

son of the various kinds of birds, etc., a *generalization* and *classification* into orders and species, and *reasoning* as to the harmony of structure with the instincts. The teacher's aim is to give no information, but by furnishing the material and leading the pupils by questions to enable them to draw their own conclusions and compare things for themselves.

These last lessons complete the series which have for their object the development of mind. Of course some knowledge is given all along, but the main object is not the acquisition of *knowledge* but *power*, which will enable the children to think and act for themselves—to become capable of educating themselves. But some may ask, "Where is the harmony between the two systems of philosophy?" It will be seen that each and every faculty of the intellect as located by Phrenology receives its share of attention, and while several faculties are always developed at once, there are especial lessons and drills for each. Not a single intellectual faculty that receives a location on the "symbolical head" is omitted or fails to receive these special lessons. The fact that many of the faculties are developed at once only adds to the harmony. Mental Philosophy as taught in the schools does not admit the possibility of mind acting in two or more directions at once. Pestalozzianism admits that the mind can recognize the form, size, color, etc., of an object at once. As the eye, ear, and muscles can all be exercised at once, so can the various faculties of mind. As to their philosophy in regard to mind as given at the beginning of this article, none will deny but that it agrees with Phrenology perfectly.

The Pestalozzian system has not reached perfection yet. The appliances are crude in many particulars; but can phrenologists boast of one more complete? Have not the latter too long ignored the former? There is harmony nearly all through, so why should they be longer separated? Is it not time that the two were united in one? I am sure Phrenology will not be the loser.

The Pestalozzians have been at work

upon a system almost identical in many respects, and have placed this system in nearly all the schools of Europe, and in less than ten years will have their principles established in all the schools of America. Phrenologists have worked with individuals; Pestalozzians with the masses. There is this fault with the latter; their works are so written that few can see any harmony between their system and that of any other system of mental philosophy. In their lessons is jumbled together a mass of unclassified truth. Some pay particular attention to one set of faculties and others to another. The Kindergarten differs from the primary lessons in schools proper; but among all we find a complete system that agrees with Phrenology. Is it not time for phrenologists to enter the school-room? Let some phrenologist gather from the works of the followers of Gall, Pestalozzi, and Froëbel, all that is in harmony. Then classify this, and put it in a definite shape, and give to the teachers of the United States a system of object lessons founded on a definite system of mental philosophy. Then let an effort be made by all believers in Phrenology to place this work in the hands of teachers. Let us become missionaries of a higher gospel of learning, and not sit with hands folded while others are gathering the harvest.

LOREN E. CHURCHILL.

### ROSES—A SONNET.

BRIGHT blooms, soft garnitured in velvet sheen,  
 Ye glad the senses with supernal grace,  
 Warm as the smile that dimples Beauty's face!  
 Gleaming from out your robes of shimmering  
 green,  
 Adown what gorgeous heights, the stars between  
 Shall we your Archetypal semblance trace!  
 Oh! if so fair in our terrestrial place,  
 Paining the heart to learn what ye enscreen,  
 How grandly fair! how gloriously bright  
 Must be the Real which ye shadow forth!  
 Eye hath not seen, nor human heart conceived  
 The fullness of that Beauty, shrined in light,  
 The slanting rays of which, adown our earth,  
 Gleam golden-hued through broken shadows  
 weaved.

ELIZABETH OAKES SMITH.