCOTT, PRESIDENT.

LORING D. CHAPIN, SECT'Y.

PHRENOLOGY VINDICATED,

AND

ANTIPHRENOLOGY UNMASKED.

IN the heading of this essay, the term "unmasked" is used under the entire extent and strength of its signification. It embraces in its meaning the detection, in the work of an antiphrenologist, of plagiarism, literary garbling and perverted quotation, fabricated charges, offensive and groundless, against Phrenology and its advocates, and other gross misrepresentations deliberately made for the purposes of deception. It embraces in fact the exposure of a long and multifarious catalogue of studied, artful, and culpable devices, expressly designed by an antiphrenological writer for the suppression of truth, the support, continuance, and propagation of error, and the enhancement of his own spurious pretension to talent and power in controversy, as well as to science and letters. To add to the demerit and offensiveness of the whole, these faults are committed under the show of a puritanical uprightness and candour of intention, and of great extent and accuracy of research. Hypocrisy therefore mingles in the aggregate, and increases at once its amount and disrepute.

Is any one inclined to remark, that these are charges weighty in themselves, and of serious import; and that therefore they ought not to be preferred, without grave reflection, and a full conviction that they are founded in truth? My reply is brief. I am aware of all this, have carefully weighed my responsibility in the matter, and strictly conformed to the requirement just expressed. I not only know that the charges are weighty; my design has been *to make* them so, and to render them productive of corresponding effects. And some of these effects are, not only to sustain truth, but to imprint an indelible brand of disrespect on a pamphleteer, who has deliberately conspired to suppress it. I have of course reflected on the charges dispassionately and gravely, and am prepared to support them by incontestable proof. And a large proportion of that proof will consist of extracts and fair inferences from the work, against which my charges are directed.

Is any reader moved by the solemnity of this exordium to inquire, who is the antiphrenologist here referred to? and what the character of the work he has written? To these questions, the answer will be found in the following title page.

“An examination of Phrenology; in two lectures, delivered to the students of the Columbian College, District of Columbia, February, 1837. By Thomas Sewall, M. D., Professor of Anatomy and Physiology. Published by request.”

Such is the production, so thickly studded with literary faults, and so deeply merged in moral delinquencies, which it is my purpose to make the subject of a critical examination. And should I in the course of it ex-

press myself in language so plain and strong as to be exceptionable to the author, I have no apology to offer for the offence, nor any but one explanation to give him; and for that he is referred to the contents and character of his own pamphlet. That production merits all the severity I shall exercise toward it. Though it will be treated however unceremoniously, it shall not be treated unjustly. While no imaginary faults will be imputed to it, those which mark it shall be called by their proper names, provided such names be not deemed offensive to the ear of delicacy, or to cultivated taste. That some of the terms and expressions employed will be stern and condemnatory, is not to be doubted; because, consistently with fitness, they cannot be otherwise. I may not, and will not attempt the language and manner of the "Athenian bee;" because they do not suit my mood, and would not be appropriate to my subject. Though I shall not studiedly embitter my pen, neither shall I dip it unnecessarily in the dews of Hymettus. When detected in the pamphlet, falsehood and deception, rank plagiarism and affected learning, shall be correctly denominated, and censured as they deserve. Nor shall feebleness of authorship, bloated pretension, or blank ignorance be passed unnoticed. As far as my time and resources may avail, the publication I am examining shall be spoken of in strict accordance with its character. My language must if practicable be suited to my theme. Foul looking objects cannot be painted in rainbow beauty. Nor can things that merit reprobation and rebuke be correctly represented in suavity of tone, and blandness of expression.

That the two lectures, as stated in the title page, were delivered in Washington, in February 1837, is probably true. They were not however *then* delivered for the *first time*. Two or three lectures to the same purport were delivered by Dr. Sewall in 1825 or '26; and whatever changes may have been since made in their style and manner, it is presumable that they were, in substance and tenor, somewhat the same with those which he has recently passed through the press. I received indeed at the time a confident assurance that such was the fact. True; he has no doubt during the whole interval been gravely pondering Phrenology, or rather the objections that may be fancied and fabricated against it, by hostile sciolists in it, and patiently incubating fresh matter, for the purpose of enriching and improving his discourses. We are authorized therefore to suppose, that he considers those discourses now mature and perfect — well calculated to dispel error, or what he *miscalls* so, diffuse the misleading phantom-light which he loves, and give him a place among the “mighty reformers and conservatives” of the age — perchance even a niche in the “Temple of Fame,” by the side of the *Stagirite*, to whose authority he refers, without, I venture to say, having ever perused a single chapter of that philosopher’s writings. That such is his ambition, if not his opinion, may be fairly inferred from a clause near the beginning of his second lecture, p. 35, in which he virtually disparages his predecessors and contemporaries in antiphrenology, by asserting that they have used only such “arguments” against the science, as “have too often been evaded” by their antagonists, and that by the “methods of investigation,” pursu-

ed by them, "the public mind has not been enlightened, as to the real merits of Phrenology." From these expressions, I say, taken in connexion with what just precedes them, I am justified in alleging, that he considers all other antiphrenologists as inefficient assailants, and himself the Hercules commissioned, and every way fitted, to destroy the Hydra of error, engendered in the brains of Gall and Spurzheim, whom, in imitation of his well-bred *brethren in abuse*, he designates by the courteous appellation of the "German Doctors."

Be his opinion on this topic however what it may, it is obvious that he has aimed at Phrenology the deadliest blow he is capable of inflicting. But mighty as was his effort, in his own estimation, it will be presently made appear, that, not only has he wasted it in air; but that in reality it is as puny and unskilful, as it is ostentatious and laboured. It is essentially a piece of *internal vapouring*, under a *subdued and calm exterior*. And if I do not prove it so, I shall submit, without a murmur, to the mortifying appellation of a *vapourer* myself.

As already mentioned, Dr. Sewall's two lectures, consisting of only seventy pages, very sparsely printed, were *conceived* about the year 1825 or 1826. Ever since that period, the Professor has been in protracted, and no doubt painful gestation and parturition of them; and his safe delivery is but of recent date. What less then could he expect of them, than that they would issue from the travail of his aching brain, like Minerva from the brain of the ruler of Olympus, adult in stature, full fraught with wisdom, "clad all in steel," and prepared for the highest and deadliest doings! And how miserable must be the disappointment, and how piteous the

condition of the doating parent, when he shall find (as find he must,) that, instead of giving birth to a paragon of wisdom and war, he has incurred the "sharp-toothed" sarcasm of the satirist; "*Montes parturiunt, et mus ridiculus nascitur!*" And the *mouse* shall be forth coming. But to drop the language of metaphor, and resort to that of sober narrative.

In the summer I think of 1824, a brief course of lectures on Phrenology was delivered in the city of Washington, and immediately on its close, a Phrenological Society established. Of that society I believe, but am not confident, that Dr. Sewall was a member. I am confident however that he *expressed* himself *favourably* toward the science — but whether *sincerely* or *dissemblingly*, subsequent occurrences rendered doubtful. About a year and a half afterward (I think in the spring of 1826) another course of Phrenological lectures was delivered in Washington, by invitation of the society, and under its sanction. That course Professor Sewall attended, under the semblance of entire friendliness to the doctrines taught in it. About the termination of the course, or shortly afterward, a slight event fell out, in no shape connected with either Phrenology, or any other branch of science, at which the Professor took offence. That offence was pointed at first toward the lecturer. Like other forms of flame and fiery meteors, however, it was probably *forked*; and while one streak of it fastened on the deliverer of the lectures, the other passed by him, or diverged from him, and made war on the science which he had taught. And that war is still raging; and the two lectures recently published, and now before me, are but a brace of the thunderbolts

the Professor has been forging, during the last twelve or thirteen years, for the demolition of heresy.

Be this an accurate representation of the chain of cause and effect or not, it is certainly true, that soon after the time of the offence referred to, Professor Sewall delivered to a class (but what class I know not) two or three lectures in opposition to Phrenology. But though I do not know of whom the Professor's class *did*, I well know of whom it did *not*, consist. *Not a member of the Washington Phrenological Society belonged to it.* As I have been informed, and believe to be true, not a member of the society was even apprized of the Doctor's intention to lecture on Phrenology, until after he had already done so. Nor did any one of them consider him competent to the task.

Not satisfied with the clandestine course Professor Sewall had thus pursued, for the purpose of discrediting the science in the estimation of those who had no knowledge of it, the Phrenological Society requested, and even challenged him, to redeliver his lectures, and allow the members of the society to make a part of his audience. With this request or challenge he promised to comply, and I think appointed the hour of meeting. His engagement, however, was violated — perhaps more than once. *The lectures were not redelivered.* The members of the society, dissatisfied at being thus sported with, and deeming Professor Sewall's whole conduct in the matter unbecoming and exceptionable, took immediate action on it, and published their proceedings, which contained somewhat of the statement I have here repeated. A copy of the publication was transmitted to myself. Unfortunately, however, I have lost or mis-

laid it, and have not a distinct recollection of all its particulars. But I well recollect that it was neither respectful toward Dr. Sewall, nor creditable to him. I think I may add, that it chagrined and mortified him.

If I have done the doctor injustice in this narrative, it is unintentional. And if I have been in anything incorrect, I doubt not that a copy of the proceedings of the Washington Phrenological Society referred to, can be found; and that will furnish the narrative accurately. How far the offence *unintentionally* given to Dr. Sewall, (for it *was* unintentionally given) has been instrumental in rendering him hostile to Phrenology, I pretend not to know. Nor, unversed as I am in casuistry of the kind, shall I take any concern in the solution of the problem. From the circumstances of the case, one of two points appears certain. The doctor was distrustful of either the solidity of the cause he had espoused, or of his own ability to handle it; else he would not have withheld from the members of the Phrenological Society, many of whom were his fellow practitioners of medicine, and all of them his neighbours and acquaintances, the privilege and gratification of listening to his lectures. There appears to have been something unsound at the fountain-head of his antiphrenological career; and, as was to be expected, that taint has more or less polluted the entire stream.

From the year 1826 until the summer of 1837, eleven long years, it was my fortune, good or bad as the case may turn out, to be an entire stranger to the movements of Professor Sewall, in his favourite enterprise of erecting barricadoes, to protect the world from the heresies of Phrenology. And even after possessing myself of the

two lectures I am now examining, (the first fruits of his love and labours) I allowed many months to pass away, (believing my other engagements of higher importance) before doing more than hastily glancing my eye over them. Nor should I ever have turned to the pages of them again, so trivial and commonplace, false and trashy did I find them, had I not been given to understand, that, by many people, they were differently estimated; and that, among persons unqualified to judge of them, they were exciting prejudices against Phrenology. Such are the reasons why I did not commence the present scrutiny at an early period; and, having commenced it, I have motives sufficient to induce me to make it as severe and definitive, as truth will authorize, and my time and other resources will admit.

As far as industry and labour may be deemed virtues, (and they are highly valuable ones, when applied, from correct motives, to correct purposes) Professor Sewall is entitled to praise. I know not when I have looked through seventy octavo pages more toilsomely thrown together, or exhibiting marks of more apparently extensive reading and research by their author, than the Professor's "Two Lectures." I say "apparently extensive" — not *really* so; for I am convinced that the writer has read himself but few of the works to which he has referred. His knowledge of them is derived from second-hand sources. Still however, scanty as I believe his *original* research to have been, did his lectures contain evidence of a corresponding amount of candour, judgment and talent, they would be a production of some merit. But in these attributes they are deplorably wanting. Morally considered, they are

a mass of falsehood, spurious pretension, and studied artifice, thrown together for selfish and other unbecoming purposes. In an intellectual point of view, they are a *caput mortuum* — a body without a soul — a bloated aggregation of garbled and perverted matter, assorted and arranged without either judgment or genius, tact or scholarship. From beginning to end, they do not contain a mark of profundity, or an original thought. Their objections to Phrenology, instead of being new, as their author professes them to be, are nearly as old as the science itself. They are among the very first that were contrived and presented by the antiphrenologists of Europe and America. And since their first conception, they have been repeated and re-repeated, confuted and re-confuted, until they have contracted the staleness of a ten-times-told tale. For they have been literally told and refuted, more, I doubt not, than *fifty times*. If Professor Sewall does not know this, he is more ignorant of the history of Phrenology than I have supposed him to be ; and infinitely more so than, as a lecturer and a writer on it, he ought to be. And if he does know it, I leave to others to judge of his motive in bringing again before the public such miserably vapid and time-battered commonplace. To pass by other and higher causes, self respect alone should have restrained him from thus exposing himself, clad but in the tattered cast-clothes of his predecessors.

For full information on all these points, if indeed he is deficient in it, and desirous of attaining it, he is referred to the Edinburgh and Quarterly Reviews, the writings of Gall, Spurzheim, and the two Combes, and the Edinburgh Phrenological Journal, from its commence-

ment to the present time, and he will be satisfied. He will there find every objection to Phrenology contained in his "Two Lectures," together with substantial and conclusive replies to them; and several others of equal validity, and equally refuted, which have not perhaps *occurred to him* — I should rather say, which he has *not seen*. For I verily believe that none of Dr. Sewall's objections are *his own*. He has too little originality of mind to conceive and frame them himself. He has collected them from books, and done them up into lectures, not to dissipate error from the minds of Phrenologists; but to plant or perpetuate error in the minds of those who are ignorant of Phrenology.

In 1826 he did not, as already mentioned, lecture to Phrenologists. He refused to lecture to them even when invited and challenged to that effect. It is far from being probable, therefore, that he delivered to Phrenologists his "Two Lectures," in February, 1837. He delivered them to college youths, who, it is presumable, were strangers to the science. Nor has he published them for Phrenologists; but for those whom he wishes to keep blind to the true knowledge of Phrenology; and with whom he is solicitous to acquire popularity, and build up a reputation for science and learning — perchance also to increase among them his professional business. Dr. Sewall would not dare to deliver his "Two Lectures" to a phrenological audience. He knows too well the reception he would encounter. Nor, I venture to say, has he presented a copy of his "Lectures" to any Phrenologist in either Europe or America. He is apprized that the act would bring down on him ridicule — not to say a harsher feeling, and a heavier infliction. I am told, however, that he has circulated his pamphlet to no

small extent among those who are already immersed in ignorance or error respecting the science. And the report is no doubt correct. I shall only add, under this head, that it would have been well for the reputation and standing of the Professor, had no Phrenologist ever opened his pamphlet. But to proceed to an analysis of his "Two Lectures;" and establish against them the truth of the charges, preferred in the second paragraph of my essay. And first, of

"Plagiarism, Literary Garbling, and Perverted Quotation."

A large portion of Lecture I. is taken *verbatim, without acknowledgment*, and therefore *by plagiarism*, from two works. The first of these is the "Biography of Dr. Gall," prefixed to the Boston edition of his works, translated into English by Winslow Lewis, M. D. &c. and edited by Nahum Capen, Esq. It is some of the matter of this production in particular, that Dr. Sewall has garbled, changed, and perverted, the better to accommodate it to his purposes of deception. The second work on which he has played the plagiarist, and garbled deeply, but without, I believe, making any perversion of its meaning, is the "Elements of Phrenology," published by myself, in 1827. Proof of these charges shall now be produced. In "Lecture I." when speaking of the early years of Dr. Gall, Dr. Sewall says :

"His (Dr. Gall's) attention was at first drawn to this subject (the conformation of the cranium) by observing, while quite a youth, that each of his brothers and sisters, his school fellows and companions in play, possessed some peculiarity of talent or disposition, some aptitude or propensity, which distinguished them from others." * * * * * "Some amused themselves by

cutting figures in wood, or drawing them on paper, in painting, or the cultivation of a garden; while others abandoned themselves to the noisy games, or traversed the woods in pursuit of flowers, bird's nests, and butterflies." * * * * * "Some were distinguished for the beauty of their penmanship, some for their success in arithmetic, others for the talent of acquiring a knowledge of natural history and languages. The composition of one was remarkable for elegance, while the style of another was stiff and dry; a third connected his reasoning in the closest manner, and clothed his arguments in the most forcible language."

So much for the first and second pages of "Lecture I." Let us now turn to its prototype, the "Biography of Dr. Gall."

"From an early age he (Dr. Gall) was given to observation, and was struck with the fact, that each of his brothers and sisters, companions in play, and school-fellows, possessed some peculiarity of talent or disposition, which distinguished him from others. Some of his schoolmates were distinguished for the beauty of their penmanship, some by their success in arithmetic, and others by their talent for acquiring a knowledge of natural history, or of languages. The compositions of one were remarkable for elegance, while the style of another was stiff and dry; and a third connected his reasonings in the closest manner, and clothed his argument in the most forcible language." * * * * *

"Some cut figures in wood, or delineated them on paper; some devoted their leisure to painting, or the cultivation of a garden, while their comrades abandoned themselves to noisy games, or traversed the woods to

gather flowers, seek for bird's nests, or catch butterflies."

Such are a few, and *but* a few, compared with the number that might be adduced, of Professor Sewall's acts of piracy committed on the "Biography of Dr. Gall. And it will be observed that, with a view to conceal those acts, he has garbled and transposed some of the passages, inserting between them a few words or lines of his own, or something drawn from other clauses of the "Biography," like mortar between bricks, to fill up the crevices. True; the effort at concealment is a very shallow one; resembling not a little that which the ostrich makes, by placing its head under a bramble, to escape from the hunter, its body and limbs remaining exposed. Still however it *is* an effort, and shows at once the studied trickery, and the puerile weakness of its author. He would have concealed his plagiarism and barrenness of intellect, had it been in his power. The worst however is to come.

In relation to the passages just quoted, Dr. Sewall has acted without much disguise, and taken them as he found them. He has neither omitted any thing material in them, nor altered their meaning, to subserve sinister purposes, by palming on his hearers or readers artful misrepresentations or false constructions. Though he has shown much weakness therefore, and reprehensible unfairness in the proceeding, he can hardly be said to have committed treachery in it, or any other act of moral turpitude. But in the following case, his fault is far different in amount, and much darker in colour. Depravity alone could have led to its perpetration.

"In 1808," says he, Lect. I, pp. 8-9, "Gall and

Spurzheim presented a joint memoir, on the Anatomy and Physiology of the Brain, to the French Institute, which at that time was in full glory, and one of the first scientific societies in Europe. The chief of the anatomical department was M. Cuvier, and the first member of this learned body to whom Drs. Gall and Spurzheim addressed themselves. He received the German Doctors with politeness, attended their lectures, and witnessed their dissections of the brain.

“A committee was appointed by the Institute to report upon the memoir, consisting of Tenon, Portal, Sabbatier, Pinel, and Cuvier; all men of *known candour* and ability. M. Cuvier drew up an elaborate report, containing within a short compass the whole substance of the memoir; but while it was approved by the Institute, it was not such as to satisfy Gall and Spurzheim, or to inspire confidence in their views of the anatomy and physiology of the brain. Some merit was awarded to them for their method of dissecting the brain, and for some other improvements they had made; but *many of the discoveries which they claimed as original were traced to anatomists who had preceded them*, and their main positions were regarded as extremely hypothetical. Such was the reception which Phrenology met with from the French Institute.”

Such is the account of this truckling manœuvre (for that it *was* a piece of truckling will be presently made appear) of the Institute of France, *given by Dr. Sewall*. Let us now turn to it, in the pages of the “Biography,” and see it there depicted as it was.

“In 1808, they (Gall and Spurzheim,) presented a joint memoir on the anatomy of the brain, to the French

Institute.” * * * * *

“The Institute was then in all its glory. In proportion as Buonaparte had cannonaded, it had grown enlightened. As the hero was the referendary of military justice, so was *it* the Areopagus of scientific truth. The chief of the anatomical department was M. Cuvier; and he was the first member of this learned body to whom Drs. Gall and Spurzheim addressed themselves.

“M. Cuvier was a man of known talents and acquirements, and his mind was applicable to many branches of science. But what equally distinguished him with the versality of his understanding, *was the suppleness of his opinions*. He received the German Doctors with much politeness. He requested them to dissect a brain privately for him and a few of his learned friends; and he attended a course of lectures, given purposely for him and a party of his selection. He listened with much attention, and appeared well disposed toward the new doctrine; and the *writer of this article heard him express his approbation of its general features*, in a circle which was not particularly private.

“About this time the Institute had committed an act of extraordinary courage, in venturing to ask permission of Buonaparte to award a prize medal to Sir H. Davy, for his admirable galvanic experiments, and was still in amazement at its own heroism. Consent was obtained; but the soreness of national defeat rankled deeply within. When the First Consul was apprized that the greatest of his comparative anatomists had attended a course of lectures by Dr. Gall, he broke out as furiously as he had done against Lord Whitworth; and at his levee berated the wise men of his land for

allowing themselves to be taught chemistry by an Englishman, and anatomy by a German; *sat. verbum*. *The wary citizen* (Cuvier) *altered his language*. A commission was named by the Institute, to report upon the labours of Drs. Gall and Spurzheim; *M. Cuvier drew up this report*. *In this he used his efforts, not to proclaim the truth, but to diminish the merits of the learned Germans*. *Whenever he could find the most distant similarity between the slightest point of their mode of operating, and anything done before, he dwelt upon it with peculiar pleasure; and lightly touched upon what was really new*. He even affected to excuse the Institute for taking the subject into consideration at all, saying that the anatomical researches were entirely distinct from the physiology of the brain, and the doctrines of mental manifestations. Of this part of the subject, Buonaparte, and not without cause, had declared his reprobation; and Cuvier was too great a lover of liberty not to submit his opinion to that of his Consul. His assertion, too, that the anatomy of the brain has nothing to say to its mental influence, he knew to be in direct opposition to the fact; but even the meagre credit which he did dare to allow to the new mode of dissection, he wished to dilute with as much bitterness as he could. So unjust and unsatisfactory, so lame and mutilated did the whole report appear, that the authors of the new method published an answer, in which they accused the committee of not having repeated their experiments. Such was the reception which the science of Phrenology met with from the Academy of the great nation."

Such is the account given by Professor Sewall of the

proceedings of the French Institute, in relation to Drs. Gall and Spurzheim, and such the account contained in the "Biography" from which he immediately derived his information. And on the Professor's departure from truth and correct principles in the matter, no comment is necessary to expose its enormity. He has committed one of the deepest and most reprehensible of literary delinquencies. Not only has he been guilty of garbling and perversion, but of gross interpolation, and such an entire change in the sentiment and design of the work from which he has quoted, as to make it hold out views directly the *opposite* of what its author intended. Not only has he rejected from his garbled extract every expression favourable to Gall and Spurzheim, which the "Biography" contains; he has, in disregard of truth, introduced an assertion of his own directly hostile to them.

While Dr. Sewall pronounces Cuvier a man "of *known candour*," the "Biography" declares him to have been "*distinguished for the suppleness of his opinions*." In plain terms, *destitute of candour*. And, in the case referred to, that "suppleness" was pre-eminent. That Cuvier's opinion had been friendly to the doctrines of Gall and Spurzheim, until a rebuke from the First Consul changed it, was no secret in Paris. In 1821, the Baron's summerset on that subject was there publicly spoken of, generally believed, and never contradicted. It was even openly asserted, that he had drawn up *two* reports on the memoir of the Phrenologists. Of these, the first contained a flattering approval of their doctrines; because *he himself* thought *favourably* of them; and the second a "*supple*" and submissive disappro-

val; because the First Consul thought *unfavourably* of them. And that was the *only* reason of their condemnation by him. That Cuvier “was *subsequently* a *Phrenologist*,” as far as he had informed himself in the science, his writings prove. But he never was fully and intimately informed in it; because he never thoroughly studied it. The engrossment of his mind by his own pursuits prevented him. And high-gifted and great as he was, nature did not make him a thoroughbred Phrenologist. Nor did he ever make himself so, by the requisite kind and extent of inquiries. To his sentiments of the science, therefore, much more deference has been paid, and much more consequence attached, than they actually deserved. Respecting the entire merits of Phrenology, he was far from being a competent judge. A man of native powers vastly inferior to his, but who had made Phrenology a serious study, would be greatly his superior, in fitness to decide on its truth or falsehood. I shall only add, that, in the few last years of his life, Cuvier spoke openly of the truth and importance of Phrenology. He sent Gall when on his death-bed, a cranium which he deemed corroborative of the science. But the patriarchal Phrenologist, not having yet forgotten the Baron’s former “supple” act of unkindness and discountenance, rejected the peace-offering, and returned it to the Great Naturalist, accompanied by a laconic and cutting message. Notwithstanding this, Cuvier, if I mistake not, was one of the five, who pronounced eulogies over the grave of the illustrious German. As far as they may avail therefore, the writings, conversation, and actions

of Cuvier testify to the truth and usefulness of Phrenology.

Again, says Professor Sewall, in the passage extracted from "Lecture I.;" "*many of the discoveries which they (Gall and Spurzheim) claimed as original were traced to anatomists who had preceded them.*" Not only is this clause scandalously false; it is a most dishonourable interpolation. Of the assertion it makes, the work on which the Professor has so disgracefully plagiarized, does not contain a single tittle in either letter or spirit — but virtually the reverse. The following strong and memorable passage appears in the extract just correctly made from that production.

"M. Cuvier drew up this report (on the memoir of Gall and Spurzheim.) In this he used efforts, *not to proclaim the truth, but to diminish the merits of the learned Germans.* Whenever he could find the *most distant similarity* between the *slightest point* of their mode of operating, and any thing done before, he *dwelt upon it with peculiar pleasure*, and *lightly touched upon what was new.*" * * * *. He moreover said, in positive violation of truth, "that the anatomical researches (of the Phrenologists) were entirely distinct from the physiology of the brain, and the doctrines of mental manifestations."

Thus was a course, not merely of deep injustice, but of virtual treachery, pursued toward Gall and Spurzheim, to injure and suppress their rising reputation, as anatomists and philosophers. And for what purpose? — to soothe the jealousy of the *savans* of Paris, to appease the resentment of the First Consul of France, and to

conciliate his favour toward an individual — And that individual was the first naturalist of the age ! The whole transaction was deeply discreditable to all who promoted or in any way countenanced it ; and on the character of the Baron Cuvier it has affixed a stain, which neither time nor circumstance can ever efface. It is not true, as Professor Sewall has asserted, that a *single* discovery, much less “ *many* discoveries,” claimed as original by Gall and Spurzheim, were “ traced to anatomists who had preceded them.” What they claimed as original and their own, *was* original and their own ; and time and truth have sanctioned their claim. They were as really the discoverers of what is now considered the true anatomy and physiology of the brain, as Harvey was of the circulation of the blood, Columbus of the New World, or Franklin of the identity of electricity and lightning. And I fearlessly add, that their discovery was not only the more intricate ; but that it is destined to prove the more important of the four. Nor is this all. Were the present a suitable occasion to embark in the inquiry, it would be easy to show, that Galen, father Paul, Servetus, Cæsalpinus, Fabricius, and others, had, before the time of Harvey, done much more toward the discovery of the circulation of the blood, than had been done toward the discovery of Phrenology, by all the predecessors of Gall and Spurzheim. The claim of the latter inquirers therefore to the title of discoverers, was in the same proportion less questionable than the claim of the former. And the paramount value of the contributions to science, made by the two illustrious Germans, is sufficiently clear from the following considerations.

Of the four great discoverers just mentioned, the discoveries of two, Columbus and Franklin, were confined to dead matter. Of Harvey, and Gall and Spurzheim, the discoveries related to living matter. These latter discoveries therefore were of the more elevated order; because, as respects the affairs of our globe, the knowledge of living is superior to that of dead matter. Of living matter again, some kinds bearing a higher rank than others, the knowledge of such kinds must be also higher. Nor will it be denied, that the *cerebral* system is of an order superior to the *circulatory*. But Harvey discovered only the anatomy and functions of the *latter*; while Gall and Spurzheim made a similar discovery in relation to the former. Hence, I repeat, the labours of the two Germans resulted in a more elevated and important contribution to the science of nature, than the labours of the Englishman.

In one respect the fortunes of Havey, and those of Gall and Spurzheim were alike. Their discoveries were pronounced unfounded, and brought down on their authors not merely denunciation and abuse, but what was tantamount to persecution. This state of things however could not last; because truth was destined ultimately to prevail. And when it did at length prevail, and the soundness of the doctrines of the *circulation* and of *phrenology* could be no longer disputed consistently with any show of reason and science, conscience, and justice, robber-like efforts were set on foot, to deprive the authors of the honours of their discoveries, by tracing and attributing them to some of their predecessors. To this work of piracy in science Dr. Sewall has lent himself. And in doing so, he has shown an

equal degree of pomp and injustice, vanity and weakness.

I mean the pomp and vanity of *learning*, which in reality Dr. Sewall does not possess. His learning in the present case, like his objections to phrenology, is altogether *second-hand*. He has not toiled for it, but has procured it as a charity from those, who had pushed their researches after it to the fountain head. By far the greater portion of it is furnished to him by Gall and Spurzheim themselves. They have frankly referred to all writers of distinction, who, previously to themselves, had pronounced the brain to be a *multiplex* organ, and marked different regions of it as the seat of different *operations* of the mind. I say "operations;" for none of those writers have even named, much less expounded, an original *power* or *faculty* of the mind. The reason is plain. *They had no knowledge of those faculties.* And herein consists the immense superiority of Gall and Spurzheim to all preceding mental philosophers. They have so analyzed the mind, as to indicate accurately its innate faculties, or original powers, together with the specific functions of each; while other philosophers have spoken only of mental operations or forms of action. From the time of Aristotle to that of Dr. Brown, every philosopher who has attempted to instruct the world in the science of mind, has spoken only of perception, and memory, and understanding, and will, and judgment, and imagination, and attention, and association, and other forms of generalization and abstraction, which are nothing but so many modes of action of the original faculties of the mind. But, so to analyze the mind, as to discover and describe those facul-

ties, to specify their functions, and to point out the portions of the brain in which they are seated, and through the instrumentality of which they are manifested — these discoveries and achievements were reserved to immortalize the two philosophers of Germany. And they have immortalized them, and are mental products of the highest order that have been exhibited by man. They are, indeed, too elevated or too profound, as the case may be, for Professor Sewall to reach and comprehend them. For his language, in various instances, shows that he does not comprehend them — or that he intentionally blunders, as often as he attempts to speak of them *discriminatingly*. Of all the mental efforts of the German phrenologists, their analysis of the mind, and their division of it into its primitive faculties, and pointing out the range of action of those faculties, is the most herculean. Their dissection of the brain, and their indication of the places of its numerous subordinate organs, though achievements peculiarly interesting and important, are far inferior, as intellectual exertions. But, to return, and bestow a parting gaze on the pyramid of learning, which Professor Sewall, in his overweening conceit, has erected to his own glory, by eleven or twelve tedious years of industry and toil.

To collect the *materiel* of this ill-constructed pile of ostentation and conceit, he has commenced with Aristotle, who he tells us learnt his letters and wrote his books more than three hundred years nearer to the birth-day of time, than the beginning of the christian era was; travelled down through the domains of Galen, Bernard Gordon, Albert the Great, Archbishop of Ra-

tisbon, Peter de Montagnana, Michael Servetus, Ludovico Dolci, Jo. Baptistæ Portæ, and Dr. Thomas Willis; and lastly, through the "New Jerusalem" of that memorable crack-brain, the Baron Swedenborg! With each of these shining personages the Professor may be supposed to have spent some time in his travels; for he gives what he no doubt considers quite an amusing account of their dates, places of abode, ranks in life, haps and mishaps, and other like domestic matters; and assures us, on the word of a man, that they were orthodox believers in the multiplex character of the brain. Now, to many people in the world, all this might have been as fresh and well savoured as the contents of the morning newspaper, had not the two "German Doctors" themselves been such communicative gossips, as to have told the same story at a prior period. For, with perhaps one or two omissions, they *have* told it distinctly. And, to speak plainly, I doubt not that it was from their writings Dr. Sewall derived his knowledge of it—without, however, as is his custom, making any reference to them, as the source of that knowledge. Such reference would expose the *limitedness* of his researches. And that he is anxious to avoid, because the exposure would detract from his standing, and reputation for learning among his readers. There is but little danger, however, that any considerable number of his class of readers will detect his plagiarisms. I have already said that they are not phrenologists, and have therefore little or no acquaintance with the writings of Gall and Spurzheim. That the Professor knows, and therefore draws his matter, in perfect security, from the works of the "German Doctors." Notwithstanding the pomp and parade of

learning which he makes in his "Two Lectures," I venture to assert, that, in a *single hour*, I can make any sophomore in the country, as learned on the subject of authorities in phrenology as he is. In the compass of five or six pages I can show him the whole of them.

I have said that Dr. Sewall begins, with Aristotle, his descant on the multiplex character of the brain. And on one of his assertions respecting that writer, I have a few remarks to offer; because I believe the assertion unfounded. His words are as follows: "But while he (Aristotle) regarded the brain as multiplex, *he considered a small head as the standard of perfection, and contends that it is indicative of superior intellect.*"

In the truth of the *underscored* clause of the sentence I have no confidence. In plainer terms, I deem it unfounded. I do not believe that Aristotle ever pronounced a "small head" either "the standard of perfection," or a mark of "superior intellect." And I will state the ground of my disbelief. First however, I must do Dr. Sewall the justice to observe, that the error, if it be one, did not originate with him. In truth he is not guilty of originating any thing. He is essentially, in all things of mind, a *borrower* or a *taker*. And this is as true of his assertion respecting the great Greek philosopher, as of his other assertions. I venture to say that he has never looked into the *original* writings of that author. Nor, I further say, could he have read them if he had. He is therefore ignorant of them. And as to translations and interpolations, they are insufficient authority — or rather no authority at all. But to my purpose.

I do not believe that Aristotle has pronounced a small

head an evidence of "superior intellect;" because I have been unable to find the assertion in his *original* works — I mean his works in his *native tongue*. And though I have not read, in Greek, one third of his writings; I have looked carefully through his *philosophical* writings for the sentiment in question; but *looked in vain*. I could no where meet with it. If it be, notwithstanding, there, Professor Sewall will confer a favour on me, by informing me of the place.

I have still another reason for disbelieving that Aristotle considered a small head a mark of superior intellect in its possessor. Such was not the prevalent opinion in ancient Greece — but the reverse. Painters and sculptors were there, as well as in every other place, strict observers and imitators of nature. On no other plea could the products of their labours have been creditable to them, or valuable in themselves. But it is well known, that to the figures and likenesses of their philosophers, sages, and other men of highly gifted minds, they never failed to give large heads. On the other hand, to their gladiators, wrestlers, foot-racers, and other persons of mere corporeal distinction, they gave much smaller heads. Hence the heads of Zeno, Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle himself, as represented by the artists of their time, were large. The head of Pericles is handed down to us as large to deformity. The heads of Hercules, and other mere heroes and warriors, were comparatively small. In a special manner the frontal region was contracted.

In representing their deities, on canvass and in marble, the artists observed the same rule. Hence the head of Minerva, the goddess of wisdom, is much

larger than that of Venus, the goddess of beauty, or of Diana, the huntress, whose occupation consisted chiefly in muscular action. And the head of Jupiter, the wisest and greatest of the heavenly throng, is immensely large. The frontal region in particular, where the organs of intellect lie, is enormous. In size, it is a counterpart to the muscles which he employs in hurling his thunderbolts. The head of Apollo, the god of science, poetry and taste, is also sufficiently large; while the heads of Mercury and Bacchus, who held inferior and far less creditable godships, were much smaller. For the preceding reasons, I say, I do not believe that ever Aristotle declared a small head to be the badge of mental superiority. The notion is wholly unworthy of him; because it is untrue. Were I even to find it in his writings, I should be compelled to regard it as a misprint or an interpolation. I can, in no shape, attach to Aristotle, an opinion which would now bring disgrace on a schoolboy. If he has intentionally expressed it in his writings, it must have been in the form of irony, jest, or ridicule. In earnest it could not have been.

As respects the Baron Swedenborg, I know not whether Dr. Sewall is serious, in asserting a likeness between the visions of that amiable but wild monomaniac, and the doctrines of Gall and Spurzheim. If he is, I pity him. His power of comparison, and his perception of similarity and dissimilarity must be extinct. He is so far therefore a monomaniac himself. For monomania consists in some derangement — excessive, diminished, extinguished, or perverted action — in one or a few of the original faculties of the mind, the others remaining unaffected. And nothing short of paralytic feebleness,

deep perversion, or entire extinction, of the powers of comparison, and of the perception of likeness and unlikeness, can induce Dr. Sewall or any body else, to identify the fancies of Swedenborg with the tenets of Phrenology. Swedenborg's writings, taken in matter, spirit, and manner, resemble the heated and irregular outpourings of high-toned fanaticism; while those of Gall and Spurzheim are the grave, and calm, and substantial productions of profound philosophy. Gall's great work on the anatomy and functions of the brain and nerves, and their instrumentality in the operations of the mind, is not surpassed in dignity, depth, and solidity, by any production I have ever examined. Such at least is my own opinion; and in making the comparison, I do not except either the "Novum Organum" of Bacon, the "Principia" of Newton, or the "Mechanique Celeste" of Laplace. And, of the four, it is a work of much the greater variety of matter and thought. To analyze the human mind, discover and expound its original powers, and explain their functions and range of action, is, to say the least of it, as grand an achievement, and requires as capacious, discriminating, and powerful an intellect to accomplish it, as the discovery and illustration of the true mode of attaining knowledge by Bacon, or the detection of the organization of the heavens, and the movements and laws of the celestial bodies, by Newton and Laplace. However extravagant this opinion may perhaps appear to many persons now, the time is approaching, when it will be viewed in the light of a familiar truth.

I have said that there is neither affinity nor actual similarity between the discoveries and doctrines of Gall

and Spurzheim, and the crude notions and shapeless reveries of the Baron Swedenborg. In proof of this, the following extract from the Baron's writings is offered ; and it makes perhaps something more nearly resembling an approach toward some of the sentiments of Gall and Spurzheim, than any other clause which those writings contain.

“ The peculiar distinctions of man, will and understanding, have their seat in the brain, which is excited by the fleeting desires of the will, and the ideas of the intellect. Near the various spots where these irritations produce their effects, this or that part of the brain is called into a greater or less degree of activity, and forms along with itself corresponding parts of the skull.”

Such is the incoherent jumble of words, expressing nothing but indefinite unintelligible notions, between which and the doctrines of Phrenology Dr. Sewall perceives a likeness. I shall only add, that it *may* be and probably *is* near akin to the *Doctor's Phrenology*, the fallacies and trashiness of which will be shown hereafter. But it is as unlike the Phrenology of Gall and Spurzheim, as sophistry is unlike solid argument, and balderdash unlike sound philosophy — or, stronger still, as the writings of Professor Sewall are unlike those of a well disciplined scholar, and a candid and profound inquirer.

Equally inconsistent with justice and correct representation is it, to liken the discoveries and doctrines of Gall and Spurzheim to the visions and crude hypotheses of Gordon, Albertus Magnus, Peter de Montagnana, Servetus, Dolci, Portæ, certain Arabian physicians, and other theorists, with which they have been frequently and disparagingly compared. Taken in their matter,

principles, and application, the writings and teachings of the two Phrenologists are in depth, intelligibility, definitiveness and merit, wholly dissimilar to the writings of all or any of their predecessors. They are productions of an entirely different order and character. As already intimated, all other writers on mental philosophy, speak only of certain modes of action of the mind, such as perception, memory, will, judgment, understanding, and imagination; while Gall and Spurzheim, passing beyond mere action and external manifestation, disclose the primitive and innate faculties of mind, by which that action is performed, and those manifestations made. They have stripped off the veil, which had previously hung over the *powers* and *instruments* of memory, will, judgment, imagination, and every other form of mental action, and brought them fairly to light. They differ from other writers on the philosophy of mind, exactly as he who analyzes the human arm, and demonstrates and describes its muscles, nerves, blood-vessels, ligaments, bones, and such other parts as are subservient to its movements and economy, differs from him who simply speaks of those movements and that economy themselves. And as far as the accomplished anatomist surpasses in profundity on this point, the common unprofessional observer, so far do the German Phrenologists surpass all mental philosophers, who had gone before them, and from some of whom they have been groundlessly charged with having received hints and derived assistance.

There are two facts in Phrenology, not so much noticed as they deserve to be, which, while they add not a little to its beauty and fitness, as the science of mind,

testify at the same time strongly to its truth. I shall briefly indicate them.

Man, possessed of the faculties which Phrenology bestows on him, is precisely adapted to the situation he occupies, as the head and chief of terrestrial beings. This could be easily and satisfactorily demonstrated, were the exposition a suitable one for the present occasion. Take from him a single faculty, animal, moral, or intellectual, and the privation so far unfits him for the station he holds. Add another faculty, and it will be useless, there being no demand for its exercise and function. Those given to him by Phrenology appear to make up the exact complement of feeling, sentiment, and intellect, which he ought to possess. Compose man, on the other hand, of only the modes of mental action of which metaphysicians make him up, and he will be wholly unfit for an inhabitant of earth. He will be in fact a mere *abstraction*, unfit for any thing. Thus compounded moreover, his nature will be as mysterious and unintelligible, as it will be inapplicable to any useful end. Man, as an active being, is intended to be conversant, not with generalities and abstractions, but with specialties and actual existences. He must be provided therefore with intellectual faculties fitted to give him a knowledge of individual objects, with their qualities of form, size, colour, and weight; a knowledge also of language, of numbers, of place, of tune, of the lapse of time, of events, of likenesses and unlikenesses, equalities and inequalities, and of the important relations of cause and effect; add to these, the feelings and sentiments suited to make him act according to his wants and desires, and to the knowledge thus received, and he

is well prepared for the station he holds, and the duties attached to it. And *all* these Phrenology gives him; while metaphysical philosophy gives him not one of them—nor any thing else, to make him a being of definite action, and practical usefulness.

The other phrenological fitness and beauty alluded to is, the location in groups of the organs most closely allied to each other. Amativeness, Philoprogenitiveness, Adhesiveness, and Inhabitiveness, form the family or domestic group; and they lie in contact. Benevolence, Veneration, Wonder, Hope, and Conscientiousness form the high moral and religious group; and they lie together. Form, Size, Weight, and Colour are the organs which furnish us with a knowledge of the essential properties of matter; and they are also grouped. Of all the other organs which co-operate to similar ends, the same is true. Of some of these kindred organs the fibres are known to intermingle with each other. And with all of them the case is probably the same. Hence the readiness with which they work together, and the aid which they promptly and mutually afford. Of all these aptitudes, beauties, and advantages, other schemes of mental philosophy are entirely destitute. Hence the surpassing value of Phrenology.

I have charged Professor Sewall with plagiarism on my "Elements of Phrenology," written in 1826, and printed in 1827; and the charge shall now be made good. The plagiarism here referred to, is confined chiefly to the locations and descriptions of the phrenological organs; and it is connected with garbling. The better to conceal his piracy, the Professor, omitting or changing occasionally a single word, or a brief expres-

sion, extracts skippingly here a clause or two, or a whole sentence or two, and there a clause or sentence or two more, and tacks them together, somewhat as a seamstress makes a patch-work bed-quilt, or a notable housewife a rag-carpet. To render the view of the plagiarisms the more simple and easily understood, I shall place Professor Sewall's name over his language, and my own name over mine.

AMATIVENESS.

SEWALL.

This organ is situated in the cerebellum, or the lower part of the occiput. When full it gives a backward protrusion of the occipitis, and a thickness to the upper part of the neck. Its function is sexual love.

CALDWELL.

Seat. The cerebellum, or lower part of the occiput. When strongly developed, it produces a backward protrusion of the os occipitis, giving unusual thickness to the upper part of the neck. Its function is sexual love.

PHILOPROGENITIVENESS.

SEWALL.

Situated at the occiput, immediately above Amative-ness. * * Its function is the love of offspring. It is more fully developed in women than in men. * * Of twenty-nine females who had been guilty of infanticide, the development was defective in twenty-seven.

CALDWELL.

Seat. The occiput, immediately above Amativeness.

Its function is the love of offspring. This organ is more strongly developed in women than in men. * * Of twenty-nine females who had been guilty of infanticide, the development of the organ of Philoprogeneritiveness was defective in twenty-seven.

CONCENTRATIVENESS.

SEWALL.

Situated immediately above Philoprogeneritiveness, and below Self-esteem. Its function is to maintain two or more powers in simultaneous or combined activity, so that they may be directed towards one object.

CALDWELL.

Seat. Just above Philoprogeneritiveness. * * * Its function is believed to be, to maintain in simultaneous and joint activity two or more of the intellectual powers, so that they may be concentrated on the same object.

COVETIVENESS OR ACQUISITIVENESS.

SEWALL.

Situated immediately behind Constructiveness. Its function is the love of acquisition generally. * * * When largely developed, and not regulated by the higher faculties, it often leads to dishonesty and theft. A chaplain in the Prussian army, in whom it was large, in other respects a worthy and pious man, was remarkable for stealing pocket handkerchiefs, pen-knives, books, ladies' stockings, and indeed every thing portable in the nature of property.

CALDWELL.

Seat. On each side of the head, immediately behind No. 7, (Constructiveness). Its function is a love

of acquisition generally. If not restrained and properly regulated by the higher faculties, it leads to great selfishness and even theft. * * * * A chaplain in the Prussian army, in all other respects a very worthy man, was remarkable for the propensity. He stole pocket-handkerchiefs, pen-knives, books, ladies' stockings, and indeed every thing portable in the nature of property.

SECRETIVENESS.

SEWALL.

Its function is the love of secrecy. * * * When largely developed, and not properly balanced by the higher faculties, it leads to management, lying, duplicity, and deceit. When properly controlled, it augments the efficiency of character. In courts and cabinets, it is a powerful engine. It is the diplomatist's sword and buckler. The fox, and several animals of the cat-kind, are remarkable for it. In some of the human race, it is almost their only power.

CALDWELL.

Its function is the love of secrecy. * * * * When not properly controlled and regulated by the higher faculties, it leads to management, intrigue, and falsehood. In relation to conduct, it is the source of art, hypocrisy, and cunning. When directed by an enlightened intellect, and restrained within proper limits by the moral powers, it augments not a little the efficiency of character. In courts and cabinets it is a powerful engine. On many occasions, it is the diplomatist's sword and buckler. * * * The fox and several animals of the cat-kind, are remarkable for it. In some of the human race it is almost their only power.

LOVE OF APPROBATION.

SEWALL.

Situated on each side of self-esteem. Its function is the love of approbation and applause. If directed to objects of importance; it becomes a lofty and noble ambition, and leads to corresponding efforts and achievements; but when its objects are low and trivial, it degenerates into vanity, and leads to frivolity.

CALDWELL.

Seat. On each side of No. 10 (self-esteem). The function of this organ is love of approbation or applause. If it be directed to objects of importance, it becomes a lofty and noble ambition, and leads to corresponding effort and achievement. But if its objects be low and trivial, it degenerates into vanity, and leads to frivolity.

CAUTIOUSNESS.

SEWALL.

Situated in front of No. 11. Its function is the sentiment of circumspection, or the impulse to take care. Regulated and sustained by the other faculties, this sentiment becomes prudence; but not thus modified, it degenerates into instability, doubt, demur.

CALDWELL.

Seat. On each side, adjoining No. 11, in front of it. The function of this is the sentiment of circumspection, or the impulse to take care. * * * Regulated and sustained by the other faculties, this sentiment becomes prudence. But if not thus modified, it de-

generates into irresolution, and instability, doubt and demur.

SEWALL.

The five following organs are proper to man, and constitute the line of demarcation between him and the inferior animals.

CALDWELL.

The five following organs and sentiments are proper to man, and constitute the real lines of demarcation between him and the inferior animals.

HOPE.

SEWALL.

Situated on each side of veneration. Its function produces a tendency to believe in the possibility of what the other faculties desire. * * * It is the castle-builder's home, his heaven, his consolation in disappointment; his panacea for every evil. It is the cynosure to which his soul perpetually points.

CALDWELL.

Seat. Immediately adjoining No. 14 (veneration) on each side. Its function is a tendency, without any solid ground of conviction, to believe in the possibility of what the other faculties desire. It is in a particular manner the castle-builder's home—he dwells in hope—it is his heaven, and gives him every good—his consolation under disappointment—his panacea for every evil—it is the cynosure, to which his soul perpetually points.

IDEALITY.

SEWALL.

Situated above 7 and 8. Its function is to give exquisiteness of feeling. It is the fountain of enthusiasm not only of the poet, but of the philosopher, the orator, the painter, the sculptor, the philanthropist, and of the high-minded warrior. It is the organ of poetry, and confers a relish for poetry on those who do not write. It gives refinement and taste. It communicates to eloquence its splendour and soul, and to conversation its highest charms and brilliancy.

CALDWELL.

Seat. Immediately above Nos. 7 and 8. Its function is to give exquisiteness to feeling. * * * * * This organ is the fountain of enthusiasm not merely to the poet, but to the philosopher, the orator, the painter, the sculptor, the mechanician, the philanthropist, and even to the generous and high-minded warrior. It confers a relish for poetry on those who do not write, and gives refinement to the taste of those who judge. It communicates to eloquence its splendour and its soul, and to conversation its highest charms and brilliancy.

INDIVIDUALITY.

SEWALL.

Its function is to give the faculty of practical observation, and the capacity to acquire knowledge in detached parcels, but not to put it well together. The possessor is full of matter for conversation and anecdote, but is a mere detailer of facts, which he seldom attempts to classify. He is a man of extensive information, rather than a profound philosopher.

CALDWELL.

Its function is to give the faculty of practical observation, and the capacity to acquire knowledge in detached parcels, but not to put it well together. The possessor of it is an agreeable, often an instructive companion. He is pregnant in matter for conversation, in which he is often accounted brilliant; but he is a mere detailer of facts and anecdotes, which he rarely attempts to classify or arrange. He is a man of information, rather than a profound philosopher.

Such are a few of the more open and daring piracies, committed by Professor Sewall, on the "Elements of Phrenology." Thrice the number, at least, of a more covert and dastardly character, but equally certain, could be easily adduced. The act, however, most discreditable to its author, as a mark of ignorance, and which ought therefore most to mortify and humiliate him, has not been yet represented. Like most mere copyists and imitators, the Professor is unable to discriminate between the faults of his original and the excellencies. He has therefore copied promiscuously.

In 1827, the date of the publication of my "Elements," the organ of Eventuality had not been discovered; or rather its peculiar function had not been ascertained. It was considered as making a part of Individuality; and, from being situated immediately over that organ, and in contact with it, it was called Upper Individuality. At a subsequent period, however, it was found to be the recogniser or perceiver, not of individual objects, but of facts, or *events*. Hence, in correspondence with its function, it was called Eventuality, and is so delineated,

named, and described, by Spurzheim, Combe, and other writers, whose works have appeared, since the time of the publication of my "Elements." For the reason already stated then, Eventuality not having a place in my production, Professor Sewall has copied so accurately, as to omit entirely that organ and its faculty, in his "Two Lectures." That this act of copyism has the merit of entire faithfulness and exactitude, may not be denied. In the performance of it, the Professor reminds us of the strict imitativeness of the Chinese tailor, who, having had sent to him an old coat with a patch on each elbow, as a pattern to work by, put like patches on the elbows of the new coat he constructed.

Two other recently discovered cerebral organs and their functions are now spoken of by systematic writers on Phrenology — Vitativeness, the love or desire of life, and Alimentiveness, the love or desire of nourishment. Of these also Professor Sewall is presumed to be ignorant; because he has made no reference to them in his pamphlet; and because they are not treated of in my work, to which he has so faithfully and scrupulously adhered.

Under this head I shall only add, that, throughout all his preceding purloinings from the "Elements of Phrenology," he has neither once referred to the work, by its title, nor used a single mark of quotation, to show that he was working with borrowed matter.

The Professor closes Lecture I. with a few remarks of a somewhat general and abstract character respecting Phrenology, to which he gives the name of "rules;" and in his exposition of each one of which he deviates more or less from truth — in his statement of some of them

widely — whether from ignorance or by design, I shall not pause to inquire. Here stands one of his rules :

“ *First.* Every faculty desires gratification, with a degree of energy, proportionate to the *size* of the organ.”

This is untrue, as every well informed Phrenologist knows, and every correctly written work on the subject testifies. The “*size*” of an organ makes but *one* of at least *four* distinct and oft-repeated conditions of its strength. I would inform Dr. Sewall what the three remaining conditions are, did I not think it more to his benefit that he should once more look into phrenological writings, and, while he is attaining a knowledge of the conditions in question, acquire a more creditable acquaintance with the science at large.

Another disgraceful blunder, or intentional and unprincipled misrepresentation — the Professor may take his choice.

“ If the organ of Acquisitiveness is large, and that of Benevolence is also full, the two propensities being thus counterpoised, there may be no special desire of accumulating wealth manifested, and as little of the spirit of liberal giving.”

This is no phrenological doctrine. The organs of Acquisitiveness and Benevolence neither counterbalance nor neutralize each other. They may both be large in the same individual, and both be exercised freely and independently. They then act alternately. A man may, and often does, labour strenuously to acquire property, and makes of it, when acquired, appropriations and dispositions the most liberal and charitable. Benevolence only forbids him to *create distress*, in his operations to gratify Acquisitiveness. But it in no way interferes with his acquisitions of proper-

ty, when effected, as they may be, without either violating justice, or producing pain of body or mind. Nor does Acquisitiveness throw an obstacle in the way of kindness and liberality. It often *draws in*, that Benevolence may the more certainly gratify itself by *pouring out*. Hence many of the most industrious and money-making individuals never grow rich. It is the abuse of Self-esteem that puts a check on Benevolence, hoards the products of Acquisitiveness, and creates the miser. In his attempt to show that certain other organs counterpoise and neutralize each other, our author manifests equal ignorance, and is therefore equally at fault. His attempts to philosophize in Phrenology are abundantly feeble, and intellectually discreditable. Nor are his efforts at sarcasm and misrepresentation less so. Yes; singular as it may appear, he is crude and clumsy even in misrepresentation, notwithstanding his habitual and extensive practice in it. In proof of this, take the following meditated blow, the obvious untruth and awkwardness of which render it harmless to the intended victims, and make it recoil on the assailant. He professes in it to show it to be one of the doctrines of Phrenology, that every person possessing large developments, moves in the direction of the organ which predominates for the time.

“The devout man (says he) bows his head forward in order to present the organ of Veneration, in the direction of the Deity in the Heavens.”

This I say is at once impertinent and untrue. Worse still for the intellect of its author, it is a *gross blunder*. No Phrenologist has ever uttered the notion; or if so, he is an *ignoramus*, as to the location of the organs.

And so must Dr. Sewall be, else he would not have made so silly an attempt to bring Phrenology into disrepute. The meditated but miserable sarcasm, recoils from its object, and fastens on himself. The organ of Veneration occupies the crown of the arch of the coronal region of the head. It points directly to the heavens therefore when the individual stands *erect* — not when he “bows his head forward.” Its direction during that position of the head, deviates from the course toward the heavens, by an angle of many degrees.

With this, I close my examination of Lecture I., and pass to the consideration of

LECTURE II.

In the first paragraph of this lecture, appears the following remarkable clause :

“My object in this lecture will be to show how far the science (of Phrenology) is reconcilable with the *anatomical structure and organization* of the brain, the cranium, and other parts concerned.”

Here is submitted a proposition, which, if sincerely submitted, is as boastful and groundless; and, if insincere, as wanton and reprehensible as art can devise, or imagination conceive. Either Professor Sewall is ignorant of the fundamental principles of physiology; or the pretension here held out by him, is intended to deceive. I am most inclined to believe the latter branch of the dilemma; being hardly prepared to suppose the Professor enveloped in so deep and dark a cloud of professional ignorance, as the truth of the first branch would throw around him.

The necessity which impels me to the adoption of

this belief, is unwelcome to me. The change of opinion which an occurrence of the kind produces, respecting a man who had been more favourably thought of, engenders not only regret, but mortification at our mistake ; and, worse still, it tends to create suspicion in relation to other persons, and thus to darken and embitter our brighter and kindlier thoughts of human nature. Did I suffer the measures of Professor Sewall at all to influence me in these respects, such would be the effect produced on me, by his deliberate efforts at deception and misguidance, with a view to bring Phrenology and its *advocates into disrepute*. I say the “advocates” of Phrenology ; for the insults he has offered them, by his remarks, are numerous and gross ; and the imputation aimed at the purity of their motives by him, in the three following paragraphs, is as false and flagitious as offensive language and a malicious spirit can render it.

“ There is a celebrated divine now living in Scotland, equally distinguished for his amiable disposition, his gigantic powers of mind, and the great moral influence which he exerts upon the Christian world. This individual, it is said, has the organ of destructiveness very largely developed, and not having any counteracting organ very large, it is contended by those who are acquainted with the fact, that he manifests his inherent disposition to murder, by his mighty efforts to destroy vice, and break down systems of error. In this way, he gratifies his propensity to shed blood.”

“ By a recent examination of the head of the celebrated infidel Voltaire, it is found that he had the organ of veneration developed to a very extraordinary degree.

For him it is urged, that his veneration for the Deity was so great, his sensibility on the subject of devotion so exquisite, that he became shocked and disgusted with the irreverence of even the most devout Christians, and that out of pure respect and veneration for the Deity, he attempted to exterminate the Christian religion from the earth.

“ Other explanations as much at variance with truth and common sense, are resorted to in carrying out the system.”

Such are the improbable, ill-contrived, and senseless falsehoods, which the vapid imagination of Professor Sewall has fabricated, with the intent of bringing ridicule and odium on Phrenology and its *expounders*. I do not call them its *defenders*; because when *well expounded*, it most effectually *defends itself*, and needs no other advocate.

Dr. Sewall is challenged to name the Phrenologist of *good standing*, or of *any standing*, who has given the preceding explanations of the characters of Voltaire and Dr. Chalmers; the latter being, I doubt not, the great Scottish divine, to whom the allusion is so falsely and unbecomingly made. Nor will the challenge be accepted. The reason is plain. No Phrenologist can be referred to as the author of the explanations. *Dr. Sewall is himself the author; and he cannot escape from the imputation.* I hold myself responsible, in pronouncing the fabrication a work of his own mind — a shallow artifice, of his own contrivance, coolly, *deliberately and maliciously* executed. It is a sinister, but feeble blow, designed, not for the overthrow of error, but for the

achievement of victory over a system of impregnable doctrines, to which the assailant is hostile — regardless whether it is attempted on true or false ground.

Dr. Sewall's paragraph about Dr. Chalmers in particular, is a flimsy network of mendacity and ignorance, mistake and blunder. It is not true that the great Scottish divine has "destructiveness very largely developed," and no "counteracting organ very large." His *ruling* organs are all large; and hence the unusual size of his head, the power of his intellect, and the corresponding weight and strength of his character. Were not his moral and intellectual organs large (his religious organs being included under the term "moral") he neither would nor could make "*mighty* efforts to destroy vice, and break down systems of error." Such "efforts" require large and powerful moral organs to give to the disposition sufficient strength, and large and powerful intellectual ones to do the work. Such at least is the phrenological doctrine on the subject; and Dr. Sewall knows it; else he is a punier novice than I have thought him.

It is evident, however, that he is ignorant of the true bearings, and of the whole range of action of the organ of Destructiveness. He evidently thinks (else is his phraseology inaccurate and deceptive) that the function it performs and the propensity it gives, lead *exclusively* to the "shedding of blood." This is a vulgar error. It is the phrenological doctrine of the stage-coach and the railroad car, the beer-house, and the newspapers. From which of these fountains the Professor has imbibed his phrenological draughts and inspiration, or whether from either or all of them, I neither know nor care. But I well

know that he has not derived them from the writings of either Gall, Spurzheim, Combe, or Broussais ; nor from any other standard work in Phrenology. To all such works they are in direct opposition ; because they are in direct opposition to truth.

The function of Destructiveness, or rather the propensity it bestows, is *to destroy*, in the abstract or general meaning of the term ; and the kind of destruction to which it may lead, depends entirely on circumstances and their influences. It depends materially on the condition and sway of concomitant organs. It may be moral or intellectual, as certainly as physical ; because there are *moral* and *intellectual* evils to be destroyed. *Vice* belongs to the first class, and *error* to the second. If serpents, alligators, tigers, and other noxious and destructive animals, as well as enemies and monsters in human shape, are to be beaten down and eradicated, so are the pernicious errors that mislead, and the ruinous vices that contaminate society. Of the two forms of war and havoc, requisite for these purposes, the latter is far the most important. Moral and mental are not only worse than physical and corporeal evils ; they are productive of them. And, other things being alike, the individual with large Destructiveness is best fitted to vanquish the former class of foes to human happiness, as well as the latter.

Destructiveness, while it renders the human character stern and severe, bestows on it much of its energy, keenness, and power of action. One of its effects is, to wind up the other faculties to a higher pitch, and thus impart to them a tenser tone. It points and sharpens the steel of satire and irony, invective and sarcasm,

and renders it more piercing, trenchant, and terrible. It is also the chief source of ill-nature, malice, slander, maledictions, and imprecations of mischief on those who have given offence, and, in fact, of every word and action designed for the production of unnecessary pain. It gives, moreover, to those possessing it in full developement a power to paint scenes of blood and slaughter in deeper colours, and with bolder and more terrific features, and to describe them in stronger, more thrilling, and appropriate language, than could ever be attained to, by persons endowed with it in a very limited degree. Nor is this all. Poets and other writers, who have large and active Destructiveness, have not only a *capacity*; they have also a *passion* for descriptions of battle and carnage. For such forms of mental exercise they have an instinctive fondness. Scott and Byron are in proof of this. They had both very full and vigorous Destructiveness; but the former in particular had it under perfect control, in consequence of the surpassing size and strength of his moral and reflecting organs. When he chose, however, to slip the leash, and give this mental dog of war full freedom and scope of action, in his battle and havoc descriptions, as he often did, its power was terrific. Take, as a single instance, out of scores, perhaps hundreds of the same character, that might be adduced, the following fearful language-picture of the vengeance inflicted by "The Bruce," on Cormac Doyle, for the treacherous assassination of his favourite page :

"Not so awoke the Bruce! — his hand
Snatched from the flame a knotted brand,
The nearest weapon of his wrath;
With this he crossed the murderer's path,

And venged young Allan well !
 The spattered brain, and bubbling blood
 Hissed on the half-extinguished wood ;
 The misercant gasped and fell !”

A more horror-striking portrait of the ruthless and vindictive crushing of human existence has never been drawn. Nor, without the aid of large Destructiveness, could Scott have conceived and given life to such a fancy-piece of slaughter, any more than a dwarf could bend the bow of Ulysses, or hurl the rock, with which Hector struck down the warrior that opposed him.

Of his description of the death of Bertram the same may be said. The picture is awful.

“While yet the smoke the deed conceals,
 Bertram his ready charger wheels ;
 But, floundered on the pavement floor
 The steed, and down the rider bore ;
 And bursting in the headlong sway,
 The faithless saddle-girths gave way,
 ’Twas while he toiled him to be freed,
 And with the rein to raise the steed,
 That from amazement’s iron tranee,
 All Wicliffe’s soldiers waked at once.
 Sword, halbert, musket-butt, their blows
 Hailed upon Bertram as he rose ;
 A score of pikes, with each a wound
 Bore down and pinned him to the ground ;
 But still his struggling force he rears,
 ’Gainst hacking brands and stabbing spears ;
 Thrice from assailants shook him free,
 Once gained his feet, and twice his knee.
 By tenfold odds oppressed at length,
 Despite his struggles and his strength,

He took a hundred mortal wounds,
 As mute as fox 'mongst mangling hounds,
 And when he died, his parting groan
 Had more of laughter than of moan."

Even in his glowing delineation of the subversion of a pile of dead matter, Scott manifests the giant strength of his Destructiveness. I allude to his volcanic picture of the night-burning of Rokeby castle.

"In gloomy arch above them spread,
 The clouded heaven lowered bloody red ;
 Bencath, in sombre light, the flood
 Appeared to roll in waves of blood.
 Then one, by one, was heard to fall
 The tower, the donjon-keep, the hall.
 Each rushing down with thundering sound,
 A space the conflagration drown'd ;
 Till, gathering strength, again it rose,
 Announced its triumph in its close,
 Shook wide its light the landseape o'er,
 Then sunk — and Rokeby was no more !"

Does any one wish to witness the outpourings of the Destructiveness of Byron, in satire, and malediction ? Let him turn to the "Curse of Minerva," and be abundantly gratified. He will there find such lines as the following, shedding blight and burning wherever they strike. And first on the name and character of Lord Elgin, for despoiling the Parthenon of its inimitable ornaments.

"For Elgin's fame thus grateful Pallas pleads ;
 Below, his name — above, behold his deeds !
 Be ever hailed with equal honours here,
 The Gothie monarch, and the Pictish peer !

Arms gave the first his right — the last had none,
 But basely stole what less barbarians won !
 So, when the lion quits his fell repast,
 Next prowls the wolf — the filthy jackall last !
 Flesh, limbs, and blood, the former make their own ;
 The last base brute securely gnaws the bone ! ”

The following curse is on the same :

“Hear then in silence Pallas’ stern behest ;
 Hear and believe, for time shall tell the rest.
 First on the head of him who did the deed
 My curse shall fall, on him and all his seed ;
 Without one spark of intellectual fire,
 Be all the sons as senseless as the sire ;
 If one with wit the parent brood disgrace,
 Believe him bastard of a brighter race.”

The poem abounds in such thunder-striking passages, the fearful product of the same faculty.

Thus spacious is the sphere of action, and thus multiplied the bearings and influences of the organ of Destructiveness, in the exercises of the mind — and without being pushed beyond its proper limits, the picture might be extended. Yet so barren and defective is Professor Sewall’s conception of its function, that he pronounces it a mere “propensity to shed blood !” And, rich, as he doubtless considers himself in this mite of intelligence, he draws on it as his treasury for the instruction of the age ! The Professor’s grasp of mind is quite too narrow and microscopic for the office of a teacher — especially for a teacher of *mental* philosophy. His own *mental* vision embraces things on so petty a scale, and with so *single* a bearing, as to remind one of the second line in the following couplet of Pope :

“ While man exclaims, see all things for my use !
See man for *mine*, replies a *pampered goose* !”

See the organ of Destructiveness, says the antagonist of Gall and Spurzheim and Combe, and others, designed to bestow on its possessor, a “propensity to shed blood !” — Had he received from nature less of a “propensity to shed” — *ink*, on a subject with which he is unacquainted, the press would have been a flood-gate of less error than it has been ; and he himself would have had less cause to sink under mortification, and forswear his pen which has so fatally disgraced him.

Professor Sewall’s remarks on the character of Voltaire are, if possible, still more offensive and reprehensible. The spirit of mendacity and defamation that pervades them is inexpressibly odious. That Voltaire had a full development of Veneration is true. And that, *in the early part* of his life, he entertained a high reverence for a Great First Cause, is also true. Of his sentiments on that subject, in his latter years, I know less — perhaps I should say I know nothing. It might have become perverted, greatly enfeebled, or entirely extinguished. Occurrences of the kind have repeatedly taken place. I myself have witnessed them. One of the most irreverent and profane beings I have ever known, was a lunatic, who had once been an enthusiast in religion. Be these points however as they may, the explanation of Voltaire’s infidelity, which the Professor has attempted to palm on the public, as the product of Phrenology, is scandalously false. It is not true, I mean, that any enlightened and correct Phrenologist has ever offered such an explanation. If so, Professor Sewall is called upon to name him, and give his

explanation in his own words. Who, except the Professor himself, in one of his unhappy and disgraceful moods ever penned such a sentence as the following?

“For him (Voltaire) it is urged, that his veneration for the Deity was so great, his sensibility on the subject of devotion so exquisite, that he became *shocked* and *disgusted* with the *irreverence of even the most devout christians*, and that out of pure respect and veneration for the Deity, he *attempted to exterminate the christian religion from the earth!*”

What Phrenologist, I again demand of Dr. Sewall, (the atrocity of the case *justifies the word “demand”*) has ever made this statement, or any thing like it, respecting the cause of the infidelity of Voltaire? Nor will he answer the demand. *He dare not answer it.* He has ventured so far already into the flood of falsehood, that he will shrink from going farther lest it should overwhelm him. The statement is the product of his own mind, compounded and concocted to poison the public ear, and render it deaf to truth. A consciousness of this will close his lips; because to speak would but cover him with deeper disrepute. Silence is his only protection from scorn, and he will use it to that effect. If I wrong him in these charges, he has but to convince me of the fact, to receive from me prompt and ample amends. Intentional injustice I do to no one. The charges are not made wantonly, or without reflection. They are preferred on ground which I consider valid; and nothing short of what I may deem more valid, shall induce me to withdraw them. To be compelled to speak thus of Dr. Sewall is not only unpleasant, but mortifying to me. And should any one blame

me for doing so, my reply and only defence would be, that, however improper, in such a case, the office of censor may be for me, I cannot admit that the censure and rebuke are misbestowed.

It is understood that Voltaire became "shocked and disgusted at the irreverence" not of "the most *devout* christians," but of the *professors* and *ministers* of the christian religion, because they were *not* "devout" — in plainer language, because they were profligate and hypocritical. He took offence at the corruptions and debaucheries of the priesthood; and, as is too often the case, he did not stop with taking offence at *them*. He unfortunately extended his disapproval and dislike to the religion which they abused. As they were the highest and most zealous professors of christianity, the defenders of its principles, the expounders of its doctrines, the depositories of its mysteries, the commissioned and consecrated ministers of its rites, and the dispensers of its benefits and blessings — as they stood related to it in these several high, sacred, and responsible capacities, he regarded them erroneously as its true representatives. Finding them corrupt therefore, he inferred improperly, that the leaven of their corruption pervaded and polluted the entire system. And hence his enmity to the christian religion.

It does not however follow, that, because the philosopher of Ferney was not a christian, he was therefore destitute of reverence and devoutness. Far from it. A sentiment of veneration is the product of nature; not of any given form of religion. Much nearer the truth would it be, to say that the organ of Veneration is the source of religion — for, without that organ in

man, religion could have no existence in him. In a higher or lower degree, a sentiment of veneration is an attribute of the human race. All men of sound minds have their share of it, what ever form of religion they profess or follow ; or whether they profess or follow any form. It is not to be doubted, that, under certain systems of paganism, higher reverence is manifested, and a more intense devotion professed and practised, than under the christain religion. Because one scheme of religion is more rational and true than another, it is not on that account certain that the professors of it are either more sincere in their belief of it, or more ardently devout in their acts of worship. The followers of the crescent are as zealous in their faith, and more strict and sanctimonious in their devotional exercises, than the followers of the cross. When the worshipper of Jugernaut moreover prostrates himself to be crushed by the car-wheels of his god, it is an act of religious devotion ; and so is that of the Hindoo widow, when she voluntarily consumes herself on the funeral pile, with the body of her husband. Nor does christianity furnish at the present period, any such offerings of devotedness as these. Nor had primitive christianity, in the meridian of its fervour, any thing of faith and zeal to surpass them. Even the crown-seeking martyr had nothing to offer more precious than life. And that offering is not withheld by the pagan.

All this shows, that religion is an inherent sentiment ; not the result of a system of opinions. Nor, of course, does the superiority of devoutness bespeak any superiority in the system of religion, under which it occurs. It is the fruit of cerebral development, and cerebral

training. The mere doctrines of religion have no influence on it, though the mode of worship may ; because one mode of worship may exercise the organ of veneration more than another ; and a higher degree of exercise gives it superior size and strength. I shall only add, that in the conical heads of some Asiatic nations, the development of Veneration and the other religious organs, is fuller than in any of the national heads of Europe, or in the heads of the people of the United States. Hence the fanatical depth of their superstitions and devotions. And we are confidently told, that a like form of head usually characterizes those individuals, who pertinaciously adhere to a bigoted belief in the doctrine of the divine right of kings to the throne and the judgment seat, the sceptre and the sword.

Neither christianity then, nor any other *form* of religion can be justly referred to as tests of either the falsehood or the truth of Phrenology. Nor could any thing short of ignorance or artifice have induced Dr. Sewall to make the reference. The latter cause is I doubt not the true one. He has appealed to the church, in the spirit of intrigue, to put her ban on Phrenology, and by her authoritative influence aid him in his attempt to subvert it, because his end is unattainable by reason and argument. But the appeal will be fruitless. The church will not aid him. Not a few of her ablest and most enlightened members and ministers have already become the advocates of Phrenology ; and they will all become so, as soon as the science shall be fairly understood by them. Instead of continuing to frown on *it*, the time is approaching when they will frown on those, who have artfully attempted to withhold from them the

knowledge of it. And in such an attempt the Doctor has signalized himself—but not by his ability. When stript of its artifice, his effort is feeble. I shall close my remarks on this topic, by referring once more to the deep insult Dr. Sewall has offered, and the coarse slander and defamation he has practiced toward the whole phrenological world, in the following sentence which has been already quoted :

“ Other explanations, as much *at variance with truth and common sense*, are resorted to (by Phrenologists) in carrying out the system.”

In plain English, Phrenologists are a brotherhood of *liars* or *fools* or both. Such is the true interpretation of the Professors charge. And *against whom*, and *by whom* is it made? Delicate and weighty as it is, this question must be answered.

The charge is preferred against Gall and Spurzheim, and all their followers, consisting at present of hundreds of thousands ; among them not a few as able and illustrious as any men of the age ; and no less signalized by their morals and virtues, than by science and letters.

On the other hand, the charge is made by a single individual, and, as far as I know, by him alone ; and that individual is Dr. Thomas Sewall of Washington city ; a name which has yet to find a place in the catalogue of the literati and philosophers of the day. Nor have we hitherto received any strong indications of its fitness for such a place.

After this specification and contrast of the accuser and the accused, accompanied by a request that the reader will “ look on this picture, and on this,” of the parties concerned, I shall only subjoin, that if there be,

in the records of insolence and injustice, an act of greater audacity, than Dr. Sewall has here been guilty of, I know not the page which it soils and disgraces.

I must now return, and offer a few remarks on Dr. Sewall's proposition laid down in the beginning of "Lecture II.," in which he pledges himself to "show, how far Phrenology is reconcilable with the anatomical structure and organization of the brain, the cranium, and other parts concerned;" and on his declaration which immediately follows, that the anatomy of the parts concerned, is the *proper and only standard* by which to ascertain the truth of the science. The meaning of this extraordinary allegation is, that a knowledge of the anatomy of any part of the human body is our only clue to guide us to a knowledge of its physiology or function; than which a more groundless assertion was never uttered. So far is it from having even the semblance of correctness in it, that in no single instance has the function of a part ever been discovered by an examination of its anatomical structure. No; the functions of organs are discovered by observation alone; observation, I mean, made, not on the organic structure of the parts when dead; but on their action and its results *while living*. And even when the discovery is made, no peculiar aptitude is perceptible between the anatomy of the organs, and their modes of action. That aptitude no researches in minute anatomy have yet demonstrated. And that the demonstration will ever be made, is far from being certain. But it is very certain that enlightened anatomists and physiologists disclaim all pretension to such accuracy of knowledge at present. If Dr. Sewall sincerely believes otherwise, his ignorance on

the subject is eminently disgraceful to him. And if he is acquainted with the plain truth, so abundantly familiar to the medical world, that the function of none of the organs of the body has ever yet been discovered by its anatomical structure ; and that as respects even the organs whose functions are known, no peculiar fitness is discoverable between those functions and the organization which produces them — if he is acquainted with this truth, and asserts the contrary, for the purposes of deception, the task of apportioning to him the measure of reprobation he deserves, is left for the present to the conception of others. I am unwilling to express it in words.

I ask Dr. Sewall to inform me frankly, whether he honestly believes, that he can tell, from its anatomical structure, *why* the simplest piece of vital organization produces the kind of action and issue, which observation assures us it does produce? Can he thus tell *why* an acorn produces an oak, and not a hickory? or why a walnut produces a walnut-tree, and not a chestnut, or an elm? Can he tell from its structure and organization, why the egg of a turkey produces a turkey, and not a buffalo? or why the egg of a goose does not produce a shark or a grizzly bear? or, stronger still, why it may not produce even a *Professor of Anatomy*? Can he tell why the liver secretes bile rather than pancreatic liquor? or the kidneys urine, rather than saliva? Can he tell why a muscle contracts? or why it is not instrumental in sensation, in place of a nerve? Can he tell from the structure even of the heart itself what must be of necessity its functions and uses? No, he cannot. Long before the discovery of the circulation of the blood, the struc-

ture and mechanism of that organ were known, as accurately as they are at present. But functions and uses very far from the true ones, were attributed to it by the anatomists and physiologists of the day.

It will be understood that I here allude not to the mechanical, but to the *organic* structure of the parts concerned. Since the discovery of the circulation of the blood, that a fitness of the valvular structure of the heart and veins for the performance of that process is perceptible, cannot be denied. It is even probable that the knowledge of the venous valves, which he had derived from his preceptor Fabricius ab Aquapendente, led Harvey to the discovery of the circulation. Still it was observation alone — I mean the actual *perception* of the functional action of the part that completed the work, and immortalized the discoverer. But neither Dr. Sewall, nor any other anatomist or physiologist can discover the shadow of fitness between the vital contraction and dilation of the heart, and its minute anatomy. From any knowledge he possesses of such anatomy, he cannot render the slightest reason, why the heart should not perform the function of the liver or even of the brain, as well as that which it does perform. So consummately empty and arrogant is his pretension of being able to “demonstrate” from its “structure,” the unfitness of the latter organ to perform the offices assigned to it by Phrenology!

That there exists an essential and immutable relation between the minute organization of every distinct part of the body, whether it be muscle or gland, membrane or blood-vessel, and its mode of action, is necessarily true; but it is equally so, that that relation has not yet

been detected. No; the functions of all our organs, as far as they are known, have been discovered, I say, not by anatomical researches into the minutiae of the structure of dead bodies, but by observations on living bodies. And, in many if not most cases, that observation may be made as effectually by men who know nothing of organs, except their existence and location, as by those who are intimately acquainted with their structure. Every one knows that the eye sees, the ear hears, the tongue tastes, and the nose smells, and that the fingers are the seat and instruments of touch. It is almost as generally known, that the lungs are concerned in respiration, the stomach in the digestion of food, and the liver in the secretion of bile. But the infant in his cradle knows as well *why* these things are so, as the ablest anatomist and physiologist in existence.

If this, moreover, is true, as respects the simpler organs of the body, much more so is it, in relation to the more complex ones. Wherefore is it then that Dr. Sewall alleges the notorious fallacy and monstrous absurdity, of being able to “show whether Phrenology be reconcilable to the anatomical structure and organization of the brain?” Just as easily can he tell, by an inspection of the nose, whether its possessor be a christian or a pagan; or by an examination of the great toe, under what form of the horoscope its owner was born.

Will Professor Sewall so far oblige his less enlightened contemporaries, as to inform them, what sort of cerebral structure is suitable, and what sort is not suitable for the production of the organ of Benevolence — of Veneration — of Firmness — of Hope — of Ideality — or even of *Secretiveness*, whose excess leads to deception and jug-

glery ; with the operations of the last of which his acquaintance is intimate. The Professor is doubtless prepared to give this information ; else how can he show, whether Phrenology is "reconcilable" or irreconcilable "with the anatomical structure and organization of the brain." In truth, he knows but very little about the brain, notwithstanding the following pedantic and dogmatical paragraph :

"The fact of the existence of the horizontal membrane called the tentorium, separating the superior from the inferior part of the brain, as well as the arrangement of the lateral ventricles, the corpus callosum, the fornix, and other parts, clearly show the absurdity of the idea of organs as described by phrenologists. The notion, then, of the division of the brain into phrenological organs is entirely hypothetical ; is not sustained by dissection, and is utterly inconsistent with its whole formation."

This is a mere "clap-trap," as empty and fallacious, as it is conceited and artful. It is designed, I mean, by Dr. Sewall, to secure to himself a character and consequence with the public, which he does not deserve, by an affectation of knowledge which he does not possess. It is instinct, moreover, from beginning to end, with a spirit of insolence and misrepresentation. It is not true, as he asserts, that the tentorium *separates* the superior from the inferior portion of the brain, in other words, the cerebrum from the cerebellum, in such a way as to interfere in the slightest degree with the doctrines of Phrenology. Nor, as far as I am informed on the subject, has any antiphrenologist, other than Dr. Sewall, ever made the assertion. No matter, however, whether

others have made it or not. Nature does not sanction it in her structure and general arrangement of the parts. It has not, therefore, I repeat, the slightest foundation in truth. The opening in the tentorium for the passage of cerebral matter is amply sufficient for the purposes of Phrenology. Nor, whether they be considered separately, or in their united influence, do the "lateral ventricles, the corpus callosum, the fornix," or any other portion of the brain, offer the slightest objection to the truths of the science. If Dr. Sewall is ignorant of this, it is because he is equally ignorant of the principles of Phrenology and the structure of the brain. No wonder, therefore, that he cannot perceive their relation to each other. I need hardly add, that the insolence of the paragraph quoted consists in its author's rude imputation of "absurdity" to a body of men who are immeasurably above him in every attribute that constitutes an element of human greatness and merit. If I treat the Professor without much observance, he may look for the cause, with a certainty of finding it, in his own repeated and reprehensible violations of truth, and his coarse discourtesies toward phrenologists. I shall only further observe in this place, that his entire exposition of the human brain is as superficial and flimsy a production of the kind, as I have ever examined. A student of medicine, who could not in a single week, learn to give one equally valuable, should retire from the profession to some trade or pursuit more nearly on a level with his humble abilities. If Professor Sewall lectured on anatomy no more correctly and instructively than he writes on it, no wonder that the medical school he held his appointment in failed to prosper.

The Professor's references to Haller, Wrisberg, Sommering, Blumenbaeh, and Cuvier, and his quotation from the writings of the latter, respecting the comparative size of the human brain, have been made and repeated by antiphrenologists, until they are reduced to the condition of the veriest common-place. Nor have they in reality any more weight or relevaney, as evidence either for or against the doctrines of Phrenology, than the same amount of matter, extracted at random from the Pilgrim's Progress, or the Tale of a Tub. As respects himself, their effect is two-fold and antithetical. While they probably excite toward him the admiration of uninformed antiphrenologists; they certainly awaken contempt and pity in the minds of those of an opposite character.

It is matter of regret to me that Dr. Sewall has deemed it necessary to make an effort to increase the influence and authority of his own notions, as an antiphrenologist, by a reference to the sentiments of Professor Warren, of Boston. In the capacity of a surgeon and a scholar, a gentleman and a high-minded member of society, Professor Warren has few equals. But, in his relation to Phrenology, I cannot speak of him in terms so elevated. His writings show, that in that science his knowledge is very limited. That in fact he has never made it a serious study, without which no man, be his intellect what it may, can thoroughly master it. His authority in it, therefore, is correspondingly without weight. That the Professor was formerly in the ranks of antiphrenology, is true. But I am far from being convinced that he is there at present. I am inclined to believe that a farther acquaintance with the

science has done not a little toward reconciling him to its doctrines. My uncertainty as to his precise posture at present, arises from the sentiments contained in a paper read by him, at the last meeting of the British Scientific Association, in Liverpool. In one part of his paper, relating to the skulls of an aboriginal people, taken from an ancient mound in the Mississippi Valley, he remarks :

“ There was (in the form of the skull) less extension of forehead than in the European head, but it resembled it ; the elevation of the forehead being equal to the Caucasian race. The vertex also was uncommonly elevated. The seat of the organ of *Veneration* seemed to be *very much developed*, and it was evident that they were a *very religious nation*; for there was evidence that they *made many sacrifices*.”

The sentiments here expressed, savour strongly of those of a phrenologist. So do the following. Speaking of the form of the Peruvian skull, Professor Warren further says :

“ I perceived that the organ of *Constructiveness* was peculiarly developed in all these heads ;” and that people were devoted to certain kinds of *building*, and other sorts of mechanical pursuits. Evidence of their *Constructiveness* still exists in the ancient monuments which abound in their country. So far as these extracts avail, Professor Warren is a Phrenologist. In a subsequent part of his paper, however, the Professor holds a language at variance with this. Discoursing of the skulls of a “ flat-headed ” people, which he had in his possession ; in other words, of *Carib* skulls, he observes :

“ I have the head of a celebrated chief, who had a

most extraordinarily flattened forehead, and he was known to have *remarkable talent*. In fact, no person was thought of any consequence in that country (the country of the Carib) unless he possessed a flat head."

So openly are these two extracts at war with each other, that they may be fairly regarded as holding their author in a state of neutrality. If the Phrenologists are forbidden by them to lay claim to him ; so unquestionably are the antiphrenologists. In the main, therefore, whatever may have been the cast of Professor Warren's opinions, at a former period, Dr. Sewall cannot strengthen himself and his cause, by the authority of that gentleman at present. The case, however, of the flattened skull of an Indian chief "*remarkable for talent*," of which Professor Warren speaks, calls, perhaps, for a few farther remarks.

The chief I say was of the Caribs, a nation now nearly, if not quite, extinct, of whose *general* history we know but little, and of their *individual* history nothing at all. We learn, indeed, chiefly by tradition, that, as a people, they were a personation of ferocity, savagism, and revolting brutality. Precisely as a phrenologist would infer from the size and shape of their heads, their intellect was extremely limited, being, in common with that of the inferior animals, the product almost alone of their perceptive organs ; morality was still more dismally wanting in them ; while their courage was fearless, their cruelty and thirst for blood insatiable, and their Secretiveness, Covetiveness, and other animal propensities on the same scale. So signally true is all this, and so strikingly and forcibly is it indicated by their developments, that teachers of Phrenology are in the uniform habit of

exhibiting the Carib head in verification of their doctrines. So warlike and indomitable were the Caribs, that they could not be subdued. They were therefore *extinguished*. Of cougars, panthers, and tigers, the same is true — not however on account of their *high intellect*; but of their fierce and intractable *animality*. And the Caribs were the *tigers* of the Indian race. They had faculties for battle, stratagem, and rapacity; but not for knowledge.

Thus far of the Carib *tribe*. And our intelligence even here is defective and dim. Of Carib *individuals*, whether *chiefs* or commoners, our information is necessarily far more restricted. Here even tradition fails to instruct us. As respects this subject, the entire tablet of our knowledge is blank; and every one *may* and *does* write on it as rumour dictates or fancy prompts.

I am compelled to believe then, that Professor Warren's information respecting the "talent" of the flat-headed chief is extremely scanty in its amount, and doubtful in its character. How can it be otherwise? The chief lived warred, and died, in the battle-field or his cave, many centuries ago — perhaps long before a Caucasian foot had placed its print on the shore of the western world; and when certainly no pen was employed, nor probably other means used, to delineate his character for intellect, or to record his actions.

Whence then I ask again, has professor Warren derived his knowledge of the "*remarkable talent*" of the Carib chief? And I reply myself, without hesitation, that it is not from any authentic source. It is from *tradition* at best; and that of a very "dim-green light." Nor is this all.

In giving character to a chief, in savage life, talents for knowledge avail but little. Bodily activity, strength, and hardihood, daring courage and brute ferocity do infinitely more. These indeed are almost exclusively the attributes of the savage leader. Hence a *brave* and a chief are nearly the same. A sachem in the council-house, and a chief in the field are different beings. Black-Hawk was a *chief*. And had he never visited the United States, he would have been supposed and reported to be a man of talent. In truth he *was* so reported. But a personal knowledge of him dissipated the illusion. He was a brutal daring savage — and nothing more. The grade of his intellect was low, and its compass narrow. His followers who accompanied him on his visit, surpassed him not a little in intellect ; yet he was their chief, and they obeyed him. His head was not indeed *flat* — was not a Carib-head. But it approached that figure. His forehead was narrow, low, and retreating. And the same is true of many of the chiefs, whose likenesses are contained in the “History of the Indian Tribes of North America,” now in the course of publication in Philadelphia. To close this discussion. The Carib chief, of whose skull Professor Warren speaks, might have been a man remarkable for talent, in a nation of “flat-heads ;” but he would not have been so in a nation of “round-heads ;” had that nation been composed of Caucasians. Nor, until the laws of nature change, in relation to the powers of the human mind, is it possible for an individual with a low, narrow, and retreating forehead, to be intellectually great. No well established instance of the kind moreover, has ever yet occurred. And I regret sincerely, that a man of

Professor Warren's standing should have given the sanction of his name to so palpable an error.

I respectfully ask the professor, whether he has ever known a man with a head "*almost as flat as a pancake,*" (his own expression on the subject) possessed of "remarkable talent?" I mean *intellectual* talent. He will not reply *affirmatively*. Has he ever seen a man with such a head, whose intellect was not the counterpart of his forehead — *low, flat, and meagre?* Neither will he answer this question in the affirmative. I, on the contrary, confidently answer it for him in the *negative*. Such an incongruous phenomenon has never met his eye.

Suppose the Professor were introduced into an assembly composed of "Flat-heads," sugar-loaf heads, "round heads," and men with well formed and large sized Caucasian heads, and requested, without putting any questions to them, or making any inquiries respecting them, to choose from among them an individual of "remarkable talent." Suppose such a case; would he make his choice from among the "flat-heads?" No. The sugar loaf heads? No. The round heads? No. Like every other observant and judicious man, he would choose from among the Caucasians, with large and well arched heads, and lofty, bold, and expanded foreheads. And his choice would be creditable to his sagacity and judgment. None indeed but a "flat head" would choose differently; and he is *flat* in all things, except *animality*. In that he is *full*.

Dr. Sewall appeals to Professor Warren for another fact, which calls, I think, for a few remarks.

"One individual who was most distinguished for the

variety and extent of his native talent, says Dr. Warren, had, it was ascertained after death, an uncommonly small brain.”

Not having Professor Warren's work, referred to in this paragraph, now before me, I cannot assert that Dr. Sewall's statement is inaccurate. But I strongly suspect it to be so. The Doctor, I greatly fear, has mistaken Professor Warren's precise meaning; or he is at his old tricks again — garbling, mutilating, or in some shape changing another writer's expression, to make it suit the better his own purposes. But here I may perhaps be wrong; and Dr. Sewall may for once be right. His correctness however, supposing it to exist, avails him nothing to the discredit of Phrenology.

Whatever may be the size of their heads, all men, not accidentally mutilated, or defective in the original *conformation* of their brains, have the same number of cerebral organs. Provided therefore his brain be well proportioned, and his temperament good, a man with a small head may apply himself to as great a “variety” of pursuits, as a man with a large head. And he may prosecute them with as much *activity*, but not with as much *power*. As relates to mental operations, the difference in the import of these two terms is not sufficiently regarded. That difference is radical as well as great. There may be great mental *activity*, with but little *power*; and great mental *power*, with but little *activity*. The activity of the racer, the greyhound, and the swallow, surpasses the activity of the dray-horse, the Newfoundland dog, and the condor; but their power is greatly inferior. In like manner, the activity of the mental faculties of woman is greater than that of the

faculties of man ; but their power is less. Yet the female may manifest as great a "variety" of talent as the male. And she does so.

By the existence of a great variety or flexibility of native talent then, in an individual with a small brain, Phrenology loses nothing. Nor, of course, does anti-phrenology gain any thing. And, as to the phrase "extent of native talent," I am ignorant of its precise signification. I can attach to it no definite meaning. And that is one reason, why I suspect Dr. Sewall of inaccuracy. I doubt greatly whether Professor Warren has used the expression. He is a scholar, familiar with the true import of words, and therefore writes correctly ; while, as might be easily shown, Dr. Sewall's style is incorrect, many of his forms of expression being indefinite, and difficult to be understood. If however by "extent of talent" he meant great compass or depth, elevation or power of intellect, the expression involves a mistake. No man of "an *uncommonly small brain*," or even possessing a brain of but *common* size, has ever yet been an intellectual giant — a Cæsar, a Napoleon, a Bacon, or a Franklin. And as soon shall a dwarf in frame equal a Hercules in achievement, as such an *unnatural* occurrence take place. If Professor Warren has really made the statement, as reported by Dr. Sewall, I respectfully ask him, whether the individual with "an *uncommonly small brain*," possessed the gigantic intellect, which once gave eminence to a Dexter dead, and now gives eminence to a Webster living? That his reply will be negative, I feel as confident, as if it were this moment sounding in my ear. To add as much as possible to the weight of Professor Warren's

testimony against Phrenology, Dr. Sewall prefaces his adduction of that testimony with the following high-toned assertion,

“Professor Warren, of Boston, has probably enjoyed as great opportunities for dissecting the brains of literary and intellectual men of high grade, and of comparing these with the brains of men in the lower walks of life, as any anatomist of our country, if not of the age.”

As a matter of personal knowledge, I am not authorized to contradict this. I can find men however of full and ripe intelligence, unquestioned veracity, and high standing, who have been intimate with Professor Warren's professional career, for the last fifteen or twenty years, who will contradict it. They are prepared to say, that the Professor's experience in the sort of inquiry and comparison alluded to is exceedingly limited. They are ready to aver, that although Professor Warren has written against Phrenology, he has never devoted himself, to any extent, to phrenological researches. That, in a special manner, he has not applied himself closely and strenuously to the ascertainment of the difference in size and character between the brains of men of high, and men of ordinary talents. More particularly still; that he has never been sufficiently observant of the relative size of the different compartments of the brain, in men of different grades of intellect. And, as respects the truth of phrenological doctrines, that is a point of superlative moment. In two individuals similar in temperament, the brain may be of the same size, and yet the intellect of one of them feeble, and that of the other comparatively strong. The reason is plain. In the latter the *intellectual* organs pre-

dominate, and the *animal* in the former. Or, the man of weak intellect may have a phlegmatic and dull, and he of the strong a nervous and highly elastic temperament. Or, though neither be a man of education, in the common acceptance of the term, the more intelligent may have exercised his intellectual faculties in the highest degree. As respects the principles of Phrenology, these are matters of supreme importance; and until Professor Warren shall have strictly inquired into them, which there is good reason to suspect he has never done, his authority, whether *for* the science or *against* it, will have but little weight. Whatever may have been his "opportunities" then "for dissecting the brains of literary and intellectual men of high grade, and of comparing these with the brains of men in the lower walks of *life*" — whatever may have been his "opportunities" I say to this effect, they have not been *sedulously and advantageously improved* by him. He will not *himself* say that they have been thus improved — whatever Dr. Sewall may say for him. As respects the truth of Phrenology therefore, or his own improvement in the knowledge of it, he might as well not have enjoyed them.

Professor Warren I trust will take no exception at the freedom of these remarks. They are made under the influence of the highest respect for him. But, as the weight of his name is thrown, as I believe, into the scale of error, I have deemed it my duty to counterbalance it, as far as possible, by the weight of facts, and fair-drawn inferences. Dr. Sewall concludes his remarks, under this head of his subject, with the following clause :

"I feel authorized to say, that the *experience of emi-*

nent anatomists of all times and countries, who have paid attention to the subject, will be found in strict accordance with that of Dr. Warren."

It is difficult to say, whether this sweeping assertion should be pronounced an equivouque, a juggle, or a bold misrepresentation. Be its name however what it may, it throws a veil over truth, by pretending to more than its author can prove. The qualification contained in the phrase, "who have paid attention to the subject," is quite adroitly, because perhaps evasively introduced. The reason is plain. It may be designed as a covert, behind which to skulk, as a protection from fair and manly contest. The "subject" alluded to is, whether the brains of very *strong-minded* men, or those of men of *ordinary* minds, have been found, by strict comparison, to be uniformly of the same size, or of different sizes? — and if differing in size, which predominates most frequently? or is the frequency of predominance between them about equal?

Such, I say, is the "subject" of inquiry. And I ask Dr. Sewall, what "eminent anatomists" of *any time or country*, except Gall and Spurzheim, and their followers, have actually paid to this subject the attention it deserves? — the attention, I mean, absolutely necessary to a satisfactory decision? I ask him to name even *one*, who has thus rigidly and faithfully inquired and compared, and who still coincides in opinion with Professor Warren. And I confidently believe, and even assert that he cannot do so. He cannot name a single anatomist, of real eminence, who has thus examined and thus decided. He can easily cite the names of men *called* anatomists, who concur with Professor Warren in asser-

tion. But neither are they "eminent;" nor have their inquiries been of the right cast. They have inquired, not to find *truth*; but to find *fault* — as Dr. Sewall himself has done. Their testimony, therefore, is as valueless as his. I know not the name of a single anatomist of authority and standing, who does not dissent from the views of Professor Warren; provided he has thoroughly examined the subject.

Taking his departure from this point of "Lecture II," Dr. Sewall threads his way through a wilderness of errors and misstatements, the most gross and palpable. Of these, time permits me to notice but a few. The cranium, he says, p. 45, is "thin in childhood, thicker in adult life, and becomes thin again in old age." These words *are* not his; but their *meaning* is; and that precisely. And the statement is incorrect. The skull does not become thinner in old age than it was in the prime of life. When any change in it occurs in advanced life, it grows *thicker* and *firmer*, by a process familiar to every physiologist — to every one, certainly, who deserves the title. This, I mean, is the usual course of things. When the skull becomes thinner in old age, as it sometimes perhaps may, the change is irregular, and is the product of some deviation from health and nature.

In p. 49, the Professor asserts that phrenologists "estimate the *amount of intellect* by the *size* of the head." This is untrue. "*Size*," as heretofore mentioned, enters into the computation but as a *single element*. And the number of elements is at least *four* — I think them *five*.

Does any one wish to banquet on a puffy, frothy, ill-sa-

voured dish or two of rhetoric? If so, let him turn to p. 50, and have his desire. He will there find a whole repast of rodomontade, as rare and exquisite, as ever mental cook did up. In the first platter, is served up, in tempting gastronomic style, the brain of Reubens—in the next that of Humboldt—then, of Wren—of Douglass—of Simpson—of Dean Swift—of Chatham—of Columbus—of Newton—of Volney—and, in the form of a dessert, the wit-spiced, rich, and racy brain of the Great Unknown!!—Seriously; this is one of the most tasteless and tawdry, flaunting and lubberly dashes in rhetoric I have any where witnessed. It reminds one of the matchless sublimity of the following stanza of an unfledged aspiring son of Parnassus:

“The sun’s perpendicular height
Had illumined the depth of the sea;
And the fishes beginning to sweat,
Cried d—n it, how hot we shall be!”

Speaking of the effects of injuries done to the brain, Dr. Sewall has deemed it important to refer to the nursery-tales of Ferrier and Rennels on that subject, though they have been repeated, and satisfactorily answered, dozens of times, until their groundlessness and absurdity are common-place and notorious. On this point the Doctor surpasses even himself, in the recklessness of his misrepresentation, or the depth of his ignorance. His words are as follows:

“In many of these cases, (of injuries done to the brain) blindness and deafness have been produced, motion and sensation destroyed, and all the intellectual faculties suspended; *but there has not been a destruction*

of a particular faculty of the mind, while its other powers have remained untouched." P. 58.

If the Professor believes the latter part of this paragraph, his ignorance is deplorable; if he does not, his mendacity is detestable. He may take his choice. To one charge or the other he must submit. As an *ignoramus* or an *impostor* he hangs on the dilemma.

No instance of the "destruction of a particular faculty of the mind, while its other powers have remained untouched!" So far is this from being true, that the instances to this effect on record are numerous; and scores of them have been seen, which are not recorded. As far as my observation and inquiries have extended, the five faculties which most frequently suffer from injuries of the brain, while the others continue sound, are Alimentiveness, Amativeness, Language, Calculation, and Eventuality. The cases, in which a temporary suspension or impairment, or the entire extinction of these has been produced, by lesions of the brain, the other faculties remaining sound, are so numerous and unequivocal, that their denial by Dr. Sewall is actually amazing. Nor is the solitary derangement of Form, Size, and Colour, through cerebral injuries, by any means uncommon. For ample and satisfactory information on these points, I refer to the Edinburgh Phrenological Journal, and to sundry other productions by members of the Phrenological school. Into that school, moreover, I earnestly advise Professor Sewall to enter as a pupil, and con, at least, his horn-book, before he ventures to write on Phrenology again. Though it is not probable that he will even then open any new mines of knowledge to the world, he may, perhaps, make a less disgraceful

exposure of his own ignorance of the treasures contained in those which have been opened by others.

On what he calls the "Theory of the plurality of cerebral organs," the Doctor attempts, page 58, to be sarcastic and witty. But here again, as is his custom, he plays the daw, by appearing in borrowed feathers. Every thought he expresses is derived from some of his predecessors in antiphrenology. He is himself still the "barren fig-tree" encumbering the ground. Let me seriously ask him, on what principle, except that of the "plurality of cerebral organs," does he explain monomania? But I take back the question. To ask him to explain anything in Phrenology, is like begging fire from the ice-berg, or water from the flint. So utter is his ignorance of the science, that he has neither shape nor shadow of explanation to give. — But through his slough of petty blunders and misrepresentations I must wade no longer. The task has become loathsome to me. Turning from it therefore, "for once, for all, and ever," I enter on the exposure of another higher and more daring effort of Professor Sewall to deceive — and that shall be the last. And it is perhaps the most flagitious the Professor has made.

The object aimed at in this stratagem, is to convince the public that the size and form of the head give no valid evidence of the form and size of the brain which it contains. This objection to Phrenology, like every other that his artifice and industry have been able to adduce, has been replied to, times almost innumerable, and abundantly refuted in all its bearings. The only thing new therefore in Dr. Sewall's presentation of it is the unprecedented falsity of the means he has employed

to give it weight, and the matchless audacity, with which he has pressed them.

This objection professes to rest on three points; the different thickness of the same skull in different parts; the difference in the thickness of the skulls of different individuals; and the different sizes of the frontal sinus. Though it is true that, to a certain extent, these differences do exist; it is equally true that, in the average of skulls, that extent is extremely limited. So entirely inconsiderable is it, as to have no appreciable influence in the result of the computation. By Gall, Spurzheim, and other phrenological writers, this truth has been amply demonstrated. Better still; it is demonstrated by skulls themselves; as every one may learn from a careful examination of them. By such examination it will appear, that the difference in these points, as relates to healthy adult Caucasian skulls, taken in mass, is not more than the twelfth of an inch — perhaps not so much. In a vast majority of skulls the frontal sinus is so small, as to place no obstacle in the path of the skilful Phrenologist, in his attempt to ascertain the size of the brain, by an examination of the head. It is not, I mean, beyond the discernment of such a Phrenologist to discriminate between cases, in which form and character may be given to the orbiter region by development of brain, or irregularity of bone. To those who have made themselves acquainted with the subject, these are but truisms. If they be otherwise to Dr. Sewall, he will find the cause, provided he search for it, in his own lack of information on the subject.

Of the healthy skulls of adult Caucasians, the average thickness is about one fifth of an inch. And,

except in a few inconsiderable points, this is uniform throughout the skull. Here again, while I refer to the works of Gall, Tiedeman, John Bell and other distinguished anatomists for concurring testimony, as to the thickness of crania, I appeal to an examination of skulls themselves, as the only infallible test of the truth of my statement. And to such test I confidently trust it. As a general rule, the difference in the thickness of the crania of different adult individuals does not I repeat vary more than from half a line to a line from this standard, or from one another, and rarely so much. The crania of children are thinner, while, as already mentioned, those of persons advanced in life, are usually somewhat thicker and harder. Such are the facts which nature, when the part is in a healthy condition, steadily presents. Let them be contrasted with the counterfeit facts presented by Dr. Sewall. And if that gentleman can witness the contrast without shame and confusion, to say nothing of the neverdying worm of remorse, I envy him neither his conscience, nor his regard for the approbation and esteem of the votaries of honour, and the lovers of truth.

His pamphlet contains seven engravings or lithographs of skulls, running from plate II. to plate VIII. inclusive. These, with a studied and cool duplicity, which might be well called detestable, he has palmed on the public, as a fair specimen of the average character of the human cranium, in respect to positive and relative thickness, and to the dimensions of the frontal sinus. Yet I venture to say that another group of seven such skulls, he has never seen. Nor can he collect such another

perhaps in seven years' research. I am not myself entirely unacquainted with human crania. For twenty years past I have been in the habit of examining carefully all I could have access to, as well in anatomical museums as elsewhere. And nothing even *approaching* in character Dr. Sewall's *seven conspirators* have I been able to find. I bestow on them that ominous and odious name; because, by the agency of their *employer*, they are made to conspire against truth and science, conscience and every other praiseworthy feeling. Dr. Sewall has collected and used them, on the principle of suborning and bribing witnesses, or packing juries — that he may derive from them false testimony, and an unrighteous decision. And he has succeeded. His seven plates are so many consciencless stratagems to delude. There is not among them the representation of a single natural average skull. In point of thickness, plate VIII. comes nearest the truth. But even in that the thickness is not correct, and the frontal sinus is vastly too large. It is on account of its deceptiveness in the latter respect, that Dr. Sewall has had that cranium delineated. He wishes to impose on his readers the groundless belief that sinuses so spacious frequently occur; whereas it is doubtful whether they occur in one skull out of every ten millions; and in healthy skulls they probably never occur, because they are unnatural. I have seen them a few times in the skulls of idiots, which are always irregular in some way, on account of the irregular development of their brains. To speak more definitely on this point.

The reader is requested to bear in mind, that, as here-

tofore stated, the average thickness of the human skull is about the fifth (*two-tenths*) of an inch, and to compare this with the following admeasurements :

The thickness of the skull, represented in plate II. is about the *eighth* of an inch ; that in plate III. a little more than *three tenths* of an inch ; plate IV. about *five tenths* ; plate V. *six tenths* ; VI. *eight tenths* ; VII. a *full inch* or more ; VIII. thickness nearly natural, but frontal sinuses enormous.

From this representation, brief as it is, the studied and reprehensible effort of Professor Sewall to deceive must be obvious to every one, His *professed* object is to give, in a series of plates, a *fair and natural* delineation of the average character of the human skull. And to effect this, he has had executed drawings of seven skulls, each of them in some way *deformed* and *unnatural* ; and most of them bearing indubitable marks of disease. The eranium represented in plate VII. belonged to the cabinet of Spurzheim. I saw and examined it both in Paris and Boston. It is, if I remember correctly, the skull of a maniae. But whether correct in this or not, I am perfectly so in stating, that, in his lectures, Spurzheim exhibited it as a *diseased* skull. And as such, it must appear to every one acquainted with anatomy — Dr. Sewall not excepted. That gentleman informs us, that he procured from Professor Smith, of Baltimore, the skulls delineated in plates IV. V. and VI. And I doubt not that Professor Smith keeps them in his cabinet, as specimens *certainly* of *unnatural*, and probably of *diseased* crania. The bones themselves may not be diseased. But they are preternaturally thickened, in consequence of derangement in

the viscus they enclosed. Such occurrences are frequent in cases of long continued madness and other chronic cerebral affections. The brain diminishes in size and the skull thickens ; changes which had evidently taken place in the brains and crania represented by Dr. Sewall, in plates IV. V. VI. and VII. The brains had been reduced in size by some morbid affection. In consequence of this, the internal table of the cranium had retreated from the external, to prevent the production of a vacuum, and a greater amount of diploe having been interposed, the whole had grown thicker. In the fashionable language of the day, a larger amount of blood flowing to the bones of the crania, they had become *hypertrophied*. I have several specimens of such changes in the skulls of maniacs. Even Dr. Sewall himself has not the hardihood to proclaim his plates a fair representation of the average character of the human cranium. No ; when interrogated on the subject by his class, instead of a manly avowal or disavowal, he plays the jesuit, and equivocates in his reply. The following are his own words on the subject :

“ You have asked, gentlemen, if the specimens of crania delineated in the plates, were not extreme cases ; of irregular structure, and to be regarded as exceptions to the general rule ? I have already stated, that I possess skulls of every intermediate degree of thickness, from that of the Waterman (plate II. one eighth of an inch thick) to the cast of Spurzheim ; and those, also, which exhibit the frontal sinuses from the size represented in plate VIII. to those which are scarcely perceptible ; and, by visiting the anatomical cabinets of our

country, the same variations will be seen in abundance." —pp. 52, 53.

The first part of this extract, I repeat, is an *equivoque* — a jesuitical reply — “ a non-committal,” practised indeed by the timid and wiley politician ; but which the man of science should throw from him, as a stigma alike on his character and calling. Yet it *may* be true. Professor Sewall *may* have the varieties of crania which he says he has. But if so, they are not an *accidental* possession. They are not, I mean, the product of promiscuous acquisition. They have been procured by the *research* and *selection* of years. And Dr. Sewall has not hazarded, I say, nor will he hazard the groundless assertion, that they are a correct representation of the average character of human crania in a natural condition. Like the poet’s witches, actuated by a spirit of moral cowardice or duplicity, he has “ paltered about the matter in a double sense ;” an act as inconsistent with manliness, as with truth and conscience. Bold, open deception is less despicable than that which is covert and dastardly ; on the same ground that *mid-day* robbery is less contemptible than *mid-night* theft. He whose timidity permits him to sin only by halves, if not the most atrocious, is the most *despised* of sinners.

The assertion made in the italicised clause of the extract is also unfounded. Such irregularities of crania are not to be “ seen in abundance,” in the “ anatomical cabinets of our country.” And if they even were, the testimony borne by the fact, would avail Dr. Sewall but little. Cabinets are made up too much of rarities — of things *curious* more than of things *useful*. Hence a cranium remarkable for thickness, thinness, or

any other unusual characteristic, will be preserved, while dozens of common ones will be thrown away. Such is our passion for novelty, and deviations from the usual course of things.

When seriously examined in its character and bearings, the conduct of Professor Sewall, in the composition and publication of his "Two Lectures," constitutes a problem not easily solved. The Professor is a practitioner of medicine of some distinction, in the capital of the nation; as a man and a member of society, I am told he stands well; his general associations are good, and many of his personal ones of a high order; to science and letters he makes no ordinary pretensions; in his usual deportment he affects great candour and fairness; and I am informed that he is also a professor of religion.

In the midst of these circumstances, each one of which ought to serve as a bond, to connect him indissolubly with truth and honour, that, in disregard of them all, he should bring to bear on a philosophical discussion the intrigues and stratagems of the hustings and the ballot box, is in no small degree surprising; and, were he a man of power, I might well say alarming. It is a measure unsound in principle, of hateful example, subversive of sincerity and uprightness, and, as far as its influence may extend, pernicious in its effects. To be rendered duly sensible of the truth of this, we have only to suppose the pursuit of a similar course by every man of standing, and to look calmly on the issue. But on a spectacle so appalling it is impossible to look calmly. The world would be a pandemonium sufficiently tormenting to inflict expiatory punishment on its own

deepest crimes. Immeasurably worse than the Dark Ages, an age of falsehood and its concomitants, would prevail. So far as his influence may extend, such is the odious tendency of Professor Sewall's conduct. It is at war with all that is sacred in itself, and valuable to man. If his conscience whisper peace to him, and his reputation can sustain itself under this trial, I know not what can shake the latter, or awaken to action the worm of the former.

One extract more from the "Two Lectures," and I shall take leave of them forever.

"But in order to render this part of the investigation the more satisfactory and conclusive, I have instituted a series of experiments, to ascertain the exact amount of brain in the skull, compared with its external dimensions. These experiments were made under the immediate inspection, and by the assistance of Thomas P. Jones of this city, and Professor Wm. Ruggles of the Columbian College; gentlemen whose high scientific character assures the utmost accuracy in the results. I am much indebted to these gentlemen for the aid they have afforded me. In the first series of experiments was ascertained, the volume of each skull, the brain included. In the second series, the volume of the brain, or the capacity of the cerebral cavity.

"Then, in order to render the difference in capacity more obvious, the volume of each skull, the brain included, was reduced to the dimensions of seventy fluid ounces.

"The table shows the result of these experiments, as extended to five of the skulls delineated in the plates.

		Vol. brain.
Plate II.	70 oz.	56.23 oz.
III.	“	51.72
IV.	“	46.21
V.	“	34.79
VII.	“	25.33

“In five adult skulls therefore, of the same external dimensions, we have a difference in the amount of brains between II. and III. of . . . 4.50 oz.

II. and IV. “ . . . 10.01.

II. and V. “ . . . 21.43.

II. and VII. “ . . . 31.89.

“In this computation we have a difference in the volume of brain, contained in two skulls of the same external dimensions, of 31.89; something more than one half. These experiments have been extended to a great variety of crania, not here delineated; which confirm the above estimate, and show that the external dimensions of the skull furnish no indication of the amount of the brain.”

This is another deliberate and unprincipled effort in Dr. Sewall to deceive those who are unversed in the knowledge of the human brain. Yet, with all his laboured insidiousness, he has presented no shadow of objection to the principles of Phrenology. That he possesses two skulls of the same volume — say 70 oz., containing brains, the one of 56.22 oz., and the other of 25.23 oz. weight, *may* be true. It may be also true, that he possesses the intermediate sized skulls and brains to which he refers. But his object is trickishly to palm on the public the belief, that these exhibit an

average of the comparative difference of size in the skulls and brains of healthy adult individuals ; *and that is not true. He knows it is not.* Nor will he hazard the remnant of his reputation (if any remnant he possesses) by *openly* pronouncing it true.

The average weight of the brain of the human Caucasian adult, when fairly developed, and in a healthy condition, is, I think, about *three pounds and three or four ounces*. Very few exceed this more than from two to four ounces. If my recollection serve me, the brain of Cuvier weighed four pounds and nine or ten ounces ; and the brain of Byron about the same ; so did that of Dupuytren—and they were all of extra size. But never has there been seen the healthy and well developed brain of a full sized Caucasian adult, which weighed but little more than a pound and a half ! In attempting the establishment of an opposite opinion, our author, I repeat, is as sensible as I am that he is violating truth—else his ignorance on the subject is worse than idiotic !

To show the fallacy and futility of the efforts of Dr. Sewall, and all other antiphrenologists, to make it appear, that the size and form of the human brain cannot be discovered by an examination of the human head, let the following experiment be made.

Let fifty skulls be taken promiscuously and bisected—some perpendicularly, and others horizontally. In the sections thus produced, as moulds, make casts of beeswax or plaster. This being done, extract the casts, and lay them and the cranial sections, in which they were formed, disorderly on a table. In this state of location, let them be examined even by a boy of ten or twelve years old, of common intellect, who was not

present at the casting, and who has never seen them before; and he will point immediately to the section of skull, in which each or any given cast was formed. This experiment I have had made; the issue was as just stated; and I deem it conclusive. And so did every one who witnessed it. And so would Dr. Sewall were the scales off his eyes.

Once more. In one respect, plate VIII. is designed to practise, and actually does practise on those who are unversed in anatomy, as gross a deception, as either of the others. Though it represents the bones of the cranium of nearly their natural thickness in most places, it makes them more than usually uneven in their thickness; and the frontal sinuses exhibited in the plate, are *eminently* unnatural. They are *four or five times* the ordinary size of those cavities. Certainly they are by far the largest that I have ever seen. Dr. Sewall will not have the effrontery to pronounce them *natural*. He knows them to be *enormous* — far, very far beyond the regular and healthy average size. And that is the reason why he has had them here depicted. His object in having the plate prepared was *deception* — not *instruction* — the propagation of *error* — not of *truth*. The stratagem is dishonourable, not to say detestable — worthy only of the unhallowed cause it is intended to subserve.

I have never seen frontal sinuses at all approaching the dimensions of those represented in plate VIII. except in the crania of idiots, madmen, and persons far advanced in years. In the first of these the cerebral organs lying immediately behind the internal orbiter plate, had been originally very small, or entirely want-

ing ; while in the two last those organs had been diminished by absorption ; in the former from disease, and in the latter, as one of the frequent, perhaps usual infirmities of old age. But I repeat, that in adult Caucasians, healthy and in the prime of life, sinuses of such dimensions do not exist in one cranium in ten millions.

But I must push this protracted and unpleasant discussion no farther. Yet protracted as it is, and multiplied and various as are the topics embraced in it, many gross errors and scandalous faults in the "Two Lectures" of Professor Sewall remain untouched. No matter. Other pens will demolish some of them ; and time, with truth and science as his auxiliaries, will overthrow and trample on the rest. As I take neither pride nor pleasure therefore, in being their executioner, I leave them to perish under these blighting influences, or of their own accord, in the deceptiveness of their spirit, the trashiness of their matter, and the feebleness of the composition, which has ushered them to the world. Nor, in the wreck that awaits them, can they fail to bury under their ruins whatever of respectability as a writer their author had attained. That they will bring down on him this full measure of retributive justice, is as certain as that we live under a dispensation, where, ultimately, truth is destined to triumph over falsehood, purity over turpitude, and right over wrong. That Dr. Sewall may receive a foretaste of the manner in which his reputation will be dealt with, by his long-incubated brood, I refer him to Milton's family-picture of Satan, Death, and Sin. He will there see depicted, in suita-

ble colours, strength, and hatefulness, the issue of a studied and stubborn infringement of the commands of Heaven. And no trait in the appalling character of the fallen arch-angel, was more sinful in itself, or more odious in the eye of his offended Creator, than his *hostility to truth*, which procured for him the appellation of the "FATHER OF LIES." The Doctor I say may herein see and contemplate the image of his own conduct, in the preparation and publication of his "Two Lectures," and the reward that awaits it.

Shall I be told again, as I have been on former occasions, in relation to some of my efforts to vindicate phrenology and phrenologists from slander, abuse, and false imputations, that I am not sufficiently calm and courteous in the tone of my reply? That I give to feeling too loose a rein, and indulge in terms of resentment and reprobation toward my antagonists, to such an extent, as to awaken public sympathy in their favour, excite disapproval and reaction against myself, and thus do an injury to the cause I am defending? Should such a charge be preferred against me, whether by friend or foe, my reply is brief. The accusation is unjust. Writers, who are themselves discourteous and insulting, slanderous in their reports, false in their representations, and insidious in the opinions and explanations they impute to others — who, in fact, adopt all means but fair ones, to achieve their own purposes, and throw disrepute on their opponents — such writers have no claim on courtesy. Not only would the boon be gratuitous; it would be wasted on them. Neither are they worthy of it, nor would they place on it the estimate

to which it is entitled. And things that are valuable should not be prodigally and uselessly lavished on those who deserve them not; and who do not know their value. The act would be not only incongruous, but injudicious and injurious. The moral gratuity thus bestowed would be ascribed by the receiver to timidity, affectation, insincerity, or some other discreditable motive in the giver. So unworthy would be the return made for courteous and respectful replies and comments, by the description of writers just referred to. And, as far as their works have fallen under my notice, of this description is every antiphrenological writer, from the first that showered the anathemas of the church on Gall in Vienna, in 1796, through the long and wrathful, calumnious, malignant, and denouncing train, ending with Professor Sewall, in 1837 — forty-one belligerent years. And the Professor himself shows, in his lectures, as little of becoming respect and observance, as his predecessors. He has the audacity to impute to the whole phrenological corps, a “departure from truth and common sense;” and mendaciously to impute to them allegations and explanations so consummately silly, that, if true, they would disgrace even the dullest and most illiterate school-boy. From me, therefore, as a phrenologist and a lover of truth, he deserves no courtesy in reply; nor shall he receive any, until he recalls and makes amends for his slanders and misstatements against the school of philosophy to which I belong, and the science whose doctrines I have endeavoured to defend.

Personally, I entertain toward Professor Sewall “no resentment.” Nor do I toward his *opinions*. He has

the same right to his opinions that I have to mine. But his manner and means, in his attempts to propagate them, I *do* resent. They are steeped in insincerity, and instinct with a desire to disparage and deceive — to disparage his opponents, and deceive his readers. They are, therefore, immoral and vicious. And vice and immorality of every description ought to be resented. And the resentment should be *active*. It should awaken and array every suitable power of the mind against the evils that excite it, until they are beaten down and extinguished. And by cool reason, bland persuasion, and calm remonstrance, that effect is rarely, if ever, produced. The evils in question are set afloat and sustained by *passion* of some kind; if not by the resentful and open, by the concealed and insidious, which are immeasurably worse. Passion, therefore, must encounter passion, as steel meets steel, else the conflict is unequal.

The man who attempts to propagate false opinions by unfair and immoral means, must have his conduct rendered uncomfortable, injurious, and openly discreditable to him, otherwise he will obstinately persist in it. And when he becomes so contumacious an offender as the antiphrenologists are, he deserves to be crushed, if he cannot be reformed; or suspended on a moral gibbet, and made an object at once of abhorrence and mockery.

The difference between the efficiency and success of a cool, reasoning, and persuasive reformer of abuses, and eraser of errors and false doctrines, and an impassioned one, is clearly seen in the different characters, modes of action, and degrees of success, of Luther and

Melancthon. Had the former of these been no more impetuous, warm, and resentful, than the latter, the Reformation would not have been achieved by them. In the physical economy of our globe, the bolt from the thunder-cloud is just as necessary, on suitable occasions, as the rain that distills from it, or as the sunbeam from the sky. And, in its moral economy, the gleam of resentment, properly directed, is often much more effective in the prevention or removal of mischief, and the achievement of good, than the light of reason, or the balm of persuasion — or than the union of both. Such are my sentiments; such has been my conduct as a phrenologist; and such shall be my future course in the same capacity, as often as any one worthy of notice shall cross my path, as rudely and offensively as Professor Sewall has done.

On the contrary, let the Professor, or any other writer, call in question the truth of Phrenology, and discuss the subject with the candour, calmness, and courtesy, which should always characterize a scientific controversy; and, if I reply to him at all, my language, matter, and manner, shall be marked with a corresponding exemption from passion and reproach; and, as far as I can render it so, from every other exceptionable quality. Fact and plainness, courtesy and argument, shall be alone employed. But they shall be employed with whatever of force and efficiency I can bring to the contest. I shall only add, that if, in preparing this vindication of a favourite science, a degree of resentment has been frequently awakened in me, by the contemplation of what I deemed an act to be reprobated, or an impu-

tation to be repelled, that state of mind has never been such, as to render me forgetful of my solemn obligation on no account intentionally to violate or neglect truth toward science, nor justice toward man. To the strictest scrutiny, therefore, I cheerfully submit the essay I have written, and hold myself responsible for all it contains.

APPENDIX.

REESE'S HUMBUG.

IT was my intention before I had seen the work, to give, in this "Vindication," a brief analysis accompanied by an argumentative refutation, of an attack on Phrenology, in the "Humbugs of New-York," by "David Meredith Reese, M. D.," of that city. A glance at the production however has dissuaded me from my purpose. I cannot descend to the level of such a publication, and reply to it with argument, or in any other way that might imply toward it the slightest degree of respect; or which might give it even imaginary weight. The only sentiments it can awaken in my mind are pity for its weakness and puerility, contempt for its conceitedness, and abhorrence for its mendacity. It is throughout a feeble, but coarse and malicious *pasquinade*, and attempt at ridicule, instead of a *fair and manly discussion*. Though its author cants about morality and religion, it breathes, from beginning to end, a spirit as *immoral* and *unchristian*, because mendacious and abusive, as it is insolent and discourteous. And in neither of these qualities is it surpassed by the vilest political tirades of the day.

If the author of the "New-York Humbugs" either possesses now, or aims at possessing hereafter, the slightest standing in science and letters, it is surprising that even folly itself, however rank and wanton, should have permitted in him an act so irrevocably suc-

cedal to his reputation, as that he has perpetrated by his attack on Phrenology. Should he even in time to come compose something true in science, and not entirely discreditable in literature, still will "Chapter III." of his "New-York Humbugs" cling to his escutcheon, a mark for the curling lip, and "slow, unmoving finger of scorn" to point and mock at, and for detestation to knit his withering brow at, which neither time nor change can ever efface. Nor is our author's emptying out of abuse and misrepresentation condemnable only, on account of its violation of truth and decorum. It is but the dregs, feculent, time-worn and stale, of what scores of his predecessors had poured out before him. It contains not a single thought, nor even perhaps a form of expression, which does not disgrace the pages of many antecedent attacks on Phrenology. It possesses not therefore even the humble merit of *originality* in calumny, or novelty in falsehood. Though, as already stated, I cannot condescend to reply by argument to such an imbecile, crude, and virulent article, it is due perhaps to the reader, as well as to myself, that I should illustrate and confirm the foregoing strictures, by a few quotations from it.

Our author commences "Chapter III." with an untruth, in asserting that Phrenology and Animal Magnetism are similar in character; that the same forms of mind are particularly prone to a belief in both; and that these forms are necessarily *imaginative*, fanatical, and inclined to the marvellous. The following are his words.

This "science, falsely so called, (Phrenology) is a among the *prevalent* and *prevailing* humbugs of the day,

and it is placed next to animal magnetism, in the present volume, because of its claiming to be of similar antiquity, and of kindred character too; since both *profess to be eminently philosophical. The same individuals who embrace the one, very frequently become the willing disciples of the other.*"

This I say is untrue. There are few, if any persons living who seriously profess the "*philosophy*" of Animal Magnetism. The number of those who even practise the *art* of it is very small; and respecting the *philosophy* or *reason* of it, nearly all, I believe, are silent; or, stronger still, acknowledge their *ignorance*. Assuredly I have never heard an individual attempting to explain it, except by attributing it to *action on the imagination*; which comes much nearer to a confession of ignorance, than to a profession of philosophy. Nor do I know of any respectable publication on the subject. No one, as far as I am informed, has ever pretended to say, either verbally or in print, why, or how any magnetic or galvanic influence is excited by the process pursued; or why or how, if it even were excited, it could produce the effects ascribed to the art. And, that "the same individuals who embrace Phrenology are more prone than others to a belief in Animal Magnetism," is a position as unfounded as imagination can conceive. It is an empty and groundless assertion of our author, made for the purpose of carrying a point, under a recklessness whether it be true or false.

As far as my information extends, Spurzheim was the only distinguished Phrenologist, who has expressed a belief in Animal Magnetism. And his belief in it was exceedingly limited. It was a good-natured friendli-

ness toward it, and nothing more. To employ a common form of expression, he fancied that there was "something of truth in it;" but he did not push his views to a fourth part of the extent with many others. Nor did he ever, I believe, attempt to practise the art.

Gall, on the contrary, was no Animal Magnetist. Nor was he in any degree an *imaginative* man. On the contrary, he was more sternly a votary of *facts* and fair inferences, than almost any other man I have ever known. In stores of analogy also he was peculiarly opulent. His conversation was enriched by them to a degree that rendered it as delightful as it was instructive. But they were never visionary, far-fetched, or laboured analogies. They came to him unsought for, and were straight to the point — led directly from the known to the unknown — from the simple to the complex — or from the certain to the probable. He did nothing more-over in the cloister or the closet. His sphere was the wide and open field of nature. And there he *imagined* nothing. He observed accurately, reflected profoundly, made correct deductions, and thus studied, learnt, and represented things as they were.

The two Combes again, Elliotson, Connolly, Broussais, Otto of Copenhagen, and scores of other able Phrenologists I could name, are no believers in Animal Magnetism. They have no fanaticism, I mean, on the subject. Nor are they indeed fanatics in any thing; but men of keen and practised observation, cool deliberation, sound judgment, and untiring perseverance. And such are the men best fitted to make discoveries, improve science, and benefit their race.

Were it admissible in me to speak of myself, I might

correctly say, that, within the last eighteen years, I have been instrumental in making several thousand converts to Phrenology. And I am inclined to believe, that there was not an Animal Magnetist in the number.

Let it not be understood, however, from these remarks, that I am a positive condemner of Animal Magnetism. Far from it. I have not hitherto studied the subject with sufficient closeness, and to a sufficient extent, to have matured my opinion, and prepared myself to pronounce on it. And I never form an opinion of any thing, whether light and simple, or weighty and complex, in anticipation of the necessary inquiry. Had the author of the "*Humbugs*" acted with like caution, fairness, and justice, that "clap-trap" work would have been yet *unwritten*. For, to the eye and understanding of every man of discernment, it "stands confessed" a deliberate clap-trap — a *bait* for popularity, and nothing more. It is a lure — I must add, a very shallow and culpable, yet not an unpalatable one — to what the writer has so elegantly and classically denominated the "gullibility of human nature."

For the prolongation of what he terms the "temporary existence" of Phrenology, our author assigns three reasons. Of these, one is,

"The array of *great names*, including those of *learned* and *scientific* men, who have cultivated and taught it, and dignified it by the misnomer of philosophy and science."

If then Phrenology be such a source of rank imposture and palpable delusion, and so senseless in itself, as the writer asserts it to be, will he favour us with a good reason, why so many great, enlightened, and scientific

men have blindly attached themselves to it, and given it their support ; while he himself, who is certainly distinguished by neither *talent*, science nor learning, has penetrated its fallacies, and detected in it its lurking and portentous spirit of mischief! Is he reared up, inspired, and fitted for the purpose,^s of enlightening his race, and protecting them from the deadly contamination, and unpardonable sin of this hydra of evil? In "humbler English," does he fancy himself some redoubtable personage, destined to do feats, at the sight or even mention of which, the "world shall grow pale?" May we judge from the tone in which the gentleman writes, these interrogatories must be answered affirmatively. Hence-forward then, let the frog in the fable be forgotten, and the author of the "New-York Humbugs," in conflict with Phrenologists, be substituted in its place! A few remarks more; and I shall dismiss from my thoughts both the subject and its source.

Among the numerous gross and unqualified falsehoods which crowd the pages of Dr. Reese's "Humbugs," the following are alone sufficient to consign to disgrace the work and its author.

"The organs (of the brain) should *all be double* or none, while the science lays down *a number of single* organs." p. 71.

Will Dr. Reese favour the public with the names of his "single" phrenological organs? I call them "his," because they do not belong to either the science or its advocates. Their organs are all "*double*," as the Doctor declares they ought to be. Whether the gentleman made this groundless statement from ignorance or a spirit of carelessness, or mendacity, I neither know, nor

care. My concern is not with its *source*, but its *character*. And I pronounce it untrue. The writer must himself moreover *know it to be so*.

Again. "And that the science of christianity, and the book of Revelation are entirely at variance with Phrenology, needs no other proof than the fact every where apparent, that *all the hosts of infidelity* are marshalled in its favour, while its originators, propagators, and prominent teachers, from Gall and Spurzheim down to Amariah Brigham, M. D., have been either skeptics or free thinkers, Deists or Atheists, neologists or materialists." p. 72.

This is a notorious falsehood, and must be so pronounced. The reader I trust will pardon me for the use of such strong and harsh expressions, which may be offensive to the ear of refinement and delicacy. Though I may acknowledge the impropriety of them as coming from *me*, and as being employed in a scientific discussion; I cannot admit the incorrectness of their application.

Neither on principle, nor in fact, have phrenology and infidelity the slightest native affinity, or essential connexion. Free thinkers, skeptics, and deists, have no more predilection for phrenology, than other men. On the contrary, very many of them are actively hostile to the science; while numbers of the most pious of the clergy, and others might be named, who are in the ranks of its ardent admirers and advocates.

Another flagrant untruth.

"And here they (phrenologists) are taught to regard the lascivious man to be prompted by the organ of Amativeness, *formed by the muscles of the neck*." p. 76.

The organ of Amativeness “formed by the *muscles* of the neck!” If Dr. Reese has ever read a single book on phrenology, he *knows* this to be false; and in making the statement, he has deliberately and intentionally violated truth, and therefore outraged religion, of which, I am told, he makes burning professions. He even stands self-convicted of falsehood in this case, by the following passages in his own work :

“The doctrines of phrenology may be briefly stated to be the following :

“1st. The *brain* is the organ of *all* our *instincts* — *propensities* — sentiments — aptitudes — intellectual faculties — and moral qualities.” p. 64.

Now, the strongest of our “instincts” or “propensities” is physical love. Yet here, in direct contradiction of what he had previously stated, the miserable blunderer declares its organ to be, not any portion of the brain, but the “*muscles of the neck!*” To be always consistent, says the proverb, “*liars* should have good memories!” The application of this, in the present case, we leave to others — to our author himself, if the task has any attractions for him.

Speaking of Gall’s discovery of the organ of Language, our author asserts, that the illustrious German “located that organ *in the eyes,*” and deemed its strength and perfection to correspond to the *size* and *structure* of those orbs. “All phrenologists,” says he again, “agree in attributing the *faculty of speech,* and the power of articulating sounds, to the *eyes.*”

An untruth more deliberate and flagitious than this, has never been uttered. That Dr. Gall discovered and pronounced, that ready and great linguists had *promi-*

nent eyes, is true. But it is equally so, that he also pronounced, that the organ or source of language was *not* in the eyes; but in that *portion of brain* which lies *behind*, and a little *above* them. That point, therefore, if unusually developed, necessarily protruded the eyes forward, and somewhat downward. Hence their prominence, which Gall declared to be an external manifestation of the internal *cerebral* organ. But, with neither the "size" nor "structure" of the eye has the discoverer alleged the power of language to have the shadow of connexion, as far as cause and effect are concerned. The entire tale, therefore, is but a profligate fabrication by Dr. Reese, devised and propagated for the selfish and vain purpose of inflating his own popularity, promoting his pecuniary *interests*, and bringing discredit on a science which he does not understand.

In his attempt to arraign phrenology before the public on the odious and fatal charge of *immorality* and *irreligion*, Dr. Reese is guilty of as unprincipled and nefarious a distortion of facts, and perversion of argument, as ever disgraced the lips of a false witness or accuser, or unveiled the turpitude of a *venal informer*. The following is a specimen of the malignant balderdash, which he distils on this subject from his calumnious pen.

"They (the phrenologists) tell us, that this disposition which loves what is astonishing, mysterious, or miraculous, is the immediate result of a particular organization; and it would be as unjust to accuse those endowed with it, of imposture, as it would be to censure poets for embodying and personifying their ideas; for they are only the slaves of a *too energetic action of one part of the brain*. If this be not sublimated impiety, material-

ism, and fatalism, we know not where these characteristics are to be found; and that such sentiments annihilate all moral distinctions between truth and falsehood, vice and virtue, is too obvious to need comment."

Again :

"The moral aspect of phrenological doctrines is, that, however, which renders the humbug the most mischievous and deplorable. Multitudes go to the science for the purpose of easing a loaded conscience, by learning that their delinquencies and views are constitutional, and depending wholly on organization. Such find a false peace — an imaginary comfort in the doctrine, that virtue and vice are alike the result of organs implanted by the Creator, and thus persuade themselves into the disbelief of human accountability. * * * * *

"Hence, a man is religious or otherwise, by reason of a *physical necessity*, since the prominence, or the depression of the top of the head, where the organs of Veneration, Theosophy, and Marvellousness are located, must *irresistibly* result in one or the other character."

On this vile and offensive outpouring of ignorance and prejudice, mendaciousness and malice, (for they are all concerned in the production,) my comment shall be brief. The charges contained in it have nothing new in them, and do not therefore belong to the author of the "Humbugs." They are the property of the fire-and-faggot guerilla party, whose standard he has joined; and are as old as the crusade, waged against Phrenology, in the last years of the last century, by the fanatics of Vienna, and continued by their auxiliaries, down to the present day, under the influence of a spirit of bigotry and injustice, falsehood and vindictiveness, that has no

parallel in modern times. Or if it has any, it is in the case of Galileo, who was placed under the ban and discipline of the church, and threatened with the tortures of the inquisition itself, on account of his sublime discoveries in astronomy. Nor can it be held doubtful, that those who now pursue an inquisitorial process against character and opinion, would, in the seventeenth century, have done the same against life and person. It is times and manners, not bigots and fanatics, that have undergone a change. In the narrow minds and ruthless tempers of many pretenders to piety and christianity, the inquisition still exists. Give them sway, and they will re-erect it in the dungeon. And the advocates of Phrenology would be its first victims; because, in the discovery and diffusion of liberal science, they are in the lead.

Did not other considerations forbid the measure, neither time nor space permits me at present to reply to the charges of materialism and fatalism, immorality and impiety, preferred against Phrenology, by those who are ignorant of it, or hostile to it through the influence of sinister motives. For the science has but two classes of opponents; those who have never studied it, and do not therefore understand it; and those who feel themselves in some way personally interested in its refutation and overthrow. And they have been already scores of times answered to the satisfaction of all such as are actuated by candour, amenable to reason, and the possessors of common sense. To repeat the arguments, therefore, in defence of the science, on the present occasion, would be altogether superfluous in me.

Let not the author of the "Humbugs" however,

imagine that I have any disposition to decline a contest, of a becoming and beneficial character, in behalf of Phrenology, should any thing occur to render it necessary. Though no professed knight-errant in the cause, yet on *one condition* I will cheerfully break a lance with any writer, whose name and standing entitle him to a meeting. And the condition, which is an honourable one, is as follows: The champion must deport himself with knightly courtesy, bear TRUTH on his banner, and present in the tourney some new ground of challenge — I mean some new charge against the soundness and merits of the science. In that case he shall be met in a corresponding style of courtesy and respectfulness. Not otherwise. To no charge or challenge, stained with untruth, stale and trashy in its character, or dictated by a spirit of bigotry or fanaticism, invective or abuse, will an answer be returned. And of such unmanly and unchristian description is every imputation, by which phrenology has been hitherto assailed. By neither Justice nor truth, magnanimity nor decency, nor by the slightest discoverable wish to benefit science, or promote the true interests of the human family, has even one of them been characterized. Nor has any of the assaults which Phrenology has sustained, committed a more profligate outrage on truth and manliness, morality and religion, than Dr. Reese's Humbug.

I shall only add, that one of my motives for noticing the "New-York Humbugs" in this place, is, that their rude and discourteous author may find himself associated *in recompense* with the author of the "Two Lectures," with whom he has associated himself in a *plot against science*. For thus associated the two writers

are, in bestowing encomiums on each other's productions, and in that way endeavouring to extend their circulation, and give weight to their matter. I have thought proper therefore, to impale them both on the two horns of the same dilemma, that, as they have been platonically united in their lives and labours, they may not, in the fitness of their reward, be divided.

NOTE.

THE frontispiece plate is designed to exhibit a fair average of the thickness of the human skull, especially that of the Caucasian race, in healthy individuals in the prime of life. And no pains have been spared, in examination and comparison, to render the view accurate.

At different periods of life, and in different states of health, the condition of the cranium, in these respects, varies. In childhood the skull is thin, and the frontal sinuses so small, as to be scarcely perceptible. In adult life, the sinuses are more developed, and the skull is thicker. Still however, in persons who are healthy, and have never suffered from protracted affections of the head, their average does not exceed that represented in the plate. I doubt whether the average of the sinuses equals it. Those cavities furnish therefore, as every one must perceive, no serious impediment to the detection of the development of the brain in that region.

In advanced age the condition of these parts is different. So it is in protracted insanity, and other chronic cerebral affections. In these cases the brain diminishes in size, the skull becomes thicker, and the frontal sinuses more capacious. The causes of these changes need not be mentioned. By all well-informed physiologists they are sufficiently understood.

PREFATORY NOTE.

THIS is the discourse, in which the Trustees of Transylvania University charge Dr. Caldwell with the design of delineating the character of Dr. Dudley. On this point two or three questions may be fitly asked.

Would any one *draw* such pictures of moral deformity as the discourse contains, with a view to their being considered the likenesses of *honest* and *honourable* men? or would any one of discernment *apply* them to such men? The application excites a strong suspicion that a likeness existed.

Suppose Dr. Caldwell had drawn abstract pictures as remarkable for piety and rectitude, and as free from duplicity and guile, as Fenelon, Hervy, or the late Bishop White, would any person have pronounced them likenesses of the same man, for whom the pictures he drew were supposed to be intended? These questions are put. The public will answer them, every one for himself.

The discourse is printed *verbatim* as it was delivered; certain portions of it that were *not* delivered, on account of its length, being in italics. During its delivery, Dr. Caldwell did not direct toward Dr. Dudley a single look or gesture. If the audience therefore, or any of them,

applied the pictures to that gentleman, they were induced to do so, not by the *manner* of the *speaker*, but by the *matter* of the speech. In a word, they made the application on account of the likeness which they, from some cause, perceived or fancied.

If there be blame in the case therefore, Dr. Caldwell feels that it cannot justly fall on him. The fault lies in *being* a man addicted to falsehood, not in *delineating* one. We have fallen on evil times, indeed, if the business of life be, not to have vice "*undone*," but to keep it "*unknown*;" as was once, we are told, the rule in Venice.

THOUGHTS
ON THE
PHRENOLOGY OF FALSEHOOD
AND
ITS KINDRED VICES.

A VALEDICTORY ADDRESS, TO THE MEDICAL GRADUATES IN
TRANSYLVANIA UNIVERSITY; DELIVERED MARCH 15, 1837, BY
CHARLES CALDWELL, M. D.

GENTLEMEN GRADUATES:

WHEN one of the sages of Greece was asked by an Athenian youth, what were the choicest elements of the human character, and the brightest ornaments of human nature, he replied, "A REGARD FOR TRUTH, JUSTICE TOWARD MEN, AND PIETY TOWARD THE GODS."

In accordance with this answer are the spirit and tenour of every precept and point of doctrine of the christian religion, that bears either directly or indirectly on the subject. In like accordance are the tenets and practice of every distinguished teacher and pattern of morals, whose history is known to us. And in a corresponding strain does one of the most accomplished judges of man deliver himself, when he exclaims:

"A wit's a feather, and a chief a rod;
AN HONEST MAN'S the noblest work of God."

But in confirmation of this maxim in morals, it is not necessary to refer to writings and opinions either ancient or modern, sacred or profane; nor to any other form of evidence from without. The truth of it is sustained by a witness within ourselves, whose testimony no infidel will reject, no casuist make a subject of cavil, nor skeptic of doubt. It is written on the constitution of man, in characters which can be neither erased, misinterpreted, nor concealed. We feel instinctively, and intuitively recognise the surpassing beauty, sacredness, and value, of the qualities embraced in the reply of the sage. And in proportion to the amount and purity of those qualities, which our consciences tells us we ourselves possess, are the complacency and satisfaction with which we contemplate our condition, and the actual degree of our self-estimation. No man, however lofty his rank, and confident his bearing in his intercourse with the world, or whatever show of respect he may receive from his adherents and followers, can stand well in his own esteem, if he feels himself deficient, in those bright and glorious attributes of character — if he feels that he is wanting in truth and its concomitants, the shield and buckler against the stings and arrows of an offended conscience — or rather that which keeps the conscience free from offence. He may for a time impose on the public, and even make an effort to blindfold himself. But the struggle is vain; and failure is certain. In his dark and lonely hours, when sleep has shed his dews on the eyelids of honesty, he is haunted by the spectre of his own degradation; and sooner or later his masquerade closes, and he appears to the eye of general scorn, the artificial and miserable thing that he is.

It is obvious then that truth and fidelity are recommended alike by a constitutional instinct in ourselves, by the ripest experience and wisdom of earth, and by all we know of the approval of Heaven, as of paramount importance, as well to the honour, as to the interests of our race. Of this also the converse is true. By the same instinct and high authority the practice of falsehood, in all its modifications — open lying, theft, slander, swindling and overreaching, duplicity in action and words, perjury, prevarication, and treachery, are denounced as deep and nefarious vices, consigned to infamy, and doomed to punishment.

I am aware of having here grouped, under the head of falsehood, a number of crimes which are not usually regarded as of the same kind, or as springing in any degree from a common, or even perhaps from a kindred source. I do not however doubt of being able to convince you that the case is otherwise — that they all arise in part from the same root, and therefore partake of a common nature — that they are convertible into each other — that he who, under one form of temptation, will equivocate, prevaricate, and shuffle, practise calumny and duplicity, make faithless professions, and debase his being by deliberate falsehood — the wretch I say, who will thus outrage truth and manliness, under one temptation, will, under another, cheat, steal, commit perjury and forgery, and play the traitor, and even the murderer! — And principle, as well as experience, confirms the position. “He that will lie, will steal,” is a phrase so strictly conformable to observation, that it has passed into a proverb.

Truth is the rock on which the temple of virtue and

morality rests. Remove it; the foundation is gone, and the fabric is a ruin. Nor is this all. Truth forms both the basis and the superstructure of creation itself. When the Deity called into existence the universe of mind and matter, he did so in conformity to the *principles of truth*. It was not in his nature or even in his power to do otherwise; for his own moral essence is truth, which at once controls and hallows his actions. To suppose him capable of acting in opposition to truth, or apart from it, would be to suppose him imperfect and feeble like ourselves. It is a strict and conscientious adherence therefore to truth, that draws man nearest to the Deity, and makes him most resemble him. And the converse is equally true. The gross and habitual departure from truth, most completely estranges man from the Deity, and covers him with the deepest degradation and guilt. To the minds of enlightened and reasoning men, this statement is as undeniable, as that things equal to one and the same thing, are equal to one another.

The crimes of robbery, piracy, and murder, though partaking also of falsehood, contain less of the meanness of it, than either of the other forms of guilt just enumerated. Robbers, pirates, and murderers are often generous, bold and manly. But liars, thieves, hypocrites, and traitors are usually incorporations of ignominy and cowardice.

On an occasion however like the present, when, for the last time, you are to be the listeners and I the speaker, and when you are on the eve of entering on the trials and responsibilities of professional life—on such an occasion, it would but ill comport with the respect and duty I owe you, and the course I have always pursued in

addressing you, were I to present you with nothing but a series of propositions, unsupported by suitable evidence. Having uniformly endeavoured, in all my discourses and discussions before you, to deal in reason as well as assertion, in philosophy as well as fact, it is not my design, in the present instance, to depart from the practice. To demonstrate therefore their turpitude as a class, and the deep abhorrence in which they should be held, I shall attempt a brief analysis of the several vices just referred to, in which their kindred nature will be made to appear. In this disquisition I shall necessarily treat the subject phrenologically; because it cannot be satisfactorily or even intelligibly treated in any other way. Nor will you regard this mode of handling it with surprise or disapproval. Most of you have studied Phrenology to such effect, as to be convinced of its truth. You know it therefore, as the genuine science of mind, to be alone applicable to the topic I am discussing, and alone competent to such elucidation of it as its importance requires.

All vices are, in their origin and character, exclusively animal. They are seated I mean in the animal compartment of the brain, and are the offspring of the excess or abuse, perversion or misapplication of one or more of the animal propensities. They hold in their composition no ingredient that is truly human — nothing I mean that elevates man above *brutality*. This representation, which is susceptible of proof, shows, on principle, the base and degraded character of vice, in addition to its sinfulness; his animal nature being the lowest and least worthy and honorable element in the constitution of man. Nor is there wanting another con-

sideration exhibiting in a still stronger light this inherent debasement. He that is habitually addicted to vice is essentially deficient or deranged in his *moral nature*, especially in the higher and nobler faculties of Benevolence, Veneration, and Conscientiousness, as well as in the superior intellectual faculties, whose master province is reflection and reason. He therefore I say who indulges in vice, of whatever description, so far descends from the sphere of *human* action and honour, and mingles with the *brute*. He even sinks beneath the brute; because he disobeys and abuses powers bestowed on him by the Creator, to withhold him from such debasement, and of which the inferior creation are destitute. Hence the pilfering of the fox is much less offensive than human theft; and the murder of man, when perpetrated by his fellow, is infinitely more shocking, than his destruction by the wolf, the hyena, or the tiger. But to speak more of the elements and philosophy of crime.

A confirmed propensity to destroy human life, like that possessed by Dehman, who was executed ten or twelve years ago, in Indiana, for the ninth murder he had committed, without provocation, or motives of interest or revenge, as a mere amateur in blood; or like that which impelled Margareta Gottfried to the actual destruction, by poison, of more than twenty human beings, on as many different occasions, and to attempt the destruction of twice as many more, for which she was beheaded at Bremen, in 1830 — a propensity such as this, is the product of excessive, perhaps morbid action in Destructiveness, and some defect or perversion in the action of Benevolence, Veneration, Conscientiousness and Causality. Had these latter organs been

sound and vigorous in their functions, they would have restrained Destructiveness, and prevented the murders — on the same ground on which a few men of peaceful and orderly habits interpose their influence, and withhold the ruffian from deeds of violence.

In him also who is addicted to falsehood, Conscientiousness, Veneration, and Causality are wanting in development or *action or both*; or their action is perverted; and the functions (inordinately strong) of Secretiveness and Cautiousness, the two meanest organs (may any be so denominated) belonging to man, constitute his "*ruling passion.*" To common *lying*, add a propensity to slander and defame, and the result shows that the organ of Destructiveness, which is the source of hatred, malice, and a propensity to mischief of every description, is also in excessive action. For the usual aim of that organ, when unduly excited, is to injure and destroy character, as well as person. Combativeness, which is comparatively a manly propensity, does not belong to the liar, who, to other marks of meanness and degradation, unites for the most part, as already mentioned, the quality of cowardice. A *moral* coward he necessarily is; because a man who is morally intrepid and firm, feeling no unsoundness in his conduct, character, or intention, has nothing to fear, were he susceptible of fear, and therefore no temptation to conceal or misrepresent. Such a man cannot descend from his proud elevation in moral rectitude, to the debasement and turpitude of hypocrisy and deception. That degradation he leaves to the changeling and the craven, the profligate and the culprit, who quail under the apprehension of their actions and designs being visited by the light

I shall only add, that a lie is an acknowledgment of inferiority or guilt in him who is its author. Men rarely ever depart from truth, except to escape from penalty or punishment; or to represent themselves or their conditions, or actions, superior to what they are, and thus gain credit for a fictitious standing—or to better their condition by criminal means. Truth serves all the purposes of the innocent and the honorable; but to the dishonorable and the guilty falsehood is essential, and can alone afford them a temporary protection.

The crime of falsifying can be perpetrated by deeds as well as by words. It consists in the intentional assertion or representation of what is known not to exist, or of facts or things in a light different from the real one. And this, I say, may be done by acting as certainly as by speaking. Falsehood, then, in its full extent, consists of two leading elements, *concealment* and *fiction*; the concealment or denial of what *is*, and the feigning of what is *not*. The main-spring of the whole therefore is Secretiveness in a state of excessive action, and divorced from the guidance and restraint of the higher faculties. That propensity, which is but the love or instinct of concealment, impels other faculties to the kind and degree of fiction, appropriate to the occasion, without which its work would be incomplete, and its purpose defeated. Its fabrications and contrivances therefore differ according to the end to be obtained by them. But, in all cases, *secrecy* is the chief ingredient among the means of deception, without which, I say, the scheme would fail. That these views are as applicable to swindling, overreaching, cheating, and all other forms of practical knavery, as they are to common falsehood, may be easily made appear.

These latter views consist in the *false* appropriation by one person, to his own ends and uses, of that which *in truth* belongs to another; in the devising of the means by which this fraud may be effected; and in the concealment of the iniquitous object he aims at. Here therefore is nothing more than the perpetration of an untruth in a new shape. And that shape is given to it by the union of the inordinate action of Acquisitiveness with that of Secretiveness. In this case, as in the former ones, Benevolence, Veneration, Conscientiousness, and Causality, are inactive, feeble, or perverted; and here also Destructiveness mingles at times in the mischief, for the malicious purpose of inflicting an injury on the person defrauded, and thus giving him pain. These vices then are identical with *lying*, except that they contain in their composition one additional element — *the love of gain*. Remove that, and you convert swindling, cheating, and other forms of knavery, into the promulgation of simple falsehood in speech, or its perpetration by acts.

Theft is but knavery in a different shape, and a higher degree. The elements of the two forms of vice are the same. In each, Benevolence, Veneration, Conscientiousness, and the reflecting faculties are again perverted, inactive or feeble; and Covetiveness, Secretiveness, and Cautiousness, are in action; the two former to excess. Each therefore is the product alike of the meanest and most grovelling of the animal propensities; and in each the highest and noblest of the moral and intellectual faculties are deficient or at fault. They are in their nature, moreover, as already intimated, closely allied to falsehood in words. In plain language, the thief, the

liar, the swindler, and the hypocrite, and he who practises knavery or deception in any other form, belong to the same family of felons ; and any one of them may be readily changed into either of the others. It is a maxim in morals, to which there is no exception, that he who does not hold his word, when pledged, as sacred as his oath or his bond, is neither an honest nor an honourable man. He who is true to his promise only by compulsion, or from a motive of deep self-interest, is not true to it at all. Remove his compulsion or selfishness, and his falsehood will appear. The greatest of felons, when manacled and imprisoned, commits felony no longer. The reason is plain. The power to steal, rob, murder, and prove a traitor, is taken from him. Nor is he less innocent on account of his inaction, than the individual is, who refrains from falsehood, only because the commission of it would prove injurious to him.

But all is not yet told. The deepest crime belonging to this class is now to be named. It is TREACHERY. No other form of falsehood equals it in baseness and guilt. In all that is vile, revolting, and criminal, it far surpasses theft. The reason is obvious. It more deeply outrages what should be held most sacred in human feeling. The traitor has been *confided in*, while the thief has not. The latter, therefore, has violated no plighted faith ; while the former is a *monument of deliberate perfidy*. When Judas is declared to have betrayed *with a kiss*, the imputation is the most damnatory that language can record, or fancy conceive, against human depravity. Yet every one who betrays at all, betrays with a kiss, or some other token of similar import — some act expressive of attachment and good will, to

prevent suspicion, and secure confidence. The traitor, I say, is therefore more guilty than the thief, because his crime is against his comrades that have trusted and cherished, or in some way benefitted him. This renders him trebly false — to *virtue*, to *friendship*, and to *his God*. But the thief, *as such*, is specially trusted by no one. Hence he violates no pledge of fidelity given in a sacred moment of confidence; nor does he deliberately trample on one of the holiest feelings of our nature.

The fair exterior that treachery puts on, while ruminating the darkest purposes within, ranks it, I say, with the most execrable of vices. It makes it realize the fearful picture of Conspiraey, drawn by the great dramatist, in one of his happiest moments of inspiration, and in his strongest colours. The scene and time are, when Brutus is told by his porter, that some of the conspirators against Cæsar, who were at his gate, on a visit to him by night, were muffled in their cloaks, to escape recognition. On receiving this information, the noble Roman thus soliloquizes :

—————“ O, conspiracy !
 Sham’st thou to show thy dangerous brow by night,
 When evils are most free ? O, then, by day,
 Where wilt thou find a cavern dark enough
 To mask thy monstrous visage ? Seek none, conspiracy ;
 Hide it in *smiles and affability* ;
 For if thou put’st thy native semblance on,
 Not Erebus itself were dim enough
 To hide thee from prevention.”

So is it with treachery. Conscious that no gloom is deep enough to mask its hideous visage, if presented in its native features and expression, it clothes it in mildness, courtesy, and pleasantness of look and manner,

and, in the blandest accents, that counterfeit friendliness and affection can utter, whispers in the ear it means to ensnare, its fatal falsehoods. For falsehood is the prime engine of its mischief. And when malice unites with this, and the guise of treachery is still retained, the compound forms one of the most appalling of human enormities. Then may the possessor of it say with Richard,

“Why, I can smile, and murder while I smile;
And cry, content, to that which grieves my heart;
And wet my cheeks with artificial tears;
And frame my face to all occasions.”

—Ay; and so can others I could name, do this, as dexterously as crook-backed Richard.

One of the basest and most abhorrent forms of treachery, is that under which a culprit, charged with a deep or capital offence, turns informer or accuser, and testifies against his associates in crime. It has long been current, as a forensic adage, that the greatest villain and coward turns “King’s or State’s evidence,” to rescue himself from the cord, and consign to it his less offending fellows. And the maxim is equally true, in its relation to *other transgressors, charged with lighter and more venial offences*. He who, in *any* case of imputed guilt, turns informer, and accuses his comrades, does so from motives of bribery, cowardice, or vindictiveness — to gratify his cupidity, escape punishment, or glut his revenge. Viewed in the two former of these aspects, he is an object of pity and scorn; in the latter, of execration and abhorrence. In either and all of them, he is a recreant and a renegade from truth, lost to magnanimity, manliness, and virtue — and will be so considered

by honorable men, until his name and character shall be lost in forgetfulness. He is one of those "wretches" of the poet, who "concentred all in self," will never, either in life or in death, be an object of sorrow or praise; but

"Living, shall forfeit fair renown;
And doubly dying shall go down
To the vile earth, from which he sprung,
Unwept, unhonoured, and unsung."

Descended from the same source, and similar in character, are various other minor forms of deception, which daily annoy us, and shed their deleterious influence through society. To this class of evils, which, though petty in detail, are momentous in the aggregate of mischief they produce, belong equivocation in speech; false professions, shuffling conduct, promise-breaking, prevarication, and all other shapes, which insincerity and duplicity so aptly put on.

Such is the motley brood of falsehood, that is over-running our land, as the land of the Pharoahs was over-run by the loathsome frog and the devouring locust. And the moral pestilence is far the most deplorable. The reptile and the insect are only an outward annoyance; but the poison of falsehood penetrates the inward man, and turns him throughout to a moral lazar. Were this pestilence of the soul confined in its ravages to the ignorant and uncultivated, it would still be an evil of dangerous import. But when it fastens on men who occupy some of the high places of the community, whose examples are weighty, and their sway extensive, it becomes a national distemper, and threatens the production of a national calamity. And such is, at present,

the alarming condition of the United States. Among the high and the low, the rich and the poor, the cultivated and the uncultivated, a disregard for truth is portentously prevalent. In the pursuit of business, and the transaction of affairs both public and private, plain dealing and honesty of purpose are wantonly discarded, and intrigue, management, and stratagem, have possession of their places. In this perverted and ominous condition of things, prevarication has supplanted truth, cunning has become the substitute for wisdom and talent, a love of power has usurped the place of patriotism, and selfishness the places of charity, justice, and philanthropy. Wealth and popular favour, as instruments of power, constitute the idol to which "the million" do homage. To propitiate that, sacrifices are made on the altar of a vulgar ambition, unprincipled in their nature, and degrading to all who take part in their ministry. The man who attains his end by hypocrisy and stratagem, instead of being censured and rebuked, as in former times, for his dishonesty and guilt, is praised now for his acuteness and dexterity.

Is a project set on foot, whose object is the promotion of intellectual or moral improvement, the correction of abuses, or the accomplishment of any other form of acknowledged usefulness? Is it for the establishment or endowment of an university or a college, the amendment of the condition of a professional institution, or the advancement of the interests of some mechanical or literary association? Or is it for any other purpose subservient to the public welfare? In such a case, sentiments of honour and manliness, no less than motives of morality and duty require, that those concerned in the project should

act with fidelity, consistency, and firmness, and not play the part of time-servers or shufflers, dependents or parasites. Influenced only by public considerations, they should press toward the attainment of a public end. Neither selfish nor social feelings, apart from this, should mingle in their counsels or sway in their measures.

But rarely, at the present time, is this line of conduct faithfully pursued. In cases of the sort, different individuals shrink, at times, from their duty in supine inaction, or join in opposition to schemes, of which even they themselves had been the first proposers, for different reasons — some from a craven dread of responsibility — others from a fear of the loss of popularity, and a forfeiture of the incense of flattery and favour — a third set from an unwillingness to encounter difficulty and trouble, or make personal sacrifices — a fourth from feebleness of resolution and instability of purpose — a fifth from bribery, or some other venal motive — a sixth, perhaps, from a mixture of several of these influences — and a seventh from a still more unpardonable cause — a malicious determination to betray their associates in the enterprise, injure their reputation and standing, and thus gain an ascendancy over them in general popularity, or in the direction and benefits of some other undertaking about to be set on foot.

As respects the foregoing general concerns, so interesting in themselves, and so important to the dignity and welfare of society, you, gentlemen, will stand doubly related to the community hereafter — as physicians, and as men. And, in both capacities, but more especially in the former, it will become the standing which, I doubt not, you will attain, not only to avoid yourselves, as a

blot on your profession and your personal reputations, the practice of every form of imposture and falsehood, but with all your powers, and the means at your command, to aim at its prevention and extinction in others. For the purpose, then, of aiding you in your preparation for the enterprise, allow me to invite your attention to a few of the methods, by which artful and unprincipled physicians violate their obligations to truth and honesty, and dishonour their calling, by descending to the devices of empirics and impostors. And here permit me to remark in general, by way of illustration, and to prevent the necessity of repetition and detail, that I would brand, as empirics, all who practise medicine without principles, or in opposition to them; and as an impostor, every one who is guilty of any form of professional affectation, artifice, or concealment. Some of these modes of affectation and imposture shall be forthwith represented to you.

In the sketch of professional charlatanry here contemplated, I shall not include operations by steam, vegetable medicines, secret nostrums, bone-setting processes, patent remedies, nor any of the numerous panaceas and catholicons, the extensive patronage and employment of which constitute, in part, the disgrace of the age. These are so universally acknowledged to be the fruits and symbols of medical knavery, that no physician of character ventures to be concerned in them.

In close affinity to these devices is the artifice pursued by many physicians, of boasting of their pre-eminent professional success. In their own report of their practice, they cure every thing. In recommendation of their skill, and to secure additional means of testing it,

some of them assert that they never lose a patient in any form or degree of fever, in croup, dropsy of the brain, or cholera infantum ; and that, in their hands, even pulmonary consumption is a manageable disease ! Such assertions are scandalous, because they are untrue ; and criminal, because they do mischief on a twofold ground. With the intelligent portion of the community they tend to bring medicine and its practitioners into disrepute ; and, by deluding the ignorant, they induce them to resort, in their sickness, to the authors of such devices, and to repose in them a confidence which often proves fatal to them, by preventing them from receiving aid from abler and more honest and honorable members of the profession. For in medicine, as in other vocations, fraud and weakness are the almost inseparable concomitants of boasting. Under such circumstances, artifice and intrigue are employed as substitutes for science, and skill ; because truth and honesty can never be made to subserve the purposes of groundless pretence and inordinate ambition.

The physicians here described never fail to exaggerate the amount of their practice, as well as the success of it ; well knowing that, like other things, business, real or reputed, attracts in proportion to its quantity whether actual, or feigned ; and that therefore an abundant extent of it produces more, by what may be accounted a law of nature.

Another class of Physicians, without falsely boasting of the amount of their business *in words*, do so *in action*. Of these, some becoming wonderfully devout, are punctual in their attendance at church, as well as at other places of public resort, where, by their servants or retainers, they contrive to be called out once or twice an

hour, as if to administer to the wants of the sick, not one of whom perhaps is under their care. A member of this class of professional counterfeits, who fell within my knowledge, practised a like imposture at the house of a gentleman to whose daughter he was paying his addresses. But even almighty love, which conquers all things else, was compelled to surrender to his mightier propensity to fraud. From the midst of his burning vows and tender solicitings, and his strenuous contest with the coyness of the fair one, he contrived to be dragged by repeated messages to contend with disease. Nor did he pack his cards and cog his dice to no purpose. He succeeded in his suit, but made no progress in the procurement of business. The *gallant's mistress* being thus fraudulently won, and the marriage ceremony and its attendant convivialities completed, the *husband* had the felicitous leisure to pass days and weeks in the company of his *wife*, without a summons to the chamber of sickness.

Other members of this class make a show of business in another way, different indeed in execution, but identical in dishonesty. They constantly exhibit themselves in gigs or on horseback, hurrying from one quarter of a city or town, or of the country, to another, as if just called to apply the trephine, reduce a recent and painful luxation, control an alarming hemorrhage from a divided artery, or to minister in some other form of disease, where delay and death would be synonymous terms. Thus are truth and honour disgracefully bartered by them for the appearance and reputation of having an extensive business; and the actual business which that reputation produces.

One of these jugglers who was known to me in Phi-

ladelphia, adopted a stratagem somewhat different, and, as the issue proved, a little more hazardous. Mounting a gig every morning, he drove hastily from dwelling to dwelling of wealthy and respectable citizens; and halting before each door, entering the hall, and remaining long enough for a visit and prescription, returned to his vehicle, and proceeded elsewhere in his career of dishonesty. That career however was destined to end in a ludicrous and very uninviting catastrophe.

From the hall of a house, to which his wayward fate directed this impostor to make a morning visit, a cloak had been stolen on the preceding night. The chief waiter in the family was a sturdy young Irishman, recently imported from the "emerald isle," to whom the vagabond *Æsculapian* was unknown. Hearing a foot-step in the hall, unannounced by the bell or the knocker, the true-blooded Hibernian, plunged into the passage, with the vigilance of an Argus, the spring of a catamount, and the fidelity of a knight of Castile to his mistress. Finding there a stranger, whose physiognomy did not please him, and who manifested surprise, mingled perhaps with alarm, at his abrupt appearance and fiery visage, the son of St. Patrick, grappling the physician by the throat, called out to his employer, in a stentorian note, and the accent of his country, "te tief! te tief? master, te tief! te tief! I have got him, I have got him, hard and fast,!" — During this boisterous invocation to his master, he beat time to his tongue, with his brawny fist, to such effect, that, before relief arrived, the discomfited prisoner, who made resistance at first, had surrendered at discretion, and was calling for quarter. Mean time the master of the house, alarmed by the uproar, hastened into the hall, and, recognising the

unfortunate pulse-feeler, rescued him from the merciless mauling of his faithful domestic. A suitable *finale* to a scheme of imposture !

But the entire story of these knights of the pestle and mortar, who like Proteus of old, assume all shapes, and, like the modern chamelion, all colours, for the procurement of business, is not yet told. Another caste of them make their way to practice, by their kind and affectionate deportment, in the families where they visit. Their inquiries after the health of the several members are made with great particularity and earnestness ; and, in relation to each of them, something complimentary and pleasing is either said or done. The school-boys and school-girls of each family are pronounced by them the most accomplished and promising in the country. For the younger children their pockets are filled with apples and cakes, ginger-nuts and sugar-plumbs ; and to mothers and grown up daughters, their tongues offer abundantly the incense of flattery. Nor do they fail in their homage to nurses and grandams, maiden aunts and gossiping cousins, who, after halting and lying by for years, at the Rubicon of their teens, have ultimately passed it. And the success and prospects in business of the males of the families share also their regard. Nothing of interest or supposed importance to the domestic establishments escapes the vigilance of their inquiries and the kindness of their wishes.

Not all the artfulness however of these practised flatterers can save them at times from mortification and disaster. One of them formerly known to me attempted to make his way to the favour of parents, by dandling and kissing their "*incomparable*" children. On an unlucky occasion, however, in stooping down to kiss the

beauteous and *darling infant*, his lips, by a fatal aberration, came into contact with the brow, cheek, or some other more sacred portion of the face of the still more *beauteous* and *darling* mother. This so incensed the fair one, that, springing from her seat, she extended to the physician her lily-white hand — but not that he might bestow on *it* also a mark of his gallantry. O! no; but that it might bestow on him a blackened eye, and a bleeding nose. Nor did her courtesy end here. She ordered him, with a significant movement of her foot, to quit the house, and never re-enter it, on pain of the vengeance of an offended husband.

Another class of these favour-hunters erect the precarious fabric of their dishonesty on a broader basis. Instead of confining their adulation and blandishments to selected families, they extend them to every one. Their courtesies and professions of regard, familiar nods and fawning salutations, are general; and they are the supple, knee-crooking incense-burners, and humble servants of the whole community. Their smiles and cringes, and other artifices to attract notice, and attain popularity, become disgustingly common. They meet their acquaintance with the smirks of cheats and the sycophancy of spaniels, approach them, lock arms with them, and, leading them into a retired place, whisper in their ears something commendatory of themselves, or condemnatory of their enemies — or administer to them perhaps a nauseous compound of both. Thus, with the arch-coquette Belinda,

“Like the sun, they shine on all alike;”

and, with Sir Pertinax McSycophant, the symbol of duplicity, make bows and protestations the scaffolding of their fortunes.

These parasites of the public rarely look you fully in the face, but eye you askance, as if watching your movements and endeavoring to penetrate your designs, and eagerly striving to veil from you their own; and their conversation is in a tone approaching a whisper. Every word they speak, and every action they perform, betoken a propensity to concealment and mystery. In the street you see them frequently walking, arm in arm, and conferring familiarly with one of their retainers, or with some person of influence, whose favour and patronage they are anxious to secure — and not unfrequently with those whom they secretly hate, and malignantly defame.

The real intimacies of such counterfeits are few, though their apparent ones are numerons. In truth the exterior of their whole lives is a compound of *appearances*; all their *realities* being studiously covered. Like so many whited sepulchres, specious without, but repulsive masses of corruption within, their whole existence is a masquerade. They live, and act, and converse but *in character*; and in whatever they do, in the eye of the world, they are as real *actors*, as McCredy in Hamlet, or Forrest in Spartacus. It is only in solitude that they are themselves; and then, if Conscientiousness be not extinct in them, they are miserable monuments of self-abasement. Subsisting thus on mere occurrence and expediency, they are necessarily the sport and football of events — consistent only in their inconsistencies, and steady only in their unsteadiness. What they said yesterday they unsay to-day; while a third and different report will issue from them to-morrow. In vain therefore would I attempt to paint them to you in their true likeness — because they have none. As well might I endeavour fixedly to embody into the form and

symmetry of an Apollo, the fleeting rack, as it drives before the storm, and changes at each sweep of its progress through the heavens. From my inability however to delineate them, nothing will be lost to you. To detect them is easy. You will know them from their *want of likeness*; and from their never ceasing changes, in their efforts to conform to the changes in the current of the times — or rather to the changes in public opinion. Such chameleon-shufflers consist of materials well fitted to be moulded into informers, traitors, and false witnesses against those who have imprudently trusted them. But to things of so much turpitude and repulsiveness, no more time can now be devoted. Consigning them therefore to scorn and abhorrence, I must pass to other forms of deception.

Hypocrisy in religion is another form of falsehood, by which physicians endeavour to recommend themselves to public favour, and to procure business. And it will not be denied that the scheme is execrable. It is fraught with a spirit much worse than that of common duplicity. Implied blasphemy makes often a part of it; for it virtually invokes a blessing from Heaven on a system of falsehood and a course of profanity. I have known physicians but slightly removed in their habits from profligacy, who were in the constant practice of dropping on their knees, and imploring divine aid in the operation of a remedy they were about to administer. And I have been called irreligious, for rebuking with sternness such revolting mockery.

This religious juggle is played off in different ways, according to the end proposed to be attained by it. Usually the aspirant to advancement enrolls himself under the banner of a particular sect, to secure to himself, on

the score of brotherly love, the patronage of its members. Sometimes however his views are broader, and his desires more ambitious. He therefore resolves to stand well with all sects; and conformable to this are the course he shapes and the means he employs.

An eminent physician of Philadelphia held a pew in some place of worship of every religious sect and denomination in the city, the Jews and the Society of Friends excepted. Of these the former were too small a body to have a strong attraction for him; and the latter not only rejected the overture of the hypocrite to take a seat among them; they rebuked it, because they deemed it dishonest and offensive.

This arch-pew-holder (who had a place even in one of the African churches) if he did not, like St. Paul, make himself "all things to all men," was at least, as a sectarian, every thing to every sect. He was as flexible and accommodating in religion, as Cataline was in vice. When in conversation with an Episcopalian, he gave a preference to Episcopacy—with a Presbyterian, to Presbyterianism—with a Methodist, to Methodism—and with a Baptist, to Baptism. Nor, when in the company of Catholics, did he fail to find beauties and excellencies in their form of worship, which excited his admiration, and commanded his approval. Yet was that physician accounted pious; and his hypocrisy procured for him extensive patronage.

But a few years ago, a wicked and repulsive spectacle was exhibited, under a show of religion, within a few miles of this city, (Lexington in Kentucky.) Two physicians, one of them of very loose morals and habits, and the other far from being a pattern of virtue, became desirous of securing, for a particular purpose, the counte-

nance and support of an influential religious sect. To accomplish their end, they repaired to a camp-meeting held in the neighbourhood, were proselyted on the same day, practised their orgies in the same pavillion, grew deeply penitent for past offences, and made pious and public resolves respecting future amendment—prayed fervently, raved and exhorted boisterously, and played the entire part of counterfeits and fanatics with such artifice and effect, as to dupe the spectators, and be accredited for sincerity. Even the clergy were persuaded that two sinners of note were metamorphosed into christians. But the delusion did not last. The project, which had been the cause of the feigned conversion, and of the gross and offensive hypocrisy which followed it, did not succeed; and, with its failure, failed also the masquerade saint-ship of the two proselytes. With appetites therefore, whetted afresh by their brief abstinence, the pseudo-converts soon returned to the “flesh-pots” they had forsaken, and plunged anew into their favourite indulgences—two of which were, falsehood and calumny.

One detestable stratagem more, frequently resorted to by physicians who are haunted by envy and jealousy, and I am done. It is that of calumniating rival physicians, by condemning and often misstating their practice. No act can be more deeply dishonourable, and scandalously base and immoral, than this. Yet it is perpetrated occasionally, even by those whom fortune has seated in the high places of the profession. Let the following case be received in illustration of my allusion, and in confirmation of its truth.

Two physicians of standing are rivals for business in the same town, but maintain with each other a friendly intercourse. One of them falls sick of a dangerous com-

plaint, and is attended by the other, who, by a bold and decisive practice, is acknowledged by himself to have saved his life. In other cases also, the physician thus rescued from death, testifies to the efficacy of the same mode of practice. For some time the relation of these two physicians to each other continues unchanged; and they meet and consult on disease as before.

At length a new and destructive epidemic occurs, in the treatment of which they are equally engaged—but with a dissimilar issue. The practitioner who had saved his rival's life is far the most successful. He scarcely loses a patient, be his condition what it may, while the other scarcely saves one whose attack is severe. From this time the physician thus surpassed in practice, rendered jealous of his rival, conceives a deep-rooted hostility toward him, which he artfully endeavors to conceal under a friendly exterior. Of his mode of practice, however, which had eventuated so successfully, his sentiments, as reported by himself, undergo a sudden and complete revolution. That mode by which his life had been previously saved, and which he had highly commended, is now the object of his dread and dislike. He avails himself of every occasion presented to him, to condemn it with bitterness (at first confidentially and in whispers, but afterwards more openly,) as being not only inefficient, as a means of cure, but highly injurious to the human constitution. In this way, though comparatively unsuccessful in the treatment of diseases himself, he succeeds in exciting against his rival, feelings and prejudices unjust in themselves, and detrimental to his interests. Yet the form of practice, I say, thus censured and condemned, is that to which the epidemic referred to, and the traducer's own malady, had most readily yielded. Nor is it doubt-

ed by any one informed on the subject, that pining envy and unmanly jealousy, and not honest conviction, are the cause of the change in the calumniators conduct. Such is the case I have ventured to state. To pronounce judgment on it is left for yourselves. I shall only add, that, though presented to you as matter of supposition, the leading features of it are matters of fact.

It has been just alleged that envy and jealousy, in the mind of the physician discomfited in the epidemic, were the cause of his subsequent reprehensible conduct. And they are ignoble passions, which rankle only in the bosom of an inferior toward one above him. Their look is upward. A superior looks down on an inferior with pity or scorn; while the inferior envies the lot of the superior; because he conceives it to be more eligible than his own. He therefore that cherishes envy, acknowledges by the act, a consciousness of his inferiority to him whom he envies.

For the same reason all affectation is an acknowledgment of inferiority in him who practices it. No individual will affect to be what he is not, unless he feels convinced that if he were really what he personates, his condition would be more elevated and desirable than it is. Affectation moreover virtually presents a fiction for a reality. It is therefore founded in falsehood, and is so far a violation of strict morality. The physician then, who affects to know more or do more than he actually does know or do, or to have made in his profession discoveries or improvements, which are the fruits of the labours of others — such a physician is wanting in that sacred regard for truth, without which his morals are unsound, his professional reports and communications unworthy of credit, and his example pernicious. His reputation more-

over, is a house on the sand, whose foundation must, sooner or later, pass from under it, and leave it a ruin.

Such, in part, is the vice of falsehood. But the picture is incomplete. Nor does time permit me to finish it at present. I have shown its origin to be animal and degraded, and that it constitutes the foundation of a group of crimes and felonies, that people jails, and give employment to gibbets. No poison has ever been secretly administered to destroy human life, except at the instigation of Destructiveness, and under the direction of Secretiveness ; the latter of which, as already stated, is the source of falsehood and treachery. The debasement of the vice, then, apart from its criminality, should prevent its commission.

Were it possible for me to analyze and classify all the crimes that have been committed by man, and enumerate all the moral and physical evils that have resulted from them, since the origin of our race, the exposition would show, that, virtually, falsehood has been the source of the whole. Paradise was lost by falsehood and treachery ; and we are taught to believe, that from that loss have proceeded all the subsequent crimes and calamities of the human family.

A world of truth would be a world of innocence, peace, and happiness. In such a glorious condition of morals, the higher and nobler faculties of our nature would control and regulate the subordinate ones, whose excess and perversion make vice and its concomitants. And to produce that condition of things, is the legitimate object of sound education. But I must pursue this theme no farther. A few suggestions respecting a remedy for the evils of falsehood shall close my address.

At the commencement of this branch of my subject,

two very important questions present themselves. Does such a remedy exist? And, if so, does it lie within our reach; and can we apply it when attained to the reform contemplated?

To these questions my reply is affirmative. A remedy for falsehood does exist; its accessibility is certain; and its efficient application, though difficult, is practicable. Answers the reverse of these would be of fearful import. They would proclaim the reformation of mankind in mass, by means within their own power, to be impossible, and their earthly condition hopeless. And to that doctrine I cannot subscribe. In my view, it would be disrespectful toward the Deity, if not calumnious and blasphemous. It would pronounce his works imperfect, and impeach his veracity, when he proclaimed them "all very good!" Boundless as he is himself in truth, justice and goodness, wisdom and power, I cannot believe that he created man to be always the slave and victim of a lying tongue, a knavish disposition, and a felonious hand. If, as we are taught to believe, all things tend to good, a time must come, when those vices will have an end, and man be permitted to repose within his dwelling in peace, and to gather in and garner up the products of his industry, without being endangered in his person or property by the hand of the felon, or the devices of the knave; or wounded in his feelings, and deprived of his good name, by the tongue of the slanderer.

In plainer and more explicit terms. So exalted is my opinion of the attributes of the Deity, that I cannot doubt the perfection of any thing he has created. I am therefore compelled to be a believer in the doctrine of a millennium to come. Though before its advent thousands

of ages will have probably elapsed. And I further believe, that that high and happy degree of reformation and improvement in the condition of man, is to be the product exclusively of his own labours. He must work for the felicity he is destined to enjoy, else he will neither attain nor deserve it. He is furnished by the Creator with the means and powers to purge himself of the grovelling vice of falsehood, and emerge from the ignominious condition it imposes. Let those provisions be brought to the task with energy and judgment, and it will be completed. Even a steady and determined resolution to employ them, is an important step toward a consummation so desirable.

The first effectual act in the eradication of falsehood, is to denounce it in words, and discountenance it in practice — to proclaim against it in every shape a persecution of intolerance, and a war of extermination. Whatever may be their wealth, or standing, or pretensions, let the liar and the traitor, the shuffler, the swindler, the knave, and the thief, be openly held in the detestation they merit ; be excluded from the companionship of the upright and honorable, and thrown into the abhorred society of each other ; or driven into solitude. Let the friends and patterns of virtue and good order shun them as lepers, or other unclean things — except when they make a benevolent effort to reclaim them. Let them then approach them in the capacity of moral physicians, and act toward them accordingly. Time does not permit me to enter in detail on the mode of treating them. In addition, however, to the inculcation of moral precepts, and the recommendation of moral practices, by example as well as advice, a part of the

curative means should be, a contrast strongly drawn, and earnestly presented to them, of the actual character and standing (with the good and the wise) of the traitor and the faithful, the reckless liar, and the conscientious friend and follower of truth — the comparative and widely different estimation, in which such individuals are held by every one, the attainment of whose esteem should be an object of ambition — the different fates that usually await them while living, the opposite feelings they experience from a retrospect of their lives, and the unspeakable difference of their hopes and apprehensions, on the approach of death. The more effectually to enforce these representations, remind such of them as are not altogether indifferent to religion, of the dismal vengeance denounced in Scripture against liars and traitors. And to render this argument still more impressive, nothing can be better suited than a recital of the examples of Ananias, who was stricken dead with a lie on his lips, and of Judas, whose remorse for his treachery drove him to suicide. Nor will it be amiss to familiarize them with the fact, that nothing is so affrontive to a man of honour as to be bearded as a liar. Why? Because the appellation is unequalled in the ignominy it imputes. But if it be degrading to an individual to be pronounced a liar; to deserve the appellation is immeasurably more so. I need scarcely add, that these efforts at reformation will be most likely to succeed, when they are made through the "*ruling passions*" of the individuals to be reclaimed. Let the proud man be addressed through his pride, the timid through his fears, the ambitious through his love of distinction, the covetous through his love of gain, and those who have religious feelings through their hopes and apprehensions as to a future

state. On this topic, however, I can dwell no longer, but must pass to another.

However skillfully and vigorously the effort may be made, it is not by any kind of action on adults, that our race can be freed entirely from the turpitude of falsehood. Though the habits of long-practised liars and traitors *may* be amended, to reduce them to soundness is perhaps impossible. Their moral malady would seem to be incurable. After years of practice, their propensity to violate truth in some way, becomes almost as deeply and immovably rooted in their nature, as the propensity to breathe, sleep, or take food. Of such profligates (and their number is not small) it might be correctly said, in the words of the prophet, "Ephraim is given over to idols ; let him alone."

It is through the medium of a suitable education, commenced in the very morning of life, that the mind can receive that moral soundness, mould, and bias, which are fatal to falsehood. Childhood is the period of mental flexibility, when the animal propensity, whose excess is lying, can be most effectually regulated. And, if neglected then, it too often acquires such strength and unbridledness, as to be afterwards irreclaimable. So true are the words of the poet :

"'Tis education forms the common mind ;
Just as the twig is bent, the tree's inclined."

That the "bent" therefore may be of sufficient compass, and in the right direction, I would follow in my advice somewhat the manner of an eloquent French writer, when urging the early inculcation of the virtue of patriotism — "Begin," said he "with the child in its cradle, and let the first word it pronounces be WASHINGTON." Thus would I say : "begin with the child, as soon as

it can understand you, and let each word it hears or utters, and every action it performs or witnesses, be in accordance with truth. Let it be taught that, in its nature, falsehood is not only sinful, but ignominious and dishonourable — that it is indicative of the meanest and basest of natures — and that to be guilty of it is to forfeit affection, favour, and kindness, and to excite displeasure, and incur punishment. And let it further learn, that an inviolable adherence to truth is lovely and honourable, and secures universal affection and good will — that it is the highest characteristic of pure and elevated natures — that even the Deity himself has virtually assumed the name of TRUTH, and made known, as one of his holiest attributes, that he will not, cannot swerve from it — and that inflexibly to practise truth, is the never-failing way to gain and preserve the esteem and confidence of the virtuous and enlightened; and, as the highest of earthly rewards, to enjoy the gratification of self-esteem, in union with the approbation of a peaceful conscience. These views to be imparted successively, as the mind of the instructed becomes capable of comprehending them.

Moral education then is that form of discipline which can alone preserve the mind from all that is base and odious in falsehood. And, contrary to general belief and custom, it can be efficiently promoted only by practice and example; not by the cultivation of the intellectual faculties. Mere moral precepts, whether oral or written, do comparatively but little to confirm the pupil in habits of virtue. They may give him *knowledge*, but nothing more. And that, as daily experience evinces, has no necessary affinity to moral duty, nor any positive control of it. A single day of moral practice imparts

more strength and activity to the moral faculties, than a month or even a year of reading, and listening to harangues recommendatory of morality.

To these remarks, however, exceptions may exist. On youthful minds of an ardent temperament and a lofty ambition, the mere contemplation of examples pure in sentiment and sublime in their moral bearing, especially if associated with deeds of greatness and glory, produces at times very salutary effects. To the native seeds of morality, sown in the constitution of those who come under their influence, they are sunshine and dew. Their genial agency awakens the germ, and future events give nourishment and growth, and bring the fruit to ripeness. Hence the benefits that result from the biographical memoirs of distinguished men. There is reason to believe that such productions have done much more in the promotion of sound morals and practical virtue, than all the didactic discourses, essays, and systems of moral philosophy, that have issued from the pen and the press, since the origin of letters. Plutarch has done more for morals, by his lives of the great, than all the sages of Greece by their writings; and the authors of the lives of distinguished Romans, more than the moral writers of Rome. Nor is it doubtful that the biographies of Franklin, Washington, Hamilton, and other illustrious Americans, composed in a manner worthy of their subjects, might be so used as to be made the means of greater amendment in the morals of our country, than all the editions of Paley, Smith and Beattie, Stewart and Brown, and all the other disquisitions on morals, that have ever been published.

But it is not by the exertion and influence of a few agents in the cause of truth and morality, however

strenuous and powerful they may be, that mendacity and its concomitant evils can be suppressed. For the completion of a work of such magnitude and difficulty, the labourers must be numerous, true to their vocation, ardent in their zeal, and untiring in their perseverance, else their efforts will be unavailing. Nothing short, I say, of a sound moral education diffused throughout the land can accomplish the object. And to that caste of education, in its true character and entire extent, we are hitherto strangers. Its very beginning among us is yet to be made, and its real value yet to be learnt. In this assertion, exceptionable as it may perhaps be thought, there is neither error nor extravagance. I fearlessly repeat, that, lofty as are our pretensions to knowledge, morality and religion, the value and sacredness of truth, and the turpitude of falsehood are either misunderstood, or shamefully disregarded by us. Were the fact otherwise, so would be the issue. In all parts of our country, and under all circumstances, truth would be held in higher estimation and honour, and falsehood in deeper disgrace and odium, than is now the case. In a special manner, those notoriously addicted to the latter, in some of its most repulsive shapes, would never be received into public favour, caressed and sustained in their movements and measures, and hailed under the prostituted title of benefactors and friends, in any cause deemed upright and praiseworthy. Yet, in whatever direction you throw your eyes over our country, you will find such scenes of prostitution abundant.

But the moment warns me that I must hasten to a close. Not however until I shall have briefly indicated to you the only source of that improvement in moral

education, which can convert the love of truth and the detestation of falsehood, into the "ruling passion" of the whole community. It is FAMILY DISCIPLINE, conducted under the guidance of solid judgment, correct knowledge, inflexible resolution and perseverance, and sound conscience, and brought to the perfection of which it is susceptible.

That truth may attain the ascendancy it deserves, and *falsehood* be held in due abhorrence, every family must be converted into a school of morals, where the former will be practically taught and encouraged, and the latter, in all its modifications, discountenanced.

And MOTHERS must be the teachers. Nor will the occupation be found either impracticable or burthensome to them. On the contrary, it will be a source of the purest and most elevated enjoyment. It will only impose on them the

"Delightful task! to rear the tender thought,
To teach the young idea how to shoot,
To pour the fresh instruction o'er the mind,
To breathe the enlivening spirit, and to fix
The generous purpose in the glowing breast."

And who that deserves the name of MOTHER, or even of *woman*, would not eagerly and joyously embark in the employment!

That mothers however may be fitted for a vocation so elevated and responsible, and prepared to discharge the duties of it with credit and usefulness, they must be suitably trained and disciplined themselves. And I lament to say, that in the present state of society, this is far from being generally the case. The systems of female education now in vogue, (if "systems" they can be called,) are miserably defective, and can never fit mothers for an office at once so sacred and important,

They qualify them much better to glitter, sport, and dazzle abroad, than to officiate in their consecrated provinces at home.

Female education, as now conducted, is deplorably superficial. It addresses itself far more to the eye and the ear, than to the understanding and the conscience. To play on the piano and the harp, to touch the guitar, to paint, dance, embroider, and dress with taste, are desirable and delightful, as accomplishments of the fair. But they are *only* accomplishments. They are the mere "trappings and suits" of female education, and should be regarded but as decorations of something "within which passeth show," and is of higher value. And that something is wealth of intellect, delicacy of feeling, refinement of sentiment, purity of morals, an undeviating adherence to truth, and a sincere regard for the duties of a religion, free from moroseness, bigotry, and superstition. For, however regardless they may be of such duties themselves, there are few men of intellect and standing, who do not recoil from the spectacle of an irreligious woman. If her infidelity be openly avowed, she is so far unsexed, and marred in her fitness for the sphere she should occupy. It is to woman we instinctively look for the ornament, charm, and solace of home — for all that is most hallowed, as well as most lovely in the *domestic* circle, and most attractive and respected in the *social*. But, if she be not spotless in her morals, refined in her taste, graceful in her manners, and pious in her sentiments, we look in vain, and feel the chill of disappointment, and the sting of regret, instead of the thrill of admiration, and the glow of delight. She neither fills up the measure of our expectation, satisfies our wishes, nor realizes our hopes. But,

when her character and virtues are suited to her sex, she is at once our most valuable exemplar and instructress in truth and fidelity, purity and fortitude, friendship and love. In all that is most attractive and estimable she towers above us, as a being of a superior nature, destined to a higher sphere, and leaves us in our inglorious caste of inferiority, the creatures of earth.

We hear occasionally of the constancy of man, as an unlooked-for event. But we witness as an everyday occurrence, the fidelity, truth, and devotedness of woman. We read, among the ornaments of epic song, of the friendships of Pylades and Orestes, Achilles and Patroclus, Nisus and Euryalus; and in ancient romance of that of Damon and Pythias, and a few others, between men. And we bestow on them an ample measure of admiration and applause. Yet what are they but heartless professions, compared to the manifestations recorded of woman—to the unfathomable attachment for example, of Kaled (a young female in the attire of a page) to Lara his Lord, as immortalized by Byron. The scene is laid at night, and the moment is that in which the chief is about to lead the charge to his last conflict. And the following are the lines, that will perpetuate to all ages, the truth and faithfulness of a female friend :

“Perhaps ’twas but the moon’s dim twilight threw
Along his (Kaled’s) aspect an unwonted hue
Of mournful paleness, whose deep tint expressed
The *truth*, and not the terror of his breast.
This Lara marked, and laid his hand on his ;
It trembled not in such an hour as this ;
His lip was silent, scarcely beat his heart ;
His eye alone proclaimed, we will not part !

Thy band may perish, and thy friends may flee,
Farewell to life, but not adieu to thee !”

And fearfully did the issue verify the fatal resolve of the eye. The leader fell, and the page was maddened and destroyed by the agonies of grief.

Or what were those male friendships, contrasted with the fidelity of Emma to Henry, as celebrated by Pryor :

“Thy rise of fortune only did I wed,
From its decline determined to recede ;
Did I but purpose to embark with thee
On the smooth surface of a summer sea,
When gentle zephyrs play in prosperous gales,
And Fortune’s favour fills the swelling sails ;
But would forsake the ship and make the shore,
When the winds whistle and the tempests roar ?
No, Henry, no ; one sacred oath has tied
Our loves ; one destiny our lives shall guide ;
Nor wild, nor deep our common way divide !”

These splendid examples of truth and faithfulness in woman are among the redeeming lights of the world, and, to the heart of sensibility, beggar the much boasted glories of man. There dwell in them a moral sublimity, power, and beauty, which render them impressive and attractive, far beyond what philosophers have achieved in the halls of science ; historians and poets in the temples of the muses ; orators on the rostrum ; or heroes in the field. Hence when a Shakspeare, a Scott, or a Byron, resolves most deeply to fascinate and enthrall the minds of his readers, he presents them with a picture of female devotedness, constancy, and good faith. Were it possible, moreover, for the reprobate votaries of falsehood and intrigue, to become instinct with the feelings of honourable men, such examples would either reclaim them from profligacy, crush them

under a sense of their own degradation and unworthiness, or madden them with remorse. And I repeat, that, if this world of deception and treachery is ever to become a world of fidelity and truth, the conversion will be, in a high degree, the work of educated woman, in the faithful discharge of her maternal duties.

This, gentlemen, as heretofore suggested, is the last time I shall ever address you — a consideration which, on my part, gives to the occasion unusual solemnity. Accept therefore, I entreat you, as my official *death-bed* discourse, the sentiments I have uttered. And consider them as consecrated by the sincerity and affection of a father to his sons, at the trying hour of their final separation.

Though but few of you rank as heads of families now, it is my earnest hope that you will all live to do so hereafter. When in that justly honoured and responsible capacity then, let me further hope, that you will not be unmindful of some of the thoughts that have been expressed to you this day. In that case, you may not have listened, nor I spoken, altogether in vain. And, at whatever period the event just referred to may occur, let truth and fidelity be the inmates of your dwellings, and your companions without; and peace, respectability, and honour will not fail to accompany them. Nor will falsehood and treachery, whensoever, wheresoever, or by whomsoever practised, escape in the end, exposure and reprobation, disaster and disgrace.

Cordially welcoming you to the professional rank which you have this day attained, and tendering to you, in behalf of the Faculty of Medicine, and the government of the University, the affectionate benediction of your Alma Mater, I bid you FAREWELL!

ERRORS.

Page 79, 5th line from the top, for "equivouque," read equivoque.

" 101—2, bottom and top lines, for "succedal," read suicidal.

" 125, top line, for "views," read vices.





NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE



NLM 02702283 7