

REPORT  
ON THE  
PHRENOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION

OF  
J. STANLEY GRIMES.

BY E. N. <sup>✓</sup>HORSFORD,

Professor of Natural History and Mathematics in the Albany Female Academy

ADOPTED BY THE ALBANY PHRENOLOGICAL SOCIETY,  
SEPTEMBER 3, 1840.

---

ALBANY :

PRINTED BY J. MUNSELL,  
1840.



BF870

.H7

## REPORT.

---

The committee to whom was referred the letter of Mr. Grimes, requesting an examination of his classification, as exhibited in his "New System of Phrenology," and a comparison of it with the classification of Dr. Spurzheim, beg leave to submit the following

### REPORT :

The importance of arranging the principles of a science in accordance with the laws of natural relationship, has been recognized from the days of the earliest philosophers to the present time. It has been acknowledged in astronomy, geology, and the other branches of natural science. The productions of the great men in these several departments of investigation are the monuments of a desire to improve and perfect classification. A like feeling has been manifested by writers upon the powers of the mind. Succeeding generations, enlightened by discoveries, and quickened thereby to the perception of defects in previous systems, attempted improvements; and the whole history of mental philosophy, from Pythagoras to the commencement of the last century, is but little more than the record of changes in nomenclature and arrangement of the attributes of mind.

In order to the exhibition of a comprehensive view of this subject, it may be well to notice briefly the principal systems that have heretofore attracted attention. They may be divided into,

Those which consider the faculties with little or no regard to the relation existing between them and corporeal organs ; and,

Those which consider the faculties as depending for manifestation directly upon certain corporeal organs.

I. A division of the mental faculties into two kinds, equivalent to INTELLECT and INCLINATION, appears in nearly all the systems, from the most ancient to the most recent. Pythagoras taught his pupils of the RATIONAL and IRRATIONAL principles of the soul. Plato divided the soul into three parts, INTELLIGENCE, PASSION and APPETITE. The second and third belong to Inclination. According to Aristotle, the human soul has three faculties, the NUTRITIVE, the SENSITIVE, and the RATIONAL ; and they are possessed to some extent by animals. The RATIONAL part alone was believed by Pythagoras and Plato to be immortal : but it is not known whether Aristotle regarded any part or faculty as destined to exist forever. There were, however, after the commencement of the Christian era, those who considered the human soul as an unit, purely spiritual and immortal : while all brutes were supposed to be guided by a mysterious and unfathomable *Instinct*, which could exist only during the organization of the body. In their writings, usually corresponding with INTELLECT and INCLINATION, we have HEAD and HEART, UNDERSTANDING and AFFECTIONS, SOUL or SPIRIT, and APPETITES or LUSTS ; terms drawn from

the scriptures, and used to embrace the two classes of mental powers.

Lord Bacon, who was the first to clear away the darkness that had long surrounded the true principles of philosophical investigation, thought there were two minds in man: one of SENSIBILITY and VOLUNTARY MOTION—another having the attributes of MEMORY, IMAGINATION, &c. Des Cartes maintained the existence of four qualities or faculties of mind—SENSIBILITY, IMAGINATION, UNDERSTANDING and WILL; and he adopted the opinion of the fathers of the church, that animals are directed by an inexplicable instinct. Malebranche recognized two primary powers of mind—UNDERSTANDING and WILL; under each of which inferior powers were treated. UNDERSTANDING embraced *Perception, Memory, Judgment* and *Imagination*; and WILL included *Inclination, Desire, Affections* and *Passions*. Locke differed little in his arrangement from Malebranche.

Reid and Brown, while they evidently considered the mind as a single general power, have admitted more of the primitive faculties than those who preceded them; and the subdivisions in both have been made under similar heads. Reid divides them into INTELLECTUAL and ACTIVE; Brown, into INTELLECTUAL STATES OF THE MIND, and EMOTIONS. “The INTELLECTUAL STATES OF THE MIND are referrable,” says Dr. Brown, “to two generic susceptibilities or capacities; those of *simple suggestion*, and those of *relative suggestion*.” SIMPLE SUGGESTION is the basis of *conception, memory, imagination* and *habit*; and corresponds with the phrenological *perceptives*. RELATIVE SUGGESTION is the basis of *judgment* *reason* and *abstraction*; and corresponds with the phre-



nological *reflectives*. EMOTIONS, he divides into IMMEDIATE, RETROSPECTIVE and PROSPECTIVE. The IMMEDIATE EMOTIONS are of *wonder, beauty, sublimity, sympathy, &c.* The RETROSPECTIVE EMOTIONS are of *anger, gratitude, regret, gladness, and remorse.* The PROSPECTIVE EMOTIONS, which, according to Dr. Brown's analysis, include several of the affective faculties of Spurzheim, are,

1. Desire of our own continued existence,
2. Desire of pleasure,
3. Desire of action,
4. Desire of society,
5. Desire of knowledge,
6. Desire of power,
7. Desire of the affections of others,
8. Desire of glory,
9. Desire of the happiness of others,
10. Desire of evil to others.

Lord Kames "distinctly refers to and describes, as original principles of thought and action, no less than *twenty* of the phrenological faculties;"\* and Smellie, who, at the suggestion of Lord Kames, was induced to prepare the *Philosophy of Natural History*, has remarked among animals the manifestations of twenty-three of the primary powers of mind; though neither of these philosophers attempted any further arrangement than a general reference to the classes of Intellectual Faculties and Instincts or Propensities.

The philosophic schools of Germany and France, while they have established a source of ideas, which Locke did not admit, to wit, *Reason*, have made scarcely

---

\* *History of Phrenology*, by R. W. Haskins, of Buffalo, N. Y.

any progress in the determination of fundamental faculties. The following extract from the writings of Theodore Jouffroy, a French philosopher, and distinguished pupil of Cousin—the acknowledged head of metaphysical science in France—presents a synoptical view of the classification of the eclectic school.

“ In the actual state of human knowledge, the irreducible capacities of the human soul appear to me to be the following. First *the personal faculty*, or the supreme power of taking possession of ourselves and of our capacities, and of controlling them : this faculty is known by the names of liberty or will, which designate it but imperfectly. Secondly, *the primitive inclination of our nature*, or that aggregate of instincts or tendencies which impel us towards certain ends and in certain directions, prior to all experience, and which at once suggest to reason the destiny of our being, and animate our activity to pursue it. Thirdly, *the locomotive faculty*, or that energy by which we move the locomotive nerves, and produce all the voluntary bodily movements. Fourthly, *the expressive faculty*, or the power of representing by external signs that which takes place within us, and of thus holding communication with our fellow men. Fifthly, *sensibility*, or the capacity of being agreeably or disagreeably affected, by all external or internal causes, and of reacting in relation to them by movements of love or hatred, of desire or aversion, which are the principle of all passion. Sixthly, the *intellectual faculties*. This term comprises many distinct faculties, which can be enumerated and described only in a treatise on intelligence.”

In all the systems that have been noticed, it is not

difficult for the phrenologist to perceive, great imperfection. The first division seems, in nearly all of them, to have been made upon the same principles: but in the determination of the several faculties, and their arrangement under the two heads, very striking differences are perceptible. Different modes and degrees of activity have been mistaken for primitive powers; and mental operations which were supposed to originate in one faculty, are now known to depend upon the combined activity of several. Mr. Combe, in his essay upon the objections of metaphysicians, has very ingeniously shown that all their intellectual faculties, perception, conception, association, memory, imagination and abstraction, are reducible to conception: and this supposed faculty he elsewhere proves to be but an attribute of the general intellect.

The INSTINCT of animals has been resolved into its elements, and the chasm between man and the other creatures of creation narrowed to its proper limits.

II. As Pythagoras was among the first to divide the mind into two parts, so was he also among the first to assign it a habitation in corporeal organs. He considered the brain as the seat of the *Rational*, and the heart of the *Irrational* principle. Aristotle believed the soul to exist in the heart. Others thought the *Intellect*, or rational part located in the head, and the *Passions* in the viscera. Albertus Magnus, archbishop of Ratisbon, in the thirteenth century, convinced that so large an organ as the brain should have assigned to it more specific functions, made it the residence of certain conceived powers of the mind. *Common sense*, he placed in the



forehead, or first ventricle of the brain; *thought*, or *judgment*, in the second; and *memory*, or *moving force*, in the third. Pierre de Montagna, in the fifteenth century, published a work, in which was figured a head, representing the site of *common sense*, *imagination*, *thought* or *judgment*, *memory* and *reason*. Lodovico Dolci, the century after, issued a work containing a similar delineation. Des Cartes conjectured that the *pineal gland* was the seat of the mind. "Willis considered the *corpora striata* the seat of *sensation* and *attention*; the medullary matter, of *memory*; the *corpus collosum*, of *reflection*; whilst the moving spirits emanated from the *cerebellum*." Charles Bonnet thought that each individual fibre was an organ of the mind. Different modifications of the views already given, concerning the disposition of the powers of the mind among the different portions of the brain, and other organs of the body, were, until the discovery of phrenology, treated with more or less attention by all learned men.

To the student of nature, it does not appear strange, that these speculations rose and fell,—that they rivalled and supplanted each other, and that they all vanished before the blaze of that light which Gall concentrated upon them with such burning power. For they had been the creatures of almost pure fancy, unaided by careful observation and induction. The viscera were proved to have no connection with the passions; and the fanciful system of Albertus Magnus, and all those of his followers, were seen to have no foundation in truth. Observation could contribute nothing to the support of Des Cartes or Willis; and their speculations, with those of their predecessors, on the habitation of the mind and

powers, will soon be known only in the pages of history.

The actual discovery of twenty-six of the fundamental faculties of the mind, and the organs through which they manifested themselves, was the first great step towards a proper classification. But the life of Dr. Gall was too short for the labor of founding and perfecting a science. Although he speaks of *propensities*, *mechanical aptitudes*, *intellectual dispositions*, and *moral qualities*; yet, besides the record of his invaluable discoveries, he has left us little more than a simple arrangement of the powers. In this he seems to have been guided merely by the relative position of the organs, commencing at the base, and proceeding regularly to the top. Accordingly, Amativeness is placed first, and Firmness last; while Cautiousness and Educability (Individuality and Eventuality of Spurzheim,) are associated together. Dr. Gall maintained that all the faculties have the same modes of action; and that a separation of them into two orders, founded upon their different modes of action, could not be made. Dr. Spurzheim, however, guided by the accumulated opinions of philosophers who had gone before him, was enabled to recognize two distinct classes of powers; and the two orders of AFFECTIVE and INTELLECTUAL FACULTIES proposed by him, have received the sanction of the greater portion of the phrenological world. Dr. Spurzheim maintained that perception, memory, and imagination, are attributes of the Intellect, and that the affective faculties have sensation alone. These views were rejected by Gall. Dr. Spurzheim divided the Affective Faculties into *Propensities*, or those internal impulses which invite to certain actions, and

*Sentiments*, which, besides inviting to certain actions, are attended when active by a peculiar emotion.

The Intellectual Faculties he subdivided into four genera: the external senses; the faculties which perceive existence and physical qualities; those which perceive the relations of external objects; and the reflecting faculties. The following is Dr. Spurzheim's classification, as drawn out in Mr. Combe's last work.

### ORDER I.—FEELINGS.

#### GENUS I.—PROPENSITIES.

- |                          |                      |
|--------------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Amativeness,          | 6. Destructiveness,  |
| 2. Philoprogenitiveness, | * Alimentiveness,    |
| 3. Concentrativeness, or | † Love of life,      |
| Inhabitiveness,          | 7. Secretiveness,    |
| 4. Adhesiveness,         | 8. Acquisitiveness,  |
| 5. Combaticiveness,      | 9. Constructiveness. |

#### GENUS II.—SENTIMENTS.

1. *Sentiments common to man with lower animals.*
  10. Self esteem,
  11. Approbativeness,
  13. Benevolence,
  14. Veneration,
  15. Firmness,
  16. Conscientiousness,
  17. Hope,
  13. Cautiousness,
  18. Wonder,
  19. Ideality,
  20. Mirthfulness,
  21. Imitation.
2. *Sentiments proper to man.*

### ORDER II.—INTELLECTUAL FACULTIES.

#### GENUS I.—EXTERNAL SENSES.

- |                    |          |
|--------------------|----------|
| Feeling, or touch, | Hearing, |
| Taste,             | Sight.   |
| Smell,             |          |

## GENUS II.—INTELLECTUAL FACULTIES,

*Which perceive existence and physical qualities.*

- |                    |               |
|--------------------|---------------|
| 22. Individuality, | 25. Weight,   |
| 23. Form,          | 26. Coloring. |
| 24. Size,          |               |

## GENUS III.—INTELLECTUAL FACULTIES,

*Which perceive relations of external objects.*

- |                  |               |
|------------------|---------------|
| 27. Locality,    | 31. Time,     |
| 28. Number,      | 32. Tune,     |
| 29. Order,       | 33. Language. |
| 30. Eventuality, |               |

## GENUS IV.—REFLECTING FACULTIES.

- |                 |                |
|-----------------|----------------|
| 34. Comparison, | 35. Causality. |
|-----------------|----------------|

In expressing an opinion upon the merits of this classification, the committee feel deeply the responsibility of their situation. The work of a profoundly analytical mind is before them; and with scarcely an alteration, it has received the sanction of the most distinguished advocates of the science, in Britain, France, and America. It is the standard classification; it is one of the many monuments of a distinguished genius, and we are bound to revere it. The committee are also aware, that the ultimate functions of all the powers are not yet established, and that there is still a broad field for discovery. Nevertheless, the following quotations from Spurzheim and Combe, show not only their own consciousness of imperfections in this classification, but appear to point out to us the path we should pursue. "If," says Spurzheim, "under any head of the nomenclature, there be a better name than I employ, \* \* \* \* I shall be glad to use it; for I am always disposed to acknowledge



truth, and obey real improvement." "It appears impossible," says Mr. Combe, "to arrive at a correct classification until all the organs, and also the primitive faculty or ultimate function of each, shall be definitely ascertained, which is not at present the case. Till this end shall be accomplished, every interim arrangement will be in danger of being overturned by subsequent discoveries."

From these remarks, the duty of pointing out defects, that in the very nature of things belong to progressive science, when necessary to the exhibition of improvement, becomes abundantly apparent.

Dr. Spurzheim's first division into Intellectual and Affective Faculties, is the link by which phrenology is attached to the mental philosophy of the old school. His division of the affective faculties into propensities and sentiments, nearly corresponds with Brown's Prospective and Immediate Emotions. It is based upon a conceived difference in their attributes. "Propensities," Spurzheim remarks, "invite *only* to certain actions;" but sentiments are not limited to inclination alone; "they have an emotion of a peculiar kind superadded." After comparing the views of writers who have recognized this distinction with the actual manifestations of the affective powers, the committee are unable to believe that grounds for this division exist. Each of these faculties has its own sphere of action, but some of the spheres are higher than others. Philoprogenitiveness has its nursery; Adhesiveness its limited circle of friends; and Benevolence, the entire world. Alimentiveness impels attention to the wants of the nutritive system; Cautiousness induces general guardianship over



both the corporeal and mental constitutions ; and Hope excites to action under bright views of a cloudless future. When these powers are aroused by their appropriate stimuli, their activity is attended in all by a feeling or an emotion, differing in the different faculties as widely as the spheres in which they act.

Now that, to Benevolence and the group of powers with which it is associated, this attribute should be extended, while to Adhesiveness and the whole genus of animal propensities it is denied, is considered a position unfounded in nature.

The subdivision into sentiments common to man and the lower animals and those proper to man, is very clearly defective. Spurzheim has given drawings showing that some dogs and horses have a developement of Benevolence ; and Gall remarked that lions were more full in the region of this organ than tigers. Imitation is admitted by Spurzheim to be a faculty of some of the monkey tribe ; and Mr. Combe remarks, that the organ is found in the brains of both parrots and monkeys. It has also been suggested, that the proverbial stubbornness of asses has its source in Firmness. These examples show that the last division, though it may be convenient, is not strictly philosophical. In the genus *animal propensities*, Spurzheim has classed together powers, at least as little associated as are the superior and inferior sentiments. Alimentiveness, a faculty related exclusively to the individual, is placed beside Amativeness and Philoprogenitiveness, which are clearly related to the species. In the arrangement of the intellectual faculties, Language, one of the lowest organs, and one which, according to Bessieres, becomes fibrous immedi-

ately after Individuality and Form, is elevated to a place directly below the reflectives.

Dr. Bessieres, a French phrenological author, denies that the external senses are intellectual faculties, and says "their essential nature is to transmit sensations, but not to know; because it is not the senses that know, but the faculties which they employ, and of which they are the instruments."

The committee do not wish to be understood as altogether approving the criticism of the French phrenologist; only as considering the ultimate functions of the organs of sense as worthy of further investigation. If from the impression upon the retina, and the sensation transmitted along the optic nerve to the brain, Individuality perceives existence—Form perceives form—Size perceives extension, and Coloring perceives color; there seems to be no function left to the optic apparatus, but that of a mere passage-way for ideas of physical objects from the external world to the brain.

Dr. Andrew Carmichael, former president of the Dublin Phrenological Society, in his memoir of Spurzheim, gives the following outline of a classification. The organs at the side of the head are related to the subsistence and preservation of the individual. Those at the back of the head are all requisite to the perfection of the species and the formation of society. Those of the forehead and coronal region are partly common to man and animals, and in part exclusively human.

Dr. Bessieres has given a classification, in which he presents a division of the powers of the mind into three classes, related to the wants, sympathies and knowledge of man. The organs of the first class are situated upon

the side of the head; those of the second, behind and on the top. He makes Imitation, Ideality and Mirthfulness, *intellectual percepts*, and denies that Benevolence is manifested by any of the lower animals. Language, he places the very highest in the intellectual class.

In the classification of Miss Miles, there are no orders or genera, it being merely a grouping of the powers together for convenience in the examination of heads, without strict regard to their functional relations.

Fowler and Kirkham's Phrenology contains a classification based in part upon an analysis of several powers, which is not adopted by most phrenological authors. Constructiveness is considered a semi-intellectual sentiment, and is ranked with Ideality and Imitation.

Several of the objections which were made to the first great system are applicable to the others that have been mentioned; and against some, objections might be urged, to which the classification of Spurzheim is not exposed.

Mr. Grimes' classification, as presented in his "New System of Phrenology," retains Spurzheim's first division of the powers of the mind under the heads of PROPENSITIES and INTELLECTUAL FACULTIES. The PROPENSITIES he divides into two classes, which he denominates *Ipséal* and *Social*. He denies the distinction between propensities and sentiments maintained by Spurzheim. His classification follows:

#### CLASS I.

IPSEAL OR SELF-RELATIVE PROPENSITIES.

#### CLASS II.

SOCIAL, OR SOCIETY-RELATIVE PROPENSITIES.

## CLASS III.

## INTELLECTUAL, OR KNOWLEDGE-RELATIVE FACULTIES.

## CLASS I.—IPSEALS.

## 1. CORPOREAL RANGE.

- |                    |                  |
|--------------------|------------------|
| 1. Pneumativeness, | 3. Sanitiveness. |
| 2. Alimentiveness, |                  |

## 2. CARNIVOROUS RANGE.

- |                     |                   |
|---------------------|-------------------|
| 4. Destructiveness, | 5. Combativeness. |
|---------------------|-------------------|

## 3. HERBIVOROUS RANGE.

- |                   |                  |
|-------------------|------------------|
| 6. Secretiveness, | 7. Cautiousness. |
|-------------------|------------------|

## 4. RODENTIA RANGE.

- |                      |                     |
|----------------------|---------------------|
| 8. Constructiveness, | 9. Acquisitiveness. |
|----------------------|---------------------|

## 5. HUMAN RANGE.

- |                     |                  |
|---------------------|------------------|
| 10. Playfulness,    | 12. Hopefulness. |
| 11. Perfectiveness, |                  |

## CLASS II.—SOCIALS.

## ESTABLISHING GROUP.

- |                   |                    |
|-------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Amativeness,   | 3. Inhabitiveness, |
| 2. Parentiveness, | 4. Adhesiveness.   |

## GOVERNING GROUP.

- |                    |                       |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 5. Imperativeness, | 7. Firmness,          |
| 6. Approbateness,  | 8. Conscientiousness. |

## CONFORMING GROUP.

- |                    |                     |
|--------------------|---------------------|
| 9. Submissiveness, | 11. Imitativeness,  |
| 10. Kindness,      | 12. Credenciveness. |

## CLASS III.—INTELLECTUALS.

## LOWER RANGE.

- |                   |            |
|-------------------|------------|
| 1. Individuality, | 5. Size,   |
| 2. Chemicality,   | 6. Weight, |
| 3. Language,      | 7. Color,  |
| 4. Form,          | 8. Order,  |
| 9. Number.        |            |

## MIDDLE RANGE.

- |                  |           |
|------------------|-----------|
| 10. Direction,   | 12. Time, |
| 11. Eventuality, | 13. Tune. |

## UPPER RANGE.

- |                 |                |
|-----------------|----------------|
| 14. Comparison, | 15. Causality. |
|-----------------|----------------|

"This division into three classes, *Ipséal*, *Social*, and *Intellectual*, is founded," says the author, "upon the following considerations.

"FIRST. *Anatomy* points to three grand divisions.

"1. The spinal cord is in three columns, anterior, middle and posterior; and Mr. Charles Bell demonstrated that all the nerves which proceed from one column are destined to perform one class of functions. The nerves from the anterior column are for volition; those from the middle for respiration and nutrition; and those from the posterior for sensation.

"2. The medulla oblongata, Mr. Bell considered as a continuation of the same three columns of the spinal cord. It has three bodies,

The pyramidal, in the anterior;

The olivary, in the middle, and

The restiform in the posterior column.

"3. The brain has always been divided into three lobes—anterior, middle and posterior—and the division may be found strongly marked in the brains of all the higher animals. Spurzheim found by dissection, that the fibres of the anterior pyramidal bodies of the oblongata, expanded into and constituted the anterior lobes of the brain. And he contended that the middle and posterior lobes originated in the other two parts of the oblongata.

"4. Each hemisphere has a great lateral ventricle,



and this ventricle presents an appearance which has been denominated tricornes, or three horns, anterior, middle and posterior."

6. In a note which the committee have received from Mr. Grimes, it is said that Spurzheim considered the spinal cord as having three commissures, anterior, middle and posterior. And also, that the functions of the body are subdivided by some physiologists into three classes. Broussais divides them into those that relate to the individual, those that relate to the species, and those that relate to the acquisition of knowledge.

"SECOND. The natural history of animals is all in harmony with this classification.

"1. The three powers, viz. Amativeness, Alimentiveness and Individuality, which constitute the foundation of the three classes, are manifested by all animals. No animal, however low in the scale of beings, is destitute of these three.

"2. The organs of these powers are found in the very base of the brain:

Amativeness at the lowest posterior ;

Alimentiveness at the lowest middle, and

Individuality in the centre of the lowest front part of the brain.

"3. In the Social class, if we begin at Amativeness, we find it manifested by all animals. If we proceed upward and forward, according to the arrangement of the powers, until we arrive at Credenciveness, we shall trace the progress of society, from its very lowest stage, up through every grade of animals, to its highest perfection in the most polished circles of human society.

In the Ipseal class, if we commence at Alimentive-

ness, we see it manifested by all animals; and if we proceed upward, according to the arrangement of the powers, we find the first and second ranges of Ipseals manifested by the lowest classes of animals; the third range is manifested by the higher and more sagacious animals; and the fourth range is fully manifested only in man, and in his brain only is it found fully developed.

“In the intellectual class, if we commence at Individuality, we see it manifested by the very lowest animals; and if we proceed upwards, according to the arrangement of the powers, we shall perceive that the organs rise and expand out of each other, in a manner strictly agreeing with the progressive intelligence of animals; Causality, the highest of this class, being manifested in a vigorous and efficient manner only by man, the very highest and most complicated of organized beings.

“THIRD. 2. The Ipseal propensities produce those actions only which have for their object the nourishment, protection, improvement and happiness of the individual.

“2. The Social propensities originate those actions only, which have for their object, the production, the establishment, and the government of society, and conformity to its useful regulations.

“3. The Intellectual faculties acquire knowledge, and point out the means by which the propensities may be gratified.”

The considerations which Mr. Grimes has presented in support of his division of the cerebral organs into three classes are of three kinds:—ANATOMICAL STRUCTURE, NATURAL HISTORY OF ANIMALS, and ANALYSIS OF THE MENTAL POWERS. Of these, the committee have been unable to perceive the value which Mr.

Grimes seems to attach to the *anatomical facts*. As a class of truths, they harmonize with this classification, and may therefore be said to lend it some support ; but alone they must be regarded as far from contributing sufficient ground for this division. The occurrence of the fundamental organs of each class at the base of the brain, and the regular gradation of the powers, from Amativeness to Credenciveness, through the socials ; from Alimentiveness to Hopefulness, through the Ipseals ; and from Individuality to Causality, through the Intellectuals, corresponding with the succession of animals in the scale of beings, from the lowest orders up to man, are certainly in beautiful harmony with, and go to sustain the last and most important consideration upon which the classification rests. In the analysis, Mr. Grimes shows that all the powers of each class perform certain specific functions that have a generic character in common. All the powers of the Ipseal class are related to the individual, those of the Social class to society, and those of the Intellectual class to knowledge. He also shows that each of the powers of the several groups in each class have a sub-generic character in common. The first four socials, Amativeness, Parentiveness, Adhesiveness and Inhabitiveness, have for their object the continuation of the species and the establishment of society ; those of the governing group, Imperativeness, Approbativeness, Firmness and Conscientiousness, have for their object the maintenance of government in society, and the administration of justice ; those of the conforming group, Submissiveness, Kindness, Imitativeness and Credenciveness, have for their object the perfection of society, by "obedience to government, condescension and kind-

ness to all our associates, and conformity to their manners, habits and opinions." In the Ipseal class, he shows that the powers of the corporeal range are related to the nourishment and preservation of the body; that those of the carnivorous range are most strongly manifested in the animals that feed upon flesh, and procure it by the destruction of life; that Cautiousness in the herbivorous range characterizes the peace-seeking, ruminating animals;\* that those of the rodentia range distinguish the whole order of animals to which the beaver and squirrel belong; that those of the human range are fully developed only in man. He makes Playfulness the link in the Ipseal chain, which connects man with the lower animals; the other organs of this range being exclusively human. He shows that men who have a developement corresponding with that of animals belonging to either the carnivora, herbivora, or rodentia, are, so far as their Ipseal character is concerned, enstamped with the dispositions peculiar to the carnivorous, herbivorous, or gnawing animals. The Intellectual class, with the exception of a division into ranges, he considers as a whole, and treats the organs in their order of succession, commencing at Individuality, and proceeding through the first and second ranges of percepts to the reflectives.

From this hasty view of the principal systems of arrangement among the powers of the mind which have hitherto received attention, the committee pass to the more direct comparison of the classification of Mr.

---

\* Secretiveness is thought by Mr. Grimes to distinguish the Herbivora. It is also manifested in a high degree by the Carnivora. The essential question, however, is whether the associated organs perform analogous functions.

Grimes with that of Dr. Spurzheim. In doing this, it may be well to notice some of the principles of classification in nature, since correspondence with them can alone give perpetuity to any system, and since they constitute the only true standard of merit. Among those which, in phrenology, are obviously important, may be enumerated the following:

I. Powers immediately related in functional character should be arranged in the same division.

II. Powers not directly related, but differing in attributes, should be arranged in different divisions.

III. The order of succession of the organs anatomically considered, and the relationship of the powers according to metaphysical analysis, should harmonize with each other.

If a classification is defective when viewed in the light of either of these principles, it is manifestly imperfect; and that classification against which, when tested by these principles, there are found fewest objections, is the most perfect.

In noticing Spurzheim's classification, it was observed that Language, manifestly low in the scale of percepts—inasmuch as it is possessed by almost every individual of the animal kingdom, and the organ of which is at the very base of the brain—is ranked next to the reflectives. It was also seen, that Alimentiveness, a propensity related wholly to the individual, is associated with Amativeness and Philoprogenitiveness, which are beyond question related to the species. He has placed in separate subdivisions, Adhesiveness, Approbativeness and Benevolence, making the first an animal propensity proper, the second an affective power common to



man and animals, and the last a power proper to man. While it is plain that Adhesiveness characterizes man, even in his higher walks, as much as animals, and more so than most, and that Approbativeness, though common to man and some animals, cannot be claimed to be possessed by all inferior creatures, it is equally plain, from facts adduced by Gall, Spurzheim and Combe, that Benevolence distinguishes several orders of lower animals. This view leaves the alternative of regarding those instances where animals present a developement of the powers not in conformity with the classification, as exceptions to a general rule, or as considering the lines of distinction as improperly drawn. As no arrangement like the above is proposed by Mr. Grimes, none of the above objections apply with force to his classification.

Since the authors of the classifications before us draw the same line, and give it the same direction between the intellectual faculties and the affective faculties, or propensities, the further question of relative merit resolves itself into the following inquiries.

1. Is the distinction between sentiments and propensities maintained by Spurzheim, founded in nature?

2. If it be not founded in nature, are all the powers of the Ipseal class according to Grimes, related to the individual; and are all the powers of the Social class related to society?

1. Combe says in his remarks upon what distinguish sentiments from propensities, that "Acquisitiveness is a mere impulse to acquire; but Veneration gives a tendency to worship, accompanied with a particular emotion." Acquisitiveness is made the representative of

all the animal propensities, and Veneration of the moral sentiments ; and the argument based upon them is applied to the two genera.

It is true that the evidence here to be adduced is in consciousness, and therefore may perhaps be thought difficult to present ; but as the laws of the mind are immutable, and as the germ of every mental power is possessed by every sound mind, it may be fairly presumed that testimony upon a point of such importance is not altogether shut out from view. Let there be taken Firmness from the moral sentiments, and Combativeness from the animal propensities. When the former is in action, the possessor feels an impulse to resist the influence of others, and to maintain any position he may have assumed—a tendency to fixedness—and this feeling or impulse is called an emotion. When the latter is aroused, the possessor feels an impulse to oppose whatever may be in his pathway. Now between the two, is there any difference beyond the particular *character* of the attribute ? Is there any thing amounting to a superaddition ? If there be not, this distinction of Spurzheim is without existence in nature.

2. Are all the powers of the Ipseal class, according to Grimes, related to the individual, and those of the Social class to society ? In other language, it may be asked, could each power of the Ipseal class be brought into legitimate exercise, though the whole species besides the individual were annihilated—and could any of the Social class be legitimately exercised without the being of society ?

A detailed reply to these interrogatories would involve an analysis of all the powers of the two classes, a task

whose execution it cannot be conceived could be brought within the limits of this report.

That these two generic functions are respectively characteristic of the two classes, it may be remarked, is not denied, since Carmichael and Besseires have admitted its truth among the lower powers of the two classes, though they were unable to perceive its extension through the whole. From a careful examination of the analyses, the ground of distinction between the two classes, and their limits seem to be well established. The subdivisions of the two classes appear among the obvious arrangements of nature. Of the Ipseals, the corporeal range has relation clearly to the demands of the physical system. So nearly allied in function are Combativeness and Destructiveness, that the language of their respective analyses almost seems to be applicable to a single power. No two, in many respects, appear so nearly related as Secretiveness and Cautiousness; and the propriety of associating Acquisitiveness and Constructiveness is obvious, for the hoarding of possessions demands a place of reception. The powers of the last range, according to Grimes' analyses, appear all related to the improvement and the perfection of the individual; they seem to point to higher and nobler spheres of action than any of the preceding ranges, and are therefore justly separated from the lower powers.

Of the Socials, all the powers of the establishing group have for one, the distinguishing generic character expressed in the name under which they are arranged. This remark is equally true of the governing and conforming groups.

While the division of the powers into three classes,

and their subdivision into ranges and groups, may be considered important and useful, the distinguishing feature, and that which to the committee constitutes the highest merit of the new classification, consists in this, that it traces the chain of functional relationship, from the lowest organ to the highest of each class.

If Mr. Grimes' classification is founded in nature, the following are some of the advantages which may be expected from its adoption.

1. It will facilitate the application of phrenological principles in deciding upon character from an examination of the head. Upon noticing the predominance of one class of organs, it may be said of the individual thus marked, he is Ipseal, Social, or Intellectual; or, upon observing two classes prevailing over the third, it may be said, he is Ipseal and Intellectual, or Social and Intellectual, or both Ipseal and Social. The same principle will be applicable in speaking of the developement of one group, or of two groups of the Socials, and also of the ranges of Ipseals and Intellectuals. The effects of a combined developement of particular groups in the different classes will be more readily understood.

2. It will aid analysis, in ascertaining the ultimate function of each organ. Upon knowing its position, and the relation it sustains to others—with what organ it would probably act, and whether in the centre of a class, or joined to organs of other classes, its manifestations will be more readily perceived, and more clearly comprehended.

3. It will aid in discovery, by directing the eyes of all phrenologists to limited regions of the brain, when in search for the seat of a faculty, in whose existence they



have been induced to believe. For example, if the seat of a supposed power related to corporeal wants be sought, the attention will be directed to developements and deficiencies in the corporeal range. If the function of the organ occupying the region marked upon the bust of Mr. Combe as unknown, be the object of discovery, several aids will be afforded. It must, in the first place, be either Ipseal or Social; and in the second place, it must be either a Social of the conforming group, or an Ipseal of the human range.

4. It will furnish phrenology with new claims to the character of an established science; and by its simplicity and consistency, will induce the student to pursue its investigation with the same kind of satisfaction that now attends his study of the older sciences.

In conclusion, the committee state, that distrusting their own abilities to discharge the duties assigned them, they entered into correspondence upon the question to be determined with several phrenological writers. They have also examined all the published works relating to the subject which they could command. And with these materials before them, after weighing the whole matter, the result is the opinion, that the classification of Mr. Grimes is a decided improvement, as it arranges the powers of the mind more nearly in accordance with the laws of natural relationship than any of the systems which have preceded it.

E. N. HORSFORD,

*Chairman of Committee on  
Grimes' Classification.*