



~ COLLECTION OF ~
Historical Commission
NORTH CAROLINA
CHRISTIAN MISSIONARY CONVENTION
C.C.WARE WILSON, N.C.
Archivist

1792





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013





RELIGION;
NATURAL AND REVEALED:

OR, THE

NATURAL THEOLOGY

AND

MORAL BEARINGS OF PHRENOLOGY
AND PHYSIOLOGY:

INCLUDING THE

DOCTRINES TAUGHT AND DUTIES INCULCATED
THEREBY,

COMPARED WITH THOSE

ENJOINED IN THE SCRIPTURES.

TOGETHER WITH THE

PHRENOLOGICAL EXPOSITION OF THE DOCTRINES OF A FUTURE STATE

MATERIALISM, HOLINESS, SIN,

REWARDS, PUNISHMENTS, DEPRAVITY

A CHANGE OF HEART, WILL, FOREORDINATION,
FATALISM, ETC. ETC.

BY O. S. FOWLER,

PRACTICAL PHRENOLOGIST, EDITOR OF THE AM. PHR. JOURNAL
AUTHOR OF FOWLER'S PHRENOLOGY, HEREDITARY DESCENT, PHRENOLOGY
APPLIED TO EDUCATION AND SELF-IMPROVEMENT, DO. TO MATRI-
MONY, DO. TO MEMORY, TEMPERANCE, ETC.

Truth always harmonizes with itself.

TENTH EDITION—ENLARGED AND IMPROVED

NEW YORK:

Published by O. S. Fowler, 131 Nassau St., Clinton Hall; Saxton & Peirce, 212 Jordan
& Co., Washington St., Boston; Colon & Co., Arcade, Philadelphia; J. A. Hop-
kins & Co., Syracuse. N. Y.; E. A. Smith, Erwinton, S. C.; M. J. Grier,
Hamilton, Canada West: and Booksellers generally.

1847:

139
F824r
DISCIPLIANA LIBRARY
ATLANTIC CHRISTIAN COLLEGE
WILSON, N. C.

CHAPTER IV.

HOPE, AND ITS BEARINGS.—A FUTURE STATE.

SECT. I.—Analysis, location, and bearings o. Hope.	117
SECT. II.—Hope continued.—Miscellaneous inferences.	126

CHAPTER V.

BENEVOLENCE.—ITS ANALYSIS, AND THE TRUTHS TAUGHT THEREBY.

SECT. I.—The function of benevolence, and the duty and pleasure of doing good.	128
--	-----

CHAPTER VI.

CONSCIENTIOUSNESS.—ITS ANALYSIS AND BEARINGS.

SECT. I.—Conscience innate.	140
SECT. II.—The nature and rationale of right and wrong; or, the foundation of moral obligation.	144
SECT. III.—What is right, and what wrong?	154
SECT. IV.—Depravity.—Its origin—its extent—its conditions—its causes—its remedy.	161
SECT. V.—Punishment, here and hereafter,	166
SECT. VI.—Penitence and pardon.	169
Conclusion.	174

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

PROBABLY no subject whatever, is fraught with interest more intense, or attended with consequences more momentous, than a comparison of the doctrines inculcated, and the duties required, by Phrenology, with those enjoined by the Bible.

For about 1800 years, has the religion of Jesus Christ, and for several thousand years, have the Scriptures exerted an all-controlling influence over the intellects, the emotions, and the conduct of mankind—engrossing the feelings, shaping the lives, occupying the minds, and filling the souls, of untold millions of the human family. Nor does, or should this interest diminish.

Phrenology is also now every where becoming a subject of all-absorbing interest; and well it may, for it is founded in *Truth*. It *must*, it *will* prevail. It is a *demonstrative* science. It is built upon **FACTS**, infinite in both variety and number. It develops and evolves those laws in harmony with which God created both man and the whole range of animated nature. Every living creature that now inhabits earth, air, or water, is a living, incontestible evidence of its truth, as are also all that ever have lived, or that will ever inhabit our globe. And men have eyes to see these facts, as well as intellect enough to perceive that they establish the truth of Phrenology beyond all cavil or controversy. And they are fast opening their eyes to these facts, and yielding to the irresistible evidence that Phrenology is true. Nor is it possible for any intelligent mind candidly to examine either the facts or the principles of this science, without becoming convinced of its truth, and enamored with its doctrines. Men cannot *help* believing it, any more than they can help seeing what they look at, or feeling fire when they touch it. All *must* and *will* admit its

truth. Many already believe it. Indeed, it is now acquiring and exerting a moral power which nothing—absolutely *nothing*—can gainsay or resist. It is crushing beneath the car of its triumphal progress whatever and whoever resist or oppose its advancement. In connexion with a sister science, it is sweeping into oblivion those old theories, unnatural customs, and erroneous institutions, by which past ages have been enthralled, and even the present is yet spell-bound. So great is its moral power, that it will prostrate and ride over *whatever* religious doctrines, forms, or practices conflict with it. If even the Bible could be found to clash therewith, then would the Bible *go by the board*. *Nothing could save it*; for it would war with Truth, and must suffer defeat. But, if it be found to *harmonize* with Phrenology, then is it based upon the rock of Truth, and defended and supported by those immutable laws of Nature which the all-wise Creator has instituted for its government; so that neither can infidelity scathe its walls, nor atheism find the least support for its monstrosities; both being overthrown by this science. •

In this view of the subject, how all-absorbing the interest, how overwhelming the importance, how momentous the results, of a comparison of the religion of Phrenology with the religion of the Bible! My pen falters! *Must I proceed?* I feel utterly inadequate to the task, and yet I feel that this neglected task should be and must be undertaken. Though the objections that Phrenology favors infidelity and fatalism, have been often and ably refuted, yet the real principles developed, doctrines taught, and life required by Phrenology, have never yet been fully and fairly compared or contrasted with the theology and code of morals of the Bible. That is, the *natural* theology and *moral* bearings of Phrenology, and the theology and requirements of the Scriptures, have never yet been placed *side by side*, to see wherein they harmonize, or wherein they differ. This ought certainly to be done. It has been studiously, if not improperly, avoided. No one has stood in the breach, while erring humanity demands the TRUTH on this all-important subject. No leaning to infidelity on the one hand—no truckling to sectarianisms on the other. Let us

appeal to PHILOSOPHY. The TRUTH is required, without fear, without favor, without stint.

I know full well that no other task requires more moral courage than this. I know that men cling with more tenacity to their religion than to all else besides. What enmity is as strong, what prejudices are as inveterate, as those awakened by tearing one's religion from him? Like Micah, he exclaims, "Ye have taken away my GODS, what have I more?"

Still, I despair not. My hope of success in this arduous and hazardous undertaking, rests in the *power of truth*. This power will ultimately bear down all prejudice, and break through all opposition. It will *force* men to abandon their religious errors, and to plant themselves upon the broad platform of the *nature of man*. That nature, Phrenology unfolds. Sooner or later, must the religion of Phrenology become the religion of man. The outlines of that religion, will be pointed out in this work. The present generation may slumber over these truths—may even scout and reject them. Even future generations may live uncheered by the sun of moral science, and die unenlightened by its rays. But the time *will* come when its general principles will govern the religious creed and the practices of mankind. Then will the fiery star of sectarianism set in eternal night, never more to torment mankind with its noxious rays. Then will religious bigotry and intolerance cease for ever. Then will unrestrained religious liberty pervade our happy earth. Then will all men see eye to eye and face to face. Then will a holy life and a spotless soul in this world, be but the entrance of man into the enjoyment of the immortal and boundless bliss which his moral faculties are calculated to pour into the human soul, both here and hereafter. Come, glorious day! come quickly.

And I derive no little encouragement, that it is "nigh, even at the door," from the fact that the religious belief of very many good people, is extremely unsettled. Now, mankind hardly know what to believe. Too long already have they been getting their thinking done out; and they begin to see it. They are no longer willing to have it done by proxy. They are unwilling, as formerly, to pin their

faith on the sleeve even of the parson. They *desire* to think for themselves. They are even *determined* to think for themselves. But they have *no data*—no *starting points*, no *base line*, no fixed and settled *first principles*—at which to commence, and with which to compare. These first principles are to be found in the NATURAL THEOLOGY, and the NATURAL RELIGION, of Phrenology. This science dissects and unfolds man's moral nature—its primary faculties, its original elements. It does this so *clearly* that man cannot fail to perceive and adopt the religious doctrines it teaches, and to practice the duties it requires. Rid any mind of preconceived prejudices, and in one year will the truth of Phrenology thoroughly renovate that mind, and purify the life. These prejudices are giving way. The last ten years have liberalized mankind more than ages have ever done before. The next ten years, will witness a moral and a religious revolution greater than all past ages put together have yet witnessed. Antiquated errors are tottering at their base. The darkness of the past is fleeing before the dawn of Millennial truth. That truth is now being developed by the daily and astonishingly rapid spread of that knowledge of the moral nature and constitution of man imparted by Phrenology. To expound this moral nature, and to show what religious fruit grows thereon, is the end and aim of this little volume. Imperfect in authorship, but rich in subject matter. Defective in style, but deep in fundamental truth. Requiring some minor qualifications, but tenable in every material position, as well as unanswerable in every leading argument. It asks no favor, but investigation—it yields nothing to the religions that be. Its pathway is *philosophy*. Its goal is eternal right. Strewed behind it in all its course, are the nauseating carcasses of hydra-headed error in all its forms. It stands high on the hill of *Science*. Its roots run deep into the nature of man. Its branches yield all manner of delicious fruits, for the healing of the nations, and the renovation of mankind. Its moral truths are food to the hungry, a cooling beverage to the thirsty soul, a foundation to those whom the tides of error are sweeping onward to destruction, and a feast of reason, with a flow of soul, to all—sight to the blind, feet to the lame, health to the invalid, vitality to the dying, and life to the dead.

A word in reference to the qualification of its Editor for properly presenting this subject. That he is thoroughly versed in *Phrenology*, and especially in that *practical* department of it which gives him just that very knowledge of the workings or manifestations of the moral faculties, in all their phases and combinations, that is required, almost every American reader will rest assured from what he already knows of his works and standing. That no other man, his brother excepted, is equally well qualified in this respect, is a matter of fact, and not of egotism.

Nor is he ignorant, either theoretically or experimentally, of what is considered genuine religion. Brought up by a mother eminently godly and devout, and by a father long a deacon and a staunch pillar in the Congregational Churches, religious from childhood, and familiar with both the Bible and the peculiar doctrines of most of the sects; he brings to the discussion of this subject not only an intimate knowledge of that science in which his deductions are based, but also a minute acquaintance with the commonly received religious notions and practices of the age.

Nor will these deductions be materially affected by their authorship. That affects only the *manner* in which they are presented. Still, the only drawback experienced by the work consists in the haste with which it has been sent to press—a haste induced by a literal pressure of professional engagements, lecturing, business, &c., which must otherwise have postponed it indefinitely. To this, the public would not consent. The public have said with emphasis, “LET US HAVE THE WORK. Be it imperfect as to style—be its authorship defective—still, at *some* rate—at all events, GIVE US THE WORK.” And the Author feels that it *will*, that it *must*, DO GOOD—the sole object for which it was written. He feels that no one can rise from a careful perusal of its contents, without being benefitted thereby.

It remains only to add, that the Author takes it for granted, that the reader admits and understands the fundamental doctrines of *Phrenology*. Taking for granted that the truths established by this science are admitted, he proceeds to investigate the moral and religious

principles laid down, and the duties pointed out, thereby, and to compare them with the fundamental doctrines taught, and duties enjoined, by the Bible. Nor will there be any evasion of knotty points; any temporizing with popular prejudices. But it will contain a full, fearless, manly, expounding of truth, and exposition of error. Dismiss prejudice. Read; ponder; investigate. Decide. Receive the good. Reject the bad.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

IN less than nine months after the publication of this work, an edition of over two thousand copies has been exhausted. This unexpected sale makes it necessary to put a second edition to press too soon to allow the Author the requisite time to revise it for that purpose and make as extensive improvements as he has hitherto contemplated. Still, he has taken scraps of time from other labors to rewrite some portions of it, transpose others, make copious additions, and, as a whole, greatly to improve it.

The chapter on the nature of right and wrong, and the origin or foundation of moral obligation, (or on the constitutional elements of the sinfulness of sin and the virtue of holiness,) as well as on the causes and cure of human depravity, will be not only new, but also directly in the teeth of all prevailing notions on this subject. Of course, therefore, it will be unpopular. Be it so. Be it as it may. With that matter, the Author does not concern himself. It concerns the *reader*—it affects *his* happiness, not mine—whether it be accepted or rejected. That this analysis of virtue and sin cannot be controverted, is certain. That it will plough a deep and wide furrow through the field of truth, now overgrown with the thorns and the brambles of popular error, is also certain. But it will prepare that field for a rich harvest of human happiness and virtue. In short, let not the reader be startled with any thing contained in these pages; but let him come up with bold, manly thought to an unbiased examination of their entire contents.

The first edition was received with a much better spirit than the Author anticipated. He expected that its fearless exposition of sectarianism, its reproving the churches for admitting the fashions into

them on the Sabbath, &c., as well as its bold advancement of **some** unpalatable truths, and fearless exposition of some glaring but generally received errors; would have subjected it and him to odium. But he finds that men can bear the truth much better than he supposed they could. He finds that they even *love* it. He expected infidelity would come down upon him on the one hand, for exposing some of its errors; and religionists upon the other, for tearing from them some of their darling dogmas. But he finds that nearly all like it. He finds, that in matters of religion, men differ much less than they suppose they do. They divide on *names* more than on *things*. And what is more, there are some fundamental religious truths which all see and admit—a broad platform of common ground, which all recognize as such. And Phrenology will bring all on to this platform. And may this little volume go forth upon the angry sea of sectarian contention, to calm its troubled waters; to harmonize conflicting elements, and to disseminate truth, and love, and moral purity among **mankind**.

RELIGION, NATURAL AND REVEALED, ETC.

CHAPTER I.

THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF MAN'S MORAL AND RELIGIOUS NATURE.

SECTION I.

MAN CONSTITUTIONALLY MORAL AND RELIGIOUS.

MAN is constitutionally a moral being. He is also naturally religious. Indeed, piety of some kind, and religion in some form, have ever constituted, and still constitute, one of the leading motives, one of the all-engrossing pursuits, of mankind. Strike from the page of history, and from the mind and conduct of mankind, every thing appertaining to morals and religion, and the identity of both will be destroyed. Take his religion from the conceited Chinese, or from the benighted Hindoo, or from the degraded Ethiopean, or from the noble son of the forest, and each in his turn, with Micah, would exclaim, "Ye have taken away my GODS! what *have* I more?" In fact, where is the nation or tribe—when and where have any existed—whose religion did not enter into the very texture of their minds, form their habits, mould their characters, shape and perpetuate their government and institutions, and even guide their intellect, as well as govern their whole conduct? Without these moral elements, how ignoble, how depraved, would man have been! But, with them, how exalted, how angelic, how godlike, is he capable of being and of becoming!

Nor is there any danger, or even possibility, that man will ever become *less* religious than he now is and always has been, any more than there is danger of his ceasing to become hungry or to breathe;

for religion is engrafted upon his very nature, or, rather, forms no inconsiderable portion thereof. This fact, established by the whole history of man, is demonstrated by Phrenology, in its showing that a large portion of the brain is appropriate to the development of the moral and religious organs. Till, therefore, the nature of man is essentially remodelled, that nature will *compel* him to have a religion of *some* kind. The great danger is, not that mankind can ever become irreligious, for that is impossible, but that his religious faculties will still continue to combine, as they always have combined, with his predominant *propensities*, instead of with his feebler intellect. For it is a fully established law of Phrenology, that large organs combine in action more readily and powerfully with the other organs that are large, than with those that are smaller. Man's intellectual lobe being usually much inferior in size to his animal, the great danger is that his moral faculties will still continue to unite with his *propensities*; and hence, that he will still make his religion the scape-goat of his sins. Always has his *religion* been the servant of his pride, of his unbridled lusts, of his sinful passions. It continues to do this. So that his religion, designed and calculated to make him better, actually makes him the worse, and the more miserable. But, let the moral sentiments combine with a vigorous and an unperverted intellect, in conjunction with a healthy organization, and incalculably will they ennoble, adorn, and happify mankind. That their power, both for good and for evil, exceeds all computation, is evident from the whole history of man, as well as from the nature of the faculties themselves.

How important, then, that man should understand his moral nature, and obey its laws! In common with every other department of his nature, it has its laws. To suppose otherwise, is to charge God foolishly, by supposing that he has neglected to establish the dominion of laws, and to arrange first principles in one of the most important departments of the nature of man. With this neglect, the Almighty is not chargeable. Of the benefits resulting from the establishment of these laws, man is not deprived. So far therefrom, fixed laws, immutable first principles, reign supreme in this, as they do in every other, department. of nature.

Nor are these laws a sealed book to man. They are not locked up from his moral vision. Like the glorious sun of the natural day, they were made to rise upon every son and daughter of creation and to throw a clear beam of light and truth throughout every human soul. Not a single dark corner exists but is capable of being illumined by the sun of moral truth. All have moral eyes. All can perceive

moral truth. All can follow in the paths of morality and virtue. None need ever stumble upon the dark mountains of error, or be lost in the mist of superstition, or make shipwreck upon the rock of bigotry, or be swallowed up in the vortex of infidelity. Moral science exists as much as physical. Moral science is even as *demonstrable* as mathematical or anatomical, or any other science. The very fact that man has a moral nature, is *prima facie* evidence that nature has its laws, and that those laws *can* be known and read of all mankind. To suppose that man *cannot* arrive at a certain knowledge of moral and religious truth, is to suppose that the Deity has sealed or blinded the eyes of man touching this important matter. Who believes this? No one, surely. *All men can* come to the moral light of our nature. Sectarianism need not exist. It *should not* exist. Truth is the sure light. Truth is *come-at-able*, to use a common, but appropriate, word. Error in this matter is a most grievous evil. Moral and religious truth is most desirable. If moral laws exist. They must not be violated. They must be obeyed. They may be known. They are not a candle hid under a bushel. They are a light set upon an hill. *All can* come, *should* come, to this light, and be saved from religious error and sin. This light can be seen afar off, even unto the ends of the earth, and by all flesh. Diversity of religious belief or practice, need not and should not exist. Diversity pre-supposes error, and the greater this diversity, the greater the consequent error. And the greater this error, the more sinful, the more unhappy, the subject of that error. Sectarianism has no excuse. *It is most pernicious*; for errors of practice grow out of errors in belief. And the greater either, the greater the other, and the more ruinous. If all would use unbiased *reason* along with their moral sentiments, all would come to the same results; for, truth is one, and always consistent with itself. If men would only employ *intellect* in connexion with their moral nature, they would always *believe* right, and *do* right, and be perfect. Oh! if man would but live in accordance with his moral constitution, how holy, how happy, would he be! Religious errors, and dogmas would disappear like the morning fog before the rising sun, to be followed by a devotional spirit, and a virtuous life. But now, alas! we grope our way in the midnight of superstition. We stumble upon the dark mountains of error on the one hand, while on the other, we plunge headlong into the miry slough of superstition, bigotry, and zeal without knowledge. And most sinful, most miserable, does this our religious nature, render us.

But, light is breaking in upon the dark mists of all past ages. Ho, ye who would return from your wanderings and be delivered from your thralldoms and your errors, follow the beacon light of truth hoisted by Phrenology. It will clear up all difficulties. It will solve all moral problems. It will point out that religion which harmonizes with the nature of man, and is most conducive to personal happiness and general moral purity. For it is self-evident—is a philosophical axiom—that the moral nature of man must necessarily be in perfect harmony with the moral government of God, as well as with the moral constitution of the universe. If, therefore, Phrenology be true, it of course unfolds the moral nature of man, and, consequently, must be in perfect harmony therewith. So that, on the principle that any two things, each exactly like a third, are therefore like each other, it follows that the moral doctrines taught, and the duties inculcated, by Phrenology, must harmonize perfectly with the moral constitution of the universe; because each, by supposition, accords with the nature of man. If Phrenology develop and harmonize with the nature of man, (which it must do if true,) and if this moral *nature* of man accord with the moral constitution of things, (which it must do, or nature will be found at war with herself,) then Phrenology, if true, must necessarily harmonize perfectly with the moral constitution of things. And *vice versa*. So that the moral constitution of things, the moral and religious nature of man, and the natural theology, the moral precepts, and the religious teachings, of Phrenology, must each harmonize perfectly with all the others.

And what is more, the moral constitution of the universe, and the government of God, must of course each harmonize with the moral character and attributes of the Deity, as well as with his natural kingdom. Hence, Phrenology, if true, must of necessity be found to harmonize perfectly with the moral character, attributes, and government of the great Creator and Governor of the universe. And if the Bible be also true, *its* doctrines, too, must tally exactly with those taught by Phrenology. But, if it be untrue, or, as far as it is erroneous, will this science expose its errors, and point out “a more excellent way.” If the original, constitutional, moral nature of man, as pointed out by Phrenology, be found to harmonize with the Scriptures, they are confirmed by Phrenology, and derive an accession of evidence therefrom which no sophist can evade, or skeptic gainsay. But if they clash, then are they building their hopes of immortality upon a rotten foundation, which this science can and will sweep away. In other words; if the Bible and Phrenology both be true, the moral precepts

and duties inculcated in either, will harmonize perfectly with those taught in the other, and with the fundamental principles by which the universe itself, as well as the great Creator of all things, are governed; but if either be erroneous, it will conflict with the other. Hence, Christianity has nothing to fear, but every thing to hope. If it be built upon the rock of truth, it will be confirmed and demonstrated. If it stand on a sandy foundation, the sooner it is swept from under it, the better. And if its foundation, like the feet and toes of Nebuchadnezzar's image, be partly iron and partly miry clay—partly strong and partly weak, partly true and partly erroneous—we here have a moral touch-stone by which to try and test every moral creed and practice. Let us embrace it. Let all study its principles and follow its precepts, and they will be the better, and the more happy and useful.

If it be objected, that the Bible is already an unerring moral guide, and a perfect standard of religious faith and practice, I answer. Then, why does every religious denomination in Christendom, and every member of every religious sect, besides multitudes of private individuals, all claim to draw their peculiar doctrines and practices from the Bible, and even quote Scripture therefor, and that though their difference be heaven wide. Do not Universalists quote chapter and verse as plausibly and as sincerely to prove the final salvation of all men, as do the orthodox in proof of the opposite doctrine that some will be assigned to eternal condemnation? The Unitarian and the Trinitarian both claim to prove their respective but conflicting doctrines each to the perfect satisfaction of himself and to the overthrow of the other, from the same Bible, and from not a few of the very same texts. The Baptist draws his doctrine of immersion from the same Bible from which sprinklers draw their opposite doctrine. Controversies without end have been held, and volumes without number written, to prove and to disprove, from the same Bible, doctrines as opposite to each other as light and darkness, or heat and cold. Nor do the schisms of the Christian churches diminish. Indeed, they are increasing in number, and widening in extent continually. Every revolving year gives birth to some new sect, and each of these opposing sects alone claim to have the Bible on their side, and give it as authority against all who differ from them; and from the same pages of the same Bible, each is reading himself into heaven, and all who differ from him, into perdition.

Now, if the Bible, "without note or comment," be an all-sufficient guide in matters of religious faith and practice, why this religious di-

versity and contention? Why does it *not compel* all to adopt the *same* doctrines and practices, and these the only correct ones? If experiment, continued for four thousand years, and tried in all ages and by a vast majority of christendom, can prove *any* thing, that experiment, or, rather, its total *failure*, and that too, under all circumstances, has proved incontestibly, that, taking man as he is, and the Bible as it is, the latter is *not*, and can *never* be, the all-sufficient religious guide and standard of the former. Nor is it *possible* for it ever to be so. Not that the fault is in the Bible. It is in man. But the Bible requires a *help-meet*—something to accompany, explain, and interpret it, as well as to enforce its doctrines and precepts. That help-meet is to be found in Phrenology. This science gives the *natural* constitution of man's moral and religious nature. That constitution is right. Whatever differs from it, is wrong. Whatever harmonizes with it, is right. Whatever construction may be put upon the Bible, not in strict accordance with that nature, is a wrong construction. Phrenology covers the same ground that the Bible claims to cover—that of man's *moral* nature. Wherein the lines of the two run parallel to each other, both are correct. But wherein the Bible is so construed as to diverge in the least from Phrenology, though the Bible itself may be right, yet the construction put upon it, is wrong. Hence, with the book of Phrenology as the elements, and the Bible as the supplement, of religion, it is to decypher out what is true, and to expose what is erroneous. Each will interpret and enforce the other, and the two together will give a far more consistent and enlightened view of the *true* religion, and of *correct* conduct, than either could do alone, as well as rectify all ignorant or bigoted perversions of either.

It is worthy of remark in this connexion, that the Bible no where attempts to prove either the existence of a God, or any of the fundamental truths of natural religion, such as of a future state, or the existence of first principles of right and wrong, &c. It takes these matters for granted, assuming in the start, that man already admits and understands them. This is fully evinced by the manner of its commencement. It opens with the statement, that "In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth," and proceeds to tell what God said and did, thus presupposing that his existence is already admitted, and his attributes understood. I do not now recollect a single argumentative attempt to prove his existence throughout the whole Bible. True, David breaks forth in the rapture, "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the earth showeth forth his handi-work," &c.; but this is only an *exclamation* of adoration in view of the wonderful

works of God. not an *argument* to prove his existence. Indeed, the one distinctive object of Revelation, seems to be to make known the *way of salvation by Christ*, not to prove the existence or attributes of God. The latter was left for *natural* theology—for the *very principles* we are urging. Modern Christianity makes too much of her Bible, by ascribing to it more than it claims, or was ever designed to accomplish. Christianity, or the doctrines of the Bible, are only the *supplement* of religion, while *natural* theology, or the existence of a God, or the fundamental principles of religion to be presented in this essay, are the foundation. Revealed religion is to natural religion, what Algebra is to Arithmetic—what the foundation is to the superstructure, or the tree to its roots. The latter unfolds the moral nature of man, and with it, the moral constitution of the universe; the former, builds on it the system, doctrines, and conditions of salvation. Now the true policy of Christians *should* be to give to natural theology all the importance that really belongs to it, and to claim no more for Revelation than it claims for itself. It nowhere claims to be the *whole* of religion. The Bible itself maintains that the nature of man teaches him natural religion. Thus: “Because that which may be known of God, is manifest in them.” “For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, *even* his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse.” “For as many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law.” “For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these having not the law, are a law unto themselves.” “Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and *their* thoughts the mean while accusing, or else excusing one another.” “And shall not uncircumcision which is by nature, if it fulfil the law, judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the law?” Rom. c. i. & ii. And before the great truths of Revelation can be fully enforced, or even understood, those of *natural* religion must be studied. And this is the great error of the Christian world. They make the Bible the Alpha and the Omega, the all and all of religion, and thrust its handmaid and twin sister, natural theology, away into the back ground, clear down out of sight and hearing, and they pay the forfeit of this unholy temerity in those sectarian dogmas which now disgrace the name and profession of Christianity. Take natural theology along as an interpreter of Revelation, and this religious zeal without knowledge, this superstitious bigotry and nar-

row-mindedness, and these lame and distorted religious opinions and practices, which now dishonor the Christian name, and degrade man, and exist every where in such rich abundance, would be swept from religion, and be supplanted by moral purity and correct conduct. Millions on millions of works on didactic and sectarian theology, are pouring forth bigotry and sectarianism from the teeming press in every civilized and in many pagan lands, while only here and there one on natural theology is published or read. Paley's "Evidences and "Natural Theology," Butler's "Analogy," Good's "Book of Nature," and the "Bridgewater Treatise," (each of which, if based on Phrenology, the natural basis of all works on natural theology, would be infinitely more valuable,) with Alcott's "The house I live in," constitute nearly or quite all the valuable works on natural theology extant, and yet their circulation is insignificant compared with that of some party religico-politico works on some *creed* or *doctrinal* point. Witness the sale of works on the Puseyite controversy. No works ever sold with equal rapidity in New-York. And yet, every man of understanding, ought to be ashamed to give a moment's attention to the points in discussion.

Not that I would underrate the importance of the study of the Bible. But I would exalt the study of *natural* religion. I would see God, study God, in clouds, in winds, in storms, in calms, in sunshine, in darkness, in vegetation, in mineralization, in every rill, in every flower, in every tree, and bird, and beast, and thing that lives or is; and, above all, in MAN, anatomically, physiologically, and phrenologically. I would make *natural* theology the basis of *all* theology, and *natural* religion, the basis of *all* religion. I would teach *natural* religion to children, along with all that is taught them, and before the doctrines and precepts of the Bible are taught; and for the same reason that I would teach arithmetic before astronomy. I would teach them to

"Look through NATURE up to Nature's God."

And, *afterwards*, would teach them the plan of Redemption brought to light in the gospel. They cannot understand, they cannot appreciate, the latter till they have studied the former. And, what is quite as important, the human mind requires somewhat more of *proof* than it finds in the Bible. The Bible gives us its *ipse dixit* simply; but the human mind requires *evidence*—requires to understand the *why*, and the *wherefore*, and the *philosophy*, of that which it receives. That philosophy, the Bible does not give; does not even *pretend* to give. It requires belief on the ground of a "Thus saith the Lord" and

there leaves it. As man is endowed with reason, it is proper, it is imperative, that his reason be satisfied. He *will* reason. He *should* reason. And natural religion will give him his fill of reason. It is all reason, and reason the most clear, the most comprehensive, the most satisfactory. Reason, which, while it exalts and fills the intellect, also feasts the soul with the most sublime ideas of God it can possibly receive or contain. And, think you, that infidelity, and irreligion, and impiety, and profanity, would stalk abroad thus unblushingly, if natural religion were taught more, and taught to children? No, never. The ideas of God thus inculcated, would be too sacred to allow them ever to take his name in vain, or wantonly to break his laws. After the human mind has studied the book of nature, it is prepared to turn to the pages of the Scriptures. And to attempt to teach Bible religion before natural religion is taught, is to plant without preparing the ground—to build before laying the foundation—to run before you can stand—or to be a man before you are a child. Nor can any thing else account for the growing impiety of the age; and that, too, in the very teeth of those mighty religious efforts now put forth, *de fide propaganda*. We have religious teaching enough, but it is not of the *right kind*. Enough of Sabbath schools, and Bible classes, and preaching, and revivals, but not of the *right character*. We require more *philosophy*, in which to base it, and with which to enforce it. Phrenology shows, that all the other faculties must be guided and governed by enlightened *intellect*. That all impressions made upon mankind, to be either permanent or useful, must be made through *reason*. Nor will the greatest stickler for Revelation, be disposed to question the great point I now urge—the necessity of employing *reason* to enforce religion. Still less will he maintain that the Bible *proves*, or even *attempts* to prove, even the *fundamentals* of religion, much less its details. So that he is compelled either to take natural religion along *with* his Bible, or else to take his religion along without his intellect.

And, surely, no field within the range of human inquiry is as rich in pure *philosophy*, as religion. None more deep or conclusive in its fundamental principles; more vast or variegated in the pure, unadulterated *truth* brought to light. In other words: The *moral* nature of man has its laws equally with every other department of nature. Its roots strike deep into the constitution of the human mind. Its branches overshadow no slight portion of that nature. Its fruit is the sweetest and the richest borne by that nature. So is its *philosophy*. So is its *morality*. Nor was this tree of the moral nature of man ever design-

ed to bear the thousands of different and conflicting kinds of fruit it now bears. Some, bitter; some, sour; some, rotten; some, green; some, hollow; some, bloated; some, shrivelled; some, rank poison. Little healthy. Most of it injurious. All of it defective. And none of it fully adapted to the nature of man. But each sect, and most individuals, have cut off the original branch or twig, on which they each hang their souls, and engrafted thereon a wild scion, whittled out by their own defective or depraved religious organization, and hang on it, fight for it, die on it—sucking to the last the poisonous fruit it bears, and rotting in every limb, every joint, with the moral disease derived therefrom. Such is not the order of nature. That order is, that the tree of *natural* religion, planted by the God of heaven, earth, and man in the soil of the human heart, is all that it ought to be. All that it can be. All that it can ever be made. Bearing fruit inconceivable in abundance. The richest possible in flavor. The most nourishing possible to the nature of man. All that is desired. All that can be required. Filling the soul to its utmost capacity with an ecstasy of joy which the world can neither give nor take away. The original constitution of man is *right*. It is all that even God could make it. Every primary faculty is all that it ought to be; and, the whole combined, surpass in excellence all the rest of creation. Man is the last, the greatest work of God. Man's *moral* nature, is the last, the greatest, part of man. Last to be developed. Last to die on earth; and the heart, the centre, of his immortality. Nor can the study of any department of nature, equal, in either importance or beauty, the study of that nature. Beauty inimitable, characterizes every joint; every muscle; every physical organ; every propensity; every element of MAN. But THOU, oh! thou moral nature of man, "excellest them all." They, the tree; thou, the fruit. They, the subjects; thou, the queen. Perfect in every feature. Immaculate in every part. And thy face reflecting the image of thy God. If we may not see God and live, yet we *may* see thee, his prototype, in whom dwelleth all the perfections of the Divinity, as far as man may see them.

Metaphor aside. Whatever man can know of God, of himself, of any thing, he must know through his faculties. No one will for a moment deny, that man was created perfect in every conceivable respect. To suppose otherwise, is not Bible; is not nature; is not truth. No one supposes that his alleged fall *took away* any original moral element, or *added* any new element or faculty of depravity. This fall could only have *perverted* his nature. It could not possibly either add or destroy one jot or tittle of nature. It took away no limb, no

muscle, no physical organ. It added no phrenological or other mental or moral faculty or power. As far as his *original constitution* was concerned, it left him just where it found him. It simply *perverted* his nature, but did not, could not, change its *original ingredients*. They are what they were in the beginning. And Phrenology tells us precisely what they are by constitution. It puts the finger of science on every element of our nature—animal, intellectual, moral. It gives us both the warp and the woof of that nature. Every item of it separately. All of it collectively. This, none will deny who admit, what this work presupposes to be admitted, namely, that Phrenology is true. Hence, in telling us precisely in what the moral nature of man consists, it reveals all the doctrines, all the practices, that grow on that nature. That are adapted to that nature. That that nature teaches or requires. Dispute this, and you charge God foolishly, and show your own incapacity and bigotry. Allow it, and you allow that that nature fully known, gives us a knowledge of every moral duty, doctrine, requirement. That obeyed, we should obey every moral duty. That perfect, in development and in action, we should be perfect in doctrine, in practice, in every thing.

“What,” says an objector, “but this throws the whole plan of salvation overboard.” Then overboard it must go. “It does away with the Bible. It does away with the Savior. It abrogates the Sabbath. It sweeps the board of revealed religion, lengthwise, breadthwise, all wise.” Then, must the Bible be done away. So must the Savior. So must all connected therewith. But, this is not *my* logic. It is *yours*. I argue thus:—The fall was *subsequent* to the nature of man. So was the plan of salvation by Christ. So the whole paraphernalia of accompanying doctrines—all the doctrines connected with that salvation, or growing out of it. They are *extraneous* to the nature of man. They are *added* to it as far as they are connected with it. This is clearly the doctrine of the Bible. Nothing can be more plain or unequivocal than its assertion that man was made *perfect* at first. He *was* created perfect. His original constitution was perfection itself. That constitution, Phrenology unfolds. It reveals it *all*—every shade, Every phase. Every line. Every item. It teaches every doctrine man needs to know. Every duty he is required to perform. Of course, this remark excepts every doctrine and duty connected with the fall. And if man will but fulfil all the precepts, and obey all the requirements of his original nature—of Phrenology—the fall, and all its effects, will pass him by. He will need no Savior, for he will com-

mit no sin. And, by consequence, the *nearer* he lives up to that nature, the less sinful, and the more holy and happy, will he be.

Intelligent reader! if these truths run athwart any of thy preconceived religious views, take the matter coolly. Go over the ground again. Scrutinize the bases of these inferences. Scrutinize the inferences themselves. Give reason her perfect work. Fear not for the Bible. Fear not for Christianity. Care only for *truth*. There is no danger that *truth* will ever overthrow either Christianity or the Bible. If they conflict with it, let them go. If they will stand the test of science, all well. If not, surely you cannot wish to build your eternal all on a sandy foundation. Prove all things. And remember, that the moment you cast overboard the chart of *intellect*, and the compass of *reason*, you are left completely at the mercy of the watery, windy elements of mere religious feeling—are carried back at once to paganism—to idolatry. The very fact, that the reasoning organs are located by the side of the moral, is proof positive that the two were designed to act together. Indeed, he who will not *reason* on religion, cannot and should not know or enjoy religion. Why reason with a man who says in the start, that he will *not* reason? It cannot be supposed, that any sensible person will be afraid to investigate the *philosophy* of religion, or throw away the unequivocal deductions of reason, in order to cling to preconceived, but erroneous, doctrines. Whoever does, let them. They are the sinners; they the sufferers.

Let not the preceding be construed into a *denial* of the fall of man, the need of a Savior, and the doctrines consequent thereon. I am persuaded, that the reader will find them confirmed by natural religion, as pointed out by Phrenology, and analyzed in these pages. At all events, we waive these points for the present. They will be discussed hereafter. Our object now is simply to state the fundamental truths of natural religion, not to array them for or against the doctrines of the Bible. Nor do we wish to place them above the Bible, but only to assign to each its true sphere and boundaries. We value the Bible. We value natural religion. "These things ought ye to have done, but not to have left the other undone." We require both. Neither, without the other. Both, with the other. "United, we stand; divided, we fall."

In view of these premises, what can be more interesting, what more important, than the study of man's moral nature and relations? Standing, as they do, (in connexion with reason,) at the very head of nature, the *subject matter* of *no* study can equal that of their study. **The** interest, the value, the importance, of any study, is proportionate

to the elevation, in the range of creation, of the *subject* of that study. Thus: to study vegetation, its qualities, laws, and conditions, together with the means of improving it, is deeply interesting and highly important, because this study is calculated to promote human happiness, both in the intrinsic interest of the study itself, and also in the application of the truths revealed thereby to the promotion of vegetation. So, the study of mineralogy, geology, geography, astronomy, mathematics, &c., are interesting in themselves, and the truths they teach are highly beneficial in their application to the promotion of general happiness. So, the study of chemistry, is both deeply interesting, and capable of being applied perhaps as extensively as any of the above-named sciences, to the promotion of human happiness. So, the study of natural history—of birds, animals, and whatever lives and moves—is still more interesting and important; because living matter is employed for a higher purpose, and has expended upon its construction and laws a greater amount of Divine wisdom and goodness, than is shared by inanimate matter. These laws, also, are quite analogous to those that govern man; so that the study of living things, teaches us many a useful lesson as to the laws that govern our own nature, and open into a field so near home that we can gather from it many a rich scientific bouquet of beautiful flowers; many a golden apple of truth to gratify our taste, and to impart health and strength to us as we pass on through life. So, also, the study of man physically—of the wonderful mechanical arrangements of bones, muscles, joints, tendons, &c.—of the heart, lungs, stomach, eyes, head, brain, &c.—is still more interesting and important; first, because its subject matter, (man), is more important than the subject matter of any of the other studies; and, secondly, because it opens up richer mines of truth, the application of which is every way calculated to augment human happiness, more than any of the other studies yet named.

But, it is the study of man's immortal *mind*—of his elements of *feeling* and *intellect*—which constitutes the climax of all studies, both as to the intrinsic interest connected with its subject matter, and as to the great and glorious truths revealed thereby. The study of appetite—of food, nutrition, the effects of different kinds of food, and times of taking it, and their respective influences on intellect and feeling, as well as of the best way of so nourishing the body as to prepare it in the best possible manner for experiencing enjoyment, and promoting the pleasurable action of mind—of the acquiring propensity, the objects on which it should be expended, the conditions of right and wrong as to property, bargains, duces, &c.; and this whole subject of acquisition,

—of man's social, connubial, parental, filial, and political relations, and all that class of duties and relations consequent thereon; as well as of resistance, fear, character, praise-worthiness, and shame, and every thing connected with the commendable and disgraceful,—rise still higher in the scale of interest and value, both as a study and as to the sublime philosophical truths elicited thereby. Still more important, still more useful, is the study of intellect, of reason, of mental philosophy.

But, since the *moral* nature and relations of man stand at the head of man's nature, its equal and twin sister, reason alone, always excepted; it follows, that the proper study of man's *moral* nature and relation—of religion, theology, duty, religious doctrines, precepts, and practices—stands at the head of all other subjects of study, both as to *subject matter*, and as to the *practical utility* of such studies. From this study alone it is, that we can learn the most sublime philosophical truths, and those the most practical which it is possible for God to teach, or man to know. Though this study is not the substitute of all other knowledge, yet it is the crowning excellence of every other. The grand focus to which all others tend. The great mirror of nature, which reflects not alone all that is beautiful and perfect in nature, but even God himself, in all his beauty; in all his glory! If man but understand and obey the laws and requisitions of his moral nature, and those only, he will be more virtuous and happy than if he understand and obey those of any other single department of his nature. But, if he violate these, he will be rendered more sinful and miserable than he could by violating any other. To know them, is the very perfection of knowledge. To obey them, the climax of virtue. To violate them, the quintessence of vice.

Will ye, then, Christians, infidels, and neutrals, one and all, give a listening ear, a reasoning mind, and unbiased feelings, to the sublime moral truth and precepts unfolded by Phrenology, and then to a comparison of them with those of Revelation. And ye who are prejudiced, “strike, but *hear*.” I shall doubtless cross the track of many, and offend nearly all; but wait, and “think on these things” one whole year, pondering, point by point, and then “receive the good into vessels, but cast the bad away.” Few agree in matters of religious faith and practice; therefore most are necessarily in error. Yet all *think* they are right, and are positive that all who differ from them, are wrong. Who, then, will take it upon himself to assert that *he alone* is right, and that all the world besides is wrong? What candid mind

bnt will rather say: I *may* also be in error, and will examine carefully, and judge impartially.

Taking Phrenology for our religious chart and compass, then, let us set sail on our moral exploring expedition, and see to what religious haven it may conduct us—whether into the angry waters of sectarian contention and recrimination, or into the peaceful and delightful haven of truth, and the promised land, fruitful in happiness, and abounding in every virtue.

SECTION II.

THE FOUNDATION OF MAN'S MORAL AND RELIGIOUS NATURE.

As already seen, man is created with a moral nature. He has a moral constitution. He cannot, therefore, be otherwise than moral and religious. As well live without air, or food, or life, as live without moral sentiments of some kind, and religious practices of some sort; because they are just as much a part of his constitution as reason, or appetite, or affection, or breathing. Nor can he live without them any more than without a stomach or a brain. This fact is set completely at rest by Phrenology. This science shows, that his moral feelings, his religious susceptibilities, are not creatures of education; are not temporary and liable to fluctuation; but that they constitute a very considerable part and parcel of his original nature. It shows that a large section of the brain is set apart exclusively for the exercise of the moral and religious feelings. And this shows, that he has corresponding moral and religious *faculties*, or *primary elements of mind*, the spontaneous action of which both constitutes and renders him a moral and religious being.

If this question be pushed back another step. If it be asked, what is, the *foundation* of man's moral nature? In what is it based? What relation do these moral faculties hold to the nature of things? In what do these moral elements consist? What lies at the entire *bottom* of that nature? In what does this religious nature *originate*? And what are its relations to the nature of things? What is its *rationale*? I answer: The same, precisely, that causality holds to the laws and causes of things. The same that the construction and constitution of the eye does to light and the principles of vision. The same that Amativeness does to the existence of the sexes and the propagation of the race. The same that Parental love does to the infantile state. **The same that any, every phrenological organ and faculty do to their**

counterpart, or to that to which they are adapted. Thus: An original arrangement in the nature of man, requires that he partake of food. Hence, adapted to this constitutional arrangement and requisition for food, he is created with the faculty and organ of Alimentiveness or appetite.

On this eating basis of man's nature, grow all those laws, conditions, requirements, pleasures, pains, &c., connected with eating, or dependent thereon, or affected thereby. Is it difficult, in this view of the subject, to see what is the *foundation*, the *rationale* of appetite? It is so, that man requires to lay up for future use a supply of food, clothing, and various necessaries of life. Hence the existence of the faculty of acquisitiveness, and of its organ and relations. Nor will any one dispute the self-evident inference, that all the functions, laws, benefits, evils—all that can be said, all that there is, all that there can be, touching appetite, touching property, is based in, grows out of, this primitive, constitutional adaptation of the nature of man to eating, or to acquiring. It being the nature of man to eat, there are certain *conditions* of eating; some beneficial, others injurious; some in harmony with its constitutional relations, and others in opposition thereto. And that out of these constitutional relations, grow all that is, good and bad, virtuous and vicious, right and wrong, of eating. So of acquiring. So, also, it is so, that individual things exist, and that it becomes necessary for man to *take cognizance* of these things. To enable him to do this, he is endowed with the faculty and organ of individuality, the constitutional tendency of which is action; and this action brings to his notice those things which it is necessary for him to observe. And every thing connected with these things, or dependent thereon, has its foundation and counterpart in this constitutional existence and function of individuality. In these relations, consist the rationale of this faculty, and of all connected therewith. It is so, that man enters the world in a condition so utterly helpless, that help of some kind, assistance from some quarter, must be had. Otherwise all children must die, and our race soon become extinct. Hence the rationale, the fundamental basis, of philoprogenitiveness. Nor will it be disputed for a moment, that all the relations of parents as parents, to their children as children, grow out of this *constitutional existence*, function, and adaptation of this faculty to its counterpart. And all that we have to do for our children, or to them, or with them, is simply to do what the constitutional function of this faculty, properly developed and enlightened, would do, or requires should be done.

So the element of beauty exists. Some things are beautiful; oth-

ers are the opposite. And if it be asked, what is the *nature* of beauty—what is its *rationale*? the answer is ready—is perfectly simple. It is this. It is so *constituted*, so it *is*, that the condition or quality of beauty appertains necessarily to things. Adapted to this existence of beauty, man is created with the faculty of ideality, the primitive function of which is to appreciate and admire this element of nature. And all is so arranged, that this faculty acts spontaneously in the perception and admiration of this beauty, whenever it is presented, and wherever it can be found. And what is more—what is most—all that can be known or conceived of beauty, is what this faculty teaches. Fully to understand the whole nature of this faculty, is to know all that can be known, all that is, of this beauty. And this knowledge would give us a perfectly full and correct estimate of all the conditions, all the qualities, all the degrees, all of every thing connected with beauty. We need to know nothing more, we can know nothing more, of beauty, than that constitutional nature of it which this faculty unfolds. I am aware that this is deep. But I trust it is also plain. It goes down to the last round of the ladder of things. There is but one thing below it—that on which this ladder rests, to which we shall come presently.

Similar illustrations of the foundation, the basis, the constitutionality, the rationale of things, might be drawn from each of the other faculties. But the principle aimed at, the thought presented, is now clear; sufficiently so at least to enable us to descry the bottom, the fundamental principle, of man's moral nature. That application is this. It so *is*, that man suffers and enjoys. And it also so is, that mankind can both promote the enjoyment, and enhance the sufferings, of mankind. Hence the existence of benevolence. Its adaptation, its rationale is, to promote human happiness, and prevent human suffering. This is its foundation, its beginning, its end, its constitutionality, its all and all. And every thing there is about benevolence—every thing appertaining to the way in which it should be exercised, to what are, and what are not, fit objects of its exercise, to its degrees, its kinds; to punishment, here or hereafter—every thing connected with this element, depends upon the primary function, the constitutional arrangement of this faculty. When we know fully the rationale of this faculty, in all its ramifications and modifications, we shall know all that can be known, all that *is*, concerning this faculty; its duties, its requirements, its rights, its wrongs, and every thing any way related to this whole class of man's nature or relations. In other words, the complete phrenologi

cal analysis of this faculty will tell us all that is, all that can be, concerning this entire department of the nature of man, and all its dependencies.

So of veneration. It so is, that man worships, just as it so is, that he eats and sleeps. He worships a Supreme Being. He is so constituted. He cannot do otherwise, any more than he can do otherwise than eat, or sleep, or die. And when we know all that Phrenology can tell us concerning this faculty, we shall know all that is (at least all that is to us,) concerning the worship of a God. All that can be known of times, places, and modes of this worship. All that can be known, all that is, concerning its frequency, its character, and its effects. All that it is possible for man to know concerning the existence, character, attributes, works, and government of this Being. In short, man's whole duty touching this entire department of his nature. So of conscientiousness. This faculty exists. Its rationale, its fundamental principle, is exactly on a footing with that of appetite, and acquisition, and parental love, and the beautiful, &c., as already seen. That foundation is, the constitutional arrangement of right and wrong, of holiness and sin, *per se*. And when we know all that Phrenology can teach us of this faculty—of the conditions of its action, of its combination in action, of its dictates, its requirements, and its nature,—we shall know all that man can know as to what is right and wrong, good and bad, sinful and holy. All that can be known of duty, of penitence, of pardon, of rewards, of punishments,* natural and artificial, and of every thing, little and great, connected with this whole department of the nature of men. Similar remarks will apply to hope and a future state. To marvellousness, and a world of spirits, spiritual monitions, impressions, existences, &c. But, as to present a few of these relations of the faculties to their counterpart, is to constitute the main body of the work, they will not be enlarged upon here. Thus much has been given, because it was deemed necessary to explore the *foundation* of morals and religion, before we began to examine the superstructure. Nor have I ever before seen a successful attempt to go back to the beginning of the moral and religious nature of man, and

* Benevolence was also said to teach us all about punishment. Let me explain. I do not mean that the function or knowledge of either of these organs *singly*, without reference to their combinations and other relations, will do this. I mean that all which can be known of benevolence in combination with conscientiousness, and all the other organs, and every thing else bearing on it, will do this. So of conscientiousness. So of all the other faculties.

the reader is earnestly solicited to become thoroughly master of this point before he proceeds. Re-perusal and mature reflection, it will certainly require. But give them. The subject itself will repay you. So will the great truth unfolded. So will subsequent pages.

It was promised above, to go still one step lower down into the bottom of the subject—to the very bottom of its bottom. And that bottom of the bottom, is the *happiness* enjoyed in the right exercise of these moral faculties. What is the reason of the existence of any and every faculty of man? What the cause of this cause? The sub-stratum of all? It is to render man happy in the exercise of each. Thus, as philoprogenitiveness is based in the infantile condition of man, this infantile condition is based in the happiness of both children and parent. As appetite is based in that arrangement of man's nature which requires food, this arrangement itself is based in the happiness of man. As ideality is based in the constitutional existence of the beautiful, this existence is based in the happiness its exercise confers on man. So of each of the moral faculties. The reason of the rationale of benevolence, is, that its exercise is conducive to the best interests of man. But as this has been fully shown in the first chapter of the author's work on Education, it need only be stated here, not exemplified.

And now, reader, being at the bottom of this whole subject, let us commence our ascent, that we may examine, step by step, piece by piece, individually and collectively, all the constituent vessels and portions of this wonderful temple of the moral and religious nature and constitution of man.

SECTION III.

THE LOCATION OF THE MORAL ORGANS, AND GENERAL REFLECTIONS ON THEIR FACULTIES.

As already implied, though not yet presented with sufficient clearness and force, Phrenology renders the great truth demonstrative and certain, that man is both a moral and a religious being, and that by *creation*, by *original constitution*. It shows that this religious tendency before mentioned, is not wholly the creature of education, or habit, but of the spontaneous action of his primary elements. The demonstration of this point is all important. It should not be left at loose ends. Nor is it. No one who admits the truth of Phrenology, can for a moment deny the therefore, that

man is *constitutionally* moral and religious—so by *creation*, not merely by education or habit. This truth is inseparable from this science. It is not necessary—it is too plain, too self-evident to require any thing more than the mere statement—that the admission of the truth of this science, necessarily brings along with it an admission that man has moral organs and faculties, and is therefore a moral and a religious being. The existence of this moral nature of man, constitutes a part and parcel of Phrenology. Since, therefore, this work proceeds upon the supposition that this science is true, and since the admission of the truth of this science implies and accompanies the admission of the moral organs and faculties, the very existence merely of which both constitutes and proves man a moral being, it is no more necessary to argue this point than, the truth of arithmetic being admitted, it is necessary to prove by argument that two and three make five; or the existence of the eyes being admitted, it is necessary to prove that man is a seeing being; or the existence of the reasoning faculty in man being admitted, it is necessary to support, by facts and arguments, the fact already and by supposition admitted.

Another preliminary remark. Religion being constitutional, it must have its laws, and be governed by its first principles. There are three important phrenological principles that bear on this point, which require elucidation here. The first is, the *physical position* of the moral organs; the second, their size; and the third, their function, relatively, as to the animal propensities and intellect.

First. The fact is worthy of remark, merely as a fact—as a beautiful illustration of the adaptation of the location of organs to their function—as well as teaching us an important lesson touching their function, that the moral organs occupy the *whole* of the *top* of the head. This denotes the elevation of their function. No one will fail to observe, that organs are higher and higher in the body, the more important and elevated their function. Thus the feet are the *menials* of the body, and accordingly, are placed at the bottom of all, because they are the servant of all, and because they can discharge their appropriate function there better than if placed any where else. So, the organs of the abdomen are still more serviceable, still more essential to life, and productive of a still higher order and more exalted quality of happiness, than the feet. But they perform a function less essential to life, and less exalted, than the stomach, lungs, and heart, situated higher up, and as high up as they can well be, and yet be contained within the body. But the head is the highest

of all, and its function—the function of *mind*, of *feeling*, intellect, reason—is the highest function of the nature of man, as well as the most pleasurable or painful. And then, too, different sections of the brain, perform functions still more elevated,* still more pleasurable, if pleasurable at all, still more painful, if painful, in proportion as they are located higher and still higher up in the head. Thus, suppose a woman to be endowed with as much of affection, relatively, as Webster is of intellect. Though we should honor her, yet this quality could not command as high a meed of praise, or be as extensively useful to mankind, as the talents of a Webster, if properly directed, are capable of becoming. So, let two men be each equally remarkable, the one for high-toned moral feeling and conduct, the other, for libertinism, or gluttony, or any animal propensity, and we honor the moral man more than the sensualist. It is the constitution of man so to do. It is not *possible* for a well-organized mind to do otherwise. A similar comparison of any of the upper faculties and organs with any of the lower, will be productive of the same results. This point has been fully presented in the Phrenological Journal, Vol. vi. No. 1, Art. II., and requires only to be stated, certainly not to be *argued*.

This truth once admitted, and the relative importance of the moral faculties rises to the superlative degree, and assumes the front rank in the nature of man, having by their side, and on a par with themselves, the reasoning intellect, but eclipsing every other element in the nature of man. They become the *natural* governors of man. They exercise the very highest functions of his nature—the throne of the kingdom of man. They ally man to his Maker, giving him the same *kind* of excellence as that possessed by the great Giver of every good and perfect gift, and differing from him in this respect only in *degree* of function, and, therefore, of glory. So, also, their exercise renders him incomparably more happy than the proportionate exercise of any animal pleasure. Who does not feel more exalted pleasure in the doing, as well as from having done, a benevolent act, than in eating, or in having eaten a hearty meal? Who does

* If I am asked what it is that constitutes one function more elevated than another, I answer, the amount of happiness produced thereby. And this amount is governed by two conditions; the one, the *quantity* of function; the other, its *quality*, or the *purity*, and the *sweetness* of the pleasure afforded. Thus; let a man exercise an equal degree of appetite and of conscience, and he will be rendered more happy by the latter than by the former, besides also feeling that the *quality* of the pleasure afforded by the latter is more exquisite, more rich, more desirable every way, than that of the former.

not feel a higher order of pleasure, as well as a greater degree of it, in the exercise of *justice*, and from the reflection of having done *right*, than in the mere acquisition of property, or in the exercise of anger, or cunning, or from having exercised them? Need this point be further enforced? Does not every well-constituted mind yield a cordial assent to it? Is it not self-evident? A moral *axiom*, even? Not the offspring of habit, but of *constitution*? Not taught, but *felt*, *inherent*, an original arrangement of our nature?

This harmonizes beautifully with the fact that the moral organs occupy a large amount of brain. It is a law of Phrenology, and, indeed also, of Physiology, that the greater the amount of brain brought into action, the greater the pleasure or pain caused by that action. Thus; not only does a large organ yield more pleasure, when its action is pleasurable, than a small one, and more pain, when that action is painful—large benevolence, more than small benevolence; large friendship, than small friendship; large ideality, than small ideality; large reasoning organs, than small reasoning organs, &c.—but, some organs are larger, when large or very large, than others when equally developed. Thus; the amount of brain occupied by, and the periphera of skull above, benevolence, or conscientiousness, or marvellousness, or any moral organ, are much greater than those of size, or weight, or order; though not greater than those occupied by many of the propensities.

But this is not all, nor even the most important phreno-philosophical fact bearing on this point. There is something in the very constitution of the moral faculties, which places them at the head of the propensities; at the helm of man, reason alone excepted; or, rather, in conjunction with reason. It is so, that, to be productive of happiness, every animal propensity requires to be governed by the dictates of enlightened moral sentiment—that is, by the moral and intellectual faculties *in conjunction*. As this is one of the great laws of the moral constitution of man—a perfect standard of virtue, and touch-stone of what is right and wrong in conduct and feeling, its full elucidation here is very desirable, to say the least, if not absolutely indispensable. It has been already presented at some length in the author's work on Education and Self-Improvement, p. 149, but, as many of the readers of these pages will not be able to refer to the passage mentioned, and as many who can refer to it will not be seriously injured by its re-perusal, but, especially, as much that we have to say in this work touching the nature of holiness and sin, virtue and vice, good and bad, right and wrong, happiness and misery—all but

different names for substantially one and the same thing—depend upon it, a few quotations from the passage mentioned, will not only be pardoned, but are even *required*, and therefore given, in connexion however, with some important additions, improvements, and inferences:—

“Without rendering obedience to this law, there is no virtue, no enjoyment in life; but, this law obeyed, all is peace and happiness. A few illustrations will serve to explain both the law itself, and its importance. Let it still be borne in mind, that we live *to be happy*—that whatever augments our pleasures, both temporarily and ultimately, furthers the ends of our being, and that whatever causes pain is wrong, and should be avoided. In short, we need only *to be selfish*—to promote our own greatest ultimate good. Our own happiness, then, and also that of our fellow-men, require that we govern our conduct by the moral sentiments and intellect—that we never exercise the propensities but “by and with the consent,” and under the direction, of the intellectual and moral faculties—that every exercise of the propensities not thus governed, results in misery, both to the individual, and also to all concerned.

“Thus: the exercise of Appetite, by itself, indulged for the mere pleasures of the palate, and without the intellect to choose the *kind* and *quality* of our food, or the moral sentiments to restrain its excessive action, will often eat unwholesome food, and in excessive quantities, which will derange the stomach, undermine the health, blunt the moral sensibilities, benumb the intellect, and sap the fountain-head of nearly all our physical as well as mental and moral pleasures, besides greatly abridge those very pleasures of the palate sought in its indulgence. But, let it be exercised under the control of intellect—let the latter choose the best *kind*, and dictate the proper *amount*, of food, and let the moral sentiments restrain its excess, and the consequence will be, the greatest gustatory enjoyment that we are capable of experiencing, as well as abundant sustenance to all the other physical faculties, and the greatest pleasures in the expenditure of this sustenance.

“If Combativeness be exercised alone, without the sanctifying influences of the moral sentiments, and in opposition to the dictates of reason, it becomes mere brute force, mere bravado and physical fight, bursting forth on all occasions, quarrelling with every body, not only without cause, but in opposition to right, and making its possessor and all around him miserable. But, let this organ be exercised under the direction and control of the intellectual and moral faculties, and it becomes *moral courage*, a defence of *right* and truth, and of the oppressed, and opposes whatever is wrong and pernicious in its tendency—than which no element of our nature yields its possessor a richer harvest of the most pure and exalted pleasure, in addition to the pleasure felt in *exercising* this feeling, and the beneficial ends obtained thereby.

“Let a man exercise Acquisitiveness as the robber and knave exercise it, without intellect, to tell him that this course, in the long run, will prevent his becoming rich, and without the moral sentiments to

show how wrong and unjust this course, (that is, let him exercise this organ without intellect to point out the most successful course, or the moral sentiments to prevent his getting it by extortion and robbery, and other similar means, however unjust,) and this organ will make him wretched, and also all whom he wrongs by his dishonesty. *Ill-gotten* wealth injures all and benefits none. But let intellect guide a man so that he choose the best course to make money, and then let Conscientiousness cause him to make money *honestly*, and pay all he owes, and Benevolence prevent his distressing any one by his efforts to acquire property, and that man will enjoy his money, and enjoy life, infinitely more than will he whose Acquisitiveness is not thus governed. The merchants in a town in which I once resided, held their goods at so enormous a price, that they drove all the valuable custom to a neighboring town, where the merchants had moral feeling enough to ask only a fair, living profit, and intellect enough to see that "a nimble sixpence is better than a slow shilling." The former merchants failed, and thus defeated their own object, but the latter are very prosperous, and enjoy much more, (both in the possession of their wealth, and in the thought that they obtained it honestly) than the former class."

Let a mother be ever so fond of her darling boy, but let her not guide and govern her maternal love by the dictates of the intellectual and the moral faculties combined, and she will not *know how* to keep her child healthy; and therefore will suffer a world of anxiety on account of his being sick, and still more if he should die. She will not *know how* to operate on his intellect or moral feelings, and thus unable to govern him, will be rendered miserable for life on account of his mischievous, wicked propensities and conduct. Or, she will spoil her child by over-indulgence—an occurrence as lamentable as it is common—and thereby cause unutterable anguish to mother, child, father, society, all in any way capable of being affected by the child or the man. But let intellect tell her what physical laws she must obey, to keep her child always well, and all the suffering of mother, of boy, of all concerned, on account of sickness or premature death, can be avoided, and, in their stead, the perfect health, the sprightliness, happiness, beauty, and growing maturity of the boy, will fill the boy himself, will swell the bosom of the mother, with joy unspeakable, and be always increasing; thus enabling the boy himself to become a boon, a blessing, to his fellow men. And the more so, if the mother's intellect enables her to cultivate and develop the boy's *intellect* in the best possible manner, and pour a continual stream of useful knowledge, and sage maxims, into his young mind, both to guide his conduct, to call out and develop all the powers of his mind, and to start the object of her deep-rooted, but well guided, maternal affection into

the paths of wisdom, and learning, and influence, till, standing on a commanding intellectual eminence, he controls the opinions, and moulds the characters, of thousands of his fellow men; he himself enjoying all that mind can confer; his mother being happy beyond description in her son; and society owing and paying a tribute of praise for the happiness spread abroad by this well educated son of intellect. Still more will these results be heightened, if the mother add high-toned moral feeling to this powerful and well directed intellectual education. Then will she educate him *morally*, as well as intellectually and physically. She will train him up in the way he should go. She will imbue him early and thoroughly with the principles of virtue and morality. She will elevate all his aims. Will chasten all his feelings. Will write as with the point of a diamond, upon the tablet of his yet plastic and susceptible mind, and in living, burning characters, never to be erased: "My son, walk thou in the paths of virtue. Turn thou away from every sinful indulgence," and he will obey her. Not only will his moral character be unblemished, and he live in accordance with the principle we are presenting, and therefore be happy himself, but he will elevate all those talents already presupposed to the cause of humanity and virtue, and thus do an invaluable amount of good. All this rich harvest of happiness to him, to herself, to mankind, will be the legitimate, the necessary harvest of the intellectual and moral seed sown by his mother. It will all flow naturally from the mother's following the law we are urging, of governing her philoprogenitiveness by the dictates of intellectual and moral feeling. And these fruits will be still farther sweetened and augmented, if the parents go still farther back, and so apply the laws of hereditary descent as to secure a good original, physical, moral, and intellectual foundation in their child, on which to erect this glorious superstructure.

The importance of this principle can be measured only by the heaven-wide contrast between the effects, on the happiness of the parent, of the goodness and badness, of the health and sickness, the life and death, of the child. If but this law were observed, we should have no premature sickness or death, no ebullitions of passion, no waywardness, disobedience, or immorality in children, to wring the hearts of parents with anguish unutterable, and to carry them down to their graves mourning. "Even if the parent love his child morally, and seek to make him better, but, unguided by intellect, actually makes him worse, a course very common, then his child is a torment to himself, his parents, and all concerned. We must love our children intellectually *and* morally, if we would either have *them* enjoy life, or we enjoy our children.

“If a man exercise his friendship, without the governing influences of intellect and the sanctions of the moral sentiments, he will choose low and immoral associates, who will lower down the tone of his moral feelings, and lead him into the paths of sin, and thus make him unhappy. But, if he exercise his friendship under the sanction of the moral faculties and intellect—if he choose *intellectual* and moral companions, they will expand his intellect and strengthen his virtuous feelings, and this will make him and them the more happy. Friendship, founded on intellect and virtuous feeling, is far more exalted in its character, and beneficial in its influence, than when founded on any other considerations, while friendship founded on the *propensities*, will increase the depravity and misery of all concerned.

“Let Approbateness, or love of the good opinion of others, be governed by the moral sentiments, and it becomes ambitious to excel in works of philanthropy, and seeks to keep the *moral* character pure and spotless ; and let it be guided by the intellect, and it becomes intellectual ambition, and seeks eminence in the walks of literature or the fields of science ; but when *not* thus governed, it degenerates into a low, animal, grovelling, sensual ambition, an ambition to become the greatest eater, or fighter, or duellist, or dandy, or coquette, which causes unhappiness to the possessor and to all concerned. If Self-Esteem be governed by intellect and moral feeling, it imparts nobleness and elevation to the character and conduct, which sheds a beam of exalted pleasure on its possessor and on all around him ; but when *not* thus governed, it degenerates into egotism, self-conceit, imperative-ness, and superciliousness, which gives pain to himself and to all affected by this quality in him.

“Let Cautiousness be exercised without intellect, that is, when there is no *reason* for being afraid, and it produces evil only ; but let intellect govern it, so that it is exercised only when there is real danger to be avoided, or let it be exercised with Benevolence, or Justice, making us fearful lest we do wrong, or careful not to injure others, and its product is most beneficial. This principle might be illustrated and enforced by Amativeness, and indeed by every one of the lower organs, and also *reversed* by showing how *happy* is the man who governs his principles and conduct by enlightened intellect and high-toned moral sentiments, but it is already rendered too plain to require it. In short, man is constituted to be governed throughout by his higher faculties, and there is no enjoyment for him unless he puts intellect on the throne and the moral sentiments as joint rulers of the kingdom of his animal nature. Much of the evil existing in society, much of the suffering which stares at us wherever we turn our eyes, have their origin in the violation of this law. Nor is the misery, so extensive, to be wondered at, if we consider that nineteen-twentieth of the time, desires, pursuits, pleasures, anxieties, &c., of mankind are consumed in feeding and gratifying his *animal* nature merely ; in scrambling after property ; in getting something to eat, and drink, and wear, and live in, and show off with : in gratifying his love or power, his grasping ambition ; in politics, friendship, and family cares ; in combating

contending, backbiting, lasciviousness, and like animal gratifications. War, love, money, and display, sum up the history of man since his creation to the present time. Before man *can* become virtuous and happy, his *animal* nature *must* be subjected to the control of his moral and intellectual faculties.

“This animality of man is in striking harmony with the fact, that a large proportion of the human brain is in the region of the feelings, while but a small moiety is found in the region of the intellect.” And before man *can* enjoy life, he must *take time* from the fashionable world, from the money-making world, from the red-hot pursuit of animal gratification, to exercise, cultivate, and adorn his moral nature. To be happy, man *must be eminently moral and religious*—must subjugate the entire animal, to the moral and the intellectual. And he is the most happy, who does this the most habitually, the most effectually.

For three reasons, then, (the first, that the moral organs occupy the highest position in the head, the crowning portion of man; the second, that they occupy so large a section of the brain, and the third, that they are the natural, constitutional guides and governors of the propensities,) should the moral nature of man be known, and its laws be obeyed. No tongue can tell, no finite mind can conceive, the amount of pleasure and pain it is in the power of the moral faculties to occasion. All the abominations of Paganism are caused by their perversion. All the blessings of that religion which is peaceable, pure, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, it is in the power of the moral faculties to bestow. Theirs it is, to sweeten every pleasure of life, and to blacken and deepen every crime which it is possible for man to commit.

How all-important, then, that we understand their true function—that we derive therefrom all the happiness they are capable of affording, and escape all the pains it is in their power to inflict. This knowledge will set us right. It will banish sectarianism. It will tell us just how to live in harmony with our nature. It will tell us what is right and what is wrong. And Phrenology will certainly impart this knowledge. It will give us the *science* of man's moral nature. It will tell us every line, every lineament of our moral constitution. In telling us this, it will also tell us what doctrines, what practices, harmonize with that nature, and what conflict therewith. It will unravel the whole web of true religion, of pure morality. That man's moral nature has its laws, there is no question. Some things are right: some things are wrong. The former are right because they harmonize with these laws. There is a moral science, as much as physical. Wherever there are laws, there science exists. And to suppose that this department of man's nature is un governed by law, is to suppose that the Author of nature has forgotten

or omitted to institute that system of laws, causes and effects, in this department of his works which are so eminently wise and beneficial in every other department of nature. Is this whole field of human nature indeed a barren waste? No right? No wrong? No laws? No cause? No happiness? No suffering? Preposterous in theory! Contradicted by fact! No! *There is a right. There is a wrong. Right is right, because it harmonizes with these laws, just shown to exist. The wrong is wrong, and wrong because it violates these laws. Nor are these laws either above his comprehension, or beneath his notice. Neither too abstruse to be deciphered, nor too simple to be worth investigation. They are completely within the scope of his mental vision, the range of his intellectual powers. He can even comprehend all that is necessary for him to know. Nor need any more doubt hang around this subject than now hangs about a mathematical problem, or about any other scientific truth. Not only does there exist a moral science, but that science is demonstrable. I use the word demonstrable in its true signification. I mean that we can prove—can demonstrate—any moral truth just as clearly, just as conclusively, as we can demonstrate any mathematical problem, any anatomical fact, any scientific truth. Of all this sectarian contention, there is no need. It is even culpable. There is a right, and man can ascertain that right. Truth exists. It is obtainable. And when attained, it will harmonize every discordant opinion, every conflicting feeling. Wherever there is opposition of views, there error exists. Truth is one. Truth always harmonizes with truth. Error always clashes with truth, and usually with error. If there be two conflicting opinions touching the same point, one of them is certainly wrong. The other is liable to be. And if there be ten, then nine of the ten are erroneous, and perhaps the tenth also. This is certain. So that all but one of the conflicting creeds and sects out of the whole two thousand that exist, are wrong, and that one is not sure to be right. And out of these errors of belief grow all manner of errors of practice, all sorts and sizes of sins and sufferings. If a man believe murder to be right, errors of conduct, and consequent unhappiness to him, to others, grow out of these errors of belief. If another believes it right to steal, or lie, his erroneous belief will lead him astray in conduct, and render him miserable, and all affected by this belief, or the conduct induced thereby, also miserable. The ancients believed unbridled licentiousness to be right, or, at least, made public prostitution a part of their religion, and suffered the consequent penalty of the sin induced thereby. True, to do right, it is not always necessary to know what is right, for a man may do right from intuition, or instinct; that is*

by simply following the original impulses of his nature. Still, to believe wrong to be right, is almost certain to induce wrong conduct, the necessary consequences of which are pain.

But *how* shall we know what is right, and what wrong. By what *standard* shall we try all our creeds, all our practices? By the standard of the nature of man. That nature is all right—is perfection itself—as perfect as even a God could make it. To suppose otherwise is to arraign the workmanship of the Deity. Hence, to follow that nature in belief, in practice, is to believe *right*—to *do* right. That nature has its laws. The fulfilling of these laws is the cause of right, the cause of happiness. Their violation, is the cause of sin, the cause of suffering.

But where can we find an unerring exposition of the moral nature of man? Such an expositor, once found, is our talisman, our philosopher's stone, in all matters of religious belief and practice. That found, we need nothing else. That obeyed, we are as perfect in conduct as we are by creation. Where, then, can that stone be found? In heaven? No, for we cannot get at it there. In the decalogue? No, it is too short. In the Bible? No, not all of it. But in the *pages of Phrenology*. That dissects, it lays man's moral nature completely open, and reveals every shread and fibre of it. Every law, every requirement, every doctrine, every action, required by the nature of man, will be found in this book of man's moral and religious nature. And this science puts all these doctrines, all these requirements, on a *scientific* basis, on that same basis of positive, actual *fact*, on which the science of mathematics places every mathematical truth; or of astronomy, any astronomical truth; or of anatomy, any anatomical truth; or of chymistry, any chymical fact; or of induction, any matter of inductive philosophy. It is *all* put upon this basis. Nothing is left at loose ends. It is *all exact*. *All demonstrable*. *All certain*. And all plain, too. No mist envelopes any point of it. No dark spots remain upon its horizon. Every fact is as light as the noon day sun of eternal truth, and unquestionable science, can make it. And I hail with joy the science that can do this. *That is now actually doing* all this. That is destined, ultimately, to do all this, yea, even greater works than these. That will both banish all sectarian deformities and parrisites, so that not a sect, not a sectarian, shall exist, but which will throw a literal flood of light and truth on this whole department of the nature of man, which it would dazzle our now benighted vision to behold.

Gracious heaven! Is there indeed such a treasure within our reach? Has so glorious a moral sun indeed dawned upon the sectarian darkness and bigotry of ages? Aye, verily. Let us proceed cautiously

but thoroughly, to unravel this thread of man's moral and religious texture and constitution. Let us bury preconceived doctrines. Let us come up to this work as sincere inquirers after truth. Let us learn from it our moral duties, our moral destinies.

But, in order fully to comprehend the moral bearings, precepts, and principles taught by Phrenology, we must analyze the moral faculties. This will teach us their nature and true functions, and, therewith, the moral nature and constitution of man, as well as show what doctrines they teach, what conduct they require.

It should here be added, what has all along been implied, that the moral faculties themselves, unenlightened by reason, are but blind feelings, mere religious impulses. To produce the good effects above ascribed to them, it is indispensably necessary that they be guided by enlightened intellect, and governed entirely by the dictates of reason, as will be more fully seen hereafter.

CHAPTER II.

THE ANALYSIS OF THE MORAL FACULTIES, AND THE INFERENCES CONSEQUENT THEREON.

THE organs of the moral faculties are all located together in a kind of family group, upon the *top* of the head. They are thus removed as far as possible from the body, so that their bland, mild, softening, heavenly, harmonious action may be interrupted as little as possible by those causes which disease, disorder, or inflame the body, and, thereby, the propensities in particular. When fully developed, they cause the head to rise far above the ears, and become elongated upon the top, thereby rendering it high and long upon the top, rather than wide and conical. They may be very correctly measured, by observing the amount of brain located above Cautiousness and Causality. They are much larger in woman than in man, and their faculties are stronger, as is evinced by the fact, that about two-thirds of our church members are females, and that piety in woman is the crowning excellence of her sex, while its absence is a moral blemish which no cluster of virtues can efface.

They are peculiar to man. In the brute creation, they are wanting or too much so to be taken into the account. They are equally defi-

cient in their character. Thus, a dog cannot be taught to worship God; nor a tiger, to pray; because neither is endowed by nature with either the moral or religious organs or faculties. And this double absence of both organ and faculty, forms a strong proof of the truth of Phrenology, while the presence of either, without the other, would prostrate the science. But, it so is, that man is both the only animal possessed of the moral organs, and also the only terrestrial being endowed with the moral and religious faculties that accompany them. This fact furnishes a positive proof of the truth of Phrenology as extensive, as diversified, as the whole human family, on the one hand, and the entire brute creation, on the other, can render it.

SECTION I.

VENERATION.—ITS ANALYSIS, AND THE EXISTENCE OF A GOD.

Adoration of a God; the Spiritual worship of a Supreme Being; Devotion; Reverence for religion and things sacred; Disposition to pray and to observe religious rites and ordinances.

GALL, the discoverer of this organ and faculty, observed, that his brother, whom his father intended and had fitted for the mercantile calling, but whose religious feelings were so strong as to tear him from all other pursuits, overcome all obstacles, and finally force him to enter the clerical profession, was largely developed upon the top of his head. He afterwards observed, that the heads of those who visited the temples for prayer and religious observances most frequently, and remained longest at their devotions, were similarly developed. He at first, called it the organ of Theosophy, or the science of religion.

It creates the feeling of awe of God. It excites the spirit of prayer and praise to the Supreme Ruler of the universe. It delights to meditate on his character, and to study his works. It induces a general, spiritual state of mind, a devout, religious feeling, which fills the soul with holy aspirations and heavenly pleasures, and attaches its possessor to those religious observances which are considered as an expression of these feelings. It creates a sense of the Divine presence, a feeling of nearness to God, and desire to hold communion with the Creator of all things. It elevates the soul above the things of earth, and places it on Divine things, and delights to contemplate his character, and to bow before his throne in devout adoration and praise.

This organ is divided. While the back part, next to Firmness and Conscientiousness, gives the devout, religious feeling just ascribed to it, the frontal portion, creates respect for elders and superiors, and venerates the ancient and sacred. It is the *conservative* faculty, and, while the other faculties reform abuses, this faculty prevents *sudden* changes, and discountenances radicalism. It is usually small in the American head and character, being rendered so, doubtless, by the necessary tendency of our republican institutions. I would not urge adherence to what is wrong, but I would respect, aye, pay deference to superiors, and show respect towards all. Let a deferential feeling be cultivated in our youth. Let impudence, and disorder, be discountenanced. Let this faculty be cultivated, or our liberty will become lawlessness, and our republic but an unmeaning name.

The existence and analysis of this organ, establishes, past all cavil and controversy, the existence of a God. The argument, or rather fact, by which this great truth is established, is this: Every organ has its own primitive, natural function, and also adaptation. Or, rather, the primordial function of every organ, is adapted to some one law of nature or want of man. Thus, Parental Love is adapted to the *infantile* condition of man. Causality adapts man to a world governed by causes and effects, and enables him to apply these causes to the production of desired results. Cautiousness is adapted to a world of danger. Combativeness, to difficulties. Individuality, to the identity or existence of things. Form, to the great arrangement of shape or configuration. Size, to that of bulk, or of big and little. Color, to the primitive colors. Weight, to the laws of gravity. Order, to that perfect system which characterizes all nature. Locality to space. Ideality, to the beautiful in nature and art. Constructiveness, to our need of garments, houses, tools and things made. Appetite, to the great arrangement, or demand and supply, of nutrition. Acquisitiveness, to our need of property. Amativeness, to the different sexes, &c.

Veneration, therefore, has *its* adaptation or counterpart in the nature of things; and that adaptation is to the *existence* and *worship* of a *Divine Being*. This argumeat is short, but perfectly *demonstrative*. It cannot be evaded. It leaves no chance for cavil. Phrenology establishes the existence of the organ, and the nature of its function, namely, the *worship of God*. Therefore, there *is* a God to be worshipped—a Spiritual Being, adapted to Veneration, to whom this organ can lift up its prayers, and with whom hold sweet communion. Throughout all nature, whenever and wherever one thing exists and

is adapted to a second, the existence of the second is *sure*, else nature would be at fault. If this argument is not proof positive, then there *is* no proof, and *no* argument can *ever* prove *any* thing; for this is proof of the strongest possible kind. An anomaly like the existence of any one thing in nature, adapted to that which never existed, can no where be found. No axiom in philosophy is more fully established than this, that when one thing exists, and is adapted to a second, the second also exists, or has existed. Ransack all nature, and not one solitary instance can be found, either in the world of mind or matter, of one thing's being adapted to another thing which does not exist, or has not existed. Thus: If you find a tooth, you feel as sure that a socket exists or has existed, to which this tooth is adapted, as of your own existence. If you find an eye adapted to its socket, or a bone adapted to articulate upon another bone, you feel quite certain of the present or past existence of the socket, or the bone to which it is adapted. So of every thing else in the world of either mind or matter.

Veneration, therefore, has its adaptation, and that adaptation is to the *existence and worship of a God*, as much as the eye is adapted to seeing, or the ear to hearing. As the existence of the eye, and its adaptation to light, pre-suppose and necessarily imply the existence of that light to which it is adapted; as the existence of the stomach, and its adaptation to food, pre-suppose and necessarily imply the existence of food adapted to it; the adaptation of the lungs to air, and the air to the lungs; of Causality to the laws of Causation, and laws of Causation to Causality; and so of illustrations innumerable scattered throughout nature, and indeed constituting a great portion of nature; so the existence of Veneration, and its adaptation to Divine worship, pre-suppose and necessarily imply the existence of a Deity to be worshipped.

This argument is short, but on that very account, the more unanswerable. It has but two points: the one, that one thing's being adapted to another, proves the existence of the other—a principle of philosophy which allows of no exceptions; and the other point, the fact of the adaptation of Veneration to this Divine worship. The first admits of no cavil whatever, and the second of none that is available. If it be objected, that its adaptation is to superiors, and that its function is that of deference and obedience to men, I answer: We have another faculty expressly adapted to that office; namely, the *force* part of Veneration.

Besides, man does certainly worship a God. Where is the human being who has never feared, loved, or worshipped a Divine spirit, the **great Architect** of heaven and earth, the **great prime-moving Cause**

of causes. Standing upon the top of some lofty eminence which commands a view of some vast, variegated, indescribably beautiful plain below, loaded with nature's choicest treasures, and skirted with yonder bold cliffs and rugged mountains, rising one above another till they hide their majestic heads in the clouds; or beholding, in mute astonishment, the cataract of Niagara, in all its sublimity and grandeur; or watching the swift lightning, and hearing peal on peal of roaring thunder; or witnessing the commotion of the elements, and the raging and dashing of the angry seas; or examining minutely the parts of the flower, and the adaptation of every part to the performance of its own appropriate function; or the organs and adaptations of our own wonderful mechanism; or, indeed, scrutinizing any of the innumerable contrivances and adaptations with which all nature is teeming; where is the moral man, endowed with an intellect capable of perceiving these wonders and beauties, whose heart does not kindle with glowing emotions of adoration and praise, rising, not alone to nature herself, but mainly to the *Architect* and *Author* of nature? Who that has never felt—never realized—the existence of a spirit in nature analogous to the God of the Christian? And if, perchance, in some dark corner of our earth, a human soul should be found, which never felt this sentiment of Divine worship, just as there are some whose organs of Color are too small to perceive the colors of the rainbow, does this prove that this sentiment does not *exist* in any *other* soul? Shall the blind man who can see no sun, assert that therefore there *is* none? Shall those who cannot see, guide those who can? Shall those who experience this heaven-born emotion, be argued out of the existence of this emotion, because, forsooth, some self-made Atheist says *he* has never experienced it? If one does not experience this sentiment, another does, and this argument rests not on the fact that *all* experience this emotion, but on the fact that *any* do. If, from the first opening of the eyes of Adam upon the surrounding beauties of creation, down to the present time, a single human soul has poured forth a single heart-felt offering of prayer and thanksgiving to a Divine spirit, he has exercised some *organ* in this worship, and that organ is *Veneration*. This organ, this *alone*, worships a God. Each of the other organs has its own specific function to perform, so that no other organ *can* perform this function. But the function of Divine worship *is exercised* by man. As well tell me that the sun never shined, as to tell me that man has never worshipped a Spiritual Being. What mean yonder towering steeples, yonder houses erected in every town and hamlet, in Christian and in Pagan lands, to the worship of God? What means yonder Hindoo widow,

voluntarily ascending the funeral pile of her departed husband, or yonder mother committing her darling child to the deified waters of the Ganges? Seest thou yonder towering pagoda; yonder temple of Juggernaut; yonder thronged mosque; yonder altar, reeking with human gore, just offered up in sacrifice to God; yonder solemn convent; yonder crowded sanctuary? Hark! Hearest thou, in yonder secret closet, the soft accents of heart-felt prayer and praise to the Almighty Giver of every good? Look again. Dost thou see yonder domestic group, bowed down around the family altar, all offering up their morning or evening sacrifices of prayer and thanksgiving to the God of every mercy and blessing, and supplicating their continuance? Tellest thou me, these do not sincerely *worship* a *Deity*? Indeed, nothing is more plain, no fact is more apparent and universal than this, that *man does worship a God*; and the *amount* of this worship is inconceivably great. It is *natural* for man thus to worship. He can no more live and be happy without adoring a God, than without reason, or any other equally essential faculty. Man worships a Deity, and has an organ of Veneration adapting him to that worship; therefore, there *is* a God adapted to this organ.

Besides: every other organ and faculty are completely engrossed in performing each its own function, leaving no other one but Veneration to exercise this devotional feeling. Thus, Philoprogenitiveness is completely engrossed in loving and providing for children. It has no time, no capacity to worship. Combativeness is all engrossed in resisting and defending, so that it cannot worship, nor is it capable of exercising any other than its own appropriate feeling. So, Appetite is all taken up with table luxuries. It is too greedy ever to think of exercising the feeling of worship. And, besides, it could not if it would. So, Acquisitiveness is exclusively occupied in hoarding, and does nothing else. Cautiousness is full of its alarms. It does not, it cannot, worship. Ideality is so completely absorbed in contemplating and admiring the glowing beauties that throng in upon its delighted, extatic vision from every quarter, that, though it may admire the beauties of creation, yet it cannot worship their Author. Causality does not, cannot worship a God. It is completely engrossed in searching out and applying *causes*. Though it may *reason out* the fact of the *existence* of a great first cause, yet it goes no farther. It can do no more. It does not, it never can, fall down on the bended knees of devotion, and worship Him; because, to investigate and apply causes, is its sole function. Its constitution precludes its exercising any other. Similar remarks apply to Benevolence, to Comparison, to each of the

intellectual faculties, to each of the propensities and feelings, and to every mental and moral element of man. So that there is no other organ or faculty but Veneration left to exercise this worshipping function. But this function is exercised as just seen. And the *amount* of its exercise is inconceivably great. Too great to be the result of habit. Too universal to be the product of education. If this sentiment were not engrafted upon the nature of man, it would not be *possible* for education to perpetuate it. It would be as if eating were not constitutional, and therefore a perfect drudge, all up-hill work, and so thoroughly irksome as to be soon forgotten and lost in the oblivion of the past. I repeat: Nothing but the fact that the sentiment of worship is *constitutional*, is *inwrought* into the nature of man, is a constituent part and parcel of his very self, just as is *breathing*, or *sleeping*, or *eating*, could account for either its perpetuity or its universality, or its power over the feelings and conduct of mankind. It *must* be constitutional. It *is* constitutional. And rendered so by the existence, in man, of a primitive faculty, the sole office of which is to worship a Supreme Being, the great Cause of causes, the God of heaven and earth.

Again, every organ performs some *important* function. Without any Causality, or power of reasoning and adapting means to ends, what a great *hiatus* would exist in the human mind? If all power of observation were destroyed; or if Individuality were wholly wanting; if Weight were entirely inert, so that we could not stand or move; if any one of man's faculties were annihilated, the chasm, the aching void thus formed, would be great indeed; because, every organ performs a function indispensable to man's happiness. Veneration has some function, some *important* function, some function, the loss of which would create an aching void quite as great as the loss of those already mentioned. What, then, *is* that function? Deference for man? But this is preformed by another faculty. There is no function left, important or unimportant, for Veneration to exercise but that of worshipping God.

Turning to the history of its discovery, we find this view reiterated and confirmed. Gall and Spurzheim, our highest authorities in this matter, both regarded its function as that of *worship of God*, and so does every Phrenologist worth referring to. In fact, that *is* its function. Man *does* worship his God by means of it, and that worship is its natural, not its distorted, perverted, exotic function. It *is* adapted to the worship of a God; therefore, there *is* a God adapted to this faculty, or to receiving the homage it was created to offer up.

If any doubt remain on this point, it is obviated by Phreno-Magnetism. On magnetizing any organ, the spontaneous function of its faculty bursts forth instantaneously and powerfully. Every faculty is thus stripped of all artificial influences, and exhibits itself in its naked, primitive state. I have never seen the back part of Veneration magnetized, without also seeing the subject clasp and raise the hands in the attitude of worship, assume a devotional aspect and tone of voice, and express a desire to pray, or else break forth in the worship of God, enraptured in contemplating him. Thus is the *worshipping* function of this faculty established by Phrenology beyond all dispute. No proposition in Geometry is more fully proved than this; and the inference that therefore there *is* a God, follows as a necessary consequence.

If to this it be objected that "most men adopt those religious views and practices in which they were educated," and that therefore religion is *taught*, I answer, that before any one *can* be *taught* any thing, he must have some *original, primary quality* capable of *being* taught. Can you teach a dog to be solemn in church, or a swine to pray? But *why* not? For the same reason that you cannot teach a blind man to see, or a deaf man to hear, or a man without limbs to use them; namely, because he has no *original, primitive faculty*, capable of *being* taught. And the very fact that men *can* be *taught* to pray and to worship God, proves that they have that very primitive faculty of prayer contended for.

In thus establishing the function of worship as appertaining to the human mind, Phrenology also establishes and enforces the *duty* and *utility* of its *exercise*. Every organ was made to be *exercised*, and hence that exercise becomes a *duty*, and also a *privilege*; for, the right exercise of every faculty, gives pleasure in proportion to the size of its organ. Veneration is a large organ, and as such, its exercise affords a fountain of the richest and most exalted pleasure. Every living mortal, then, should daily and hourly breathe forth holy aspirations of prayer and praise to his Maker—should "keep the fear of God *continually* before his eyes;" should cultivate pious feelings always. Thus saith Phrenology.

And now, reader, art thou satisfied as to whether Phrenology leads to infidelity and atheism? Is not its moral bearing in this respect in beautiful harmony with the requirements of Revelation? The one requires all human beings to worship God in spirit and in truth, and to remember that "Thou God seest me," and the other, by implanting this Divine sentiment in the breast of every man, also re-

quires of him that he *exercise* it *daily* and *habitually* in religious worship.

To this doctrine that Phrenology proves the existence of a God, by pointing out a natural sentiment of worshipping a God, it is often objected, that, "If this religious sentiment *were* natural, it would lead *all* men to entertain similar and *correct* religious opinions, and give all the *same* views in regard to right and wrong. But men's religious opinions differ as much as do their faces; producing all our sectarian diversities, as well as every form of Pagan worship, however revolting and criminal." To this I answer, (and this answer not only satisfactorily explains the *cause* of these religious differences, but also develops the only *true* religion, and teaches us the *true* attributes of the Deity,) that every phrenological faculty constitutes a medium, or as, it were, the colored *glass*, through which the mind looks at all objects. As, when we look at objects through green glasses, they look green; when through yellow glasses, they look yellow; when through dark shaded or smoky glasses, they look dark, gloomy, or smoky; when through glasses that are light shaded, they look light; when through red glasses, every thing beheld assumes a fiery red aspect, and that, too, whatever may be the *actual* color of those objects observed—so the phrenological organs constitute the mental glasses through which we look at mental and moral objects. Thus, those in whom Acquisitiveness or love of money, prevails, look at every thing, whether matters of science, or religion, or politics, or business, not in the light of philosophy, or the welfare of man, or of right and moral obligation, but in the light of *dollars and cents alone*. But he in whom Benevolence predominates, looks at all matters, not in the light of their effects on his pockets, but in their bearing on the happiness of man. He in whom Conscientiousness predominates, looks at, and judges of, things, neither in the light of expediency, nor of their pecuniary advantages, nor self-interest or popularity, but in that of *right and duty*, and abstract *justice*. But he in whom Approbativeness prevails, seeks popular favor, and when any new thing is presented to his mind, say Phrenology, or Magnetism, or any thing whatever, asks, as the first and main question, not, "Is it *true*?" nor, "Is it philosophical?" but, "*What will the folks say* about it, and about me for embracing it?" The man in whom the Reasoning organs predominate, asks, "Is it *reasonable*? What are its *laws*? Is it *consistent* with itself and with nature?" and looks at every thing through the glasses of *philosophy*.

We find an additional illustration of this principle, in appetite for different kinds of food. The argument is just as conclusive that appetite is not a natural, constitutional element of the human mind because some men love some things and dislike others, while others like what is disliked by the former, and dislike what is liked by them as that the element of worship is not a primitive faculty, because men's religious tastes and opinions differ. Unless appetite were natural, there could be no diversity even. No such idea could be entertained or conceived. And the very fact of such diversity, proves the point at issue, and leaves us to account for the fact of this diversity, just as we are left to account for diversity in appetites, opinions, &c.

A story in point:—A man born blind, was once asked, what idea he had of colors. He answered by saying, that he had no very distinct idea of them any way. Pressed still farther, and asked to compare his idea of them to something as nearly like them as possible, he said that he might not perhaps be right, but he thought they very much resembled the *sound of a trumpet*. Without some primitive faculty for perceiving the existence of a God, and experiencing the sentiment of Divine worship, men could no more form an estimate of this whole matter, than the blind man did of colors. And the fact, that men *do* form these ideas, proves the existence of the primary faculty of devotion; while the fact, that men differ as to their ideas of a God, shows that they have these ideas, and therefore have the faculty in question, while the fact that they differ is perfectly explainable on the ground that the other faculties modify these ideas, and therefore that this is caused by diversity in other faculties.

To illustrate still farther: A minister, or speaker, has the motive or powerful temperament, yet with none of the pathetic, together with large reasoning organs, and large conscientiousness, but small ideality, eventuality, and language. He is therefore a strong reasoner, and a good writer and theologian, yet he has no eloquence, no emotion, and no beauty of style, together with a most unfortunate delivery. Those hearers who are similarly organized, have their organs called out and gratified, and therefore like him much. But others who have an opposite organization, finding no food for their prevailing faculties, but seeing the full force of every defect, dislike him as much as the others like him—the one liking, the other disliking him, for precisely the same qualities. Another minister, having an opposite organization, will be liked by those who disliked the former, and disliked by those who like him. This shows why some men think a given man highly talented, while others, who know him equally well, think him

a simpleton—why, in short, men differ in their tastes, desires, pursuits, opinions. Still, as this diversity of opinion in matters of taste, does not prove that there are no first principles of taste in things, or faculty of taste in men, &c. ; so, the corresponding diversity of opinions as to the character of a God, does not prove that there is no primary element in man for the worship of God.

Should a picture, perfect in every respect, be hung up for inspection, if the beholder have the organ of size only, he will take cognizance of the *proportion* of its parts and admirable *perspective only*, all its other qualities being a dead letter to him, because he has not the faculties that perceive or admire them. But, add the organ of color, and he perceives a new beauty in the picture, namely, its rich and variegated shades, tints, hues, varnishes, &c. ; and is now doubly delighted because *two* organs are agreeably exercised. Add large form, and a *third* beauty now breaks in upon him, namely, the perfection of the *likeness*, and the exquisiteness of *figures* or *shape* given to the persons and things represented in the picture. Add ideality, and still another source of beauty opens upon him—its richness of taste, its admirable designs, its creations of fancy, its perfection and harmony of parts. Add causality, and he sees the *moral* taught and the *sentiment* expressed in it, and so of the other organs. His views of the picture are more and more perfect, and his delight greater, and still greater, by every new organ added.

So of Judgment. The man who has large color, is a good judge of colors, but if causality be small, he is a poor judge of ways and means ; but he in whom causality is large and color small, is a good judge of plans, ways and means, the feasibility of measures, and every thing requiring the exercise of causality, but a poor judge of every thing appertaining to colors. If ideality be large and constructiveness be small, his judgment of poetry, propriety, and matters of taste, will be good, but of mechanics, poor. If size be large and conscientiousness be small, he is a good judge of bulk, and the weight of things by looking at them, of height, perpendicularity, &c yet a poor one in matters of right and wrong. If one's perceptive organs and acquisitiveness be large, and conscientiousness and causality be moderate, his judgment of the value of property, the qualities of goods, a good bargain, or horse, or any thing appertaining to those organs, will be good, but of moral reasoning and of what is *right* between man and man, poor indeed. But he who has *all* the organs fully and evenly developed will take consistent and correct *views* of all subjects, have good judgment about every thing, and en

tain comprehensive and consistent opinions. This principle of Phrenology is clear, and its application universal. Hence the Phrenological developments of a man, tell us what is the color of the glasses through which he looks, and what kind of judgment is poor and what good.

Now let us apply this principle to the religious opinions of mankind. for it holds equally true of his religious judgment, feelings, and opinions. Veneration worships God, but the other organs color our views of the character and attributes of God. Thus, the ancient Greeks and Romans had large veneration, and were very religious, but their other moral organs were small, and their animal propensities were strong, so that they worshipped gods of various animal passions. Their large veneration, combining with their very large amativeness, worshipped a Venus, or the goddess of love and beauty; combining with their very large combativeness and destructiveness, worshipped a Mars, or the god of war, and carnage, and blood; with their powerful alimentiveness, worshipped a Bacchus, or the god of feasting, revelry, and wine; with their large acquisitiveness, worshipped the god Terminus, who guarded their boundaries, and protected their goods from pillage; with large secretiveness, worshipped a Mercury, or the god of cunning, finesse, duplicity, theft, &c. But they had large intellectual organs, as well as powerful, unbridled passions. Hence, they worshipped a Jupiter, the great director and manager of the universe, and the governor of the gods; but a god full of most disgusting amours, most vindictive and revengeful, without moral principle, and swayed by a power of animal passions as much above that of mortals as he himself was rated superior to them.

And now, ye sectarians, do ye see why ye differ and quarrel about religion? Your *organs* differ, and this diversifies and distracts your religious views and feelings. One sect has one set of organs, or looks through glasses of one color, and another sect has on glasses of another color, and both are looking at the same object and quarrelling about its *color*. One has got on green glasses, and is stoutly contending that God is *green*; another, with yellow glasses on, is as stoutly contradicting the *greenness** of the Deity, and maintaining that he is *yellow*. But the Atheist has black glasses on, which shut out all light, and therefore he maintains that there *is* no God, because he can *see* none. Foolish all. Take off your glasses. Look at God with the

* Far be it from me to make light of things sacred, but I do design to ridicule **sectarianism** for maintaining absurdities as great as that God is green, or yellow.

natural eye of fully and evenly developed moral organs, and you will "behold him as he is," and "worship him in spirit and in truth."

In accordance with this principle, each modern religious sect has its own peculiar set of phrenological developments, which harmonizes perfectly with the peculiarities of its creed. To show minutely *what* developments characterize each, and their departures from the only true standard of religious faith and practice involved in this principle, would be to thrust my face into a hornet's nest of the worst character, which is unnecessary, yet I will give a few illustrations. Universalists almost invariably have large veneration, combined with predominant benevolence and adhesiveness, and moderate destructiveness, and hence they adore God for his *goodness* mainly, and dwell in glowing colors upon his *love*; while the old-fashioned Calvinists usually have large veneration, with predominant self-esteem and firmness, and large conscientiousness, and accordingly adore the *sovereignty* and unbending *justice* of God. Has not the reader often seen stiff orthodox deacons, whose heads rose rapidly from the intellectual organs to firmness and self-esteem, showing more reverence than benevolence, and more firmness and conscientiousness than either, with a tolerably wide head? But did a Methodist, or Universalist, or Unitarian, or Episcopalian, ever have this form of head? These remarks do not apply, however, to Congregationalists, nor to believers in the "New School" doctrines, whose conscientiousness usually predominates and self-esteem is only moderate, and destructiveness seldom more than full, and whose high-toned, or rather ultra-Calvinistic notions, are materially softened down. In them, amateness is usually moderate, and accordingly they abhor no sin more than its perversion. Episcopalians usually have large veneration, with predominant benevolence and large ideality, firmness, self-esteem and social faculties, conscientiousness being not always large, though often full; and hence they place their religion in works of charity, and in attending "*the church*," rather than in penitence, and are not as strict and rigid as the orthodox; yet they are always genteel, rather exclusive, and eminently social. Nearly all their women have superior heads, are remarkable for devotion, good sense, for the domestic qualities, and especially for *benevolence*. The Quakers have no characteristic moral developments, and accordingly allow their members to hold any and every belief, provided they *do* thus and so. Infidels, Deists, &c., usually have moderate hope, small veneration, scarcely the least marvellousness, large benevolence, and conscien-

tiousness variable. I never saw one of Infidel sentiments who had not a poorly balanced moral head.*

Those who have conscientiousness predominant, with small veneration and marvellousness, place their religion in doing *right*, or in honesty and morality, but disregard the *externals* of religion, while those in whom these organs are reversed, attend to its outward forms and ceremonies: but, though they are devout, yet they are often unjust and immoral. Those in whom benevolence predominates, place their religion in *doing good*, to the neglect of other Christian duties; those in whom marvellousness is great, regard religion as consisting in *faith*, and implicit reliance upon Divine providence; but those in whom this organ is small, do not feel that awe of God, that sense of the Divine presence, which this faculty inspires, but attribute all events to cause and effect. But those in whom *all* these organs are *fully and evenly* developed, "put on the *whole* armor of righteousness." They do *good*, do *right*, *worship* their God, and *trust* in his providence; which, united, constitute the very *perfection* of the Christian character. Such live a blameless life, worthy of admiration and imitation; whilst imperfect religious faith or practice is the natural fruit of unevenly developed moral organs.

In harmony with this principle, that each phrenological organ stamps its impress upon the religious opinions of its possessor, it follows, that those in whom *all* the moral organs are *fully and evenly* developed, will entertain *consistent and correct* religious opinions, and view the character and attributes of the Deity *as they are*. If, as already seen, veneration, with predominant benevolence, worship a God of kindness; with predominant conscientiousness, a God of unbending *justice*; with large causality, as the great first *Cause* of all things; with large self-esteem and firmness, as the great *Sovereign* of the universe; immutable, omnipotent, unchanging and unchangeable; clothed with authority, and doing his own will and pleasure in the

* The proverb that we judge others by ourselves, is in harmony with this principle, and illustrates it. Thousands of times in my professional practice, when I have ascribed to a man a strong ruling passion, say love of praise, for example, telling him that he is excessively sensitive to praise and reproach, "And so is every one," is the usual reply. Perhaps the next man I examine, will have small Approbativeness and large Self-Esteem. I tell him that he does not care a straw for the opinions of others. "Well, who does? for I'm sure I don't," or, "He's a fool who does," is apt to be the response. What we love desire, hate, &c., we are almost sure to think others love, desire, hate, &c.,

armies of heaven above, and among the inhabitants of the earth beneath, &c.; then one in whom benevolence is large, will worship him for his great *goodness* to the children of men; in whom benevolence and Conscientiousness both predominate, as kind but just; and with firmness, combativeness, destructiveness, and self-esteem added, as “a God merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, and who will by no means clear the guilty;” as perfectly holy himself, and requiring holiness in all his creatures; as creating and governing them with a wise reference to their greatest ultimate good, and in doing this, as rewarding those who obey his laws, and as punishing those who disobey; or, rather, as infinitely benevolent, yet as a God who will “not let the wicked go unpunished;” with large cautiousness and philoprogenitiveness, as exercising a fatherly care over his children, and providing a bountiful supply for all their wants, &c. Hence, one having *all* these organs fully and evenly developed, will take ALL* the characteristics of the Deity into account, and give each their *due proportion*; because the moral constitution of things must necessarily harmonize with the moral character and attributes of God, and man’s moral character, as far as it goes, must tally with the attributes of the Deity, as already seen. Consequently, if an individual possess a well-balanced and a perfectly developed phrenological organization,† or have all the organs large and *unperverted*; his views of the character, attributes, and government of God, will be consistent and correct. And the nearer one’s head approaches to this phrenological standard of perfection, the more correct will be his moral feelings and conduct, as well as his religious opinions and worship. But the further one’s head departs from this standard, that is, the more *uneven* one’s head, and more imperfectly balanced his organs, the more erroneous will be his religious opinions, and proportionally imperfect his moral conduct and his worship.

* For ought we know, the Deity may have other attributes as conspicuous in his character as his benevolence, or justice, or wisdom, which man has now no faculty for perceiving, and to which he has no faculty adapted, just as the brute creation have no faculty adapted to, or capable of perceiving, either his existence or any of his attributes. This, however, is all conjecture; but as far as man’s faculties do go, they harmonize with and lead him to adore God *as he is to man*.

† In my work on Education and Self-Improvement. p.115, the reader will find this principle carried out and applied to the phrenological definition of a good, or rather perfect, head and character—a principle than which none is more important, and the application of which will heal most of the religious and other differences existing among men.

By the application of this principle to his own head, every individual can see at a glance the departures of his own religious opinions and practices from this the true standard of our nature, pointed out by Phrenology. If his veneration be moderate or small, he thinks too little of divine things, and should cultivate his sentiment of devotion. If his firmness, self-esteem, combativeness, and conscientiousness predominate over his benevolence, that is, if his head rise higher on the back part of the top than on the fore part of the top, and form a kind of apex near the crown, his notions of the character and government of God are too austere and orthodox. But, on the other hand, if his benevolence rise high, and his conscientiousness, cautiousness and destructiveness be only moderately developed, he takes the other extreme, and regards God as all kindness, but not retributive. If causality and conscientiousness predominate, and veneration and marvellousness be moderate or small, he is too radical and ultra. He is speculative, hypothetical, and more moral than pious. Let him pray more, and theorise less. So, if veneration be larger than reason, let him remember, that he is too apt to believe as he is told to believe, and requires to use more intellect along with his religious feeling. But the *principle* is before the reader. Let each apply accordingly as his developments may require, and let all profit by the great lesson taught thereby. By this standard—this moral *formula*—any and every one should test his religion, and then should both cultivate the deficient moral organs, and also put his intellect over against his warped and contracted feelings. By analyzing the phrenological organs, his intellect can and should inform him what is the *true* and *natural* standard of religious belief and practice, and to this standard let all conform. Then will sectarianism hide its hydra head. Then will all embrace the *same* doctrines of *truth*, and “do works meet for repentance.” “He that is wise, is wise *for himself*.”

It should be added that the physical position or location of veneration, as regards the other moral organs, is in beautiful keeping with its powerful influence over the feelings and conduct of man. As already seen, the moral organs are grouped together in the *top* of the head, and veneration occupies the *centre* of this group, where it can unite and control, in no small degree, the action of the others. In harmony with this fact it is, that no organ in the human head is more promotive of virtue and happiness, none exerts a greater or more salutary influence over the animal passions of man, or modifies his conduct more, than the worship of God, and his religious opinions. What exalts, ennobles, and purifies the soul of man more—what more effec-

tually restrains his boiling, furious passions, than the thought, "Thou, God, seest me"? Who, while realizing that the eye of his Maker and final Judge is steadfastly fixed upon him, can knowingly commit sin? And if you wish effectually to restrain childhood and youth, *pray* with the erring sinner, and you will subdue him and his passions. Or if your own animal lustings require restraint, if temptation be strong and resistance be weak, pray to thy Father who seeth in secret, pray fervently and cultivate an abiding sense of his presence, and he will succor thee, and give thee the victory over thy easily desetting sins; for, veneration is the *natural* antagonist of the animal propensities. Nor is it till the propensities have wheedled and cajoled veneration into the adoption of a religion in which they can find gratification, that man *can* be wicked and yet he devout. Think you, that, unless the excessive approbation, or the besetting vanity of modern, so called, Christians, had cast dust in the eyes of intellect, and coaxed veneration into a tacit admission that decent attire is promotive of worship, veneration would have at all tolerated the disgusting and wicked vanity, and show, and fashionable glitter of our fashionable worshippers? But for this perversion of veneration, long ago would she have driven every fashionable bonnet, and dress, and cloak, and coat, and hat, and corset, and bustle from the sanctuary, and interdicted church fellowship to every fashion-loving man and woman, and *because* they loved the *fashions* more than the plain-dressed Savior of mankind. Ye fashion-loving, gaudy religionists, let this merited rebuke sink deep into your hearts; for, remember, that the more you think of *outside appearances*, the less you think of the true, spiritual worship of God

SECTION II.

THE TRUE RELIGION AND THE FALSE.

AND now, reader, dost thou ask, what kind of religion is that required by Phrenology? I answer, unhesitatingly—I answer, in the name of this great principle of man's nature—That which harmonizes with *all* the faculties of man in their normal, constitutional action. That which calls out all; which blends with all; which satisfies all. Thus, the social and domestic feelings should each, all, be exercised in conjunction with the religious sentiments. Connubial love—that sacred, heaven-born emotion of the soul of man—should be exercised with prayer. Animal love—lust—may not—does not—invoke the blessing of heaven. But I believe it to be natural for those who feel the sacred fires of pure, connubial love warming their inmost souls, and cementing their affections, to pray for, to pray with, the object of their love. Husbands and wives, and also lovers, ought always, as their hearts go out to each other, to let them also go out after God. They ought to hold sweet communion together upon heaven and heavenly things; ought to excite each other to holy deeds and heavenly aspirations, as well as to season all their conversation, their whole conduct, with the savor of religion. I do aver, in the light of this clearly established principle, about which there can be no question, that true love cannot exist, in all its power and loveliness, without co-existing with religion, and, *vice versa*, that true religion cannot exist in all its glory and power, without commingling with this sacred element. To be truly pious, and to the fullest extent, it is indispensable, not only that the person be married, really if not nominally, but that the partner of his joys and sorrows, be also a partaker in his holy aspirations. This principle exhorts, commands husbands and wives to cultivate this reciprocity of religious feeling. And it admonishes those who talk religion to others, but not to their families, that they are inconsistent. That where they require the most, there they have the least.

It also, and for the same reason, requires parents to cultivate the religious sentiment in their children. Parents can do this far better than the clergyman can. The latter see children but seldom, and then do not always improve every opportunity to excite the religious feelings. And then, too, it is not *possible* for any one but those who have the *care* of childhood, and are *constantly with* them, to cultivate

this element. The Sabbath school teacher sees the pupil but once a week, and then but an hour, and what is more, he spends that hour in expounding some religico-doctrinal point. He rarely excites the religious spirit. To teach a child religion, you must get the *love* of that child. Parents can do this more effectually than all others combined. Clergymen cannot do it. Sabbath school and Bible class teachers cannot do it. *Parents must* do it. And I fear that these religious schools called Sabbath schools and Bible classes, will do more harm than good; because parents will rely on *them* to do up the religion for their children, and thus fail to discharge that daily duty, or, rather pleasure, which devolves especially on parents. And then, too, they are generally used to teach sectarianism. This, I abominate. I would have parents teach their children religion *along with science*. I would have them teach God in all that is taught. Would have parents explain the book of nature to their children—expound God in every thing. I would have them taught science, but I would have no fact taught them without teaching *natural theology* along with science, *pari passu*.

So, Phrenology recommends, even enjoins, family prayer. Family prayer blends the social and the devotional so beautifully! It promotes family affection. It secures family obedience. It, especially in the evening, calms and quiets the mind, and prepares it for sleep. Indeed, families should set as much by the family altar, as by the family table. So, Phrenology recommends saying grace before meals—that is, of exercising devotion along with appetite. Social, neighborhood prayer meetings, and the exciting of our neighbours and friends to religious exercises, &c., are also recommended, even enjoined, by this principle. At the south, where neighbors live too far apart to see each other often, it is quite the custom to stay an hour after service, and gratify the social feeling, by exchanging compliments, news, friendly feelings, neighborhood incidents, &c., and its participators describe it as most delightful. So the Quaker, strict to attend church, asks his friends home to dinner or supper; and then a cordial, friendly interchange of sentiments and pleasureable feeling ensues, where all ceremony, all restraint, are banished, and you indeed feel at home and happy. This is as it should be. At all events, let us have conjugal religion, parental religion, family religion, and friendly religion, and let neither be separated from the other.

So, we should make money, but we should never let love of riches interfere with religion. It should indeed be a part of our religion to acquire sufficient of this world's goods to live comfortably. And I

am plain to say, that I think giving money in order to promote religion, is clearly engrafted on this principle. I believe it to be right—to be promotive of our own happiness—that we give money to advance the cause of religion.

It would be quite in place here to animadvert upon the prevailing spirit of *money-making* which characterizes our age and nation, and is not wholly unknown to professors of religion. Well has the Bible pronounced the love of money to be the “root of all evil.” Many—most—of the other vices that disgrace and torment man, come from this prolific source. All our robberies, burglaries, defalcations, dishonesty, forgeries, gambling, racing, betting, &c. &c. to an unlimited extent. Many of our murders. Much of the vice and wretchedness of the rich, and most of the grasping, shark-like selfishness and rapacity of all classes. This is not Bible religion. It is not phrenological religion. The former is full of denunciations against it. The latter reiterates these denunciations, and enforces them by the sanctions of the natural laws. Why is it, then, that those who bear the name of Christ, and profess to be his followers, should, in the very teeth of the Bible, in the face of natural religion, and in the eyes of their own and their children’s virtue and happiness, allow themselves to amass immense wealth, and so set their hearts upon it? I do not see but that there is about as much of this worldly spirit, this lusting after “mammon,” and this idolatrous worship of it, too, in the church as there is out of it. I do not see but that the pretended followers of the meek and lowly Jesus, who was so poor that he had not where to lay his head, have as much aristocratical exclusiveness on account of wealth, as those who make no such pretensions. I do not see that they give more—that they give as much—for the promulgation of the peace-giving, soul-cleansing “gospel of the son of man,” as politicians do to secure party elections; as pleasure lovers do to secure pleasure; as other men do to secure other objects. This ought not so to be. Surely, the objects, ends, of the true Christian, infinitely supersede those of the man of the world. Why, then, should not efforts to promote the ends of religion, be made with corresponding vigor? I do not say but that religionists often give *liberally* to promote *their sectarian* creeds—to build up their church—to secure the services of some *renowned* minister, and all that sort of thing. But, is that *piety*? Does it really promote the cause of either true religion or human happiness?

So, too, I do not see but that wealth gives a man as much *character* in the church as out of it. Be a man but *rich* in the church, and

he has the say. He is the leader. Ministers, be they ever so good, are his play-things. The managing committee know full well, that they must choose and dismiss such ministers as *he* says, or, possibly, which his *sinful propensities* say, or else lose his subscription; and that of course must be secured, right or wrong, come what may. And ministers, too, sometimes bow to the rich men of their parishes. Sometimes—hush! “Tell it not in Gath.” Let such church managers, and such ministers, too, humble themselves in sackcloth and ashes. Behold the spectacle! Religion, with all its high and holy claims—all its eternal sanctions—kneeling down and doing homage to the idol of mammon! Bowing her sacred neck to his infernal chains! Oh! Jesus, are these *thy* sheep? Do they bear *thy* image, and hear *thy* voice? I now submit, whether this pretty widely extended fact, as to the religion of the day, does not say, and in the language of the Bible, “Ye have no part nor lot in this matter.” This mammon-loving, or the Christ-following spirit and conduct, form a kind of *test* of true Christianity, and, tried by this test, weighed in this balance, I submit to nine-tenths of the professed followers of Jesus Christ, whether you are really his followers or his betrayers. I know this is plain talk, but, remember, it has both science and the Bible on its side, and only a miserly, penurious, bauble-loving *propensity* against it. The Bible says, “Be ye *not* conformed to this world.” “Unless ye forsake *all*, and follow me, ye cannot be my disciples,” &c., to almost any number of like passages. And Phrenology says, never let animal Acquisitiveness rule spiritual Devotion: Subject thy love of money to thy love of God. Exercise thy love of money *never*, but in obedience to thy moral sentiments.

Reader! Allow me to call your attention to the harmony between this precept of the Bible, and this requisition of Phrenology; and then to ask how many *tares* there are growing within the folds of the Christian churches to every stalk of wheat? I recommend those whose names are enrolled on our church records, to read a small work entitled “Mammon, the Sin of the Christian Church,” and then read the great law of the nature of man, which requires that all the animal propensities be subjected to the royal family of the moral sentiments, whose President is, Veneration. I call upon *rich* Christians [? hot ice!] to empty their coffers, or erase their names. I tell ministers—I tell churches—but ye know, now. See that ye *do*.

It was said above, that appetite should be exercised in conjunction with veneration, as well as all the other organs. The Jewish passover furnishes an illustration of this principle, and so does or should our

thanksgivings. It is proper that we eat with special reference to the exercise of the religious feelings. I do not say that all our eating should be of that class, nor that we should, or should not, have particular days and seasons—annual, periodical or otherwise, for religious festivals. I rather think, however, that we should; partly as talismen of the lapse of time, and partly that friends at a distance may know that on particular days, a gathering of old friends will take place, as on thanksgiving, or christmas, or other occasions.

So, also, tune should be exercised with veneration. It is proper that we *sing* religion, as well as *converse* religion, &c. Sacred music is natural to man—grows spontaneously on the tree of man's nature. Remarks on the *character* of church music would be in place here, but suffice it for the present merely, that we have called the attention to this doctrine of Phrenology.

In like manner, man should exercise his mirthfulness along with his religious feelings. Let us have no gloomy, acetic piety. No fears that we are too great sinners to be pardoned—no *oppressive* feelings of self-condemnation. Let us mingle cheerfulness, and even a sportive mirth-making disposition, perhaps even laughter, along with religion. The idea that to make fun is wrong—to be jocose and witty are sinful—is erroneous, and yet quite common. Many, in ignorance of this principle, suffer great condemnation for doing what it is perfectly right that they should do, namely, being lively and jocose. If to be witty and funny had been sinful in itself, God would never have created the organ and faculty in man. But the exercise of this faculty, besides being so rich a source of enjoyment, is pre-eminently healthy and promotive of all the great functions of life—digestion, respiration, circulation, vitality, and all their attendant blessings. I regard the proper exercise of mirthfulness as pre-eminently a religious duty, as well as most happy in all its effects.

So, also, we should exercise our *intellect* along with our religion. We should study the works of God, and the character of God as exhibited in his works. And we should especially exercise *reason* along with our religion. It is entirely proper also to open literary societies with prayer, and to introduce natural theology into the pulpit. If our clergymen would take the eye, and by unfolding its constructions, show how beautifully and wonderfully every part of it is adapted to seeing, and to light—if they would unfold man anatomically, physiologically, phrenologically—would expound and present *nature* in her never-ending adaptations and contrivances, and then lead the delighted audience up from those wonderful works to their Author, showing them his *existence* and *character*. as evinced in those works, what a

vast amount of *information* would they thus scatter! How draw in the thoughtless and the ungodly to their meetings, for the sake of the intellectual feasts thus served up to them, and then convince and persuade their intellects, and draw out their souls in devout adoration and praise!

The *phrenology* of this course is this. The more organs brought into combined and harmonious action, the greater the pleasure and profit experienced thereby. By thus introducing natural facts, the *perceptive* organs are delighted and gratified; so are also those of reason, in tracing out their adaptations, or their fitness in relation to their ends. And this high intellectual action reacts upon the moral feelings, greatly increasing their intensity and flow, and thus, blended into one harmonious whole, gratify and improve the human mind more than any other class of emotions it can experience. For my own part, nothing gives me such exalted views of God, of his character, wisdom, goodness, &c, as does the study of his works. Nothing kindles my veneration to its highest pitch of delighted and exalted action, equal to a beautiful landscape, a lofty summit, a wonderful adaptation of means to ends. Under the open canopy of heaven, surrounded by the beauties of nature, admiring the glories of the rising or setting sun, or gazing at the starry expanse over my head, it is that my soul is lifted up to the third heaven of delight and devotion, while sectarian religious worship is stale and insipid compared with it. And yet our clergymen rarely ever think of introducing natural theology into their sermons, at least, except by passing allusions. They too often assume—some one doctrine, or, more properly, *dogma*, and another, another, to thousands of isms, and then go on and build up dogma upon dogma; the blind leading the blind into the dark labyrinths of error and superstition.

I insist upon it, that science should be taught *along with* religion, and particularly, the laws of Physiology and Phrenology. Without obeying the laws they unfold, it is impossible to be virtuous or happy. And to facilitate this obedience, let them be taught, along with our other moral duties, which it most assuredly is, the duty of preserving health. Indeed, I know of no virtue, no duty, that will compare in point of importance with that of obeying the laws of Physiology—preserving health, prolonging life, and keeping the body in that state which is most promotive of virtue and enjoyment. That to be sick is to be sinful, and sinful in proportion as you are sick, has been demonstrated in my work on Education, and will be still further enforced in the forthcoming works on Physiology and Amateness. I have

there shown that sin is generally the product of *physical disorder*. This point I deem all-important. I shall enforce this point, also, in this work. At all events, I consider clergymen almost culpable for not preaching more Physiology and Phrenology. I would have them carry their manikin into the desk, in the one hand, and their anatomical and physiological preparations in the other, to be followed by herbariums, specimens of animals, of all kinds—birds, beasts, insects, fish, and the whole range of nature, animate and inanimate, and preach on astronomy, on electricity, on chemistry, natural history, &c.—on all the works of God—his noblest work of course the most

“Oh, horrible! Blasphemy! What a profanation of the Sabbath, of the sanctuary, of things sacred, would this be!” Indeed? indeed! The house of God so *very* holy, that the *works* of God will *profane* it? Very holy, that. Somewhat holier than heaven itself, I doubt not! Why was not nature packed up and put out of sight every seventh day, lest its presence should *profane* the Sabbath? But, as I shall take up this matter of the Sabbath, of religious teachers, &c. hereafter, I dismiss it with a short catechism.

Question. Phren.—“Well, Mr. Universalist, please take the stand, and tell the jury, whether you do or do not think that every orthodox minister in Christendom would preach more truth and less error, and do much more good in the world, if he should preach *natural theology*—God, as manifested in his works—than he now does by preaching orthodoxy.”

Answer. Universalist.—“Most certainly I do; because now he is preaching a doctrine erroneous in itself, injurious in its tendency, derogatory to God—an outrage”—

Q. P.—“That will do. Mr. Orthodox, do you not think that Mr. Universalist would do more good and less injury if he should lecture to his people on science, and especially, on science as connected with religion, than he now does?”

A. O.—“Beyond all question. Then he would certainly do no harm. He would even dispel ignorance, and do good; whereas now, he is tearing up the good old land-marks; is a stepping stone to infidelity; is even fast *ruining souls*, by crying peace to the wicked when there is no peace. No ten infidels in this place are doing as much damage to the cause of virtue, and to young people in particular, as he is doing.”

Q. P.—“And, Mr. Unitarian, what do you think? Would the Rev. Mr. Trinitarian do more good or evil than he now does, if he

would cease preaching the peculiarity of his creed, and preach science and natural religion?"

A. U.—"I think this truth is always beneficial. Error is always pernicious. He is now preaching error, and therefore doing harm. Then, he would at least preach truth, and convey much valuable information. Now, he is doing a positive injury to society. Then, he would do a positive good."

Q. P.—"And, Mr. Trinitarian, what think you as to the preaching of the Rev. Mr. Unitarian. Would he profane the Sabbath and the sanctuary more or less by adopting the course under discussion?"

A. T.—"Less, decidedly. I consider error to be a profanation of things sacred; but truth can never profane any thing. He might then do some good, but now he is certainly doing immense injury to society. He is sowing the seeds of a fatal error, that cannot fail to make shipwreck of many an immortal soul. I advocate the change most cordially."

Q. P.—"And, Mr. Pope, what say you?" "Say *I*? Why, I say you cannot possibly profane what is not holy. Their churches"—

Q. P.—"Whose churches?" "Why, *all* the churches—all the orthodox churches, (and a pretty application of names indeed, to call those *orthodox*, [?] who maintain errors as palpable, as fundamental, as do those to whom this title is usually applied. A rose by any other name would smell as sweetly—all Episcopalian churches, all Unitarian churches, all Methodist churches, all Baptist churches, all churches, of all names and kinds, not consecrated by the apostolic succession, are no more sacred than so many old barns. To talk about profaning them, therefore, is to talk of spoiling rotten eggs. I consider them all heretics, enemies of —."

That will do, Mr. Catholic. Your opinion is all we want.

Q. P.—"Come up to the stand, all ye Protestants, in a row. All answer together: Do you think that Catholics would profane the Sabbath as much, the house of God as much, if they should carry their philosophical apparatus into their pulpits, and explain the laws and phenomena of nature; should expound man, and tell the people the laws of life, health, mind, and virtue, as deduced therefrom, as they now do?"

A. All—"NO," with one loud, long, united, emphatic response, which makes the gates of Rome tremble, and thunders in the ears of the Pope and the Vatican, that they think him just about as holy [?] as he thinks them.

This catechism might be continued till it embraced every religious and anti-religious sect, and every fragment of every sect in Christendom, and in pagandom too. And, what is more, what is most, all but *one* must of course be wrong, and that one might not be right. If such sublime, intellectual, and moral truths as those presented in "Good's Book of Nature," Chalmer's work on a similar subject, "Combe on the Constitution of Man," "Paley's Natural Theology," &c., are not good enough for the Sabbath and the sanctuary, then must the latter be too good, too holy, for man, for earth! But they are *not*. We shall soon see how holy the Sabbath is—how holy the churches are—and can then judge whether they are so holy that nature, pure, immaculate, God-made Nature, will profane them. The plain English of this whole matter is simply this: Our Sabbaths, and our pulpits, are wanted for another and a meaner purpose than to present the sublime principles of natural religion. They are wanted as *party religico-hacks*, to be mounted and rode *to death*, for the exclusive purpose of propagating those particular religious tenets that built them up. Every Unitarian pulpit is wanted to propagate Unitarianism. Every Calvinistic pulpit, is plied to its utmost to defend and extend Calvinism. Every Methodist pulpit, is wanted exclusively to propagate the faith delivered to the saints by John Wesley. So of Universalists. So of all those even who *pretend* to be *liberal*. Nor do I remember ever to have heard a single sermon from any sectarian pulpit—that is, in any pulpit; for, where is the pulpit that is not a *sectarian* pulpit, except where a church is owned by all in common, and is therefore dressed out in orthodoxy one Sabbath, in Universalism the next, in Trinitarianism the next, &c.—the nub or butt-end, drift, and texture of which did not consist of the particular tenets of the sect that owned the pulpit. Or, if some of the "Evangelicals" exchange, those points are urged which are held in common by both sects. Indeed, this is *the object* of sectarian pulpits and sectarian churches—an object so much more "holy," and "sacred," and "solemn," than the preaching of *God in his works*, that the latter actually *profane* the former. The holiness of heaven itself is but as a flickering rush-light, compared with the transcendantly dazzling glorification of sectarian pulpits!

Irony aside. The moral sentiments themselves are stone blind, mere impulses, and as capable of receiving a bad direction as a good one. We have already seen, that they combine with the other organs that are the largest. If, therefore, they do not combine with intellect, they must of course combine with the propensities. *It cannot be oth-*

erwise. And when they thus combine, we have a religion of entire animal propensity. When, as in the ancients, they combine with amativeness, we have a religion made up, in warp and woof, of public, shameless, unbridled prostitution, to the temples of which crowds of worshippers throng, of both sexes, and all ages; each more eager than the other in the unblushing indulgence of unhallowed lust, he or she being the most pious who indulge the most in venereal intercourse. Combining with appetite, and unguided by intellect, they make a *religion* of their bachanalian revels, he being the most religious who can drink and carouse most. Combining with secretiveness and acquisitiveness, they make religion to consist in stealing, and lying, and knavery. Combining with cautiousness, and ungoverned by intellect, they look upon God with dread, and trembling fear, instead of with love, and offer sacrifices to appease the wrath of offended Deity—a species of animal religion, not entirely unknown to some of the pious of the present day. And so of its other animal combinations. Look at the animal religion of the ignorant, superstitious negro of southern slavery. His intellect untrained. His prayers perfect blasphemy. His preaching—look, ye who can look, at the negro's religion. And all, because he cannot, must not, read; cannot, must not, think; and hence, by a necessary consequence, that combination of veneration with the propensities which produces his heathenish notions of religion. And all solely because he has no intellect, to elevate, and enlighten, and direct his blind religious impulses. I wish to be fully understood. I say, in broad, unequivocal terms, that the moral sentiments, to be productive of good, and not to be the worst engines of depravity extant, MUST in ALL CASES, be enlightened, and guided by *intellect*, by *science*, by *reason*, by *knowledge*. And, surely, no species of knowledge—neither political knowledge, nor novel knowledge, nor polite literature knowledge, nor any other form of knowledge—will sanctify and direct the moral sentiments as effectually as will a knowledge of *Nature*, so presented as to teach us God, his character, his laws, his government—man's duty. I say, in the name of this incontrovertible principle, that we *cannot have* a religion “pure and undefiled,” without *basin*g it in natural science, and making it *consist of* natural theology. No other views of religion can be correct. No other can make man better. All others render him blind, bigoted, sinful, miserable. They satisfy the religious sentiment, without improving the morals, or seasoning the conduct.

And now, intelligent reader, let us test the religion of the day, by this fully established law of Phrenology and of mind. Does the religion

of the day call out and expand the *intellects* of men? Does it impart knowledge, particularly the knowledge already shown to be needed by the moral sentiments—a knowledge of nature? No; not at all. As mute as a mole on all matters of science. And I always find ten times more difficulty in getting religionists, particularly old-fashioned, old-school Baptists and Presbyterians, to look at Phrenology, than I do to get all the world besides to examine it. I find, that where religion reigns with the most complete sway, there Phrenology is interdicted; Physiology, excluded; Geology, rejected; and the other natural sciences are uncultivated! The *new-school* men, of all denominations, and *reformers* of all kinds, go in, heart and soul, for Phrenology; but deacons—and these furnish a better test than clergymen—and the *leaders* in our churches—as well as the *ladies* of church ton—I submit to the reader, where, in the ranks of science, are they to be found? Last, always. And not at all, till popularity *compels* their tacit ascent. I submit, who, but clergymen, and those, too, made up of doubled-and-twisted orthodoxy, have ever raised a dissenting voice against Geology? Who imprisoned Gallileo? Who are the most illiberal, the most bigoted, narrow-minded, anti-scientific men of any and every community? And, per contra, who are the most scientific? Who patronize scientific lectures most? Who are the most liberal minded? The most candid inquirers after *truth*, as well as its most cordial devotees? I leave the fact to answer. I leave this principle to draw the inference. I leave the two united, to say, whether men are rendered more wise, or more ignorant, (that is, the better or the worse,) by the religion that is. If that religion advances *science*, it makes men's moral faculties expand more generally and powerfully than they otherwise would, with the intellectual—which, as just seen, sanctifies the moral, and alone prevents their doing injury. But, if it *retard* the progress of science (which is, beyond all question, the fact,) *it is a damage to mankind*. Nothing can be more injurious. And nothing more beneficial than that which *cultivates* the intellectual faculties, in connexion with the moral.

Another test of the anti-scientific spirit of the religion of the day, and of course, proof that it is injurious, is to be found in the refusal of the great majority to allow their churches to be used for scientific lectures. These churches *might* be, *ought* to be, the *promoters* of science, by offering those facilities which their spacious walls, comfortable pews, and central locations, always and every where might afford for lectures on science—particularly the science of man. But, the blue-stocking orthodoxy utterly refuse their houses to all and every thing,

except the promulgation of their contracted tenets. Andover religion would not open her doors to lectures on Phrenology. Hence, other denominations, who otherwise would open their churches, follow suit, in order to keep up the *dignity* of the house of God, till even Unitarians and Universalists, who claim to be liberal, also lock all but Universalism and Unitarianism out of their houses. And yet, they claim to be *liberal!* Away with professions without practice! It is in your power, if you would but improve the noble opportunity offered, to steal the march on bigotry and intolerance, to show your liberality, and thus commend your sect, by opening your doors to the cause of science, and even *paying* something as societies, to *promote* the cause of science. But, suit yourselves. Pursue the illiberal course, and it will ruin you. Pursue the liberal policy, and it will save you. The views here presented, *will prevail*. Oppose them, and you die. Science asks no odds at your hands. *Take care of yourselves*. That is all. That is quite enough for you.

I ought here to state unequivocally, that I find clergymen much in advance of the deacons, and those *church aristocrats* who govern both priest and people. I also find that those called "new school," men of each of the sects, particularly of the orthodox, generally take liberal views of things, are generally ready to open their churches, and are decided advocates of Physiology, Phrenology, Magnetism, &c. This is right. They are the salt of the churches. God grant that they may go on to banish bigotry and invite science into the sanctuary, and thus purify the religion of the day from the dross, the intolerance, the ignorance of the dark ages, and of the present age, and bring intellect into delightful action with the moral sentiments.

"But," says an advocate of the religions that be, "does not much of the preaching of the day, particularly orthodox preaching, *employ reason*, and appeal to reason? Where do you find more *logic*, more of consecutive *argumentation* than is found in much of the preaching of the day?"

Theorizing, you mean. I grant that they employ a *show* of reason—a mushroom, spurious, deceptive species of reasoning, but it is a species of reasoning that proves and disproves any thing and every thing. It proves orthodoxy, and the decrees, and partial salvation, and the trinity, to a perfect demonstration, while it is at the same instant, in a pulpit over the way there, engaged in *disproving* these very doctrines, and proving their opposites. In one pulpit, it proves most conclusively the final perseverance of the saints, and in the next pulpit, is

disproving this doctrine, and proves* that it is possible, to fall from grace. Indeed, that there is great *danger* of it. In a Methodist pulpit, it reasons out to a demonstration, that Armenianism is the true doctrine of the "word of God," while in an orthodox pulpit, it is proved quite as logically and incontestibly, that the opposite doctrines of rigid Calvinism are true. In a Trinitarian pulpit, the divinity of Christ is *proved* to be bible, to be reason. In a Unitarian pulpit, the same doctrine is overthrown—shown to be anti-reason, anti-bible—and its opposite doctrine established as truth. So of the peculiarities of all other creeds. I submit to one, to all of the believers of these doctrines, whether ministers do not each reason out their peculiar tenets logically, and forcibly, and also show by reason the absurdity of the doctrines opposed thereto? I ask Trinitarians if they do not think their ministers *reason* out the three-fold nature of the Godhead as clearly and cogently as Unitarians think their ministers reason out their opposite doctrine? So of each sect, as to its peculiar tenets. And yet the fact, that truth always harmonizes with truth, and reason with reason, renders it self-evident and certain that most of their reasoning is spurious. They do not *reason*. They simply *theorize*. They give a *therefore* without a *wherefore*. They reason through colored glasses. Diversities in their religious and other organs, warp intellect, and render their reasoning unreasonable.

My conscience constrains me here to censure, what I wish I could let pass in silence. I refer to the gay, dressy religion of the age. If dress had no moral character, or were harmless in its effects, most gladly would I say nothing about it. But, it is not so. It is most pernicious. Scarcely any thing is more so. To two points, illustrative of its evils, allow me to advert. First, to the amount of *extra* sewing required thereby, and to the deleterious influence of so much *sewing* on the female constitution, and thereby on the race. I do feel that a vast many of our blooming daughters, first lose their health and are rendered miserable for life by sitting and sewing so steadily. I call attention to this point. Ye who regard suicide as sinful, open your eyes, I beseech you, to this lamentable subject. If our fabrics were made strong, and a uniform fashion prevailed, I venture to affirm

* I use the word *proving* here and occasionally elsewhere, not by any means in its true sense, but ironically. This is so palpable, that the reader hardly requires to be put on his guard by this note. I generally use words in their true sense; always, indeed, except where the subject itself cannot fail to give them the signification intended. To save circumlocution, I generally use the word *orthodox*, however, in its popular, generally received sense, rather than in its true sense.

that at the lowest estimation, nine-tenths of the sewing now performed might be avoided, and men and women be just as comfortable as now and infinitely more happy than following these fashions can possibly render them.

Secondly: Look, and weep, in view of the vast sacrifice of life and virtue, caused by tight-lacing. I will not enlarge. Nearly half of the deaths of women and children, are caused by this accursed fashion, besides an amount and aggravation of misery which no tongue can tell, no finite mind conceive.

“And what has religion to do with this, or this to do with religion?” says one. A story. In making a recent Phrenological examination of a woman, I saw and told her that she had almost *ruined* both body and mind by tight-lacing. She answered, that she never laced more than one day in the week. Reader, what day do you suppose that one was? In what one day of the week is committed more suicidal and infanticidal corsetting, than in all the other six, and that by hundreds to one? And yet ministers administer the sacrament to women by thousands, while *in the very act* of committing both suicide and infanticide. I pity clergymen. An excellent class of men, taken by and large. They would fain do their duty, and speak out. But the daughter of the rich church-member mentioned above, exercises her pious Approbativeness, by attending church richly dressed and tightly corsetted, in order to be the ton of the meeting. Let the clergyman open his mouth against this life-destroying sin if he dare, and he will get his walking papers pretty soon. Sometimes ministers defy consequences, but alas, what can they do? A living they *must* have, and they yield to stern necessity. They put on the shackles, and bow their knees. But, ye ministers of God and of truth, I submit whether it is *right* thus to let this crying sin pass unrebuked? Starve if you must, but tell the *truth*; “whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear.” Be no longer “dead dogs” in reference to this subject of life and death. Your silence gives consent. Bond yourselves together, and you can rid our land, our world, of a far greater sin than intemperance is or ever was. If you do not know both its evils and their extent, it is high time for you to learn them. If you do know them, but dare not, or do not, sound the alarm, abandon your calling. Yield your post to those who will not let a sin as glaring as this go unrebuked. Do your *duty*. Imploring millions yet unborn, say, *do your duty*.

But, I have not yet lashed this lacing and these fashions on where they belong. They go along with, they are propagated by, *religious*

meetings, particularly on the sabbath. Where do those who wish to learn the fashions as soon as they are out, go? To church, of course. Nor need they go any where else. Neither the ball-room nor the theatre, nor the social party, get the fashions as soon, or propagate them a hundredth part as effectually, as do our religious meetings on the sabbath. I am plain to declare, what every mind of common intelligence will admit, that if I wished to amass a fortune by the popularity of some fashion, even though it might be pernicious, I would not attempt to introduce it into the ball-room or theatre, but if I could introduce it among the *ton* of some D. D.'s church, in some populous city, my end would be attained, for then all the other dressingly religious maids and matrons must also have it, both in that church, and in all the churches of the land. And if they have it, surely those who do *not* profess religion must also have it. Besides, who does not know, that unless a woman dresses well *at church*, she *loses caste*. And, I submit to any candid observer of the facts of the case, whether nine-tenths of those women who labor for wages, do not spend nine-tenths of these scanty earnings, for something "descent," (that is, fashionable,) with which to appear in church on the sabbath. Nearly every new coat, new hat, new bonnet, new dress, new fashion, new every thing, goes to *church first*—goes to church mainly. And sometimes the pitiful wages paid to our laboring women, do not allow them to get as many "decent" things as fashion requires, with which to go to meeting on sunday; and, not having fathers or brothers on whom to rely for "pin-money," much as they love virtue, much as they abhor moral pollution, bedeck their persons on the sabbath with the wages of sin! If even religion did not *compel* them to dress, they had retained their virtue; and I verily believe more than half of the prostitution of the land, private as well as public, is chargeable to the sabbath *dressing* sanctioned, aye, even *demand*ed, by the religion of the day. But not by the religion of *Jesus Christ*. He no where requires his followers to wear bustles, or corsets, or fashionable attire. He dressed in swaddling clothes. He loves you none the better, ye painted, padded, bustled, ribboned, milliner-made *lady*-christians, because you go up to the sanctuary attired in the latest fashions, with your gilt-edged prayer-book or Bible in hand, &c.—in that nipping, swinging, artificial walk, and affected manners—the natural language of self-esteem and Approbativeness. Indeed, such he does not love *at all*. Ye cannot serve two masters. If ye will dress fashionably, ye cannot be the disciples of the meek and lowly Jesus.

Methodists! I have one word to say to you. Ye *did* run well. What hath hindered you? Ye once interdicted church fellowship to the daughters of fashion. But "ye have fallen from grace. Have glided along down that swift current of fashion which is sweeping away all that is pure and lovely in the religion of the Bible, of the cross. Watchmen! to your posts. Sound the alarm!

If any reader suspects that I have chained the fashions on to the car of religion a little more closely than truth will warrant, I defend, I even advance, my position, by calling your attention to *Saturday afternoon and evening*; and bring shop-keepers, milliners, seamstresses &c., as my witnesses. These things speak volumes. They tell a tale which religion should blush to hear.

It remains to add, that thus the exalted heavenly emotions of Veneration, are not enhanced, but grievously retarded by this parasite of approbateness. It is that *propensity*-religion, all along shown to be so injurious in its effects, and so unholy in its exercise. True, it is not quite as low as the licentious worship of Venus, the revelling worship of a Bacchus, or the murderous worship of a Mars, of the ancients; because Veneration now combines with organs a little higher in the head, and less animal in character, than with them. Still, it is *animal* religion yet. It is not the religion of either enlightened intellect or high moral sentiment. It is in the teeth of the nature of man, and of the requirements of Phrenology.

I might say more. I may rue my having said so much. Be it so. But it is true—only that "the half is not told."

From these few applications of this great principle, that correct religious doctrines and practices involve the combined and harmonious action of all the faculties, with the moral and intellectual in the ascendancy, the reader will see its sweep, its power. That it forms a correct test and touchstone of true and false religion, cannot be doubted. That it criticises effectually much that now passes for religion, is self-evident. That these few are but the beginnings of its application, is also apparent. Still, as these applications will be rendered much more clear, general, and powerful after we have analyzed a few more of the moral faculties, and demonstrated a few more fundamental principles, we postpone them for the present. Perhaps entirely; for two reasons: first, the reader can apply them—cannot help applying them for himself; and secondly, the task is most painful thus to criticise what so many good people hold as so sacred.

SECTION III.

THE SABBATH.

Having proved the existence of a God, and the duty of man to worship him, and laid open the great principle, by applying which we may form *correct* views of the character, attributes, and worship of God; the inquiry comes home with great force, "What in regard to the SABBATH? What says the nature of man touching this religious institution? Does Phrenology recognize *any* sabbath? If so, which? The Jewish, or the Christian? Does the nature of man set apart, or require to be set apart, any portion of time for religious worship? If so, *what* portion?"

Phrenology answers this question thus: "Man, worship thy God. Worship *daily*. Worship *habitually*. Exercise thy religious feelings, not by fits and starts, not at given times and seasons, but *continually*. Make this worship a part and parcel of thy daily avocations, or, rather, pleasures." It saith, "Arise, thee, in the morning betimes, and as the glorious sun is lighting up and animating all nature with his presence, do thou pour forth *thy* heart in praise and adoration to the *Maker* of the sun, and to the *Author* of all those beauties that surround thee. And when the setting sun is shedding on delighted earth his last rays of glory for the day, and spreading his golden hues over nature, to wrap her in the mantle of night, do thou offer thy evening orisons of thanksgiving for the mercies of the day, and supplicate protection for the night." Instead of spending all thy energies in amassing wealth, or in pursuing merely animal, worldly objects, Phrenology saith, "Take a little time to feed thy immortal soul." Phrenology says, thou mayest go to church if thou pleasest, or not go if thou objectest. It says, that *place* and *mode* are nothing; that the *worship* is the *main* thing. We should think as much of thus feasting our immortal souls with thoughts of God and heaven, as of feeding our frail bodies with our daily bread. Should exercise worship as often and as much as we exercise appetite or vision. Should take *time*—should make a *business* of one as much as of the other. I enjoy neither food, nor sleep, nor life itself, more than I enjoy this communion with my God. I look upon these seasons as the brightest spots upon the page of life. The most pleasurable. The most profitable.

5. At least, it is lawful to walk abroad in the fields on the sabbath, enjoy the fresh breezes, and pick and eat fruit, and what we like. This shutting ourselves up in-doors, is positively wrong. It dimin-

ishes circulation, and this deadens the action of the brain and nervous system, and, by consequence, of the mind and religious feelings. In order that the worshipping feeling should be most active, the *body also* must be in motion. This is founded clearly in a physiological principle. It is as necessary that we take exercise on the sabbath as that we eat. If the day be indeed so very holy, why are not *all* the physiological laws suspended on that day? If the day is too holy in which to take exercise, it is, of course, too holy in which to eat, or breathe, or live. Why does not the heart stop its wanted pulsations the moment sunday begins, and resume them the instant it terminates? For, if it be right to eat or breath on the sabbath it is equally, and for precisely the same reason, right that we exercise, recreate, pick flowers and fruits, enjoy nature, enjoy life.

Besides, this enormous stuffing on the sabbath, is ruinous alike to the religious sentiment, to the whole mind. Baked beans and pork, the most indigestible of all things, is the Yankee dish for a sunday dinner as sure as sunday comes. Precious little piety, at least, in pork. Above all things, children should not be confined on the sabbath, nor on any day. The law of their nature that demands physical exercise almost constantly during the waking hours of childhood and youth, is imperious, inexorable, even on the sabbath, and must not be violated. Cannot be, with impunity.

"Oh, but," says one, "let us at least have a sabbath as a day of rest from the toils and burdens of the week. As a civil institution, it has no parallel in value. Our horses and servants need rest. We all require one day to clean up, refresh our weary bodies, banish the cares and vexations of business, and place our distracted minds on heaven and heavenly things." I know, indeed, that *if* men will work too hard one day, they require to rest the next. Not so if they do not *over* do. Indeed, perfect health requires a given, equal amount of labor *daily*. So, if a man will eat too much, he will be benefitted by fasting. Not, however, when he has eaten just enough. If you will not work your beasts too much week days, they will need no rest sundays. If you do not follow the world too closely six days in the week, you will not feel the need of resting from it on the seventh, but will be the better for not resting. So, if you will exercise Veneration sufficiently during the week, you will need no sabbath to increase its energies. Live just as you ought to during the week, and you will require to live just the same on the sabbath. I might enforce this point, by alluding to the force of *habit*, but, as habit only requires the applica

tion of that same great law of proportionate action already pointed out and is therefore already embraced in effect, enlargement is hardly necessary.

SECTION IV.

REVIVALS OF RELIGION.

GOVERNED by the same principles, and so nearly related as to deserve notice in the same connexion with the sabbath, is the doctrine of "*revivals*." Phrenology discards them entirely. First, on the fundamental principle of Phrenology, and the great law of mind already brought to bear on the Sabbath, (namely, that *uniformity, proportionate* action, is the great law of perfection,) revivals are to the mind what artificial stimulants are to the body. They elate only proportionably to depress. It is a law of mind, that extreme action induces the opposite extreme. Now, if it be desirable to render our religion purely periodical—the ebbing and flowing tide, or the mountain torrent—rather than the quiet, steady, stern, then get up revivals. But, we have shown, that these extremes violate a law of mind, and that a most important one. "To the law and to the testimony" of man's nature, I submit this point, as also the kindred one, touching sudden convictions. Quick conversions, on the principle that "the hottest love is soonest cold," is like a fire made of shavings, blazes, and scorches, and dies, leaving no valuable influences behind. To be productive of permanent good the moral organs must be exercised *habitually*. Nothing but *continual, long continued exercise*, can essentially either promote the growth of the organs, or improve the tone and vigor of the faculties. Let this great truth, elsewhere demonstrated, (that all improvement of the faculties must be brought about by improving their organs,) be borne constantly in mind, and also that this improvement can be effected only by a perpetual *exercise* of both faculty and organ. Fitful action will not, cannot do this. *Permanent* action alone can do it. This doctrine is opposed to revivals. That is, the revival principle.

Besides: These revivals are *sometimes got up*; and, indeed, I speak the sentiments of all their advocates, when I say that they are *always* got up by means of protracted meetings, powerful appeals, &c. I know something about this, for I have *got up* revivals and religious

excitements myself. I say, then, without any fear of contradiction, that religious excitements are produced just as we produce impressions or excitements about Physiology, Magnetism, Singing, Temperance, &c. They are induced by their own appropriate *means*, just as any and every thing else in the physical and the moral world. The means used bring them to their crisis sooner, or protract them longer, according to the nature of the means used. I advocate, then, that they be *protracted* so as to have a *permanent* revival. I do not object to revivals, as creating *too much* religious feeling. I would have as much religion *always* as there is in any revival, divested, perhaps, of some extraneous matter. But I uncompromisingly oppose periodical religion; or, rather, *annual* religion; for, revival matters are so managed as to “*get up*” revivals at stated seasons of the year. It will not take much of the spirit of prophecy to foretell, that about next January revival meetings and efforts will begin to multiply, and begin to produce copious showers of “Divine grace” by February, only to be completely dissipated by April.

But, *why* do April showers, perhaps the chilly winds of March, dissipate or supersede the showers of Divine grace? Because revivals must give way to business. January brings leisure to merchants, tradesmen, &c., to get up revivals till the money-making season again returns. I submit, to Christian and to all, if this periodicity of revivals, and at *such* times and seasons, too, does not tell a story touching revivals that should make those blush whom it may concern.

Let me not, by any means, be understood to speak against man's exercising the religious feeling. So far from it, I would advocate our exercising the religious sentiments more *all the time*, than they are now exercised even in revivals. But, I would *not* have these exercises *fitful*, but perennial. The day of Pentecost should have lasted till now, and even swept down the vista of all coming time, till the last human being gave up the ghost. The principles advocated in this essay, show that religion should be *the paramount* feeling, pursuit, occupation, of man, and not a winter's coat, that he can put on when he cannot make money, only to be put off when he can. Money should be the one to give place to religion, and not religion to money-making. And this subjecting the “Spirit of God,” as revival influences are called, to the worldly spirit, tells a deep, dark story on the religion of the day—tells it that it is both animal, and secondary at that, while it *should* be *primary*, and in-wrought into the very texture of all we do, say, feel. This is the revival doctrine and spirit of Phrenology, and of the nature of man, if not of the pages of the Bible.

'ndeed, I am fully persuaded, that the Bible does not inculcate, does not even sanction the revival spirit, or measures, or converts, of the day. For, those that are *converted* by impulse, must, by a law of mind, be impulsive, periodical Christians, and therefore disqualified to enjoy constant, permanent religion, as well as to shine as a steady Christian light upon the sinful darkness of the surrounding world.

But, if others entertain other views, let them. Let those cultivate annual religion who have no better religioa. But, let *me* live near to my God *always*. Let me pray *without ceasing*. Like Blackhawk, let me never take the refreshing draft from the bubbling spring, without offering up thanksgiving and praise to the Author of all good. Let me be as religious in August as in February. Let my religion not be the changeable garment; but, let it be *in* me, and form the major part of me. No annual piety. No weekly, Sunday piety, even. But *daily*, and hourly, and constantly, may my soul hold sweet communion with the God of nature. And I am persuaded, that these views will accord with both the intellect and the better feelings of those who have either. At least, I shall not concern myself with those who differ from me; for the very good reason, that I consider them in error.

I know that I have now touched two of the four tender places of the religion of the day—the Sabbath, and Revivals. I know that I shall excite against me the proscriptive spirit* of the religion of the age. Be it so. I stand where even *their* anathemas, (I know they are more powerful, more unrelenting than the anathemas, the proscriptions, the tyranny, of any thing else in this world,) cannot essentially harm me. The truth of Phrenology is above their reach. So is my professional reputation. If they say I do not understand my business, the spontaneous voice of the entire community will give them the lie, and react against *them*, not me. So that if they commend, or if they condemn, my patrimony is beyond their reach. I fear them not. Why, then, should I turn aside for them, or even bow and scrape to curry their favor. I have more business on hand constantly than ten men can execute. So that, if they even do operate against me, they cannot hurt me. My bread and butter is beyond their reach. Let them do their worst. I bow not. I ask no favors. I grant none.

* There is no better proof that the religion of the day is no better than it ought to be, than the way it treats its opposers. When one cheek is smitten, it does not turn the other also. It proscribes, anathanizes, aye, even *punishes*. And punishes, too, those who are *sincere* in their belief. But I may take up this point separately.

And, oh! if I ever thanked my God for any thing, it is that I stand in a position where I can *tell the truth*, and defy the consequences. It is awful, to have truth struggling within one's soul, reel and rumbling like the earth, when its pent-up fires are seeking vent. I appeal to ministers, who ache to tell truths which they know will cost them their salaries. But, it is glorious to be able to utter truth, in all its dignity, in all its power. To see it cut its own way, and prostrate whatever opposes it. To see it make those in error wince and writhe under its folds, only to be overcome and prostrated by their own vain struggles. To see the human mind delivered from those thralldoms by which it has been spell-bound, and come out free as air into the glorious liberty of the sons of truth. To see error and misery supplanted by virtue and happiness. To see thirsty souls drink in *truth*, and be refreshed, and to be re-invigorated, and become regenerated thereby. That glory, I enjoy. I glory in the mere utterance of truth. I glory in being the instrument of good to man thereby. I glory in not being obliged to truckle even to religious bigotry and tyranny, the worst form of tyranny, proscription, intolerance on our globe. Even it, cannot harm me. I snuff the wind of its threats in my nostrils, and sing, aha, aha! And I tell all whom it may concern, that I ask no odds of any one. I have got the American ear; the confidence of Americans. And I shall use that confidence without abusing it; and so as even to *increase* it. It cannot be taken from me. There is a power in TRUTH which will make ten friends to one enemy. I can live without ever making another cent. I can satisfy my conscience, by telling the *whole* truth, and am *able* to father its consequences. So, reader, you may hear or forbear. You may laud or cavil. What you say and do for or against these things, will react on *you* for good or for evil. Better take it kindly, then, and profit by the lessons it teaches.

Hence, when I come to the other two places—(corns! on the feet of modern Religion, that make her limp and hobble along)—I shall tread on them just as though they were not there. Temporize, I need not. Suppress truth, I *will* not. So that the reader may calculate on straight-forward, thorough work.

SECTION V.

RELIGIOUS TEACHERS, OR PREACHERS

SINCE it is beneficial, necessary, for man to be religious, the question recurs on the expediency of having *religious teachers*, preachers, &c. Phrenology, I think, favors the existence of this profession. Man is capable of being influenced by his fellow men. Hence, those who are truly religious, are capable of infusing the religious spirit into their fellow men. Still, that profession, as now conducted, is sadly faulty, and comes far short of effecting the good it is capable of accomplishing. Ministers are able to do immense good, but they not unfrequently wield their tremendous influence to the *injury* of mankind. How often do they become dogs in the manger, neither eating the hay of science themselves, nor letting those under their influence eat it. This is strikingly true, in regard to Phrenology. And, indeed, not unfrequently in regard to other great reforms in mankind. Their influence is entirely too conservative. They hold society back from effecting those changes that are evidently beneficial to society. As a class, they hang on too tenaciously to the *old* ways, and set their faces against Phrenology, Magnetism, Science, Geology included, &c. &c. and thus greatly retard human improvement, whereas they should be the first to descry improvements, and urge their adoption.

A single illustration: Let there be one stiff, hard-headed orthodox in any place, and he will be the nucleus around which all the anti-reform influence of the place will gather; and will make many bigoted who would otherwise take liberal views of subjects. A D. D., clergyman in a certain old-fashioned town in New England, is a cordial, whole-souled opponent of Phrenology, and censures severely some of his family who have been compelled to believe it; besides keeping it out of *other* ministers' churches, who, but that he is a leader or exemplar among them, would favor it, and open their churches for lectures, &c. But they must keep up their dignity by doing as he does; thus employing the same principle of augmentation mentioned on p. 71, to appertain to the opening of churches.

And then there is something radically wrong in their education. They are educated to be sectarian, and they are sectarian—the main propagators of sectarian influences. I confess, I have no faith whatever in the present method of manufacturing ministers. They are

made to order as a tailor would make a coat. They must all go through certain *mills*, called the Academy, the College, the Seminary and be ground out, all ready for taking holy orders, and cooking up sectarian sermons. They must know nothing of Physiology. Oh, no; they have other more important things to which to attend. They come out of College, the Seminary, and all, ignorant of nearly every law of health, and generally with impaired constitutions; and, often, soon become confirmed invalids, and die young. They do not even know, that to preserve the health is a moral duty; or even that life and health *can* be preserved. They even generally think that sickness and premature death are *providential*, and not the products of causation. And if, perchance, some of them do find out that to be sick is to be sinful, they must not *preach* on health, its duty, or its conditions, but must preach sectarianism. The palpable ignorance, or else culpable neglect of both Physiology and Phrenology, is the main fault I have to find with them. As a class, they are excellent, moral men. They *mean* better than they *do*. They have been looking at *kais gars*, &c. till they have contracted the scope of their intellectual vision into the arena of their own sectarian dogmas, and there they stay. Still, as a class, their *motives* are as good as those of any other class. They do as well as they know how. I pity their ignorance and contraction more than blame their motives. I say ignorance. Not of *sectarianism*. Not of Theological lore. Not of old-fashioned science, "falsely so call." But of that practical knowledge of men and things, and plain common sense, which constitutes the basis of all true knowledge. Of mind, its laws, its elements, and the means of operating on it, they know very little, and most of that little they need to unlearn. To be good ministers, it is necessary that they all be good Phrenologists. Then will they understand the human mind, and how to operate on it. And I tell Clergymen that they can turn their attention to no branch of study that will equally fit them for the station they occupy.

* It is customary for the professors at Andover to let their chapels to such lectures as they think it proper for their unfledged ministers to attend. I accordingly applied for it, in which to lecture on Phrenology and Physiology, and their bearings. My application was brought forward at a regular meeting of the faculty, and negatived. The answer returned was, that the attention of the students was pre-occupied with other more important matters. This refusal was tantamount to a public condemnation of Phrenology. So much Andover knows

I repeat: They are generally honest, sincere, well-meaning men and most of their faults are faults of *education*, (or rather, the want of it,) not of motives. I am far from joining in the general tirade against ministers, or trumpeting their faults. Faults they certainly have. But they are faults that grow out of their habits, and the temptations to which they are exposed.

The second fault of ministers, is that they do not labor sufficiently either for health, or talent, or moral feeling. They are feasted to death, because they eat much from home, and must live on the fat of the land; every table to which they are set being loaded with the good things. Then they write and preach too much, and allow themselves very little time for recreation or exercise. Every minister ought to have several acres of land, and to work enough on it to raise most of the eatables for his family. This, besides vastly improving his health, and, consequently, his talents, will render him more independent than he now is. I do say, that no religious teacher should depend on his preaching for his living, for two reasons:—

First: It renders them more *mercenary* than is consistent with their station—hirelings, that preach for *wages*. How can this help seasoning their preaching, and making them have an eye to higher salaries?

But the main reason is, that it incapacitates them for telling the truth. And hence, though conscious that certain unpopular doctrines are true, and ought to be preached, they yet keep one eye upon the loaves and fishes. It cannot be otherwise. This makes them temporize with the sins of the rich men of their parish, or with the sins of their wives, or sons, or daughters, so as to augment their own salaries. Let those who are so disposed, give. But let the minister be able to support himself, if he must, so that he may be free and bold to declare the whole truth, without fear or favor.

I would also have them mingle somewhat more with their flock and be more *familiar* with them, and *talk* religion, and *live* religion, to them *daily*. Having these set seasons for religion is not the thing. It renders it formal. Besides, we require to have our religious feelings kept perpetually in action; and these organs can be operated upon only as can all the others, namely, by presenting their appropriate food, daily, hourly. And, particularly, by *living* religion. I confess, the Quaker notions as to ministers, come nearer to the doctrines of Phrenology, in this respect, than any others.

One thing more: Preachers of morals should also be teachers of science. Religion and science ought never to be separated. They are twin sisters. Their organs occupy contiguous portions of the head

Their functions *naturally* blend, and excite each other. I have *demonstrated* the principle which settles this matter. All their homilies should be based in science, and mixed through science, and all science should be accompanied with religion. Thus says Phenology It also saith: Let no man become a religious teacher, unless prompted by the religious feelings; and let him never attempt to preach, pray, exhort, unless when imbued with this sentiment; so that it will gush forth in every word, in every action. Let us have no *formal* preaching or praying.

I think one evil grows out of our having a set ministry: And that is, that the people *rely* on them to do up their preaching, praying, piety. They do not exhort their neighbors to love and good works, because they pay their minister to do that. And so of many other religious duties and feelings. Now piety cannot be done up by proxy. Every one must be religious *for himself*. If to shirk this private, personal piety off on to the ministers, were the natural, necessary consequence of having ministers, Phrenology would utterly condemn having any minister, yet I do not think it is necessary, only accidental, caused by a low state of religious feelings.

But, after all, though religious teachers are good in their places, and though they may perhaps do good by exciting their fellow men to religious feeling and good works, still no one can pray or be religious for any other. Every one must be good and do good *for himself*. Ministers cannot pray *instead* of their flock, and thus excuse the latter. Nor believe for them. Nor be benevolent for them. Nor do works meet for repentance for them. "Every man *for himself*." And I really fear, that the mere fact of the existence of ministers of religion, is generally abused in this way. We would fain be religious *by proxy*. Better not have *any* ministers at all. Then, we shall not rely upon them to our soul's injury. Nor need the fact be disguised, that many *do* rely upon their minister to do up their religious thinking, and their religious feeling for them. As well get your minister to *eat* for you, or *sleep* for you, or *live* for you. And let us be religious *for our own selves*, and also do all that in us lies to promote holy feeling and godly conduct among mankind.

As to the way they make ministers, by laying on of hands, ordaining, &c. it is all useless. All the ordinations and holy orders of all Christendom, from St. Peter down to the latest dates, cannot make a person one whit the better man, the better minister. But they sometimes work injury, by leading the people to suppose a man to be good **because** he has been ordained. As to laying on of hands, mentioned

in the Bible, it was evidently, simply a *magnetizing* of the moral sentiments. As far as the "fathers" in the ministry actually charge the moral organs of their seminary-made minister with the religious fluid or impulse, by holding their hands on the top of his head, this ordaining process may do some good. In no other way.

A word in this connexion, about the *consecration of houses* of worship. How much more holy, sacred, is that church as a church, or the wood and mortar that compose it, after its consecration than before? Does the quality of holiness belong to *matter*? Does it not belong exclusively to *mind*? Perfect nonsense to consecrate, holify wood, plaster, pews, steeple! Too absurd to require exposition. And yet, to make it a profanation of holy things, a desecration of the sanctuary, to allow any but an ordained minister to mount the pulpit, or anything but the sectarian dogma that consecrated it may allow to be uttered within its walls! Science—Nature—Man! Oh, horrible! what Profanity! Desecration! And then too, a bishop, a church, consecrated by Catholics, is catholic-holy, but *un-holy* to all Protestants; while priests and churches consecrated by Trinitarians, are trinitarian-holy, but unitarian-unholy; and so on of all the sects. I have no patience with *sectarian* religion, sectarian holiness, sectarian churches, ministers, doctrines, any thing sectarian.

SECTION VI.

RELIGIOUS SOCIETIES, OR ASSOCIATIONS.

NEXT to Clergyman, come Religious Societies, or bodies of religionists associated together for religious objects. Is this Phrenological? Clearly so. The principle already explained, that the social affections should combine with the moral sentiments, decides this matter in favor of religious organizations. But, it also says, that the basis of such organizations should be *voluntary association*, and without one iota of compulsion or restraint. Phrenology goes in for the largest liberty, especially as regards the moral sentiments. It does *not* believe in creeds, in any form; for this implies that they must govern our belief, and this trammels that perfect liberty which the nature of man requires. All prescription, all proscription, are abhorrent to this science. I will not here stop to inquiry wherein, but shall

probably demonstrate this principle hereafter. Suffice it for the present to observe, that the faculty of will, in like manner with all the other faculties, should combine with the moral faculties. Where there is compulsion of any kind, in any form, there liberty is abridged, and with it virtue and enjoyment. Man was never made to think by proxy, or to pin his faith on creeds or on leaders. Every man has or should have, religious feelings, intellect, and will, and should exercise all three *together*. Should think *for himself*, without let or hindrance, and take the consequences. Perfect liberty of thought and action is a cardinal doctrine of Phrenology. But all creeds, and all the religious organizations of the day, operate *against* this liberty. Think of it! The Council of Trent legislating for the consciences of men! The General Assembly, telling their churches and members what they shall believe, and what not! The Pope of Rome, telling intelligent beings what is heresy, and what not! Or the Methodist Conference saying, believe this, reject that! Every thing of this kind—the entire paraphrenalia of modern religious associations—in *character*, is on a par with the fires of Smithfield, and the Inquisition. There are faggots and inquisitions in our day, in our midst, and I doubt not but that some readers have been scorched. I have, and expect to be again. But, having on the coat of truth, woven with asbestos, I tell them to fire away, for they are only scorching themselves. I boldly aver, that there is more of religious tyranny than of all other kinds of tyranny put together. Men must *think in the traces*—must *believe by rule*—or else have all their business, all their influence, taken from them. We declaim against the intolerance of the Catholics. They are intolerant. But the Protestants are about as much so. I verily believe, that if the civil law did not step in and prevent, religionists of our day would burn each other at the stake, for opinion's sake—as the honest and virtuous Quaker has been burnt—as Salem witches were murdered! They do all but hang and burn now. They do even worse. They rob of character. They slander, and do the worst they can. Instance the treatment of the Come-outers.* If they had been very devils,

* I do not choose this illustration in order to side with the Come-outers. I say they are persecuted, but I also say that they show precisely the intolerent spirit towards their enemies that their enemies do towards them. Both deserve censure. At least, it is all wrong for them to disturb the meetings of others. If others want meetings, or ministers, or what not, be it even liquor, let them have them. Let all men do exactly as they please. Simply point out their errors, in the spirit of kindness of course, and then let them chose and act for themselves.

they should not have been treated as many of them undoubtedly were. Would not some folks like to burn a Rodgers now alive, as somebody burnt his ancestor? Shame! a burning shame! Forbidden by the Bible! In the teeth of Phenology! And for opinion's sake! Put on the straight-jacket of creeds, and hew every man's mind down to it, lengthwise, breadthwise, all wise (if you hew him in pieces) so that you but make him fit into the hole dug out for him! And then call that *religion*! Religion it is, but it is that of popery. It is *propensity*-religion. It has not one generous trait to recommend it. And what is more, each sect has got its own straight-jacket, and is trying to fit not only their own members to it, but also all the world besides.

But the worst of all is, that they require us to believe lies, and then put us into the Inquisition, because we will not comply. To be *compelled* to believe any thing, even the truth, is horrible. But to be obliged to believe error, or else to be put upon the rack!—don't call yourselves *Christians*! “A rose by any other name may smell as sweetly.” The Bible speaks of that day as most glorious, when every man shall worship God “under his own vine and fig-tree.” And so it will be; but, though man is a little nearer to that blessed period than in the dark ages, he is a long way from it yet. Men are yet attempting to cram their creeds down each others throats; and “might is right.” What moral man but dispises the politics of the day, for turning men *out* of office, and putting them *in*, for opinion's sake, and thus destroying the freedom of the elective franchise. Contemptible? And much the very same spirit of proscription runs through nearly every sect, only that it is plied with greater minuteness and efficacy by the latter than by the former. Why did not Jesus Christ catch Judas by his collar, and, after jerking and twiching him about, cuffing and pelting him almost to death, pitch him out of the pale of discipleship? And what would you have thought of him if he had thus treated even Judas? What do you think of yourselves! and that too though your opponents are as sincere in belief, irreproachable in life, as yourself, perhaps more so? Away! It is *not* Christianity—it is narrow-minded, bigotted, tyrannical, sectarian deviltry. I mean, to esteem, or treat *voluntary* man any the better or worse because he does or does not *believe* as you do. Let him believe as *he* pleases, and you believe as *you* please, yet both continue to be as cordial friends as ever. But enough of this painfully disgusting subject. Let us all do unto others as we would have them do unto us. As we all like to think and act for ourselves, let us yield the same liberty to

others, and yet not think any the worse of them therefore. And let intellect be the only weapon with which to propagate the peaceful religion of Jesus Christ. Let Mahomet make men religious by the sword. Let the Pope propagate popery by means of the Inquisition. Let Protestant dissenters employ in effect the same odious, anti-republican, anti-christian *spirit* against which they themselves protested and rebelled. But let Phrenologists take the atheist by the hand as cordially as they do the faithful, and give and take the largest liberty.

The only principle on which all religious associations, and indeed *all* associations, should proceed, is that of the natural attractions of kindred minds for each other. No formal reception. No expulsion. Let members come and go at pleasure, and believe and do what they please, influenced only through the medium of intellect. Let the pleasure taken in each others society be our only creed—our only bond of union.

SECTION VII.

PRAYER.—ITS DUTY.—ITS EFFICACY.

VENERATION prays. Prayer is then our duty, as it certainly is our pleasure. This has been already shown. But it remains to answer the question: Does praying for any given thing have any tendency to bring about the end desired? Does it alter the course of the Deity? Does it change the immutable plans of the Almighty? Does it set aside the laws of cause and effect? No, neither. Then, "How can it be efficacious, which the Bible abundantly assures us it is?" Simply thus: We cannot pray for a thing very earnestly without *desiring* it as earnestly. Indeed, prayer is but desire, and each is proportionate to the other. Now, who does not know that when we *desire* a given thing very much, we naturally, necessarily put forth corresponding efforts to obtain the thing desired; or, what is the same thing, *prayed* for? And who does not know that this effort, this application of appropriate causes to the production of the effects desired, tends to bring about the end prayed for just as we produce a crop of corn, or wheat, or peas, or whatever else we pray for. We pray for every thing we want, and every single thing we effect, is but an answer to prayer. To pray for a thing and not to put forth the corresponding effort is but mockery—is no prayer, no desire, for desire and effort

go together *pari passu*.* Neither can be without the other, and the degree of either is the measure of the other, and generally, of the *efficacy* of the prayer; though that is also affected by the amount of *causality* brought to bear upon the end prayed and labored for. Causality must accompany veneration—a doctrine already urged.

“But,” says a truly pious Christian, “we sometimes pray for things beyond our power to effect, and on which causes cannot be, and are not, brought to bear. For instance, I prayed earnestly for the conversion of a certain impenitent sinner. I said not a word to him. I used no means. But he was converted, and in answer to my prayers.” Agreed. “A mother prays for her son who is far off, and wrestles in spirit for days, but holds no communication with him. Still, he is converted. So, with hardened sinners sometimes in revivals. So, in regard to praying for the sick, and their almost miraculous recovery, and in cases innumerable where your plausible exposition will not apply.”

First: In the next chapter, I shall present a doctrine in relation to spiritual influences which will show how it is that your prayers for an impenitent sinner operated as causes, to bring him to repentance. Men commune with each other *spiritually* as well as sensibly. Man has a spiritual nature, a magnetic, immaterial nature, that is not always chained down to his body, but, bursting the shackles of clay, leaps over immeasurable space, and knows neither time nor distance, but is indeed and in truth a spirit. This state is pre-eminently a state of prayer. And in this state, though the mother sees not her son with material eyes, or addresses him with her voice, yet her spirit holds communion with his spirit, and his with hers. Though you see not, speak not to the impenitent sinner for whom you pray, yet your spirit yearns for his spirit, and impresses him with that religious feeling which pervades, engrosses, your own soul, which becomes the cause, and his conversion, the effect. The organs are all catching. The exercise of any faculty in one, naturally, necessarily, excites the same faculty in another. Anger in one electrifies all around him with the same angry feeling. So with the religious spirit. The religious feelings becoming roused in one, excite the same in another. These two combine and reaugment and rekindle similar feelings in the souls of others, and thus the “revival” goes on till the very atmosphere becomes charged with the religious fluid

* “With even pace,” I sometimes quote Latin because it is often appropriate and expressive, and because I could wish men generally knew more about languages.

thrown off by so many, which spirit impresses the impenitent and finally converts them.

Secondly : Our world is governed throughout by *cause and effect*. Nothing occurs that is not *caused*. And this is as true of the world of mind as of that of matter. For one, I am not atheist enough to believe that the *first* thing ever occurred without being *caused*. Nor can I admit that, after the Deity has got his plan all laid right in infinite wisdom and for the greatest good of the greatest number, that the prayers of mortals will either change the purpose of high Heaven,* or nullify the laws of causation as to the thing prayed for. Such are not my views of God or nature. If, reader, they are yours, I pity you. I pray that you may see your error, and I will do my best to get my prayer answered ; that is, to convince you that such notions show your views of God to be extremely limited and erroneous.

Intelligent reader ; while this view of prayer diminishes nought from the efficacy of prayer, it presents the character of God in a dignified light, and sustains the great arrangement of cause and effect in all its power, in all its universality.

It remains to add, that both *verbal* prayer and also *public* prayer, find their counterpart in Phrenology ; the former in the spontaneous disposition of language to clothe thoughts and feelings in appropriate expressions, and of adhesiveness, which, with veneration, inculcates *social* prayer. On these two principles, grow both *vocal* prayer and that *social* prayer in which one is spokesman for the others. Praying with and for others, intensifies the action and extends the scope of veneration, and thereby increases the pleasure, and the profit to be derived from its exercise.

* In making this allusion to the doctrine of Divine decrees, I do not wish to be understood to advocate the existence of such decrees ; nor do I now wish to be understood as abrogating this doctrine. I simply say let it stand untouched for the present.

SECTION VIII.

RELIGIOUS CREEDS, CEREMONIES, OBSERVANCES, ETC.

WE cannot well close our observations on this faculty without remarking upon religious forms, ceremonies, rites, observances &c. Do they aid veneration, or augment its action? If so, they are good. If not, they are useless, besides being liable to cheat us with the shadow without the substance.

Phrenology answers this question *negatively*. It says, that as friendship is *impeded* by ceremonies, so is veneration. Gushing friendship is all cordiality. It knows no intervention between the feeling and the expression. It requires to go through no ceremony in order to express itself. So with the religious feelings. And as, when a would-be friend receives you very *politely* and *ceremoniously*, you may know that he does not *feel* friendship, but only puts on its semblance, so when religious ceremonies are rigidly observed, take it for granted, that it is *mainly* ceremony. That there is very little soul or religion in it.

And I cannot but think this to be the New Testament view of this matter. I do think, that Christ took special pains to do away with *all* rites, ceremonies, forms, &c. except the two baptism and the communion, and has not left *one form*, except a short prayer, on record. He does not say that we shall begin our set worship, (or even that we shall have any set, formal worship,) with asking a blessing; to be followed by reading a portion of the Bible, and this, by singing, and this by a *long* prayer; this again by singing, this by a sermon, and this by a *short* prayer, a sing, and the benediction. One would think this specific routine, if not absolutely necessary to salvation, at least had some saving virtue in it, and hence its universal adoption. Phrenology sees no special virtue in the Episcopalian or Catholic form of service.—(No heaven-wide difference between them.) It sets no store by creeds, by councils, by religious liturgies, prayer-books, homilies, and all the *attaché* of modern religion. Away with them all. They but *interrupt* thy communion with God from thy heart. And if thy religious feelings and aspirations are so weak that these printed prayers and set forms are necessary, are even helps to devotion, why thy religion is *weak indeed!* and thou art making it still weaker.

Break away from all shadows. Regard only the *substance*. Exercise the religious feelings. Forms or no forms, printed prayers or vocal prayers, or no formal, outward expression of prayers at all, so that thy heart but communes with God. So that thy feelings are but softened down by prayer's subduing influences; so that thy soul is bedewed with the holy, happy, soul-satisfying worship of thy God. But, beware that these ceremonies do not leave thee the shadow for the substance.

Quite analogous to ceremonies, are creeds, articles of faith, &c. Phrenology discards them. It is like measuring out a given kind of food to each and all members of the human family, and then compelling them to eat this particular dish, (perhaps dose,) and to eat no more, no less, nothing else. And that dish, too, all embittered and even poisoned with some *ism*. It is like making a bedstead, and stretching those who are too short to fill it, and cutting off unfeelingly those who are too long till they come within its iron dimensions. It also abridges liberty of thought. Above all things, it is odious to coerce belief. Many a hypocrite do these creeds make; for he who is true to the faith, gets *patronized*, and he who is not, is not only neglected, but is *proscribed*, by a silent influence to be sure, but "by a mighty hand and a stretched out arm" notwithstanding. And modern religion gets paid for this in her having so many tares, and so little wheat. Phrenology says, patronize men none the less, respect them none the less for opinion's sake. Let a man be an infidel, so that he is sincere, treat him just as though he believed with you. Agree to disagree. Proscriptions for opinion's sake, are detestable. Out upon politicians for giving offices exclusively to their *own* partizans. It is a direct and palpable interference with the elective franchise, with that pretended, air-bubble *liberty*, in which we glorify *ourselves*. It must bring even politics, (scandalous, contemptible, as they are any how,) into disgrace with every sensible man. But, to carry this proscription into religion—to buy up religion as they buy up votes—shameful, despicable! And yet this is the nature of all creeds.

"Oh, but," say you, "we want it as a test of their belief. We want none with us who do not believe with us." I repeat: Let members come and go at pleasure. Let the natural bonds of friendship and adhesion alone operate. Let those form themselves into religious associations whose opinions and feelings naturally, mutually, attract each other. Let those go elsewhere whose pleasure in the association will not bind them to it. Let those come in who are attracted to it, just as the literary seek the society of the literary; and so of other

instances of association. Phrenology advocates the largest liberty. This liberty, especially of opinion, is the glorious birth-right of every human being. Upon this liberty, creeds trespass. It sets articles of faith to thinking for those who subscribe thereto. They can be valuable only as they are minute; and if they are minute, they divide, bewilder, injure their subscribers, injure all.

This train of remark, or these applications of Phrenology, might be extended at pleasure, but I forbear. Reader, carry them out for yourself. Drink in the fundamental principles, and then run them up and out for yourself in their most beautiful, most interesting applications.

CHAPTER III.

THE SPIRITUAL.

God is a Spirit; and they that worship Him, must worship Him in spirit and in truth.

SECTION I.

SPIRITUALITY, OR MARVELLOUSNESS.—ITS ANALYSIS AND BEARINGS.

Perception and feeling of the spiritual; belief in the superhuman; trust in Divine providences for guidance; intuitive perception of future events; the spirit of prophecy; prescience; that spiritual state of mind and feeling, which, as it were, separates the soul from the body, and perceives things independently of the physical senses or other faculties; Faith.

MAN has a soul—a spiritual essence—which sees without eyes, hears without ears, operates disembodied, and connects him with heaven, and with God. Without this soul, this spirituality, this disembodied susceptibility, how could he form the least idea of a spiritual state, of spiritual beings, or of God as a Spirit, or of any thing at all related to the spiritual? What better idea of any thing spiritual, of any thing material, than the blind man, (mentioned on p. 53,) did of colors? How completely foreign to all his perceptions would be even the being of a God? He could conceive of him only as a material being or thing, and could form no conception whatever, either **right** or wrong, of any being, thing, state, independent of matter, any

more than the blind man could of colors, or the total idiot of first principles.

But, man has these perceptions and feelings. They are in-wrought into his moral constitution, his very *being*. They are not creatures of education; for how can that be educated which does not exist? How cultivate the spiritual, when we can form no idea whatever of the thing to be cultivated? And the universality of this sentiment, in the form of a belief in ghosts, in an hereafter, in transmigration, a heaven, a hell, and the like, in all ages, and among all mankind, establishes the existence of some faculty analogous to the definition given above, from the exercise of which these perceptions and feelings proceed. Precisely the same argument, *mutatis mutandis*,* which proved the existence of veneration, will equally prove the existence of this faculty. And this existence and analogy established, the same argument of adaptation which established the existence of a God, (p. 47,) will establish both the existence of a spiritual state, the spiritual existence of God, and the existence of spiritual beings. Let us apply it.

Belief in a spiritual existence, is universal. From the earliest records of man, he has held converse with spiritual beings, and has had his heaven and hell. Adam, Cain, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Hagar, Esau, Moses, Aaron, Joshua, David, Solomon, the Prophets, in sacred history; the druids of our ancestors; Eneas, and all the ancients; all paganism, all Christendom, all mankind, in all ages, have talked with Jehovah, or with gods, or angels, or devils, or departed spirits. Indeed, the entire texture and frame-work of the Bible, of ancient mythology, of Hindoo worship, of Indian worship, of all religion, is a spiritual existence. To deny that man has the sentiment of the spiritual, is utter folly. To assert that it is formed by education, is equal folly; for education can never create *any* thing, only *develop* primary powers. Education must have some *original faculty* upon which to operate; else it is powerless. And, as of veneration, so of the spiritual feeling. If it were not *indigenous*, it would soon be eradicated. At least, it could not pervade the whole human family, and govern them, too, so energetically. A foreign element, a parasite, a feeling for which man had no predisposition, and that was foreign, and therefore repugnant, to the nature of man, could not possibly fasten itself upon that nature and *stay* fastened, and then infuse itself all through that nature as this faculty has done. The supposition is preposterous. For, the mental nature of man, like his physical, would soon expell a foreign intruder, or else merely furnish

* "Those things being changed that require to be changed."

it *room*, but would separate itself therefrom completely. I cannot see that this point requires argument; namely, that this sentiment of the spiritual is CONSTITUTIONAL in man.

Besides: Man *requires* such a faculty. Many things can be known only by its instrumentality. We often require to know what causality cannot reach, because it has no data on which to operate, or because unknown contingencies will render the results unknown; in short, which can be arrived at through no other faculty, but which can be by this. Which often is by this. Man has a power of vision which the light of the sun cannot enlighten, cannot bedim. Which thick darkness cannot obstruct. Which penetrates the unknown future. Which dives deep into the sea of time, and gathers pearls from ... bottomless abyss. Which distance does not intercept. Which sees, not with the natural eye, but uses the telescope of angels. Which reads the book of fate before time has broken its seals. Which descends danger, and either shuns it or prepares therefor. Which precedes time and plucks many a golden apple, a delicious fruit, before Saturn* opens them to the gaze and the contemplation of all. Which looks down the long vista of time, and surveys all coming ages at one great view. Which soars above the clouds of heaven. Which leaps death's dark hiatus, and reveals to man what shall be hereafter, when the moon dies, the sun goes out, and rolling ages speed their onward flight through eternity!

But to be specific. First: Man needs *some* element in his nature to *spiritualize* that nature. To throw off its terrestriality, and etherealize his soul. To shake off the materiality of his nature, and clothe himself with immateriality, as with a garment of glory. To elevate his entire nature. To whisper constantly in his ears that God is a spirit; that he himself is a spirit; that anon, he will join a spiritual throng which no man can number, whose bodies will not wear out; will only brighten with age. Oh! thou God of spirits innumerable! Can we ever duly love Thee, duly praise Thee, for this the most glorious department of our nature? Oh! do Thou spiritualize our inmost souls, that we may see Thee, worship Thee, as Thou art! That we may cheer on earth by tastes, by bountiful repasts, of heaven." I do certainly regard this view of the nature of man as beautiful, glorious, beyond all expression, all conception. Without it, existence, how tame! Death, our extinction! Life, transient! Eternity, banished! No conception of an hereafter, of a God! But, blessed be God, for this element of Spirituality. For the lessons of immortality, of divinity it teaches.

* The god of time.

Secondly: The spirit of man does certainly reveal his coming destiny. Man is often forewarned. Often impressed with the feeling that that will happen which is about to happen. A few examples:—

The lamented Upsher, at the very time when the fatal gun was loading that blew him to atoms, and immediately before its disastrous explosion, in drinking a toast, took up an empty bottle, and remarked, that these *dead bodies*, (empty bottles,) must be cleared away before he could drink his toast. Setting it aside, he took up, by chance, nother empty bottle, * repeated, that he could not give his toast till the *dead bodies* were cleared away. Nor did he. In a few seconds his own dead body, along with many others, were indeed "*cleared away.*" In conjunction, read what follows from a correspondent of the Boston Daily Advertiser, who says:—

"It is worthy of remark, as a singular instance of pre-supposed danger, that the late Secretary of State, Mr. Upshur, could not be prevailed upon to join in either of the previous excursions in the Princeton down the Potomac, assigning as a reason *his fears of some disaster from the big cannon*. It was only by much persuasion that his prejudices were surmounted, and he prevailed upon to unite with other members of the Cabinet, and many personal friends, in accompanying the President on that greatly to be deplored occasion. Of this remarkable fact there can be no doubt, for I have it from one who heard it from the Secretary's own lips, wondering at the same time that an individual possessed of so much good sense, and strong nerve, should permit his fears or prejudices thus to influence him."

While going down to the Princeton in the morning, Com. Kennon, another of the killed, remarked to Capt. Saunders, that if any accident should befall him on this occasion, he [Capt. S.] would be the next in command at the Navy Yard.

Judge Wilkins had a similar premonition, to which he took heed, and by which his life was saved. As the fatal gun was about to be fired, he remarked, pleasantly, "Though Secretary of War, I don't like this firing, and believe I shall run;" and suiting the action to the word, he retreated to a place of safety. If Judge Upsher or Com. Kennon had heeded their premonitions, so plain, so powerful that they were uttered, and in the face of the ridicule with which they were met, they too would have been saved. So loud was the voice of this spiritual monitor in Judge Upsher, that he could hardly be persuaded to go on

* From all accounts, it would seem, that they had a real drinking frolic on board, and that many were intoxicated. I do not mean entirely drunk, but "essentially corned." What examples for our rulers to set! What a national curse such rulers! And whose money bought that fatal wine? Reader it was *our's*, Comment each for himself.

board, and, when on board, could talk only of "*dead bodies.*" These facts are undoubted. Their inferences are palpable. These facts are recent and striking, but they are by no means alone. Another:

Sudden Death. The Bay State Democrat of last evening announces the death, on Sunday morning, of the Rev. David Damon, Pastor of the Unitarian Society at West Cambridge. He was engaged at Reading on Friday afternoon last, in preaching a funeral sermon, when he was attacked with a fit of apoplexy, which has thus proved fatal. A short time since, while delivering an address at a consecration of a rural cemetery at West Cambridge, he made the remark, that possibly he should be the first to repose in death beneath its shades; and the words of the speaker have literally proved true!—*Courier.*

Maria Martin was killed by her sweetheart, William Corder, and buried in a barn at Ipswich, England; and he left for London. Her mother-in-law dreamed three nights in succession, that she had been killed, and her body buried in a certain red barn. Her *dreams alone* induced a search in the barn, where they discovered the body, and in the exact place where she dreamed it was, and dressed in men's clothes, as she dreamed it was dressed. He was executed in 1827.

The mother of McCoy, the Sabbath before he was killed in the ring at White Plains, while lying down to rest was awakened by a horrible dream which so terrified her that she sprung from her bed, and run into the room where the rest of the family were, exclaiming, "I see him horribly beaten the blood gushing from his head with great fury." The next Tuesday, he was beaten till he was blind, and died from profuse bleeding.

A highly nervous woman, insisted that her sons should tackle up one cold night, and go a given distance in a certain direction, where they would find some persons in distress. She had had other premonitions, which they had found to be as she directed, and therefore went, and found some persons who had been turned over in the snow, and but for this timely assistance, would have perished. With her, such prophecies were so common, and so certain, that her family always followed her visions, because they always found them so uniformly correct.

The wife of the Adams who was murdered by Colt, dreamed, two successive nights, before the murder, that she saw the lifeless corpse of her husband, all mangled, wrapped in a sail, and packed away in a box. She told this to her husband, and remonstrated almost with frantic earnestness the last time he went out, to prevent his going, urging as her sole reason, that he would be murdered. So deep was

the saddening impression left upon her mind, that she felt little surprise at his not returning, alleging that he had been murdered.

Mr. R. S. says, he always dreams out any thing remarkable before it happens. He dreamed one night that he struck a young friend of his, and that the blood gushed out of the wound. In a day or two afterwards, this same young friend of whom he dreamed, becoming intoxicated, demanded his wages. Mr. S. refused to give them to him till he got sober, because he knew he would waste them, and told him to come sober to-morrow, and he should have them. But no, he must have them then, and took up a club to beat Mr. S., who was obliged to clinch in with him, in order to save himself. This young friend embraded his hands in the hair of Mr. S., and tried to choke him, till Mr. S., after remonstrating with him, and telling him he should have to hurt him, finally struck, and ruptured a blood vessel, which caused copious bleeding. The young man, however, recovered, and thanked Mr. S. for not paying him.

A friend of mine, living in Albion, Orleans county, N. Y., tackled up his horses to go a few miles, and, before starting, called his family together, and, what he had never before been known to do, kissing them affectionately, bid them all good by. "Why, husband, what in the matter? Are you not coming back soon?" said his wife. "Yes, I calculate to return about three o'clock; but, somehow or other, it seems to me just as though I never should see you again," was his answer. He started. His horses took fright, ran away, and killed him, and he was brought back to his family a corpse. This I had from his wife.

Abercombie states several analogous facts. Time would fail me to narrate what I have seen, felt, and heard fully authenticated. Indeed, the world is full of them. So full, that it requires a greater stretch of Marvellousness to disbelieve and account for them, than to ascribe them to the natural workings of this faculty. How often, when our sky is cloudless, and every prospect bright, does a strange feeling flit lightly cross our mind, whispering bad news or trouble in our ears—faintly, perhaps, but so that we *feel* it, and so it turns out to be. And, again, how often, when hope is blasted, our way is hedged in with thorns, and no bright spot appears on our horizon, do we internally feel that all will yet be well, and so it comes to pass? So strong is this sentiment in man, that it has given rise to the proverb, "*I feel it in my bones.*"

But more: The canon of prophecy is not yet sealed. Men prophesy in this our day. Their spiritual vision precedes the rapid flight of time and fore-shadows coming events. A few facts:—

Elias Hicks prophesied many years ago, that, in 1842, England would be without a King, the United States without a President, and the times hard in the extreme. And so it came to pass.

There are many now living in Boston, who, eleven years ago, heard Dr. Beecher prophesy, that, in ten years, Tremont Theatre would be converted into a church, and he should preach in it. "And it was so." Just ten years after uttering this prophesy, he preached its dedication sermon. And what is more, he uttered the prophesy when there was no shadow of a prospect of its being fulfilled. The main theatre of Boston -- of New-England -- popular; every thing *against* the prophesy. But it has literally been fulfilled, and "at the time appointed." And what is still more, this prophesy was uttered during a revival, in which this faculty was of course unusually active.

Josephine was Bonaparte's prophetess. He generally followed her advice. She told him *not* to go to Russia that year. He disobeyed. He fell. Indeed, I do not believe the great man ever lived who had not some bosom friend, generally a female, a wife, a sister, a mother, a friend of childhood, or some female friend, whose whole soul is in the cause to which he devotes his life, to give the required advice. This spirituality, this intuition, is in the organization of woman, in the head of woman. But enough. I shall not be believed. Thou' I do not put forth these views as positively as most others that I advance, still, I think them correct. I think I find them advanced by Phrenology. If others think otherwise, they have as good a right to their opinion as I have to mine.

THIRDLY. Man requires and uses this faculty as a guide to truth. "There is a divinity within" some men that siezes truth by a kind of intuition, and without the aid of intellect. That *scent*s truth, as the hound, the fox. That drinks it in as the fish drinks in the water, and with evidence, without evidence, in spite of fallacious evidence, arrives at truth. It aids causality in reasoning. It helps comparison propound analogies. It joins ideality in her sublime reveries, and opens a door for the reception of truth through that channel. It guides the social affections upon proper objects. It warns us of hypocrites, and tells us whom to shun, whom to trust. Man has, or can have, in his own soul, a directory and a compass, to spy out his coming destiny, which, unperverted and properly cultivated, will warn him of approaching danger and point out the road to success and happiness.

But I am talking Greek to many. To most. Few have this organ, except very feebly developed. Miserably small in the American head! Usually, a deep *cavity*, and that in so-called *Christians*. They even *pride* themselves in rejecting Phrenology, Magnetism, every thing,

till they can *see and understand*. Till the *reasons*, and the *whys* and *hows*, are given, and so fully as to breakdown all disbelief. Why the existence of this organ, unless to be *exercised*? Its absence is a great defect. Its presence constitutes a part of every well balanced and truly philosophical mind. If the human mind were so constituted as to admit nothing which it did not see, or else fully comprehend and understand, its progress in knowledge would be exceedingly slow, and its attainments very limited. Children could know little or nothing, for they are incapable of profound reasoning or extensive observation. Indeed, we are obliged to receive much of knowledge on *testimony*. The importance of the function of this faculty, and of duly exercising it, and the utter folly of those who refuse to believe till they can see, know, and understand, is thus too apparent to require comment.

But, since we take Phrenology for granted in the start, why attempt to prove what this science has already proved at our hands? The existence of the faculty, and its analysis in substance, as I have given it, or what is tantamount to it, is set at rest by Phrenology. It not only shows, as in the case of veneration, that all the other faculties are exclusively engrossed each with other functions, but that these apparitions and spiritual impressions are made upon the mind by means of this faculty. Phrenology drives the nail of its existence and then clinches it. It renders its existence and functions *demonstrably certain*.

And glorious indeed are the results to which these inferences conduct us! They open immortality upon our vision. They reveal a spiritual principle in man which age only invigorates, and which will be young far into the vista of eternity. Veneration tells us that there is a God. Spirituality tells us that he is a Spirit, and hope tells us that we shall one day see him as he is, and be like him. Infinitely does it exalt the character and ennoble the nature of man! Glory! Hallalua!

The *argument* by which this existence of a world of spirits is established, is analogous to that employed in proving the existence of a God, from the adaptation of veneration to that existence. Spirituality exists in man. It even forms no inconsiderable a part of his primitive constitution, one of his original elements of mind. This faculty has its counterpart, its adaptation. That adaptation is to a spiritual state. Therefore there is a spiritual state of being adapted to this faculty. Short, but demonstrative. But two points. The existence of this faculty in man, which Phrenology sets completely at rest; and that great law that one thing being adapted to a second, proves the ex

istence of this second. Phrenology says that this faculty exists, and the inference that a spiritual state also exists, that God is a spirit, that man has a spiritual department in his nature, that man can commune with God, with spirits, and with eternity, and kindred inferences, follow as a necessary consequence.

SECTION II.

SPIRITUALITY CONTINUED. INFERENCES.

“To be spiritually minded, is life.”

HAVING demonstrated the existence of this faculty, it remains to point out its legitimate function, and then to draw those inferences dependent thereon.

Prayer—spiritual communion with God—is one of its functions. I have my doubts whether the spirit of prayer is fully understood—whether its true analysis has yet been given. The general impression is that its main object should be to *bring about* something—to supplicate some blessing, obtain some gift from God. This interpretation cannot be sanctioned by Phrenology. This science shows—all nature shows—that the whole universe, God himself included, is governed by immutable, unalterable laws—that causes and effects reign supreme, and allow not the least chance for prayer to effect the least change in effects, because it cannot change their causes. And to suppose that human entreaties can change the mind, the will, the eternal purpose of the Almighty, is utter folly—is downright blasphemy. These notions are revolting to correct notions of the Supreme Ruler of the universe. But, having already refuted the doctrine, let us inquire, What is the true function of prayer, and what its effect?

Its function is the exercise of the self same spiritual feeling already pointed out. The value of this spiritual feeling, has been already shown, and prayer induces this spiritual state of mind. “No man hath seen God at any time, so that we do not, perhaps cannot, know his nature, or the *mode* of his existence; but, be he what he may, prayer assimilates our souls to his soul, and, by frequently throwing us into a spiritual, holy frame of mind, it induces a *permanency* of this spiritual state which foreknows the future, and perceives the truth, as if by magic. When particularly anxious to perceive and enforce truth, I feel like praying, perhaps not audibly, but like throwing myself into this spiritual state in which truth flows into my own soul,

from which it radiates into the souls of all who hear me. I hope I am fully understood as to the effect of prayer on the soul. Hence Paul says, "If any man lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all liberally and upbraideth not." We see, in this aspect of prayer, *how* it is that God giveth wisdom, namely, that by and in the very act of praying, we throw our minds into that spiritual state in which we perceive truth as if by intuition. As a means of arriving at truth, nothing equals prayer, and he who does not pray, is compelled to follow on after truth through the paths of intellect merely, and plod and dig for that which a prayerful spirit perceives at once, and with perfect certainty. And, then, how happy, holy, pure is the praying soul! How transported from earth into that blessed state that awaits the pure in heart! Let scoffers laugh at prayer. Let the sons of sin and lust forget to pray. But let me bow the knee of humble prayer, and lift the eyes of devotion to my God, and hold sweet communion with him till I become embued with his spirit, and am transformed into his image!

I cannot forbear expressing the conviction not only that prayer is not generally understood, but also that there is much *less* prayer in the world than is supposed. Many of our clergymen *preach* in their prayers, and pray as if trying to impress some *truth* upon the mind of the hearers rather than to call out their soul in pure devotion. Let ministers preach when they preach, and pray when they pray. These *preaching* prayers are out of place. Besides, they substitute the form for the thing, and thus satisfy the praying appetite, without feeding the praying spirit.

As to the best *place* for exercising the prayerful spirit, Phrenology is unequivocal in recommending nature, the open fields, the velvet lawn bedecked with flowers, the shaded brook, the mountain cliff. The works of God are wonderfully calculated to impress his being, his attributes upon the soul. They call out the spiritual feeling. They bring us near to God. They assimilate us to him. And I fully believe, that our churches should be generally in the fields of flowers, in the bosom of nature, rather than in houses made with hands. If I were to erect a church, upon the plan propounded by Phrenology, I should build it of trees unsawed rather than of timbers, and of flowers, not with nails. Verdant leaves should be my roof. Paths among flowers should be my aisles. A projecting rock should be my pulpit. Fragrant trees and flowers should be my perfumery. Boquets should be my psalm-books. The chirping songsters of the grove should echo to my notes of praise, and the balmy breezes should waft my prayers to heaven. Suppose that immense sum ex

pended in building Trinity Church, in New-York, had been spent in making a magnificent pleasure park, adapted expressly to call out the religious sentiments, how infinitely more real homage would be offered up to God than will ever be exercised within its massive, fashionable walls! I have no objection to having churches. If they promote the religious feelings, they are useful. If not, they are injurious. But, be they good or bad, to spend so much money in their erection, is making but a poor use of what, if properly applied, spent in works of charity, would do a vast amount of good.

By spiritualizing the soul, prayer prevents grossness and sinful animal indulgence, and refines, elevates, purifies, and exalts the soul more than words can tell, but not more than may every reader experience.

The reader will see an additional reason, from the analysis of this faculty, why revivals of religion and religious exercises should be *permanent*, not transient. The prevalence of a belief in ghosts is in point, and strengthens our position of spiritual premonitions. If you ask me whether I believe in the existence and appearance of ghosts, I say yes, with emphasis. Not that I ever saw one. Nor is it the testimony of others that imparts this confidence. *It is this principle.* I never saw an apparition. My organ of spirituality is too small ever to see one. But I believe this principle. It will not lie. I believe that the spirits of departed friends hover over us, and conduct our choice, our course. I believe the spirit of my departed mother has watched over her son, guided his footsteps into the paths of Phrenology, and still continues to throw around him those spiritual impressions which tells him what is truth, and guides him in its exposition. She prayed for her oldest son on her dying bed, and even while death was severing her spirit from her body. To these spiritual exercises, reader, you may possibly owe a small debt of gratitude. And if this be delusion, let me be deluded. Let me be joined to this idiot, if idol it be.

I believe farther: If we were sufficiently spiritualized, we might hold converse with the spirits of our departed friends, with angels, and with God! I believe they might become our guardian angels, to tell us all what we should do, and what avoid. I believe we might talk with them, as did Abraham, Moses, and the prophets! And when our friends die, we need not be separated from them, though we live and they are dead. They are in a state more exalted than ours, but, if we were as spiritually minded as we are capable of being, we could still hold direct communion with them, and they would become spiritual conductors, carrying a torch-light by which we could guide our erring footsteps into the paths of success, of holiness, of happiness.

If this be so, man has in his own bosom a directory, a spy on his coming destiny, which, unperverted and properly cultivated, will warn him of approaching danger, and point out the course of success and happiness.

Animal Magnetism also establishes the spiritual, immaterial existence of mind in a state separate from matter, as clearly as any fact in nature can be demonstrated by experiment; for, first, it throws the mind into a state probably analogous to that after death, in which the body has little control over it, in which time and space are unknown, in which it sees without the eyes, or as disembodied mind sees by a spiritual cognizance, and in its independent capacity as mind; and, 2dly, when the magnetizer and the magnetized are both pure minded, the latter sees and holds converse with the spirits of the departed, and receives from them warnings, directions, council, for those who make the proper inquiry. Words cannot express what I have seen in this respect. And, oh! If I have ever seen a happy soul, it was one in this state, with the moral organs highly charged, and all excitement removed from the propensities. Description would be sacrilege! And then to have this holy spell broken in upon by exciting one or more of the propensities at the same time! But I am utterly incapable of describing the scene. Still, I saw how ineffably holy and happy the human soul could become by the exercise of the moral sentiments, and particularly that faculty under consideration. The Reverend Mr. Tenant of New Jersey, who was in a trance three days, and who, in that state saw and heard what mortal tongue may not, could not tell, was in this spiritual state. So are those at religious meetings, particularly camp-meetings, who pray and sing till they "have the power," as it was formerly called. This having the power, fanatical as most religious men call it, is sanctioned by Phrenology. It requires guiding, but it could, should be exercised till it transformed earth into heaven, and feasted our souls with rich foretastes of those joys which "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive," but which are laid up for the spiritually minded. But enough, I am treading on holy ground. Few will appreciate. Fewer still experience. But *woman will* appreciate, will feel. To her I commend these remarks. Her I exhort to breathe forth these holy aspirations, "for in due time, ye shall reap if ye faint not." And, oh! such a harvest. A feast on the food of angels! A banquet served up in the palaces of heaven! Fruit from the tree of eternity! Reach forth. It is within your grasp. Pluck and eat, and give to others, that they may eat and live.

SECTION III.

SPECIAL PROVIDENCES

“Trust in the Lord.”

CLOSELY connected with this subject, and deserving of remark in this connection, is the doctrine of “DIVINE PROVIDENCES” so called. Spiritual guidance, has already been seen to be recognized by Phrenology. But about *providential interpositions* it knows nothing. Whatever effects do not result from *causation*, or, especially, whatever *interrupts* causation, it discards. Nature never allows anything to step in between causes and effects. Spiritual impressions may *guide*, and hence may be called providential interpositions by their *guiding* our choice; but, they never cut off legitimate effects from their true causes, and substitute others. Still, an event is none the less providential when a spiritual precaution or monition forewarns us to escape danger, or induces us to choose our best good, than if the laws of nature were interrupted and the great arrangement of cause and effect rendered null and void; for the results are equally beneficial to us. If our organization be fine, and if this feeling of spirituality be cultivated, we shall be preserved from all harm thereby, and guided into the right course, so that our happiness be secured. And the fact is beautiful to philosophy, and encouraging to mortals, that those who are the most perfectly organized, should receive most of this heavenly guidance. By cultivating those highest elements of our nature, already specified, we shall be most effectually promoting our own highest happiness.

But we cannot dismiss this subject of providence without exposing a prevailing error in regard to what are considered providences. Spirituality perceives, follows, and trusts in these spiritual guidings; hope expects good to result therefrom; veneration adores God therefor; and benevolence adoring God for his kindness, trusts in him that these spiritual guidings will be for *good*; and all, guided by causality, that they will harmonize with fixed laws. This principle leads to the inference that all spiritual guidings and providences, as far as these providences exist, are *for good*—are never afflictive, but always pleasurable. Nor does the benevolent Creator of all things do evil that good may come. He does not give pain first, that he may give pleasure afterwards. In every single instance throughout creation, he so arranges it as to give *all* pleasure, and no pain in order to arrive at that

pleasure. What right have we, then, to suppose that he makes us suffer in order afterward to cause us enjoyment, for this would be a *toto celo* departure from every principle, every fact of his entire government, and in direct conflict with that view of the divine character and government already evolved from Phrenology. No; *afflictive* providences do not exist. All pain is but *punishment*, not providences—the natural consequences of violated law, not divine chastisements. God does not carelessly dip the arrow of affliction in the wormwood of his malignity or wrath, and thrust it causelessly into the soul of man. All that God does, from beginning to end, is all promotive of happiness. The idea, so often held forth from the pulpit, that sickness and death in the prime of life, are afflictive providences, sent to *chastise* us, is onerous; for they are the *penalties* of violated physical laws. Sickness and premature death are as much the *effects* of their legitimate causes, as any other event is an effect of its cause. A child dies, and the parents, while bleeding under the wounds of lacerated parental love, console themselves by “The Lord gave, the Lord hath taken away. Blessed be the name of the Lord.” “It is the *Lord's* doings,” &c.; whereas *they* killed their child. They allowed it to disorder its stomach and bowels by eating cucumbers, or green corn, or unripe fruit, or too much fruit, and then it was exposed and took cold, was badly doctored, had the summer complaint, and died. Or, in the fall and spring, it was exposed till it took a violent cold; a fever set in, and fastening upon the throat, it had the croup and died. Or, upon the head, and it died of brain fever. Its sickness and death were *caused*, and that by violations of the physical laws. It was murdered by neglect or improper treatment, and then all this blame is thrown off from the guilty perpetrators, by charging it to the providence of God. Just as though God killed your child!

An anecdote in point. One Christmas evening, the parents of a child tickled it mightily with the idea, that if it would hang up its stocking, Santa Claus would come in the night and fill it full of good things. She did so, and in the morning while yet in bed called for her stocking, which she found filled with raisins, nuts, rich cakes, &c., and which she continued to eat till she had swallowed the whole. She was plied through the early part of the day with additional good things; till at three o'clock she was taken in a fit, and died at night. Dissection showed the cause of her death to have been simply, solely, an overloaded stomach, and yet, at her funeral, the good old minister soothed the lacerated feelings of parental anguish by telling the parents that “It was the *Lord's* doings, to which they must bow in silence

—that it was a mysterious providence, sent as a chastisement, to wean them from earth and earthly things, and place their souls on heaven and heavenly things.” And yet both the gormandizing of the child and also the dissection, showed its death to have been caused solely by parental indulgence. I doubt not but every reader has seen cases in point. And then, what idea must he have of God, who suppose he killed the child, not only without law, but directly in the teeth of those very laws which he himself has established. And even if they think he meant it for their good, just as though he did not know how to seek their good without making them thus miserable.

Similar remarks appertain to the sickness of adults. We go on to violate every law of physiology, and for a series of years, and then, when nature would fain vindicate her laws by punishing their aggression, we deafen our ears and harden our hearts to her remonstrances by accusing the Deity of stepping aside from his laws, and tormenting us by his afflictive providences. The plain fact is this, that *we need never be sick*. We have no *right* to be sick. We are *culpable* for being sick, for all of every thing is caused. All sickness is caused, and caused directly by the violation of some physiological law. Let parents as parents, obey these laws, and then let children be brought up in their obedience, and then continue therein all the days of their lives, *no sickness, no pain, would, COULD occur*. Every organ of the body was made to be healthy, none to be sickly. Health is but the *natural, primitive*, action of them all, while sickness is their abnormal or painful action. Let them alone, save giving them their unnatural stimulants, and they will all go on to perform their normal, healthy function from the cradle to the grave. No truth is more self-evident, than that health is the natural function of every faculty, and sickness their perverted function. If we do not *make* ourselves sick, we shall always be well. Teeth were never made to ache. They were made to masticate food. They give us pain only when we cause their decay by abusing them. The Indian never has decayed or aching teeth, nor need we if we take proper care of them. So with every other organ of the body. They all give us pain only after we have abused them, and in *consequence* of that abuse. And the natural order of death is, that, like the setting sun, we should gradually descend the hill of life and die by slow and imperceptible degrees, just as the western sky becomes less and less bright, till, finally, the last rays have taken their departure. Violent death, in the prime of life, is most abhorrent—is inconceivably shocking to Benevolence, and forms no part of the *natural* order of things, or of the Providence of God. We die *in spite of*

Providence, instead of by its hand. "We give *ourselves* the wounds we feel. We drink the poisonous gall, and then sickness and death punish us for our transgressions.

If these principles were not rendered perfectly *demonstrative* by physiology, I would cut off my right hand rather than pen them; for they are most unpopular, and especially will excite religious prejudice against me. But they *are true*, and will ultimately bear sway. Reader, let me entreat thee to examine this point carefully one full year, and then you will coincide with me. I grant that sickness and death are often induced by parents, either as parents, in their having some hereditary disease, or by their not understanding how to preserve the healths of their children; still, they are never providential, but always *punishments*, and imply guilt *some where*.

If I be asked, why I bring forward a point so unpopular, I answer, *to save life*. As long as men continue to regard sickness and death as providential, they will not be led to obey the natural laws. But the doctrine urged above, cannot be believed without powerfully enforcing obedience to those laws; and I doubt not but a knowledge of this very principle will enable many a reader to *escape* many an afflictive providence, and to enjoy the society of his children, companions, and friends many years longer than he otherwise would—reason enough, surely.

SECTION IV.

CONVERSION; THE OPERATIONS OF THE HOLY GHOST; DIVINE GRACE;
FAITH, ETC.

"Unless ye be converted, &c. ye cannot see the kingdom of God."

THE principles thus represented teach us the true doctrine of those spiritual influences called conversion, the operation of Divine grace, the Holy Spirit, &c. That a Divine Spirit exists, has been already shown. Also, that it is in every place. And that prayer communes with him, &c. But, the tendency of the principles already presented, shows that *we seek him*, not he us. He does not turn aside from the usual operations of nature, to pour out his spirit upon mankind. Or, rather, that spirit is like the wind that blows every where, except where it is excluded, and that will blow even there, and with the same freedom, if the doors and windows of the human soul be but opened

for its reception. In conversion, I believe. It consists simply in the *spiritualization* of our natures already pointed out, the main medium of which is marvellousness. By operating upon this faculty and organ, it extends the range of its action so as to quicken benevolence, veneration, hope, conscientiousness, and the whole moral group; and this gives them that ascendancy over the propensities which we have already shown to constitute virtue, the product of which is "joy in the Holy Ghost," moral purity, and consequently happiness. Natural, it is; supernatural, it is not. Not for the chosen few—the elect. But as free as the air of heaven, or the gushing fountain. All can, who will, drink in these heavenly influences—be converted—be holy—be happy. Nor should any wait to be operated on. They must operate on themselves—must pray—must *spiritualize* themselves. And so we must spiritualize, convert, one another; for all the organs are capable of being excited. The exercise of these spiritual feelings in one, will tend to excite them in others, and then again in others; thus widening their influences and happying mankind beyond what tongue can express or mind conceive.

Prayer, being an exercise of this spiritual feeling, is eminently calculated to promote it in others; that is, to convert others—to convert ourselves. So, praying for the impenitent is equally calculated, as already shown, to spiritualize, convert, them. And let all seek these religious, elevating influences, for the same reason that they should eat, or think, or talk; namely, to be happy in their exercise.

But, let these exercises be *permanent*, not transient. To *sudden* conversions, the same principles apply that are already shown to govern revivals. But, the mere statement of the principle is sufficient.

Is it not highly probable, that these principles throw some light on the existence of what is called the Holy Spirit; the Holy Ghost; the Spirit of God, &c.? Do not these phrases refer simply, solely, to that *spiritual* existence of God already pointed out, and refer to the mode of Divine existence, rather than to separate personages of the Deity? At all events, other than this, Phrenology, as far as I am now able to interpret it, knows nothing of the existence of a separate part or person of the Deity corresponding with the usual doctrines of the Holy Ghost.

SECTION V

(CHANGE OF HEART CONTINUED.—OBJECTION ANSWERED.)

MANY believers in the doctrine of a change of heart and life, are unable to reconcile this doctrine with the principles of Phrenology. And as the following quotation from page 410 of "Fowler's Practical Phrenology," states and answers this objection satisfactorily, it is inserted accordingly.

"To the Messrs. Fowlers :

"Sirs,—At your next lecture, I wish you to explain, according to the principles of phrenology, how any material or radical change in a man's moral character, disposition, or conduct, can take place. For example; we frequently see the infidel and irreligious man, suddenly and radically change his sentiments and practices in life, and become pious, reverential and devotional. Now, according to the principles of your system, it seems to follow, that, in reality, there are no such changes, and that they are wholly imaginary or hypocritical, or else, that there must be a corresponding change of the phrenological organs, namely, a sudden *diminution* of one class of organs, and an equally sudden *enlargement* of another class, whose functions are directly opposite.

"That men do often experience these changes, is evident to every one; but that the bumps of the cranium, are subject to such sudden growth and depression, is certainly most doubtful; and, if these organs do not correspond with a man's changes in conduct and disposition, how can they have any reciprocal relation to his true character?
D. J. MALLISON, M. D."

"Admitting this doctrine of a change of character and conduct, called regeneration, as believed in and taught by orthodox Christians, to be *correct*, and the first question to be considered in relation to its bearings upon the doctrines of Phrenology, is, *in what does this change consist?* From even a superficial view of the subject, it is evident, that it does *not* consist either in a *substitution* of one primary mental faculty for an other opposite faculty, or in a *change* of the *original nature and character* of the faculties, or of their *proportional strength*; for, if the subject of this change possessed a strong and original intellect *before* conversion, he has just as strong and as original an intellect *after* conversion; but, if he is weak-minded before, he still remains so. Even his leading *peculiarities* of mind, thought, and feeling, remain unaltered. If, before conversion, he possessed a remarkably retentive memory of incidents, of faces, of dates, of principles, and of places, his memory of these things is equally tenacious afterwards; but, if his memory of any of these things was weak before, it is equally so afterwards. If, before, he was remarkable for his mechanical or any other talents, he is uniformly found to possess these very same talents, and in the same degree, afterwards. If he be possessed of a superior musical talent before he meets this change, he possesses the very same talent, and in the same degree of excellence, after this event.

“In what, then, does this change consist? *Simply and solely in a change of the DIRECTION of these respective faculties, or of the objects upon which they are exercised, and not in a change of their nature and character, or of their relative power.* For example: if the person converted, had a great talent for music, the effect of his conversion is to change the direction of this faculty: thus, before conversion, it was chiefly exercised in singing songs, lively airs, &c., whereas, it is now chiefly exercised upon pieces of sacred music. If, before conversion, his reasoning powers were great, but exercised principally upon political, philosophical, or scientific subjects, they are afterwards equally powerful, but directed mainly to religious and theological subjects. Benevolence, which was before manifested in relieving the physical suffering, and promoting the temporal wants and earthly happiness of his fellow-men, is now directed to a different and far more elevated object, namely, the salvation and eternal happiness of mankind. And so of every other feeling, faculty, and talent, of the individual.

“Now, inasmuch as the *relative power* of the faculties themselves, remains unchanged, though directed to different objects, there is no call for alteration in the proportionate size of the *organs*, and, of course, no need of a *sudden diminution* of one class of organs, and an equally sudden *enlargement* of another class. But, if this change of heart *did* necessarily involve a change of the *nature* and the constitution of the primary mental powers the inevitable conclusion would be, that these faculties were not *well made* at the first, and therefore, require *remodelling*, or, rather, *re-creating*, which would necessarily imply imperfection on the part of the Creator; and, not only so, but this radical change in the nature of the faculties themselves, would certainly destroy the *identity* of the person converted, thus making him, *not a new, but another, being.*

“Again: if this conversion were to change the *relative power* of the primary faculties, the same inferences hold good. Whilst, then, the nature of the faculties themselves remain unchanged, and their proportionate strength the same as it was before, the amount of it is, that divine grace simply gives to the faculties as they originally or previously were, **A NEW DIRECTION.**

“An illustration will, perhaps, make the point clear. A steamboat, which is made perfect and beautiful throughout, is being propelled down a river, by the power of steam. The rudder is turned, and the same boat is *now* propelled up the river, *by the same power*, and by means of the *same apparatus.* But the *boat* is not changed, or transformed; for it is, by supposition, made perfect; nor is the nature of the steam changed, nor the character or proportionate strength of any one thing about the boat. This is not necessary. The boat is perfect. Its *direction, merely,* is altered; and that by means of the co-operation of the power of the boat and that of her commander. So it is in the matter of conversion. The sinner is sailing smoothly down the rapid current of sin and worldly pleasure. He is arrested, and changes, *not the nature of the thinking faculties themselves,* but merely the *direction*

of the thoughts produced—not the nature of the *propelling powers themselves*, but the *drift and current of the feelings that flow from those powers*, by setting before them a different object to stimulate and occupy those powers.

“The analogy of the steamboat, does not, of course, hold good throughout; for man is a moral agent, the steamboat, a mere machine. It, however, holds good as far as I have occasion to apply it. Men are depraved, *not* because they have *depraved faculties*, but because they make a *depraved use of good faculties*: see last proposition under the last objection, p. 403 of Fowler’s Practical Phrenology.

“You allude to a ‘*sudden*’ change. So far as the change is sudden, it is not a change, either of *faculties*, or of their *RELATIVE strength*. This change of the *proportionate strength* of the faculties is always *gradual*. The man whose besetting sin before conversion, was an inordinate craving for money, has the same craving afterwards, with this difference merely, that, by the grace given him at conversion, it is restrained from breaking out into overt acts of wickedness. The same is true of the passionate man, &c. Paul speaks of carrying on: ‘warfare against the lusts of the flesh;’ and the Bible everywhere holds out the idea that victory over our depraved propensities, must be gradual, and can be obtained *only* by *long continued and laborious effort*—by watching and praying, and severe self-denial. Christian experience is compared to the ‘rising light, which,’ from a feeble gleaming, ‘groweth brighter and brighter till the perfect day’—‘to a grain of mustard-seed, which,’ from the smallest of seeds, ‘becomes a great tree;’ plainly implying, that, as far as the *relative strength of the faculties* is changed, so far the change is *gradual*.

“I would ask any true Christian, if he is not *obliged* to hold in with a strong rein, those propensities that predominated before his conversion; and, if a *long time* is not requisite effectually to subdue “those sins that most easily beset him,” so that their instinctive promptings are not plainly felt. By the time, then, that he has subdued his *propensities*, or altered the relative strength of his *faculties*, the *organs* will have time to adjust themselves accordingly: see pp. 123, to 140, of Education and Self-Improvement; second edition, 1844.

“If I mistake not, then, I have clearly shown, that the doctrines and principles of phrenology, are not at all inconsistent with the doctrine of regeneration; and, also, that phrenology enables us to tell *what kind* of Christians particular individuals are.”

SECTION VI.

MATERIALISM.—OBJECTION ANSWERED.

THE doctrine of the immateriality of the soul, of an eternal existence beyond the grave, is glorious, is beatific, in the highest degree, and holds out the blessed hope that that eternity may be infinitely happy, as well as of infinite duration. But, it is alleged, that Phrenology militates seriously against this soul-inspiring doctrine, by demonstrating the existence of relations between the body and the mind so intimate, so perfectly reciprocal, in nearly or quite every and all conceivable circumstances, as to leave room for the inference—as even to force the inevitable conclusion upon us, that, when the body dies, the soul dies also. The intimacy of the relation existing between the body and the mind, I admit. But I do *not* admit the *therefore*, that mind is material. This *therefore* depends, not on the *intimacy* of the relation between the body and the mind, but on the fact of the existence of *any* relation whatever. Whether this intimacy be great or little; uniform, or occasional; *perfectly* reciprocal, or not so at all; does not affect the question. Be the relation ever so distant, so that it but exist *at all*, that existence goes just as far in proof of either doctrine, materiality or immateriality, as would the most intimate relation. But, I cannot see that the existence of this relation, be it more or less perfectly reciprocal, proves any thing either way. Even if matter should be shown to be the cause, and mind the effect, the doctrine of materialism would not necessarily follow. If it could even be shown, that organization was the cause of mind, and that mind was simply the product or function of organization in operation, I cannot see that this product is necessarily material because its machine or manufacturer is material. And the more so, since we cannot say for certain that the physiology is the cause, and the mentality the effect, rather than mind the cause, and physiology the effect. That laws of cause and effect exist between the two, or even govern all the relations of either to the other, is demonstrated by Phrenology; but whether it is the original cast and character of the mind which gives the form and texture to the body, to the brain, or the size and other conditions of the latter, that govern the former, has not yet been fully established. And even if mind could be shown to be the product of organized matter in action, the materiality or immateriality of that mind remains still undecided, that depending on the nature of mind itself, and not on its material agent.

But it is hardly necessary to discuss this whole subject of material

ism itself, but simply to show that Phrenology does not lead thereto. The great truth is admitted, that we know nothing of mind in this world, except as it manifests itself, and acts by means of the corporeal organs. And particularly the brain and mind are perfectly reciprocal, is plain matter of fact, which all see and feel every hour, moment, of their waking existence. "The whole question, then, seems to resolve itself into this:—Whether or not the *connexion* of mind and matter *necessarily* involves the doctrine of materialism.

"But, decide this question as we may, this much is certain, that *phrenology* is no more liable to the charge of materialism, than is *every* system both of physicks and metaphysicks extant. If phrenology is chargeable with materialism, the science of anatomy, of medicine, of physiology, of natural and moral philosophy, and, in short, of *every* thing which treats of the human body or mind, is *equally* chargeable with supporting the same doctrine; for they, one and all, equally with phrenology, admit, and even demonstrate, this same great principle of the intimate connexion and relation between the physical organization and the manifestations of thought and feeling. Nay, even the Bible itself is chargeable with this heresy of materialism. But, if there is any more materialism in the proposition, that *one portion* of the brain is employed to perform one class of mental functions, and another portion, another class, than there is in the proposition, that the *whole* brain is brought into action by *every* operation of the mind, *then*, indeed, is phrenology guilty, but not otherwise.

All systems of physiology support the doctrine, that the brain is the corporeal instrument by means of which the mind performs its various functions; and this doctrine constitutes the data, and the *only* data, upon which the charge of materialism, as urged against phrenology is founded. Hence, so far as the objection has any force, it *virtually* lies against the existence of *any* connection between, not only the brain and the operations of the mind, but between *any portions of matter whatever* and the mind. But it has already been shown, that we know nothing of the existence or operations of mind in this life, as a *separate entity*, or a thing that exists or acts *apart* from organized or animate matter; but of its existence and operation in *connection* with organized and animate matter, we *do know*, just as well as we know that matter itself exists.

"But this objection is not urged by infidelity against the Christian religion so much as it is by professing Christians against phrenology. They argue that "Materialism is false, because it is contrary to divine Revelation; but that phrenology leads to materialism; and, therefore

phrenology must be untrue." But let those who are zealous for the truth of the Christian religion, beware, lest, by proving materialism upon phrenology, they *thereby* prove it upon themselves, and thus fall into the snare which they had set for phrenologists. They infer that, if phrenology is true, it necessarily implies the truth of the doctrine of materialism, and, consequently, overthrows Christianity. Now, if, after all, phrenology *should* become (as it unquestionably will) fully established, materialists and infidels will prove their doctrines by the very arguments furnished by Christians themselves.

"They will reason thus: 'According to your own arguments, if phrenology is true it establishes the truth of materialism, infidelity, fatalism, &c.: phrenology *is demonstrably true*; therefore the doctrines of materialism, infidelity, fatalism, &c., are undeniable.' And thus, even though their arguments are sophistical, Christians will be 'condemned out of their own mouth,' or else driven to the disagreeable alternative of admitting that their arguments are fallacious, and the offspring of religious bigotry."*

But, so far from bearing in the least in favor of materialism, Phrenology furnishes the strongest argument that exists in favor of the immateriality of the soul, and of a spiritual state. No argument can be stronger in proof of any thing whatever, than the existence of this organ and faculty of spirituality is proof that man has an immaterial nature, a spiritual existence. What proof can be stronger that man is a seeing being than the fact that he possesses eyes, adapting him to seeing, and constituting him a seeing being? What, that he is a reasoning being, than his possession of the primary element or faculty of reason? What that he has a spiritual nature than the analysis of the primary element of spirituality just shown to form a constituent portion of his nature? It is demonstrative proof. It is the highest possible order of proof. It settles the matter completely. It leaves no evasion, no cavilling, no room for the shadow of a doubt. Man has a spiritual, immaterial nature, just as much as he has a friendly nature, or an observing nature, or a moving nature, or any other nature, and is therefore, and thereby, and therein, an immaterial being, just as much as he is a thinking being, a talking being a parental being, a remembering being, or possessed of any other constitutional quality whatever. Amplification will not strengthen the argument. There it is, in the plainest terms. Whoever admits the truth of Phrenology, and denies that the soul is immaterial, is incapable of reasoning. To admit the truth of this science, is of necessity to admit the spirituality and the immateriality of man. No middle ground, no other position exists.

* Fowler's Practical Phrenology.

CHAPTER IV.

HOPE, AND ITS BEARINGS.—A FUTURE STATE

SECTION I.

ANALYSIS, LOCATION AND BEARINGS OF HOPE.

Expectation.—Anticipation of future good.

“Man never IS, but always TO BE, blessed.”

MAN lives a three-fold life. Through the agency of memory, he lives over, again and again, the past, for the ten thousandth time. He lives in the present by actual sensation. He lives in the future as often, as luxuriantly as he pleases, by mounting his glowing imagination upon the pinions of hope, and soaring aloft, and afar, to that blissful period in the future to which he expects ere long to arrive. But for hope, the heart would break, the hands hang down. Little would be attempted, because little would be expected. In trouble, we should be unwilling to change lest it but increase our misfortunes. In prosperity, we should not expect its continuance, but stand in perpetual fear of adversity. Indeed, words can but feebly portray the condition of the human mind, without the enlivening, invigorating influences of hope. Thankful should we be for its existence. Careful, lest we abuse it. And assiduous in its proper cultivation.

But, what is its legitimate function? What its true sphere? What its bearings? What great practical truths does it unfold?

IMMORTALITY A state of being beyond the narrow confines of earth, and extending down the endless vista of eternity, infinitely beyond the conception of imagination's remotest stretch! And an eternity of *happiness*, too, if we but fulfil its conditions. And to an extent, the height, the boundaries of which, Hope, mounted on her loftiest pinions, cannot environ—cannot reach. Oh! the height, the length, the depth, the richness, of that ocean of love, of unalloyed bliss, opened up to the foretaste of mortals by this faculty!

“But,” says one, “is not *this* world the natural sphere, the legitimate termination of hope? Have we not *earthly* desires and prospects, in our children, in property, fame, intellectual attainments, and kindred objects, sufficient to satiate this faculty, without resorting to these far-fetched, and at best only visionary reveries, of this organ? What is your *proof* that another state, and not this, constitutes its legitimate sphere of exercise? We *know*, that to hope for this world’s goods, is its true and natural function. Why, then, abandon its real, known function, for one that is both uncertain and chimerical?”

Look, first, at its *location*. Location is a certain guide to direction and cast of function. Though every organ is designed to act with every other, yet all the organs are designed to act most with those located nearest to them. As the heart and lungs, designed to act with perfect reciprocity, are therefore placed close to each other, and so of the eyes and brain, and of all the organs of the body; so, of appetite and acquisitiveness, that we may lay up eatables; so, of the social, of the intellectual, of the moral, of all the organs of man. We will not demonstrate this principle here, but simply refer the reader to that series of articles in Vol. VI., entitled, “The Philosophy of Phrenology,” where it is fully stated and so applied as to develop many beautiful and valuable principles. (See also p. 34 of this work.) But, taking this principle of juxta position as admitted, and applying it to hope, we find its organ located among the *moral organs*; and *not* among the propensities. Now, if in the great economy of nature, the legitimate function of this faculty had been originally intended to be restricted to this world, (that is, been designed to operate with the propensities mainly,) it would have been located among the propensities. If man’s hopes have been originally intended to fasten on property, and to inspire the hope of becoming immensely rich, or to operate with ambition so as to create a hope for fame; or with appetite, to make us anticipate rapturously every coming meal, or to work principally with the domestic organs, and inspire hopes appertaining to the *family*, &c., this organ would have been located by the side of acquisitiveness, or approbateness, or appetite, or the domestic group. But it is located as far *from* these animal organs as possible, showing that its main function is *not* to be restricted to the things of time and sense, but it is located in the moral group, showing that its main office is to hope for *moral* pleasures, not animal. And what is more, is most, it is located by the side of spirituality on the one hand, so that it may fasten its anticipations mainly upon a *spiritual state*; and on the other, *by the side of conscientiousness*, so that it may expect the rewards of

our good deeds. It is this juxta position of hope and conscientiousness which makes us satisfied that when we have done right, we shall be the gainers thereby.

An example:—Let the Author, actuated purely by conscientious scruples, put forth truths in this work, or in his lectures, which he knows will be unpopular for the time being, and be a means of retarding its sale, as well as of seriously injuring him for the present, yet, the very fact that he is conscious of having done his *duty* thereby, makes him feel that he shall *ultimately* be the gainer by thus telling the *truth*. That man whose *conscience* is clear, fears little. A clear conscience makes a stout heart. It renders its possessor bold, and makes him not only feel safe, but encourages hope to predict ultimate success. Truly “are the righteous as bold as a lion.” That is, when conscience is in its normal, self-approving state of action, it quiets cautiousness, and stimulates hope to expect happiness therefrom.

But, reverse this principle, and we see why it is that “the wicked flee when no man pursueth.” For, when conscience is disturbed by the compunctions of guilt, this its painful action throws cautiousness also into a painful, fearing state, a state of alarm and terror, besides withdrawing all stimulus from hope. Hence it is that when a man feels guilty, he is conscious that he is continually exposed to punishment. Walled in on all sides, he could not feel safe. Protected by armies of true body-guards, he would live in continual fear. Let A. steal, or commit any crime, and let B. step up to him familiarly, and tap him on the shoulder: “I did not steal that,” exclaims A. “No one supposed you did; but ‘a guilty conscience needs no accuser,’ I now think you did steal it, else you would not be so anxious to exonerate yourself,” replies B. The plain fact is, that if a man would be happy, he must keep his *conscience* clear, and if he does this, he will rarely be miserable.

Secondly: Man *expects* to exist hereafter. No other faculty can exercise this feeling. As shown under the head of veneration, (p. 49,) all the other faculties are exclusively pre-occupied, and wholly engrossed, each in performing its own legitimate function. No one will question the position, that those who expect to exist hereafter, do so by exercising the organ and faculty of *hope*. Now, is this expectation of immortality the *legitimate* function of hope, or its abnormal, exotic, unnatural function? If the latter, then must this expectation of eternity be repulsive, and all up-hill work, contrary to the nature of man, and therefore certain not to continue long or extend far. No

stronger proof can exist, that to hope for a future state of being is the *natural* function of this faculty, than the *universality* of this expectation in all ages, among all flesh. In short, the same argument by which the function of Divine worship was proved to be constitutional, [p. 46 to 53,] *mutatis mutandis*, proves, with equal clearness, that to expect to exist hereafter is the legitimate, primitive function of hope, and not its perverted function. And that same branch of this argument by which it was shown that worship was not taught, but was *innate*, also proves the innateness of this expectation of eternity. Without this faculty, and unless to hope for eternity were its true function, man could form no more conception or idea of a future state than the blind man could of colors. In short, all the ramifications of that argument, apply to this. The premises, the data, the application, the answers to objections, the all of either, are every way alike.

But, again: (And this argument applies equally to veneration.) If to expect to live hereafter, be the true function of hope, that function, that hope, must be every way beneficial to man; for every organ, faculty, element of our nature, exercised in harmony with its normal, primitive constitution, is every way promotive of happiness, because in obedience to the laws of its constitution. But whatever exercise of any faculty is *not* in harmony with its normal, primitive constitution, violates the natural laws, and thus induces their penalty. Now, I submit to any reflecting mind, what pain, what penalty is there that grows naturally, necessarily, out of this hope of immortality? So far from experiencing *pain* in the act itself, the human mind even *exults* in the pleasures of such anticipation as much as in, perhaps, any other mental exercise whatever. If I wished to give the human mind a literal banquet of pleasure, I would feast it on thoughts of immortality. If I wished to make the strongest possible, and the most impressive, appeal to the mind or soul of man, I would found that appeal on *eternity!* Reader! does thy hope of existing hereafter, give thee pleasure or give thee pain? And if pain, is that pain the *necessary*, or the accidental, accompaniment of hope? That is, is it absolutely impossible for hope to be exercised without inducing this pain? Surely not. Nor do any painful after consequences grow necessarily out of this exercise of hope. Both the exercise of hope in this way, and all the products of that exercise, are pleasurable *only*, and pleasurable, too, in the highest possible degree. There is *no* pain, no punishment growing out of this exercise of hope, but a certain reward. Therefore, this exercise is in obedience to the

fixed laws of our being, and therefore in harmony with the *primitive* function of this faculty. Nor can this argument be evaded.

If it be objected, that thinking so much of another world, unfits us for this, I say thinking just enough about another world is the best possible preparation for enjoying this. I go farther: I say that, merely in order to enjoy this life fully, we require to hope for another, and I submit this remark to the consciousness of every reader. I put it home to the feelings of all, whether enjoying another world in anticipation, does not sweeten every pleasure of this; and whether a practical belief that there is no hereafter, does not render the pleasures of this life insipid; besides, weakening a most powerful motive for good, a powerful restraint upon evil. Nor do I feel that this position can be shaken or evaded.

If it be still further objected, that many, that even the majority of, professing Christians, spend so much thought upon another world, that they fail to study and obey the organic laws, and both shorten life and render it miserable; whereas, if they did not hope for another life, they would study to make themselves happy in this; I answer, by admitting the *fact*, but denying that it is a *necessary* consequence of believing in an hereafter. So far from it, the highest possible preparation for enjoyment in this life, constitutes the best possible preparation for enjoying immortality; and *vice versa*, the highest possible preparation for eternity, involves the very state which will best fit us to enjoy time. I know, indeed, that perhaps the majority of our truly religious people, neglect health, and often hasten their death, solely in consequence of their religious zeal. But, is this the *necessary*, the *universal*, *inevitable* consequence of this hope of immortality? Is it utterly impossible to indulge the latter without inducing the former? Surely not, and he is simple who asserts otherwise.

In short: Viewed in any light, in all aspects, the inference is conclusive—is established by the highest order of evidence—that the legitimate, normal function of hope is to expect to exist beyond the grave.

This established, and the inference becomes clear and even demonstrative, that there is a future state adapted to this faculty. If not—if there be no hereafter, why was this faculty, or at least this manifestation or exercise of it, ever planted in the breast of man? Would a God of truth and mercy thus deceive us? Would he cruelly raise the cup of immortality to our lips only to tantalize us therewith while alive, and then to deceive us with the hope of immortality thereby raised in our souls, while no immortality exists to await or fill this natural de-

sire and expectation? In case there were no hereafter, man would have no hope adapted thereto, or capable of creating this expectation. And, surely, the location of hope by the side of *spirituality*, so that the two may *naturally* act together, and thereby create the desire, the feeling, that there is a spiritual state, and that we shall exist therein forever, forms the strongest kind of proof that there *is* an hereafter, a spiritual, never-ending state, adapted to that constitutional arrangement of the nature of man. Who can doubt the concentration of proof that goes to establish this glorious result? Who can say that this radiating focus of truth is but midnight darkness, or only the glare of the delusive ignis fatuus? Nor have I ever seen the man who could invalidate this blessed conclusion. It is plainly grafted on the nature of man, or, rather, founded in it. The admission of the truth of Phrenology, presupposes, and necessarily implies, the conclusion to which we have thus been brought. And I am free to confess, that, faith aside, and as a matter of *reason* and *argument*, I pin my hopes of immortality (and they are neither few nor weak,) on this argument. No other argument that I have ever seen at all compares with it in point of clearness and force. I repeat it. A natural, spontaneous exercise of the faculty of hope, is an expectation of existing hereafter. This is its *natural, legitimate, primitive* function; therefore, this faculty is adapted, and adapts man, to an hereafter. Hence there *is* an hereafter adapted to this organ.

Many infidels have been converted from Atheism, or at least from scepticism thereby. Among the thousands that have come to my knowledge, the following are given as samples:—

“*New-Fairfield, March, 1843.*”

“Mr. Editor—During the little leisure I could get from the duties of a private school under my charge for about eighteen months past, I have been studying Phrenology. From the first, I was so deeply interested in its principles, its application to morals, religion, and almost every other subject of public importance, that I determined to become its public advocate as soon as I could command time and means to acquire that practical proficiency adequate to the accomplishment of the duties involved in so responsible an undertaking. And I think, of all other persons, I have the greatest reason to *love* and to *revere* Phrenology, inasmuch as it has been one of the principal instruments in saving *me* from the *rock* of infidelity, on which I had struck. When I saw, that the mind was *constitutionally* adapted to the great and leading principles of Christianity, I was enabled to comprehend the fallacy of the *base* and *servile* doctrines of the infidel. Instead of inculcating or encouraging any thing anti-Christian, as some in their ignorance and opposition have said, Phrenology beauti-

fully explains and establishes all the important principles of religion. We find, that certain organs of the brain are *necessary* for the exercise of those feelings of worship and adoration of the Deity, trust in his providences, and confidence in the revelations of his will. Hence, the infidel must, at least, be deficient in the organs of veneration and marvellousness, and, accordingly, this was the case with me. And *now*, to obviate this tendency to disbelief, I set intellect over against it, and take the revelations of God for granted, without once trying to doubt them—knowing that my doubts are the result of small marvellousness. To me, the fact, that there is an organ whose function is, trust in Divine providence, and belief in the spiritual, proves a future state, and an over-ruling hand. If this be not the case, then the Creator has given us a faculty for perceiving, and having faith in, a state which does not exist—a thing entirely incompatible with the character of Omnipotence.

“Now, the confirmed infidel or atheist requires some plain, positive, and tangible evidence, that may be brought under the cognizance of his senses; and this is the kind of evidence afforded by Phrenology, for he can both see and feel it. It was this process of reasoning that convinced me of the truth of Christianity, and the error of infidelity, and I feel bound by love to the science, and the interest I feel for those who have unfortunately stranded upon the shoals of infidelity, to make this public statement. “B. J. GRAY.”

Extract of a letter from a gentleman in R. 1., dated May, 1844.

“A little more than a year since, an inquiry arose in my mind respecting the truth of the fundamentals of religion, such as the being of a God—the divinity of the scriptures, &c. But, my mind becoming excited on these points, and getting into a doubting, sceptical mood, did not stop here. I asked after the foundation and origin of governments, the utility of the social state, &c. I would know what constituted an action virtuous, or if there was actually any propriety in the distinction of right and wrong. I ruminated over all the ‘scenes of man,’ to inquire into the elements of every thing, to see *if*, in spite of pride, in erring reason’s spite, ‘whatever is, is *right*’—I feared what ever is, is *wrong*; or, at least, I felt I must see the reasons for Pope’s proposition. ‘Time would fail me’ to give you a detailed account of the state of mind into which I was hurled. What I have said must suffice. But I began to read extensively. I procured the best books I could obtain on the subjects which looked most momentous to me. I began to meditate also methodically and rigidly, to determine perplexing questions with the precision of a philosopher. But I found, what I had partly realized before, that authors differed, and that I was in want of *first principles*. In my distress, I turned my attention to Phrenology, of which I had already a little knowledge, for salvation from universal scepticism’s painful confusion or derangement—which last I very much feared. And, blessed be God, I found it a *universal logic, an endless dictionary, a chart of the universe, and the God of first principles*. Before the revelations of Phrenology, all of my doubts and perplexities fled like morning vapors chased away

by the rising sun, and left my soul to enjoy a great amount of truth, established in the certainty of demonstration. And it was during the time of my emancipation from the thralldom of corroding, soul-killing uncertainties, that I became acquainted with your writings. I feel to rejoice that you have ever been raised up to labor as a Phrenologist.

* * * * *

I must say, before I close, I am waiting with intense interest to see what you shall say upon theology in the 'Journal' of this year. Hundreds and thousands are doing the same. Among these, I know of several distinguished ministers of the gospel. Do your best. Be thorough. Your work, 'Natural Theory of Phrenology,' is good; but too limited, as I wrote you several months since. Don't leave a point not thoroughly treated."

Letters and statements of this character, flow in continually from all quarters. Those who accuse Phrenology of leading to infidelity and scepticism, either practically or theoretically, have either but a smattering of this sublime, this religious science, or else are incapable of comprehending it. Its influence on my own mind has been to *deepen* my religious feelings, and enlarge their boundaries, not to enfeeble them. True, it has enfeebled my narrow minded sectarian notions. I thank God that it has. Much that was bigoted, intolerant, contracted, and erroneous, it has abolished. But the gold of Ophir, the wealth of India, the treasures of the whole earth, could be but a drop in the bucket compared with the value of those religious doctrines and feelings it has *added* to my former religious stock. Nothing would tempt me to return back to that state of semi-darkness from which Phrenology has delivered me. I consider that true religious feeling has been multiplied within me a hundred fold by this science. Nor, in all my extended acquaintance, do I know the man whom Phrenology has rendered infidel. I know those whom it has liberalized. Whose bigotry it has slain. But not whose soul it has hardened to religious impressions. It will melt the hearts of all who drink in its doctrines. Fear not, then, intellectual reader. Fear not, pious reader. It will make you better Christians. It will purify your souls. It will elevate your religious nature. It will make you more holy-minded, more exalted in your views of the character and government of God, and go far towards preparing you for a blessed immortality.

SECTION II.

HOPE CONTINUED.—MISCELLANEOUS INFERENCES.

“ Which *hope* we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and stedfast, and which entereth into that within the veil.”

HAVING pointed out the general function of hope, it remains to add a few suggestions relative to its exercise.

1. It is very large in the American head—larger than in the heads of any other nation which it has been my good fortune to examine; caused, doubtless, by that continual inflation of it, growing out of the very nature of our institutions. (See Hereditary Descent, p. 47.)

2. It combines mainly with acquisitiveness; whereas it *should* combine mainly with the moral faculties. We confine our hopes mainly to the things of *this* world; whereas we should place them mostly on heaven and heavenly things. On this root of the violation of man's nature, grow the inflations and depressions of trade in this country which have overthrown so many, and set our whole nation upon the full gallop after riches. Our pecuniary embarrassments were not caused, cannot be cured, by either political party, or leader, by a national bank, or the want of it, but simply, solely, by the over-exercise of hope, and by confining it to *this* world; whereas it should soar to another. And as long as men go on to violate this law of their natures, by this wrong exercise of this moral faculty, they must suffer the penalties of its infraction. But, when they will obey this law, not only will our pecuniary embarrassments cease, and our worldly spirit be subdued, but all the glorious, soul-inspiring fruits of its proper exercise, will be ours in this life, along with a preparation for that which is to come.

3. This organ is sometimes too small. Those professing Christians in whom it is small, with small self-esteem, and large cautiousness and conscientiousness, suffer much from gloomy religious feelings, feel extremely unworthy, and too guilty to be saved, and indulge doubts and fears as to their future salvation. Let such remember that these gloomy doubts and fears are not piety, but are inconsistent with it—that the absence of *hope* is a *defect*, and that, if this organ were larger, and conscientiousness smaller, though their conduct would be no better, and heart perhaps worse, yet their hopes of heaven would be much stronger, while their prospects of future happiness would be

less bright. To such, Phrenology says, that these gloomy feelings are caused, not by any *actual* danger, but simply by their organs. I tells them to cultivate this organ, and not to indulge these religious doubts and fears.

4. I find, that most disbelievers in a future state, have moderate or small hope, and hence their expectation of existing hereafter is feeble. They say and feel, "well, I neither know, nor care much, whether I am to live hereafter or not, but I will take my chance with the rest of mankind." To such, this science says, your doubts as to a future state grow out of your imperfect phrenological organization, and not out of the fact that a future state is doubtful. Cultivate and properly direct this faculty, and your doubts will vanish, your soul be cheered with hopes of immortality.

5. The proper cultivation and exercise of hope, becomes a matter of great importance. To show *how* to enlarge and direct this faculty, does not come within the compass of this work, they having been treated in 'Education and Self-Improvement.'* Suffice it to say, that in order to enlarge it, it must be *exercised*, and to effect this, its appropriate food, (immortality,) must be kept continually before it; it being feasted thereon, and ravished thereby.

6. It is a little remarkable that the exercise of this faculty, in reference to a future state, is so often commended and enforced in the Bible. In this, the Bible harmonizes with Phrenology, and is *right*.

7. Some beautiful inferences grow out of the combinations of hope and marvellousness, but being in possession of the requisite data, the reader can carry them out for himself.

* Directions for cultivating all the moral faculties, and indeed all the faculties, will be found in that work, so that their repetition here would be out of place.

CHAPTER V.

BENEVOLENCE.—ITS ANALYSIS, AND THE TRUTHS TAUGHT THEREBY.

SECTION I.

THE FUNCTION OF BENEVOLENCE, AND THE DUTY AND PLEASURE OF DOING GOOD.

“It is more blessed to GIVE than to receive.”—*Christ.*

PAIN exists, and man is the subject of it. Governed by laws, the violation of which induces pain, man often sins and suffers. Instead of placing us in a world of chaos, confusion, uncertainty, and chance, Infinite Wisdom has seen fit to throw *laws* around us, and to sanction those laws, by rewarding their obedience with pleasure, and punishing their infraction with pain. But for these laws, man could have calculated upon nothing, could have enjoyed, could have effected nothing; and without the reward of pleasure attached to their obedience, and a penalty of suffering affixed to their infraction, these laws would have been utterly powerless, and therefore perfectly useless. Indeed, self-contradictory though it may seem, no feature of the Divine character or government is more benevolent than in the institution of pain; for, without it, we should be liable, carelessly or ignorantly, to lean upon a red hot stove, or put our hands into prusic acid, and destroy them, and indeed to destroy all parts of our frame a hundred times over, if possible; as we now are, the instant we injure ourselves, or violate any physical law, we feel pain, and are thereby warned of our sin, and seek relief. So in the world of mind. We may even take it for granted, that every pain ever experienced, or ever to be experienced by man, is a consequence of the violation of some law of his being. And on the other hand, that every pleasure we experience, whether mental or physical, flows from our voluntary or involuntary obedience of some law.

But, if this institution of pain existed, unless man had some faculty analogous to that of benevolence, to dispose him to pour the oil of consolation into the soul of the sufferer, and assuage his pain, how desolate would our world have been! Callous to the sufferings of our fellow-beings, and not disposed to lift a finger to relieve them! Re-

ardless of how much pain we inflicted, how much trouble we caused ! not one kind feeling in the soul of man ! How utterly desolate ! How shorn of its blessings, would be our earth ! Or, if man had been created an isolated being, incapable of bestowing or receiving favors, or of augmenting or effecting the happiness of his fellow-men, this faculty would have been out of place, and only tormented its possessor with the sight of suffering which could not be relieved. But, a benevolent God has instituted pain for a wise and beneficial purpose. But lest suffering unrelieved should blast, or at least mar, his works, he has offset it by planting in the soul of man this kindly feeling for his fellow-men. And then, in addition to this, he has put man into that relation with his fellow-men by which he can both assuage their suffering and promote their happiness.

Again, the exercise of every organ gives its possessor pleasure in proportion to its size and activity. Benevolence is a large organ, and therefore fills the heart of the truly benevolent man with as pure and exalted pleasure as he is capable of experiencing ; for, "it is *more* blessed to give than to receive." Thus does it double the pleasure of man ; first, by pouring the oil of consolation into the wounded heart ; and, secondly, by filling the benevolent soul with a pure fountain of pleasure, "which the world can neither give nor take away." But for the existence of suffering, this faculty would have had no sphere of action, and must have been in the way ; but, with the existence of pain, man is rendered, as already seen, much more happy than he could possibly have been without either law or consequent suffering ; and doubly happy : first, in *bestowing* charity, and in *doing* acts of kindness ; and secondly, in becoming the *recipient* of these favors, and responding to them with heart-felt gratitude. Oh, God ! in infinite *wisdom* hast Thou made us ! Thou hast bound us to Thee and to one another by a three-fold cord of love and wisdom : first, by the institution of pain ; secondly, by off-setting this institution with this faculty, and, thereby, by making its exercise so pleasurable to both giver and receiver ! Wanting in either, Thy government would have been imperfect. But possessed of all combined, it is infinite in itself, and infinitely promotive of the happiness of all Thy terrestrial creatures !

The existence of this faculty, makes it our imperious *duty* to *exercise* it in doing good, and to exercise it *much*, because it is a *large* organ ; that is, it occupies, when large, a greater periphery or surface on the skull, and a greater amount of brain, than perhaps any other organ ; and, as already observed, Phrenology requires us to exercise *every* organ *habitually*, and in proportion to its relative *size* when

large. Man is too selfish, even for his own interest. If he were less selfish, he would be *more* selfish: that is, if he were more benevolent, he would be more happy. This organ saith; "Throw open the doors of thy house to the benighted wanderer. Be more hospitable, for thou mayest entertain angels unawares. Make sacrifices to do good, and thou wilt thus cast thy bread upon the waters, to be gathered in greatly increased. Nay, in the very *act* of doing good, thou hast thy reward."

But, not to dismiss this subject with the mere abstract inference, that it is our duty to do good, let us look at some of its practical illustrations; that is, to the advantages to be derived from its general and proper exercise. To draw an illustration from hospitality: To entertain friends, and even strangers, is one of our greatest pleasures. It is *not* the order of nature, that we should have so many public houses. For, besides their being the greatest nuisances that curse any community, the receptacles of gambling, drinking, and all sorts of wickedness, which, but for them, could not exist, they deprive us of that *privilege* of exercising the hospitable feeling which would result from throwing open our doors to our fellow-men, and loading our tables to feed the hungry. In a tavern, little social feeling is exercised, and but little benevolence. It is purely a dollar and cent affair, and very dear does it cost those who are entertained; because a few of the guests want a great deal of waiting upon, which raises the price, and then those who want but little, have to pay just as much; thus wounding acquisitiveness and conscientiousness.

Familiar as I am with the principle, that the violation of any of the natural laws punishes the disobedient, I am, notwithstanding, often surprised and delighted to see it practically illustrated in ways innumerable, which escape general observation. The violation of the law of hospitality is a case in point. Taverns are the direct, legitimate product of the violation of the law of hospitality. And "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive," the number and the aggravation of the public and private sinfulness and vice, of all descriptions and degrees of heinousness, that grow on this root of violated natural law. Drinking, and all the vices that accompany it, "whose name is legion," are their legitimate offspring. If taverns produced but this single sin, it would be punishment enough in all conscience, yet this is but the beginning. Balls are another. Not that dancing itself is wrong. Indulged in at proper seasons, say in the day time, or till nine or ten o'clock in the evening, dancing would be the best recreations to be found, and

most healthy, especially for woman; but, carried to excess, and connected, as it usually is, with drinking and many other objectionable things, especially the exercise of amativeness, in various combinations, I deem it most objectionable. Besides, dancing being carried to such excess, generally continued all night, trespasses too much upon time that should be allotted to sleep, of which young people require a great amount. They also cultivate artificial manners. These balls are almost always held in taverns, and go to support them.

Another is, tavern associations—tavern stories, (almost always obscene,) tavern lingo, of which profane swearing furnishes the warp and considerable of the filling,* betting, political discussions, horse-racing, and this whole class of evils. I should rather bury my children than have them brought up in a tavern where liquor is sold. I would make an exception in favor of temperance taverns, and I urge it upon every temperance man, upon all moral men, to patronize *temperance* taverns wherever they can be found. I never go to any other when there is one in the place, and I am sometimes almost tempted even to solicit entertainment in private families, rather than to put up at a liquor-selling house however "respectable."

My brother urges that taverns should be supported at public expense, as we support a minister, for example, so that they may not be allowed to sell liquor. He argues, that we properly pay taxes to support the poor; that these poor are almost all made by taverns; and that we should be gainers by supporting taverns at public expense rather than the poor made by these taverns. That they are a great public curse, cannot be questioned. That we can do without them, I fully believe. Quakers make perfectly free to call on each other for entertainment wherever they are. I doubt not they call it a great *privilege* both to entertain each other, though perfect strangers, and certainly it is most grateful to be thus entertained. Let us all manifest the quaker spirit, and we shall rid our land of its most blighting

*Swearing is unquestionably a great sin, not so much against God, as the swearer. If, as is often, perhaps usually, the case, it is mainly the dialect of anger and blackguardism, it simply shows the disposition of the one who swears, and tends to increase his rough, wrathful state of mind. If it has become habitual, it shows that these feelings are habitual, and indicates permanent depravity. It also tends to increase these unhappy feelings in the minds of those who hear it. Swearing before children is very bad; because all children will imitate, and by imitating the language of swearers, they soon come to feel the accompanying feeling, and thus grow up under the dominion of the propensities. I put swearing upon the ground of the injury it does to the swearer and to the community, rather than on its being an offence against God. It also indicates vulgarity.

sirocco—public houses—and both give and receive a vast amount of pleasure. This doctrine is correct in theory, and beautiful in practice, and I hereby extend the rites of hospitality to all who may chance to pass my door,* and want victuals or lodging, as free as the air we breathe. By this means, vast accessions of knowledge would be derived by that interchange of views, experience, feelings, &c., consequent thereon. Acquaintances would be extended, friends multiplied, and society linked together by the strongest of bonds. In short, it is impossible to count or estimate the blessings that would grow on this tree of the nature of man.

Another illustration of the beneficial effects of exercising benevolence, is to be found in providing for the poor. The way they are now supported, almost entirely precludes the exercise of this faculty. This should not be. I doubt whether there need ever be any poor. To do away with taverns alone would obviate probably two thirds of their number. And most of the balance would never become poor but for this grasping love of money which actuates all classes, and hoards immense wealth in the hands of the few, and thereby ever over-reaches the many. Property is only another name for the necessaries and comforts of life. Now it is plain, that if a few have a great amount of them, the many must be proportionally deprived thereof. I believe it wrong to become very rich, and that it should be prohibited by law, just as we prohibit other things that injure the public.

Especially, if we give the poor an opportunity to help themselves, nearly all would embrace it. To be supported at public expense, is most humiliating. How many poor widows have worked themselves into their graves to support a starving family, rather than to go upon the town! Reader, writer! how would you like to go to the *poor-house*? But, when poor, and needing help, if some more fortunate neighbor would give you an opportunity to help yourself, to till land, or to do other work, how would your lightened heart leap for joy! The prettiest way to help a poor neighbor is to employ him, and to give him ample, bountiful if you please, wages.

A story:—A fortunate, but benevolent man, had a poor colored neighbor too infirm to do much, but very deserving. The former would *sell* to the latter, but postpone the reception of pay, or tell him that he would give him a certain sum per capot for whatever tares

* Three miles north of Fishkill village, on the road to Ponghkeepsie, Dutchess county, N. Y. I call it 'The Bird's Nest.'

or vermin he wished exterminated; say, a round sum for the head of every crow, or squirrel, or muskrat, &c., or for every thistle-root, or dock-root, &c. In this way, the poor man nominally *paid* for what he had, so as to be relieved from that oppressive feeling of obligation and dependence that always accompanies the reception of gifts, and yet was as much benefited as though he had not paid a cent. Thousands of ways which every reader can devise for himself, may be contrived in which to bestow charity and yet relieve the recipient from all feelings of obligation.

Making christmas, new-year, and other holiday presents, furnishes another delightful exercise of this faculty. Phrenology recommends it most cordially, and also the general interchange of neighborly acts, Thus: "neighbor A. come over into my orchard whenever you like and help yourself to such apples, pears, plums, cherries, peaches, and the like as you please." "Thank you, neighbor, I will avail myself of your kind offer. I have a fine lot of currents, more, probably, than will be wanted. Come over or send any of your folks, and pick what you like. My grapes come on finely, and when ripe, make free to pick what you want." Or, as you pick a fine watermelon for your dinner, send one in to your neighbor, or a dish of fruit, or a quarter of veal, or a few pounds of butter, or a large loaf of cake, or whatever you can conveniently spare. Neighbors should not count dollars and cents as often as they now do; nor as many thousands.

My uncle and my father, living on adjoining farms, were in the habit of "changing works," whenever either needed help and the other could spare it. If either had a lot of hay down and needed help, and the other was not driven with work, they would both turn too and help each other; and so in reference to grain, or hoeing, or ploughing—every thing that seemed to require it; neither ever thinking of keeping any account, or putting the matter on the ground of debt or credit, but on that of neighborly accommodation. Nor did I ever hear a word of complaint from either, that the other had not helped his part, or any thing of this kind. So that neighbors *can* interchange these acts of kindness greatly to the accommodation of each other, and without any thing to mar the good resulting therefrom.

Again. Many more things should be regarded as common property than now are. Say, let every town own considerable public ground, on which any who pleased are allowed to raise potatoes, or corn, or what they like or need. So, also, let there be much more public spirit than now exists. Let every town have its pleasure park, full of fruit and ornamental trees, the fruit of which shall be common

property, and where the whole town may congregate, say at sunset for recreation and an interchange of good feeling—where our youth may meet for play, where our boys may drive the ball, our girls the hoop, our maidens take the fresh air, and give vent to their youthful, buoyant, sportive, merry, happy feelings. There is no telling how much pleasure, profit, might be derived from such an arrangement.

Analogous to this would be that of lining our roads with fruit trees of all kinds. Let the inhabitants of any town, of all our towns, save the pits and seeds of all the fruit eaten in but a single year, and plant them by the way-side, and then graft them with the very best of fruits when old enough, and what vast quantities of fruits would they produce in twenty years, sufficient to supply every family in town, and thousands to spare. The poor could pick and *sell* to our cities, and thus live comfortably, or at least be relieved from pinching want. What a vast blessing might be conferred on coming ages by a little pains on the part of a few. For one, I shall line the road that passes across my little farm in this manner, *pro bono publico*, and persuade all I can to do the same. Let all the believers in Phrenology do this, and long would posterity extol that science which prompted so wise, so philanthropic a deed.

If it be objected, that in this case, each, eager to get his share, or perhaps all he can, will scramble for it before it is ripe, I answer, Have enough for all. If it be further objected, that the cattle will browse off the trees, I reply, Still, the trees will get above them, gradually to be sure, but ultimately. Or, they may be protected till above their reach. Or a town ordinance might easily exclude them from the streets.

An additional motive for moving in this good cause, is to be found in the fact, that *bread and fruit* are the two main supporters of animal life, or at least, the *best*. Bread is emphatically the staff of life—the very best article of diet that our earth produces. Fruit is most wholesome, besides being so very delicious. But it is the two *united* which constitutes the diet for man. A meal made of good home-made bread manufactured of flour not killed in being ground and baked, eaten with first-rate apples, either raw, or baked, or stewed, or made into sauce, is the most palatable, the most wholesome, that can possibly be eaten. Few are aware of the fact, that a meal of this kind gives more gustatory pleasure in eating than a meal made up of any other sort of food. Fruit should always be eaten *with meals*, and as a *part* of them. The juice of fruit, either boiled down into a jelly, and eaten on bread in place of butter, or the juice of fruit with bread

crumbled into it, and eaten as we eat bread and milk, is most delicious, most wholesome. No better article of diet can be had. Butter is most injurious. A poor family need not starve, if they can get nothing else, especially if they had some handy press for mashing and pressing the fruit, say every day or two, as it is wanted for use, so that it need not ferment. The juice of all fruit after *fermentation* has taken place, is most injurious. But apples can easily be kept till strawberries are ripe. Cherries, blackberries, currants, &c., last till early apples and peaches come again, and thus nature has so arranged it that we may have fruit the year round. Has the reader never observed how *wholesome* and palatable strawberries are to the sick, especially to consumptive patients? And if I had a consumptive patient in the strawberry season, I should order as many as the patient pleased to eat. I should not only prescribe them in *place* of medicine, but *as* medicine. They will even effect cures where medicine will not. The diet above recommended, would prevent most our of sickness, by which so many are made poor, and would in nine cases out of ten restore health.

An arrangement for raising abundance of bread-stuff might easily be made, or in its absence, potatoes, easily raised in any abundance, might be substituted, and thus the poor be relieved.

Besides, there is such a thing as saving at the spigot, but letting it run out at the bung—as giving to the poor by litles, and yet allowing causes to remain in action—to even augment—which increase poverty by wholesale. Giving a shilling here, a dollar there, five dollars yonder, &c., may do a moiety of good; but one well directed effort to obviate the *cause* of human suffering, will be productive of greater results than thousands of acts of individual charity. For one, let my happy lot be to espy and point out these causes—to cut away at the *root* of this fruitful tree of human suffering, and “dig about and dung” the tree of humanity.

Bearing on a kindred point, my brother, in his lecture on the moral bearings of Phrenology, makes some excellent remarks on the proper exercise of this faculty; in illustration of which he tells the following story:—A medical student from the south, in going from New-York city to Pittsfield, Mass., *gave away*, in the form of *treats* mainly, seventy dollars—all he had; so that he not had enough to pay his fare the last part of the way. Though he was so very generous, yet his liberality did more harm than good. He says, and with propriety, that men have yet to learn *how* to do good. In other words: there is much more benevolence in the world than is exercised *pro-*

perly.* To be effective, it must always be governed by intellect, and blend with all the other moral sentiments.

We cannot be too careful how we occasion pain to our fellow-men, or even to brutes. We cannot be too assiduous to promote their happiness. We can never exercise enough of the kindly spirit, of good feeling, of gushing benevolence, in expression, in action. Let all who are at all affected by us, be the worse in nothing, be the better in many things, on our account.

The reader must excuse another quotation or two from Education and Self-Improvement. They are made because the ideas there presented require to be inserted in this connexion, and because they might not gain by recomposition.

“It should be added that the *killing of animals*, is directly calculated to sear and weaken this faculty; and should therefore rarely take place. Were a flesh diet productive of no other evil consequences than lowering down and hardening benevolence, that alone should forever annihilate so barbarous a practice.* Destructiveness should seldom be allowed to conflict with benevolence. The cruelties practiced upon our animals that are slaughtered for the meat market, are sickening and incredible. See the poor calves, sheep, &c., tumbled together in the smallest possible space; their limbs tied; unfed, belching continually, and in a most piteous tone, their eyes rolled up in agony, taken to the slaughter-house, and whipped, or rather pelted *by the hour* with a most torturing instrument, and then *strung up by the hind legs*, a vein opened, and they dying by inches from the gradual loss of blood, the unnatural suspension, and cruel pelting—and all to make their meat white and tender. A friend of the author, who lived near one of those places of torment, blood, and stench, had his Benevolence, naturally very large, wrought up to its highest pitch of action, by the horrid groans and piteous exclamations of these dying animals, and was compelled to hear the blows with which they were beaten. At last he went to the butcher and remonstrated. This produced no effect. He went again and *threatened* him, telling him that if he heard another groan from dying animals, he would make *him* groan, and in so positive a manner that the cruelties were abandoned. To kill animals outright, is horrible, but words are inadequate to express the enormity of the refined cruelty now generally practiced

* My brother's lecture on the moral bearings of Phrenology, is sweet, lovely, beyond almost any thing else I ever heard fall from the lips of man. Its amalgamation with this work would greatly enhance its value. As yet, he has been unable to present it to the public in a printed form.

† A young lady of high moral feelings, and predominant benevolence, seeing a calf led to the slaughter, urged and pleaded with her father to purchase it and spare its life. He did so. She never allows herself to eat anything that has ever had life in it, and this is *right*.

upon helpless dumb beasts by these murderers of the brute creation. Look at the hideous and indescribably painful expression left on the heads of calves, sheep, hogs, &c., that we see in market, or see tumbled into a cart for the glue manufacturer."

Allow a short argument in reference to flesh eating. It is a clearly established principle of Phrenology, that no one faculty should ever be so exercised as to conflict with the legitimate function of any other; and that, wherever the exercise of two or more *do* thus come in contact, one of them is wrongly exercised. Is not this principle too self-evident to require argument, and too plain even to require illustration? But if either is wanted, the reader is referred to "Education," p. 157. Now sympathy for distress is one of the normal functions of benevolence. So is that pain consequent on witnessing distress which cannot be relieved, or beholding death, or the killing of animals. In short, to kill animals without wounding benevolence—without cruelly tormenting it—is utterly impossible. Nothing but killing human beings is equally painful. And now I submit to every reflecting mind, whether it is *possible* to butcher animals for food without thus calling benevolence into painful action? But this painful action of any organ, and especially of so high an organ, is wrong. Therefore is the killing of animals wrong. Or thus: The exercise of destructiveness, in killing animals for the table, necessarily comes in direct and powerful conflict with the normal function of benevolence. This quarrelling of the faculties gives us pain, and is therefore wrong. Hence, meat as an article of diet conflicts with the nature of man.

Now; since the killing of animals violates the nature of man, some great evil must grow out of it; for we cannot break nature's laws, without experiencing pain, and that too in the direct line of the transgression.* And I think it would not be difficult to show *wherein*—*now*—flesh eating punishes the transgressor. But as diatetics do not come within the sphere of this work, having stated the principle, I leave it, for the present at least.

"Another barbarous practice against which Phrenology loudly exclaims, is *shooting birds*. This is, if possible, still worse, especially when the little warblers are of no service after being killed. To kill them suddenly by a shot, is not particularly barbarous, because they suffer little, and only lose the pleasure of living; but to kill them from the love of killing, must harden the heart and sear benevolence beyond measure. Its influence on the cruel *perpetrator*, is the main

* See Education, p. 21.

motive I urge. Another motive is, do not kill birds of song ; for you thereby deprive your fellow-men of the great amount of pleasure derived from listening to their warblings. And then again, they feed on worms and insects, and thereby preserve vegetation. I doubt not but much of that destruction of wheat, of late so general and fatal to the wheat crop, would be prevented by an abundance and variety of birds. In other words, take heed to the monitions of benevolence, and commit no cruelties, but scatter happiness in all your path, and you will be the happier, and greatly augment the happiness of all concerned."

The exercise of benevolence in connection with veneration, is *par excellence*,* a doctrine of Phrenology, as it also is of the Bible. To do good is our duty, our privilege ; but to do good by promoting the cause of morality and virtue, is one of our highest moral duties— one of our greatest personal pleasures. We should try to make our fellow-men happier by making them better,—should seek their spiritual good more, even than their temporal. This is the very highest exercise of benevolence, which is one of the largest organs and highest faculties of man. This principle is plain in its application, and yet multifarious.

"Above all things, this enlarged kindness is the duty and privilege of Christianity. But do professors *live up* to this law of their Lord and Master, who "went about *doing good*." They, of all others, should not go about with their gold spectacles, riding in their splendid carriages, living in palaces, furnished after the manner of princes, and then begging money to spread the gospel among the *heathen*. Away with your proud Christianity (?)—your *aristocratical* Christianity, your *I-am-better-than-thou—because-I-am-rich*—Christianity ; your money-making and money-hoarding or miserly Christianity. As well talk about hot ice, or cold fire, or honest rascality, as talk about *rich* Christians, fashionably dressed Christians, or Christians who do not spend their ALL, their *time, property, energies*, and LIFE, in doing good, and in the exercise of the sentiments.†

Remarks on missionary operations would be in place here. The *principle* of giving, to promote religion, Phrenology demonstrates—enforces. But it sees much in these foreign and domestic missionary societies to censure. Still, every reader can judge for himself as well as others can for him, when he knows as much about them. Those missionaries who have left the American Board, have not done so wholly without cause. That Board dictates quite too much. Besides ; it was established, and is now conducted, to propagate *sectarianism*, as much, perhaps, as any thing else. If Phrenologists would

* Pre-eminently.

† Education and Self-Improvement.

form a society, to send out missionaries to teach *Phrenology* simply, "without note or comment," more good and less harm would be the result; for not even the heathen could long know how to find the organs, without *moralizing* thereon, and deducing inferences as to how we should live, the nature of man, and the opinions and conduct that harmonize therewith, and are therefore right, &c. If the American Board would introduce *pure Christianity*, they would do immense good. But they propagate a strange mixture of truth and error, along with those false tastes and habits of civilized, artificial, unnatural life, which cannot fail to do more harm than their mongrel Christianity will do good. In these views, very many excellent religious men concur; and more would do so if they knew more, and were deceived less.

Much as might be said upon this faculty, we will dismiss it with the remark, that the kindly, benevolent spirit just commended, would do more to banish crime than all the laws, lawyers, courts, civil officers, jails, prisons, penitentiaries and executions on earth. The *punishment* of crime will be treated under Conscientiousness. Its prevention is infinitely better, and can be effected by kindness and philanthropy, a thousand times more effectually than by all the means now in operation. Let criminals discover a kindly spirit in the community as a whole, and they could not have a heart to commit offences against its laws or its happiness. Kindness will kill enmity; will kill lawlessness; will kill the revengeful spirit, and implant the same good feeling in the souls of those who otherwise would be pests to society.

Let us all, then, cultivate the kindly. Let it shine forth in all we say, in all we do, in all we feel. Harshness, severity, invective, are not *Phrenology*,—are not *Christianity*,—are the ascendancy of the propensities over benevolence, which is forbidden by the Bible,—forbidden by *Phrenology*. It intercepts our own happiness;—it does not promote that of our fellow-men. *The law of love* is the law of the nature of man,—the law of Christ. The mantle of charity covereth a multitude of sins. It will hide our sins from others. It will hide the sins of others from us. It will put the *best* construction on their errors, not the worst. It is the greatest of the Christian virtues. It is *the* distinguishing feature of all the works of God. To *promote happiness* is the end of creation. And shall not *we* do by others as God has done by us? Shall we not evince our gratitude for the continual shower of blessings he is pouring out upon us, by doing what *we* can to promote the happiness of others? Infinite are our own

capacities for enjoyment, and God does continually all that a God can do, to fill them to the full. Let us imitate our Heavenly Father in this labor of love. Let us second his great design in creation; for in so doing, we shall be co-workers *with* God, be even *like* God. Glorious, this opportunity of doing good. Let every day, every hour, find us employed in this great work—the work of God—the work of man!

CHAPTER VI.

CONSCIENTIOUSNESS—ITS ANALYSIS AND BEARINGS

SECTION I.

CONSCIENCE INNATE.

Innate sense of moral accountability; integrity of motive; perception of right and wrong, and feeling that right is rewardable, and wrong punishable; sense of moral obligation; love of justice, truth, and right, as such; regard for duty, promises, &c.; desire for moral purity, and blamelessness of conduct: that internal moral monitor which approves the right, and condemns the wrong; gratitude for favors; sense of guilt; penitence for sin; contrition; desire to reform; disposition to forgive the penitent.

“Thrice armed is he who hath his quarrel *JUST*.”—Shak.

So constituted is the human mind, that it regards—that it *cannot but* regard—most of our feelings, actions, expressions, conduct—that we do and say, or are capable of doing and saying—as either *RIGHT* or *WRONG*. True, it regards some things as destitute of moral character, because done without motive, or by accident, or prompted by derangement, &c.; but these form so small a portion of their aggregate as to deserve mention merely. As we look upon some things as reputable, and others as disgraceful; upon some as dangerous, and others as safe; upon some as beautiful, and others as deformed; some as past, others as present; some as ludicrous, others as serious; some as causes, others as effects, &c.; so we consider—cannot help considering—most that we do, say, feel, as *right or wrong*; and that *per se*—on its own account, and in its very nature and constitution. Destitute of this faculty, the soul of man would be wanting in its brightest jewel, its crowning excellence. Let a human being be endowed with the talents of a Webster, a Franklin, a Bacon, but be destitute of mo-

ral principle, he deserves but contempt; for he employs them to further what is wrong as soon as what is right; to serve his propensities, to injure mankind, to augment his own sinfulness and misery. How changed! when those talents are governed by high-toned moral principle—are employed to subserve the cause of justice; to oppose whatever is wrong, and urge on what is right! How infinitely more exalted the character, more beneficial the conduct!

Not only do these perceptions and feelings of right and wrong exist, but they are *innate*. Not creatures of education. Not fitful, but permanent. In-wrought into the very nature and constitution of the human soul, and forming a prominent department thereof. Pervading, and almost governing, the whole human family, in all conditions and countries, in all past ages, in all coming time. Man *feels* it, and *knows* it, that there is a right and a wrong in the very nature and constitution of things.

And not only are these feelings constitutional, but man intuitively feels that the right must govern, and the wrong be discarded. Nor is this feeling of moral obligation a tame, passive element, that simply whispers this moral sentiment gently in the ears. But it is clothed with *authority*, and felt to be *imperious*. Strong, doubly armed, is he whose conscience sanctions all he does; but faint and feeble is he who *feels* that he is wrong. Barely able to hold up his head, and powerless in all he says and does. Conscience is designed to govern. It is the primier of the human soul, while all the other faculties are but representatives or subjects. Its edicts constitute the supreme law of the man. Its prohibitions are imperative, inexorable.

The existence of this moral sense has always and every where been admitted, but its *innateness* has long been a subject of universal discussion. Its advocates urge its innateness from its universality, and appeal to every one whether he is not conscious of its existence; whether his own soul does not feel its internal monitions daily and continually, while its opposers aver that it is *wholly* the creature of *education*, as is evinced by the diversified and even conflicting opinions of men as to what *is* right, arguing that men think and practice in this matter as they are *taught*. Phrenology, however, demonstrates that man has, by nature, an *innate faculty*, which forms a part and parcel of his original nature, the specific function of which is to create the sentiments of right and wrong; and to approve the right, and condemn the wrong, and accounts for this diversity of opinion as to right and wrong, by showing that men's opinions and practices as to right and wrong vary as their phrenological developments differ.

While, therefore, this fact completely overthrows the doctrine that conscience is the creature of education, it fully establishes the fact that conscience is *innate*—that every man has, by nature, an internal monitor to accuse him when he does wrong, to approve him when he does right, to warn him against committing sin, and to entice him into the paths of virtue and happiness.

Phrenology even goes farther. By pointing out the existence of this primary sentiment of right and justice in the soul of man, it proves, beyond all cavil and controversy, the existence of certain PRIMARY, ABSTRACT PRINCIPLES of right and moral fitness, lying back in the very nature and constitution of things, and forming a constituent part of that nature, to which this faculty in man is adapted. Under the head of veneration, (p. 46,) it was shown that the existence of one thing and its being adapted to another, proved the existence of the other. That same argument, “*mutatis mutandis*,” or changing it from veneration to conscientiousness, shows that the latter, by being adapted to *right*, proves the existence of certain great and first principles of eternal *right* and *justice*, founded in, and forming a part of, the original nature and constitution of things. It proves that some things are right and others wrong, *in themselves*,—in their very *nature and essence*. This adaptation of conscientiousness to these first principles of right, is indisputable, and even demonstrative: therefore, these primary principles of right exist, adapted to this organ in man.

More and better. Besides establishing the innateness of conscience and the consequent existence of right and wrong in themselves, Phrenology also demonstrates the moral accountability of man, and, therefore, that he is a fit subject of rewards and punishments. As the existence in man of eyes, both constitutes him a seeing being, and also proves him to be such:—as the fact of his having lungs, both renders him a breathing being and proves him to be such; the existence of a stomach, both makes him a digesting being, and proves conclusively that he is such; the existence of bones and muscles, a moving being; of teeth, a masticating being; of the social faculties, a social being; of the intellectual elements, an intellectual being; of the reasoning faculties, a reasoning being, and so of all his other primary powers—so the fact that he possesses the organ and faculty of conscientiousness both *constitutes* and *renders* him a *moral and an accountable* being, and deserving of rewards and punishments, at the same time that it conclusively *proves* him to be such. No proof is stronger. It is *demonstration*, and in the fullest, strongest sense of the term. Proof that appeals to the senses is not stronger. The fact

that mankind exist, is not more fully, certainly established by our *seeing* them, than the truth of Phrenology being admitted, is the fact that man is a moral, accountable, rewardable, punishable being, rendered incontestable, *demonstration*, CERTAIN. If required to prove that man was *constitutionally* a seeing being, and not so by education, I should be unwise to *argue* the point, but simply appeal to the fact that he is *created* with *eyes*—a kind of *ad hominem* home proof, which it is impossible to gainsay or resist. The highest order of proof that reason is innate rather than taught, is the fact that man possesses original elements of reason. The human mind is so constituted that it cannot possibly resist or evade this kind of proof, any more than it can resist the evidence of the senses. It is, in fact, proof drawn from the senses, and founded on them; for we *SEE* that he has originally a primary organ and faculty of conscience. We also *see* its workings. We *see* that he possesses the primary power of conscience, just as we *see* that he possesses the primary elements of walking; and we also *see* and *feel* the workings of this faculty, just as we see and know that he walks and talks. If his having feet proves him to be a walking being; his possession of lungs, a breathing being; of a stomach, a nutritive being; of eyes, a seeing being; of causality, a reasoning being; of sexes, a sexual being; of benevolence, a humane being; of veneration, a devotional being; of language, a communicative being, then does the existence in him of conscientiousness prove him to be a moral, accountable, rewardable, punishable being. Mathematical demonstration is not clearer, stronger, more demonstrative, *ad hominem*, infallible, than is this species of reasoning. Indeed, whoever rejects its conclusions, is incapable of reasoning—incapable of arriving at any conclusions, or knowing any thing whatever; and as such, he is unworthy of notice.

How unjust, then, the accusation that Phrenology establishes fatalism, when it *overthrows* that doctrine, and establishes the *moral accountability* of man! And if any thing were wanting to complete his argument, the fact that there is an organ of *will*, (the lower portion of self-esteem,) goes, if possible, still farther; and the two together establish the additional doctrine, not only that he is a *moral and accountable* being, but also free to choose, will, decide, and act for himself; which completes his *punishability* as well as accountability. Those, therefore, who accuse Phrenology of favoring fatalism, are either ignorant or bigoted. So far from it, it even furnishes this moral accountability of man, to the Christian already proved—as clearly demonstrated as any proposition in geometry. Receive it, then. At

least stop these clamorous imputations. Let it also be remembered, that under the head of veneration, by proving the existence of a God, Atheism was proved to be false; of marvellousness, the immateriality or the spirituality of the soul was proved; and of hope, a future state of being was also proved to exist. No refutation of these objections can be more complete, and even demonstrative.

To every reflecting reader, I have now two points to submit. First, whether the *innateness* of conscience, and the moral accountability of man, has not been set completely at rest by being *demonstrated*, as we would demonstrate that two and two make four. Secondly, whether the accusation that Phrenology leads to fatalism, is not most unjust and even reprehensible; for if those who bring it, do not know enough about it to know better, they know *nothing* about it, and should *say* nothing; but if they *do* know better, they are actually culpable. So that whoever brings it, is *censurable*, and should be esteemed *less* therefore. Nor will it be long before this will be the case.

SECTION II.

THE NATURE AND RATIONALE OF RIGHT AND WRONG; OR THE FOUNDATION OF MORAL OBLIGATION.

HAVING established the moral accountability of man, and the existence of FIRST PRINCIPLES of right and wrong, two questions naturally present themselves to the reflecting mind. Since the quality of right and wrong necessarily appertain to our opinions, conduct, expressions, feelings, &c.

FIRST: WHAT things are right, and what wrong, that we may choose the former, but refuse the latter.

Secondly: *Why* is that right which is right, and *wherefore* is that wrong which is wrong? In what does this quality *consist*? In what fundamental principles is it based? What are the *constitutional elements* of right and wrong; of sin and holiness; of virtue and vice?

Though the first question naturally comes first, yet its answer depends upon that given to the latter question. Hence, the last shall be discussed first.

In July, 1843, the author listened to an able discourse, preached by the Rev. Mr. Culver, of the Tremont Temple, Boston, from the text;

“Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind;”^{*} in which he urged that the COMMAND OF GOD constituted the *ground-work* of right, and his prohibition, that of wrong;—that the Jews were commanded on certain occasions, to sacrifice a *white* heifer, not because a white heifer was better than one of any other color, not because there was any fitness in a white heifer more than in others; but simply, solely because GOD COMMANDED a white heifer to be sacrificed;—that baptism *by immersion* was right—not because there was any inherent virtue, either in it itself, or in it more than in sprinkling; but simply, wholly, because CHRIST COMMANDED it—that we should love God supremely, and our neighbors as ourselves, for no other reason whatever than because *God commanded it*;—that a “*Thus saith the Lord,*” was what *constituted* that right, which was right,—that wrong, which it prohibited, and not the *nature of the thing commanded*. And my *impression* is, that this is the doctrine maintained by the great majority of ministers and laymen.

But, from this doctrine Phrenology dissents in toto. It shows that the rightness of right, and the wrong of wrong, are *constitutional*, being based in the very nature and fitness of things, without any reference to either command or prohibition of God on the one hand, or to the want of them on the other. Suppose it possible for God to command that which was wrong in itself;—suppose it wrong in the very nature of things for a man to seize a virgin by force, carry her off by main strength, and compel her to live with him in opposition to her wishes, such a course being repugnant to her, besides sundering those social ties that bound parents to her and her to the home of her youth, would that command render it right—render any thing right that is *wrong in itself*—*necessarily constitutionally* wrong? I trow not. Phrenology shows, as fully, conclusively as it shows any thing—and we have seen that this is *perfectly demonstrative*, and from precisely the same data, that the right is right, and the wrong is wrong; not at all because commanded or forbidden by God, but *solely, wholly*, because so by *constitution*,—by *nature, in and of itself*, and without any reference whatever to the commands or prohibitions of God. If things are rendered right or wrong by the word of God merely, then are there many things which are right *constitutionally*, but wrong *in fact*; and others wrong by nature, but right by command; while the great majority of our every day feelings and doings are destitute of *all* moral character, because neither commanded or forbidden, at

* Matt. xxii, 39.

least explicitly. How *can* a fiat of the Bible render *any* thing right or wrong, good or bad, not right or wrong, good or bad, *in and of itself*? Is it *possible* for a command of the Bible to alter, add to, abrogate, one iota of the original constitutionality of right and wrong? This would be to array the Bible against nature—against even the fundamentals of that nature. It would make the Bible say, “Observing this ordinance, is right, is a moral duty obligatory upon every member of the human family, from the moment of its institution; its neglect wrong, sinful, punishable;” while the voice of nature responds: “No such thing. There is no right or wrong about it either way.” I caution believers in the Bible not to array it against nature, for the latter will not yield one hair’s breadth to the former, and what is more, what is most, nothing will equally lower the estimation of the Bible in intelligent minds, or more effectually advance infidelity.

It requires considerable patience even to argue a point so palpably fallacious in itself, and so directly in the teeth of the nature of man. The fact of the existence of the faculty of conscientiousness as an innate, primary element of the human mind, proves both the *existence* of right and wrong, and also their *constitutionality*—that they are so *of necessity* and *in their own inherent nature*, not by the requirements of the Scriptures. Though the Deity commands us to do what is right, and forbids us to do what is wrong; yet, things are right and wrong *in and of themselves* and prior to all command, independently of all prohibition. Phrenology *demonstrates* this point *in and with* its demonstration of the existence of conscience. The two necessarily go together. They can never be separated without doing violence.

To argue the point, that things are often rendered right or wrong by *legislation*, by *law*, &c., such as that hanging is right when it is *legal*, and *because* of its legality,—because we are commanded to obey our rulers, &c., is folly; for he whose conscience is so weak as to imbibe such a doctrine has not sufficient conscience to yield assent to the right when he knows it. And yet, there are those, and those too who have considerable influence, weak enough, intellectually as well as morally, to advocate a doctrine that strips right of all its high and holy sanctions, and makes it a mere thing—a mere play-thing, even—with which mortals may tamper and even sport—a perfect weather-vane, shifting continually with every shift of legislation, however corrupt.

But, to the point: *Why* is the right, right? *Wherefore* is the wrong, wrong? I answer: They are rendered so by their *consequences*—by

their *effects* on the happiness and the misery of ourselves and others. This is rendered evident, by that fundamental principle on which *every department* of the nature of man proceeds. That principle is *happiness*. I will not here illustrate this doctrine in detail. The reader will find it run out in part in the few first pages of "Education and Self-Improvement." It is there shown, that the fundamental basis of the nature of man—THE only end, object, function, and entire constitution of every organ of the body, every faculty of the mind, every element of our nature, is *happiness*, all happiness, and nothing but happiness. As this is an important point, the reader must pardon another quotation from "Education and Self-Improvement," p. 13, in which this fundamental principle is, perhaps, expressed better than it could be if re-written.

"That HAPPINESS is the sole object of Man's creation, is rendered evident by its being the only legitimate product of every organ of his body, of every faculty of his mind, of every element of his nature. What but happiness is the end sought and obtained in the creation of every bone, of every joint, of every muscle?—happiness in their exercise, happiness in locomotion, labor, &c., and happiness in the results obtained by this motion. What but pleasure is the legitimate function of the eye?—the most exquisite pleasure in the exercise of sight itself, and an inexhaustible fund of happiness in the ends attained by seeing—in its enabling us to find our way, and in pouring into the mind a vast fund of information, and also furnishing an inexhaustible range of materials for thought and mental action. What but enjoyment is the end sought and secured by the creation of lungs?—enjoyment in breathing freely the fresh air of heaven, and enjoyment in the expenditure of that vitality furnished thereby; few realizing the amount of pleasure capable of being taken in quaffing luxuriantly and abundantly the health-inspiring breeze! What other object than pleasure dictated the creation of the stomach?—pleasure in the act of digestion, and pleasure in the expenditure of those vital energies produced thereby. And what is the object sought and obtained in the creation of the brain and nervous system—what but happiness is the only legitimate product of their primitive function?—happiness in their exercise itself, and inexhaustible happiness in that boundless range of mental and moral ends secured by their creation.

Narrowing down our observations to the mental faculties, we find the same sole end sought and obtained by the creation of each one separately, and all collectively. Benevolence was created both to pour the oil of consolation into the wounded heart, to avoid occasions of pain, and to beautify and bless mankind; and also to pour still greater blessings into the soul of the giver; for, it is even "*more* blessed to give than to receive." Parental love, while it renders the parent happy in providing for darling infancy and lovely childhood, also renders the child most happy in receiving the blessings showered down upon

it by this happifying faculty. The legitimate function of ideality is pleasure; both in contemplating the beautiful and the exquisite in nature and in art, and also in refining and purifying all the grosser elements of our nature, and softening and gracing all our conduct. Acquisitiveness was created to afford pleasure, both in the mere acquisition of property, edibles, and the comforts and conveniences of life; and also to furnish all the other faculties with the means of gratification: appetite, with food; benevolence, with the means of bestowing charity; cautiousness, with instruments of defence; the social feelings, with comforts for the family; inhabitiveness, with a home; constructiveness, with tools, farming utensils, &c.; intellect, with books, philosophical apparatus, and the means of prosecuting the study of nature and her laws, &c. Appetite, while it gives us gustatory pleasure in partaking of food, also furnishes the stomach with the materials required for manufacturing that nourishment and strength without which every enjoyment would be cut off, and life itself soon cease. Causality was created, not only to produce the richest harvest of pleasure in studying the laws and operations of nature, but also, that we might adapt ways and means to ends, and secure our own highest good, by applying the laws of causation to the production of whatever results we might desire. The legitimate function of language is to furnish a world of pleasure, merely in the act of talking, and then to add to it that inexhaustible fountain of happiness which flows from imparting and receiving knowledge, ideas, motives for action, &c., and in reading, in hearing lectures, sermons, &c., &c. Memory enables us to recollect what gave us pleasure, and what pain, that we might repeat the former and avoid the latter; that we might remember faces, places, numbers, &c., and recall our knowledge at pleasure, so as to apply it to beneficial purposes. Veneration naturally gives us pleasure, both in worshipping God, and in those holy, purifying influences which prayer sheds abroad in the soul. The same principle applies to Friendship, to Connubial Love, to Ambition, to Perseverance, to Sense of Justice, to Hope, to Imagination, and to every other element of the human mind. I repeat: The legitimate function every physical organ, of every mental faculty, of every element of man, is HAPPINESS, ALL happiness, *pure, unalloyed, unmitigated happiness, and nothing else.* Man was made *solely to be happy*, to be PERFECTLY happy, and for *that alone*.—Nor does the needle point to its pole more uniformly and certainly, than does every part of man point to this one result. No truth can be more plain, more universal, more self-evident.”

I call upon all who doubt this great truth, to specify a single organ, faculty, function, any thing, of the nature of man, of which this is not the palpable, self-evident fact. No truth is more apparent. It runs throughout all nature. It is the substratum of every thing belonging to the nature of man.

Right, of course, then, harmonizes with this great arrangement of nature, is founded in it, is designed to carry it out. Wrong conflicts therewith, and violates it. And whatever does conflict therewith, (that is, whatever occasions pain,) is wrong, and wrong *because* of this conflict—because it causes pain. So, also, whatever harmonizes with it, (that is, whatever causes happiness,) is right, and right because it produces pleasure—because it fulfils not merely *a* law, but THE LAW—ALL THE LAWS IN ONE—of the primitive nature and constitution of man.

How this principle can be controverted, I see not. So constituted is the human mind as to *see*, and *feel*, that the normal action of every department of its nature is pleasure, and pleasure *only*; and that all pain proceeds from—is caused by—a violation of that nature. It is also so constituted as to see that right *consists in* obeying the laws of our being, and wrong in their violation, as well as that their observance is right—their infraction wrong. Put these two points together, and the result is clear, satisfactory, that the fundamental basis of right,—its rationale, the *reason why* right is right, is—the *happiness* that flows therefrom—the furtherance of THE END of our being occasioned thereby; it amounting to the same thing as an augmentation, or increase, of ourselves, namely, happiness. And, per contra, the *reason why* wrong is wrong, is, that it *violates*, or counteracts, that nature—mars the work of God, by inducing suffering.

One phase more of this argument: That whatever is right, is promotive of happiness, no one will for a moment deny, and, *vice versa*, that whatever is promotive of happiness, is right, as well as that the opposite is true as to wrong. Otherwise, the nature of man is at war with happiness; and nature, with nature. And what is more, happiness and right, on the one hand, and suffering and sinfulness on the other, stand related to each other in the light of cause and effect. That either obedience to law, that is, virtue, causes happiness, or else that virtue is caused by, or else consists in, obedience to law, and, per contra, that the violation of law, (that is, sinfulness,) causes pain, or else that sinfulness is caused by suffering, is self-evident, from the fact, that the one is the cause, and the other the effect. The first impression is, that obedience to law is the cause, and happiness the effect. But *why* is obedience the cause? To secure the effect, (happiness,) of course. Hence, it is self-evident, that it is this *effect*, (namely, happiness,) that governs. Right would not be right if it did not secure this effect. Hence, as happiness governs virtue, it of course is the *cause* of virtue. The contrary is true of pain and sinfulness. In sinning, or disobeying law, we suffer in order to *make us obey*. To avoid suffering, is

the governing motive, and not merely or mainly to avoid doing wrong, *per se*. Wrong in itself, and aside from the suffering it causes, is a matter of little account. It is to *escape suffering* that constitutes the governing motive, so that it is this suffering which governs, and, therefore, becomes the cause and the essence of the sinfulness of sin.

Finally, and mainly: Man has a natural aptitude for pleasure, and a natural shrinking from pain. This arrangement of his nature, is the whole of him—all there is in him, and of him, and about him. This is the git and quintessence of his entire constitution, and of every adaptation, and organ, and function, of which he is composed. This is the nucleus. Every thing else in him, and of him, is attached to—is gathered on this. Along with that of all his other elements, it forms the centre of right and wrong. Right and wrong, like every thing else, are *dovetailed into—framed upon*—this standard, this foundation timber, of the man. Hence, right becomes right when, and because, it squares and plums with this standard: and wrong becomes wrong solely in consequence of its deviating therefrom. In short, the pith and summary of the whole argument, is simply this: Happiness, along with suffering as its natural antagonist, forms the governing principle or element of the nature of man. This governing principle of his nature, of course governs reason, friendship, appetite, praise, censure, kindness, connubial and parental love, truth, refinement, vulgarity, hope, fear, virtue, sinfulness, right, wrong, sin, holiness, goodness, badness—the *WHOLE* of man, and, by consequence, becomes the *cause*, and the *rationale*, of them all, right and wrong, goodness and badness, of course included.

To take a few examples:—It is *right* that we exercise benevolence. But, *why* right? Simply, because that, by so doing, we further the end of our creation—enjoyment—both our own, and that of the fellow-being whom we help. Nor is there any other reason why it is right to exercise it. There is but one other *possible* reason why it is right; and that is, the command or will of God, to which we shall come presently. The opposite holds true of causing pain. To cause suffering for the *sake* of causing it, is wrong. This, all admit. But, *why* wrong? Because it *retards* the end of creation by producing its opposite. Nor is there any other reason why it is wrong to inflict pain as such.

It is right to eat. It is our bounden duty. It is wrong to starve. But, *why*? Solely because not eating causes pain to ourselves and others, which does violence to this fundamental law of our nature—the law of happiness. Our eating does not effect the Deity. We cannot offend *Him* by not eating. Nor by eating too much. He is infinitely

above all influences which it is possible for mortals to exert. To suppose it *possible* for our sinfulness to affect the ALMIGHTY, is to degrade him by putting him upon a par with man! I am loath to argue a point so self-evident. I can hardly believe that any intelligent mind really entertains such an idea, except by tradition, or from superstition. Certainly not from intellect. Its absurdity could be easily demonstrated, but to state it is refutation sufficient. It is at war with every principle of common sense—at war with the Bible, which saith:—“Can a man be profitable unto God, as he that is wise may be profitable unto himself? Is it any pleasure to the Almighty, that thou art righteous? Or, is it gain to him, that thou makest thy ways perfect?”—*Job* xxii. 2, 3. “If thou sinnest, what doest thou against him? or, if thy transgressions be multiplied, what doest thou unto him? If thou be righteous, what givest thou to him? or, what receiveth he of thine hand? Thy wickedness may hurt a man as thou art; and thy righteousness may profit the son of man.”—*Job* xxxv. 6, 7, 8. “What is man, that thou art mindful of him,” &c. &c.

If by sinning against God be meant simply a breach of his laws,—the laws of nature, then may man be truly said to sin against God, but not in the sense of offending him *literally*. Man can indeed break the law of God; because all the laws of our being may be considered as laws of God; and man being capable of obeying and breaking these laws, he is, of course, capable of obeying or of disobeying God. In this sense, but in no other, does the conduct of mortals stand related to their God.

But, to proceed with our illustrations: It is right to worship God in spirit and in truth, not at all because our righteousness affects the Almighty, or our impiety injures him, but simply because in so doing we secure to our own souls the beneficial effects of our prayer. Prayer softens down the propensities, subdues the soul, elevates the higher faculties, and makes us happy. Therefore it is right, but not because it in the least affects the Deity. It is wrong to take the name of God in vain, not because profanity injures the Almighty, but because it renders the swearer unhappy, by debasing his feelings, cultivating the propensities, searing the moral sentiments, and thus rendering him and those affected thereby miserable. It is *right* to keep our word; because a liar is not to be believed though he speak the truth, and therefore loses all the advantages of confidence; but he who keeps his word inviolate, his character spotless, his credit good, reaps all the benefits of thus fulfilling this law of his being, (and they are many and great,) besides rendering his fellow-men

happy in so doing ; whereas he who does not regard his promises occasions pain to his fellow-men. It is the *pain* consequent on dishonesty, a breach of truth, promises, &c., which constitutes them wrong. And the more pain they occasion, the more wicked they are. So murder is a most *heinous* crime, because it occasions so *much* misery so much to the one deprived of life and all its blessings, to his family or friends, to community, besides it so effectually hardens the heart of its wicked perpetrator. So of stealing. So of every crime that can be named.

We might thus take up one after another, any and all of the laws of our being, physical or moral, and show that the heinousness of their violation consists in the pain consequent on such enfracture ; that the virtue of their obedience consists in the happiness caused thereby. But this is unnecessary ; for if this is the case of one, it is so of all. To the *principle* alone reference is had ; and if that principle applies to the above illustrations, it applies to all illustrations—to all possible shades and phases of both sin and holiness.

If to this it be objected, that it is *motive alone* which constitutes the virtue or the sinfulness of acts, I answer : This has nothing whatever to do with the *nature* of right and wrong. We are now discussing the *constituent elements* of right and wrong. Motive may make an action which is right *in itself*, wrong in the doer, or one wrong in itself, right in the doer. Thus, in attempting to deceive or wrong my neighbor, I might do him an actual favor. My wrong intention might make it wrong *in me*, and yet the act done did not eventuate in wrong to him, but the reverse. Or, if in attempting to shoot a furious bull which was tearing my friend in pieces, I should shoot my friend, I should *do wrong*, while I *meant right*. This killing my neighbor is *wrong in itself*, but not wrong to me, because done by accident. Still, this is foreign from the real point under discussion ; namely, the *constituent elements* of right and wrong, *in and of themselves*. The question of *motive* will be discussed hereafter.

This principle, that the nature of right and wrong is founded in the pleasure or pain consequent thereon, does not tally with the principle of deism, which maintains that there is *no such thing* as right and wrong *in the abstract* ; for it demonstrates that there is a right, a wrong, *in itself*—in the *abstract*—in its *own nature*, and in the nature of things. This difference is fundamental—as *toto celo* as the admission of the principle of a conscience is from its total denial—as the admission of the existence of right and wrong *per se* is different from its denial. This doctrine enforces the moral accountability of

man. That denies it. In short ; light does not differ from darkness, or heat from cold, more than this deistical doctrine of no right, no wrong, does from the phrenological doctrine of the existence of both, *per se*. Touching the *morality*, the *accountability*, and the *punishability* of men, it makes all the difference of a positive and a negative.

To Christianity, this principle, that conscience is innate, as well as the one that right is right in its very *nature* and *constitution*, is very important. Not only does it harmonize with a similar doctrine taught in the Bible, “*Deal justly*,” “*Owe no man any thing*,” “*Whatsoever ye would that others should do unto you, do ye even so unto them*,” “*Lie not, but obey the truth*,” “*Righteousness exalteth a nation*,” &c. &c., in texts without number ; but what is still more, it greatly enhances the moral virtue of doing right, as well as the heinousness of doing wrong. It gives to the right a distinctive character, a specific nature of its own, thereby imparting to it a moral beauty, power, and grandeur which, if it did not possess, it would be tame and powerless, as well as destitute of all inherent, specific character, while it reveals in bold relief the naked deformity and inherent moral turpitude and heinousness of sin. This principle renders right and wrong *positive* in their characters. In maintaining the doctrines of Christianity, this inherentness of right and wrong, of virtue and sin, is all-important, and even fundamental. It is, indeed, a corner stone of the whole superstructure of Christianity. Overthrow this original constitutionality of right and wrong, and you take away the corner stone of Christianity, and overthrow its whole superstructure ; but establish it, and at one fell swoop, infidelity is overthrown. On this radical point the victory turns, and Phrenology gives it to Christianity. Christian ! dost thou fully appreciate this *scientific* confirmation of thy foundation stone ? And ye religionists who oppose Phrenology, “*know not what ye do*,” and are crucifying your best friend. Let me warn Christianity that she is fast losing intellectual ground, and that nothing but a *scientific proof* of her fundamental doctrines will arrest this onward march and these rapid strides of infidelity and scepticism. But Phrenology, if promulgated, *will* stop it. Its proof of this fundamental doctrine, infidelity cannot reach, nor scepticism resist. They are *ad hominem*—they go home to the understanding, and innate *consciousness* of one and all. Christianity ! wilt thou embrace this thy twin sister and handmaid, or wilt thou, unwise, ungrateful, bigoted, turn her coldly or contemptuously away ?

There is, then, *constitutionally*, a right, a wrong. And that right is enforced, is invited, by all the happiness it is *possible* for man to ex

perience in doing right; that wrong is prohibited by a punishment it is possible for man to suffer in breaking the laws of his being. Nor is it immaterial whether we do right or wrong. Nor are the *motives* for doing right far removed from us; nor the penalties of doing wrong. They are not in heaven, not in hell, exclusively, nor even mainly. They are *in us*—*in the happiness, in the suffering, we are capable of experiencing*. They go right home to the *inmost soul* of every member of the human family. To do right, is our own highest possible *interest*. To do wrong, is directly, necessarily, in the very teeth of that interest.

Let us all, then, strive to be right, that we may be happy, Let us all eschew evil, that we may escape pain. Let us avoid sin for precisely the same reason that we would not put our hands into the fire, namely, because in doing wrong, we suffer its consequent penalty. Wonderful!—the workmanship of a GOD!—is this contrivance, this arrangement, of right and wrong. Calculated, in the highest possible degree, to induce men to do right, and to prevent their doing wrong.

SECTION III.

WHAT IS RIGHT, AND WHAT WRONG?

“There's but one way to do a thing, and that is the right way.”—

HAVING thus shown that great first principles of right exist, and are founded in the very nature and constitution of things; and, also, what is the *nature* of right and wrong; we pass, naturally, to the application of this principle to what *is* right and wrong. On this subject, much diversity of opinion exists, and its proper decision will do more for mankind than the knowledge of any other thing whatever. In deciding it, Phrenology says: “That is right which harmonizes with the primary nature and original constitution of all our faculties, and whatever violates this primary nature of any faculty, is therefore wrong.” It moreover affirms, that all those actions, feelings, and opinions which harmonize with the primary nature and legitimate function of any or all the organs, and violate none, is right; but that whatever violates any faculty is wrong—that the *natural, legitimate* exercise of any faculty is right, and its perverted action wrong, **It**

also shows what *is* the natural, and what the perverted function of any faculty ; and thereby furnishes us with an unerring test of every opinion, feeling, and action of our whole lives. For example : You wish to decide whether a given business or bargain be right or wrong. Conscientiousness summons a moral court martial, and subpœnas the other faculties as witnesses. It says : ‘ Well, benevolence, what sayest thou to this bargain, or business, or act, or practice, or whatever is to be judged ? ’ If this faculty respond : ‘ I say it will distress yonder innocent man, or make that widow or orphan more wretched, or will grind the face of the poor, or is oppressive and cruel, or even is in the way of human enjoyment ; ’ conscientiousness then says, ‘ It is wrong. Do not this wicked thing. ’ ‘ And, causality, what sayest thou ? ’ ‘ I say its effect will be unfavorable, ’ or, ‘ such and such an effect will be unfavorable, ’ or, ‘ such and such a law will be violated thereby. ’ Conscientiousness again puts its ban upon it. ‘ And, ideality, what sayest thou ? ’ ‘ I say it is coarse, vulgar, disgusting, repulsive, and offensive to taste, as well as degrading and debasing. ’ ‘ No, ’ responds conscientiousness, ‘ this thing is wicked, and must not be done. ’ If veneration sees that the thing proposed will conflict with the worship of the true God ; or friendship complains that its legitimate exercise will be circumscribed or wounded, or parental love mourns over its injury to offspring and the young, or self-interest complains that it will conflict with enlightened selfishness, by injuring the health or circumscribing legitimate enjoyments ; or time says, ‘ I have more important matters on hand ; ’ or the organ of muscular motion says, ‘ It will not allow me sufficient *exercise* ; ’ or vitativeness says, ‘ It will shorten my days ’—if any of the organs rise up and testify against the thing to be judged, conscientiousness vetoes it, and then firmness and all the other faculties combine to resist it. But if enlightened benevolence says, ‘ It will do thee good, and him also ; ’ if friendship says, ‘ It will deepen my roots and strengthen my cords ; ’ if ideality be charmed with its beauty, causality commend its effects, time can make room for it, veneration be gratified, life prolonged, self-enjoyment secured, and all the other faculties sanction, none condemning, conscientiousness, as judge, says, ‘ Neither do I condemn thee ; all is right ; ’ and the other faculties aid in its execution. This is predicated on the supposition that all the faculties act in harmony with their primary natures and legitimate functions. When any act, opinion, or feeling has thus been once decided upon, eventuality recollects it, and firmness abides by it.

In still another way—by another of its principles, already explained—does Phrenology tell us what is right, and what not; as well as explain the cause of that diversity of opinions and practice as to the right and wrong in opinion, feeling, and conduct. It says that the *even*, *equable*, or *proportionate* action of all the organs, is *right*, and the *excessive* action of any, *wrong*. Thus, if acquisitiveness be too large, and benevolence too small, Phrenology saith: “Wake up, benevolence, thou art too sluggish; hold up, acquisitiveness, thou art too grasping, and dost over-reach.” If cautiousness predominate, and combativeness be weak, it saith: “Thy fear prevents thy enjoyment, and retards thy success: do not thus procrastinate;” but, if Phrenology finds cautiousness small, she saith: “Take care, take care there, Mr. Reckless, thou art continually injuring thyself and others, for want of prudence.” If she find benevolence predominant, she saith: “Do not thus give away thy all, but reserve for thyself the means of sustaining life, and capital enough to acquire more property, with which to do still more good.” If she find ideality small, she chides her for allowing improprieties of feeling and expression, and for not enjoying those rich and ever-varying *beauties* with which nature every where shines so resplendent. If veneration be small, or marvellousness, (faith,) be feeble, she saith to the former: “Lengthen thy prayers, and pour out thy soul oftener in worship and praise to the God who made thee;” and to the latter she saith: “Away with thy scepticism, and let thy faith grow till from a mustard seed it becometh a great tree.” And so of all the other faculties. It saith to the feeble ones: “Quicken your actions;” and, to the predominant one: “Restrain your excesses.” It would fain keep them all along together, *pari passu*, and combine all into one harmonious whole.

By another of its fundamental principles, and one already given, does Phrenology proclaim the right, and point out the wrong; namely, by that of the supremacy of the moral sentiments and intellect over the propensities; or, at least, as the constitutional *guides and governors* of the latter; but, having already explained the principle fully, its application, in this connexion, is left for every reader to make. Let him who would know whether a given thing be right or wrong, stop and ask, whether the thing to be adjudged be in harmony with the dictates of enlightened intellect, and the normal constitution, or the primitive functions of the moral sentiments, and the answer will soon tell him what is right, and what wrong.

I have said that Phrenology shows *why* men differ in matters of right and duty. Men's opinions and practices as to right, duty, &c.,

will accord with their phenological developments. That is, different phenological developments cause men to think and feel differently on these subjects. To illustrate: Suppose conscientiousness be alike in two persons, A. and B., and full in both, or five in a scale from 1 to 7. A. has large benevolence, and small acquisitiveness and veneration; while B. has small benevolence, and large acquisitiveness and veneration. A.'s conscientiousness combines with his large benevolence, and makes him feel that he is in duty bound to do all the *good* he can, and that it is wrong to take a large price from a poor man because he *can get it*; while his small acquisitiveness induces him to give the poor man more for an article than it is really worth; yet, as his veneration is small, his conscience does not require him to go to church. But the large acquisitiveness and small benevolence of B. warpe his lesser organ of conscientiousness, and allow him to take from the same poor man more money for a thing than it is really worth, because the poor man can do no better. His large acquisitiveness throws dust into the eyes of smaller conscientiousness and benevolence, and hushes up their feebler remonstrances, while he grinds the face of the poor, takes advantage of their distress, and extorts money from them, because they are in his power, though he is wringing out their very heart's blood. Still, this same conscience, though it allows acquisitiveness to cheat and extort, also combines with veneration, and compels him to go to meeting the next Sabbath, to read his Bible, say his prayers, and go to the communion table—to “sand the rice, water the gin, and then come in to prayers.” The conscientiousness of A. would torment him for extorting the money extorted by B., just as much as that of B. would torment him for not praying and going to church; while the conseintiousness of B. would acquit him for extorting this money from the poor man, or taking the advantage of him in a bargain, as much as that of A. acquits him for not praying and attending church. The opinions of these two men as to what *is* right and wrong, are directly opposite; each condemning what the other approves, and each approving what the other condemns, and both reading each other out of heaven, the one for the other's extortion, and the other for the other's impiety. Now, Phrenology condemns them both, and yet approves both. It saith unto A., “Thou art right in thy humanity, (provided thou dost not injure thyself and those dependent on thee, by giving too much,) but wrong in thy impiety, Give to the poor, but worship also thy God.” Phrenology then turns to B. and saith, “Thy devotion is right, but thy extortion is wrong. Reduce thy acquisitiveness; increase thy benevolence; for **it** is wrong

for thee thus to oppress and distress these poor sufferers." But D. has *all* these organs large and active. *He* makes money, but always makes it *honestly*, and never distresses others. He also gives to the poor, but not to his own injury, or that of those dependent on him; and worships his God, both socially and in secret. *His* conduct Phrenology fully approves, and his conscience makes him happy.

Thus, large conscientiousness, combining with large domestic organs, and weaker intellectual and moral faculties, tells its possessor that his *main* duty consists in taking care of his family; and adds, "He that provideth not for his family is worse than an infidel;" but this organ, when it combines with small domestic organs and large benevolence, tells its possessor that *his* duty consists mainly in doing good to the *heathen* or to mankind in *general*, though, in so doing his family suffer, and quotes the Scripture, "He that giveth to the poor lendeth to the Lord." He who has large conscientiousness and ideality thinks it *his* duty to keep his *person* neat and nice—to shave and change his linnen often, though he make some poor slave work half the time in order to keep himself clean and nice. A fashionable lady, (and all fashionable women are ladies, of course, however ill bred, for fashion "hideth" (and maketh) "a multitude of sins,") with more vanity than sense, but having large veneration, full conscientiousness, large ideality, very large Approbativeness, a silly mother, and a soft-soap preacher, feels it to be her *imperious* duty to go to church, always *provided* that she can go dressed in the very top of the fashion, show a wasplike waste, and wear a half bushel bag of bran or a small bale of cotton; but if she can *not* go thus fashionably, foolishly, and wickedly attired, she does not feel it her *duty* to go at all, because her dress is not *decent*; for it would be *very* wrong *indeed* for her to go to church without being decently (fashionably) dressed, lest her dress should attract attention; though if her extreme fashions should attract the gaze of all present, that would be all right; (how *very* tender some people's consciences are, though, about certain matters!) but the conscientiousness of another lady, who has large intellectual and moral organs, feels it to be *her* duty *not* to dress, and frowns upon our scrupulous fashionables. Conscientiousness with acquisitiveness makes one feel it to be his duty to make and hoard money; but with acquisitiveness small, that it is *wrong* to devote all his energies to amassing paltry wealth; with self-esteem large, that it is his first *duty* to take care of self—but with this organ small and benevolence large, that it is *his* duty to serve others first, to the neglect and even injury of self. And the greater the number of faculties

brought into simultaneous or combined action, the greater the diversity of opinion and conduct as to what is right and wrong.

The reader will thus perceive that the same principle which was pointed out in regard to veneration, showing that the organs give us our views of the character of God, while veneration falls down and worships, applies also to conscientiousness; the other faculties biasing our moral opinion and conduct, and then conscientiousness impelling us to do what these other organs tell us is right. And as this principle, when applied to veneration, tells us the *true* character and attributes of God, when *all* are equally developed and not perverted; so when it is applied to conscientiousness, it tells us what *is* right and wrong *in itself*; for he who has *all* the organs *equally* developed and unperverted, will take *correct* views of right, and do accordingly—will think it right to take care of his family, to make money, to defend the truth, and the poor, to be guarded and careful to dress respectably, to worship his God, to observe and admire the beautiful; to do good at home and abroad, to take care of self, but not to be too selfish, and so of all other faculties. He, therefore, whose organs are most uniform and not perverted by education, will form the *most correct* opinions as to right, and live the best life; but he whose head is uneven, some of his organs large and others small, will be lame, and warped, and bruised, and zig-zag in his moral conduct and opinions. Hence, also, by examining his own head, every individual can see wherein his own standard of right and wrong in conduct and belief, departs from this the only true standard; and wherein it accords with it; so that, by putting his intellect over against his excesses and defects, he can see and remedy defects. This moral formula is the test and touch-stone, by which to try every opinion, and judge every act of his whole life. If any organ be deficient, Phrenology will analyze that organ, and tell how much more of that ingredient he requires in his composition, and also help him to supply it in theory if not in fact, and also tell him what organs are too large, and therefore what kind of feelings and actions to suppress in order to be virtuous and happy. This single principle, this moral formula, is worth more than all the works on ethics and speculative theology ever written. It shows every man what colored glasses he has on, and what ingredients are requisite to restore to them the color of *truth* and the practice of *right*. Guided by this principle, men will no longer regard themselves as infallible, any more than when they know that they have on green glasses, or pink glasses, or dark glasses, will they contend that every thing at which they look is green, or pink, or dark, just because it *looks* so to them;

but they will say, "I know that *my* glasses are green, and you know that *your* glasses are pink, and you know that *yours* are dark, so that the same objects look green to *me*, but *pink* to you and *dark* to you. Though it really seems to me that these objects are green, to you, that they are all pink, and to you that they are all dark, still we can none of us tell what the *real* color is, till we get off our colored glasses—till our organs are *equally active*, or else till intellect can make all necessary allowances. Then all objects will appear alike. Till then, we will not each read the others out of heaven, just because we wear different colored glasses. No, we will be charitable—will each recollect our own liabilities to error, and not condemn those who differ from us. Will not this principle, if applied, heal over and effectually cure those sectarian isms—those "wounds, and bruises, and putrifying sores," which now cover poor, sickly, feeble Christianity "from the crown of the head to the sole of her foot?" Each will not then say to his neighbor, "know *ye* the Lord" as I know him, or I'll not have you in *my* heaven, "but *all* shall know him" *right* and *alike*.

"Fly swifter round, ye wheels of time,
And bring this welcome day."
Shine brighter yet thou star of Gall:
Teach us thy better way.

This principle also shows how it is, that some men can be very wicked, and yet very religious, and even pious. A few anecdotes, by way of illustration: A certain deacon, that lived less than fifty miles above Troy, N. Y., the leader of his society, earnest, gifted, sincere in prayer, eloquent in exhortation, the right-hand man of the minister, and forward and zealous in all matters appertaining to religion, but somewhat slippery in money matters; set up a store, and, in buying his goods in Troy, gave his minister, Mr. L., who was well known in that city, as his reference. Shortly afterwards this minister being down to Troy, was beset by the pious deacon's creditors, to know what for a man he was, and whether he could be safely trusted, &c. The reverend gentleman hesitated and evaded, but, finally, answered: "To tell you the truth—God-ward, he is honest; but, towards man, rather twistical."

Mr. S., being hired by a neighbor to help move a family to the west, stole several things, axes and other things, as he could lay hands on them along the road; and some things from his employer; and yet, all the way along, he talked *religion* to those he met, both in the *bar-rooms*, and stopping them by the way-side.

Other similar cases have been reported in the Journal. [See that of the girl who would steal, and also that of Mr. N., of U., who prayed so fervently sabbath days, and was converted by every revival that came along, and yet sought and took every opportunity to cheat his neighbors—both of which are given in Vol. IV.] Henry A. Wise is both a zealous Christian, and yet a great duellist. Cases analogous to these occur in every community, and in nearly every church. Nor are these pious sinners hypocrites. They are sincere in both their sinfulness and their religion. And the reason why some men are both great sinners, and yet great religionists, is two fold: first, some of their animal propensities are powerfully developed, along with some strong religious organs, which act by turns, and thus render them very zealous in religion at one time, and yet very immoral at other times.

Much has been said of late in denunciation of those ministers who have been guilty of immoral conduct, as if they had all along been guilty of the most consummate hypocrisy from the commencement of their career until the disclosure of their crimes. This is by no means necessarily the case. They *may* have been truly religious, sincerely godly, *at the very time* in which they were indulging unbridled lust; for it is possible, it is not uncommon, for the propensities to act at the same time that the moral faculties are in exercise, and even in combination therewith, thereby producing animal religion. Secondly their organs may differ, are likely to differ, from your own—causing them to regard that as allowable which your organs condemn. Be charitable, therefore. Put the best construction possible on the faults, foibles, errors, selfishness, sinfulness of your fellow-men. But, more of this hereafter.

SECTION IV.

DEPRAVITY.—ITS ORIGIN—ITS EXTENT—ITS CONDITIONS—ITS CAUSES—
ITS REMEDY.

HAVING proved the *existence* of sin, as well as shown its rationale, we pass naturally to consider its origin; its extent, whether total or partial; its conditions; its causes; and how to obviate them, and thus diminish it—questions on which the religious world have been divided, and yet questions which the happiness of man requires to be

settled. What, then, saith the nature of man, touching these points?

First, its *totality*; or what is called *total depravity*; *original sin*, &c. I will not attempt to state, refute, or establish any of the numberless views of this doctrine entertained by the different religious sects; but shall proceed to show the phrenological doctrine touching this point. *It* knows nothing about any other original sin than the contained in the doctrines of hereditary descent, presented in the last and present volumes of the Phrenological Journal. That the iniquities of parents—the violations of both the natural and the moral laws—are *transmitted* from parents to children, it fully establishes. If a parent, or a succession of parents, violate the laws of physiology so as to induce a consumptive tendency, the children are born with that disease actually fastened upon them. So of cancerous, apoplectic, bilious, nervous, and other affections, and indeed, of all physical diseases, and of all predispositions. A similar principle applies to the transmission of moral maladies, be it insanity, or inordinate love of money, or love of liquor, or revenge, or irritability, or lust, or deception, and with all forms and degrees of sinful predispositions. And so also of length of life, health, strength, buoyancy of spirits, and also kindness, amiableness, integrity, devotion, talents of all kinds. So, indeed, of all the qualities and tendencies of our nature. The conditions of goodness, badness, sinfulness, virtue, of the parents, and indeed of the ancestors for generations back, effect the nature, goodness, badness of the children, to give them *originally* a good or a bad tone or direction.* Like parents, like children, is its motto, as it certainly is the motto of truth. But, about any other kind or degree of original sin, or total, innate depravity, it knows nothing. It says, that the sin of the first parents of our race, is capable of tainting all their posterity —“the sins of the parents are visited upon their children unto the third and fourth generations of the disobedient,” (when the race runs out,) but, otherwise, unto thousands of the disobedient. Aside from this original sin, it knows no other.† Still, it does not positively say there is no other. But if there be, it is a revelation of the *Bible*, not of Phrenology.

* For a full exposition of the doctrine of the hereditary influences, the reader is referred to the Author's work entitled, “Hereditary Descent.” its laws and facts.

† In conversing recently with a Dutch Reformed, though formerly Congregational, clergyman, on hereditary descent, he stated it as his full belief that original sin, or innate depravity, consisted in this doctrine of hereditary descent, and was explained by it. No one who knows him, will for a moment doubt his “total” Orthodoxy as to Calvinism. I also heard it from a staunch orthodox

Another principle of Phrenology deserves at least *mention* here, though it may not bear much upon the *original sin* advocated by orthodoxy. It is this. Every primary faculty of man, is good, and its normal, constitutional function, is virtuous. Man's original nature is right.

The depravity of man, however, Phrenology certainly *recognizes*, in the fact that the *natural* exercise and function of all his faculties are more or less perverted and distorted in nearly or quite all mankind. Few, if any, live up to their *original* natures, or are any thing near as good in *character* as they are in their *developments*. The perverted and excessive action of the faculties in children is much less than in adults, and their heads are *better*. No one can look upon a healthy child born of really *good* parents, without seeing much to admire—very much that is sweet, lovely, angelic. A man's business and circumstances tend greatly to increase his virtue or vice, as do also his physical habits, what he eats and drinks, temperance and intemperance, associates, &c. &c. The artificial state of society in which we live, the inducements and temptations to sin which every where beset us, the universal scrambling after money, and rush for places of profit and power, corrupting examples, wrong education, and thousands of similar causes that are continuous and powerful in their action, greatly enhance this depravity, if they do not cause much of it, by distorting and perverting the nature and conduct of man. But, as to either the *innate* or the *total* depravity of man, Phrenology is clear and demonstrative. It says that every primary faculty of man, as originally constituted, is *good* and *right*, and that the *legitimate* exercise of any and every faculty, upon its own appropriate object, and in a proper degree, is virtuous—that *no* faculty is *constitutionally* bad; that *all* are good *in* themselves, and in their *primitive* action and function, and that depravity forms no *constituent* or *necessarily* accompanying part of the nature of man, but is a *perversion* and *violation* of that nature. Farther than the hereditary descent of qualities from parents to their descendants, already alluded to, Phrenology knows nothing of man's depravity, either total or innate. If this fully established doctrine of Phrenology is found to embrace or explain the doctrines of "original

pulpit, and an Andover educated clergyman in June 1844, and also in a recent conversation, found it to coincide with the views of another leading Congregational clergyman in New England. Yet, whether this sentiment be orthodoxy or not, is left for others to say. I give it merely as *his opinion*, and leave it to others for consideration.

sin" or "total depravity," by showing that children inherit from their parents particular predispositions, propensities, tastes, aptitudes, passions, tendencies, and mental and physical qualities, then Phrenology may possibly be said to recognize these doctrines.

At all events, children do inherit depraved propensities from their parents, and also virtuous predispositions. Still, these hereditary tendencies may be counteracted. Though insanity, which consists in the *over* or exalted action of one or more faculties, and liability to be wrought up to this exalted pitch of derangement, be hereditary; yet, by avoiding those causes of excitement which are calculated to develop and increase this naturally excessive susceptibility, as well as by applying causes calculated to allay constitutional excitability, and to soothe and relax; no one, however crazy his ancestors may have been, need become deranged. Indeed, this very susceptibility, instead of degenerating into insanity, if properly managed, is calculated to augment his talents and happiness; for derangement is only the *excess* of that very action which, when healthy, gives talent and enjoyment.

If this be construed so as to militate *against* the doctrine of *innate* depravity and *original* sin, still it is clearly a doctrine of Phrenology, and as such I state it and leave it. Whatever other doctrines conflict with it are erroneous. It is not necessary for Phrenology to *contain* this doctrine of original sin, only that it should not *conflict* with it; for, as already observed, it is not founded in the *original* nature of man, and therefore is not a doctrine of either Phrenology or Natural Theology. Its advocates claim it to be a doctrine of Revelation, and regard it as one of the doctrines of salvation by Christ. To this claim, Phrenology willingly accedes.

One origin, one great procuring cause of human depravity, is to be found in a disordered *physiology*. In my work on Education, p. 94, I have shown, *fully* and *conclusively*, that there exist the most intimate relations between the body and the base of the brain, or the organs of the propensities—that whatever stimulates the former, naturally, necessarily excites the latter. This law is unquestionably a fundamental principle of the nature of man. I have also shown in this work, p. —, that the ascendancy of the moral sentiments and intellect, is one of the leading conditions of virtue, while the action of the propensities *without* the direction and government of intellect and the moral sentiments, is sinful. Now put that and that together, that physical inflammation and disease often excite the propensities till they *predominate*, and thus induce sinfulness, and we see that *physical health* is indispensable to moral purity; while one prolific cause of

That widely extended depravity of our race is to be looked for in the *diet* and *physical* habits of mankind—in the enormous quantities of ardent spirits, ale, beer, flesh, cucumbers, hot bread and butter, &c. &c., consumed. That alcoholic drinks vastly enhance the sinfulness and suffering of the drinker, is a matter of fact which stares us all rully in the face. That it does so by disordering the physiology, is self-evident. In no other way is it *possible* for matter to effect mind. Then why should not all physical disorder produce moral disorder? Indeed, I regard sin as not unfrequently the product of a disordered brain, while the normal function of a healthy brain, is *always* virtuous. I regard flesh as highly corrupting to the blood, as highly inflammatory, and thereby, as directly calculated to inflame the *base* of the brain; thereby producing moral impurity. Man is a *physical*, as well as a moral being. He is under the dominion of physical laws, as well as of those that are moral. Why, then, should not the violation of the *physical* laws be as sinful as that of the moral, and *vice versa* of their obedience? Indeed, the moral cannot possibly be obeyed unless the physical are first obeyed. Virtue and vice, sin and holiness, happiness and misery, depend far more on the conditions of the body—on health and sickness, what, and how much we eat and drink, how much, and where we sleep, whether we exercise or not, &c. &c., than is generally supposed. A child is more cross and fretful, and therefore more depraved, when a little unwell, than when not so. Eating green fruit, therefore, or doing anything else to impair its health, induces this fretfulness, and therefore augments depravity. Similar illustrations innumerable, apply to adults—to the whole human family. And the way to reform men morally, is to reform them *physically*. But the principle is probably clear, and the inference most important.

Let me not be understood, however, to ascribe *all* sin to physical diseases. Volition also enters into the composition of sin. An act cannot be called *culpable* unless it was done *voluntarily*. This is a matter of *consciousness*. The *motive*, as well as the act committed, goes far towards rendering the doer criminal or innocent. We cannot feel really guilty for any act, however wrong *in itself*, when our intentions were right. Nor can we help feeling condemned for an act good in itself, but committed with wrong intentions. When we have injured others unintentionally, we may feel sorry, but we cannot feel *condemned*. Conscientiousness can act only in conjunction with the power of will.

Intellect, is also a necessary ingredient in accountability. An idiot cannot be morally accountable, for, by supposition, he has no intellect to guide his choice.

So derangement diminishes accountability: and so does all those physical disorders already spoken of, as inducing sinful actions. As far as they affect us they are upon a par with derangement.

In short, the great Phrenological law is this. As the even, uniform action of all the faculties, constitutes virtue, and also gives us *correct* ideas of what is right, so our accountability is greater or less, according as all our physical and moral faculties are more or less perfectly developed. The parable of the talents is a happy illustration of the same doctrine. Our moral accountability increases as does our moral and intellectual *capacity*. In Phrenological language: the more fully and evenly developed our faculties, the more material has conscience with which to operate, and therefore the more accountable the subject, and *vice versa*. This is the phrenological principle. Every reader can run it out in its ramified applications for himself.

SECTION V.

PUNISHMENT, HERE AND HEREAFTER.

HAVING already demonstrated the existence of right and wrong, only other names for virtue and sinfulness, it remains to discuss the rewards of virtue and the punishment of sin. It has all along been implied, it has been even demonstrated, that goodness is rewardable, and sin punishable. That is, obeying any and every law of our being, always induces a given kind and amount of pleasure as a reward, while violating them inevitably brings down upon the transgressor, and upon all affected thereby, a given kind and degree of pain, as a penalty consequent upon such violations. In the *very act* of such obedience and in all its consequences, to ourselves, to all concerned, we enjoy, whilst in and by the transgression, and in all its consequences, we suffer. This is a certain, uniform, universal *fact*. The penalty goes along with the transgression. The reward, with the obedience. Each are linked together as causes and effects, and are therefore *certain*. They are inseparable each from the other. It is not *possible* to sin without suffering, or to suffer without somebody having sinned to cause it. Nor is it possible to do right without receiving pleasure therein ourselves, and also making happy as far as the act in question at all affects others.

Farthermore. Different kinds and degrees of rewards and punishment accompany the obedience and violation of the several laws. And these are proportionate to the value or importance of the

obeyed or broken. As, the greater any blessing, the greater the curse of its perversion, so the obedience or violation of the several laws, for both amount in fact to the same thing.

Not only does this doctrine of *proportion* exist between the importance of the several laws and the penalty of their infraction, and *vice versa* of their obedience, but there is something in the very character of the pain or pleasure, analogous to the nature of the law broken or obeyed. Thus the obedience or violation of the natural laws, bring physical happiness or suffering, while the violation or obedience of the mental or moral laws, brings mental or moral suffering or pleasure. The violation of the law of reason, induces error, and this error punishes us in a variety of ways, according to the nature of the error imbibed; and *vice versa* of correct reasoning. Obeying the law of friendship, induces pleasure in that department of our nature, and in all its dependencies, and *vice versa* of its infraction.

But this whole range of thought is condensed in this—the *self-acting* of the various laws. Every obedience to law *rewards itself*. Every violation of law *punishes itself*. *In the very act* of obedience consists the pleasure. *In and by* the transgression occurs the pain. Hence, the analogy between the two on the one hand, and the pleasures of obedience, or the pains of its disobedience on the other. Hence, also, the *universality*, of the rewards and punishments.

This doctrine of the *self-acting* of all the laws of our being, shows *how* it is that we shall be punished, both here and hereafter. It repudiates the doctrine of a *literal* hell of fire and brimstone: we shall be as it were, *chained to ourselves*—chained to the *characters* we form here, and to their consequences. This will constitute all the hell we shall ever experience. Heaven *consists in doing right*, and hell in *doing wrong*. Both are *conditions*, rather than places. They are *in* us, and form a *part* of us; so that we need not wait for them hereafter. Not that Phrenology repudiates the doctrine of a heaven and a hell hereafter, but it shows what *constitutes* heaven, namely, *obedience to the laws of our being*, and what makes a hell, namely, the *violation* of these laws, both here and also hereafter.

Again: virtue and vice are *self-perpetuating* and *self-progressive*. The Phrenological doctrine of the increase of organs by exercise, and of their diminution by inaction, establishes this point beyond a doubt. As already shown, Phrenology establishes the doctrine of a future state of being, and that *to us, as us*—to us in our *own appropriate personality*; and as the same beings *then* that we are *now*; for the argument already shown to prove a future state of existence, when applied

to our own personal existence, also proves that personal existence—proves that *we ourselves here*, shall be *ourselves hereafter*—shall be the same beings here as there, except important changes; yet these changes will not affect our identity, or our personality, or our existence *as ourselves*. That is, we shall be the same beings *there* that we are here, except changes analogous to those that occur between infancy and old age.

Since, then, we shall exist hereafter in our own appropriate persons, and be the same beings there as here, we must of course be *morally accountable* there as well as here, and also, as such, punishable. Otherwise, one fundamental condition of our present existence will be wanting, which will destroy our identity and personality. Now, add to this the Phrenological doctrine of *progression* in virtue and vice—the doctrine that the natural tendency of goodness is to grow better, and of depravity to become worse, and we have all the principal materials of all the heaven and hell that await us hereafter. What influences may be thrown around us to induce (not compel) us to choose the good and eschew the wrong, Phrenology saith not. These influences may be very powerful, and be calculated to make the good better and the bad worse, or to make *all* better, and of course the more happy; but I am aware of but one Phrenological principle that bears on this point. That principle is, that as sin consists in the predominance of the *propensities*, and as death is likely to weaken them, perhaps destroy many of them, and also relieve us of all those causes of depravity which come through a disordered physiology, the propensities will not then predominate. Therefore we shall cease to sin; cease to suffer. Still, there is too much of *theory* about both these opposing inferences to render either *demonstrative*. But I cannot resist the conviction, to which Phrenology brings us by several roads, that as long as we exist, that is *forever*, we shall reap the rewards of our conduct in this life. In the chapter on hope, when showing the juxta position of hope and conscientiousness, I think I demonstrated a principle that bears on this point. Still the principle being before the reader, he will draw his own deductions. Let it be borne in mind that this work purports to give, not the theology of its *author*, but of *Phrenology*; supposing this science to be true. *Individual* opinions should have no place in the work. The author has sedulously endeavored to deduce every doctrine presented in these pages legitimate^{ly} from some fully established principle of Phrenology.

Let it also be distinctly remembered, however, as all along implied, **that Phrenology teaches NATURAL theology ONLY—the moral NATURE**

and **CONSTITUTION** of man **ALONE**—and *not* the doctrine or means of **salvation** by Christ. Though it teaches the doctrine of penitence and pardon, on which salvation by Christ is founded, yet it neither reveals a Savior, nor shows what we must do to be saved. The one specific object of Revelation, appears to me to be, to *reveal a Savior* and disclose the *means* of salvation, not to furnish a code of morals for the guidance of man's conduct. The fall of Adam and salvation by Christ, occurred *after* the *nature* of man was completed, and are *extraneous* to that nature ; so that Phrenology, which unfolds the constitution and laws of man's nature, could not have any specific bearing on these points. The code of Phrenology was sealed before a Savior was needed, so that those doctrines connected with salvation, such as the doctrines of the *trinity*, *atonement*, *total* depravity, special divine influences, and kindred doctrines, are all left to be developed by revelation. For Phrenology to claim their revelation, would be plagiarism, and derogatory to the Bible, to reveal which is its main design. Whether Phrenology develops principles relative to the atonement of offences by a third person or not, I know not, but I believe that this also is left to be revealed by the Bible.

SECTION VI.

PENITENCE AND PARDON.

“ Then came Peter to him and said, Lord how often shall my brother sin against me and I forgive him ? Till seven times ? Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto thee, until seven times, but, until **SEVENTY TIMES SEVEN.**”

In morals, the doctrine of penitence and pardon, is one of great importance—is even fundamental. It is also undecided. Christianity maintains, or rather is *based* in the doctrine of the forgiveness of sin, or of atonement and salvation by Christ. Infidelity scorns this doctrine on the ground that it directly contravenes every law of nature, and argues that the violation of every law of nature induces its own penalty, while its observance brings with it its own reward—that this doctrine of penitence and forgiveness shields the guilty from deserved punishment, allowing them to violate the inexorable laws of their being, and yet escape their penalties—and there is nothing in sorrow for sin at all calculated to ward off its fearful penalties—that if a man take **arsenic**

or laudanum, and the moment afterwards is deeply penitent thereof, yet that this penitence does not in the least stay the effects of the deadly poison—that even when we sin ignorantly, the effect is the same and the penalty sure; and that therefore this doctrine of forgiveness of sin is utterly unphilosophical, and right in the very *teeth* of all that we know to be true in nature touching this point.

And now, Christian, where is thy answer? A “thus saith the Lord” will not do, for the infidel does not admit the truth of revelation, but requires an answer drawn from *nature*, and founded in the constitution of man, or in some fully established moral principle. It may safely be said that nature no where furnishes any evidence of this leading Christian doctrine; but so far from it, is directly opposed to it, because her natural and physiological, as well as moral laws, are inexorable, and the punishment attached to their violation *certain*. The Christian is nonplussed. Nothing in nature affords him any aid, but everything is against him. Phrenology now kindly steps forward to his aid, and says to Infidelity, “Cease thy triumphant boasting, for this Christian doctrine has its counterpart in the nature of man.” One of the functions of conscientiousness is to be sorry when we are convinced of having done wrong, and another is forgiveness of the penitent. I have examined tens of thousands of heads, and am plain to say, that large conscientiousness not only experiences deep remorse and contrition when sensible of having sinned, but also freely and fully forgives the penitent; but, with combativeness and destructiveness also large, it never *will* forgive the sinner till he shows penitence. Till he breaks down with sorrow for sin, it pursues him with unrelenting moral indignation, and the more so the larger this organ; but, the moment it discovers penitence, it says, “I forgive,” “go thy way, sin no more.” It is not in the heart of a conscientious and benevolent man to punish an erring but penitent sinner, who is humbly supplicating pardon for sins committed. Until it *does* discover this penitence, however, it says, “Let law have its course. He has sinned, and his punishment is deserved. Let it be inflicted without mercy.” But the very instant it discovers sorrow for sin, its sword of justice is sheathed. Its primitive feelings are subdued. Its moral indignation is disarmed and smothered, and succeeded by full forgiveness. But I never yet have found the man with small conscientiousness, and large combativeness and destructiveness, who showed signs either of penitence for his *own* sins, or of forgiveness of others. A story of one will serve for all. At Cambridge, in 1838, I examined the head of an old college mate having this organization. The night following, he conceived himself *insulted*

by a friend, whom he accordingly *challenged*. His friend apologized. "But what does your *apology* have to do with my wounded *honor*? Does your sorrow atone for your insult? No! Apology or no apology, *I will have satisfaction.*" If benevolence be large, it may stay the uplifted hand of vengeance, but the old grudge will still rankle in the bosom. A cordial reconciliation is impossible, however humble and penitent the transgressor. But large conscientiousness fully and freely forgives, freely restores the guilty to confidence and affection, and even bestows increased favors upon him.

The doctrine of penitence and pardon then, so essential to the maintenance of Christianity, is proved by Phrenology to form a part and parcel of the nature of man, and to be consistent with that nature. True, Phrenology says nothing about forgiveness and salvation *by Christ*. It proves that the great *element* or *principle* of forgiveness is not only not inconsistent with the nature of man, but is actually engrafted on that nature. It proves the *basis* or *ground work* of this Christian doctrine, and leaves it for the Bible to say *how* and *by whom* we are to be forgiven. Overthrow this doctrine of forgiveness, and Christianity is overthrown, and even razed from its very foundations; but establish it, and you thereby establish the fundamental basis of forgiveness by Christ. Phrenology, as already seen, proves this doctrine of forgiveness to be a function of conscientiousness, and to be engrafted in the nature of man, and then leaves it for the Bible to tell us *how* we are to be saved from the consequences of sin. Tell me, Christian, art thou sufficiently thankful for this timely aid? Wilt thou not embrace and kiss thy twin sister and thy handmaid? How ungrateful is this nineteenth century Christianity (falsely so called,) in thus turning its twin sister out of doors!

Let me not be understood to say that we can sin and not be punished *at all*. But not to the *full extent*. *In and by the very act* of transgression, we suffer. But that suffering often continues throughout this life. And, what is more, the natural tendency of sin is to *augment itself*. But penitence induces reform—always, necessarily, and thus both arrests the increase of the transgression, and consequently stays the penalty that would otherwise have occurred, as well as tends towards healing the wound already made.

This principle shows that it is our duty, our privilege, to forgive the penitent. Our fellow men wrong us; wrong others. At first, we feel disposed to pursue them with the uplifted hand of punishment. But this principle stays that hand. It teaches us that to "err is human: to forgive, divine." "Let him that is without sin, cast the first stone"

Sinful man should *not* be censorious. Why is he so much so? Do they who condemn others, think they are perfect? Should not they forgive who pray to be forgiven? How many, themselves no inconsiderable sinners, essay to pray "Forgive us our sins as we forgive those who trespass against us," and yet are unsparing not in their censure merely, but in their ceaseless condemnation of those who are even no worse than they are. This is not Phrenology. It is not Bible. It is not Christianity. FORGIVENESS was one of the greatest lessons taught by the great Teacher and Exemplar of mankind. "If thine enemy hunger, feed him." "He that smiteth thee on the one cheek, turn to him the other also." This is Christianity. This is Phrenology. And he is the best Christian who is the most forgiving. One of the very best of men it was my happy lot ever to know, was one of the most forgiving. He will take an erring brother by the hand and tell him, "sin no more," but not cast him off because he had fallen. Above all things, because a man has one "easily besetting sin," should he not be condemned as a bad man in *all* things. And yet the general say is, "He that will lie, will steal." As though a man could not be guilty of one sin without being black-hearted throughout, and given to all manner of wickedness. One propensity may be strong, yet others not so, and the moral organs generally large. That propensity may overcome him, and yet he be at heart good, and correct in all other respects. Or, under some powerful temptation, he may give way for a single moment, only to repent and abhor himself in sackcloth and ashes therefor, and yet be cast out of society, and by those, too, who call themselves Christians; though a rose by any other name would smell as sweetly. Especially should this forgiving spirit be manifested towards the young. They often sin from impulse merely. Forgive and restore them, and they will reform, whereas, if not forgiven, but blamed and cast off, they would plunge again into the vortex of sin and misery, from which they might otherwise have been saved.

Look again at the practical utility of the application of this principle of forgiveness. As long as the drunkard was cast out of society for being a drunkard, and treated with *contempt* therefor, he continued to drink. But when he was taken by the hand of brotherly feeling by Washingtonianism,* and restored to his lost standing in society, and

* By many good men, and even Temperance advocates, Washingtonianism is held in light esteem. They say, "Oh yes, it has done good to be sure, but, but, but." Allow me to say, that nearly every distinctive feature of Washingtonianism is founded in a principle of the nature of man. Its forgiving spirit pre-eminently. Its whole-souled benevolence. Its brotherly feeling. Its practical

made again to feel that he *was* a man, he reformed. But twit a Washingtonian of having been a drunkard, and you take the most effectual method possible to re-plunge him into that abyss of ruin from which he would otherwise have escaped. As great a reform is yet destined to be effected among the daughters of sin, as is now in progress among the inebriates. It cannot be that this whole class of unfortunates must perish. Benevolence will not permit it. Humanity, flushed with the triumphs she is now achieving for the intemperate, as well as in other departments of philanthropy, will not allow so numerous, so miserable a class of human beings, to perish in their sins. And in this greatest of works she will not be buffeted. Success will even *increase* upon her. But, *how*—by what *weapons*—is she to achieve her conquests? By *forgiveness*. By *love*. Now, when a woman sins, be she ever so penitent, be it that her seducer is almost wholly in fault, as is almost always the case, be it even that she sinned under the most solemn promises of marriage, or by mock marriage, still, she is cast out of “gentle” society. All the *respectables* point at her the finger of scorn. Even *so-called* Christians are loudest in her condemnation. Every friend forsakes her. All employment forsakes her. Though willing to earn her living by any occupation however laborious, however menial, yet even that is taken from her. She must *starve*, or else live completely abandoned, however repulsive such a life. Nobly, immortal Mrs. Childs! hast thou done by Amelia Norman. Beyond all praise, thy conduct! Worthy of all imitation, thy example! *And it will be followed*. It will rescue from “hell” thousands who must otherwise perish in untold misery! A worthy sister of the great apostle and martyr of moral reform! Go on. Persevere, ye sisters of moral reform. Teach men *practical* forgiveness. Rather *re-teach* them; for, by precept upon precept, by parable after parable,* by example after example, did Christ Jesus inculcate, enforce, command, his disciples to exercise this pre-eminently Christian virtue. I long to see the Washingtonian movement extended to the moral reform cause. Wonders, will this forgiving principle work. Let its virtues be tried. Let this rarest of Christian virtues be cultivated. And immeasurably will the fruits thereof gladden mankind, as well as fill the forgiving soul to

effects and practical workings. Its narration. Hardly any thing interests the human mind more: convinces, argues, persuades, instructs, or calls out all the faculties of the human mind, more than *narrative, facts, experiences, stories, &c.* And it is destined to teach even the learned many a lesson of human nature which metaphysics does not reveal.

* See Matthew xxi.

its utmost capacity with a joy which it hath not entered into the heart of man to conceive.

These, and other fundamental principles, developed by Phrenology, both expose the utter folly of sectarianism, and reveal its remedy. Its disciples can hardly fail to agree in matters of religious belief and practice; for its problems and corollaries are so reasonable, are enforced so clearly, as literally to *compel* belief. Taking the worst sectarian bone of contention that exists—that of original sin, or total depravity—let us see how this science will bring harmony out of Babel.

This doctrine is by far the most knotty point of controversy that divides the warring sects from each other, and separates them all from infidelity. Payne assails this doctrine of imputed sin with all the ridicule, all the opprobrium, which his satirical pen could command. He even arraigns that part of the venerable decalogue which declares that God will visit the iniquities of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generations of them that hate him, but showing mercy unto thousands of them that love him and keep his commandments. He argues, that this horrible doctrine of punishing innocent children for the sins of their guilty parents is an outrage upon every principle of justice and benevolence, as well as directly at war with the whole known character of God; and hence, that God could not be the author either of the decalogue, or of the Bible. Many even of those who believe the Bible, side with him far enough to discard the doctrine of imputed sin. Unitarians, Universalists, and even Methodists, reject its orthodox version: "In Adam's fall we sinned all." Even Dr. Taylor avows that we are not punishable for the sin of Adam; and this is substantially the new school doctrine. This single point, and those doctrines that grow out of it, occasion more sectarian discord than probably all others united, it being the great dividing line between them. Now, if Phrenology can so far solve even this problem as to restore harmony of belief here, it can surely reconcile minor differences, and calm the troubled waters of sectarian strife.

This doctrine of original sin, is set at rest by the phrenological doctrine of hereditary descent, or the transmission of qualities from generation to generation as far as this matter can be traced, which is often, for ten generations; and, in the case of love of property and facility of acquiring it, the religious sentiment, mechanical ingenuity, and superior natural abilities, it can be traced from Abraham, all along down throughout the whole Jewish nation, to the present time. The law by which children inherit both the virtues and the vices of their ancestors, running back even to the beginning of time, is *demonstrated* by this science. (See the Author's work, entitled, "Hereditary Descent," in

which this transmission is shown to appertain to the whole man, both mental and physical—to diseases of both body and mind—virtues and vices included.) Now, *in this doctrine* is embodied all the original sin known to Phrenology, if not to man. Nor is this version of that doctrine repulsive to either reason or justice, for it is as *right* that children inherit the mental and moral virtues, vices, and capabilities of their parents, as their lands and property. Payne, then, was too fast. So are all those who declaim against this doctrine. The fundamental doctrine of Orthodoxy is therefore sustained by Phrenology; and yet this doctrine is so modified by this its only true version as to be objectionable to none—to be readily admitted by all. Payne himself would have been *compelled* to admit, would cheerfully have admitted, both the doctrine itself and its utility, and even its absolute *necessity*. This principle of hereditary descent would have *compelled* him to eat his own words. It will *compel* assent to this Calvinistic doctrine as thus modified. Still, while it sustains the fundamental doctrine of orthodoxy, it materially modifies it; so much so, that now it both compels our assent and calls forth our admiration, whereas then it outraged both our justice and our reason. Thus does Phrenology harmonize even *infidelity and orthodoxy*, and that too on the very point in which they differ most widely and fundamentally. And in doing this, it will settle by mutual consent many a minor point now controverted. It will also essentially illustrate other orthodox doctrines based on this point, thereby bringing all into the same (and that the *right*) ground concerning them. Similar remarks will be found to apply to nearly or quite every sectarian doctrine now in dispute. A great religious *peace-maker* will Phrenology be found to be. But, why particularize? for if it can harmonize *this* the greatest and most fundamental difference so easily and perfectly, surely it can the lesser ones.

To recapitulate the numerous and striking coincidences between the religious doctrines taught, and practices required by Phrenology, and those enjoined in the Bible, is scarcely necessary, for every intellectual reader must have observed them in passing. To take a few as samples: The Bible enjoins continually and positively, the worship of God. So does Phrenology, in its pointing out the existence of veneration, and the fact of its existence rendering its exercise *imperative*—our highest duty, our greatest privilege. And the attributes of God as pointed out by Phrenology, harmonize beautifully with those contained especially in the New Testament—such as his benevolence, his justice, his wisdom, his paternity, his spirituality, his firmness, his sovereignty, &c. As the Bible requires us to *do good*, and represents *charity* as the greatest of the Christian virtues, and our great Exam-

pler as *wholly devoted* to the cause of humanity, so Phrenology also inculcates the same sentiment, by pointing out the existence of benevolence, and our consequent duty to exercise it

Both the Bible and Phrenology recognize the doctrine of *spirituality* as appertaining both to man and to angels, as well as to God. See the whole tenor of the Bible touching this point, especially its requisition of faith, as compared with those views of spirituality found in this work.

Phrenology and the Bible both enjoin the sentiments of *justice*, of penitence, of forgiveness. Both inculcate the hope of immortality, and require its exercise. Both interdict lust, profanity, drunkenness, gluttony, covetousness, stealing, fraud, malice, revenge, false swearing, lying, murder, and kindred vices; while both inculcate filial piety, moral purity, chastity, honesty, good works, parental and connubial love, friendship, industry, manual labor, self-government, patience, perseverance, hospitality, sincerity, cheerfulness, faith, spiritual-mindedness, intellectual culture, and the whole cluster of the moral virtues.

I do not, however, hesitate to say, that the *Old Testament* allows some doctrines which are at war with Phrenology, such as war, capital punishment, the "life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot" doctrine, &c.—(Deut. xix. 21.) These, however, the *New Testament* abrogates, supplanting them by the law of kindness—a law so signally in harmony with the teachings of Phrenology. Indeed, the doctrines and teachings of Christ, are found to harmonize *perfectly*, and in *all their shades and phases* with the doctrines and teachings of Phrenology. *His* doctrines are perfect. Wonderfully calculated to reform and adorn mankind. Every doctrine, either an exposition of some law of mind, or else founded on some law. Every precept, calculated to promote moral purity and human happiness. A perfect pattern in both precept and example, of that ascendancy of the moral sentiments so clearly demonstrated and so forcibly enjoined by Phrenology, as the *sine qua non* of virtue and happiness. Phrenology does not suggest a single error or improvement either in his doctrines or examples, or in that inimitable exemplification of them in practice described in the first few chapters of the Acts of the Apostles, where they went from house to house, healing the sick, bestowing alms, breaking bread, and having all things in common. Oh, what his benign and heavenly doctrines were but comprehended and practiced by his *professed* followers—by the whole world. A holy and a happy world would then be ours! Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive, the joy, the ineffable glory, that obedience to his precepts and practices would confer on man!

P. 131 - Favours.

P. 233 - Renewals?





1
H. Button

General Howard
as thick and clear

The glass is
broken and so

