

In. 1. Closed. P.P. 1258.0.

THE PHRENOLOGICAL REVIEW.

The Journal of the Incorporated British Phrenological Society.

Edited by BERNARD HOLLANDER, M.D.

Contents:

"PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS,"

By James Webb.

"PHRENOLOGY APPLIED TO
EDUCATION,"

By William Cox.

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.

What is Phrenology?

Phrenology is a system of, physiological psychology, localising the various primary mental powers in definite regions of the brain, and is based on experimental, clinical and pathological evidence, besides that of practical observation.

Thus the intellectual and moral powers, the highest attributes of man, are located in the frontal lobes, *i.e.*, that part of the brain, the size of which distinguishes man from animals; and the remaining lobes contain the centres for those fundamental feelings and emotions which form the character of the individual.

The size of the entire brain, therefore, is an indication of mental power, but whether that power is intellectual or lies in strength of feeling depends on the region which is most highly developed.

The size and shape of the brain can be estimated by the size and shape of the skull, a truth demonstrated repeatedly by the leading anatomists of the day.

Its ready method of diagnosing individual capacities and character renders Phrenology, not only the most practical system of psychology, but also an invaluable aid to the successful education of the young, to the treatment of crime, and the proper understanding of insanity.

B. H.

THE Phrenological Review.

VOL. II.

JULY, 1906.

No. 2.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS TO THE BRITISH PHRENOLOGICAL SOCIETY INCORPORATED,

On April 19th, 1906.

By JAMES WEBB, Headmaster, Capworth Street School, Leyton.

The British Phrenological Society is a bond of union between all students of mental science in their common object to discover the truth concerning the faculties of the mind and their physical organs. Hence our meetings afford opportunities for mutual encouragement and instruction.

Having joined ourselves together in this fraternal manner, confirmed each others' experiences and observations in regard to the relationship of mind and brain, and having arrived at a rooted conviction that it is our duty to teach their great science to the public so as to obtain for it the recognition that it deserves, we anticipate the day when it will manifest its usefulness in the intellectual and moral improvement, and the sanity of our race.

Hence our anxiety for the growth and good name of the Society. We require a far larger membership and a far larger income. We have a world-wide field to cultivate. We are sowing the seed in hope, however long it may be before the ripening of the harvest.

We have already some cause for congratulation—the number and *personnel* of our membership are improving. An increase of 31 members during the past year is no small gain.

What has the Society already done to accomplish its object? We have published considerable literature on the subject of Phrenology, we have founded a library, and have held classes for scientific study of the skull and brain, and the psychological part of Phrenology, under the tutelage of Dr. Withinshaw and Mr. G. Hart-Cox. Dr. Withinshaw's dissections are invaluable.

I cannot omit to state that our literature has been enriched by valuable works on Phrenology by several of our members, Messrs. O'Dell, Donovan, and others, including Dr. Hollander's masterpiece, "The Mental Functions of the Brain." The "Popular Phrenologist" has also done good service to Phrenology.

Moreover, we have succeeded in nearly, if not completely, annihilating adverse criticisms in the public press, and we are not without evidence that many intelligent readers have been won over to our principles by the discussions they have taken part in.

Lastly, I am proud to remind you that the Society has received the imprimatur of the Government as a legalised Scientific Society, with power to grant certificates of proficiency in Phrenology, the first and only Society in the Empire so qualified.

I have spoken of the prejudice and error that we are fighting against. Custom and erroneous instruction, the result of the unenlightened and unnatural philosophy of the schools, are responsible for this prejudice and this error.

Mr. Webb proceeded to show the curious notions anti-phrenologists have of the science.

Thus, S. V. Clavanger, M.D., in his "Comparative Physiology and Psychology, Chicago, 1885," says:

"With Phrenology which locates bibativeness in the mastoid process of the temporal bone, and amativeness in the occipital ridge, the convolucional controversy must die out."



What are the facts? No phrenologist ever located bibativeness or any other organ in the mastoid process, nor in the occipital ridge, nor in any bony process or prominence whatever. The organ of alimentiveness is found in the extreme anterior area of the temporal lobe of the brain; that is two inches anterior to the ear, whereas the mastoid process is behind the ear. The instinct of amativeness is in the cerebellum; that is *below* the occipital ridge. No phrenologist ever stated otherwise.

Again, Dr. Bastian asserts :

“ If we take the organ of ‘philoprogenitiveness,’ for instance, whose assigned situation is at the back of the head, as may be seen in any phrenological bust, we find, that it corresponds with a bony prominence, which varies greatly in thickness in different individuals, whilst internally it corresponds to the point of union of four great venous sinuses.”

No phrenologist ever taught such nonsense. Dr. Gall and all his disciples have always taught that this organ constitutes the inferior portion of the occipital lobe of the brain, *i.e.*, that it is in third occipital convolution. It “corresponds” with neither the “bony prominence” nor with the “point of union” of four great venous sinuses. That bony prominence and that “point of union” are *between* the occipital lobe and the cerebellum.

Again, Dr. Albert Wilson, last year in his lecture at Leyton, said :

“ But is the skull a close-fitting cap to the brain? This is a question the phrenologist has to face, having assumed the affirmative. We know that the brain floats in a watery fluid inside a tough membranous case.”

After it had been pointed out in the *Leyton District Times* that the brain and all its parts in relation to the skull are fixed, held in position by the tentorium, falx and other parts of the dura mater, its bloodvessels, etc., he tried to escape from one error by committing another. He replied :

“Fluid has an awkward habit of falling to the bottom, and so there is more fluid at the base of the brain. . . . This is as near floating as we can get in a confined cavity.”

He quite overlooked the fact that brain is heavier than water or any serous fluid of the body, so that if one of them must float it will be the fluid, and not the brain. The heavier body has “an awkward habit of falling to the bottom” and *not* to the top.

If medical men who have tried to refute the teachings of Dr. Gall had read his valuable works, they would have escaped the flagrant errors that abound in their statements about the brain. For example, many years after the death of that great physiologist and anatomist, Dr. Munro wrote :

“As the brain of the adult is enclosed in an unyielding bony case, the enlargement of any one part must occasion general pressure as a whole, unless a quantity of sound brain equal in bulk to the diseased be removed by absorption or a part of the skull elevated above the general level.”

Dr. Munro forgot, or had never learned, that the skull is neither a yielding nor an unyielding substance so far as brain growth is concerned. He never knew that they are reciprocally *conrescent*. The adjustment of skull and brain is a matter of growth.

Fifty years ago it was fashionable amongst physiologists to believe in the teachings of Flourens, that the brain has no specialised areas devoted to separate functions, and that all the brain takes part in every mental operation. Dr. Flourens had settled the convolutional doctrine of the brain, as Dr. Clavanger has settled it recently, for ever ! It will not be without interest if I quote Sir Wm. Turner's view of that question. Speaking before the Anthropological Section of the British Association at Toronto in 1897, he said :

“It has been experimentally demonstrated that the cortex of the cerebrum is not as M. Flourens conceived of the same physiological value throughout, but that particular functions are localised in definite areas and convolutions.”

Without opposing the phrenological doctrine, he is careful not to commit himself to its full acceptance, for he continues :

“ In speaking of localisation of function in the cerebrum, one must not be understood as adopting the theory of Gall, that each has its seat in a particular region of the cortex, and that the locus of this region was marked on the surface of the skull and head by a more or less prominent bump.”

Whether Sir Wm. Turner believes or refuses to believe that the mental faculties are definite in their number, few people will trouble. For all that, I assert, with all the phrenologists, that every man, woman and child has a definite number of faculties. To assert otherwise would be to believe in chaos. And I also assert that neither Sir Wm. Turner nor any other physiologist or psychologist can prove the contrary.

However, we agree with him that an organ is not marked on the outside of the skull by a “ bump.” The phrenologist knows nothing of bumps, and never professed to do. Still, we note that he has deserted the ranks of those who believe with Flourens “ that the cortex of the brain is of the same physiological value throughout ” and has joined the ranks of those who have accepted the teachings of Gall, that “ particular functions are localised in definite areas and convolutions.”

What seas of ridicule the phrenologist has had to brave whilst teaching this uniquely fundamental phrenological doctrine ! Yet it is sad to find that instead of attributing its discovery to our great master, Dr. Gall, he ascribes it to the experiments in recent years on the mutilated and anæsthisised brains of dogs and monkeys !

One by one the discoveries of Dr. Gall are appropriated by modern scientists as though they were of recent date, as so graphically described by Dr. John Forbes, F.R.S., in the *British and Foreign Medical Review* some time ago. Hear him :

"We are acquainted with medical and educational works which have gained no small repute from the copious but unacknowledged use they have made of the doctrines of Phrenology, and the reputation of which depends chiefly on their borrowed views. We have, sometimes, indeed, been tempted to smile at the ready acceptance which strictly phrenological ideas have met with when thus stolen and offered at second-hand, only a little altered in dress to prevent their paternity being traced. But much as we rejoice in the diffusion of useful truth, we cannot refrain from condemning this plan of acquiring a temporary popularity at the expense of science, and we are glad that the risk of detection will soon become so great as to deter most men from such unscrupulous conduct. It may seem at first sight a light matter to put forth a truth in disguise, but in reality its forced separation from the principles which alone render its application safe and advantageous, deprives it of much of its practical value, and it is for this reason, as well as for its dishonesty, that we object to the practice. . . . Phrenology embodies many facts and views of great general interest, and direct practical utility to the physician, the philosopher and the philanthropist, and that as such it has established a claim to a more careful, serious and impartial examination on the part of the profession than it has ever yet received."

Such are the words of one of the most respected physicians of the nineteenth century.

Dr. Williams, in *Harper's Monthly* for September, 1899, admitted the value of the doctrines, "that the brain is the organ of the mind," "the idea of specialization of cerebral functions," and the "juster appreciation of the condition of the insane" on that account; at the same time informing his readers that they had been rescued from "the Phrenological rubbish heap." Such plagiarism has been so recurrent that Dr. Nivelet, sixteen years ago complained in his excellent work then published ("Gall et

sa Doctrine") that Littrè and Robin, while admitting and confirming several of Gall's discoveries on the anatomy of the brain, in their "Dictionnaire de Medicine," they did not scruple to make use of his discoveries in other parts of their work without mentioning him, *i.e.*, without acknowledgment.

Dr. Williams, who did not fail to utilise in his articles what he discovered in "the Phrenological rubbish heap," also admitted "that given the condition of the mind, the condition of the brain ought to be capable of detection," and that a "juster appreciation of the condition of the insane was largely influenced by the novel ideas of Dr. Gall whose studies were allied to those of the alienists, and who, even more actively than they, focalized his attention upon the brain and its functions."

And what has been the practical result of Gall's discoveries in regard to mental aberration as a result of the condition of the brain? Very little. Why? Because physiologists and alienists have neglected the study of the brains of men and their specialized areas as taught by Gall. Their attention has been diverted to the motrocities of the brain areas of dogs, monkeys and other dumb animals.

Mr. Webb then referred to the increase in the number of the insane, and proceeded:—Every case of insanity has its cause in an unhealthy excitement of some particular part of the brain whose function is concerned with such excitement. He declared that a knowledge of Phrenology would aid the physician in the treatment of insanity, and quoted Dr. Rayner's remarks :

"I am inclined to fear that the vast congregations of lunatics with a very limited amount of medical attendance is responsible for the non-recovery of a number of cases. For with all the increased care, there is no increase in the recovery rate of to-day as compared with sixty years ago."

A long time might elapse before hereditary and congenital predispositions were reduced, but the right treatment being provided, the present dreary aspect would disappear and the human

mind, the most precious element in creation, would become far saner, because the human brain would be healthier.

Mr. Webb continued:—I have so often placed my views of education before you as a schoolmaster and phrenologist that there is little need for me to say anything on that subject now. I will merely affirm that till he is able to judge of character and ability at sight, and outside of Phrenology that is impossible, the teacher will remain unable to give his pupils suitable individual instruction.

Professor Hill, of the Royal College of Surgeons, would dispute that statement, for he says :

“ We read what is passing in a man's mind by the lines of his face.”

For my part, I should have believed his statement quite as much had he said he could tell a man's mind by the *lies* of his face, for the face is used to deceive as much as language is used for that purpose.

And similarly, Prof. James believes that a teacher will correctly estimate a pupil's position by his temper and manner, “by the listlessness, alertness, by the ease or painfulness with which his school-work is done.” On the contrary, I say that no teacher could, in any real sense, be able to tell a person by such outward conduct. But I will let two other eminent psychologists repute the two I have quoted.

Titchener says :

“ The abstract ‘ child ’ of psychology does not exist for education ; the teacher has to face not ‘ the child ’ but real children—Katie Jones and Tommy Smith. Psychology cannot deal with Jonesness and Smithness, but only with childness.”

Again, Prof. Adams, of the University of London, says :

“ Psychology cannot help us to know this individual John ———. We cannot observe John's soul ; we can only observe his body and interpret his motives in terms of what goes on within ourselves. We feel thus and thus, and accordingly act in a certain way ; therefore, he feels thus and thus. . . . The master's interpretations of John's actions are not always quite accurate.”

Far from it; no two masters could interpret John alike, for they are themselves unlike each other. Had Prof. Adams studied Phrenology, he would have known that the phrenologist does not judge either boy or man by himself, but by what he knows to be the true standard for the purpose—by his brain development. I know that Prof. Adams never studied Phrenology, because he speaks of the “bump” of destructiveness being behind the ears, whereas it is the organ of combativeness that is *behind* the ears. And that word “bump” is a confirmation of his lack of knowledge of Phrenology.

Prof. Sully has *his* method of studying human nature, which will be recognised as the method generally adopted from the days of Adam. He writes:

“I may study a mental process in another mind so far as this clearly betrays itself in outward manifestation. Thus, in listening to a person’s talk, I can note the connections which his mind forms between certain ideas, in watching his actions I am able to study the play of his motives. This is called the indirect or external way of investigating mind because we are here getting at mental facts indirectly through the medium of certain external manifestations perceived by the senses, as audible word or cry, the visible movement or change of colour,” etc.

This method, about which there is nothing new or different from any other person’s ordinary observation, is just as fallible as the “modern” physiologist’s—the study of man by means of the “cry” or visible movements of the lower animals on the operating table with their skulls broken by hammer or saw and their lacerated brains under the peculiar influence of a galvanic current, which varies in intensity and quantity according to the battery used, and the difficulty of insulation owing to the excellent conductivity of the brain surface. Dr. Ferrier need not have told us that different experimenters obtain different results from similar experiments: We know that such must be the case—under such circumstances.

You may be saying to yourselves that many physiologists have lost confidence in these experiments, and have come to the conclusion arrived at, or accepted rather by Dr. Wilson, who told us less than a year ago that "the true condition of the brain as the organ of the mind can only be revealed by the *microscopical investigation* of its cortex and chiefly of the pyramidal layers. This is the key to the situation and none other."

So at one fell stroke all the high falutin about the galvanism of the brains of the lower animals is banished by the microscopes, which provide us at last with the only key to the functions of the brain and its connexion with the mind !

But most unfortunately for our studies of mind we are again taken to the brains of the dumb animals, and worse for our purpose, to *dead* and dumb animals. Dr. Wilson says that he does not "attach much importance to vivisection" as it is "liable" to error, and though "the microscopic examination of the brain is essential," it "cannot reveal the ideas of living men—it can demonstrate whether the living men were capable of any ideas or sentiments."

How interesting it would be if the microscope could tell us which men had neither ideas nor sentiments !

Worse and worse. The microscopists, whilst agreeing as to the number of layers comprising the cortex of the brain differ in regard to their position and function. For example, Dr. Wilson says the first layer has no cells ; Dr. Saleeby says it has cells ; Dr. Wilson says the second layer is pyramidal ; Dr. Saleeby says no ; "the third and fourth layers are pyramidal." When I pointed out these contradictions to Dr. Wilson, he replied with this wonderful argument :

"Dr. Saleeby may have a classification of his own and make a dozen layers."

Such are the trivialities of men who arrogate to themselves the title of scientists, as arguments against Phrenology. But the phrenologists work on. They have at last ventured to start a fund for the foundation of a Phrenological Institute of some

pretensions, and are prepared to find teachers and lecturers on mental science, so that in time the great objects that the Society is working for may be accomplished.

The great difference between Phrenology and all other attempts to form a scientific system of psychology, is the ready means by which it can be tested. The phrenologist appeals to facts, and by facts alone does he desire that his system shall be examined.

I have had a lengthy experience of Phrenology and its advocates, and I cannot point to anyone who once having become well acquainted with its teachings has renounced them, though I have heard of several who have known a little about it, as they have thought, who, on the mere word of some supposed authority, have done so. The phrenologist looks to the future with hope. He sees a growing desire among the young and the unprejudiced to know more about his science—a science that shall do more than any other science to anticipate the day when there shall be universal peace and universal goodwill among men.

PHRENOLOGY APPLIED TO EDUCATION.

By WILLIAM COX.

[Read before the British Phrenological Society Incorporated, June 14, 1906.]

The education question is by no means settled yet, and it never will be until Phrenology is applied to it—applied to the training of the teachers, and to the selection of them for their work, as well as to the instruction of the scholars or students themselves. And going back further still, Phrenology needs to be applied to, and by, those who legislate on the subject of education, so that they may know how to frame laws and educational machinery that will work without requiring to be constantly tinkered and doctored up.

Let us quietly go to the root of the matter, and be clear in our understanding of what education really is. And in the next place, consider what Phrenology really is. Then, see how Phrenology can be used advantageously in the practical work of education. To my mind, Phrenology applied to education is synonymous with commonsense applied to education.

But *what is education?* Does it merely consist in cramming information into children's heads, after the manner of squeezing clothes into a portmanteau just before starting on a holiday? No! That is not it at all, though one would think it was so from the tests, in the shape of examinations, which are applied to students in order to find out whether they are educated or not. The very name "crammer," commonly applied to one who prepares candidates for these tests, indicates the prevailing notion, as it also describes the actual work, of the teacher. The severe stress, and oftentimes the terrible distress, occasioned by this system of so-called education is pitiable. It is called "grinding." It is grinding, and hard grinding too. Now, even without revolutionising this bad and cruel system, the application of phrenological principles to the mere acquisition of accurate knowledge for the purpose of passing a stiff examination would transform hateful drudgery into a pleasurable exercise. How? By exercising the various memories, of which there are quite a dozen, or even more, and sharing the work amongst them, instead of overtaxing two or three. For though psychology as ordinarily understood admits only one faculty of memory, yet, as a matter of fact, several elementary powers of the mind are of necessity exercised in the ordinary methods of cramming. But if the whole range of the intellectual memory faculties were called into employment and the work intelligently distributed amongst them, the task of teacher and student alike would become, as I have said—a pleasure, instead of a drudgery.

I am digressing, however. Let us come back to the question, In what does education consist? It really means a drawing out, not a packing in. This root principle, if received and admitted

into practice, would be the starting point of a revolution in educational methods. We are thankful to observe that common-sense is beginning to be used not only in the Elementary Schools, but in the Secondary, and, to some extent, even in some of the University Colleges and Public Schools of this country. In the Infants' Department of Elementary Schools children are taught to use their eyes and hands, in the Boys' Schools to work at useful occupations, and in the Girls' Schools to keep house, to cook, and to make themselves useful. But in spite of this, a lot of effort is wasted in not discriminating between the individual scholars. What we want is that Phrenology should be applied specifically, and not merely in a general way. In the Secondary Schools or Technical Colleges some real advance is being made in teaching in a skilful and practical manner those things that will be useful. And in the Public Schools and Universities some commonsense has been introduced. In other words, Phrenology is being applied, though unconsciously, to the work of education. Physical science, both experimentally and theoretically taught, is being given its proper place in drawing out the inherent intellectual and other powers of the mind.

We see a sign of the times in the recent utterance of Sir Fredk. Treves, the noted scientist and surgeon, who bearded the Cambridge University dons in their dens. He attended the speech day at Leys School, and, despite the recent emphatic decision at Cambridge in favour of compulsory classical education, declared boldly for a practical education, as opposed to the classical.

He pointed to the Leys School as an instance of the remarkable changes in the methods of education. Their grandfathers would have held up their hands in horror at the idea of a school for the sons of gentlemen with workshops and laboratories; but science was an overwhelming element in modern education. The pedagogue of old strove to make his pupils men of high culture, scholarly and well-read, and apt at quotation. But to-day for the purely cultured man of scholarship there did not seem to be the demand or the place there used to be. The lad who had

to make his way in the world had in these days to regard his education with commercial eyes. Time was so short and art was so long that it was a matter of infinite importance to ascertain how his object could be most quickly and surely attained. Many found that a knowledge of volts and amperes was of more utility than an intimate acquaintance with Greek, and that a knowledge of the last Board of Trade returns might be of more value than the utmost familiarity with the Odes of Horace. The school-master of to-day realised that he had not only to make a man of his pupil, but a specific man—a man of science and a man of business, a man with a definite profession. In conclusion, Sir Fredk. Treves recommended medical students not to stick too closely to text-books.

The report of Sir Frederick's address is punctuated with "cheers" and "applause," showing that his ideas were appreciated. He seems to have got hold of the right principle—the truth of the matter in regard to education—so far, at any rate, as intellectual education goes.

Education, let me repeat, is the process of unfolding the mind—opening it out; it is evolution in the true sense of the word. Education is the evolving of what is already involved by nature. The teacher's work is to assist in this natural process of development or growth.

Just as in Horticulture the possibilities of plant life are brought out, or in Agriculture the earth is assisted in yielding her increase, so in culture of the human mind its inherent possibilities are brought out to some creditable degree of perfection. That I understand to be education. But the field is much wider than intellectual education. There is the education of the feelings, embracing those powers of the mind which are not intellectual. This part of education is sadly overlooked in many quarters. Even the possibility of it denied in others. As, for example—I was startled the other day when I picked up a copy of the *Daily Mail*. The heading of a leading article attracted my attention—"Can courage be developed?" A headline like this would instinctively impel a phrenologist to look and see whether such a

question could be seriously asked. I read the article, and was still more amazed when in it I came across the following :

“The scope of teaching is limited to knowledge. . . .
Moral qualities cannot be taught. A child constitutionally devoid of courage can no more be taught to be brave than a child born deaf could be taught to love music. . . . A cowardly or timorous child is generally one who is suffering from ill health.”

How helpful a knowledge of Phrenology would be in dispelling such ignorance. I merely refer to this in order to introduce the next question—“*What is Phrenology?*”

Phrenology is the true science of the mental powers. It analyses the mind; shows its component faculties. But, in addition, it demonstrates that there is a definite and a definable relationship between the various elementary powers of the mind and certain parts of the brain. It teaches, too, that all these elementary powers can be cultivated by exercise, each one after its kind, both in intellectual faculties and the feelings too.

Without enlarging upon the matter further let me say that the size and shape of the skull, which in turn are a sufficiently accurate guide to the brain developments contained therein, indicate, in the case of children, which mental faculties are inherently strong and which are weak. This is on the assumption of course that size is a measure of power. It is necessary to take also into account certain other factors connected with the bodily constitution, such as quality of tissue, the blending of the various elements which enter into temperament, the health, activity, environment, hereditary conditions, and so forth, of the person concerned.

Now, a science which can justify these claims ought to be of invaluable use in the work of education. To apply Phrenology needs properly qualified exponents or experts. This Society is aiming at turning out phrenologists of that type, both men and women of general culture and attainments, but possessing in

addition this special qualification, that they are thoroughly acquainted with Phrenology as a science, and able to apply it as an art. It is no wild dream to predict that these experts will be called into requisition by the educational authorities, both in training teachers and in advising as to the direction in which children should be trained and educated according to their natural talents and abilities.

Children should be classified when quite young, that is, in the infant stage. It would be quite easy to sort them out according to the quality of their brains, keeping the coarse ones to themselves, and the refined ones to themselves. Adapt the training to their abilities, and keep a special watch over any precocious ones to see that they do not go too fast. The main object during these early days should be to develop the bodily organs in a systematic way, to call into activity the observing powers, and to instil elementary principles of good behaviour into the children, not by precept but by practice. No books, but objects of different sorts should be the means of instruction so far as the intellectual faculties are concerned, in this early stage.

Mr. Benjamin Broadbent (brother of Sir Wm. Broadbent) in regard to babies, lately said :

“Babies are individualists, and every baby is necessarily different from any other baby. It is quite useless to treat these individualist babies, each with a strong personality, alike.”

The same in regard to children when they grow older. Until the teacher knows the children under his or her care, education is a haphazard matter. Phrenology is the key to the individuality of each child, and every teacher should be equipped to the extent of having a working knowledge of Phrenology.

Communications referring to the literary contents of *The Phrenological Review* should be addressed to the Editor, Dr. BERNARD HOLLANDER, 35A Welbeck Street, Cavendish Square, London, W.



British Phrenological Society

(Incorporated),

63 CHANCERY LANE, LONDON, W.C.

INSTRUCTION CLASSES.

Lecturers:

**Dr. G. W. WITHINSHAW, L.R.C.P., L.R.C.S.,
L.M.EdIn., F.B.P.S.**

**Mr. GEORGE HART-COX, F.B.P.S.,
Ex-President, B.P.S.**

COURSES OF LECTURES are given at the above address embracing the Elementary Anatomy and Physiology of the Brain and Nervous System; the Elementary Anatomy and Physiology of the Human Skull; Dissections and Demonstrations of the Human Brain; the History and Philosophy of Phrenology; the Discovery, Definitions, Locations, Functions, and External Signs of the Organs or Centres of the Mental Faculties; Temperamental and other Modifying Conditions affecting Mental Manifestations; the Practical Application of Phrenology to the Living Subject, in the Determination of Mental Tendencies, Capacities, Talents, and Dispositions.

Two Courses of Ten Lectures each. Fee £1 is. per Course.

EXAMINATIONS.

An Examination for the Certificate of the Society's Board of Examiners will be held early in November next.

For full particulars apply to the

HON. SECRETARY,

63 Chancery Lane, W.C.

British Phrenological Society

(Incorporated),

63 CHANCERY LANE, LONDON, W.C.

THE OBJECT OF THE SOCIETY

Is the investigation and promulgation of Phrenology, and the study of such kindred subjects as the Physiology of the brain, Craniology, Anthropology, Psychology, and Educational Science.

PRACTICAL AND SCIENTIFIC MEETINGS ARE HELD IN ADDITION TO THE MONTHLY LECTURES.

MEMBERS HAVE THE USE OF A COMPREHENSIVE LIBRARY.

Annual Subscription: Ten Shillings.

THE FOLLOWING MEETINGS HAVE BEEN ARRANGED:—

Thursday, 13th September, 1906,

SOCIAL GATHERING.

Thursday, 11th October, 1906,

SHORT PAPERS.

Friday, 9th November, 1906,

ANNUAL CONGRESS.

GEORGE HART-COX, Secretary.