

THE PHRENOLOGICAL REVIEW.

Edited by BERNARD HOLLANDER, M.D.

This number contains an article on :

“PHRENOLOGY

and the

MEDICAL PROFESSION.”

By The Editor.

The responsibility for the facts and arguments embodied in the contributions published in this Journal dwells wholly with the respective authors.

PRICE THREEPENCE.

Published by Authority of
The Incorporated British Phrenological Society.

63 Chancery Lane, London, W.C.

P. P. 1258. 6.

THE Phrenological Review

VOL. I.

APRIL, 1905.

NO. I.

PREFACE.

To many men phrenology is merely a science of "bumps," not worthy of consideration. If this were true, no self-respecting person would undertake its defence. But most people know only as much of the subject as is conveyed by its name, and hence we are not surprised that many of them regard it as a "pseudo-science." To such this journal will prove a revelation. We have been studying these doctrines for twenty years and we can assure the reader that we are still learning.

Phrenology, as represented by its founder, is the science of the mental functions of the brain, and cerebral physiology being really a branch of medicine, we need offer no apology for undertaking the editorship of this Review. The popular character reading from the size and shape of the outer-covering, the skull, is merely one of its practical applications, and its accuracy depends on the amount of knowledge and experience of those who practice it.

This small Review has been established to explain the principles of phrenology, which are still little known and greatly misrepresented, and it is proposed—we need hardly say—to conduct it on strictly scientific principles.

We sincerely hope that all those interested in scientific phrenology and approving of our desire to raise it to a higher level will give us their hearty support so that our well-meant efforts may be crowned with success.

PHRENOLOGY AND THE MEDICAL PROFESSION.

BY THE EDITOR.

Being a qualified physician with a special training for the treatment of diseases of the brain and nerves, and having devoted many years to the investigation of phrenology, we ventured four years ago to publish a mass of evidence, experimental, clinical, and pathological, supporting Gall's doctrine, in a work entitled "The Mental Functions of the Brain." We held no delusions as to its being favourably received by the medical profession, knowing the hostility to phrenology, but when the book to our surprise was, with very few exceptions, reviewed in flattering terms by almost the entire leading lay press, we did believe that this recommendation would lead the editors of medical periodicals to give phrenology, especially when for the first time after nearly half-a-century presented in a scientific manner, unbiassed treatment. The support, too, which we had received from individual colleagues, some supplying us with reports of cases in confirmation of our theories, gave us additional hope.


Apparently just this boom of phrenology by the lay press appears to have caused annoyance to the conductors of medical periodicals, and one of the leading ones refused to accept a modest advertisement of our book, and another declined a review written by one of the foremost surgeons of the day, with whom we are personally acquainted. Next a coterie of physicians of a certain club, the committee of which had invited us to join, threatened to blackball us if we persevered with our candidature. Investigation revealed that there was no other accusation against us than that we had defended phrenology. There was still hope, for the most influential journals had not yet expressed an opinion, and might still do so. Would they ignore our book like the others had done, would they be fair and analyse its contents, would



they confirm or contradict our statements and results of investigation? This was the question?

They have done nothing of the kind. The leading journal of the profession would not condescend to disprove the facts placed before them but made the following statement:—"The attempt to revise the doctrines of phrenology is distinctly a retrograde step. Phrenology is unworthy to be countenanced by a scientific profession. We cannot but think it unfortunate that such doctrines should be promulgated by a member of the medical profession." What tyranny! Is a student of science to be debarred from publishing his researches, merely because he happens to be a physician, and his profession has a rooted prejudice against the subject on which he writes? This verdict, unsupported by a single fact which would justify such a conclusion, had its immediate effect. Fearful of being held up as believers in phrenology in the face of an antagonistic profession, those gentlemen, chiefly Superintendents of Asylums, who, without our asking, had furnished us with the report of cases in support of phrenological localisations, verified by post-mortem examinations, straightway swallowed their convictions and wrote to us, forbidding us to make any use of the documents with which they had previously supplied us. Although as phrenologists, some men would class us with criminals, we respected their request, not having any desire to subject our colleagues to the severity of the Editor, of whose censure they stood in such fear, and not wishing to damage their worldly prospects, though in the interests of truth and science we wish they had had the courage of their convictions.

It is to be regretted that the noble profession, which is alike distinguished for its humanity, its ability, its love of science, its love of truth, its large and comprehensive philosophy, is not yet willing to give to the "hateful" doctrine of phrenology, even when supported by new and adequate experimental, clinical and pathological evidence, presented in a strictly scientific manner, the benefit of a fair and dispassionate enquiry.



Here is another extract from the same journal :—" Sexual passion is relegated to the cerebellum, chiefly, it appears, on the ground that the philosopher Kant, in whom the organ was very slightly developed, was by way of being a misogynist."

The chapter on the cerebellum occupies thirty pages, closely printed, giving a whole series of experiments performed by twelve different investigators, in addition to our own observations, and seventy cases of injury and disease of this organ, all proving the functions attributed to it by Gall. Yet the Editor selects the incidental mentioning of the case of Kant, and is so unjust as to state that this is our chief proof in support of this localisation.

On one page of this journal we are found fault with for having adduced no fresh evidence other than *second-hand* clinical cases ; on another page we are charged with having quoted *our own* cases, which conduct is declared to be " a lapse of good taste for a medical man."

If it be unprofessional to quote one's own cases, then no fault can be found with second-hand ones. This only shows that in the desire to avoid genuine criticism of the facts presented in the book, the writer was at a loss where to find fault. When objecting to the quotation of one's own cases, does anyone really think that the object of the person who advocates phrenology can be pecuniary gain or worldly reputation? Loss is nearly certain ; contempt, ridicule, violent abuse, and serious injury are all inevitable.

The book is full of details of experiments performed on animals in support of the phrenological theory, yet this journal labels us as anti-vivisectionists, and states that " The author in several places makes virulent attacks on vivisection, which naturally affords no support to the fanciful theories put forward by him."

Another journal says :—" Suffice it to say that he (the author) completely ignores the important fact of the disparity between the volume of the brain and the capacity of the skull containing it ; the brain has been shown to be as much

as from 7 per cent. to 16 per cent., on occasion even 33 per cent., less in volume than the cranial cavity in capacity."

What a love of truth this passage shows! Firstly, we are charged with completely ignoring the relations between skull and brain, when a special chapter (No. VIII.) is devoted to this consideration. And what an outrage on common sense to declare that the brain may occasionally only fill two-thirds of the cranial cavity. The reviewer does not tell us what fills the remaining third. Since nature abhors a vacuum, there must be either air or fluid. If the reviewer thinks he possesses such, he is an exception, for in all normal individuals "the skull is moulded on the brain, and grows in accordance with it" (Sir George Humphry, late Professor of Anatomy in the University of Cambridge). Curiously, in the very same number in which phrenology is "disposed of," two anatomists, Prof. Symington, of Belfast, and Prof. Cunningham, of Edinburgh, state that the size and shape of the skull is an index to the size and shape of the brain, and quote this fact in support of phrenology. So much for the knowledge of some of our reviewers. One of these says:—"It is quite true that in forming an estimate as to character, the trained observer will not disregard the size and shape of the head." If this be so, then it is only when phrenology is in question that the brain does not fill the cranial cavity; on all other occasions it does.

Another leading journal of medical science speaks of "several" clinical cases quoted in our work on "The Mental Functions of the Brain." The "several" cases amount to over 800!

Another reviewer, renowned for the position he holds in the profession, declared it unnecessary to give particulars of our book, because in his opinion "phrenology is dead beyond any possibility of revival," having been killed by the "Edinburgh Review" in 1820. He does not state, however, that Lord Jeffrey, the writer of that article, disposed of phrenology in the virulent language to which he was accustomed on the ground that "there is no relation between mind and brain."

Many other examples of a still more personal nature could be quoted, but we refrain. Just because we appreciate the greatness of character of the individual man whose life is devoted to medical science, we think it is very much to be regretted that the leading journals should lend themselves to such methods of suppressing a scientific work on a subject against which they are prejudiced. It does not seem to us a particularly "moral" proceeding of those in authority who exact such a high standard of ethics from the individual members of the profession, to shut the doors to investigation, to prevent the author from being heard or read by the profession, to denounce his work in such vague terms, and to misrepresent it in such manner that no reply is possible. These are tactics which delay the recognition of truth, if they do not prevent it, and they show a want of toleration which, exhibited in any other calling would be instantly condemned.

Englishmen love their freedom, but I fear there is no nation on whom the fetters of convention weigh so heavily as on the British, and no profession which has restricted individual liberty to such an extent as the medical. England has always been renowned for the free expression of opinion. What right has any medical journal to interfere with that freedom of thought?

Because one happens to be a member of a Royal College, is this to debar one from writing on a subject not recognised by the profession? Even the severest critic cannot assert that we ever wrote for the vulgar or in an unscientific spirit. Even if the subject, which we choose to take up, were at present relegated almost entirely to quacks, surely we are entitled to lift it from the mire to which popular neglect and prejudice has driven it.

Moreover, we would remind our critics that phrenology is not a purely medical subject. Its philosophy, as advanced by George Combe, has stirred the public sixty or seventy years ago, and is of interest and very great importance to other men of culture besides medical men, who have ignorantly misrepresented it as if it were no more than a science of

“bumps.” Are educated phrenologists to be debarred from contributing their share to the problems of education, criminology, sociology, and to other questions which affect the welfare of mankind, simply because they happen to be members of the medical profession?

Vivisection and microscopical work are not the only “scientific” methods and the result they produced after a century of hostility to the phrenological method are not so encouraging to enable us to despise the latter. Considering the absence of positive knowledge as regards the mental functions of the cortex, the growth of the brain, the significance of its size and weight, investigators can little afford to sneer at an honest attempt of elucidation of these problems, such as scientific writers on phrenology have made from time to time. Medical science does not know so much about mental disease that it can afford to pass over the vast amount of material in support of the localisation theory found in phrenological literature.

As a consequence of this foolish opposition to phrenology, physiologists still disagree even as regards such a fundamental localisation as that of the intellect. There are some investigators who hold that the intellectual functions are related to the whole brain; some who agree with us that the frontal lobes are concerned with them; some again who hold that only the posterior lobes, at the back of the head, have to do with these functions; and the latest are those who declare that the parietal lobes, at the sides of the head, are concerned with intellect. If a journalist were to enquire of the leading physicians particulars of the functions of the brain, he might thus get some highly contradictory evidence.

Not even as to the growth and development of the brain are medical men agreed. A leading author on feeble-minded children states that the brain stops growing at twelve years of age, one puts it as low as seven, another as high as thirty and forty. Quite recently a well-known professor of mathematics has enlightened the profession at the Royal Society, and Royal Institution, that “generally at about seventeen years of age,

there is a noticeable shrinkage within and without the skull, which continues during the remainder of life, so that size and weight of brain-material forms no criterion for the judgment of human intelligence." Why does no medical reviewer contradict this statement? He would quickly dispose of this absurdity had the statement emanated from a phrenologist. Can it be possible that it is this shrinkage which causes the narrow-mindedness of our critics?

With such diversity of opinion prevailing as to the functions of the brain, and this hostility to receive new facts, is it a wonder that so little progress is made in the treatment of the insane and feeble-minded? The unfit are ever increasing, and Royal Commissions are appointed to investigate the causes of this increase. But what is the good of all these inquiries so long as there are authorities who declare that the brain may be injured or diseased without any mental change taking place, as stated in one of the latest editions of a recognised textbook on physiology.

These statements lead us to the real reason why certain members of learned societies do their utmost to prevent phrenological writers getting a hearing. A discussion of the subject would show the public that they have been misled, that the persons who throw stones live in glass houses and are afraid of having the missiles returned to them. Already another nation is being enlightened, and there are some German textbooks doing justice to Gall's doctrine. Is history going to repeat itself? Elliotson and Braid were persecuted for their advocacy of hypnotism as a therapeutic agent; forty years later a German Professor, Dr. Preyer, of Jena, the great authority on "Braidism," was invited to come over to explain to an English medical audience what Mr. Braid, their distinguished countryman, whom the Germans had learned to honour, had achieved.

Had the hostility of the profession been at least straightforward, phrenology might not have fallen so low, but the misrepresentations and abuse were, and are still, such that it can be no wonder that even those convinced of its truth

should shrink from an open avowal, and the public, placing their faith in great names, thinking their judgment to be infallible, do not support phrenological societies as they should. Even funds left for the propagation of phrenology, such as the money left by one of the founders, George Combe, are actually used by the trustees for the payment of lecturers who openly speak against the doctrine to which he had devoted his life. There are other funds, but those who administer them are similarly discouraged by the present state of phrenology and the small number of its adherents.

Intellectual indolence and apathy induced the great mass of mankind to content itself with assuming the falsehood of phrenology, from its very beginning, and now this disbelief has almost become hereditary, although, as we have shown, many of the discoveries of Gall have been re-discovered within recent years, and an extraordinary amount of new evidence has been produced in its favour. We have never yet met a disbeliever in phrenology who showed the least acquaintance with the science and the endless and diversified facts upon which it is founded. The absurdity of the objections to which one is compelled to listen, is not less wearisome than the ignorance of the facts amassed by Gall is disgusting. The opponents raise objections which have long been refuted. Any statement, however absurd, is good enough to refute phrenology.

If opponents ignored Gall's phrenology alone we could still believe in their honesty, but when they also refuse to take notice of his numerous anatomical discoveries, about which there can be no controversy, and one of which should have sufficed to bring Gall fame, we can but hold them to be prejudiced.

Medical writers can be sharp-sighted enough in detecting narrowness of spirit in any other quarter; they can be advocates for freedom of conscience in theology, for the amelioration of our criminal code in matters of jurisprudence; they can be liberal, tolerant, and haters of abuse; but the moment that phrenology is proposed as an auxiliary to our

knowledge of the brain, that instant they are as sensitive, as angry, as staunch adherents of what is old, as stout opponents of what is new, as though the charter and privileges of their order were being jeopardised for ever. Doubtless in all new doctrines of a strange and novel character, the public do expect from the medical profession the most cautious, slow, and deliberate frame of mind; they expect from them the most searching, scrutinising, hesitating conduct. Nay, they would not even be displeased to see an enquiry carried on in a sceptical, unbelieving spirit. But still they do expect enquiry of some kind. They do not expect to see a subject of this important nature treated with contempt and ridicule, and its supporters stigmatised as unworthy of professional confidence, without a fair hearing, and they do not expect to see the heads of a profession which prides itself pre-eminently on its liberality, exhibiting the bigotry of the middle ages.

Let the wits exhaust their raillery at our expense; let the prejudiced shake their heads and sneer; let the timid and cautious hold back; let the dishonest and vulgar abuse and libel us. No amount of persecution will shake our conviction, which has become all the more firmly established by the conduct of those whose duty it should have been to confirm or contradict the evidence submitted to them, and by our opponents not being able to give one counter-fact. We cannot renounce what we firmly believe to be true, and we feel sure that truth will prevail in the end, notwithstanding all attempts of suppression.

The chief article in the next number will be by Dr. C. W. WITHINSHAW on "Phrenology corroborated by recent Medicine and Surgery."

EDITORIAL NOTES AND REVIEWS.

SKULL AND BRAIN.

One of the oldest and most constantly repeated objections to the old phrenology, not merely by laymen, but by doctors, who ought to know better, is that there is no correspondence between brain and skull. Let any person ask his local practitioner whether he believes in phrenology, and he may be sure to receive the reply that it has no foundation, for the size and shape of the brain cannot be determined by the size and shape of the living head. Anatomists have asserted the contrary for a long time, but this purely scientific discussion is evidently ignored by the dispenser of physic as of no practical value. Let us, therefore, quote two recent utterances by men who are held in esteem by the whole profession :—

Professor Cunningham, Professor of Anatomy in the University of Edinburgh, at the British Association Meeting in 1901 (see *British Medical Journal*, 20th September, 1901, p. 818) said :—"The cranium is the outward expression of the contained brain, and the brain is the most characteristic organ of man ; cranial peculiarities therefore must always, and should always, claim a leading place in the mind of the anthropologist."

Prof. Symington, Professor of Anatomy in the University of Belfast, at the British Association Meeting in 1903 (see *British Medical Journal*, September 19th, 1903, p. 683) said :—"It is brain-growth that determines the form of the cranium, and not the skull that moulds the brain into shape. There can be no doubt but that within certain limits the external form of the cranium serves as a reliable guide to the shape of the brain."

Really our opponents should invent new objections. These hackneyed refutations rebound only on their own heads, and show both ignorance and narrow-mindedness.

OLD VERSUS NEW PHRENOLOGY.

The *British Medical Journal*, March 19th, 1904, in a review of Dr. Alfred Russel Wallace's book, "The Wonderful Century," says :—"We cannot believe that the present epoch will be spoken of hereafter as of 'almost incredible narrowness and prejudice' because it taboos the old phrenology. Have we not the new phrenology of Ferrier and Hitzig, of Horsley and Schäfer, and is it not far better?"

Does the writer of this passage really think the old and the new phrenology can be compared? The former localises the elementary capacities and dispositions of the "mind," the latter localises centres for movement and sensation. The old phrenology has to do with the psychical activities of Man, and is, therefore, a system of physiological psychology, of importance in the treatment of insanity, feeble-mindedness and crime, and useful in the education of the young.

The new phrenology has to do with movements of muscles and sensory impressions, and throws but little, if any, light on psychical problems.

Moreover, if we look at Ferrier's map of brain-localisations which was undertaken at the instigation of Sir James Crichton-Browne, at that time an ardent phrenologist, we find that it covers nearly the whole cortex, and confirms several localisations of the old phrenological school. Beever and Horsley, who followed Ferrier, changed this map and restricted the excitable area to the Rolandic convolutions. Sherrington and Grünbaum quite recently made a still further change, and showed that only the convolution in front of the fissure of Rolando responds to galvanic stimulation. So much for the stability and usefulness of the new phrenology, which it would seem has received exaggerated importance, because to those unacquainted with Gall's work it appeared to contradict the old localisations.

REPORT OF MEETINGS.

THE GROWTH OF INTELLECT.

Messrs. James Webb and C. P. Stanley, both school-teachers, lectured on "The Growth of Intellect" at the January Meeting of the Incorporated Phrenological Society.

Mr. Webb said we should never understand this subject without a knowledge of the mental functions of the brain. English teachers had to undergo a special course of study in psychology which was of no value to them in the school-room. They did not know the order of development of mental powers; and had a notion that all children developed alike, which was wrong.

Mr. Stanley cited examples of particular children, explaining the causes of the differences between them, and illustrating his remarks with photographs, diagrams, and specimens of their efforts at different periods. He showed why a child may appear to be very dull at one period of school life and bright at another; why clever in some subjects and dull in others; and stated that with earnest study any intelligent teacher could achieve the same results as he had, even to understand at first glance any child's special gifts or peculiarities.

Having, he said, received such inestimable aid from his studies and experiments in this direction, he deplored the pitiable state of things to-day, when the training of any number between sixty to a hundred children was expected from teachers who have no such guidance. Mr. Stanley made it abundantly clear from his illustrations that a knowledge of the laws which govern the growth of intellect is entirely dependent on a previous acquaintance with the primary mental faculties and the ability to estimate their respective activities.

The audience showed intense interest both with Mr. Webb's opening paper and the instructive lesson of Mr. Stanley. A hearty vote of thanks was accorded to the lecturers.

"TEMPER."

At the February meeting Mr. William Cox spoke on the subject of "temper." The popular notion, he said, was that "tempers" were either "good" or "bad," but this classification was too arbitrary for the phrenological student. In most of the so-called bad tempers the combination of elements was not bad at all, and it would be found that by judicious and wise direction such tempers, especially in the case of children, could be made to serve useful and practical purposes in life, transformed, indeed, into good tempers; whilst with regard to the so-called good tempers, they might often be better described as "goody-goody" tempers, or no good at all in the work-a-day world. For the most part persons like that were without push, without energy, without aggressiveness, mere creatures of circumstances, having, it is true, never done anything very bad, nor on the other hand ever accomplished anything really great, noble, or lasting.

Temper, the lecturer said, is the particular combination in any individual of those elements of his mental make-up, known as the feelings, plus his bodily conditions as described in the word temperament, the intellectual faculties coming in as the regulating, directing, guiding power. Phrenology was the only science to give an adequate explanation of temper, for it showed the elementary faculties that made up the mental constitution. By means of phrenology it was possible to estimate or gauge a person's temper at sight without the necessity of provoking him to display it. There was nothing mysterious, nothing occult in this. Phrenology is a practical science, true to nature, based on facts and confirmed by experimental tests; it fitted in beautifully with other branches of natural science, and explained many of the enigmas of human and animal nature, not least of which was the extraordinary puzzle why one person should behave so differently to another under precisely similar provoking conditions, in other words, that tempers should be so strangely diverse.

Mr. Cox explained how to cure temper, and described the

mental and bodily indications of its many varieties. In conclusion he said the object each should have in view ought to be to gain control over the animal propensities; they were good servants, but bad masters.

An interesting discussion followed.

EXTRACT FROM THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE
BRITISH PHRENOLOGICAL SOCIETY
(INCORPORATED).

1st April, 1904 to 31st March, 1905.

During the past year fifty meetings, general, social, and scientific, have been held in connection with the work of the Society under the able presidency of Dr. C. W. Withinshaw. The following are some of the subjects dealt with: "The brain as organ of mind," "Heads and what they tell us," "Dissection of a human brain," "The study of character," "The growth of intellect," "Cleverness and size of head," etc.

For practical delineation many "subjects" of great interest were introduced by members and their friends both at private and public meetings.

The Annual Congress on November the 9th, was held at Essex Hall, and was attended by most of the provincial members.

A scheme for the establishment of an institute has been drawn up. Meanwhile, classes are being held for those desiring instruction in the theory and practice of Phrenology, by Mr. George Hart-Cox, and one on Brain Dissection will follow, by Dr. Withinshaw, as soon as the required number of students have entered their names.

The special thanks of the Society are due to Mr. Dennis E. Samuel, who has assisted the Society for many years and contributed most generously towards the Society's expenses.

At the annual meeting in March, 1905, Mr. J. M. Severn was elected president for the current year.

THE JOURNAL FUND.

Mr. Edgar Gardner, the Hon. Treasurer of the Journal Fund, on behalf of the Society, has much pleasure in acknowledging the following donations :—

£ s. d.			£ s. d.		
Edmund Durham, Esq.	...	1 1 0	Mrs. S. Philp	...	0 10 0
G. H. J. Dutton, Esq.	...	1 1 0	Miss E. J. Poulton	...	0 10 0
G. Blunden, Esq.	...	1 0 0	A. J. Smith, Esq. (collected)	...	0 10 0
Duncan Campbell, Esq.	...	1 0 0	Miss E. S. Cooper	...	0 5 0
James W. Sharpe, Esq.	...	1 0 0	H. C. Donovan, Esq.	...	0 5 0
H. F. Atkins, Esq.	...	0 10 6	Miss E. Ling	...	0 5 0
Mrs. Hollinrake	...	0 10 6	Miss A. Ley	...	0 5 0
E. Gardner, Esq.	...	0 10 0	Miss Pasquay	...	0 5 0
Miss E. Higgs	...	0 10 0	Mrs. A. L. Phillips	...	0 3 0
G. F. Horsley, Esq.	...	0 10 0	Miss Wright	...	0 2 0
J. Keith Murray, Esq.	...	0 10 0			
W. W. Padfield, Esq.	...	0 10 0			
					<u>£11 13 0</u>

The following are guarantors :—

£ s. d.			£ s. d.		
W. Jolly, Esq.	...	2 0 0	C. H. Proctor, Esq...	...	0 10 0
Richard Hall, Esq...	...	1 1 0	S. Sarna, Esq.	...	0 10 0
Duncan Campbell, Esq.	...	1 0 0	F. R. Warren, Esq.	...	0 10 0
G. Hart-Cox, Esq....	...	0 10 0	James Webb, Esq.	0 10 0
Dr. Bernard Hollander	...	0 10 0	E. S. Cooper, Esq....	...	0 5 0
G. F. Horsley, Esq.	...	0 10 0			
C. Morgan, Esq.	...	0 10 0			
					<u>£8 6 0</u>

We sincerely hope that those who approve of our endeavours, to gain for the long-neglected and misrepresented science of Phrenology proper recognition, will show their sympathy in a practical manner by contributing to the Funds of the Society and towards the expenses of this Journal.

Remittances and orders for the *The Phrenological Review* should be sent to the Hon. Treasurer of the Journal Fund Edgar Gardner, Esq., 78, Edith Grove, Fulham Road, London S.W.

Communications referring to the literary contents of *The Phrenological Review* should be addressed to the Editor, Dr. BERNARD HOLLANDER, 62, Queen Anne Street, Cavendish Square, London, W.

