

forbidding look and uncertain purpose. They are suitable as coverings, and protection for whatever creatures or chattels as may need roofs and side-walls; but they hardly indicate a special purpose, and least of all a religious purpose. And yet, perhaps, if we look a little closer, we shall discern some mark or token by which they may be known as places of worship—synagogues, *proskutaé* or meeting-houses. In the country, a grave-yard may give you the clue; and in the town some ornamental porch or stray carving, as though under protest, will tell you that this place has a speciality, and that speciality is worship.

So it is with churches as with clergymen. However unlike “the Man of God,” you will generally tell him by some peculiarity of the profession. This you may not always do. I have seen very shrewd observers deceived,—as once, in regard to a gay, smart minister who, in conversation, asked a chance acquaintance of travel what he would take him to be? The reply was—“I’d take ye for some Yankee spekiler!”

It is no wonder that we sometimes take churches for barns or stables, or other places of unclean resort; or, since we have churches in theatres, that the church should be mistaken for a theatre. We do not at present refer to the inside nor to the behaviour of the audience, nor to the style of teaching in the two places—fertile themes for one who has the courage to contrast them. We deal at present with structures, ecclesiastical structures, and these in one aspect only: not as the offspring of art, nor as complying with or violating its rules; but as indicating the sort of inhabitants, as the outer skull of the seething intelligence, that there praises, prays and preaches. We would deal, if it were possible, phrenologically with these meeting-houses, chapels, churches, cathedrals. And really we do think that there is oftentimes as much that is indicative about the house covering the worshipping inmates, as Spurzheim could find in the cranium of the intelligent, passionate, active soul, which for the time being used it for its purposes.

There are brains that are Gothic and gloomy; others are of Grecian mould, with a Doric massiveness or a Corinthian grace. This one is low, basilar, but wanting in the coronal sentiments: that one shoots upwards towards heaven as tall steeples. We have brains that are roomy and unfurnished, presenting cold quarters for wandering ideas; brains that are small but well filled. Here is a man who digs deep down for the foundation of knowledge, only satisfied when he gets to some rock—like DesCartes—determined to build on no less sure basis than “I doubt, or I think.” Another takes for his foundation some yielding sand such as legend, or myth—running up his wooden structure, painted, varnished, and good for half a century. Then again you can see the man of cultivated tastes in paintings and statues and music—while you find the practical useful person has his likeness in the low meeting-house with a tight roof, high back pew and sentry-box pulpit. So might we go on comparing the brains or minds of men to the various fashions of churches. Can we not also reverse the similitude and find that probably the Ecclesiastical structures have all more or less their elucidation and origin in the kind of mind that planned, or the feelings of those who were to be the worshippers in the buildings.

This side of the comparison is more difficult. Sometimes the architect who plans has a very different kind of mind from the people who are to worship in the church of his construction. The consequence will be that we shall be led astray in our estimate of the congregational brain. Besides, in the present day especially, there is a great deal of eclecticism in church architecture.