

No one will deny the existence of the random observations referred to. We instinctively attribute keenness of observation to deep-set eyes, musical talent to long-fingered hands, decision of character to a square-set jaw; we tell a gentlewoman by her voice, and a man of ability by the shape of his head and eyes; we can recognize an undertaker by his resolute air of settled gloom, a milkman by the angular, pump-like movement of his arm, an Oriental by his almond eyes, and a widow by her bonnet.

But seriously, we have only to think a minute to see how vast a field lies ready for the harvest. And as an instance of the beginning of a scientific treatment of the subject we may refer to the elaborate system of measurements and close observations carried on by criminal experts. The *criminal ear* is an acknowledged fact, and the *imbecile thumb* is said to be an infallible sign. But these too smack of empiricism, and we still lack the organizing principle. Can it be found?

Max Müller says: "An empirical acquaintance with facts rises to a scientific knowledge of facts as soon as the mind discovers beneath the multiplicity of single productions the unity of an organic system"; and that there is such an organic unity is amply evident. To illustrate by a metaphor, let us say the soul is the centre of a circle of which the body is the circumference. Rather, it is the centre of a series of concentric circles, the inner one representing say the internal organs, the second the external parts of the body, the third,—farther from the centre, and more likely to be merged into other circles, but still more or less true to the centre,—the acquired habits of speech, gait, voice, gesture,

dress and so on. Now the centre has no meaning except in relation to the circumferences, and on the other hand every part of each circle is determined by that centre. This is a little fanciful perhaps, but it illustrates the fact of the exceedingly intimate relation and inter-relation of mind and matter. And here we find the organic unity which is to be the basis of Psychosomatics.

It is quite evident that this vast science will subdivide into many branches. Indeed there have been various attempts to follow out these minor divisions,—palmistry, phrenology, cranioscopy, craniology, &c.,—all more or less failures because they take a partial view of the subject, and especially because they fall so readily into the hands of charlatans. It is not to be wondered at that Oliver Wendell Holmes gently sneers at phrenology as a "pseudo-science," or that Christopher North satirizes it in an elaborate treatise suggesting the use of metal caps to change the shape of heads and thereby modify the character of the individual to any desired type. Most scientists indeed laugh at it, but so able a one as Alfred Russell Wallace regards the neglect of phrenology as one of the mistakes of the "Wonderful Century," and in a very convincing manner shows the ground on which it stands, and the reason it has failed and fallen into disrepute. But we claim the real reason of its failure lies, not so much in the points he has brought forward, as in the fact that it has not been correlated with the other branches to form one grand science. The shape of the head is much, but we must also consider the eyes, the eyebrows, the nose, the mouth, the hands, the feet, the nails, the hair, and so on. A thousand