

PHRENOLOGY

KNOWN BY ITS FRUITS,

BEING

A BRIEF REVIEW OF

DOCTOR BRIGHAM'S LATE WORK,

ENTITLED

"OBSERVATIONS ON THE INFLUENCE OF RELIGION
UPON THE HEALTH AND PHYSICAL WELFARE OF
MANKIND."

BY DAVID HERBERT REESE, M. D.
OF NEW-YORK.

"THERE seemeth to be a superfluity of books—but, shall no more be made?
Yea! make more good books—which, like the serpent of Moses, may devour
the serpents of the enchanter."—LORD BACON.

STANFORD LIBRARY

NEW-YORK:

HOWE & BATES, 76 CHATHAM-STREET.

1836.

54

215153

ENTERED, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1836, by DAVID
MEREDITH REESE, M. D., in the Clerk's Office of the District Court
of the Southern District of New-York.

YRA 9811 090718AT2

CLAYTON & BUCKINGHAM, PRINTERS,
No. 9 Thames-street.

TO

THOMAS SEWALL, M. D.,

PROFESSOR OF ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY IN THE
COLUMBIAN COLLEGE OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

DEAR SIR—

Your well known hostility to the whole Phrenological fabric—because of your well founded apprehensions of its deplorable moral influence—as well as the profound esteem and respect I have always entertained for your personal and professional character, have emboldened me in the dedication of this humble effort to you.

Accept, Sir, this small token of my affectionate regard and friendship.

DAVID MEREDITH REESE, M. D.

New-York, October 1st, 1836.

PREFACE.

THE author of the following pages, having more than once had occasion to appear before the public in the unenviable character of a polemick, had become weary of controversy. With increasing years, he had thought to have shielded the sword of wordy conflict in its peaceful scabbard, and whether he had become wiser or not, he verily thought to have "learned war no more." In this pacific purpose he found no small share of self complacency, and was already employing his leisure hours in the quiet avocations of reading and study, preparatory to the completion of some literary efforts, which have been long contemplated, and still lie unfinished upon his escritoir, among the few manuscripts which his time and opportunities have allowed him to begin, with no other result than to "report progress."

After such a resolution to retreat from the din of polemical strife, some explanation of the motives for his suddenly emerging from his obscurity is due to his friends, to whom his purpose had been communicated, and who will be surprised, and some of them, perhaps, grieved, that he should so soon buckle on his armour. To such he will only need to say, that the work of Dr. Brigham had not then appeared, which has called forth this reply, nor was it until a short time since, that it came under his notice. His attention was first directed to it, by a distinguished literary friend, in the city of Washington, who, in a letter referring to the work, earnestly urged the importance of an early antidote to the moral poison it contained, and made an appeal to the author, for a prompt attempt to repel this assault upon both medical and theological truth, and to refute the heresies it contains against science, as well as religion. This appeal was rendered irresistible, by the importunity of other judicious friends, who overcame all scruples against farther controversial writing, by alleging that the minds of the young and rising generation would readily imbibe the prejudices against religion which Dr. B.'s book is so obviously calculated to inculcate, coming as it purports to do, from a regu-

larly educated physician, and shielded from suspicion by the pretext of being dictated by philosophy and science, and under the imposing guise of a "profound respect" for religion itself. And they still further urged the writer to this unwelcome service, by the consideration that the character of the work was such, embracing the subjects of health and disease, and especially by reason of the observations on insanity, that none but a physician could be appropriately expected to reply to it. Constrained to concur with them in the opinion that the book imperiously called for an answer, the author has yielded to their judgment, rather than his own, in becoming the writer of the following pages, but not until he had waited several months in vain, in the hope that another would undertake it.

Ever aware of the imperfections of his wisdom and piety, and peculiarly sensible of his liability to an excess of zeal, and occasionally to a degree of causticity in manner and style, the author, while he regrets this torrid temperament, which may be ascribed to his physical and phrenological "organization," can offer no apology for "calling things by their right names." Towards the author under review, he is conscious of no sentiment inconsistent with "the law of love;" but with the book which bears his name, he has no fellowship, and he is free to avow that he condemns and even abhors the errors on which he has animadverted, and he "loves to abhor them." He has no kindred affiliation with the sentiment, that because a man is a professor of the religion which inculcates "love to all men," that he is, therefore, to "suffer sin in his neighbor" without uttering reproof; or to "prophecy smooth things," when the "citadel of this world's hopes, the sacred edifice of our holy religion," is approached by the brand of an incendiary, even though he should be "transformed into an angel of light," or attempt the deed of darkness under the specious guise of philosophy, or "science, falsely so called." In humble imitation of an apostle, he would "withstand him to the face, because he is to be blamed;" yet, in doing so with the plainness of speech, and just indignation which the cause of truth demands, he trusts he has not betrayed a spirit of vindictiveness, or unbecoming censoriousness. If it shall so appear to any friend of the truth, it will be a subject of regret, and to none more sincerely than to himself, since it would grieve him to find that the infirmity of the writer should thus deteriorate from the

usefulness of his effort. He can, therefore, only say to the reader as his apology for imperfections either in matter or manner, that the reason why the task has not been *better* performed, is for want of an abler hand, a wiser head, and a better heart. That it has not been *earlier* published, is wholly owing to the incessant avocations which other and imperative duties have imposed, by which he has been deprived of those hours of leisure which he would gladly have devoted to the work, and by which he has been constrained to prepare detached parts at intervals, sometimes of weeks together, and to write chiefly during those few hours which a laborious profession render needful for repose.

Having written the whole under these disadvantages, the author can scarcely say that he is himself satisfied with the manner of the performance; nor can he hope to escape the ban of reprobation from that class of critics, who make a man "an offender for a word." As, however, he does not write for reputation, nor yet for money, in the present case, but wholly for the purpose to expose error and vindicate truth, irrespective of any minor or personal consideration, he will be content to bear with what grace he may, the condemnatory sentence of such as demand perfect symmetry of elocution in every page of an original work. He "could not meet their requisitions if he would," and, in sober verity, he may add, he "would not if he could." To have his sentences stereotyped into conformity with their archetype, would afflict him as grievously as to distort his own limbs, and limit his locomotion by a straight jacket.

In respect to the views he expresses of Phrenology, and the disrespect with which he treats that "science," the author deems it proper to inform the reader, that his own opinions on that subject have recently undergone an entire revolution. Attracted by the learning and labors of Gall, and admiring the genius and untiring industry of Spurzheim, with many others he had hailed phrenology as a science, and even partially invested craniology itself with the merits of a philosophical system. It was, however, with anatomical views entirely that he had looked upon the subject with favor, and he had not been led to investigate its moral aspect or tendency until recently. He had regarded the light which phrenologists claimed to have thrown upon the structure and functions of the brain, as calculated to contribute to the business of education, to aid in some questions of medical juris-

prudence, and to facilitate the curative management of certain obscure diseases of the head. Thus far he was disposed to look into phrenology, and though aware of the crude and imperfect condition of its doctrines, and the arbitrary character of many of its dogmas, still he hoped that as it should be studied and improved, valuable contributions to our stock of knowledge might be the result. An expression of these views, has identified him *nominally* with one or more phrenological societies, abroad as well as at home; and he had consented thereto, that he might learn whatever truth might be discovered, which could be useful in his profession. His relation, however, was purely nominal, for he never found either leisure or inclination to attend a meeting on the subject, nor ever thought it needful even to acknowledge in any way, the compliment conferred by those phrenological societies who have elected him a corresponding member.

Some months since, however, he was led to consider the subject for the first time, in its moral aspect, with the view of writing a paper, which he had been invited to prepare for one of the "reviews," vindicating Phrenology from the charge alleged by its enemies, that it "savoured of materialism." Having thus been constrained to look into Gall, Spurzheim, and others, with this object in view, and thus brought to *study* books, into which before he had only glanced by occasional reference, he was surprised to find that all the evidence these works afforded was just that which he did not want, and which until now, though often rallied on the subject, he had not believed. He was, therefore, obliged to decline preparing the proposed paper, and resolved to leave the vindication of phrenology to others. Indeed, he then resolved to abstain from the subject wholly, until it could be vindicated by somebody, or until he could cultivate it in works written by other than infidels.

Soon after this resolution was formed, it was confirmed by the following circumstance. A friend of the author, himself a phrenologist, confessed that his religious convictions had been shaken, and a most hazardous and deplorable species of scepticism had supervened. Being somewhat shocked at this unexpected disclosure, and led to remonstrate against what was truly regarded as a calamity, it was soon manifested by unequivocal evidence, that a somewhat ardent cultivation of phrenology, was the direct

and obvious cause. And notwithstanding the writer had become fully persuaded of the infidelity of both Gall and Spurzheim, and had often seen and heard the charge of materialism brought against the science by its enemies, he had never before had the subject brought home to his heart.

Almost simultaneously with this event, the attention of the author was directed to the work of Dr. Brigham under notice, and the convictions of the nature and tendency of phrenology, to which his mind had arrived, he need scarcely say, were greatly strengthened by its perusal. That the direct and legitimate tendency of phrenology and craniology is to neology and essential atheism, appeared to be demonstrated in the case of Dr. Brigham and his book, and the author felt that the evidence here furnished must be irresistible to every candid mind. He has little doubt, that multitudes like himself, have been beguiled by the plausible aspect of the system, anatomically considered, irrespective of its moral tendency. And now that it is exemplified, as in the instance before us, that the cultivation of this subject leads to coarse infidelity and irreligion, it appears to be the dictate of duty that all such should abjure their adhesion, or even connivance at the subject. And even those who have regarded this species of philosophy as a harmless humbug, impotent for good or evil; a mere puerile speculation, which might be innocently indulged by children and fools, may discover their error in the light which this work throws upon the subject, by its melancholy effect upon its author.

As the following pages are designed as a reply to the work of Dr. Brigham, though in the form of a review, it has been thought necessary to indulge in some degree of amplification on two or three important points. The prominence given in Dr. Brigham's book to the "religious sentiment," and upon which *ignis fatuus*, the whole volume is based, has called for a more free and full criticism, than it would otherwise be entitled to. And the extent of his chapter on "*revivals of religion*," against which Dr. B. has put forth all his strength, together with the importance of the subject, has required a more theological examination of that topic, than under other circumstances would be expected from a medical man, while the unphilosophical and mischievous doctrines in relation to the nature and causes of *insanity*, with which

the "observations" of Dr. B. abound, have seemed to demand a somewhat extended notice of this whole subject. The hints which are introduced with reference to the management of insane persons, although they may be somewhat novel to many, are the result of no small share of diligent investigation of the subject, and some considerable practical experience in the treatment of diseases of the brain. Whether the theory of insanity, and the curative agencies deduced therefrom, which are here submitted, will meet the favor of his professional brethren or not, the author has full confidence that practical men will estimate them for what they are worth. He trusts, however, that he has fully succeeded in vindicating religion from the charge of being the cause of insanity, and this is the important point at which he aims; nor, in what he has said on this whole subject, has he introduced a single remark which is not designedly tributary to this primary object.

No one can candidly peruse the observations of Dr. Brigham, without becoming lamentably assured, not only that he has fallen into the mysticism of infidel philosophy, but it is equally clear that his scepticism has been recently acquired, and that he is wholly indebted for his present "bad eminence," to his reception and cultivation of the science of phrenology. A remnant of the "old leaven" still lingers in his mind, and though he has left the vantage ground of truth, yet he retains sufficient respect for certain correct principles, to prevent his discovering from what a height, and into what a depth he has fallen. Would that he might pause, before the last ray of "light that is in him becomes darkness!" May the writer add, without presumption and without offence, would to God that this reply to his book, might be instrumental in discovering to himself the fearful havoc upon his principles which phrenology has wrought, and lead him to escape the withering influence which has well nigh overwhelmed his soul.

With such feelings, these pages are committed to the press, and the humble hope is indulged, that they may be useful to the rising generation; and should they "pluck some brand out of the burning," or rescue one victim out of the devouring jaws of phrenology, infidelity, and irreligion, this effort will never prove a source of regret, whatever fate may be awarded to

THE AUTHOR.

PHRENOLOGY

KNOWN BY ITS FRUITS.

"Observations on the Influence of Religion upon the Health and Physical Welfare of Mankind. By Amariah Brigham, M. D. Boston: Marsh, Capen & Lyon. 1835."

SUCH being the title page of the work, which has elicited the following pages, the reader will perceive that, as its name imports, the book is of a compound nature, being professedly both scientific and religious. It is on this account, that our criticisms must necessarily partake of the same medico-theological character. And as we have chosen the form and style of a review, for convenience and greater brevity, we must be indulged with a series of preliminary observations, without

being accused of introducing irrelevant topics, or being justly chargeable with circumlocution, since the design of this exordium is so obvious. We wish to glance at the whole "order" of *pseudo-religious* writers, which includes a diversity of "genera and species," with a view that Dr. Brigham's book may be classified by the reader according to its merits; and we do this because the important bearings of the subjects upon which he treats, will not be so apparent, if it be viewed abstractly from kindred publications.

The Divine authority of the Holy Bible, and the truth of that system of *Religion*, denominated Christianity, which is therein revealed, have been so often demonstrated by the presentation of the evidences and proofs which accompany both the one and the other, that he who avows his infidelity, at the present day, is justly regarded as proclaiming his deficiency either of candor or intelligence. And that such estimate of scepticism on these subjects, is neither uncharitable nor unmerited, receives confirmation from the well known fact, that very many of the most learned and able among the enemies of the truth, have embraced Christianity, and espoused the cause of the Bible, so soon as their intelligence and candor permitted a sober examination of these important subjects. They had previously rejected the Scriptures, without having investigated their merits, and, in many instances, without having read the sacred

volume; and their knowledge of our holy religion having been derived from the writings and testimonies of its enemies, they were necessarily ignorant of its true nature, and blind alike to its claims and its authority.

These examples have been so numerous in every age, that the enemies of the truth have, for the most part, despaired of making proselytes, except by the art of depreciating or concealing the sacred volume; and hence, the propagators of every species of false religion, as well as the advocates of irreligion, have expended all their ingenuity in the effort to extinguish or obscure this "lamp of life." Priestcraft, when enlisted in an unhallowed conspiracy against the truth, has chosen for its motto, the convenient maxim, that "ignorance is the mother of devotion," and hence labored to close the volume of inspiration from vulgar eyes, and claimed the book of God, designed by Him to be the common property of all, as the sole inheritance of their own order—arrogating the exclusive proprietorship both of its possession and interpretation. Other enemies have more plausibly, yet with equally hostile and pernicious designs, corrupted and falsified the contents of the "Book of Books," and by new and unauthorized translations, forced interpretations, and pretended improvements, have grossly and wantonly perverted the sacred text, and thus conformed the revelation of Jehovah to their own

creeds and dogmas. These corrupted Scriptures, they liberally consent, may be distributed and read by all, and they claim for these the same authority as though they had the seal of genuineness and authenticity which the unadulterated "word of God" bears on its front, the impress of the Holy Ghost.

But while such are the devices of those who claim to be religionists, and yet are the enemies of the truth, there are those who seek, by misrepresentation of the sacred volume—by denying the truth of its chronology—by questioning the facts of its history—by declaiming against its miracles and mysteries—and by the force of sarcasm and ridicule, to cast it into utter contempt and abhorrence, and they thus hope to inculcate absolute irreligion, and teach men to despise the Bible and the God of the Bible. These, however, though the most virulent, are nevertheless the least dangerous of all the foes of the truth, for their very deformity renders them incapable of extensive mischief. Every semblance of argument which their ablest champions have ever produced, and every vestige of their sophistry and and false philosophy, have been fully and unanswerably met and refuted, and all their weapons have been thus made to recoil upon their own heads, by the contributions of those, whose sanctified learning has been consecrated to the vindication of the truth.

So signal has been the defeat, so utter the overthrow of the mightiest among the ranks of infidelity, during the last and present century, and so multiplied are the trophies of victory which enlightened philosophy, and the discoveries of science, have furnished over the enemies of the Christian revelation, that few can be found in any country, who make pretensions to real learning, and yet have the temerity to proclaim themselves the advocates of open and avowed infidelity. But we are not thence to infer that there is less disposition to oppose the truth of God, or that the rejecters of Divine revelation have abandoned their hostility to Christianity. If such inference should be drawn, it would be erroneous indeed, since facts, deplorable facts, in our own and other countries, alas, too visibly demonstrate the contrary.

The infidelity of the *heart*, is one of the characteristics of fallen human nature, and it often lingers here, after it has been driven from the head by the force of truth, and clamors most loudly when thus imprisoned. Indeed, in this fact, so clearly and pathetically taught by the pen of inspiration, and so universally felt and seen in our experience and observation, we have an *argumentum ad hominem*, in favor of the truth of Divine Revelation, which is and must be forever unanswerable ; and it is no marvel that so many have

been thus constrained to bow to the majesty of truth, upon whom other and even potent means had been employed in vain. But alas! in a multitude of instances, those who cannot resist the external and internal evidences of Christianity, *as a system*, nor gainsay the array of logical and learned argumentation with which its enemies have been confounded by the wise and good, are nevertheless impelled by the infidelity of the heart, to enter upon a warfare against some of the *distinguishing and essential features* of the system, either singly or together, while disavowing any hostility to the system itself.

These who denominate themselves rational, philosophical, or liberal Christians, are by far the most dangerous, and most successful opposers of the truth. They profess respect, and even reverence for the Bible, and denominate it Holy; and in all their religious nomenclature, but little variation from the ordinary language of orthodoxy can be detected by a superficial observer, while they nevertheless utterly reject the doctrine of Divine inspiration. They speak of "our Savior and blessed Lord," though they disbelieve and deny his Divinity, holding him to have been either "a man, a mere man, a good man, a super-human, an angelic, or super-angelic being," or perhaps a "greater than Moses, but *less than God*." They even discourse upon the efficacy of his "sufferings and death," and the "value of his blood,"

while at the same time they deny his "vicarious sacrifice," and reject the scriptural doctrine of the "atonement for sin." Such will even dwell upon the "evangelical doctrine of regeneration," and sanctification, in Scripture language, while in their philosophy they wholly reject the doctrine of "Divine influence," and believe in a religion without spirituality, and will employ their sophistry, and even ridicule, against all claims to experimental knowledge of the agency of the Holy Ghost—and yet all the while zealously contend for liberal Christianity—and so far from avowing infidelity, or consenting to be ranked among sceptics and unbelievers, they maintain themselves to be true believers, and genuine Christians. Indeed many of them discourse logically and learnedly upon the "folly of scepticism, the madness and danger of infidelity."

That there are many such who are self-deceived, and while claiming to be Christians, really believe themselves to be such, may be readily admitted, for there are, doubtless, many such who possess too much of honor, integrity, and character, to allow the supposition, that they would voluntarily deceive others, or designedly practise imposture. It is not our purpose or province to make inquisition of motive, since to assume so high a prerogative is alike foreign to our inclination and design. But sincerity in error, does not transform error into truth; nor on the presump-

tion, if we dare indulge it, that all of this class of religionists have been, and are living "in all good conscience before God unto this day;" and that such have "verily thought they were doing God service"—yet even this presumption would by no means "change the truth of God into a lie," nor in the least diminish the dangerous and mischievous nature of their errors, especially if those errors be fundamental. It is true, if such were the fact, and it shall so appear to the Searcher of Hearts, their errors may not render them criminal in His sight, nor may absolute guilt be predicated of their heresy, however great or flagrant; yet, nevertheless, the baneful influence, and pernicious tendency of their heretical opinions upon others, are not the less to be deprecated by the cause of truth.

Indeed, nothing can be more obvious than that while the cardinal and essential features of Christianity, and the great and fundamental truths of Revelation, are rejected, impugned, or obscured; the more of the semblance of truth such a system of error retains, the more it is to be deprecated. This is the device of the grand adversary of souls, for we read of "false prophets and false Christs, who perform many wonders, and deceive, if it were possible, the very elect;" and the apostle affirms, that "Satan is transformed into an angel of light" to deceive and betray. And by similar authority we are distinctly taught, that it is possi-

ble for men in the world, and in the Christian church, to "seem to be religious," and *only seem* to be so, while "deceiving their own hearts;" for "there is a way that *seemeth right* unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death." Hence, without discussing, much less deciding, the merits of this or that species of heresy, we are constrained to believe, that error is more mischievous and dangerous to the souls of men, when clad in the habiliments of truth; and the more the enemies of Christianity assume the resemblance of true religion, the more they are to be dreaded and avoided.

The publication of books, emanating from known and acknowledged infidels, and professedly hostile to the Bible, and the God of the Bible, need not occasion apprehensions, or awaken anxiety among the friends of Christianity, for the truth of God has little to fear from the open assaults of its enemies, as the history of the past abundantly proves. Hence, such issues from the modern press are exceedingly rare, and for the most part do but little mischief, and are soon forgotten. The maxim of the prince of infidels was, "*Conceal your march!*" and thus only have kindred spirits, ever since, found any measure of success. They who have not discovered this feature in the tactics of the party, who, in any place, are laboring to overthrow Christianity, must, indeed, have been careless observers. Infidels know that

all history and experience have shown, that an avowal of their principles and designs will be necessarily fatal to their influence in any community. Hence, hypocrisy, deep, dark, and cruel hypocrisy, is indispensable to success in making proselytes to any modification which infidelity has ever assumed, and he who can most effectually "conceal his march," is regarded as the best skilled in the science, the most valuable advocate of their cause.

These remarks are designed to direct the reader to the fact, that we are not to look for the enemies of the truth, who are the most dangerous and mischievous, in the army of atheists, deists, and sceptics, who proclaim their own folly, and glory in their shame. There are many such, who with their "colors flying," impiously mouth the heavens with their blasphemies against the Bible, and the God of the Bible, and openly celebrate their orgies under circumstances of enormity, and with deeds of guilt and infamy, "enough to make the cheek of darkness pale!" These depraved and fallen spirits are, however, among the most impotent of all the foes of truth and virtue, since the naked deformities of their principles and practice disgust by their very loathsomeness.

Neither are the forms of infidelity, denominated Atheism and Deism, to be regarded as the most corrupting and dangerous to the virtue of the community, since the rising generation are, for

the most part, protected from these extremes, by that instinctive horror, which is happily the result of almost any share of Christian education. Even when we find such unbelievers, as is sometimes the case, without those hideous enormities upon morals and virtue, by which others of the party are distinguished, still the denial of the existence of God, and the utter rejection of the Holy Scriptures, is a "great gulf," into which no man steps at a single stride.

But while the transition from an historical faith in the truth of Christianity, to an open avowal of dark and cheerless infidelity is so great that no man suddenly makes it; and while there is truly a "great gulf" between those two distant points, yet there are a number of steps which imperceptibly but surely lead across and downward from the vantage ground of truth, into fatal and ruinous heresy. All who have been converted to infidelity have been led by these steps, most of them unconsciously; for had they known whither they were bound before they were shrouded in the bewildering mazes of scepticism, shuddering at the enormities to which custom has now reconciled them, they had torn themselves away from the snare. The enchantment of "free inquiry," the bait of "knowledge," the charms of "metaphysics," the witchery of vain "philosophy" the mysticism of "phrenology and craniology," or some other of the "golden balls"

thrown in their way, have led them successively to hesitate, to speculate, to doubt, to ridicule, and to scoff. Or, what is more probably and more frequently the case, they have become spell-bound in the gaudy decorations of "*rational Christianity*," or "*natural religion*," or perhaps the "*liberals*" and "*utilitarians*" of the day, have entangled them in the net of subtlety and mysticism, which they so ingeniously and adroitly weave for themselves and others. Thus led to doubt, and prepared even for the *denial* of the great essentials of Christianity, ingeniously made to *appear* "*irrational, unphilosophical, or illiberal*," and taught to try inspiration at the bar of their own reason, and measure Almighty wisdom by the standard of the human intellect, the rejection of the truth of God, and the substitution of the dogmas of men, becomes both natural and easy. Hence, when the minds of men are by such discipline and mental training led away from the truth distinctively, they are like a "wave of the sea driven by the winds and lost." All, all becomes mystery and uncertainty when the darkness of their mental vision "*obscures the pole, rejects the compass, disdains the chart*," and, like the maniac crew of the phantom ship, they and their "*rational philosophy*," are soon lost in the ocean, and a fatal moral shipwreck closes the terrific scene.

Error, like vice, is rapidly progressive; "*its march is ever onward, and its tremendous ten-*

dency is to accumulation." Illustrations of this sentiment are seen on every hand, and in no instance more visibly than in the history of religious defection. All the world have heard of the concession of the great Dr. Priestly, who said, in reply to an inquiry as to what were his present religious views, proposed by one who had witnessed and deplored his downward progress, after he had once renounced the truth: "Once" said he, "I was a Trinitarian, then I became an Arian, next a Socinian, but with increasing light, I have become a Humanitarian, and though this is where I now stand, yet I know not where I shall be soon!" by which he candidly admitted what his experience had proved, that he had no fixed principle of religious belief, no standard of faith at all satisfactory or conclusive, even in relation to the great fundamental doctrine of the character of the Lord Jesus Christ. And in America, one of the most distinguished Atheists of modern times, by having successively followed the steps of Priestly so far as he is admitted to have descended the ladder, has been led to take still other steps downwards: universalism first, then deism in its refinement, and subsequently in its vulgarity; and at present he is a public champion of atheism, in all the darkness and blackness of its morals; and lingers on the shores of time, a revolting picture of one "treasuring up wrath against the day of wrath."

Such examples of the downward tendency of religious error should teach us the infinite danger of being "driven about by every wind of doctrine;" and as a wrong habit of thinking may be readily acquired, and as this will infallibly lead to a wrong habit of acting, equally imperceptible in its approach and difficult to conquer, when once acquired, the young and rising generation should be scrupulously guarded and protected from those "evil communications which corrupt good manners" and good morals too. Erroneous opinions will necessarily result in erroneous practice, correspondent to the measure of error those opinions embrace; and as the liberty of the press, which is our glorious inheritance, by its licentious abuse, affords such infinite facilities for the propagation of erroneous opinions, it is important to the well-being of the community, and essential to the public safety, that every modification of religious error emanating from the ever prolific press, should be promptly followed by an appropriate antidote. For unless the friends of truth, of virtue, and religion, exercise the utmost vigilance over the current literature of the day, the fountains of popular knowledge may be poisoned with the corrupting leaven of infidelity and irreligion. And if this can be done to the extent which the open and secret enemies of Christianity are laboring to effect, the nation and the world will feel the withering influence of the unhallowed deed.

The maxim, that "error of opinion may be tolerated, while reason is left free to combat it," imposes by its very justice, a solemn and imperious obligation upon the friends of truth to renew and perpetuate the employment of "reason" in the "combat," co-extensively with the "toleration." Unless this be done, intolerance itself would be a lesser evil than the toleration of error, when that error involves the brightest hopes, the dearest interests, and the everlasting destinies of men. But if the defensive warfare of reason against error be diligently and faithfully maintained, there never has been, there never need be, one anxious apprehension for the result, for "truth is mighty, and will prevail." The pulpit and the press should never cease to repeat the voice of warning against "walking in the counsel of the ungodly, or standing in the way of sinners, or sitting in the seat of the scornful."

In the exercise of the vigilance which is called for in the present aspect of our country especially, American patriots and Christians will find that the most demoralizing and mischievous publications of the day, are those which aim to sap the foundations of the sacred edifice of Christianity, under the garb of pseudo-philanthropy and false philosophy. Some of these conspirators are professedly very religious, and kindly propose to *improve* upon the "oracles of God," *simplify* the doctrines and duties taught us by inspiration, and conform the

Christian system throughout, to the present advanced age of light, and refinement, and education. They seem to allege, that the instructions of Christ and his apostles, though highly valuable and useful in times of comparative ignorance and barbarism, are altogether too antiquated for the present improved and elevated intellectual condition of our species, and hence their philanthropy and philosophy alike prompt them to innovate and reform. They honor and approve of the Christian religion, and are only laboring to purify it of all exceptionable features, and make it what it ought to be, a very paragon of perfection. We are not, therefore, by any means to rank them among the enemies of the truth, for they are the friends and advocates for the system, and only wish to refine it, and benevolently bring their philosophy to this desirable and plausible work.

That an extensive and simultaneous combination now exists, both in Europe and America, for the purpose of subverting Christianity, and overthrowing the truth of God, needs no other evidence than the fact every where visible, of the employment of the public press, for the alleged purpose of *improving* the doctrines of our holy religion, and perfecting what inspiration has pronounced already "perfect." The Bible is not only complained of as erroneous and defective, but it has been pronounced so exceptionable in many of its parts, that new versions are projected and absolutely

making, and this too not by enemies, but friends of the Bible, who benevolently desire to amend "the words of God," out of pure friendship for His truth. Books and pamphlets, without number, are deluging the land, written by professed Christians too, for the purpose of correcting errors in the theology and ethics, which the world of scholars and divines have learned from the bible, but must be now abandoned and abjured, because, as they tell us, enlightened philosophy, and improving science, render them no longer worthy of veneration. And such are the multiplied and multifarious improvements which have been proposed and recommended for the sacred edifice of Christianity, by the learned men of our own and foreign countries, sustained by an ostentatious exhibition of Hebrew, Chaldaic, Greek, and Anglo-Saxon learning, that if all of them could be embodied together, instead of an harmonious system of symmetrical proportions, worthy of its Divine Author, their Christianity would be a type of old chaos, more confounding than the confusion of tongues at the building of Babel, more bewildering than the mazes of infidelity itself.

Perhaps no one event among the novel discoveries of modern times, is more plausible, subtle, and dangerous, than the introduction of the science of phrenology. Introduced to the world by truly learned and deservedly eminent men, pro-

fessing to be based upon the Baconian philosophy of induction, claiming the discovery of a multitude of new and important facts, which are calculated to enlighten mankind upon the abstruse philosophy of mind, and arrayed in all the attractions which genius, eloquence, and literature, combine to furnish, it is not to be wondered at, that a system thus fortified, should resist the assaults of dogmatism and the sneers of ridicule, which have been for the most part the only weapons employed against it. Hence the believers in the doctrines of phrenology have become a great multitude, which no man can number, although there are still comparatively few who have studied the science, and a still smaller number who have sufficiently cultivated it to become fully acquainted with its nature and tendencies. It is only very lately, that in this country, the subject has gained the public attention, and the immensely deleterious and demoralizing influence it is calculated to exert upon the public mind and character, is not yet discerned, or appreciated.

The truth is, it ought to be known and felt, that phrenology is not that indifferent subject of speculation, which may be regarded utterly impotent for good or ill, as it has been viewed by many; nor is it that insignificant and contemptible conceit, which can be annihilated by laughter, or the sneer of sarcasm. It has assumed the form

of science, the name of philosophy, and has gained upon public credulity, and secured the allegiance of many wise and good men, who have overlooked its moral aspect, or misapprehended its tendency and bearing in relation to the sacred edifice of Christianity. However ingeniously the hook of infidelity has been baited by Gall, and gilded by Spurzheim, and however adroitly other advocates of the science may attempt its vindication, the true character and tendency, if not the original design of this whole phrenological and craniological system, is by recent events becoming disclosed. And this exposure, philanthropists and Christians are imperiously called upon to make known by early and combined exertions, so that our country and the world may be protected from the mischiefs which the prevalence of this moral heresy may otherwise inflict.

We need not detain the reader, even by alluding to the numerous examples and forms in which modern writers, and particularly phrenologists and physicians, are attempting to enlighten the public, upon the subject of Christianity, while their works betray either absolute ignorance of their chosen theme, or the secret, though deadly hostility they bear to its distinctive characteristics. It will be sufficient for our purpose to select one of this class, by no means the most attractive or able, yet calculated by its plausibility and guile, to mislead the unwary, and under the mask of

religion and science, to inculcate both irreligion and barbarism. And we make the selection moreover, mainly because it is an example of what false philosophy, such as phrenology is propagating, has both the disposition and the power to effect.

The work to which we refer, is entitled, "*Observations on the Influence of Religion upon the Health and Physical Welfare of Mankind, by Amariah Brigham, M. D.*" It was published at Boston during the last year, and the author is a respectable physician of Hartford, Conn. He had become known to the public by a smaller volume on "*the Influence of Mental Cultivation and Mental Excitement upon Health,*" published a short time before. In that earlier effort of his mind, with a great deal of good sense, and sound practical truth upon the subject of physical education, there is much false philosophy and perverted phrenology, giving evidence that the author is more familiar with Gall and Spurzheim than with the book of nature, and demonstrating that he has more reverence for their productions, than he has for the Bible. By what he calls the "freedom and independence" of his remarks upon the "mental excitement occasioned by the *number of churches, religious meetings, and Sunday schools,*" alleging these among the causes tending to produce *insanity*, by promoting "excessive action of the *brain!*" he had broadly intimated what were his opinions on

these subjects, and what would be his ulterior design, should he deem it practicable or expedient to prosecute it farther. Indeed, there was so much in that volume indicative of the scepticism of the author's mind, that it required little discernment to discover that its publication was but the pioneer of a still farther "developement," of less equivocal character. Hence, those who read that book were not surprised to learn that the doctor had issued another work; nor were they at a loss to predict its true character, especially when its title avowed, that "Religion, and its Influence upon Health," was to be the subject of his "observations." In short, the former book prepared the way for the latter, and this has fully confirmed the forebodings of those who had anticipated its dangerous and mischievous tendency.

As a medical man, it is certainly within the author's legitimate province, to enlighten his fellow-citizens and the world upon the subject of the *public health*. As one of its guardians, his obligations to society, by virtue of this relation, are commensurate with his ability, and so far as acquaintance with his profession qualifies him for this task, we are not inclined to question his pretensions. Indeed, with the author we have no quarrel, since he is known to us only through his writings, and from these we judge him to be a man of intelligence and education, possessing a mind cultivated by reading and travel; of ardent temperament, a

vivid imagination, and no small boldness and originality of thought, and but for his ultra phrenological views, by which his mind has been bewildered, we should suppose him to be capable of high intellectual effort, if he had been trained under better auspices.

Having formed this estimate of Dr. B., from all the data in our power, we cannot possibly feel toward him, personally, any other than amicable and respectful sentiments. Yet, without impeaching either his intelligence or integrity, much less impugning his motives, which are beyond our scrutiny, it is with his book which we have to do, and as this is public property, neither he nor his admirers have any just ground of complaint, that we should frankly aver, that while our "health" might be safely entrusted to his professional skill, we could not consent to commit our "Religion" to his keeping.

Indeed he allows in his preface, that he lacks both "learning and leisure," for the important and extensive subject of which he treats, and professes to have been urged to undertake it under these disadvantages, by its "practical utility," and the dearth of information on this topic. But though he gives evidence in his book of his lack in these respects, yet a much greater deficiency is still more apparent. His "learning and leisure," however limited, are, doubtless, fully adequate to the investigation of "anatomy and phy-

siology," and the whole science of health; but neither of these, in any measure, qualifies him for the full and proper elucidation of the sublime science of Religion; and in his case it would seem that by perverted views of physical science, his learning, or rather want of learning, has become an absolute disqualification, of which however we may again have occasion to remark.

In bespeaking the favor of the reader, in his preface, he begs him to "study the New Testament, free from all preconceived opinions, as if it was a work but *just issued from the press!*" He might with as much propriety have reversed his petition, and desired that *his* book might be read, "as if it was a work," written many centuries ago, by "holy men," who "wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." A compliance on the part of the reader would not at all be rendered more difficult by this change in the order of priority, though the one and the other are alike impracticable and absurd. If he mean that his book should be read beside the New Testament, and a relative comparison instituted upon their merits, as though *cæteris paribus*, a Christian would decide that such a request indicates a degree of impiety, little short of blasphemy. Does he claim the same authority for the sentiments he inculcates, as the inspired volume demands? And does he himself read the New Testament with no more of reverence and veneration, than he feels

for his own lucubrations? Then is he absolutely disqualified for estimating that sacred book, wherein is revealed "Christ crucified, to the Jews a stumbling block, and to the Greeks foolishness;" and were his demand upon his readers at all feasible, he would inflict upon them a similar disability.

How amazing is the difference between this writer, who fails to perceive any distinction between "matters of science, and those of piety," and the language of a late able and scientific writer, in pursuing an analogous inquiry.* He warns his reader against allowing his "conjectures, however rational, to disturb his religious convictions," and admonishes him "carefully to abstain from the error of confounding the deductions of reason with the testimony of the inspired writers, nor ever to allow any part of the authority, or the serious and sacred import that attach to the latter, to be extended to the former." And he adds, "this would indeed be a grave fault, and especially so, if on the strength of even the most reasonable theory, we are led to bring into question a particle of that which the text of Scripture, duly interpreted, requires us to believe. Hence we should hold every thing light and fallacious which countervails, or which will not readily consist with the sure words of Christ and his apostles."

* "Physical theory of another life."

No one, on comparing these sentiments with those of Dr. B., can fail to decide, that their author writes like a Christian who believes in the high and paramount authority of revelation, and desires his reader to discard both him and his speculations when they conflict with the standard of infallible truth. Not so, however, with the work before us; for we are here directed to place the New Testament and this book on a perfect parity; to read them both as if "just issued from the press," and thus force an analogy where there is no parallel.

But he next assures us, in this same preface, that he "entertains a profound respect for *the religious sentiment*, notwithstanding the absurd forms, ceremonies and customs with which it has been connected, and he hopes to render it *more productive of good* by exhibiting the evils which some of these ceremonies and customs have caused mankind, and which will continue to afflict them unless they are abandoned."

And now let the reader inquire what is this "religious sentiment" for which the author "entertains profound respect," and he will learn that it is a something "*innate in man*,"—an "indestructible sentiment" which is "a part of his nature," which he illustrates by affirming, that "no race of human beings have been known who had not a religion and some form of religious worship." We are not to suppose then that he feels this "pro-

found respect" for Christianity, else we should greatly misapprehend his meaning; for while he admits that "the religion of Christ is superior to all others in promoting the *physical welfare of mankind*," yet he regards Christianity only as another form or development of the same "religious sentiment," which is "innate in man," and common equally to "the savage and the civilized," and existing among all the pagan and heathen nations of antiquity, as well as those of the present day. This "religious sentiment," he affirms, has "impelled men and women to *sacrifice themselves, their offspring, their dearest kindred*, and driven nations into the *most cruel and destructive wars* the world has ever witnessed;" and it is this "most powerful sentiment of our nature" for which he "entertains profound respect."

To the existence and universal influence of this "religious sentiment" he ascribes all "religious worship, and the diversity of its forms;" and to this alone he attributes it that men "adore invisible and superior powers; it impels them to discover methods of communicating with them; to appease their anger; to seek their forgiveness, and to obtain their aid and blessing." The inference plainly deduced therefrom, is that the recognition of the Supreme Deity, and our relation to Him, as well as the duty of prayer and religious homage which Christianity inculcates, have no other origin or authority than this "innate, universal and inde-

structible sentiment." And accordingly we find him quoting and adopting the language of Dr. Gall, the father of modern phrenology, descriptive of the idolatries of heathenism, in all their number and variety, as illustrating and confirming his views.

From such gross forms of religion, which "powerfully strike the senses," and which the author says are the only forms which can benefit "savages and barbarians," he attempts to show that the pure and spiritual form of Christianity has descended in regular succession by the cultivation and improvement of the "religious sentiment," in the ratio in which mankind have improved and progressed in knowledge. Hence, he says, the religion of the Hebrews was adapted to their intelligence, and, for a time, was undoubtedly the best for them; and as mankind, at the period of Christ, had still farther "progressed in knowledge," Christianity was substituted for the law or religion of Moses, which was not now sufficiently pure, spiritual and ennobling for the times. In the present "improved condition of mankind" in knowledge, we must not therefore be shocked at the proposition, that Christianity should be considered superannuate, and be substituted by the improved religion of Dr. Brigham.

The reader is probably aware, that the phrase "religious sentiment," and the doctrines here advanced in its explanation and defence, are purely

phrenological. Dr. Gall, the father of the system, and Dr. Spurzheim, his pupil, and the eloquent advocate of the doctrine, divide the human brain into thirty-five, or more, compartments, to each of which they ascribe certain propensities, *sentiments*, and intellectual faculties. The "religious sentiment" on which the author before us builds his theory and his book, is that bump or prominence on the top of the head, which Dr. Gall denominates the "organ of theosophy," and is called by Spurzheim the "organ of veneration." The doctrine of the system is, that men have no ideas on any subject, but through certain organs in the brain, which originate or give birth to them. This organ is that which gives man the idea of a God, or at least of some superior and invisible powers or beings, and prompts to devotion, constituting man a worshiping animal. The existence of this organ, which is the seat of the "religious sentiment" phrenologists tell us, proves that religion is founded in *nature*, and they generally agree that it has no other origin. This brief explanation will serve to show what the author means when he speaks of the "religious sentiment;" and the reader will perceive the legitimate tendency of such a system. It is not within our province, at present, to pursue the subject farther than is necessary in the examination of the work under notice.

In order that we may fully discover the claims of our author, to the superior station he assumes

as a great reformer of the "ignorance, ambition and fanaticism," which he affirms have "marred the incomparable purity of the Christian religion," and "injured the health and physical welfare of mankind," it is only necessary to examine the brief exhibit of his creed, which is given in the "introduction" to his book. The following seems to be a summary of the articles of religion, to which Dr. Brigham subscribes.

I. *Of God, and the Holy Bible.*

In the language of Dr. Spurzheim, "The Old and New Testament attribute very different qualities to the Supreme Being,—the God of Israel was *jealous, revengeful and terrible, a God of war!* the God of the Christians, on the contrary, is *love, benevolence and charity.*"

II. *Of the Religious Sentiment.*

"It is a part of man's nature to believe in gods of some kind or other, which arises from the religious sentiment which is innate in man, and is the most powerful of his sentiments. All religious worship, and the diversity of its forms, as well as the innumerable objects of adoration result from it. From this religious sentiment has successively proceeded, human sacrifices, circumcision, emasculation, flagellation, wounding the body by cutting instruments, ankylosis of joints, austerities, penances, monachism, fasting, the Lord's supper,

baptism, night meetings, camp meetings, protracted meetings, ringing of bells, and modern revivals. This innate religious sentiment has led to most cruel and destructive wars, bloodshed, mutilating the body, exciting the brain, destroying the mind, and producing insanity, murder, and suicide. This religious sentiment was *implanted in mankind BY THEIR CREATOR*, and for it Dr. B. entertains *profound respect !*"

III. *Of Christianity.*

"Christ imposed *no forms* of religious worship on men,—he established *no ceremonies*,—he gave *no creed* for all to embrace, he did not seek for *unity in forms of worship*, but only to establish uniform morality. When a barbarian abolishes of his own accord polygamy, the mutilation of the body, castes, slavery, tyranny and fanaticism, these abominations once gone, the barbarian *becomes a Christian*, and be he a follower of Mohammed, he may justly call himself a disciple of Jesus. The gospel is to civilize the world, by building up new opinions among heathen nations, but *not* by destroying their *present creeds !*"

IV. *Of Spirituality.*

"The *spiritual* nature of the Christian religion is its tendency to strengthen and exercise the *mind* of man, his moral and intellectual powers. And in the phrase, *fruits of the SPIRIT*, *nothing superna-*

tural is meant, but only the fruits or natural results of the MIND of man, for God has no supernatural dealings with men !"

These four articles of religion are expressed as nearly as possible in the precise language of the author, and the intelligent and candid reader will be constrained to confess, that he is in no respect misrepresented. And although other articles, equally startling, might easily be prepared from the materials contained in the "introduction" to his book, yet we forbear, as these are amply sufficient for our purpose. They will serve to show the qualifications of the author to the office he assumes, of being a *censor morum* in religious things, and explain the nature of that "calm, simple and pure manner of worship recommended by our Savior," which the author proposes to restore, as well as that "religious sentiment," for which he "entertains profound respect !"

Nothing can be more manifest than that the Doctor's creed is a virtual denial of the Bible, and a rejection of the Christianity inculcated in that sacred book ; and that any disciple of rationalism, any deist, or any atheist in the land might consistently adopt it in gross and in detail. The God of whom he speaks, is evidently none other than a figure of speech, a mere rhetorical flourish. His Christ, of whom he says so many favorable things, compared with other early reformers,

seems to be only a metonymy or personification* of truth, love, charity, self-denial, &c., virtues which he says men ought to be taught to worship; or at most he can be regarded only as another "human sacrifice," prompted by the innate "religious sentiment," impelling men to "appease the anger and seek the forgiveness of invisible and superior powers," for all nations "believe in gods of some kind or other." And as to the "religious sentiment" itself, the author means no more than that wherever he is found, "man is a worshipping animal;"—while his definition of spirituality would suit the atmosphere of materialism, and is sufficiently sublimated for that of any shade of infidelity or irreligion. Indeed, throughout the whole volume, there is scarcely a single sentiment advanced, or even an opinion which a man could not safely adopt, while avowing himself an enemy of Christianity, or saying in his heart, and with his tongue, "there is no God." And it is truly painful to add, that much of the caricature and ribaldry with which Christianity, and its professors are treated in parts of this book, would compare with the vulgarity of Tom Paine, or the still more loathsome profanity of Fanny Wright. See pages 63, 224, 276, 284, 321, 328, &c.

But we are constrained to add another and still more serious disqualification to that implied in the *infidelity* of our author, for it is possible for a man

* See page 321.

to write ably and learnedly upon a subject, in which he has no measure of belief or confidence, provided he has made himself acquainted with its nature. In the present case, however, we have an example of a man, a gentleman, a scholar, and a physician, undertaking to enlighten the community upon a subject, in relation to which he betrays, not merely deficient knowledge, but *total, absolute ignorance*. We are aware that this is a serious charge, and though the articles of his creed amply sustain the allegation, that Dr. B. is utterly ignorant of the nature of *religion*, yet, for the satisfaction of the reader, still farther illustration is at hand.

Let the *title* of his book, "Influence of religion upon the health and physical *welfare* of mankind," be considered in connexion with the whole tenor and tendency of the publication. And shall the reader, form his estimate of "religion," by the "influence" which the author labours to attribute to it? What then is its "influence" upon the health and physical welfare of mankind? If this book is to be believed, it is "evil, only evil, and that continually." For among the effects of its influence," he enumerates almost all "the ills that flesh is heir to," such as "mutilation of the body, flagellation, injury to the brain and nervous system, melancholy, insanity, suicide, and the destruction of human beings." And are these the effects of the influence of religion? They are such

as this book is designed to exhibit, and none but such are here dwelt upon. With such views of religion, the title of the book should have been essentially different, if its real character was not designed to be concealed. It should have been "Observations on the influence of religion in *producing wars, bloodshed, sickness, insanity, and death.*" The reader would then have been prepared for the contents of the volume, by reading its name. But the author utterly fails in tracing any of the mischiefs, cruelties, or abominations, he describes, to the "influence of *religion*;" though he ascribes them all to the "religious sentiment," for which, nevertheless, he "entertains profound respect!" because, as he says, it was "implanted in man by his Creator!"

If, however, all this does not fully convict him of utter and hopeless ignorance of the true nature of religion, let us examine for a moment his pretensions to a knowledge of the scriptures upon which he ventures profound and sapient criticism. Speaking of the character of Abraham, the father of the faithful, that venerable patriarch, who was justly styled "the friend of God!" he says, "In Abraham, we do not find that nice and lofty sense of veracity, which distinguishes a state of society where the point of honor has acquired great influence." Now had the author been at all acquainted with the Bible, he would never have hazarded his reputation for intelligence and can-

dour by such an assertion. Has he overlooked, in his history of Abraham, his hospitality to strangers, Gen. xviii. ; his generosity to his nephew, ch. xiii. ; his uprightness in war, ch. xiv. ; his compassion towards the sinners of Sodom, ch. xviii. ; his tenderness towards Hagar and her son, ch. xxi. ; and his "*nice and lofty sense* of justice, politeness, and honor, in the transaction recorded ch. xxiii. It is plain, that the Doctor must regard Abraham in the same light as he regards the God of Abraham, for of the Great Supreme, he affirms, that He is both a "God of war, and a God of love," which he attempts to sustain by a comparison of the Old and New Testaments. Estimating thus the God of the Bible as a compound of good and evil, it is not to be wondered at that he should indulge in criminations and censures against His faithful servants.

But his ignorance is still more apparent in the remarks on page 17, in relation to the Jews, of whom he asserts, *en masse*, that "they were not a people of high moral endowments, and *no individuals among them of whom we have any account*, can properly be referred to as *examples* worthy of all imitation. The reader will perceive from this single sentence, that the author either measures the saints of God by a standard of morality higher than the "law of the Lord," or he must be ignorant of the self-denying spirit of Moses—the disinterestedness of Caleb and Joshua—the spotless

integrity of Samuel and the prophets, and the righteousness of Zechariah and Elizabeth, to name no other of the Jewish worthies of sacred memory, whom he has impugned by his sweeping denunciation.

It were easy to show from the "introduction" alone, that the author of this book is not only an unbeliever in religion, because ignorant of its nature, but that he is equally ignorant of the *nature of man*. His first sentence reads thus: "The religious sentiment appears to be *innate* in man." And is this true? How does it "appear?" Has a child any idea of religion, or of the being of a God, until such idea is implanted by some kind of education, or by the Divine Spirit? Certainly not; no more than he has of inhabited worlds beyond the region of the fixed stars.* But he goes still farther, and adds, that this "religious sentiment forms a part of *man's nature* as truly as *benevolence*." Here then he maintains that "benevolence is a part of man's nature."† But what

* This, however, is one of the dogmas of phrenology, and the organ, the presence of which is indicated by a "bump" on the top of the head, is the source whence the "idea of God and religion" infallibly emanates.

† Certainly; for there is another "bump" on the anterior part of the skull, called "moral sense" by Gall, and "benevolence" by Spurzheim; and this organ necessarily generates "benevolence," since it is there for the purpose; and besides, all phrenologists agree that "man is naturally good," for this "organ" is found in the heads of all men, though sometimes its quality is overcome by opposite sentiments, because of the greater development of "destructiveness" and the like.

says the Bible, that book of books; without a knowledge of which, it is presumption either to write or speak upon the subject of *religion*? An inspired apostle, whose knowledge of man's nature was acquired in "the third heaven," describes the moral state of mankind in this and the like language: "*Haters of God*;" "*without God*;" "*without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful*;" "*enmity against God*." These and multiplied other testimonies of inspiration might be adduced to prove the infidelity of the doctrine that either "benevolence," "religious sentiment," or "any good thing" dwells in man, or is innate in his nature.* The apostle's melancholy description of the natural state of man would fully accord, however, with the author's accusations against the "religious sentiment" of which he speaks, though the reader will hardly be prepared to believe that this is "implanted in man by his Creator," nor can he fail to marvel that such a "sentiment" should still have the author's "profound respect."

We need only allude to one more instance in proof of the author's deplorable ignorance of the nature of man; and for this purpose would refer the reader to the strong affirmation he makes in the following interrogatory: "Who has not seen the

* Had he affirmed that "*atheism*" is innate in man, and constitutes a part of his nature as much as "*selfishness*," he would have conformed his doctrine to the Bible, however it might have conflicted with phrenology.

lascivious man, the drunkard, the reveller become chaste and temperate by the exertion of *his own moral powers*?" This question is proposed in a ludicrous argument he attempts to invalidate the Scriptural doctrine of the supernatural influence of the Spirit in regeneration, which he unequivocally denies. In answer to his query, we are constrained to assert, and we do so on the authority of infallible inspiration too, that *no man has seen it, or ever will see it*. "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may ye do good who are accustomed to do evil." This interrogative form, chosen by the prophet, is the strongest possible affirmation of the negative of Dr. B.'s position, and is a distinct and unequivocal declaration, that man cannot "by the exertion of his own moral powers," effect the revolution in his moral nature and habits, which the author concedes to result from the religion he gainsays and rejects.

As then it appears plain from the evidences thus briefly presented, that the author of the work before us, is an unbeliever in the strongest sense of that term, however he may be self-deceived; and it being equally evident that he is profoundly ignorant of what true religion is, and equally so, of the character and nature of man, we think we have fully made out our charge, that he is utterly disqualified from treating the subject he has had the temerity to attempt. He must not complain

then at the retribution which will be the reward of such rashness and presumption, by reason of the exposure of his mistakes and egregious misrepresentations, which duty to the cause of truth imperiously demands. And the reader will be prepared to appreciate the degree of credibility with which his sentiments and affirmations are to be received. Indeed we cannot refrain from offering additional testimony, since the same lamentable deficiency of knowledge is discoverable on almost every page, and in almost every department of his subject. For example, let the reader notice the statement on page 20. "All great reforms in the moral world are the result of long and previous instruction of the mass of the people;" whence he argues that no great reform could succeed unless the world was prepared for it by "previous cultivation of the moral and intellectual powers." Here it is obvious that he builds his pyramid upon its apex, for the reverse of his proposition is the truth, even in the cases he refers to for its proof. Every reformation this world has ever seen, has been effected in the face of violent and persevering opposition, and in general the opposition has been conducted by those of the higher classes of society, whose "moral and intellectual powers" were arrayed against reform. Witness the great reformations resulting from the labors of Christ, and Paul, and Luther, and Wesley, and Wilberforce, and others. So far from the world

having been prepared by "long and previous instruction of the mass of the people," these reformers have succeeded, although called upon to resist the whole torrent of public opinion. And the allusion he has made to the "temperance reformation" in our own country, is singularly unfortunate for his purpose, and betrays a most deplorable and inexcusable want of information. He says, that the "friends of the temperance cause would have toiled in vain half a century before," and attributes their success to the "improved state of society;" intimating that "long and previous instruction of the mass of the people" had also preceded this reform. But, unhappily for his theory, the converse of this statement is notoriously the fact, for on the promulgation of the doctrine of total abstinence by the noble spirits who originated this work, the "mass of the people," by reason of their "long and previous instruction," were at once in battle array against them. And that eminently successful philanthropist, the Rev. Dr. Hewitt, who is a near neighbor of the author, could furnish ample reminiscences from the journal of his early labors, to annihilate Dr. Brigham and his theory. That distinguished champion undertook this mighty reform when the pulpit and the press, the learning and the ignorance, the theory and the practice of the nation, with very rare exceptions, in one mighty phalanx reared a formidable barrier against him. He and his coadjutors, with no

other weapon than omnipotent truth, went forth to the battle, and beat down every opposition, whether "moral or intellectual" which stood in their way. They found public opinion wrong; they proclaimed it so in tones of thunder; they avowed their purpose to change and reform it; and they have literally "turned the world upside down." It was the *bad* state of society, and not its "*improved condition*," which rendered the reform necessary, and by reason of which it has been thus far successful.

But our author commits himself still more egregiously, for after stoutly maintaining that Bouddhisme has improved Brahmanisme in India, as Protestantism has improved Romanism, by rendering it less intolerant and cruel, he affirms that Mahomedanism has *improved* the "religious sentiment" of the ferocious Arabs, because, as he says, the prophet abolished the horrible crimes of "robbery, assassination, selling their women as slaves, and burying their daughters alive." Now had the author acquainted himself with the subject before he wrote, he would have known that these precise abominations are still perpetrated, and perpetuated among the Mahomedans, without any evidence of the improvement he names.

But we forbear to pursue the author in the numerous blunders he has committed in the "introduction" to his work, and shall now proceed to remark upon its contents, in the order they are pre-

sented. His first chapter is on "Human Sacrifices," which he admits are the most deplorable of all the effects of the "religious sentiment," though they are introduced in illustration of the "influence of religion upon the health and physical welfare of mankind." The reader will distinctly perceive, that there is not the remotest particle of affinity between "religion" and this "religious sentiment" of the author, and yet he uses these terms as perfect synonymes. That there is, and can be no analogy between them, will appear manifest from his own definitions.

1. "The *religious sentiment* is innate in man."

Religion is not innate in man.

2. "The *religious sentiment* is a part of man's nature."

Religion is no part of man's nature, and is at war with fallen nature.

3. "The *religious sentiment* prompts men to worship gods of some kind or other."

Religion teaches the worship of one living and true God, and forbids the worship of any other.

4. "The *religious sentiment* produces wars and bloodshed, and the destruction of human beings."

Religion produces peace on earth and good will to men.

A similar contrariety might be exhibited between every characteristic ascribed by the au-

thor to the religious sentiment, and the distinguishing features of religion, but these are sufficient for our purpose, which is to prove, that Dr. Brigham has fallen into this fundamental error of identifying religion and the "religious sentiment;" a blunder which necessarily vitiates and nullifies his whole performance, since they are, as we have shown, not only essentially dissimilar, but are antipodal to each other. The effects attributed by him to the religious sentiment, so far from being justly chargeable upon religion, are all the result of the absence of religion. This is eminently the case with the subject of "human sacrifices," which is the theme of his first chapter; for these were never authorized or permitted by true religion, in any period of the world, and their general discontinuance, of which the author speaks, is demonstrative evidence against him, since this has resulted every where among those nations to whom the gospel has communicated the light and influence of religion, and they are now only continued where religion is not known.

The author, however, alternately charges human sacrifices upon the "religious sentiment," and upon *religion* itself, and this too in the face of the testimony he himself presents from the Old Testament, demonstrating, that upon these abominations the almighty Author of religion denounces his heaviest judgments and anathemas. Indeed, these very quotations are sufficient to prove that

idolatry, which is, and always was, the height of *irreligion*, has been the prolific source of all the human sacrifices ever known in the world. These cruel abominations, as related by the author, and diligently gathered from the pages of history, for the purpose, are all of them, without exception, examples of worship paid to idols, and imaginary gods, who are unknown to religion, and rejected by it; however justly they may be charged upon the fiction of the author's brain, which he calls, in phrenological language, "the religious sentiment," and which seems uppermost in all his thoughts.

No farther evidence is desirable to convict him of the consummate folly of mistaking religion for this religious sentiment, than is found in the following sentence, p. 34, of his book.

"It is as idle to talk of a nation without *religion*, as without love of offspring,* or any *other* instinctive propensity!"

* The "love of offspring," is the fruit of a "bump" or organ in the posterior part of the head, called by phrenologists, "philoprogenitiveness," and is regarded in that philosophy as an "instinctive propensity" truly. And when cases like those related by the author are alleged as objections to the doctrine, that the organ of "Destructiveness" should be so developed by organization, as to predominate over "philoprogenitiveness," Dr. Gall replies, that this is a proof of "the harmony of the science with nature, for *man is confessedly an assemblage of contradictions.*" Hence phrenologists repel the charge of inconsistency, by showing that as is man, so must be the "philosophy of man," a "bundle of inconsistencies." It will be seen on page 41, that Dr. B. in

Here, then, we are taught that "religion" is one "*instinctive propensity*," and the "love of offspring" is *another*; while on the same page, the author records as "human sacrifices" impelled by religion, that among some heathen nations, parents, "knowingly and wilfully, go through the bloody work of slaughtering *their own children*, with *as little remorse* as one would kill a lamb or a chicken!" Here, then, one "*instinctive propensity*," *religion*, annihilates the other "*instinctive propensity*," "love of offspring," and changes it to the most envenomed hatred of offspring, and yet he tells us that this murderous instinctive propensity was "implanted in man by his Creator," and says, he feels for it "profound respect." Nay, he maintains that mankind have been created with these dispositions, and he zealously argues, that a religion which imposed these absurd and cruel rites, and demanded the destruction of millions of human beings, as sacrifices to idol gods, is greatly preferable to being left without any religion; and he adds to the bloody catalogue he has enumerated, "I am of opinion that *all religions* the world have ever known have been of use, and they have

common with Spurzheim and other phrenologists, entertains similar views of the nature of the Supreme Being, and represents Him to be a compound of good and bad propensities, alternately developed in the history of the world, and he even appeals to the Old and New Testaments for his proofs!

proved injurious *only* when they have failed to keep pace with the progress of intelligence."

But the author, unwittingly as it would seem, not only maintains the identity of the religious sentiment with religion, but he regards *superstition* as synonymous with both. This precious confession is made on page 35, where he adopts the sentiments of Polybius, in confirmation of the views previously alluded to, who declares, that "the republic of Rome was sustained by *superstition*," which he defines to be "the opinions entertained by them about their gods," and which, he says, was a creed, "*contrived* for the sake of the populace." He adds, "if a society could be formed of wise men only, such a *scheme* would not be necessary ;—but since the multitude is always giddy and agitated by illicit desires, wild resentments, and violent passions, there was no way left of restraining them, but by the help of such *secret terrors* and *tragical fictions* ! It was not, therefore, without great prudence and foresight, that the ancients took care to instil into them *these notions of the gods*, and *infernal punishments* ! which the moderns are now rashly and absurdly endeavoring to extirpate." It is immediately in connexion with this language of Polybius that the author observes, "I am of opinion that all religions the world has ever known have been of use !" thus ranking *superstition*, religion, and the religious sentiment,

among synonymous terms, and exposing what other portions of the volume appear designed to conceal, that religion is, in his estimation, a "contrivance for the sake of the populace," useful, it is true, though accompanied by "secret terrors and tragical fictions." It is true the author claims to be a Christian, but infidelity personified could desire no more of its willing votary. The Mosaic, no less than the Christian religion, held human sacrifices in abhorrence, and though they may be justly attributed to the "religious sentiment," which is synonymous with idolatry and irreligion, yet religion has ever abjured and prohibited them. And the destruction of human life, to which reference is had by the author, as in the case of the innumerable company of martyrs, the horrid murders of the inquisition, the 100,000 executions for witchcraft, and the massacre of St. Bartholomew's day, all of which he charges upon *religion*, exhibit either a shocking perversion of his intellect, or something infinitely worse. For that all these, and even the 30,000 widows annually immolated upon the funeral pile of their husbands in India, should be included under the significant head of the "influence of *religion* upon the health and physical welfare of mankind," is an act of impiety, which in a professed Christian is an enormity for which we can scarcely find a name.

In the second chapter the author introduces the „religious rites which mutilate the human body,”

and he enumerates in his catalogue "circumcision, emasculation, flagellation, wounding the body by cutting instruments, and ankylosis of joints by religious ceremonies."

Circumcision, or the sign and seal of the Abrahamic covenant, an ordinance of Divine appointment is selected as the first topic of his criticism, nor does the sacredness of the authority by which this custom was introduced, shield it from his assault. This is the only rite justly ascribed to religion, for the rest have arisen from the absence of religion, or what he calls the religious sentiment. Nevertheless, he affirms that this rite prevailed *before* the time of Abraham, for which he has no semblance of authority, and he assigns physical reasons for its origin, alleging that in warm climates this was resorted to for health and cleanliness, and thinks it probable that it was not at first a religious custom.* That he conflicts with the authority of the Bible is not to be wondered at, when he quotes Gibbon, that prince of infidels, as paramount authority, who says that "health rather than *superstition* first invented circumcision," and by the term superstition, this infidel writer obviously means the identical "religious sentiment," for which the author pleads, so that Gibbon contradicts both Dr. Brigham and the Bible. It would have been well if one or

* Why then does he call it a "religious rite?"

both of these sapient critics had accounted for the fact, if circumcision prevailed before among surrounding nations, for physical reasons, why it was that on the "self same day" on which the covenant was made between Abraham and his Maker, this ceremony was performed not only upon himself and his son Ishmael, but upon *all the men* of his house. Why was it that Abraham had lived to "*ninety and nine years*," without having conformed to this *prevalent* custom; and that his son of thirteen years of age, and no one of the men in his house had ever been circumcised until that day, if "health rather than superstition invented it." It is painful to admit the evident truth, that both Gibbon and the author have advanced this sentiment for the self same reason, that they both designed to discredit the inspired history. Of the remaining mutilating rites it is only necessary to say, that they are all of them the fruits of superstition, or the religious sentiment; but all of them are directly contrary to true religion, and prohibited by it. It is idle, therefore, nay more, it is sacrilegious trifling to include these among the effects resulting in whole or in part from the "influence of religion."

In the introduction to the third chapter, which embraces "austerities, penances, monachism, and fasting," the author intimates, that "it is *natural to man*, in certain stages of civilization, to believe the Deity to be a malevolent being delighted with

the misery of his creatures," &c. What a delectable picture we have here of this religious sentiment which is "innate in man," a "part of his nature," "implanted in man by his Creator," and deserving "profound respect."

With respect to the austerities and penances of monachism, religion is not justly chargeable with them in whole or in part, and with this absolute disclaimer we may dismiss these with the same remark contained in the notice of the former chapter. But in relation to fasting or abstinence, which is a scriptural duty, and a part of religion by Divine authority, it may be expected that something should be said in reply to the gross caricature drawn by the author. He affirms, that "it was not till after the death of the Apostles that fasting was considered an important duty," and "that Christ did not authorize fasting from food," and these assertions are made in the face of the plain and unequivocal directions of Christ in his sermon on the mount, where he not only enjoins fasting, but adds instructions in relation to the manner of fasting, so as to be acceptable to God.—Matt. vi. 17, 18. And yet the author declares authoritatively, that the New Testament does not authorize any other fast than when "nature withdraws the appetite, as the natural result of sorrow." His lamentable want of information on the subject of which he writes, must excuse this among other similar blunders, which abound

in every chapter of his book. As regards the effects of fasting upon health, we have but a single remark, and it is this, whenever fasting is carried to the extent of being injurious to health, it has no semblance of authority from religion, but is prompted by superstition or the religious sentiment.

Thus far our author has chiefly directed his attention to the effects of "the religious sentiment," as seen in paganism and heathenism, with only occasional reference to the ceremonies of any sect of Christians. In the fourth chapter, however, he approaches the subject of Christianity distinctively, by considering "the influence upon health, of some of the rites, sacraments and ceremonies of the Christian church." He enumerates the seven sacraments of the Roman Catholic and Greek churches, but contents himself with a labored criticism upon "The Lord's Supper and Baptism," because these are very generally celebrated in Christian churches, and we now hear no more of "the religious sentiment."

Of the Lord's Supper, the author admits that "there is *no* objection to it on account of *any* injurious effect upon health, when the ceremony is *short*, and does not interfere with the *usual meals* of the day, and when the *bread and wine*, or what ever else is used, is of *good quality* and taken in *small quantity*." In this preliminary concession, every thing is granted which the practice of any

sect of Christians in this country, or in the world requires where the Lord's Supper is celebrated. 1st. The ceremony is short. 2d. It does not interfere with usual meals. 3d. The bread and wine is of good quality ; and 4th. It is only taken in small quantity. As with these conditions no injurious effect upon health is alleged as probable, or even possible, we might have expected that he would have spared any farther animadversions upon the subject. But instead of this, he proceeds to describe the variety in the ancient and modern forms of administering this ordinance, and the author gravely enlightens his readers in the history and mystery of the recent petty fanatical disputations among some dozen or more illiterate zealots and ultraists in the northern and eastern portion of this country, on the subject of substituting some other article for *wine* in the sacrament. This controversy, to which he attaches immense importance, attributing it to "many of the clergy of this country," has been regarded as too insignificant to call for sober refutation, and the authors of the stupid and senseless proposition to substitute " tamarind water, molasses and water," and the like, for the "fruit of the vine" will acquire more of notoriety and publicity by the notice taken of them in this book, than they could otherwise have hoped to acquire. We doubt, however, whether they will be very thankful to the author for perpetuating a piece of folly, of which the sen-

sible portion of the disputants are already heartily ashamed.

It would be an unanswerable refutation of all the author has said on this subject, to allude to the fact, that notwithstanding the celebration of the Lord's Supper was shockingly perverted and abused by the Corinthians, and called forth from the apostle the most pointed rebuke, yet no intimation is given that the ceremony ought to be abandoned, or might be innocently omitted, in consequence of its being susceptible of this abuse. The holy apostle, however, was not a phrenologist, and he did not know that it would "prove injurious to health and ought to be abandoned," much less had he learned, that this ordinance "derives no support from the instructions of Christ."

But the author having failed to make out his case of the injurious effect upon health, produced by any form of administration of the Lord's Supper, he nevertheless proceeds to discuss the very relevant subject, whether Christ ever instituted it; and having, as he sagely imagines, established the negative of the proposition, he decides *ex cathedra* that it ought to be abandoned. He quotes from the Evangelists and Robert Barclay, but wholly overlooks the Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, as though this was no part of the sacred canon. Had he read the eleventh chapter of this epistle, he would have learned the Divine authority for the institution of this ordinance, which the apostle

affirms he "received from the Lord," as well as for its perpetuation to the end of time. And yet such is the author's ignorance upon the subject upon which he writes, that he asserts that the institution "derives *no* support from the instructions of Christ," though he concedes there is "a *slight* command in the words, "Do this in remembrance of me." Yet as it is only "a slight command," and as there is "no authority from *reason* for its continuance," he insists it ought to be abandoned.

Among other objections, the author alleges that "reflecting and inquiring men see nothing of a moral or instructive nature in this ceremony." This information will amaze the unsophisticated reader who has become at all acquainted with this sacred subject, even in theory. The institution of the Lord's Supper is not only a monumental celebration of the most stupendous event in this world's history, and an expressive symbol of the most important doctrine in the moral universe, but it is likewise a standing and irrefragable evidence of the truth of Christianity, as well as the Divinely appointed seal of the covenant of grace. And yet the author and his "reflecting and inquiring" brethren "see in it nothing moral or instructive."

But his strongest objection to this ordinance is, that "it seems to be a kind of worship of Christ himself, which he never enjoined upon all his followers." That an infidel or Socinian should take

this position is perfectly natural, but for a Christian to present such an objection, is both inconsistent and absurd. But the author has so little acquaintance with the Scriptures, that he affirms that the "worship of Christ implied in this ceremony, is inconsistent with his teachings, in which he *"always kept himself out of sight!"* How any man would hazard his reputation for intelligence, common sense, or common honesty, by such an idle assertion, with the Bible in his hand, it would puzzle a Jesuit to determine. Did Christ "keep himself out of sight" when he taught his disciples, saying, "*I am the light of the world.*" "*Without me, ye can do nothing.*" "*I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, the first and the last.*" "*If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.*" "*I am the way, the truth and the life.*" "*Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life.*" "*I and the Father are one.*" Are these the proofs that in the "teachings of Christ he always kept himself out of sight?" And does the *worship* of Christ which is implied in the Lord's Supper, so grievously offend this theological cynic? What then does he do with the plain and unequivocal declarations of Scripture on this point? "*All men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father.*" "*At the name of Jesus every knee shall bow.*" "*Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing.*" "*To Him be glory, both now and forever, amen.*"

But we forbear to multiply citations in a case so plain, and must acknowledge that we are shocked at the temerity which has led the author into so ridiculous an attitude as this portion of the volume places him. *Quem Deus vult perdere, prius dementat.* Surely so flagrant misrepresentation and sophistry as that we have been constrained to expose, would seem to imply that the author is not only destitute of any species of information on the topics he pretends to discuss, but that he must have been deprived of his reason. If we were to name the species of insanity under which he labors, we could not call it *mono-mania*, since this is not the only topic upon which he appears to be *non compos mentis*. We would probably be obliged to invent a term significant of the fact that he is demented not on *one* topic, but on *many*, and hence call his malady *polymania*. He cannot be suspected of religious derangement by any one who reads his book, unless we adopt his phrenological exposition of the religious sentiment, and account for his symptoms by the prominent "developments" which depend upon "his organization."

In relation to the ordinance of Baptism, very nearly similar ground is taken. He first describes the various modes of its administration in different periods of the church, and then attempts to prove that Christ did not enjoin baptism, and this in the face of the Scripture testimony, part of which he quotes. He ascribes the baptism of

Christ by John to the same reason which influenced the circumcision of Timothy, wholly disregarding the essentially different reasons assigned by inspiration. The command of Christ to go into all the world, baptizing, &c., he interprets to mean, giving the converts a new name, but he carefully abstains from any allusion to the practice of the Apostles under that commission, and the multiplied instances of baptisms recorded in the Scriptures, in all of which *water* is explicitly stated to have been employed, and nothing at all said of his "*new name*." But it were idle to detain the reader by any farther notice of such consummate folly, a refutation of which is not worthy of idiotic talents.

In his remarks on the effects of baptism upon health, he maintains that the mode of immersion is dangerous, especially to the feeble, to infants, and in cold climates ;—but he does not presume to urge this objection against the modes of sprinkling and pouring, but singles out for his animadversions those few cases in which the mode or circumstances *may* prove injurious to health. He seems sensible of the imbecility of this portion of his book, in which he arrives most truly at a lame and impotent conclusion, and he therefore hastily winds up the chapter with a flourish about "washing feet" and "kissing," which is too puerile to deserve criticism. In this connexion he again quotes largely from "the excellent Robert Bar-

clay," whose reasonings he pronounces unanswerable. If he had weighed Barclay's reasonings in relation to "the gift of the Holy Spirit," and his "special influence," he would have found arguments which remain unanswered, because they are unanswerable. Barclay rejects only "the outward and visible signs" of these ordinances, but he zealously contends for the "inward and spiritual grace," which is the substance of that which the former only "shadow forth and symbolize."

But Dr. Brigham utterly repudiates both the substance and the shadow; denying the "baptism of the Holy Ghost," and by consequence the figure divinely appointed to represent it; rejecting the anti-type he would annihilate the type, which, according to his philosophy, is unmeaning, signifying nothing. Abjuring religion itself, he can have no possible use for any of its forms, rites, and ceremonies. There is, therefore, an inconceivable moral distance between these two writers, for while Dr. B. denies both the *form* and the *power* of religion; Robert Barclay only rejected the "form," because of his confidence in the "power of godliness." His reason for dispensing with "water baptism," is declared by himself to be that this was only a figure instituted temporarily in the primitive church, and is rendered unnecessary now that the "dispensation of the spirit" is fully come, because the *shadow* may be dispensed with, when

we have the *substance*. If the author found his "reasoning unanswerable," as he affirms, then it is plain that even Robert Barclay has proved the "special influence of the spirit," beyond the power of Dr. Brigham's philosophy and logic to refute, and he therefore proves too much; since both the abrogation of "water baptism," and the "necessity of the baptism of the Holy Ghost," which the former symbolized and prefigured, are sustained by the same "unanswerable reasonings." And yet they seem to have produced no other impression on the mind of the latter, than to lead him to the rejection both of "the letter and the Spirit." The reason will presently appear, and in no wise proves that Barclay's argument has this design or tendency, but Dr. Brigham having *already* rejected all the "spirituality" of religion, only needed these reasonings to authorize a similar estimate of its "forms."

In the fifth chapter our author treats of places of worship, inconvenience of houses, night meetings, camp meetings, protracted meetings, and ringing of bells. With his observations on the manner of building and furnishing houses of worship, so as to make them comfortable; and with his just censures on the carelessness so prevalent in these respects, and so prejudicial to health, we need not detain the reader. Nor are we at all disposed to censure the merited rebuke given by the author, to those who, while attending church, allow

their horses to suffer by being exposed to the weather. On these, and the like subjects, the author is qualified to write by his previous studies, habits, and information, and were he equally acquainted with the subject of religion, this book would never have been published.

But when he takes up the subject of *night meetings*, which seem to be his peculiar horror, the author appears unable to suppress his indignation or restrain his anathemas. He premises that by night meetings, he means "those which are holden for *religious* purposes," for of these he says, "I consider theatres and balls as *less injurious* to the health of the people of this country than *religious* night meetings." To be sure he assigns as a reason the great comparative frequency of the latter, but from the stress laid upon their *religious* character, and the sneering he uses in relation to the variety of occasions for them, it is plain, that if the night meetings were *not religious*, and were ever so frequent, they might, in his opinion, be innocent and useful.

While he admits that "hundreds of females lose their lives from complaints produced by attending theatres and balls," yet he "wishes dancing were more general in private houses," so that this kind of "night meetings" would be salutary to health, however frequent, if there was no religion mingled with them, a proviso which we should think, not very difficult to secure. And he

broadly intimates, that "theatre going" is not objectionable, on account of being injurious to the body, nor would it be injurious to the mind if it were not for the indecent and vulgar plays brought upon the stage.

The dangerous and alarming influence of religious night meetings upon health is dwelt upon at great length, and the clergy are pathetically appealed to for their abandonment, while the *ladies* are warned to avoid them as they wish to escape "*nervous and hysterical diseases, apoplexy, palsy, consumption and death.*" If this black catalogue does not affright the fair inhabitants of New England, and all the world, from *religious* night meetings, he has called "spirits from the vasty deep" in vain.

The zeal, fervor, and eloquence of the author on this subject, would be absolutely sublime if there were more than "one step" from thence "to the ridiculous." But to overlook, as he does, the multiplied and multiplying parties, soirees, quiltings, levees, and converzationes of the ladies, and the secular, political and festive assemblages of the other sex, and especially those which are far more frequent, and continue to much later hours of the night than the meetings he reprobates, renders his sage criticisms superlatively ludicrous. In our large cities, multitudes of both sexes, it is well known, are in the theatres, circuses, concerts, museums, or other public places of amusement, almost every

evening in the week, and most of these, as in New York, are thronged even on the Sabbath. Beside these public places, which are crowded at all seasons of the year, and often until after midnight, there are musical, and dancing, and card parties, publics, and balls, which are protracted during the greater part of the night, where all the mischiefs to health which the author deprecates are ten-fold greater than in the cases complained of; and yet the author sounds no note of danger, utters no cry of alarm, proclaims no voice of lamentation, but is so exceedingly explicit as to say, "By night meetings, I mean those which are holden for *religious* purposes," and upon these only he places his ban of reprobation.

The truth is, the night meetings held in the churches, are seldom continued longer than from *one to two hours*, and are crowded only on some special occasions, which, for the most part, are exceedingly rare. The frequency of these meetings is therefore greatly overrated, and on this, as well as on other topics, the author draws largely upon his imagination for his facts. A striking example of his propensity to exaggeration is furnished in the opinion he expresses that "*one half of the females* between the age of fifteen and fifty, throughout the whole community, attend religious meetings one hundred and fifty *nights* in a year." The reader will need no other evidence to determine what share of credibility is merited by his

sweeping assertions. And even if it were true, the short time usually occupied in such meetings could not then be productive of the mischiefs so terrifically portrayed. Indeed, it must be regarded as beyond all the mysteries of the universe, that so large a proportion of the females of the whole community, as he describes, should be perennally subjected to the causes which ruin their health, while the instances of the actual production of disease from this source should be so "few and far between." For we hesitate not to aver, that the most accurate statistics will prove that more females die every year of *hydrophobia* in the various parts of this country, than of diseases produced by *religious* night meetings. We regard the doleful predictions and lamentations of this alarmist, as evincing profound stupidity, and meriting supreme contempt.

The author, next in order, takes up camp meetings, by which, he says, "I mean meetings of numerous individuals out of doors, usually in the woods, for the purpose of devoting themselves for several days and nights to *prayer*, and to attendance on other *religious exercises*." The reader will perceive, that in thus selecting camp meetings as the topic of his animadversions, he condemns only those which are for "prayer and religious exercises." This, as in the case of night meetings, is "the head and front of their offending." Encampments for hunting, fishing, and pleasure ex-

cursions, or those upon the race course, are innocent and perhaps salutary, for though they consist of "numerous individuals, out of doors, and in the woods," yet they are not for the unhealthy and mischievous "purpose of prayer and religious exercises," and are therefore harmless, if not laudable. That this view of the author's meaning is correct, may be seen from the fact, that "four day's meetings," or "protracted meetings," which he says took their rise from camp meetings, are declared to be equally mischievous to the health, though these resemble each other, neither in being "out of doors," nor "in the woods," but only in their being held "*for prayer and religious exercises*," which seem to be the peculiar horror of the author, since he seldom mentions such things, but he associates them with "hysterics, apoplexy, insanity, and death!"

In the accounts he selects of a number of these meetings, and the correctness of which he does not question, we find no mention of any injurious effects upon the health of the multitudes in attendance, though the Doctor says he has "professionally attended several persons who were made sick, they themselves were convinced, by attending camp meetings, and he has heard of many others." These facts are highly probable, but it would be a most astounding miracle indeed, if camp meetings should prevent any person who attended them from being sick, among the thousands usually

assembled on such occasions, especially if, as he says, "the accommodations in the tents, especially for females, are bad." Indeed, the description he gives of these meetings will convince their warmest admirer that they must be injurious to health, were it not for the inconsiderable circumstance, that it happens to be untrue. For example, he says, "*necessarily!* there must be great exposure to *cold and rain!*" when, as it is notoriously known, hundreds of camp meetings are conducted to their conclusion throughout, in a temperature varying from 70 to 90° of Fahrenheit, without a particle of rain. But again, he says, "*necessarily* there is great exposure to *bad air* in crowded *tents!*" This again is a very rare occurrence, for the public exercises are not held in *tents*, but in the open air, where it is impossible to be *crowded*, or to suffer from *bad air*, unless they could fill "all out doors," and arrest the winds of heaven. But he next enumerates, among *necessary* evils, "that meals will be irregular, and sleep disturbed," when the fact in the case is well known to be, that the "regularity of the meals" is often much greater than people are accustomed to at home, and the experience of those who attend these meetings will prove, that so far from having their sleep disturbed, they may, if they please, sleep longer and more undisturbed than usual. This results from the almost universal regulation of the times for meals, and the times for retiring,

by the blowing of a horn. The *rules* for the government of camp meetings, and which are strictly enforced, absolutely prevent either "irregular meals or disturbed sleep," unless it be under some special circumstances, or on the last night of the meeting, when religious services are sometimes continued through the night.

But the author not only blunders in every part of his theory, in enumerating the cause which produce diseases at camp meetings, and which, as we have seen, only exist in his morbid imagination; but he is equally in fault, when in the exuberance of his liberality and boundless charity, he conjectures the motives of those who hold them. He says, that "no other reason *can* be given, but that they affect the mind and agitate the body." Here then we are told by high authority, that the motive of those who hold camp meetings, is to "affect the mind and agitate the body," and as they are over and over attributed mainly to the "Christian sect called Methodists," it is plainly the object of the author to impute this object to the clergy of that denomination. How it "affects the mind," we are not informed in this book, except that "the sect of Methodists has been greatly increased by them," and "they have added greatly to the number of the Methodists," events, which however calamitous to the public health, he does not specify whether they are the result of "affecting the mind or agitating the

body." It is true, he affirms that "he witnessed a most deplorable case of insanity, which *appeared* to be caused in a young lady, by attending a camp meeting," which appearance is highly probable, if she was in "the bad air of crowded tents," or "exposed to cold and rain," with irregular meals and disturbed sleep," for these would both "affect the mind and agitate the body." To be sure, he says, these are "necessarily" the circumstances attending camp meetings, and he professes to speak from personal observation. It is difficult to account for this false description and caricature, unless we suppose that some time or other he went to a camp meeting in a storm of cold and rain, when the public exercises were interrupted, and the people crowded in the tents to escape the temporary inclemency of the weather. And if, under such circumstances, some were not made sick, it would be enough to invest these meetings with sovereign and miraculous endowments for preventing disease. It may have been in a contingency of this kind, that the young lady he speaks of suffered in her health, and afterwards became insane. We remember an analogous instance of most deplorable insanity, which *appeared* to have been caused by a young lady being married, and "in her case, there was no hereditary tendency, nor had there been any symptoms previously" to the ceremony of her nuptials. And we might, with as much propriety and with equal

success, attempt to frighten the ladies from *marriage*, because of this rare instance ; as to intimidate females from camp meetings, because of the case he names. Indeed, the ceremony of *marriage* "affects the mind and agitates the body," in most instances, more than attending camp meetings, and if the author should witness a case like the one we have described, according to his logic, "reason would condemn it, and experience show it to be dangerous both to mind and body," and we might expect him to read a homily, calling upon the "intelligent clergy," "influential men, and *especially females*," to examine the subject, and "agree with him," that *marriage* "ought to be abandoned, or greatly modified !"

Protracted meetings constitute the next theme of the author's strictures ; by which term he says, "I mean *religious* meetings of several days continuance," sometimes called "four days meetings." They are "similar in all respects, *except the camping out*, to the camp meetings of the Methodists." He says they are held "for the *purpose* of producing *religious* excitement," and sometimes continue forty days. He gives the following account of the manner in which they are generally conducted, viz: prayer meetings or inquiry meetings early in the morning ; then preaching, praying and singing in the forenoon ; in the afternoon, another sermon with prayers and singing ; in the evening, a third sermon, praying, singing, exhor-

tation and examination of those called *anxious* or *awakened*."

That these meetings are injurious to the health, is alleged by the author for the following reasons: "Assembling men, women and children; *talking* to them, *exciting* them, and making them anxious and disturbed for days and weeks on the subject of *religion*;" the *bodily* labor and fatigue in attending *church early* in the morning, *most* of the day, and *late* in the evening, *days and weeks* in succession, exposed to variable *weather*, a vitiated *atmosphere*, sudden and great *changes* of temperature, by going from *heated, crowded* rooms into the *open air*." For these reasons, as well as the injury suffered by the clergy by preaching, praying, declaiming and exhorting most of the time, he objects to these meetings on account of their mischievous influence upon health. He says he has "known *several* cases of severe disease, which he believes originated from attending protracted meetings, and several cases of insanity which *appeared* to have the same cause," and he refers for still further evidence to "the case books of the lunatic establishments in New England."

That there are circumstances, some of which are named by the author, which are justly reprehensible in protracted meetings, because hurtful to health, is readily admitted. Indeed the descriptions he quotes from published documents of the meetings conducted by weak, ignorant and fana-

tical men in several towns and cities of the north and east, *if they are true*, are justly censurable, not only for their influence upon health, but for their deplorable *moral* influence. But that *religion* should be censured or condemned, or even protracted meetings made the theme of indiscriminate denunciation, because of the folly, indiscretion, and extravagances of such "weak brethren," is profoundly stupid, and indeed criminally reprehensible in a professed Christian.

It is ridiculous and absurd, as well as cruel injustice to charge upon the whole Christian community, and upon religion itself, the wild and incoherent ravings of fanatics or madmen, or hold the churches responsible for the effects such men produce by their phrenzy. The effects of such meetings as are here described, are evil, and only evil physically, mentally and morally, nor do intelligent Christians approve, tolerate, or excuse the improprieties complained of. And had the author restricted his censures to the agents and abettors of these enormities he might have claimed respect for his faithfulness and candor.

No one, however, can read this book and not distinctly perceive that the reprobation of the author extends to protracted meetings indiscriminately, not because of the exceptionable features above mentioned, but as in the case of night and camp meetings, because they are "held for *religious* purposes." Indeed the zeal exhibited in

his attempt to convict religion itself of causing disease and death, has led him to indiscretions and perversions of fact of which he ought to be ashamed. In his classification of reasons for the unhealthiness of these various meetings, it is obvious that the author enumerates a number of causes of disease which are demonstrably more palpable and vastly more potent than "mental," or even "religious excitement." Hence he dwells upon the "*bodily labor and fatigue*" imposed, the "*exposure to variable weather, a vitiated atmosphere, and sudden and great changes of temperature by going from heated crowded rooms into the open air.*" And he finds himself under the necessity of arraying all these physical causes of disease, which are mere contingencies, in the catalogue of morbid agencies, which render such meetings unhealthy, because he discovers that "religious excitement" is wholly insufficient for his purpose. Nobody doubts that the circumstances he names are *physical* causes of disease of themselves; but he superadds all these to the "mental and religious excitement" with the view of rendering it probable that such meetings are unhealthy. Yet they are wholly irrelevant, because neither "religion" nor "religious excitement" can be justly implicated in the causation of maladies, which are avowedly produced by physical agents, such as those he describes.

A number of accounts of protracted meetings

are here introduced from various religious journals, and the use made of them is truly extraordinary.

For illustration we refer the reader to the sketch of the life and death of a little girl, extracted from the "Sunday School Record," and found under the head of Protracted Meetings, on page 178 of this book. The author attempts to render it probable that the child's death was caused or accelerated by *religious* excitement, which, however possible he may think it in other cases, in the instance here named, has not the least semblance of evidence. The facts are, that a child of eleven or twelve years old, the daughter of a minister, attended a protracted meeting, at which her father officiated, became interested in religious things in which she had been early initiated at home and in the Sabbath school, and after a short season of anxiety of mind, was hopefully converted. A "*few weeks after,*" this child became sick, and died of a "*fever of the most malignant kind,*" during which her reason was impaired, as is usual in such fevers, for a short time ; but four days before her death she was rational and intelligent, and conversed with her parents and friends in a manner which demonstrated the possession of her reason, and the experience of genuine evangelical religion. The narrative is drawn up without any savor of enthusiasm or extravagance, and will be found pathetic and interesting.

On this case the author founds a "warning to parents," against such reprehensible conduct as cherishing religious exercises in their children, and after describing the habits of devotion and piety of this little girl as highly censurable, he adds, "then came delirium, disease and death!" and proceeds to attribute the child's death to attending religious protracted meetings as its cause. But, unfortunately for his professional character and candor, the narrative states, that the disease did not appear "for weeks after" these meetings, and moreover, the disease is represented to have been a "fever of the most malignant kind," in which all the world knows delirium would have occurred, if she had never seen a "protracted meeting," and the Doctor surely need not be informed, that *malignant* fever must have some other source than "attending sunrise prayer meetings," which he names as the most horrible proximate cause of her malady.

Ring of bells is the subject with which this long chapter concludes, and is another evidence of the "influence of *religion* upon the health and physical welfare of mankind." He says, people in health, and himself included, are "greatly *annoyed* by the noise of the bells on the Lord's day, the sick are very much injured, and he has no doubt that in some instances it has proved fatal." He argues that the "church-going bell" should be silenced henceforth, and suggests that the inha-

bitants may be summoned to church, by *criers* from the "galleries of the minarets attached to the mosques," as the Mahometans do, or by the *blowing of a horn*, the *beating of a drum*, or by *hoisting a flag*. This last method he greatly prefers, and should be substituted for the ringing of bells, since it makes no kind of noise. One can scarcely preserve his gravity, in perusing such sublimated nonsense. It is not wonderful, therefore, that a lady of New England has yielded to the temptation of castigating the author by a piece of satire, which deserves a more permanent place than the columns of the "Connecticut Courant." In the notice she takes of this homily of the author against the church bells, which so terribly disturb his equanimity, she points to an analogous evil, arising from the ringing of physicians' night-bells, where the most serious and alarming mischiefs result in consequence of the neighbors being roused from their slumbers, and especially mischievous to the sick. She imitates the author in proposing a remedy for this dangerous method of summoning the doctors on emergent occasions, and modestly suggests Miss Elizabeth Carter's plan, by a long string being tied to the foot of the learned gentleman of the faculty, and reaching to the front door. In that case she thinks that if deep sleep, or a cold night, should not be overcome by humanity and the prospective fee, and a slight twitch from the shivering messenger should not rouse, that a stout tug might soon bring the son of Escu-

lapius to a sense of his duty. And as she is sure "all *intelligent* physicians" and influential men will view this subject as she does, she confidently trusts her hints may remove the dreadful mischiefs which ringing of bells, in such cases, never fail to induce. The puerility of the author on this subject merits no other reply than such an exposure of his folly to merited ridicule.

The sixth chapter is devoted to "modern revivals of religion, and what are called the *special* effects of the Holy Spirit, and a comparison of these effects with the phenomena of disease, animal magnetism and excitements of the nervous system." From the evidence already before the reader, he may be prepared to estimate the fitness of the author's mind and habits to discuss a subject of this nature. He declares, that it is "eminently philosophical," and professes to estimate its "gravity and importance," and promises to treat it with "candor and solemnity," with the "desire predominating over all others, that the *truth* may be elicited."

After such an exordium to this "eminently philosophical" department of his subject, and such an assurance of candor in its examination, we can scarcely be prepared, even after all we have seen of this erratic writer, for such a tissue of unfounded distortion of facts, impeachment of motives and censorious denunciation of character, as are here exhibited. The doctrine of Divine influence,

which is as eminently scriptural as it is philosophical, is grossly misrepresented, and a "statement of doctrinal views," in relation to the gift and influences of the Holy Spirit, is ascribed to the "advocates of revivals of religion," which no sect of evangelical Christians in the land ever held or taught. Nay more, if the sentiments attributed by the author to "innumerable clergymen," were avowed through the pulpit or the press, by any man, however exalted in character or popularity, he would be forthwith excommunicated from any Christian church in the country, for "damnable heresy." And we hesitate not to affirm, that no man could be found, in the possession of his reason, who would testify that he ever before saw such doctrines in print, or heard them uttered by any professed Christian or minister of the gospel. Some of them are too shocking for repetition, and too revolting to have found a place in the heart of any other than the author. The monstrous extravagancies of Irving, the shocking mysticism of the Mormons, the profane impostures of Matthias are pardonable, nay, innocent, in comparison with the "blasphemy against the Holy Ghost," of which the author accuses "innumerable clergymen," and indeed all who advocate "revivals of religion."

Perhaps no where in this extraordinary volume does he exhibit more clearly the wretched perversion of his mind, than in the self-complacency with

which he denounces his literary, philosophical and theological philippics against the great and good, the illustrious Jonathan Edwards! Of the works of President Edwards, which he says he has carefully examined, the author authoritatively pronounces, that they are "*illogical, inconclusive, and evidence but little research or reflection; and that they are contradictory in important points, and abound with careless and erroneous statements.*" Such is the grave criticism, pronounced with amazing composure, in relation to the works of a man, whose enlightened piety, learning, and acquaintance with the philosophy of mind, has challenged the admiration of the wise and good in both hemispheres, and whose name is imperishably identified with the history of his country, as one of the brightest luminaries in the department of sanctified learning. That the author should thus write in New England, where the name and reputation of Edwards are revered and venerated, betrays a recklessness of character in which he will scarcely find a rival.

It is true, that the names of Sprague and Finney are associated with Edwards in his wholesale condemnation, but these ordinary men will find in the fact of being connected with that intellectual giant, a consoling recompense for all the condemnation, which, with him, they are permitted to share. Nor can the author gain any share of credence, even for just and merited criticism upon the works

of other writers, when he inscribes his own folly, by branding such a man as Jonathan Edwards with "justifying the most wild fanaticism the world has ever known."

The reason why President Edwards is thus singled out for the author's reprobation, is manifest in the extracts made from his writings, which prove that he believed in "revivals of religion," and attributed them to the "agency of the Holy Spirit." For this reason alone, he and Wesley and Whitfield, with others among the eloquent and learned divines of the last century are jointly classed with Finney, Burchard, and other modern "revivalists," and an attempt is even made by garbled and distorted extracts from the writings of those holy men of the last century, to identify them with Irving, Pierson and Matthias. This, as the author thinks, can be logically justified, for as the former believed in the "special outpouring of the Spirit of God" in revivals, they *must*, to be consistent, also believe in the effects ascribed to that Spirit in "*convulsions, fallings, outcries, dreams, visions, gift of tongues, spirit of prophecy*," and all that the most *wild fanatics* claim and exhibit. By such logic does the author attempt to make out his case after all his professions of candor and solemnity, and a predominant desire to "elicit the truth."

Possibly, however, he has fallen into these multiplied mistakes, and misapprehensions, solely be-

cause of his manifest ignorance on the subject upon which he writes, and the reader may make the effort to believe that his head rather than his heart is in fault. Charity will suggest this thought, if, as we proceed, truth and justice do not constrain its abandonment.

In this long chapter of more than eighty pages, and constituting nearly one-fourth of the book, there are so many topics introduced, that it will be necessary to detain the reader here by a few preliminary suggestions. In the description here given of the nature of what is called "a revival of religion," the author grossly misrepresents the circumstances ordinarily attending them, and selects to suit his purpose, solitary instances occurring in revivals, which are exceptions to the general rule, and some of them exceedingly objectionable in the estimation of sober Christians. He makes no mention of the comparative darkness and ignorance of the times in which some of the events occurred, nor of the intellectual imbecility of the individuals who were the subjects of some of the extravagancies named, concessions which candor and truth required him to make.

But his account of the doctrines held and taught in common by Edwards, Wesley, Whitfield, Sprague, and others, is still more uncandid and exceptionable. Their doctrine in relation to revivals, are strictly those of the Bible, while the sentiments ascribed to them by the author are both

unscriptural and absurd. The whole representation here given of the "doctrine of the special influence of the Holy Spirit," is essentially erroneous, and in relation to those excellent men whose writings were before him, his allegations are absolutely calumnious and libellous. They never held or taught the sentiments ascribed to them, nor is there any sect of evangelical Christians who would not utterly repudiate them, either in this or any other country. This entire statement of the views of those who advocate revivals of religion, is a vile caricature, and if the author believes it himself, he will find few readers equally credulous. Indeed, if with the books before him from which his detached and dislocated extracts are taken, he could *persuade himself* that Christian men and ministers could subscribe to such a creed as he has attributed to them, then is he entitled to our commiseration, rather than our censures, since it is obviously his misfortune rather than his fault.

As the author says on page 196, that he does not question the special influence of the Holy Spirit as mentioned in Scripture, as in Paul's conversion, in the day of pentecost and other places in the New Testament, we shall now give a brief summary of the views of those who, with Edwards, Wesley, and others, believe in revivals of religion, and the reader will perceive that they bear no analogy to those attributed to them by the author.

They believe that "a manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal," that Christ is the "true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world," from which Scriptures they learn that by the atonement of Christ, who "by the grace of God tasted death for every man," salvation from sin and its consequences, is attainable on condition of repentance toward God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ." They believe that it is by the Spirit of God that men are convinced of sin, and that under His influence, which is promised to all who ask for it, any sinner has all necessary ability to obtain salvation. They believe that "except a man be born of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven," and that "except we repent we shall all likewise perish." They believe that the preaching of the Gospel is Divinely appointed as the great instrument to "turn men from darkness to light," and that the Holy Spirit, given in answer to prayer, renders the Gospel efficient and successful in the conversion of sinners. And as Jesus Christ is the universal and all sufficient savior of sinners, so also they believe He is the *only* Savior, and that if men believe not in him, they will "die in their sins," and that the "wicked will be turned into Hell, with all the nations that forget God."

This is a concise statement in Scripture language of the sentiments of those whom the author has so grievously caricatured, and entertaining

these opinions, they pray for the "gift of the Holy Spirit," which is promised to all them that ask, and by a "revival of religion," they mean only that this Spirit and His influences are given for the awakening or conviction of sinners, for the conversion of penitents, and for the sanctification of believers. The progress of this "work of God," is what they call a revival, when many prove these Scriptures that "God has sent forth the Spirit of His Son into their hearts;" the "Spirit of God witnesses with their spirits that they are the children of God;" His "love is shed abroad in their hearts by the Holy Ghost given unto them." The evidences by which the revival is known to be by the "special influence of the Holy Ghost" are these: "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature, old things are passed away and all things are become new." "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His." "He that believeth on the Son of God, hath the witness in himself." "He that is born of God doth not commit sin." "He that committeth sin is of the devil." "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the children of God."

The reader cannot fail to discover that in this brief narrative of the Scriptural doctrines of those who, with "Edwards and Wesley," believe in "revivals of religion" as resulting from the "special influence of the Holy Spirit," there is not the least shadow of authority for the vile caricature

drawn by the author, whose malignity, imputes to Christian men and ministers "views," which he professes to have "selected from their writings," and in which he affirms that "those who favor revivals generally concur," which, we shudder to repeat it, plainly imply the most impious "blasphemy against the Holy Ghost." That the reader may be in possession of the horrible and revolting opinions, which are falsely imputed to "innumerable clergymen," and to "all who favor revivals," we present as nearly as possible in the author's language, the following summary of this fictitious creed, condensed from various parts of the chapter, so that it may be seen at one view in all its hideous deformity.

He charges all such with believing that "a very small number of Protestants are affected by the special influence of the Holy Spirit, and none other can be saved, and that no human being of the seven hundred millions of the human race can escape indescribable torments in hell forever, unless this special influence is imparted! That the Omnipotent Being created for his own good pleasure all these suffering mortals, and by withholding this influence of the Holy Spirit from them, innumerable millions of beings created in the image of God himself, are doomed to unutterable misery! That this Divine influence, absolutely essential for man's salvation, is only imparted occasionally to a few individuals of one sect, or religious congregation, at a time, and even these revivals of reli-

gion are not always genuine, though caused by the special influence of the Holy Spirit! That this influence has been withheld from the myriads of human beings who have lived, and is now imparted only to a few of the immense number of mankind on the globe, while without it no human being can escape indescribable torments in hell forever!" and besides all this compound of inconsistency and profanity, and much more too scandalous to detail, he accuses these Christian men and ministers with relying on certain "*feelings*," as the conclusive evidence of the "presence and agency of the Spirit of God," and with believing that "outcries, fallings, convulsions" and all the "outward signs" spoken of in revivals, together with "every species of wild fanaticism," are invariably the effect of divine influence. To all such allegations against religion, its doctrines, its ministers, and professors, we here enter our solemn protest in the face of heaven and earth, and leave their fabricator with the brand of a calumniator, burned into him, by his own hardness and folly.

Having thus disposed of the general slanders of the author, we proceed to a further exposure of the misrepresentations and falsehoods with which this book abounds. In the doctrinal exhibit we have given of the sentiments of the advocates of revivals, it will be perceived that there is nothing of "gifts of tongues and spirit of prophecy," nor do we find any authority for charging upon those

who hold these Bible doctrines, either "convulsions, fallings, outcries, dreams, visions," and the like, nor can any of the "wild fanaticism," described as their's, find any show of justification from the sentiments we have attributed to those Christians who believe in the special influence of the Holy Spirit and in revivals. Nevertheless, we may readily admit, that a genuine revival is often accompanied with external features, which, though they may appear to be fanatical to such lookers on as the author, are not by any means to be justly so considered. For instance, the author maintains that "solemn and anxious feelings," "sorrow for sin," "trembling," "weeping," and "feeling differently from what they ever did before," "turning pale," and "audible sobbing and sighing," are all evidences of "wild fanaticism;" and that those who believe in *any* of these effects being produced by the spirit of God, cannot consistently deny any measure of *extravagance and folly* which may be ascribed to the same agency. If this be not a specimen of "wild fanaticism" in the author, we know not where it is to be found.

Let us try these extravagancies, as they are called, by the teachings of inspiration, and by the dictates of reason and common sense. Were there no "solemn and anxious feelings" when, under the preaching of the Apostles, the multitude inquired—"men and brethren what shall we do?" Was there no "sorrow for sin, trembling, weep-

ing," &c., when Peter "went out and wept bitterly," or when "Mary washed the Master's feet with her tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head?" And if it be not unscriptural, is it unreasonable that men should, under the influence of enlightened views impressed upon their consciences, feel and act thus? Supposing it to be true, that the spirit of God convinces a sinner of his guilt and danger, as taught in the word of God, is it wild fanaticism that he should tremble, and weep, and pray, even audibly, for that mercy and forgiveness which he needs? And when, as often occurs in revivals, careless, hardened, and impious sinners, are suddenly brought to discover the enormity of their wickedness, is it to be condemned as extravagance that such feelings as remorse of conscience occasions, should "affect the mind and agitate the body?" And yet this and the like, is what the author calls "religious excitement," which is to be condemned as "wild fanaticism," and calculated to produce disease and death.

That instances of inexcusable extravagance, and even consummate folly, are sometimes exhibited in connexion with "revivals of religion," is not denied, indeed the author has industriously, and with a zeal worthy of a better cause, collected examples of this character, truly humiliating to our species, and calculated to disparage revivals, and disgrace those who participated in such folly.

These, however, so far from showing the "influence of religion," as he designs they shall, are only the excrescences which deform and disfigure revivals, and there may be, and often is, no religion in them. He may attribute them to *sympathy*, to *animal magnetism*, or to *hypocrisy itself*. We will give him all such examples as he can find throughout Christendom, to glut the buzzard appetite of those who can feast on the solitary carcasses which here and there defile the vast field of moral beauty and loveliness, which true "revivals of religion" have spread out, in the face of heaven and earth, and the fruits of which are seen in the radical reformation of the profligate and abandoned, living epistles, "not written with ink on tables of stone, but on fleshly tables of the heart, by the finger of the living God."

The striking infatuation of the author's mind, may be seen in the attempt he makes to disparage the intellectual character of the holy men of whom he speaks, as for example, he accuses President Edwards of "a strong tendency to *fanaticism* in early life;" and against John Wesley he brings the same formidable objection, "He early exhibited a tendency to *fanaticism*," and he classes these gifted and evangelical men, together with Whitfield, among "religious enthusiasts and fanatics," and talks of their "early enthusiasm having increased to extravagant fanaticism!" Who that is acquainted with the history of these men of God,

can fail to be amazed at the temerity and depravity which is implied in such injustice and censoriousness.

Having alluded to the spirit of unkindness and unfairness with which Edwards is treated by the author, we are here called to notice a similar want of candor towards Mr. Wesley. From the works of that great and good man, a narrative of a "revival of religion" is selected, which, *because it was extraordinary* in many of its features, is detailed by Wesley with great minuteness. The reader, who is not acquainted with the history of the labors of that distinguished and successful minister, might conclude, from this detached quotation, that the "outcries, falling," &c., here described, were common and frequent attendant circumstances upon his preaching, and that Mr. W. regarded these as *essential to a revival*. Indeed, all the accounts given in this book, are such as described irregularities, unusual in their occurrence, and are by no means regarded by the narrators as necessary, or even characteristic of revivals. Such, however, is the impression this book is designed to make, for no instance of the "special influence of the Holy Spirit" is here referred to, except only such as can be made to serve the purpose of identifying revivals with "extravagance" and wild "fanaticism." This is especially the case in the allusions made to Mr. Wesley and the Methodists, when, if "to elicit truth"

had indeed been the author's desire, he would have been constrained to state the fact, which must have been known to him, that Mr. W. was in the midst of "revivals" for more than half a century, preaching the gospel in various parts of the United Kingdom, and in other countries, proclaiming the doctrine of the "special influence of the Holy Spirit," and with a success in the conversion and reformation of tens of thousands, scarcely equalled since the days of the apostles. And yet the extravagances complained of were exceedingly rare, multitudes who were converted under his ministry, giving no examples of wild fanaticism. Occasionally, however, instances did occur, in which circumstances such as those described took place under his ministry, and that of his fellow-laborers, but no one can read his journals, as the author professes to have done, without perceiving that Mr. W. often records them as a faithful historian, not with a view of approving them, but accompanying the narrative with his doubts on some occasions, and in others attributing them to sympathy, animal feeling, fanaticism, and even hypocrisy. Indeed, he not unfrequently warned the people against them, attributing certain examples he names, to the influence of Satan, who designed to bring into disrepute the genuine work of the Spirit of God upon the hearts of men.

We inquire, then, is it fair, or candid, or ho-

nest, to select these incidental circumstances, which constitute no part of a "revival," and which, in some instances, were attributed to the devil, by Wesley, and the other ministers who record them, and insist that these are true descriptions of the "influence of religion," examples of the "effects of the Holy Spirit." The reader cannot fail to perceive, that by such a course the author has forfeited all claim either to confidence or respect. For not only Edwards and Wesley are thus foully misrepresented to suit his unhal- lowed purpose, but Whitfield, Rev. Dr. Alexander, Dr. Humphreys, Dr. Sprague, Mr. Finney, and others, receive no better justice at his hands. Nor would the reader suppose, from aught that this book contains, that these "semi-crazy enthu- siasts" condemned enthusiasm and fanaticism, even preaching and writing against some of the precise extravagancies of which he complains, and which he labors to impress the reader, are essential features in "revivals," and proofs of the mischievous and unhealthy "influence of religion."

Indeed, he maintains that no one can consistently deny, that "the Spirit of God produces outcries, tremblings, convulsions, fallings, dreams, visions, the gift of tongues, spirit of prophecy, and all that the most wild fanatics from the ear- liest ages, down to Irving, Pierson and Matthias, have claimed," while at the same time professing

to believe in "the special presence of the Holy Spirit, in revivals!" If this be not puerile, preposterous and absurd, we know not where these attributes are discernible in all the sophistry we have ever met with. He asks, in a strain of mock triumph, "Who can point out the dividing line in the conduct of those who claim to be actuated by the special influence of God, and say which conduct is caused by the Holy Spirit and which is not?" This interrogatory will convince the reader, that the author might have found an example of "wild fanaticism," without travelling from home, since he could have beheld its unconscious victim if he would but have approached his mirror. His arrogant question finds an easy solution, when we tell him that the Scriptures are our "infallible rule of faith and practice," and by these we may ordinarily decide, even in doubtful or difficult cases. But in the instances of "wild fanaticism," he names, the merest tyro in the knowledge of the Bible, could solve the problem with absolute certainty, without denying, as he does, that "God has any supernatural dealings with men." The creed of the author, as we have seen, is, that there is no medium, either there is no such thing as the "special influence of the Spirit," or all who claim it, however visionary and extravagant, must be relied on with implicit confidence. His article of religion on this subject is formed irrespective of the Bible, else he would have known that the

"sure word of prophecy" commands us to "try the spirits, whether they be of God," warns us of "evil spirits and false prophets, who lie in wait to deceive," and furnishes the criterion by which we may infallibly know "whether the spirits be of God." His ignorance of the Bible must plead his apology in this instance, also, for it is the only mantle broad enough to protect him from the charge of foul moral delinquency.

After such a course of sophistry and rhodomontade as we have just noticed, the author says, "Here then I rest the *argument!* and maintain, that whatever serves to prove that the special presence of the Spirit of God *induces awful solemnity*, and is evinced by the *flowing tear*, will serve to prove that some of the *most fanatical* conduct the world has ever known was owing to the special influence of the Holy Spirit of God!" Let us see, then, how this "argument rests," though we might rely upon the fact, that it is obviously a *non sequitur*. But waiving this, as he "rests the argument here," we maintain that the HOLY BIBLE *proves*, that the special presence of God induces "awful solemnity, and the flowing tear," and when we shall show this by one or two out of ten thousand citations which might be made, we convict the author of profanely affirming, that the Bible proves that the "most fanatical conduct the world has ever known, was produced by the Spirit of God!" To prove that

"awful solemnity" results from the presence of God, we refer the author to the exclamation of Jacob, "And he was afraid, and said, surely God is in this place and I knew it not, How dreadful is this place," &c., and if the New Testament authorities suit him better let him contemplate the "awful solemnity" of that scene, when the disciples exclaimed, "Master it is good for us to be here," or when Saul fell beneath the "awful solemnity" which "affected his body and agitated his mind," and led him to exclaim, "Lord what wilt thou have me to do."

And as the "flowing tear" gives our author great offence, and he stoutly repudiates the idea, that this evinces the presence of the Holy Spirit, we would again refer him to the *weeping* of the woman whose sins were forgiven at the house of Simon, to the *tears* of Peter, when the Spirit of God convicted him of his apostacy, &c.

But these will suffice to establish the position, that the author's logic impiously charges upon the Bible, the "wildest fanaticism the world has ever known:" and here we "leave him alone in his glory," and proceed to notice the attempt next made to ascribe the results attributed to the Spirit of God, to natural causes, which, he maintains, will account for them all. And we barely remark, that there is not, to our apprehension, in the universe of God, an object of purer fanaticism, more deserving of the pity of angels and of men, than

a man standing unawed into solemnity, and unmoved to contrition, before his Omnipotent Maker! How deep the moral infatuation which can scoff, deride, and even sneer at the emotions which spontaneously spring up in the hearts of those who realize the presence of the invisible Jehovah!

First of all, the author perceives a striking resemblance between the "work of God," a phrase which he significantly quotes, in frequent and vain repetition, and which his peculiar fanaticism, scarcely names, but with a sneer, and the symptoms of nervous diseases, such as hysterics, convulsions, frenzy and insanity." But as this theory does not gratify his malice, he adds, that there is a striking analogy between the effects of "revivals" and *witchcraft*! They are promoted, he says, by the same means. "So long as people talk about ghosts, apparitions and witches, so long will people see them, and to prevent witchcraft, it is only necessary to cease talking of witches." And then, he adds, with imperturbable gravity, "*So it may be with religious feelings!*" The reader should remember that the author professes to be a "Christian," having a "profound respect for the religious sentiment." And yet he proceeds to attribute every kind and degree of religious excitement to the same causes which produce a belief in ghosts and witches, and demonstrates that he believes all spiritual experience to be wholly delusive and imaginary.

Not satisfied, however, himself with his own explanation of this difficult subject, he proceeds to ascribe these extravagances to the "influence of a powerful or singularly endowed preacher, whose *eloquence*, like that of Whitfield and Wesley, leads the immense multitude to be passive instruments in his hands." Indeed, under such circumstances the author thinks that in large assemblies the feelings and actions, like certain other fevers, become *contagious*. And to sustain this latter opinion he alludes to the French prophets, as a sect of trembling and convulsed enthusiasts were called, who appear to have suffered under the disease, called Chorea Sancti Viti, and which is known to be propagated by a propensity to imitation, and which under certain circumstances, has been thought contagious. He also introduces "demoniac possession" among the causes of similar excitements and delusions, but as he finds "the special presence and agency of the devil but rarely mentioned in the accounts of modern revivals, he thinks it probable that the belief of his agency in human affairs will soon pass away."

But he proceeds to explain all that is "mysterious and miraculous" in modern revivals, by the phenomena of the stupid imposture denominated "animal magnetism," and this he does in the same style of vulgarity and sarcasm employed by the infidel writers whom he quotes. And as these have, over and again been answered and refuted,

we need not detain the reader with any farther notice of this ridiculous conceit.

We shall, therefore, briefly consider the conclusions to which the author professes to arrive in the close of this long chapter. The first is, that "the outward signs and visible appearances spoken of in revivals may have other causes than the Spirit of God." This we readily admit, and with the knowledge of this fact, the author is inexcusable for pretending to ascribe these effects to religion, as though no other causes resulted in "affecting the mind and agitating the body." The outward signs of which, he complains so hideously, because injurious to health when excited by religious emotion, awaken no anxiety when they proceed from other causes, against which his spleen has not been directed. But the author has neither the manliness nor the honesty to record, what he knows the truth required of him, that these outward signs and visible appearances, are, so far from being regarded by Christians as invariably the effect of the Spirit of God, that even the warm advocates of revivals look upon them as suspicious, and by no means confide in the experience of such, unless constrained to do so by that moral revolution of the life, which is invariably the result of regeneration.

The second sage conclusion to which the reader is brought in this chapter, is, that "it will not do to *rely on feelings*, as evidence of the presence and

agency of the spirit of God," else we "must admit the claims of Mr. Irving and numerous other wild fanatics to inspiration." Here is a truth to which the most strenuous Christian heartily subscribes; and it is because no friend of revivals ever did "rely on feelings as such evidence," that the pretensions of all such fanatics as he names are detected and denied. But the deliberate design of the author obviously is, to impose upon the reader this false and malicious creed, as the undoubted belief of those who speak of the special presence of the Holy Spirit in revivals. There are times when it were treason to truth and justice, to withhold the expression of a holy indignation against outrages upon common decency; and we are constrained to say, that this is an instance in which the author has degraded himself beneath contempt.

We pass to his third inference, in which, he asserts, "*positively*," in his usual style of italicised dogmatism, that "the Holy Scriptures do not warrant us in believing that modern revivals are caused by the special outpouring of the spirit of God;" and he affirms this as *certain*, while he thinks it possible they "*may* be so construed as to *partially* justify the opinions of Mr. Irving." And here we are constrained to say, that the author exhibits no great excess of modesty in pronouncing *positively* and *certainly*, in relation to the testimony of the Holy Scriptures, when he has already mani-

fested, so palpably, his ignorance of their contents; and more especially, when his opinions conflict with those of the most profoundly learned among the scholars of the old and new world. But he will pardon us, when we object to his qualifications to judge in relation to modern revivals, after having failed in his book to enlighten his readers in reference to their true character. He has drawn a vile caricature, which he calls a "modern revival;" and he persuades himself into the stupid notion that the "outward signs" he describes, are the effect of certain "feelings" which he imagines; and then he is so silly as to believe that Christians regard both these "outward signs and inward feelings," as the evidences of the special agency of the Holy Spirit. Now, having built this man of straw, he goes on a Quixotic crusade against his windmill, and with consummate stupidity, felicitates himself on having made a magnificent conquest. If the subject were not too serious, we might yield to the temptation to satirize his ludicrous position; but, however tempting, we must forbear.

4thly. He enquires—"Does the 'fruit' of these revivals force us to believe that nothing but the *special influence* of the Holy Spirit causes them?" To this sober question we might have expected, from any other than an infidel, a direct and sober answer; but the author proceeds to hold up the wrangling and disputes of the same sect, and of

different sects, and represents these and other "works of the flesh" as the "fruits of revivals;" and this in the face of the facts known and read of all men, that these reprehensible disputes are universally alleged as hindrances to revivals wherever they exist. If he had been desiring, as he professes, to "elicit the truth," he would, in reply to his question, have given the known fruits of revivals, as described by the authors from whose works he has elsewhere quoted. We find on page 241—2 of his own book, that the fruits of revivals are described by Mr. Wesley, to be the "conversion of the drunkard, the whoremonger, the oppressor, the swearer, the sluggard, the miser, and prostitutes." And Mr. Finney is quoted on the same subject, as follows: "Very often the most abandoned profligates are among the subjects of revivals. Harlots and drunkards, and infidels, and all sorts of abandoned characters are awakened and converted. The worst part of human society are softened and reclaimed, and made to appear as lovely specimens of the beauty of holiness."

These then are the "fruits of revivals," as quoted by the author, from the writings of their friends, whose experience and learning qualified them to judge correctly, and whose veracity is beyond reproach. Indeed, the author does not deny the facts, but alleges, that all these things "have often happened before;" and labours to

account for them by blotting the name of God Almighty out of the Universe so far as in him lies. Here, however, we have the fruits after which he inquires; and on these we rest the argument.

He may ascribe these results to "nervous diseases, witchcraft, demoniacal possession, eloquent ministers, or to animal magnetism;" and so long as by any of these agents he can effect these moral wonders, we shall not forbid him to "cast out devils," because he follows not us; but will rejoice in any instance of his success. Nevertheless we will still believe and maintain that "there is no other name given among men by which we can be saved, but the name of Jesus Christ;" and to his Spirit and its "special influence," we will still attribute the conversion of sinners, and the reformation of the profligate and abandoned. And while we unite with the author in denying that those who "manifest the works of the flesh" are "led by the Holy Spirit," whatever be their pretensions; yet, we as positively deny that such are in whole or in part the "fruit" of either ancient or modern revivals; and we are shocked at the hardihood under which he could make the insinuation. The "fruits of the Spirit," as described in the New Testament, "love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, and temperance," are those which must and do follow every genuine revival of religion; and

where these do not appear, or whatever may accompany revivals contrary to, or incompatible with these, we utterly reject, and are willing that the author may attribute them to animal magnetism, or whatever other cause may suit his taste or philosophy.

We have not forgotten, however, that the author affirms, in the "introduction," that by the phrase "fruits of the Spirit," in the Scriptures, nothing more is meant than the *natural* results of the moral and intellectual powers of man; and the apostolic catalogue is there repeated as resulting from the "inherent moral powers," and not the fruit of any "supernatural gift." So, that if these "qualities" were *universally* the "fruit of revivals," in all the subjects, still, according to his theory, they would furnish no evidence of the special influence of the Holy Spirit, which he so pertinaciously denies. It would be useless, therefore, to pursue this subject any farther, with so incorrigible a sceptic.

His last inquiry in this chapter, deserves a more particular notice—it is this: "Do the lives of those men of past ages—men illustrious for their piety—men who have been the foremost and ablest advocates of Christianity—men who have been the bulwarks of the Protestant religion—teach us that they were thus affected and converted?" To this interrogatory, we give an unequivocal affirmative answer; and on the proof of

this, we are willing to rest for the refutation of the author and his book.

In the first place, then, we refer to the experience of the Old Testament saints, as well as the conversion of the primitive disciples of Christ, as recorded in the New Testament. The Psalmist undoubtedly felt what the author calls an "affection of the mind, and agitation of the body." At one time, he exclaims—"Against thee, and thee only, have I *sinned*, O God, and done this evil in thy sight;" and again, "My soul is exceeding *sorrowful*;" "My tears are my meat and drink both day and night;" "The *sorrows of death* compassed me, the *pains of hell* got hold upon me, I found *trouble and sorrow*. Then called I upon the name of the Lord. Oh, Lord, I beseech thee deliver my soul;" "Cleanse thou me from secret faults;" "Take not thy Holy Spirit from me;" "Uphold me with thy free Spirit." Here we see clearly that David not only felt "awful solemnity," but it was accompanied by great excitement, sorrow, pain, trouble, tears, prayers, and what is still more, he believed in the "special influence of the Holy Spirit," which is the distinguishing feature in modern revivals, and which the author represents as contrary to Scripture or reason.

But let us turn to the New Testament, and we shall find numerous instances of similar affections of the mind and agitations of the body. The con-

version of St. Paul was attended with more excitement, emotion, and what the author calls extravagance and wild fanaticism, than ordinarily attends modern revivals, and that he taught and experienced the "special influence of the Spirit," it is hardly necessary to prove by citations. "If any man have not the *Spirit* of Christ, he is none of his." "The *Spirit* itself beareth witness with our spirits, that we are the children of God." And he speaks of it as the common privilege of Christians to be "sealed with the spirit," and "filled with the spirit," which cannot be understood to be any other than its "special influence," as claimed in revivals.

But to come to more modern times, we are content that this question may be decided by a few individuals out of the great multitude, which no man can number, who will be witnesses before the throne, in that day "for which all other days were made." Edwards, Wesley, Whitfield, Baxter, and others whom he names, would be rejected by the author as incompetent witnesses, because of their fanaticism, but David and Paul, and the whole testimony of inspiration, are all under the same condemnation. Newton, and Watson, and Payson, and Robert Hall, and John Mason Good, were all so fanatical, in his estimation, that though he appeals to the experience of such men, "as have been the ablest advocates of Christianity," yet he dares to do so, only because he is ignorant

of their history ; for all, all such are against his creed, and none but infidels will be found, who deny the "special agency of the Holy Spirit," in the regeneration and salvation of the soul. Paley, whom the author quotes, has been so often and so ably disposed of, that it is needless to reply to his speculations, some of which are both ridiculous and absurd, and for this reason they readily assimilate with the creed and philosophy of Dr. Brigham.

Having thus followed the author throughout this long chapter, we proceed to the next, which is more professional, and treats of the injury of the brain and nervous system, from frequent meetings and religious excitements; the increase of certain diseases from these causes—and concludes with special advice to the ladies and to clergymen.

And first of all we have a very learned description, anatomical, physiological, pathological, and *phrenological* of the human brain, in which he assumes, First, that the brain is the organ by which the mind acts, a truism which no one doubts, and in relation to which he might have spared the ostentatious display of authorities to substantiate it. His inferences, however, from this undisputed fact, are profoundly stupid, as we shall presently have occasion to show.

His second *assumption* is purely such, though he calls it a well established position, susceptible of

positive proof. It is this, that "all excitement of the mind increases the *action* of the brain." This doctrine is anatomically and physiologically false, nor is there, among his pretended "proofs," a single instance of even the semblance of evidence in its favor. It is not proved, nor can it ever be shown to be at all probable, even by analogy, that "the brain, or that nervous mass contained within the skull," is capable of *action* of any kind. And the reader will perceive, by examining the cases referred to by the author, that they are wholly irrelevant, though for the purpose of imposing upon popular credulity, they are adroitly and plausibly urged as direct and conclusive evidence.

For example, he says, "sometimes when the mental excitement is very great, instant death is produced from the *rupture of a blood-vessel* in the brain, causing apoplexy." This is his first testimony in proof of the "*action of the brain*," when there is demonstrably no *action* of any kind in the brain, or that "nervous mass which occupies the skull;" but only an "increased action in the *heart* and circulating system, by which more blood is sent to the *head* than can be sustained," and these are his own words on the succeeding page, and they explain the pathological truth, not only of the case here named, but of all the examples he gives of death occasioned by anger, fear, grief and joy, or other excessive mental emotions. That the author himself understands this subject

correctly, is evident from his ascribing the flushed countenance, in such examples, to an "increased *rush of blood to the head*," which he cannot but know is the result of the *vis a tergo* in the *heart*, and *not* in the *brain*. If there was any conceivable *action* performed by the brain, it would be in offering resistance to this "rush of blood," in accordance with a fundamental law of nature, in which the different organs of the body are endowed with this power for their own protection. Instead of which, however, in all the true examples he cites, the mental emotion increases the action of the heart, and the blood rushes to the brain with increased velocity, while this organ, instead of being *active* is perfectly *passive*, as in the apoplexy which follows, and in which the pressure upon the brain, produced by the effused blood, paralyzes that organ mechanically, as any other foreign body, so that sudden death is produced. Such is the truth in the case, as every pathological authority he names unitedly prove, and as dissection universally demonstrates.

It is as idle, then, to pretend that "all excitement of the mind increases the action of the *brain*," as it would be superlative folly to affirm, that mental excitement increases the *action* of the *NOSE*, when epistaxis, or bleeding from this organ occurs, under such circumstances, which is by no means unfrequent, and universally salutary, because hemorrhage in the brain is thus prevented.

Or, indeed, the author might with equal propriety assert, that emotions of the mind increase the action of *the stomach or bowels, the kidneys or bladder,* for abundant proofs are on record, in which the excessive indulgence of the stimulating passions of anger or joy, has produced excessive and even fatal hemorrhages from these several organs, and the depressing passions of grief and fear have been followed, when inordinately indulged, by extensive secretions and excretions from each of these portions of the body. And the flow of *tears*, which is involuntary and uncontrollable in almost all cases of intemperate mental emotions, might afford him equal authority for the axiom, that all excitement of the mind increases the *action* of the *eyes*, or the lachrymal apparatus appended to them. But he knows very well that all these arise from the increased *action* of the heart, and there is no *action* of the *brain* in any case, other than the passive action, if it may be so called, of transmitting through the nerves, the stimulating or depressing mental cause to the *heart*, and this organ is that, the increased action of which produces apoplexy and death, either by distending the vessels of the brain until they rupture and empty their blood into the cavity of the skull, or by their distention alone, as is sometimes the case, producing the same result.

The same may be said of the example he names of sudden death in public speakers, during

their bursts of eloquence, which he falsely ascribes to mental exertion and the action of the brain, when he ought to know that all such cases arise from *physical exertion*, not mental, as in the impassioned efforts which accompany these bursts of eloquence. In all such instances the increased action of the *heart*, and *not of the brain* is the cause of the mischief.

The citations from Astley Cooper, Broussais, and Blumenbach, are striking illustrations for our purpose, since what they record as evidence of the action of the *heart*, Dr. Brigham gratuitously attributes to the fiction of his phrenological theory, the "*action of the brain*." They speak of mental and moral causes having increased the "*pulsations of the brain*," and having resulted in "engorgement of blood," and even "inflammation of the brain," but they never dreamed that these arose from any other action than the action of the heart and blood vessels.

The reader may now correctly appreciate the opinions of the author when he urges an analogy between the effect of religious excitement in increasing the "*action of the brain*," and the influence of ardent spirits upon the stomach; and he infers this analogical doctrine, and, indeed, says, "it must be true, if it be true that the brain is the organ on which the mind acts." This ridiculous sophism is exposed from the obvious consideration that there can be no parallel in the cases. In the

one, the stimulus acts not only upon the heart, but directly upon the stomach itself; and this action is mechanical and chemical; while in the case of mental and religious excitement, there is no other action than that of the heart, and the series of consecutive effects which result from an increased circulation of the blood. Whatever else the author may imagine *religion* to be, he can never persuade even himself into the notion, that it can be a *mechanical and chemical irritating fluid* upon the brain, as ardent spirit is upon the stomach, when introduced into that organ. It is true there is a striking analogy in his morbidly perturbed mind, since he proposes the same remedy for intemperance in religion, as philanthropists recommend in reference to ardent spirits; for, if the maxims of his book are obeyed, *total abstinence from religion* would be the only course for the security of the "health and physical welfare of mankind."

The next position of the author is, that "*insanity, epilepsy, convulsions*, organic affections of the heart, and many of the most dangerous diseases" are "caused by mental excitement increasing the *momentum of blood* to the brain!" Mark, not "the action of the brain," but the action of the *heart*; for this alone, as we have seen, can produce an increase of the "momentum of blood" to any organ. The author finds it convenient or expedient to save his professional reputation at the expense of phrenology, in this as in other cases.

We design to convince the reader, in these brief hints, that insanity, when it arises from mental or moral causes, which is sometimes the case, is uniformly attributed by the author to what he calls the "increased action of the brain," which implies, and takes this for granted, that there is an *action* performed by that organ in health, and that the increase of it constitutes the disease. This is a dogma of phrenology; but is both unfounded and irrational, since the structure of the brain, so far from affording the least indication of a capacity for *action*, ought to satisfy any observer that it is merely an organ of transmission, and not of action, since for this latter it has no adaptation. The office of the brain, and for which it is adapted with consummate skill, as seen in the apparatus of nerves emanating from it, and which are the channels through which mental emotions and sensations are conveyed to the different portions of the body, is justly expressed by the author when he says, it is "the organ on which the *mind acts*," thus admitting that the brain is *acted on* by the mind, not that itself performs any act. And yet, by a strange incoherency and inconsistency, he is found insisting, in the same paragraph, upon the "*action* of the brain," and explaining the rationale of insanity, by the inordinate degree of this action, which he says results from "mental or religious excitement." And yet he soon forgets this phrenological theory, and records that "in cases of in-

sanity there are always found, upon dissection, visible marks of disease and disorganization of the *structure of the brain.*"

Here we have the pathological fact, admitted by himself, which explodes his whole theory, by furnishing the key to unlock the mystery by which he is so sadly puzzled; and, by this single fact, the *modus operandi* of the mind in cases of insanity, is shown to be dependent on a very different cause, from any real or imaginary "action of the brain." We need none of the lights of phrenology, or indeed those of any other "science, falsely so called," to aid us in so plain an inquiry. Common sense will enable us to decide, that if "the brain is the organ on which the mind acts," any morbid alteration in the structure of this organ, will necessarily result in irregular action, not of the organ, but of the mind, which is obliged to act on a diseased or defective organ. Hence, insanity, by whatever cause it may appear to originate, is a disease purely physical, and is, by wise men, uniformly ascribed to disease in "the organ on which the mind acts;" and it is irrational and absurd to prate, as the author does, about the "action of the brain." But we shall have occasion to revert again to this subject, and we therefore proceed.

After a grave attempt to prove that *insanity* is a disease of the brain, and not a malady affecting the immaterial, immortal mind itself, which no

one but an idiot or a materialist ever soberly imagined, we have it affirmed that it invariably arises from *mental or moral causes*. This absurd and ridiculous statement of the author, betrays a recklessness of truth, and a contempt for medical authorities, which, if his hopeless ignorance of the subject does not palliate, must imply moral delinquency of the most deplorable kind. Indeed, the plea of ignorance will scarcely avail him, since the reports of the Connecticut Retreat for the Insane, an institution located in his own city, and with which he professes an acquaintance, most conclusively refute all he has written. From the tenth Annual Report, now before us, it will be seen, that of the one hundred and sixteen cases of mania and melancholy, including insanity of every form, in the Hartford Asylum, more than one-third are either attributed to "hereditary or constitutional" causes, or are set down "unknown," there being no suspicion of mental or moral excitement in either of them. The rest are variously ascribed to the following *physical* causes, viz. "intemperance, dyspepsia, puerperal fever, repelled eruptions, insolation, onanism, ill-health, intermittent fever, liver complaint, amenorrhœa, menorrhagia, leucorrhœa, epilepsy, paralysis, inflammation of the bowels, licentiousness, and excessive *bodily* exertion." These are the various causes, purely physical, which have resulted in insanity, and when the hereditary and

constitutional cases are added, they will be found to constitute a large majority of the cases, not only in this institution, but in every similar one, where investigation into the causes is made with any degree of accuracy. It is true that this report, in enumerating the *supposed* remote and exciting causes, attributes a considerable number of the cases to grief, disappointment, and other mental causes, yet, out of the one hundred and sixteen cases, only *seven* are even *suspected* to be in any wise connected with *religious* excitement or anxiety, and this is itself a palpable contradiction of Dr. Brigham and his book.

In the first place, he maintains that insanity uniformly arises from mental and moral excitement, and quotes, with approbation, the testimony of a French infidel, who says, that "those causes which tend to derange the brain, by the *very exercise of its own functions*, are the most frequent, nay, almost *the only cause capable* of producing mental alienation." This is a virtual denial of the fact which universal observation and experience will demonstrate, that *nearly all* the insane are hereditarily predisposed to this malady by physical causes; though, as is well known, it is exceedingly difficult to obtain from the friends of patients, this humiliating and disreputable confession, as it is regarded; for to conceal a family predisposition to this dreadful disease, is natural and for the sake of others, in some cases, it may be laudable.

And this denial of the author is made by a strange fatuity, in the face of the truth, which he himself attests by numerous authorities, that "thickening of the skull, organic alteration of the brain, and other changes of structure are *always* found in the heads of insane people upon dissection." Surely whatever stress he may be disposed to place upon the "*action of the brain*," which he imagines to be the result of mental emotion and excitement, he can scarcely deceive himself into the opinion that "*thickening of the skull*" is thus produced, for this theory would explode his whole phrenological fabric, and annihilate his favorite "science of bumps."

But we next find him maintaining that while mental excitement on any subject may produce *insanity*, there is "especial" danger from the subject of "*religion*." Indeed, he declares that "in all ages religion has been one of the *most fruitful sources* of the disease!" And this inexcusable and heinous outrage upon historical truth, he attempts to bolster by kindred authorities. For its ample and conclusive refutation, the reader need only refer to the facts contained in the report to which we have just alluded, wherein he will discover that there are but *seven*, out of one hundred and sixteen cases of insanity in the Hartford Asylum, which are even *supposed* to be caused by this "most fruitful source of the disease." Only *one-seventeenth* of the examples, if this be, as we

suppose, a fair average, can possibly be attributed to religion, directly or indirectly ; and a large majority of them are distinctly ascribed, in the report, to physical causes, in which religious and mental excitement cannot possibly have had any share. And yet, with these demonstrations in his own city, and under his own eye, the author does not scruple, for the support of his theory, to make assertions which are as utterly at variance with truth, as with every species of medical philosophy.

The report to which reference is had, is selected because of its being issued in Hartford, where the author resides, and not because of any singular or peculiar adaptation to our purpose. Similar documents from any of the Asylums for the Insane, in our own and other countries, present the same facts, and many of them in a still stronger light. Dr. Benjamin Rush in his valuable work on " Diseases of the Mind," not only declares that in the Pennsylvania Hospital the cases were *very rare* which were ascribed to religion, however remotely, and these *invariably* to " erroneous opinions in religion ;" but they were, for the most part, temporary, and peculiarly susceptible of cure ; and recent inquiries of one of the most extensive practitioners in the city of Philadelphia, whose opportunities in the management of *insanity* have probably equalled those of any other on the continent, have elicited the opinion

that not one in fifty cases, can be ascribed to religion; and he never saw one such, but it was found to have occurred in a constitution hereditarily predisposed to the malady. In the Bloomingdale Asylum, near New York, observations accurately made upon all the cases which have been received from the commencement of the institution, have convinced the able and estimable physician of the house, that not more than one in forty can be referred to religion as its source, however remotely. Indeed, so far from religion being among "the most fruitful sources of insanity," it must be conceded by all whose intelligence and candor are led to investigate the subject, that if the disease has ever been produced by religious excitement, which is very possible, that such cases are very rare, proportionably to other causes. And the fact that professors of religion are so seldom found among the victims of insanity, is doubtless to be ascribed to the *preventive* influence of religion, which the author not only wholly overlooks, but utterly denies. Among the mental causes to which insanity is often ascribed, we find enumerated "the loss of friends," "disappointment in business," "reverses of fortune," and other calamities, all of which are perennially suffered by multitudes, who, but for the powerful supports and comforts of religion, would, in all rational probability, fall victims to melancholy and insanity, and are only preserved in these fiery

trials, by the consolations which religion, and religion alone, has power to bestow.

If there were any semblance of truth in the assertions of the author on this subject, or any correctness in his theory, instead of a few solitary cases of religious mania, we should, in these days of religious excitement, and even fanaticism, be authorized to expect a multitude of such examples. But what he lacks in facts, he makes up in wild and gratuitous assertions, as startling as they are unfounded, as the following specimens will prove: "No other disease is probably increasing faster in our country than insanity!" and he even "fears that it already prevails here to a *greater extent than in any other country,*" and these deplorable results, which his morbid imagination has conjured up, to affright himself and others, he ascribes to "exciting the minds of the *young*, and particularly *females*, on the subject of religion!" Indeed, such is the peculiar horror of his perturbed intellect, upon this frightful subject, that there can be little doubt that if the author were employed to investigate the causes of *mania a potu*, *puerperal insanity*, or even the *hereditary* cases in a mad-house, he would find that every one of them, had *some time or other*, been at a *camp meeting*, or a *Sunday school*, a *protracted meeting*, or *revival*, a *sun-rise prayer meeting*, or at least a *night meeting*! and hence, most logically, attribute them all to religion, or at least to the "religious sentiment,"

which, according to his philosophy, "brought death into the world and all our woes." We must not forget, however, to remind the reader, that this most potent "cause of causes," so fruitful of insanity, epilepsy, and convulsions, was "implanted in man by his Creator!" and has the author's "profound respect!"

But he seems so apprehensive that the reader will be incredulous in relation to the *actual production* and development of these frightful maladies, as resulting from *religion*, that he labors to terrify us by the warning, that even if it *does not ACTUALLY* produce these violent and fatal diseases, yet it "*may give rise to melancholy, hypochondriasis, tic doloieux, nervous affections, diseases of the stomach,*" &c., &c.; and though he labors to establish this position, until he exposes the weakness of his cause, yet he leaves it like the former, without a particle of evidence.

Failing, however, to implicate religion in the foul accusation he has brought against it, he still insists that *mental* excitement is dangerous, because the "South sea bubble," the "revolutions of America and France," &c. produced cases of insanity. After these, and the like very relevant arguments, in proof of the "influence of *religion* upon the health and physical welfare of mankind," he concludes by the following prodigious announcement, "religious excitement, like all mental excitement, *may* cause insanity and other di-

seases," and then admits, though with constrained and reluctant grimace, that "pure religion, Christianity, has no such effect; but the *abuse* of it has!" We marvel that he was not afraid to add his book to the multiplied causes of insanity which he deplures; for if the "*abuse of Christianity*" be a cause, he has furnished the world with a memorable example of that "*abuse*," and one which, in this respect, will scarcely find a parallel. Indeed we are not surprised to learn from the Christian Spectator, that the volume before us has already produced *one victim of insanity*, in which this disease was *caused* by reading it. Should the author's monomania protect himself from the baneful influence of "*religion*," and restrain him from "*night meetings*," he may escape personally from insanity, notwithstanding his "*abuse of Christianity*." For, however potent his "*abuse of religion*" upon the credulous victim who has become insane by reading it, we have little fear that the writer of this "*abuse*," *believed* in his own theory, and because we desire his convalescence and sanity, we ardently hope he does not.

But, in justice to this strange and incoherent inconsistency, which has led the author to disclaim any intention to assail religion, and to allege the evils he deplures only against its "*abuse*," we will pause for the purpose of ascertaining what are the "*abuses of religion*" in his estimation. And first, the reader may observe, that "all reli-

gious rites or ceremonies," of whatever kind, are examples of the "abuse of Christianity;" for he over and again declares that "Christ established *no ceremonies* at all!" Secondly, the doctrine of Divine influence is another "abuse;" for he positively affirms that "God has *no supernatural dealings with men*!" Thirdly, all public assemblies for worship, all preaching and praying, are instances of "abuse," and ought to be abandoned, since they "excite the mind and agitate the body," and besides being unscriptural, are "very *unreasonable in this age*, when information on all subjects can be obtained by *reading*!" Not only should all religious meetings be abandoned, but Sunday schools also, for they are another "abuse;" and as "the Sabbath ought to be a *day of rest* for man and beast," it is not only an abuse to "assemble and hear sermons all day," but it is almost as bad to "make horses work" by carrying people to church. It is no abuse, he says, to "walk or *ride or visit friends* on Sunday," so as people abstain from hearing sermons on that day, and are scrupulous not to *ride to church*. It is true the Dr. consents that a part of the day may be spent in devotional feelings, "provided they are not carried to an unreasonable extent." The "extent" which he regards as not unreasonable, may be estimated by what we have presented above; in explanation of the abuses of religion, all of which are of course "unreasonable."

A long extract from another French infidel, on demonomania, designed to sustain his accusation against religion, in "causing alienation of mind," and which he calls an "admirable article," is here presented, and may be taken as a true illustration of the author's real sentiments, although to the reader is committed the task of reconciling these doctrines of M. Esquirol, which he fully adopts as his own, with the Doctor's professions of profound respect for religion, and of his aiming only to correct the "*abuses of Christianity.*"

Among other flagrant exhibitions of depravity and infidelity, we are here taught that Christianity only "consecrated and extended the opinion of Plato and Socrates, as to the *existence of spirits,*" and hence, by the *introduction of Christianity*, "*demonomania was increased,*" because of the universal terror occasioned by the fear of yielding to the instigations of the devil, and the exaggerated opinions of the power of *spirits* over the body; and "exorcising," a practice resorted to in the "primitive church for restoring the possessed of the devil," though called miraculous, is here described as a vile imposture; and these observations are evidently designed to apply to the cases of demoniacs, who were healed by Christ and his apostles; and all such "miracles" are ascribed to "strongly affecting the imagination." How strange that the "mental excitement" thus produced, should *cure* the possessed, and *restore the in-*

sane, when such maladies are *caused* by the same excitement, which afterwards becomes their *cure*. But this anomaly is all explicable by the Doctor's "philosophy of bumps."

But next we are introduced to the period of the Reformation; and *Luther* himself is charged with having "revived fanaticism," and by "menacing damnation eternal," having "added a great increase of religious melancholy." Indeed, *Calvin* is here said to have *increased* them still more. "Every where could be seen the excommunicated, the damned, and the *witches*. The people of course became terrified. Tribunals were erected and the *devil* was summoned to appear in a court of justice!" These and similar disgusting and mischievous falsehoods, are endorsed by the author as sober truth, because they are found in the *Dictionnaire de Sciences Medicales*, and ascribed to M. Esquirol.

The object for which this extract is introduced, is obviously to persuade the reader into the belief that "demonomania," which is "the most deplorable of all kinds of insanity," does legitimately result, *not* from the abuses of religion, but from Christianity itself. Hence he dates the increase of this malady, from the period of the "introduction of Christianity," and charges it upon the "primitive church," that they not only furnished examples, but held "solemn festivals to cure the possessed" by pretended miracles. Then he at-

tempts to implicate the doctrines of the reformation in the same condemnation, charging upon Luther and Calvin similar enormities ; and though he professes to attribute the abandonment of a belief in demons and witches to Christianity, yet he records, as coeval with the renunciation of these follies, that "*religion* lost much of its power and influence on the ideas and conduct of men." And regarding this "power and influence" as necessary to "insure the docility of the people, and to produce obedience," he says the government of Europe have had recourse to other means for this purpose. And in this connection, he places the "fear of the police, of prisons, and of punishments," as being analogous to the terrors of religious excitement, and thinks it probable that the hospitals for the insane will soon contain the victims of the former fears, instead of the latter ; and this, we suppose, is on the hypothesis that religion is to be "abandoned," or at least not cultivated "to an unreasonable extent."

And here the author introduces his own testimony in corroboration of "religious excitement" producing that *variety of demonomania*, usually called "religious melancholy," and which, he says, "leads to suicides, and attempts to destroy themselves and their kindred." These dreadful cases are produced, we are told, by "imagining that they have committed great crimes," for which "they must go to hell," and that this "cruel des-

tiny" is unavoidable, because they are guilty of "the unpardonable sin," and their "day of salvation is passed." All these "*imaginary terrors*," accompanying this form of insanity, are ascribed to "religion and religious excitement," and the author has "the particulars of above *ninety* cases of suicide from religious melancholy, which have occurred in six of the northern states, within the last twenty years, and most of them within a very few years; and thirty instances in which the unhappy sufferers either killed, or attempted to kill their children, or dearest relatives, to ensure their future happiness." And he has "no doubt, that if all the examples of insanity, from the like cause, could be known, their number would surprise and grieve the friends of humanity, as did the *first* published accounts of the *ravages of intemperance!*" Such is the exaggerated and unfounded note of alarm which the author sounds, the monstrous extravagance and absurdity of which, will prevent the salutary effect of his criticisms, even when they are directed against acknowledged evils. That there are appropriate examples of fanaticism and folly, which deserve the censures and reproofs which are here so indiscriminately bestowed, is every where known; but to charge any such instance upon religion as its cause, is not only absurd, but absolutely impious.

After the astonishing hyperbole of language

employed by the author, and the frightful array of false facts, which have been imposed upon his credulity, until his morbid imagination, it would seem, has been prepared to believe that there are five hundred thousand insane religionists in the country, and thirty thousand annual victims of suicide and murder from this form of demonomania, analagous to the startling statistics of the "ravages of intemperance;" instead of being, himself, shocked at the horrible picture, which his fancy has sketched, he says, with prodigious composure, that the reader should "*not be surprised at the number of the insane being so great,*" but he should rather be amazed "*that it should be so SMALL!!*" This, he thinks, will be the case, if we "*call to mind the immense amount of machinery in operation to excite the minds of men, women and children,*" by preaching, praying, protracted and night meetings, "*sunday schools,*" &c., thus attributing insanity directly to these and other religious means, or machinery, and not to any real or alleged *abuses*. We have seen already that every distinguishing peculiarity of Christianity or revealed religion, is, by the author termed and regarded an *abuse*.

Before we pursue these extracts farther, it may be proper briefly to review the astounding sentiments which the author here avows, as well as the statements of fact he has introduced. Everybody knows that there is a *bodily* disorder, from which

religious men are not exempt, which tends to great mental distress, and ultimate insanity. Now it is no more a fair objection, that religion should not secure any one against this affliction, than it would be to allege that it does not *prevent the gout*, or *cure the consumption*. It would be a sad thing, indeed, if the Almighty made it a rule never to convert any person who had a constitutional or hereditary tendency to derangement, or any disorder of the brain. And if such persons embrace religion, it may be expected that their minds, in a season of distraction, will run upon the same subjects which previously occupied their attention; and that they will view them in a distorted manner, just as others in a similar state, view the subjects with which they had been conversant. Cowper, the poet, whose case is often referred to by infidels, who attribute his affliction to *religion*, in the precise spirit of our author, was deranged *long before* he knew any thing of evangelical religion. He owed many years of unspeakable comfort to the consolations of the gospel. And when he suffered a relapse of his physical malady, his distress was occasioned *not by religion*, but by a false idea, which is in direct opposition to the gospel, and one which he adopted only because of the paroxysm of insanity from which he suffered this relapse in his latter years.

Now if we had before us the "*ninety cases of suicide, from religious melancholy*," which the

author seems to present with exultation, and the particulars of which he boasts of having obtained from within six of the northern states, during the last twenty years, we should probably be able to interpret many of them by this key, and so far as any of them, were justly chargeable upon mental or physical excitement of any kind, it would be found, that no evidence could be adduced, at all calculated to prove that religion, or even what the author calls the "abuses" of religion, had the least agency in their causation. The world has been too long imposed upon by false philosophy, and by a false nomenclature, which, on this very subject has inculcated a belief in perverted and distorted facts, which it is full time were exploded. The author, if he had not himself become a victim of these popular delusions, would have availed himself of the opportunity, which his subject furnished him, of enlightening his readers in relation to the impostures alluded to. He does, indeed, explode the notion which implies that the mind, the soul, the immaterial part of man, is the seat of insanity, an opinion which has been imposed upon the public by physicians who have written learnedly upon "diseases of the *mind*." By a similar misnomer, many medical authors, and Dr. Brigham among others, introduce the term, "*religious* melancholy, or mania," and the latter defines this term in his book, in accordance with this false nomenclature,

It is a remnant of the dark ages which barbarism invented, which nominal Christians have perpetuated, and which Dr. B. would render eternal. Indeed, the ancient term was far less exceptionable, than, as it has since been modernized. The disease was called by Hippocrates and Celsus, "*mania religiosorum*," literally, "the insanity of religious people," by which they and the ancients meant no more than to designate the form in which the disease of insanity was developed, in those persons who had previously been devotional and pious. They had not then learned the refinements of phrenology, nor "the science of bumps," else they, too, might have discovered upon the top of the head, a protuberance greatly developed, 'yclept, the "organ of veneration,"* or, "the re-

* This "organ of veneration," as Dr. Spurzheim denominates it, was called by Dr. Gall the "organ of *theosophy*;" and is the same which Dr. Brigham calls "the religious sentiment." To prove that the latter has not misrepresented his great masters in the "science," the reader is referred to the work of Dr. Gall, where he will find, that "a prominence on the median line, occupying the summit of the head, is the *organic and innate source of ALL BELIEF*!" And Dr. Spurzheim teaches, that another organ, in the neighborhood of the former, which he denominates "*marvellousness*," contributes to "strengthen our *faith* and fortify our *belief*." And all these great men concur in maintaining, that "it would be as unjust to accuse those endowed with these organs, with imposture, as it would be to censure *poets*, who are impelled by the organ of "*ideality*," for embodying and personifying their ideas." For "we have the idea of a Supreme Being, *because we have an organ fitted for such a purpose, and without an organ of*

ligious sentiment," and, in such case, they would have changed the name of the disease to "*mania religiosa*," instead of "*religiosorum*," and thus, by using the adjective instead of the plural noun, they would have taught the medical heresy of the author, and conformed to modern public sentiment, for the existence of which this misnomer is responsible. Thus, in physics as in morals, error has been perpetuated by fallacious names and technicalities.

By the term "religious melancholy," as now employed by the intelligent and candid among the profession, we design only to designate a case of insanity more or less severe, in which the patient is either a *monomaniac*, and irrational on *no other subject* except that of religion; or, that the mind is prone to run upon this subject, to the partial or entire exclusion of every other. Such cases are found in almost every asylum for the insane, and are very rarely incurable. Indeed, there is good reason to believe that no such case is hopeless, unless it be hereditary, and even such constitutional insanity, as only assumes the mild form of "religious melancholy," is usually periodical in the return of its paroxysms, and has lucid intervals of longer or shorter duration, sometimes

theosophy we could have had no communication with the Supreme Being, nor should we have had any conception of his power and attributes."

consisting of a number of years, without a single symptom of its return.

Let it not be supposed, however, that, in these examples of "religious mania," either "religion" or "religious excitement" is universally, or even ordinarily, the ostensible cause of the malady, as its name would seem to indicate. So far from this being the fact, it is known to every practitioner whose education or experience qualify him to judge in the case, that these cases, denominated religious mania, exist in irreligious, and even profanely wicked men, and are very often produced by *bestly intemperance*. We have known many examples in which habits of drunkenness have resulted in this form of insanity, and the patients would pray and sing psalms, exhort all those who visited them with great solemnity, and employ their solitude in preaching to the congregations of sinners, with whom their imaginations would fill the cells, to which necessity and humanity had confined them. We have witnessed such instances in individuals who had never paid any attention to religious meetings, or subjects of that nature, and yet, though known to be suffering from the direct fruits of intoxication, such persons were said to be religious maniacs; and when suicide resulted, this act was ascribed to religion as its cause, for no other reason than this was the subject of their ravings.

The same may be said of other causes, whether

physical or mental, resulting in this disease ; and nothing but blind infatuation could have led the author to the attempt he has made to identify all cases of religious mania, as being the result of "religious excitement." The fact is often directly the reverse ; for in those instances in which persons have become insane while in a high state of religious excitement, and their hereditary predisposition has been developed by this cause, it is often the case, that, instead of devotional exercises, they employ themselves in all manner of profane and obscene discourse, making no allusion whatever to serious things ; and yet these too, *may be*, and often are reported as cases of religious mania, by friends who conceal their constitutional predisposition, and ascribe the paroxysm to the subject which occupied their minds, immediately previous to the attack.

There would be just as much truth and philosophy in the application of the term *lunatics*, to those suffering from insanity in general, as to employ the phrase religious mania in relation to a single class among the insane. And the author would not have been more unprofitably or dishonorably employed, had he gotten up another moon-story and given us a learned dissertation upon "the influence of the *moon* upon the health and physical welfare of mankind." This may appropriately enough, be the title of another in the series of volumes he has commenced. All the

moon-struck individuals in the community will furnish him with examples and illustrations in proof of lunacy; and the case books of the insane institutions are filled with instances, all of which he may charge upon the "influence of the moon," with a much greater show of authorities, philosophy, plausibility, and truth; for the terms "*lunatic*" and "*religious maniac*" are both entitled to equal authority, as indicating the nature and cause of the malady, in the individuals to whom these names are applied. In the one case, the disease may be as justly ascribed to the "influence of the moon," as in the other, to the "influence of religion;" because both terms belong to the vocabulary of ignorance and superstition, which the improvement of mankind, and the lights of science, have rendered obsolete.

These remarks will serve to show, the utter futility of any judgment formed of the causes of insanity, either by the name assigned to it, or the circumstances of the patient at the time of its commencement, or by the peculiar topics on which the mind appears to run in its incoherent ravings, after the disease has appeared. The truth is, there can be very little dependence placed on the reports of insane hospitals, with however much of care and integrity they are prepared, by the officers of such institutions, especially in relation to the *causes* of the disease. The friends of the patient usually attribute the disease to the proximate

cause most apparent at the time of their first discovering unequivocal marks of derangement; and they will often ascribe the attack to a number of causes, not only different, but even opposite in their nature; and these are often wholly imaginary as events prove. At other times, they will conceal the real cause, for the reason that it is disreputable, as when the result of some odious vice. And it is incredible to what a multitude of expedients a whole family will resort, for the purpose of preventing the suspicion of there being any hereditary tendency to the disease; sometimes because of the injury it will inflict upon other members of the family; and often, because of the fear that the case will then be considered hopeless. It is obvious, from these considerations, that the "ninety examples of suicide from religious melancholy," which the author so vauntingly records in confirmation of his views, must be regarded as very equivocal evidence at best, because of the ambiguity and dubiousness which pertain to all investigations into the etiology of every form of insanity.

While alluding to this subject of insanity, we again recal to the mind of the reader the dogma of the author, that insanity is the result of the increased "action of the brain;" and we do so because his theory and his book are both built upon this "vanity of vanities." Indeed, his former work on "the influence of mental excitement upon

health," has the same "sandy foundation," though it has been lauded to the skies, by men who on other subjects exhibit some share of intellect and judgment. We pause, then, to enquire what conceivable "action" the brain is supposed to perform? Does the brain *think*, and is it the increased thinking produced by religious excitement, which tends to insanity and develops alterations in its structure? Surely the author forgets that he calls the brain the "*organ on which the mind acts*;" and uninitiated readers have always supposed that it is the *mind* which thinks, and that thinking is one of the *actions of the mind*, which is conveyed through its organ, the brain, by means of the nerves, to the limbs and other portions of the body. He will scarcely allege, after this concession, that the brain thinks; for this would be unsophisticated materialism, which he and his brother phrenologists indignantly disclaim. We ask then, in the name of any species of reason or sense, what kind of *action* is that of the brain? Does the *brain* see, hear, taste, smell, or feel? or is it only the organ by which the mind performs the act of seeing, hearing, tasting, smelling, and feeling, through the organs or sub-organs adapted to these several functions? According to the doctrine here inculcated, the sights and sounds accompanying a "protracted meeting," or a "revival of religion," produce increased action of some kind on the part of the brain, and this ex-

cessive action results from mental excitement of any kind, and especially on the subject of religion. And yet, he does not enlighten us in relation to the nature of this imaginary action, which, if his own brain had been acting, he would have felt to be his imperious duty, in discussing so grave and important a subject as the nature and causation of insanity.

The truth appears to be this, that in all the examples of insanity there are *physical* causes which dissection demonstrates amply sufficient to account for the malady; and these causes, as we are here taught, are uniformly found in the brain. And as we have shown that to suppose *any* action of the brain, is to admit a physical impossibility and a metaphysical absurdity, it is scarcely needful to add, that this theory assigns "more causes than are necessary for the effect," which, according to any species of logic, is irrational; and that phrenology has led the author to do so, is a striking evidence of the tendency of the system, and demonstrates its fallacy.

That great mental excitement is particularly dangerous to females, and especially to mothers, during the season of their solicitude and lactation, has been long known; and, though the author devotes a section to this subject and that of the consequences upon their infant offspring, yet he says nothing new in relation to it, nor does he furnish any evidence that religion is accessory to such

mischiefs in any of the examples he relates. It is true, he charges the "great jugglers of church and state," among whom he includes the ministers of religion, with availing themselves of the "highly excitable" susceptibilities of the female constitution; and, in the language of another, he alleges that "women are the *chosen vessels* for enthusiasm, and the most apparent subjects of delusion." Yet all this is mere rant and rhodomontade, while unaccompanied by any well attested facts, in confirmation of his accusations.

It would have better become a philosopher such as our author, to have set himself soberly to investigate the examples of "religious mania" upon which he dwells, in the light of facts, some of which he records, and others which the pathological authorities he quotes, concur in testifying. The public have need of instruction on this subject, and he might have performed an invaluable service to the cause of truth, had he disabused his fellow men of the impostures they have suffered, because ignorant of these facts. Instead, however, of employing his pen in explaining and illustrating the intricacies of the subject, he has thrown his whole energies into the scale of popular delusion; and his book will serve to create and aggravate unfounded and superstitious fears, which both science and humanity should have prompted him to allay.

The facts which he has himself collected and

recorded, are of themselves amply sufficient to refute his whole theory. For example, after enumerating, "thickening of the skull," "organic alterations," and "changes of structure," as always found "in the heads of insane people," he adds, that "the brain, the material organ of the mind, *must* become diseased, before the manifestations of the mind can be pronounced deranged!" What has become of his phrenological "increased action of the brain?" Does he mean to insinuate that this action "thickens the skull?" If phrenology be true, in whole or in part, then this action would *thin* the skull; for the action of any one of the organs when cultivated, is developed by wearing away the skull or its inner table, since there must be a correspondent cavity beneath each of the "bumps" or developments, else the exterior convexity can be no index of the size of the "organ." But waiving this tangible and irrefragable difficulty, we enquire again, does the "action of the brain," produced by "religious excitement," create the "changes of structure," and "organic alterations," which are "always found in the heads of insane people?" Or are these diseased "changes of structure" necessary, before "religious" or any other "mental excitement," can produce insanity? These are questions one would think worthy of solution by this astute philosopher. He would find, however, that they would place him and his theory in an awk-

ward dilemma, since they change the order of priority in *cause and effect*. If he attribute those changes directly to the "action of the brain," he conflicts with his own doctrine; for, on page 296, he maintains that this "action" only "predisposes" to insanity, and the disease may be afterwards or finally developed by "ill health" or other causes; and if he choose the other horn, and admit that these organic affections exist prior to the religious excitement and consequent action of the brain, then he must admit, not only that the individuals who become victims to the disease are physically predisposed to it, but that these organic and structural diseases are insufficient to develop insanity, without religious or mental excitement, which is at utter variance with his own book, and all his authorities.

If we were at liberty to pursue this subject, and the limits we have prescribed to ourselves in this review did not forbid any considerable amplification, we might readily demonstrate what at present we can only glance at, both in relation to the inconsistencies and palpable contradictions of our author, and also in reference to the facts and admissions contained in his own book, from which the true theory of insanity may be deduced. It may be in place, briefly to remark, that as the brain is the material organ of the mind, and is invariably diseased in its structure, and must be so before any form of insanity can exist, it is plain

that the essence of the disease consists in some organic affection of the brain, even when, as in many cases, we may be unable to discover the nature of the structural alteration by dissection itself. Whenever insanity appears then, in any instance, whatever may seem to have produced it, whether physical or mental in its character, there is in the brain of the individual the seat or proximate cause of the disease. From these premises, distinctly admitted by the author, it follows that, before we can legitimately infer that "religion" or "religious excitement" has occasioned insanity, much less affirm that it is "one of the most fruitful sources of this disease," we must prove, or at least render it probable, that such excitement will produce "organic alterations," or "changes of structure," or "thickening of the skull;" for these are "always found in the heads of insane people." We need not say, that the author has utterly failed to furnish a single example, even with the aid of his visionary fable of the "action of the brain," in which there is the least semblance of evidence that religious excitement created these physical derangements in the structure of the brain. So far from having made this appear, he seems so conscious of the absence of all proof that religious excitement has ever occasioned insanity, though he has ~~over and over~~ again asserted it, that he says "it produces a *tendency* to insanity, which other causes may finally de-

velope." And hence, he argues that even when religious excitement does not produce insanity, yet it creates a "predisposition" to it; and the individuals, although they afterwards become insane, obviously from *other causes*, yet this result would not have taken place, had it not been for the "previous excitement." And even if they *never give any symptom of insanity*, yet still, he contends, that a "still greater evil is to be feared in the effect which the excitement will have upon a *succeeding generation*, the offspring of excited and nervous parents." The ingenuity of this alarmist, in his zeal to make out his case against religion, by first contending that it makes people insane, and next that at least it prepares them to become so from other causes, and then alleging that *at any rate*, if they will not become victims of insanity, their children or grandchildren will; is conclusive evidence that he designs to make up in prophecy what he lacks in argument and facts.

On this subject there is not only extensive popular delusion, but the profession is in no small degree accountable for it; nor indeed are physicians themselves altogether free from confused and unphilosophical opinions. For example, we hear and read perpetual eulogies on what is called the *moral* treatment of insane persons, in contradistinction from the physical, which implies that insanity is a mental disease, and not a physical one, hence the appropriateness of moral means. Ex-

perience and observation, however, are continually adding a multitude of facts, which abundantly prove that no moral means are useful, unless they produce a *physical effect*. Hence, solitude is often the most successful moral remedy, because it abstracts the association of ideas which company, of any kind, occasions. The activity of the mind is often greater, in proportion as the organ on which it acts is enfeebled and impaired by the malady. Hence, when solitude alone fails to calm the perturbed and incoherent ravings of a maniac, other moral means are used, such as *darkness* and *silence*, by which light and sound, those potent stimuli of thought, are withdrawn. The morbid sensitiveness of the visual and auditory organs, consequent upon the diseased condition of the brain, frequently render it necessary to superadd profound silence and darkness to solitude, in order to tranquilize the system, and this effect is produced by the physical operation of these moral means. Occasionally, however, it becomes requisite to confine the limbs, when motion alone proves a stimulant to the action of the mind; and, in addition to all these means, starvation, another physical measure, must occasionally be resorted to, since it is found that the act of taking food excites both mind and body, apart from the processes of digestion and assimilation, which are often incompatible with convalescence in such cases. All such means as we have named, are curative in

their tendency, by their withdrawing all the stimuli of mental action; and that this is the rational and philosophical indication is apparent, when we consider that the brain is the seat of the disease, and this "organ on which the mind acts" being feeble and sick, it is necessary to suspend the use or employment of this organ as far as possible. And as any use of a defective or broken instrument of music, is calculated to increase the mischief, and prevent the possibility of its being repaired, so it is desirable in all cases of *recent* insanity, that the mind be kept in a state of quiescence, since it cannot act without using a suffering or injured organ; and all action upon an instrument in this condition, must not only be irregular and incoherent, but it must necessarily increase the difficulty of cure. It is for want of giving the brain the *rest* which is required, that recent cases of insanity are so often rendered permanent and hopeless, a result which is often the consequence of company, or employment, or recreation.

While the mind is acting on a diseased brain, how can this organ be expected to yield to any curative treatment, whether physical or moral. Would a diseased or inflamed eye ever recover, if it were constantly employed for the purposes of vision? Or could a serious injury of the knee joint be successfully treated, while the limb was constantly disturbed by forced attempts at walk-

ing? It would be as rational and philosophical to treat an inflamed eye, or a diseased joint thus, as it is to hope for the recovery of insane persons, by requiring or allowing them either to read, to sew, to work, to walk, to ride, or to engage in any avocation, employment or amusement, which imposes action upon the mind, when the organ on which it is obliged to act, is impaired in its integrity, or disturbed in its functions by disease. Especially is company of any kind, much more that of the insane, indiscreet and pernicious. So far from this prevalent and popular, though erroneous management of insane persons, being judicious, it ought to be our object to give the enfeebled brain entire rest, so far as we can effect this by withholding every cause calculated to excite mental effort. Hence, solitude, silence, darkness, abstinence from food, and the prevention of all motion of the body or limbs, are found by experiment to be the most successful method of management, for every form of *recent* insanity. After convalescence commences, then, and not till then, can exercise, or recreation of any kind, be salutary. In all old cases, which have acquired a character of hopelessness, the indication then is, to make the patient's situation as comfortable as possible, by imposing few privations, and none but such as are indispensable for safety.

These brief hints, touching the treatment of insanity, will serve to show, that "the action of the

brain," of which the author speaks, has no share in the causation of the disease, and finds no support from the philosophy concerned in its medical management; and they are designed, at the same time, to corroborate the testimony already before the reader, that religion is not among the causes of insanity.

If we have succeeded in vindicating religion from the allegation of being "among the most fruitful sources of insanity," it is a duty which truth demands, to record our conviction that it is both preventive and curative in its effects, for this is its legitimate province and tendency, as abundant facts most conclusively prove. Not that it will universally prevent an attack, nor that it is adapted as a remedy to all cases and stages of the disease, for the reader cannot so understand us after we have so explicitly stated essentially different opinions. But we maintain that the calamities incident to mortality, and which afflict great multitudes of our race beyond endurance, and by which men are often driven to insanity, and even impelled to suicide, are very frequently borne with supernatural patience, and sustained with superhuman fortitude, by those who are obviously indebted for the impunity with which they pass through the "furnace of affliction," to the supports and hopes which *religion* inspires. But for this, both body and mind would sink beneath the intolerable load of misfortune, suffering and be-

reavement, which such are oftencalled in the Providence of God to endure. In such examples, which are witnessed in almost every community, the preventive power of religion is exemplified, and for want of this influence others become victims of insanity from causes inconceivably less afflictive. Besides, how many there are, who, when suffering a wounded spirit from worldly influences, such as disappointed affection, sudden bereavements of wealth or friends, mortified pride or defeated ambition, have stood upon the precipice of insanity, and desiring death in the error of their ways—multitudes have gone so far, that they have chosen the fatal weapon, held the poison to their lips, trembled over the river's brink, or prepared the halter, and in the very act of self-murder, when almost consummated, the impulses of religion have awakened the latent energies of the desponding heart, and darted a ray of light and hope athwart the soul, even when driven to desperation, and thus restored the son of wretchedness to reason and to life. In all such instances, and they are far more numerous than are the victims of insanity, from every cause, religion has *prevented* insanity. But there are many evidences, even among the insane, that religious consolation has proved the only restorative sufficiently potent to win the despairing back to hope, to make the wounded spirit whole. And, accordingly, we find that when the furious maniac is

tranquilized by appropriate means, and moral influence is indicated, in almost all the asylums and retreats, such patients are uniformly benefited by religious services. Reading the scriptures, prayer and even preaching the gospel to the convalescent from insanity, has universally proved a salutary cordial, and is every where becoming included among the arrangements of such institutions. And in this single fact, we have a strong collateral argument, in opposition to the doctrines of Dr. Brigham's book ; for surely *religion* cannot be the *cause* of insanity, and yet, as we have seen, prove itself useful and potent, both for *prevention* and *cure*.

Nevertheless, it may be conceded in perfect consistency, that "erroneous opinions in religion" and "false views of doctrine and duty," may be cultivated until they become the habit of the mind, and when these errors are of an inordinately exciting or depressing character, they may overspread the soul with imaginary raptures, or overwhelm it in gloom and despondency ; and thus, a disease of the brain, may be superinduced, which may develope insanity in constitutions hereditarily or otherwise predisposed to this malady. But in the name of reason and common sense, do such examples "change the truth of God into a lie," and involve religion in the charge of being the source of the disease. Falsehood, fanaticism, hypocrisy, and sin, may all impel men to insanity and suicide, and have often doubtless done so.

Thousands have fallen victims to insanity for want of religion, and from causes which this would have rendered harmless. But it is a gross and flagrant impeachment of the wisdom and benevolence of the Creator, to harbor the thought, much more to hazard the assertion, that a Religion which He has instituted by the display of all the attributes of Deity, and the exhibition of the infinity of His perfections, and the proclamation of His eternal love, should be the source of the most appalling and unutterable calamity on this side of perdition. And yet such is the "bad eminence" to which Dr. Brigham has aspired, and such is the legitimate doctrine of which he has become the exclusive proprietor. If such be the *fruits of phrenology* upon his mind, we may sentimentally and most heartily adopt the exclamation of the prophet, in relation to the whole sect: "My soul! come not thou into their secret, to their assembly mine honor be not thou united!"

We come now to the section containing recommendations and cautions to clergymen. The author begins by conceding the "sincere desire to do good, to the clergy, very generally;" but he deplores their "want of knowledge," especially of human physiology, by reason of which lack, "with the best intentions, they have often done great harm." He seems to regard the great body of the clergy of the country as "weak brethren," well meaning, but ignorant men; and the most

deplorable deficiency he laments is, that they "do not know" that when they strongly excite the feelings of their hearers, they produce a terrible "action of the brain," which is "transmitted to succeeding generations!" And here again, he repeats his stupid corollary, that "the *brain acts* as really when impressions are transmitted to it, as the stomach does when aliments are received into it." We have already shown the consummate folly of this brainless imp of phrenology.

The arguments by which he commends the study of physiology to the clergy are, that they may learn how to "*improve the physical organization* of the heathen, the Indians, and the dark-colored races of men!" He encourages them patiently to persevere in this work; for though little can be done in one generation, or one century, yet by continuing for "*successive generations*" to improve and strengthen their intellectual and moral faculties, they will "cause an improvement in their physical organization," by the *developement of the necessary bumps*, and these will be transmitted to posterity!

After much sage counsel of similar import, in condescension to the clergy, he "advises, recommends, and refers" them to a number of books on Anatomy, Physiology, Animal Magnetism, Insanity, and the sublime and celestial science of Phrenology, as well as a number of medical periodicals, all of which, taken together, he seems to think will make them "wise unto salvation."

It is, indeed, superlatively ludicrous to witness the amazing pomp, circumstance, and self complacency, with which this venerable young doctor seats himself in the tripod, assumes the mitre, and announces his episcopal, nay, his papal, ghostly counsels, as though *ex cathedra*, with oracular authority. "*I advise the clergy;*" "*I recommend to this useful class of men;*" "*I have long thought;*" and then, in the exuberance of his wisdom and benevolence, instructing the clergy of this country, as to the subjects and books they should study, and reprimanding them for the deficiency of their libraries, and their ignorance of the subjects they ought to know. If the learned presidents and professors of theological seminaries do not exclaim "a second Daniel's come to judgment," now that "Sir Oracle opes his mouth," the world will attribute it to the want of improvement in their "physical organization," by which they are disqualified for the reception of the pure, and spiritual, and phrenological religion of the illustrious Dr. Brigham.

We come now to the concluding chapter of this treasure of theological lore, the profundity of which we are endeavoring patiently to fathom. Having already noticed in another place, the author's opinions in relation to the Sabbath, we pass to the section on the importance of cultivating devotional feelings. And here we are enlightened

by the information that the "religious sentiment," so "naturally disposes man in all ages and climes to devotion, that he universally *seeks it*, and is benefited by it, when the forms of religious worship are not such as his *reason repels!*" Hence, as the forms in which Christianity is taught, are made by "the priesthood to linger behind the intelligence of the times," it is for this reason that people forsake religious worship. Of course, it follows that it is only necessary to improve the forms in which religion is inculcated, so that they may not be repulsive to reason, and all men will be naturally disposed to be religious.

The author concedes the importance of reverence for *superior and invisible beings*, because the want of it leads to a disregard of civil rulers and all other authority ; and hence, admits that "a decay of the national religion is always accompanied by that of the nation." It is for this reason, that he benevolently and zealously desires that in this country, "the political feelings should never be stronger than the religious," which, he says, is sometimes the case; a remarkable thing truly, when he maintains that the "religious" is the "most powerful sentiment of our nature," and has "more influence on mankind than all their passions combined." Still, however, he tells us that the "spirit of sect yields to the spirit of party" when it runs high, and this he deplors as a national calamity. He thinks "great pains should

be taken to cultivate sentiments of veneration for *sacred things*, for *truth*, *honesty*, and *perfect uprightness*." These are the "sacred three" which he seems to invest with the attributes of Deity ; for he says, " Men should be taught to venerate the *virtues* inculcated by our Savior—to *worship*, if I may so express myself, *truth*, *love*, *charity*, *self denial*, &c., virtues of which he was the *living personification* !" And it will serve to illustrate the author's meaning, to remind the reader that though he commends *worshipping* these *virtues*, yet he wholly objects to the *worship of Christ* ; and argues against the Lord's Supper, on page 130, because that ordinance " seems to be a kind of worship of Christ himself ;" this he says, " the Savior never enjoined." " Christ did not desire that men should assemble in vast numbers, and prostrate themselves before him and chant his praise." Especially does the author protest against " holy day keeping, sermon reading or hearing, church ceremonies and long prayers, modern sermonizing and church going." These are the forms of religion which are repulsive to reason, and behind the intelligence of the times ; and yet the title of this section is, " the importance of cultivating devotional feelings." What kind of devotional feelings he would cultivate, the reader will be puzzled to know, since he rejects all present forms, and prescribes no others.

He next animadverts upon the clergy of the day,

who, *en masse*, he represents as "agitated by the puerile and exciting topics of the day." This he accounts for, by their temperament and disposition phrenologically. He says: "Preachers, like other men, *in consequence of their organization, model, without knowing it*, the character of their Heavenly Father after their own!" The reader will be struck with the fact, that the clergy are here represented to conceive of their Maker as a Being resembling themselves in their temperament and disposition. But this enormity, it is stated, is the "consequence of their organization," and they cannot help it. Indeed, so far from their being implicated in criminality by thus misrepresenting their Heavenly Father, these well-meaning, good-intentioned "class of men," commit this sin "without knowing it." Indeed, but for the lights of science, which the "philosophy of bumps" reflects upon the author's mind, "in consequence of his organization," even he "would not know it."

"And still he gazed—and still the wonder grew
How one small head could carry all he knew!"

In relation to the "denouncing preachers," who are here denounced, the reader will agree with us, that whoever employs "coarse and vulgar terms," "denunciatory and dogmatical language in their preaching," and "mistakes the love of sectariapism for that of Christianity," even though,

as the author alleges, they belong to a "great class," such ministers are incapable of vindication. That the author has drawn largely upon his morbid imagination for his facts, however, is very apparent; and this is a fault which is doubtless "a consequence of his organization," and he commits it perpetually, like the preachers of whom he speaks, "without knowing it."

But having initiated the clergy into the proper books for their libraries, and given them his sage counsels, "cautions," and admonitions, he now proposes to correct the mistakes of their preaching, by arguing that "*Christianity* is yielding to the spirit of the age, and has become *philosophical*." He shrewdly reminds them, that "heretofore it has been dogmatical, imperious, and *immutable*," but now, simultaneously with the appearance of his book, we suppose, *Christianity like all other subjects, must* submit itself to discussion, analysis, and examination; and what was before immutable, "*must, like all other subjects,*" become mutable, and change with the spirit of the age. Hence, he talks not only of "philosophical Christianity," but the "democratic spirit of the gospel," which, though a *spirit*, is not a supernatural one; for he stoutly maintains that "God has no supernatural dealings with men."

Such preachers as he describes to be under the influence of this "democratic spirit," make the people "*fond* of attending church on the Sabbath, and the love and habit of attending is acquired;

and this is beneficial to health, because a *natural want*, the *love of devotion*, is thus gratified." Here the author represents the love of church-going to be a "natural want;" and yet he objects to their "sermon hearing or chanting praises," or worshipping any Deity but truth, charity, and self denial, when they get there. Indeed, as he repudiates all rites, all ceremonies, all forms, all psalm singing, and all sermon reading or hearing, and indeed all preaching, except in the "democratic spirit," we can hardly conceive what kind of employment would occupy the time, or serve to gratify this "natural want, the love of devotion," on the part of those who should become "fond of attending church." It would never do to *pray* to Christ, for this would be to worship *Him*, instead of worshipping the *virtues* of which he was only the personification. It would beside "excite the mind and agitate the body," it would introduce "forms and ceremonies," which are all unauthorized and injurious to the health. And as for expecting any other benefit from devotion, than gratifying the natural want inspired by the religious sentiment, this would be to admit what the author regards as a most mischievous heresy, that "God has any supernatural dealings with men."

And yet, the author professes to deprecate the entire neglect of devotion, as almost as injurious to health as religion itself, even as it is understood and practised by the present generation; and, therefore it is, that he endeavors to enlighten the

reader into the moderate and temperate use of religious worship and devotional feelings, believing that these things are "beneficial if not carried to an unreasonable extent." Whether any one can learn from his book, what kind of religion or devotional feelings he may cultivate, and to what extent, without their becoming unhealthy, is a question we leave to others for solution. For ourselves, we are free to confess our fears that so far as the author obtains the public confidence, we believe the necessary and unavoidable tendency of his book will be to create a contempt for religion and its ordinances, and strengthen the hands of infidelity and sin. For, if the sentiments inculcated in this volume were to become general or universal, the very name of religion would become synonymous with infamy and reproach, and the Bible, and the God of the Bible be everywhere renounced.

The author concludes his volume, by a "brief summary of some of the opinions he has endeavored to establish;" and, in stating these, we shall accompany each of these six opinions with a brief notice, which will be in effect a summary of the contents of the present review. The following is the summary of Dr. Brigham's opinions:

"First. The religious sentiment is innate in man; but as it often acts blindly, and to the injury of man, it needs the guidance of reason and knowledge.

"Secondly. Christ established no ceremonies at all; he exacted virtuous conduct, not the observance of

"rites. The reformation of Luther abolished some of
 "the ceremonies that had been improperly ingrafted
 "upon Christianity, but not all. That they have ever
 "been fruitful sources of discord, and ought to be re-
 "linquished.

"Thirdly. Mankind are not at present under any
 "kind of miraculous dispensation ; that God has no *su-*
pernatural dealings with men, that we can observe ;
 "and does not now impart the *special influence* of his
 "Spirit to a few individuals and at particular times, as
 "is claimed by modern revivalists. That this doctrine
 "of revivalists, lies at the foundation of religious fana-
 "ticism—is not essential to Christian faith or conduct,
 "and if enforced by preachers and believed by the
 "people, some form of this fanaticism will always dis-
 "turb the church and the world.

"Fourthly. That numerous meetings for religious
 "purposes, night meetings, camp meetings, protracted
 "meetings, &c., injure the health—cause insanity, and
 "other diseases, and ought to be abandoned as unscrip-
 "tural, and very unreasonable in this age, when infor-
 "mation on all subjects can be obtained by reading.
 "That they produce and perpetuate great excitement
 "that is particularly dangerous to females, to mothers,
 "and the rising generation.

"Fifthly. The Sabbath is a *day of rest* for man and
 "beast, and ought to be so regarded in practice.

"Sixthly. That religious worship and the cultivation
 "of devotional feelings are beneficial to man, when not
 "carried to an unreasonable extent."*

* As a celebrated philosopher observed, "La devotion, est un opium pour l'ame, elle egare, anime, soutient quand on en prend peu : une trop forte dose endort, ou rend furieux, ou tue."

In reply to his first proposition, we think we have shown, that whatever may be affirmed of the phrenological "religious sentiment," *religion* is not "*innate in man*," and that so far from being so, it is an effect of Divine influence, superinduced in man by the agency of the Holy Ghost. This, therefore, *never* "acts blindly and to the injury of man;" and so far from "needing the guidance of reason and knowledge," as the author contends, true religion is itself the guide of both reason and knowledge.

To his second opinion, we reply, that "baptism and the Lord's Supper," though *ceremonies*, as the Scriptures prove, "established by Christ," and "*rites*, the observance of which he enjoined," are not the only "ceremonies and rites" which have the same authority. Public and private prayer, watching, fasting, reading the Scriptures, attendance upon the public and private ordinances of religion, alms-giving, preaching, "sermon hearing," and even "protracted meetings,"* are all rites and ceremonies, the observance of which were enjoined by Christ and his Apostles, both by precept and example. It is not true, therefore, that Luther abolished any of the ceremonies of Christianity which are properly such; but he restored those exclusively which Christ had estab-

* Witness the sermon on the mount, and the preaching of Paul from morning till evening, &c.

lished. These have never been "fruitful sources of discord," and though their relinquishment is insisted on by the author, it is only because of the delusion and infatuation under which he has had the temerity to hazard the assertion, in the face of the Bible, that "Christ established no ceremonies at all!"

In relation to his third position, we maintain that the Christian dispensation, like the Mosaic, is strictly and essentially *miraculous* in its origin, nature, evidences, privileges, and effects. Was not the incarnation of the Son of God, with all the phenomena which accompanied, preceded, and followed that stupendous event, truly "miraculous?" And is there nothing "miraculous" in the events recorded by the Evangelists and Apostles, as well as in the gift and preservation of the volume of inspiration? And are not the promises of the gospel, as fulfilled and fulfilling in these latter days, demonstrably "miraculous?" How, then, does the author presume to say that "mankind are not at present under any miraculous dispensation?" He can only do so, either by *denying* that they are at present under the Christian dispensation, or by maintaining that this is not "miraculous;" and he is welcome to either horn of the dilemma.

But he goes still farther, and asserts that "God has *no supernatural* dealings with men, that *we can observe!*" thus denying at one fell swoop the important and scriptural doctrine of Divine Provi-

dence, as well as that of grace. Are not the "dealings" of the Providence of God, as observed in the history of nations and individuals, evidently "*supernatural*?" If they are not, then is the world governed by chance, and if there be a God at all, or if the world had a Creator, as the Father of all, he must have cast off the universe he has made into an eternal orphanage, and the millions of our race are without a Father, even in heaven. Thus it is apparent, that if the author was professedly a Christian when he expressed this sentiment, his transition to the dark and cheerless gulf of atheism, is not merely natural and easy, but absolutely inevitable.

Again, he proceeds to affirm, in the same style of dogmatism, that "God does not *now*, impart the special influence of his Spirit to a few individuals, and at particular times, as is claimed by modern revivalists." By the introduction of the word *now*, he avoids the denial of the scriptural narrative as to the events there related, and seemingly admits that *formerly* the Spirit was given, as claimed. But he overlooks the fact, that he does as effectually contradict the Bible, by denying the fulfilment of its prophecies and promises, in these latter days. Either the Spirit of God influences the hearts of men now, or it does not. If it does not, the Bible is a "cunningly devised fable," and if it does, then if it influences any individuals, it must be "*special*," nay, it must be imparted to some "particular individuals, and at

particular times" if ever, unless indeed, he contends that the impartation of the Spirit is universally the same upon all men, in its nature, extent, and fruits. This he would scarcely venture to affirm; and if he did, a single glance at the condition of the world, as shown in his own book, would convict him of egregious folly. We need hardly remind the reader of the positive assurances given by Christ to his disciples, of "the gift of the Holy Spirit," and that He would "send the Comforter," who would abide with His church forever. Nor is it necessary to dwell upon the explicit language of the Savior, in explaining to Nicodemus this "special influence" in regeneration. "The wind bloweth where it listeth, thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh nor whither it goeth—so is every one that is born of the Spirit." Here we are distinctly taught that "the special influence of the Spirit" is "imparted to particular persons, and at particular times, as claimed by modern revivalists;" unless the doctrine of the new birth is to be rejected as superannuate, and the author would have us believe that this too is obsolete. But this single text demonstrates that men are at present under a "miraculous dispensation;" that "God has supernatural dealings with men," and that "the special influence claimed is imparted." In maintaining, as the author does, that this latter doctrine "lies at the foundation of religious fanaticism," he charges upon the word of God, the en-

tire book of Revelation, the origination of fanaticism. And in deciding as he does, that it "is not essential to Christian faith or conduct," he proclaims himself wiser than the Bible or the God of the Bible! A lamentable confirmation of the inspired truth, that "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, because they are foolishness to him, neither *can he know them!*"

We now pass to the fourth proposition of this summary; and, in reply, we think it has been shown, that the author utterly fails in his labored effort at proof, and furnishes no shadow of evidence that the numerous meetings for religious purposes, of which he complains, injure the health, and much less has he been able to prove that they "cause insanity and other diseases." That they are either "unscriptural" or "unreasonable in this age," we trust has been satisfactorily disproved. And indeed, every portion of this position has been so fully considered in another place, that we forbear to enlarge.

His fifth opinion, in relation to the Sabbath, is aimed at all religious assemblies, and is designed to oppose all "church going," "sermon hearing or reading," as a disregard of this day of *rest*. But while he thinks it ought to be regarded as such both by man and beast, yet he denies that it was divinely instituted as a *day of rest*, much less for religious observances. Indeed, he has no objection to the violation of this *rest* both by man

and beast, if the riding is for recreation and "visiting friends," instead of "church going." The reader will find this subject sufficiently noticed in its appropriate place.

The sixth and last proposition is the most extraordinary exhibition of inconsistency, and though designed as a saving clause, yet in the connection in which it is found, is superlatively stupid. After objecting to all religious rites and ceremonies of whatsoever kind, as "unscriptural and unreasonable in this age," and indulging in a satirical strain of ridicule in relation to every form of devotion, he here admits, that "religious worship and the cultivation of devotional feelings are beneficial to men, when *not carried to an unreasonable extent.*" What kind of "*religious worship*" could be performed without "*ceremonies of any kind,*" or of what use such worship, and the "cultivation of devotional feelings," could be, when "God has no supernatural dealings with men," the author does not condescend to enlighten us, though he obviously means by their being beneficial, that they would be healthy, in the way of exercise to the body. Hence his caution that this exercise be "*not carried to an unreasonable extent,*" so as to induce fatigue, or "*produce excitement,*" or in the least to "*agitate the body.*" When these effects are produced, then worship and devotional feelings become unreasonable. The note which he appends, from "a celebrated

philosopher," and which he leaves untranslated, may be thus rendered :

— "Devotion is an *opiate* to the soul ; it excites, animates, and sustains, when taken in *small quantities* ; but too strong a dose produces stupor, madness, or death !"

This quotation is introduced in illustration of the sentiment of the author, as expressed in his sixth and last proposition. It is obviously equivalent to the declaration that the influence of religion is purely and exclusively *physical*, analogous to that of opium or any other similar narcotic, precisely as set forth in the argument to which allusion has been made, in relation to the resemblance between the effects of religious excitement upon the *brain*, and those of alcohol upon the *stomach*. And that this is unsophisticated materialism and infidelity, will not admit of denial or doubt. It represents religion, or what he regards as synonymous, the religious sentiment, to be "implanted in man by his Creator," and when taken "in small quantities" to be healthy, since it only "*excites, animates, and sustains* ;" but if used in "too strong a dose," like opium, it is not only unwholesome, but "produces stupor, madness, and death." He forgets, however, to furnish any criterion, by which we may decide what is the proper "dose," or degree of excitement which is salutary and safe, unless by the expression, "when not carried to an unreasonable ex-

tent," which is a most ambiguous and uncertain direction truly, and one utterly unintelligible.

But if we would examine his analogy philosophically, we must remember that the effect of opium when it *excites*, and which effect is represented to be rational and healthy, is not only unnatural and artificial, but is essentially morbid, because produced by a *poisonous* agent, and this is true of any quantity, however small, provided it be sufficient to "excite, animate, and sustain." And when too strong a dose be used, it does indeed "produce stupor, madness, and death," because it is a poison, unnatural, morbid, and fatal in its nature and effects. And yet, religion is here represented to be "opium for the soul," an unnatural poison, which may be used in small quantities, with no other ill effects than "excitement," which, on the subject of religion, is represented to be exceedingly dangerous; for when taken in too strong a dose, it results in "stupor, madness, and death." Surely those who entertain this doctrine for a moment, will perceive that instead of a caution against indulging in this moral opium "to an unreasonable extent," the dictate of wisdom will obviously be to "flee from" religion, "as from the face of a serpent," and "neither touch, taste nor handle the accursed thing."

Soberly, if the author has fully adopted this creed, he ought not to content himself with writing this book, for humanity and philanthropy should

constrain him to a mightier effort for the reformation and salvation of his fellow beings. He should forthwith institute an American and Foreign Anti-religion Society, and by multiplying branches of it all over the world, he should rival the great Temperance enterprize, in zeal and exertions. Let him organize the society under a pledge of "total abstinence" from all religion, as the only moral engine sufficiently potent to preserve the human race from utter extermination. If it were not presumptive to dictate to so great and puissant a reformer, we would recommend a pledge somewhat like the following :

Whereas, "devotion is opium for the soul," and "religion is one of the most fruitful sources of insanity, convulsions, and death;" and whereas, "God has no supernatural dealings with men," and "Christ established no ceremonies at all;" and whereas, "numerous meetings for religious purposes are unscriptural and very unreasonable in this age," because they "produce excitement most dangerous to health and life, especially to females, to mothers and the rising generation;" and whereas, the Sabbath is a day of rest for man and beast; and the ringing of church bells on that day, is injurious to health and life :

We, the undersigned, hereby pledge ourselves that we will wholly abstain from all *religion*, including among the fruits of this moral "opium" all

"church going, psalm singing, sermon hearing or reading, protracted meetings, night meetings, sunrise prayer meetings, camp meetings, baptism, the Lord's Supper, ringing of bells, forms, rites or ceremonies," which are "for religious purposes;" and believing that the dangers of "carrying devotion to an unreasonable extent," and taking "too strong a dose," can never be avoided, until religion and all its means of "excitement are abandoned," we will use our influence to inculcate "*total abstinence*" from it among the community.

Such appears to us to be an outline of the measures which Dr. Brigham is imperiously called upon to adopt, on the presumption that the doctrines he here teaches, are entitled to his own belief and confidence. Surely if a moiety of the spectres he has conjured up, wherewith to portray the dire calamities, with which religion is perennially cursing our race, have any existence other than in his morbidly vivid imagination, he should forthwith proclaim a war of extermination against this giant evil, and labor without weariness, and without rest, for its immediate, instant abolition. Nor need he "compass sea and land to make proselytes;" for he will find them ready made to his hand, wherever the "carnal mind, which is enmity against God" is discoverable, there will his pledge be adopted by acclamation. "Wide is the gate and broad is the way, and many there be which go in thereat." "A great multitude which

no man can number," in every nation, kindred, people, and tongue; in every city, town, village, and settlement in this and every other country, will spontaneously marshal themselves under his banner, and his society will be the most numerous under heaven. In the membership of this Anti-religion Society, he may calculate, in anticipation, on the great army of infidels of every grade, and all the profligate and abandoned, the profane and the ungodly, the blaspheming and the drunken; for all these will be ex-officio entitled to recognition, since they already practise on the principle of total abstinence from all religion, and will not need to sign the pledge, since their pretensions will not be questioned, nor is there any danger of their being suspected of its violation. But, alas! he will find ready access for books and newspapers and agents of this anti-religious crusade, among the sons and daughters of folly and fashion, the worldly and the formalists, the moralists and the hypocrites, and all who are forgetting God, and neglecting their souls; who restrain prayer, and delay repentance; and who seek and need just such arguments as he urges, to quiet conscience, and arm them against the truth. And the rising generation, whose licentious passions cannot brook restraint, multitudes of whom desire deliverance from the bonds, which religious education has imposed, that they may "throw the

reins upon the neck of headlong appetite," will find an asylum in the Anti-religion society which they have heretofore sought in vain,

But we forbear to dwell upon the deplorable moral influence, which the sentiments under notice, are calculated to exert upon individuals, and upon the community. And it is with the humble hope of contributing in some measure to counteract their pernicious and mischievous tendency, that these strictures have been prepared for publication. It is true that the author has expressed his confidence that all the "*intelligent*" members of the medical profession, will approve of the medical doctrines he has advanced; and the fact that we gainsay them, and attempt to prove that they are fallacious and unphilosophical, will involve in his estimation the forfeiture of our claim to be ranked among "*intelligent*" men; yet, at the expense of being denounced in the elegant language selected by himself, as "muddle pated, narrow minded, bigoted, enthusiastic, and perhaps hypocritical;" and at the risk of being written down among "the psalm singers of the profession," who "if sincere are fools, and if not so rogues," we have ventured upon this feeble effort to expose error, and to vindicate truth, especially as the subject is one which involves the immortal hopes and everlasting destinies of men. And firmly believing as we do, that the religion of Christ is a Divine reality, however unworthy to bear His

name, we are not ashamed to confess our faith in the "special influence of the Holy Spirit," with as much confidence as in a "special Providence," both of which doctrines we hold on the testimony of inspiration. With such belief, whether true or false, the Divine guidance has been sought, and the Divine blessing is now implored upon the present publication; and though Dr. Brigham's creed may constrain him to despise us therefor, yet for none is that blessing sought more devoutly than for him, that he may be "converted from the error of his way," by the agency of that Holy Spirit, whom he contemns, and whose "special influence" he denies. That truth may be promoted, and the cause of religion advanced, is of infinitely more importance than the decision of the question of the comparative qualifications of the disputants. This reply, therefore, is issued from the press, without any overweening anxiety as to the fate of the author among the critics of the day. If it shall be useful to the souls and bodies of men, and in any measure prevent the disastrous results which flow from infidelity and irreligion, he will deem self an insignificant sacrifice in a cause so exalted.

APPENDIX.

IN the vindication of religion from the allegations of Dr. Brigham, which is attempted in the preceding pages, and which indeed is the leading design of the present review, the author has taken occasion to show that the infidel and irreligious tendencies of the sentiments upon which he has animadverted, are the legitimate fruits of Phrenology. But those of the sect, who retain their respect for the "science, falsely so called," and at the same time adhere to their faith in evangelical religion, will deny the conclusion to which we have labored to bring the reader, and maintain that we have only proved that infidels are attempting to make the system tributary to their unhallowed purposes. Such we know has been uniformly the employment of sceptics in every age, and no sooner has any new discovery in science, or new system of philosophy been announced, than they at once aim to bring it into their service; and profess, however absurdly, to derive valuable contributions to their cause, from every improvement in physics, which the genius or industry of man is developing. But, however plausibly this opinion may be urged, by those who agree with the strictures of the present volume, so far as to unite in reprobating the infidel and irreligious tendencies of the work under notice, and yet allege these to be perversions of phrenology,

rather than exhibitions of its nature and tendency ; we must still maintain the opinions we have expressed, and for their proof, we have thought proper to add the present brief appendix, the design of which is to acquaint the reader with the true character of the "science," that he may form his own estimate of the moral tendencies which we have ascribed to it.

Phrenology, as the system is now designated, has been modernized,* and introduced formally to public attention, chiefly through the labors of Dr. Gall, and was called by him *cranioscopy*, *craniology*, *organology*, *cranognomony* and *cephalology* ; though the term phrenology is now generally adopted by the unanimous consent of his disciples. He designs by the term *cranioscopy* or *phrenology*, to designate a new system of mental philosophy, including the functions of the brain, as well as all the faculties, propensities, and sentiments : and one which shall be alike applicable to man and all other animals, and he builds his whole fabric on the following four "primordial ideas," viz.

1st. "All the instincts, propensities, intellectual faculties, and moral qualities of man and animals, are *innate*."

2nd. "That the exercise or use of all these, whatever may be the principle from which they are derived, is subject to the influence of *material and organic* conditions."

* I say modernized, for an analogous system was propagated centuries before him, and busts, with the supposed seats of the various faculties marked, were engraved and published. The gross materialism of the theory, however, very soon consigned it to oblivion.

3rd. "That the *brain is the organ* of all our instincts, propensities, sentiments, aptitudes, intellectual faculties, and *moral qualities*."

4th. "That each of our instincts, propensities, sentiments, talents, intellectual and moral faculties, has a *portion of the brain*, which is *specially appropriated to it*; a *determinate seat*, and that the developement of these different parts, which form so many *small brains*, or particular organs, is manifested on the *external surface of the cranium*, by *visible and palpable signs or protuberances*, so that by the examination of these protuberances or cranioscopic elevations, the *dispositions, and intellectual and moral qualities*, peculiar to every individual, may be ascertained."

In these four "primordial ideas," the reader has a sketch of the fundamental principles upon which Dr. Gall founded his system, and in the progress of the science to the present day, they have not been essentially modified. The arguments by which his disciples have labored to render these principles plausible are various, and drawn from anatomy, physiology, and metaphysics. The intricate and complicated structure of the brain, and particularly its elaborate and mysterious convolutions, are regarded as proofs that so beautiful and inexplicable an organization, renders it both rational and probable, that its different parts must be destined for special and determinate functions. And if we refer the whole of the impressions made upon the mind, through the medium of the nerves to any central or given point of the brain, it is alleged that we can conceive no possible use for the remaining parts of that organ. The partial loss of the mental faculties, which

sometimes occurs, from disease or injury of the brain, is maintained to favor the doctrine that these faculties are distributed over different parts of that organ. While the fact, that the various nerves connected with the organs of sense, perform essentially different offices, is urged as an analogical argument in proof, that the different convolutions of the brain are the organs of the respective mental functions. And again, it is maintained, that the perfection of the brain corresponds to the state of the mental faculties in the different periods of life; and a necessary connexion must be supposed between these circumstances. While the difference in the form and size of the brain and its respective parts, which is so obvious in different individuals and animals, renders it plausible to suppose this to be the cause of the differences which exist in the faculties. And it is still further urged, that when the exercise of the mental powers is attended with fatigue, this sensation is only felt in a particular spot, which implies that the faculty which has been exercised is confined to that particular portion of the brain. And the *innate* nature of all the dispositions and mental faculties, which is presupposed by the system, it is argued, proves that they must be attached to different organs, unless we deny that they exist in different proportions in different individuals.

Such are the principal arguments by which modern phrenologists labor to sustain their favorite theory; and with these, as well as the "primordial ideas" of Dr. Gall before the reader, he may form an accurate conception of the system, and be able to understand the authorities for the "map of regions," which has been laid down on the surface of the head, by which the various faculties and propensities are located. This may

be seen in the various busts and drawings, which are sufficiently numerous in every part of the country, and which are potent in making uninitiated rustics stare and wonder at the mysteries of the philosophy of their own brains.

The reader will perceive that Phrenology is only an extension of the science of Physiognomy, though possessing infinitely less philosophy and truth. For while Lavater interpreted the expression and form of the countenance, as indicative of the mental constitution and character, yet he relied upon the visible and tangible *action* of the muscles of the face, which, to a great extent, are acknowledged to be under the influence of volition and habit. But Dr. Gall relies upon the *invisible* and intangible *action*, which he gratuitously supposes the *brain* to perform, and which, if it really existed, must necessarily be unappreciable, because of the solidity and thickness of the bones of the cranium, after the age of puberty, although he and his disciples contend for the validity of their maps of developments, during every period of life, even to advanced age. And the important circumstance, so often mentioned, that the departments of the brain, which Phrenology designates with so much accuracy and minuteness, neither agree with the natural divisions of the brain, which are so remarkable, nor with the metaphysical classification of the mental phenomena, has neither been gainsayed nor refuted.

It is not our purpose to analyze the principles of the science, or examine the arguments by which its professors aim to support it with any minuteness, as this would be foreign from the design of this appendix; nor is it at all desirable or necessary, as will presently ap-

pear. For even, on the admission of the whole of the "primordial ideas" we have named, though the third in the order they stand, is the only one which has any share of plausibility or truth, still it would be easy to show that the artificial division and appropriation of the functions, to distinct localities, as taught by Phrenology, is wholly arbitrary and fictitious. This will be obvious, when the reader is informed that the first grand discovery of Dr. Gall, and which has led to the whole of the numbers and localities which the maps of the regions exhibit, as subsequently laid down by himself and others, was made under the following circumstances. He observed, while yet at school, that all his fellows who were distinguished at the public examinations, were indebted for their success to an extraordinary *memory*, and that they all had *very prominent eyes*. This remarkable coincidence, led him irresistibly to the conclusion, that there must be some mysterious connection between a *good memory* and a *protrusion of the eye-balls* from the socket, such as that for which some persons are so remarkable. And, on this momentous thought having taken possession of his brain, at once he leaped to the still farther conclusion, that every other faculty must be connected with other external conformations.

But for this accidental discovery of the organ of *memory*, being located in the *eyes*, and its perfection being developed by their size and *prominence*, the world might have yet been in the dark whether we had any "organs," nor should we be possessed of a map of our own brains, which is now, thanks to Dr. Gall, the privilege of every man and woman in Christendom.

But while Dr. Gall located this organ of *memory* in the eyes, his pupil, Dr. Spurzheim, denominates it "the

organ of language," by which term he means to convey the idea, that "prominent eyes" indicate not only philosophical memory, but an aptitude for the study of languages. All phrenologists agree in attributing the *faculty of speech*, and the power of articulating sounds to the *eyes*, and great skill in the use of language to their *prominence*. And Dr. Gall used to exhibit in proof of this ridiculous conceit, the cranium of a lunatic who was unable to articulate words, in which the roofs of the orbits were arched, and this organ small, or, in other words, the eyes were not prominent.

As this faculty is avowedly the origin of all the discoveries made by Gall, and the cause of all his researches, as well as the foundation of the whole science of Phrenology, the reader who will acquaint himself with the anatomy of the eye, and the causes of its prominence, may readily satisfy himself that this "corner stone" of the entire edifice is a mere fiction and fable. Nor can he persuade himself to believe that the structure and relative position of the human eye, while it is so admirably adapted by the Creator for the purposes of vision, is at the same time designed to impart the *faculty of speech*, and the articulation of sounds, for which it has no degree of adaptation, while locally disconnected with those organs, whose elaborate structure indicates their design and use for this important and essentially different function. And yet all the phrenological authorities will be found to inculcate the doctrine, that "large and prominent eyes" indicate the development of "the organ of memory and language," though Spurzheim is so very particular as to inform us that for the perfection of this organ we are to look, not merely for "large and prominent eyes, but at the same time,

pressed, *as it were*! towards the lower part of the orbit," a coincidence which will be found in practice to be as scarce as instances of *white crows*. This appendage of Spurzheim, appears to have been designed to meet the objections to the science which were constantly multiplying upon the hands of practitioners in this art and mystery, who found thousands of examples, in which "large and prominent eyes," were connected with a *deficiency* both in "memory and language." He, therefore, adds to the description of the organ that the "large and prominent eyes must, at the same time, be *pressed* towards the lower part of the orbit," and the convenient words "*as it were*," are parenthetically introduced for wise and obvious purposes. With such an equivocal definition of signs, a common fortune teller would rival the most acute phrenologist in developing character. And, we need hardly add, that as the "science" is as applicable to all other animals as man, that no human example of the perfect development of "the organ of languages and memory" can be produced, which will at all compare with the claims possessed by an OWL.

We have dwelt a moment on this first discovery of Dr. Gall, because it was the origin and cause of all his researches, the *primum mobile* of the whole machinery of the system. And as this philosopher was impelled by so pure a fiction, to proceed in the location of the faculties and propensities in the various parts of the brain, it is not to be wondered at, that the divisions which he and his followers have successively discovered, marked, and numbered upon their maps and casts, should, like the first, be wholly arbitrary; nor will it be found, that any one of them possesses any greater claim to our confidence, either drawn from philosophy or facts,

though of the latter they are ever proclaiming themselves the discoverers and inventors, and upon these alone they profess to rely.

Another specimen of the *facts*, upon which Phrenology has authoritatively located the "organs" of the human mind, and an exhibition of the slender basis on which these localities rest, may be seen in the "love of offspring," which Spurzheim calls the propensity of "*philoprogenitiveness*," and which both he and his illustrious master, place in the posterior and inferior part of the head, and when much developed forming a large prominence above the centre of the neck.

The reader must preserve his gravity, while the history of this "discovery" is thus accurately developed by a distinguished phrenologist. "Dr. Gall had long known that the back part of the head was more prominent in *females, children, and monkeys*, than in men, but was utterly unable to account for this wondrous *fact*, even after he had long believed and taught the science. At last, however, a *clergyman* who attended his lectures, led him to the true solution of this problem, which had so long puzzled his brains, by reminding him that the 'love of offspring' was remarkable in *women!* and *female monkeys!*" This striking collocation and astonishing coincidence, conclusively established the organ of "*philoprogenitiveness*," as it is now called; and it has since received conclusive confirmation by another prodigious *fact*, discovered by the lamented Spurzheim, that it is this organ which *induces young girls to play with dolls!*

Such are a few examples of the *facts* upon which every "faculty, propensity, and sentiment" of man and all other animals, have been laid down in maps of the

brain, with more than mathematical precision ; and they and their definite localities are now learnedly spoken of with magisterial authority. But we forbear to enlarge on these several topics, and shall confine our observations to a few of those which present the science in its moral aspect, and, as we think, demonstrate its infidel tendencies. And the first of these we would present, is the "organ of *moral sense*," or "*benevolence*;" for these dispositions, according to the system, are owing to the "developement" on the "superior, anterior part of the head, just above the forehead." From the universal presence of this "organ," phrenologists maintain that "*man is naturally good*," and that "the question so often agitated among philosophers, whether man is born with a disposition to good or evil," has been settled definitely by the "science." It is scarcely necessary to say, that the authority of revelation is here utterly rejected, and the multiplied testimonies of the Bible denied ; nor need we add, that the history of every nation under heaven, demonstrates the fallacy of the position, and of the system which inculcates it.

Immediately in a neighboring locality, on the upper part of the head, is the "organ of *marvellousness*," or "*the love of supernatural objects*," while near the crown of the head is the "organ of *theosophy*," which Spurzheim divides into three "organs," viz. "*veneration*," "*conscientiousness*," and "*hope*." Upon these several organs depend, according to the system, the dispositions to see and believe in visions, ghosts, witches, and *supernatural revelations*, together with *all belief in the existence of a God*, all idea of a Supreme Being, all propensity towards *worship, devotion, piety, love of God, idolatry, &c. &c.* And it can scarcely be necessary to remark, that

this single fact—that all these dissimilar and even opposite sentiments, in which good and evil, virtue and vice, reality and delusion, truth and falsehood, are mingled in heterogeneous combination, and yet all ascribed to the same “organs” and “developments”—is enough to brand the system which recognizes such absurdity, not merely with infidel character and tendency, but with profound stupidity and folly. And to exhibit the immorality of such a vile imposture upon public credulity, if it were at all needful, would be easy, by simply repeating the opinions of Gall and Spurzheim, in their arguments in favor of the validity of their designation of these organs. Alluding to those who believe in ghosts, visions, and witches, and indeed in any supernatural revelations, they tell us, that “this disposition which loves what is astonishing, mysterious, or miraculous, is the immediate result of a particular *organization*; and it would be as unjust to accuse those *endowed* with it, of imposture, as it would be to censure poets for embodying and personifying their ideas, for they are only the slaves of a too energetic *action of one part of the brain*.” If this be not sublimated impiety, materialism, and fatalism, we know not where these characteristics are to be found; and that such sentiments annihilate all moral distinctions between truth and falsehood, vice and virtue, is too obvious to need comment. And yet, they go on to tell us, that in the *creation* of the organ of marvellousness, NATURE had views and intentions, which serve to strengthen our faith and fortify our belief, and thus *nature*, not the “God of nature,” is represented to be the “author of faith.”

But, in relation to the “organ of theosophy,” or veneration,” these phrenologists more distinctly disclose

their gross and unmingled atheism. Here we are taught that "some persons, for want of this organ, have *no capacity* for religious instruction, while others, who possess the organ, receive it with the greatest eagerness;" and surely if there be those who have "no capacity" for religion, because of their "physical organization," their accountability is annihilated, and those who are religious, because of a different organization, are equally victims of uncontrollable destiny, nor can virtue or vice be predicated in either case. Indeed, all this and more, is unblushingly avowed; for they affirm that "our ideas on all subjects depend on our being furnished with *organs* to originate, or to give birth to them, and we have an idea of God, as we have love of offspring, benevolence, &c., because we have an organ fitted for such a purpose." And still they maintain that man wherever he is found has the "organ of theosophy," and hence a "sentiment of the existence of the Divinity is *innate*, and *inherent in our nature*." And yet they add, that there is a great difference between this sentiment and the *revelations*, dogmas, mysteries, &c., of different *religious sects*. And it is obvious, that the revelations of Christianity, and of the Bible, are here aimed at as among the religious sects, whose dogmas and mysteries Phrenology disclaims. This disclaimer might have been spared, however, since there is a mutual and irrepressible repulsion, which must eternally separate Phrenology from Christianity; and, we think, sufficient evidence is now before the reader, that from the nature of this science, falsely so called, its votaries must not only believe ours to be literally "a world without *souls*," but equally "without God."

The source whence Dr. Brigham derived the philo-

sophy and creed, under the malign influence of which his book was written, is now plainly before the reader, as well as the proof of our allegations, that the evil genius of Phrenology, like a mighty incubus, sits enthroned upon his soul.)