

answer some of the more prominent objections of those who are opposed to its claims; and in these respects the paper fulfilled its objects very satisfactorily. It commented on the labours of the modern school of craniologists, insisting on the futility of such inquiries when not conjoined with the study of cerebral functions, and expressing astonishment that such minute attention should be bestowed on the mere casket which enclosed the treasure, while that alone which could possibly give it value was so greatly neglected. The writer also availed himself of some testimonies to the reasonableness of the fundamental principles of phrenology given by eminent men, who, he contended, could have had no undue bias in favour of a doctrine which they refused to accept as a whole, and particularly instanced Hugh Miller, from whom he gave a very interesting quotation, and Dr. Whately, the late Archbishop of Dublin.

The chairman, in inviting discussion on the paper, expressed his entire dissent from the doctrines of phrenology, commenting on the impossibility of tracing in the brain any divisions equivalent to the phrenological organs, and the further impossibility of detecting the precise shape of the brain through its various coverings.

Mr. Wallace, on being called on by the chairman, stated his disappointment that the paper had scarcely touched the ethnological bearings of phrenology, the point of main interest to the Society. At the same time he declared his own conviction, based on careful thought and observation, that the main doctrines of phrenology were thoroughly sound, though he was by no means prepared to go the lengths of its special supporters.

Mr. Hodgson, in an address of great earnestness, reviewed the objections raised by the previous speakers, exhibiting a complete familiarity with the subject, and giving a very able and eloquent exposition and defence of its doctrines.

Mr. Dunn, on being appealed to by Dr. Donovan, also emphatically declared himself in favour of the science, on the basis of the pathological facts observed by himself and recorded by others, as well as upon those of developmental anatomy, both comparative and human, and quite irrespective of the numerous cranioscopical observations of Gall, Spurzheim, Combe, and Carus.

After some remarks by Dr. Wild, who gave a case illustrative of the practical value of phrenology, some controversy arose as to the further continuance of the discussion, the chairman deciding on its termination, as the Council had promised a short space of time to a paper by Professor Bell, on what he termed *Visible Speech*.