

THE STATISTICAL AND SOCIAL INQUIRY SOCIETY OF IRELAND.

~~Part C III~~

PRACTICAL CHARACTEROLOGY.

By MR. JUSTICE MEREDITH.

[*Read Nov. 15, 1928.*]

A paper on Characterology needs some apology, I fear, if it is to be read to a Statistical and Social Inquiry Society such as this. No doubt characterologists are not in quite as unenviable a position as palmists, clairvoyants or spiritualists. They are not liable to be imprisoned or fined under the obsolete provisions of enactments originally directed against gipsies and witches. But that is not because practical characterology is regarded as worthy of very serious consideration—though not a few people imagine themselves to be fairly good amateur characterologists—but only because it is not regarded as mischievous, and so not worth considering at all. In the public mind characterologists are supposed to stand in much the same relation to psychologists as homeopathists, herbists and bone-setters stand to those whose names are to be found on the Medical Register. The object of this paper is to consider if characterology does not deserve some measure of definite recognition, and, if it appears to do so, to offer some suggestions as to the statistical methods that should be employed as the basis of characterological research.

It is only practical characterology that is regarded somewhat contemptuously by educated opinion. The number of works that have appeared in the last few years on the psychology of character is, in fact, exceptionally large, and testifies to the wide interest taken in the subject. The following may be mentioned as a few of the more important: "Psychological Types," by Jung; "The Psychology of Character," by Roebuck; "Individual Psychology," by Adler; "Sex and Character," by Weininger; "Character and the Unconscious," by Hoop; "Philosophy of Character," by Pierce; "Problems of Personality," by Campbell and others; "Personality in the Making," by Coffin;

"Personality," by Bruce; "Conception of Personality," by Heath; "Character of Races," by Huntington; "National Character and the Factors in its Formation," by Barker; "Dawn of Character in the Mind of the Child," by Mumford, "Human Character," by Elliott. Then in the line of applied psychology of character may be mentioned: "Character and the Conduct of Life," by McDougall, an interesting and extensively read work; "The Making of Character," by McCunn; "Directing of Mental Energy," by Aveling, "Formative Factors in Character," by Martin, "Personality and Social Adjustment," by Groves.

But there is evidence of an awakening interest in what I have ventured to call practical characterology. Perhaps the most important work that has recently appeared is "Physique and Character," by Kretschmer of Tübingen, which has now been translated into English by Sprott of Cambridge. A short but most valuable contribution will be found in an article by M. Souques in the *Revue Neurologique*. From the point of view of scientific treatment and the establishment of definite and instructive facts the researches of M. Souques are most important. In addition to the works named there are: "Character-Reading Through Analysis of the Features" and "Character Revelations in Mind and Body," by Fosbroke, and "Judging of Human Character," by Hollingworth. Besides works such as these which are entirely devoted to the subject, a considerable amount of useful material is continually cropping up in the fields of physiological and of anthropological research. That is, of course, quite natural. If character and mental endowment are to any extent at all hereditary then they must have a physical basis. For no matter how special and complex a particular mental endowment may be, if it has been transmitted, then, at some step of its derivation, it must have had its ground, or, as I might call it, its physiological guarantee, in the inner constitution of an impregnated ovum, for that is the sole and exclusive receptacle or carrier of all that can be transmitted. As a single illustration of the manner in which material useful for the purposes of practical characterology is continually emerging in the course of scientific research I might mention a contribution by Levin in the "*Deutsche Medicinische Wochenschrift*" to the subject of hereditary transmission. Schopenhauer and others had noticed long ago the fact that in the case of great men their mental endowments seem always to have come to them from their mother's side. This rule, however, does not appear to hold in the case of great women. Levin has explained the reason. It

is now known that the differentiation of sex is associated with a definite pair of chromosomes. Now in the case of human beings, as also in the case of the *Taufliege* which Levin specially examined, the chromosome that carries the sex character has two like components, which are designated x-chromosomes, whereas the corresponding chromosome in the male has two different components, an x-chromosome and a y-chromosome. Now in man the male always receives his x-chromosome from the mother; but the female receives her two x-chromosomes from father and mother. In other words, the male cannot get an x-chromosome from the father, but the female gets them from both father and mother. It has been ascertained that there are psychic endowments that are associated with the sexual chromosome. These endowments the male can never inherit from the father but only from the mother, for the reason that he can obtain the important x-chromosome only from the mother. He does not transmit it to his sons, but he does transmit it to his daughters. This is typical of what we can learn from the physiologists. Then, a mass of material is also furnished by the anthropologists; but a trouble in that direction comes from the deficiency of definite facts on the psychic side to correlate with the anthropological data and the piled-up mass of ares, indices, coefficients and angles. A certain general correlation between the development of intellectual capacity and the development of cranial capacity is the main point that seems fairly clearly established. Were it not for the dearth of material on the psychic side such facts as Professor Parsons recorded in his interesting paper to the British Association last year on "The Englishman of the Future" would be more instructive. He shows that in England, besides a development of cranial capacity down from the neolithic age by steady degrees, "the head shape is showing unmistakable signs of an increase of its proportional height, with a decrease of its proportional length, and that this increase of proportional height is greater than has been found in any of the stocks from which the modern Englishman is derived." Facts such as these, besides indicating the correlation between cranial development and intelligence, are at least sufficient to interest us in looking for further and more definite psychical correlation, and support the plea for a wider recognition of the claims of practical characterology.

Perhaps, at this stage, I should say something as to what we mean by "character" when we speak of "characterology." For some writers are most punctilious on this

point of definition—as if anything that was the subject of empirical investigation could be decided by a preliminary definition. The determinate meaning that a writer assigns to the word “character” must depend upon the results of his investigation, and the scope of this investigation will in general be determined by the original conception of the problem. The word “character” will therefore be used in different senses by different writers according to the purpose of the inquiry undertaken. All that is required at the outset is to delimit, as far as possible, the subject-matter of the enquiry—just as the subject of a logical proposition need not necessarily have any connotation, but may satisfactorily indicate what is spoken about by a proper name or even by a mere demonstrative “this” or “that.” I will even go a step further in opposition to the doctrinaires in question. It is not clear that a final and determinate definition should emerge even as the result of the enquiry. As Kant said, we can only strictly define what we create for ourselves according to a rule of our own making. So we can define what we mean by a “parabola,” or a “hypothetical proposition,” or a “check-mate.” But character, as generally conceived, is a thing of life—a very vital dynamical reality. In utter disgust, therefore, at the number of deductions and criticisms that such writers as Roback base on their mere definitions of what they mean by “character,” I will say that I am not sure that “character” can be defined at all, except in a general descriptive manner, and, further, that, if convenient, I am prepared to use the term in different senses in different connections.

If the word “character” were not being used in reference to what we call “practical characterology,” which has a purpose in view, I think I should be tempted to define “character” in a descriptive manner as follows: *Character is the expression of a dissociated and integrating self.* This definition evidently has in view what we mean when we speak of a man as a man of character and say he has personality. It stresses the fact that the self to which we attribute character in this sense is a self which dissociates itself from its immediate feelings and inherited propensities. So we do not attribute “character” in this sense to a dog or cat, because we think of these animals as following their nature—even though this nature may be modified in different breeds, and even in different individual dogs or cats of the same breed. This definition also stresses the fact that the self, which withdraws and dissociates itself from what is more immediate, exhibits the specific function

of integrating. If a man lacks character his action takes now this direction and now that, and betrays no unity of self-expression. But the man of character is a man on whom you may bet. Up against a clearly-defined situation he acts in accordance with a settled character, and his action is that of his well-known self. Whether we agree with him or not, we recognise that he is obviously sincere, and, if we are broad-minded, we let that count for a great deal. Further, this definition shows that what is attempted is only a general description of an expression, the source of which is left undefined as an indeterminate and dynamical X—the inner “self” (whatever that is) which is being gradually realised. Lastly, this definition looks forward in such a way as readily to accommodate such a conception as Kant’s conception of an “independence from nature in the power of determining ends, and of the employment by man of nature as a mere means in accordance with the maxims of his freely determined ends.” But, at the same time, it enables us to look backward from the psychic process and find a physical correlate in a process which has its beginning in the formation of a nucleus in the simplest unicellular organism. There we see a similar dissociation of an integrating formative agency, and this same process is only developed with greater and greater intensity until we come to man with his most highly developed brain and nervous system. The definition suggested enables us to look at the whole course of evolution as a simple process culminating in the expression of what has profound ethical significance—something which, if it can be practical in ourselves—that is, determine our wills—is qualified to be the true dynamical ground of the whole evolutionary process.

Such is the definition of character which I would offer if the purpose in hand were not a practical characterology, which views character as something which individuals participate in or exhibit in an endless variety of ways, and which we regard as endowing them with this or that capacity, or giving them a bias in this or that direction, or as controlling any such bias; the intention being to distinguish and contrast individuals in respect of character as a thing which may be endlessly varied, though it has definite components which may be analysed. In this sense of the word “character” we may quite properly speak of our friends the dogs and the cats as having even individually different characters. Also, a work on “characterology” so conceived may readily be allowed to use the word “character” in a special sense, as contrasted either with “temperament” or intellectual endowment,

even though it includes all these in the scope of its enquiries. In speaking of "characterology" I, therefore, propose to be most impertinent to the doctrinaires in my conception of what is meant by character; for the purpose in hand requires that the conception should be determined just by what it is convenient to treat under that heading.

The need of an expert in characterology was forcibly impressed on my mind in the early part of this year by the difficulty of settling a scheme for the application *cy près* of a charitable fund producing £150 a year. The fund was left to provide a succession of scholarships tenable for seven years, and was intended to enable sons of members of the working class in Dundalk, who had received primary education in a national school, to go on and get a higher education that would fit them for a professional career. The examination indicated by the donor was only open to candidates of not more than 16 years of age, and was quite an impossible one for a youth of that age, and one who had only received a national school education; so a scheme had to be settled. But the difficulty was that no mere examination of the ordinary kind would provide a reliable means of choosing the youth who would be most likely to benefit by being sent to a University. I pointed out in that case the useful services that might be rendered by a reliable vocational adviser. In Canada I understand that a Mr. Jacob occupies a Government position as vocational adjuster, and that his services are availed of extensively. In reply to my enquiries as to the scope of his work he sent me interesting details, and gratuitously appended to his letter a delineation from my own handwriting, and added the remark that I was suffering from slight astigmatism and should consult an oculist. As a matter of fact, I had just done so, and the glasses I am wearing are the result. I was glad to see that views similar to those which I expressed in my judgment in the Dundalk case were expressed in a paper which Dr. Arnold read at the last meeting of the British Association. The paper evoked considerable discussion at the meeting and subsequently in the Press, and it is significant that so many of those associated with the University system were severely critical of the adequacy of University examinations as tests of fitness for the several learned professions. The placing of the candidates at these examinations is more often than not rudely disarranged in after-life. It is noteworthy that when the Universities themselves come to make appointments to high positions in the University they do not look merely to success at examinations. Thus in Dublin University—a fairly con-

servative institution—the old fellowship examination has been abolished. That, however, is not the kind of appointment in respect of which the strongest case can be made out for the employment of the services of a characterologist. The success of many industrial concerns is largely due to the fact that the managing director is a good chooser of men. But if characterology does not happen to be the forte of the managing director, why should he not be able to procure the services of a specialist in that kind of work? Fosbroke justly remarks: “For extended test for the selection of employees for important positions, and particularly in trades that require skill, the Binet-Simon Scale for measuring intelligence, or the revised scale known as “Standard Revision of the Binet-Simon Scale,” and other psychological tests, are of unquestioned value” (*Character Revelations*, p. 9).

This is all so immediately obvious that it will probably be admitted that the question is not so much one of the importance of the functions of a vocational adviser as of the probable reliability of his reports. But before turning to that question it would be well to form some conception of the characteristics as to which advice would be useful.

Even in the sphere of intellectual endowment there are points as to which the usual examination tests are inadequate. First of all there is the associated group of characteristics generally indicated by the terms: originality, inventiveness, constructiveness, **imagination**. In some examinations an effort is made to obtain information on these points by means of intelligence tests. Such tests are worth more or less according to the intelligence of the examiners. They are generally worth something, but not very much. They do not usually reach very far—hardly ever as far as what goes by the name of a “brain-wave.” But these are all matters as to which characterologists profess to be able to give very definite advice.

A discriminating or analytical type of mind is also one which is essential for some positions, but not an absolute requirement for others. The ordinary competitive examination does not reveal much in this direction. It is, however, one of the mental characteristics about which characterologists usually express themselves with great confidence.

Power of observation is another most important characteristic and one which varies very much in different individuals. It is of most service when associated with a large capacity for attending to detail, a retentive memory and large powers of comparison. Reports of university professors on post-graduate research work may deal ade-

quately with capacity in this respect, but the less advanced ordinary competitive examination affords no real test.

Tact is an essential requirement in some vocations. Its presence or absence readily makes itself felt in the course of business dealings. But, while we soon learn if a man has tact, strategy—in the broad sense in which an Abraham Lincoln had strategy—is not so easily discerned. For strategy relies most on the big principles that have a way of winning in the long run. A simple, straightforward individual may be very sound in strategy, but he rarely does more than avoid being tactless. His diplomacy is sometimes disconcerting in its simplicity.

Bacon in his *Advancement of Learning* (Book VII., Ch. 3) recognised two very distinct types of mind. "Some," he says, "can divide themselves, others can perchance do exactly well, but it must be a few things at once. . . . Some minds are proportional to that which may be dispatched at once, or within a short return of time; others to that which begins afar off, and is to be won by length of pursuit." These types are very familiar and easily recognised. Those who are at their best when able to devote prolonged and exclusive study to a particular subject, get absorbed and hate being forced to switch off for a moment and turn to something else. If an example of this type is immersed in study he is thrown out of his stride for half an hour if his wife enters the room and asks him what he would like for dinner. Absent-mindedness is an almost invariable characteristic of such persons. The opposite type of mind seems stimulated by change. It is a marvel how some men can take in hand a particular piece of work that requires attention for a couple of hours and repeatedly lay it down and take it up again without the least irritation at the interruption. Now for some positions the power of concentration that is most often associated with the first mentioned type of mind is more than a set-off for the disadvantage of slowness in adjusting the focus of the mind's eye, but for other positions the second type of mind, with which quickness and agility is also usually associated, is more important. Now all characterologists profess to be able to give a confident opinion in any case where either of these two types is pronounced; but the usual competitive examinations tell us nothing on the subject.

There is another most distinctive and far-reaching character-contrast. It is one for which I have always used the terms subjective and objective, but I find that Jung uses the expression "introvert" and "extravert" in describing what seems to be the same distinction, though, of

course, a slight difference in point of view and explanation may underlie the difference of terminology. Anyway, the distinction seems to be recognised in the fable of the elephant who saw some eggs deserted by the mother bird and immediately in the fulness of his heart sat down to hatch them. Result disastrous to the eggs. There are many persons who are just like the elephant—they think and act straight out from themselves, just as they are, and are quite incapable of appreciating the extent to which the advent of their subjective selves is a disturbing factor. Such persons cannot see facts as they are, because their own subjective selves are inseparably fused with the objects with which they concern themselves. All their estimates are subjective interpretations. Kant had his portrait painted by a Jew. He said it was a good portrait except for the nose, and no Jew could paint a Christian nose. That was as much as to say that all Jews are extraverts. In matters of affection the extravert must give and receive affection in his own way. The extravert husband kisses his wife with a wet moustache, and gets offended if she wipes her cheek. The extravert finds it impossible to cure any natural tendency. An extravert cook who has a heavy hand will, as long as she remains a cook, put cloves into the apple-tart as if they were currants for a plum-pudding. If an extravert wife with a similar tendency pours out a cup of tea, then to her dying day she will be unable to leave room for the milk. Contrasted with such persons are those who can stand apart from themselves and who have a comparatively detached or impersonal ego. These can see facts, and in their estimate of things they can allow for their personal equation. A great man, when of this type, if you get him to chat about himself and his doings, will do so as if he was discussing some third person. The late Lord Chief Baron used to talk about himself in this detached manner. This type of mind in this respect reacts upon and modifies almost every quality of character. Thus most men have a certain degree of egoism—but whether this egoism is obtrusive and objectionable depends largely on whether they are introverts or extraverts. So of many failings—for “a sin confessed is half forgiven.” I knew a lady who, despite many peculiarly feminine weaknesses, was a most engaging personality. “I’m afraid I’m a bit selfish,” I heard her once say with a laugh. “When I was a child they called me Little Miss Grabb-all. I can’t help grabbing—the best I can do is to share my grabbings.”

The foregoing reflections are intended to bring out the point that even before we come to what is usually under-

stood by character in the narrower sense—that is to say, while we still remain in the region of mental development and stamp of mind—there is a great deal which is of the utmost importance but which is not touched by the usual examination tests. As regards character proper, the corresponding point is too universally admitted to require argument. Yet for success in almost any department of life character counts at least as much as intellect. That being so, there can hardly be much doubt as to the usefulness of the services of a practical characterologist. The main question must be as to reliability.

Now what opinion are we to form on this point? Here I may say that I hold no brief for practical characterologists of any particular school, or, indeed, for practical characterologists generally. I merely propose, as far as I can, to arrive at an unprejudiced estimate of the actual achievements and also of the possibilities of practical characterology. Endeavouring to approach the question in this dispassionate manner, there are a couple of important concessions that must be made straight away. The first of these is that different men have different characters, and that these characters are knowable, however else, by their actions, words and behaviour generally. There is then, first of all, what I may call the “behaviour” test of character. This covers several of the tests mentioned by Bacon in his “Advancement of Learning.” He there says that there are six different ways by which men may be known, namely, by (1) their countenances; (2) their words; (3) their actions; (4) their tempers; (5) their ends; and (6) their designs—an enumeration which obviously involves a considerable amount of cross-division. Dramas, novels, biographies, as well as much of the conduct of life, all recognise the validity of the behaviour test of character, and, consequently, I need only point out its main limitation. The traits of character that are immediately revealed by general behaviour are frequently the result of character-complexes, that is to say, result from the interaction of several character elements. The analysis of these composites into their components is often a psychological problem of no little difficulty. Thus we all know well the type of man—often very estimable—who, while exceedingly stingy in small things, can be most generous when it comes to big things. His character seems to change completely when he is confronted with action on a large scale. I submit that it is not an altogether easy matter to analyse the precise character-elements upon which this trait depends. Again, there is no difficulty in recognising that a certain

individual is pugnacious. He probably imagines that his attitude will impress people with the idea that he is full of courage and determination. But is not pugnacity more often due, among other things, to lack of confidence? Men and women who are exceptionally small in stature are generally somewhat self-assertive and not infrequently pugnacious; as if they feared they might be overlooked unless they made a demonstration. And why is it that exceptionally small men rarely make great friends among themselves? To give one last instance. Gratitude might seem to be a very simple quality. But the phrenologists showed a certain amount of acumen when they gave man a bump of benevolence but no bump of gratitude. Many cynical things have been said about gratitude, which is generally expected in return for generosity, as if it were one of the commonest and most natural of sentiments. But in truth gratitude is rare and seems to require considerable bigness of soul. Indeed, using the word "character" in the strict and somewhat ethical sense which I attempted to define at the outset, only a man of character can be really grateful. McDougall ("Conduct of Life," p. 139) says that "generosity is the rarest, as it is the finest, of all qualities." I would be more inclined to give the palm to gratitude. Generosity may sometimes be promoted by weakness; gratitude never. Gratitude also implies culture. Ingratitude is the general rule. We find many men who are not at all too proud even to beg, yet are much too proud to be grateful for assistance. However, the most flagrant examples of this type generally give themselves away by their mode of approach. They do not beg; they just lay their case before you; they desire to know if you "would like" to assist them, and they let you understand that they are willing to give you the opportunity. Will a man of your character miss the chance of a lifetime? It is not difficult to appreciate the character-elements responsible for this attitude; the difficulty is to estimate the source of simple, genuine, positive gratitude. Similarly jealousy, which seems to be a very simple and easily recognisable characteristic, is probably a composite the essential components of which it is not so easy to analyse. We see, therefore, that many very easily discerned traits of character have roots that seem to be buried deep beneath the surface. The second concession which, I think, must be made is that the inner workings of the mind are often quite clearly revealed by immediate outward expression. Hence, although what characterology is most in search of are tests that are amenable to scientific method, intuition unquestionably

affords an avenue of approach in many cases. Feelings, emotions and even thoughts are often betrayed by what may be called instinctive expression. Hence, I would regard instinctive expression as the second test. Bacon gives "tempers" as the fourth test, but temper is itself only revealed by expression. No one will dispute that it can be so revealed. If a man is livid with rage and you observed: "The man seems to be annoyed," you would be intending a little joke which would be capped if someone else said: "How do you know?" Our own feelings and emotions tend to externalise themselves in a manner of which we are sensible, and we immediately recognise a similar expression in others. Some men's minds may be read much more readily from the changing expression of their faces than others. The Chinaman's face is usually immobile, and he says that we Europeans speak to the accompaniment of an endless variety of grimaces. Such facial expressions are often as eloquent as words or actions. I remember chatting over the fire with a man who was speaking of the success of his business enterprises. "Yes," he said, "I've done very well, thank you." As he said this he looked fixedly into the fire and I saw the way his eye glistened and the oblique lines caused by the tightening and drawing up of the muscles under the eye. You could feel his sense of pride and self-satisfaction. Then the look of a witness who is telling a deliberate untruth and who turns round and fixes his eye on you is frequently quite unmistakable. But for the most part the expression test applies to transient emotions from which the settled character is only inferable indirectly. Yet there are expressions of the face, some fleeting, some more fixed, which are a reflex of permanent characteristics. There is a foxy or sly look in the eye which may be caught at first sight, which is very difficult to analyse, but which no one would hesitate to say betrays something of the rogue. Then there is the heavy sensual expression which differs from that of smouldering passion, so also there is the beaming and gleaming expression of iridescence on the part of those whose tedium at once gives place to general exhilaration at the approach of a member of the opposite sex. Clearest and perhaps most beautiful of all expressions is the devoted parents' smile of loving approval. The smile that shows the tooth is proverbial. The greatest painters sometimes succeed in catching some of these different expressions—there is the notable expression on the Mona Lisa—but they are so difficult to analyse that characterology can hardly do more than note their existence. Intuition may here snap its fingers at scientific

method. The test of instinctive expression must be conceded. Even a child will in most cases at once pick out the sympathetic, and so, indeed, will many animals.

We come now to the tests which are of chief interest to this Society. They are a miscellaneous assortment which, however, may be grouped together by reference to the common feature that they are all open to verification by statistics, and, even where not subjected to such scientific treatment, they must fundamentally rely on observation, more or less methodical, of actual correlations. Now as the correlation on the side of outward expression must always have some definite analysable form, in contradistinction to the fleeting instinctive expression test, we may bring the whole last group of apparently heterogeneous tests under the single conception of the correlated form test. This is in accordance with the practice of physiognomists, who group phrenology, palmistry, graphology, and even the walk, under the head of general physiognomy. So we may call the third test the correlated form or "physiognomy" test of character.

As to the compilation of statistics in respect of the correlated form test it is necessary to stress the point—quite obvious in itself—that the establishment of a test of the third kind by accurate statistics, which is the only method, presupposes in every case the determination of the character in the first instance by some independent reliable test. We cannot obtain statistics and verify the statement that such a type of physique or style of handwriting indicates this or that character until we have got a sufficiently large number of individuals with that type of physique or style of handwriting whose characters are definitely known independently of their physique or handwriting. But unless elaborate methods of investigation are employed the number of individuals whose characters are minutely known to any one person is extremely small. I do not think that at all sufficient pains is taken in respect of the independent test. That is mainly why, if I may anticipate my conclusion, I have more faith in the possibilities of characterology than in its actual achievements. Practical characterologists seem to me to have generally overlooked one half of the difficulty. What experience is gained by a phrenologist, palmist or graphologist who spends years in delineating character if opportunities are rarely afforded of satisfactorily testing the delineations? And the matter of the independent test is often not an easy one. Temperament is probably the point as to which the clearest form signs are discoverable. Suppose we adopt the most familiar classification of temperaments as choleric,

phlegmatic, sanguine and melancholic, how many of us would be certain how we should describe our own temperament? That, no doubt, is partly due to the fact that our temperament colours our view of things, and we generally attribute this colour to the things rather than to ourselves. But few of us probably would undertake to describe the temperaments of many friends or relations with certainty. Of course, I do not deny that much valuable work has been done by several psychologists in the way of testing the temperament of different subjects; my point is that such independent tests are not sufficiently rigorously applied when seeking to verify the correlated form tests. Investigators seem to me to "scamp" the work on one side or the other. A field of enquiry that, to my mind, would probably be instructive on the question of temperament is the field of sport. It can hardly be denied that certain differences of temperament are very clearly manifested in certain games. An enquiry might then be instituted on these lines. I understand that a special temperament is required for golf called the "golf temperament." First of all it should be ascertained if that is really so, and, if so, the peculiar type of temperament should be precisely described. A hundred or more of the best golfers should then be approached and they should be supplied with a questionnaire and chart such as that drawn up by Kretschmer. The questionnaire would be directed, first of all, to the verification of the assumption that as golfers they were recognised to have the golf temperament as described. Secondly, it would be directed to ascertaining if the manifestation of the temperament was confined to golf or if it was recognised to be the general temperament. In this way it would probably be possible to obtain information as to some seventy or so golfers who clearly and without qualification possessed the golf temperament. The objects of the chart, which should be supplemented by a photograph, would be to ascertain the peculiarities of physique, if any, common to all these selected examples of the temperament. The charts and photographs could then be sent to Kretschmer and others to find out what in each case would be their description of the physical type and what the type of temperament they would expect. In addition specimens of handwriting should in each case be obtained, and these, after being studied personally by the investigator, could be sent to leading graphologists with a request for a delineation specially directed to the matter of temperament, and a statement as to the characteristic in the handwriting relied on. Subsequently, if a positive result was obtained, it could be

verified by obtaining similar material as to a number of good golfers who were regarded as failing to attain real championship form owing to the golf temperament not being sufficiently strong, although well qualified in other respects. In the United States every young man who takes up athletics is most carefully measured by an anthropologist, and from these measurements an accurate forecast is made of the event or events in which he would be most likely to succeed. If this practice were extended to other games and sports and also directed to include an enquiry as to temperament, very useful material for practical characterology would almost certainly be obtained in a few years. But it seems to me to be quite futile to hope to obtain material for really scientific investigation by simply obtaining, say, specimens of handwriting from a number of distinguished members of this or that professional or other class. There is hardly a vocation which does not afford scope for very great variety of temperament and character, and, though in a less degree, even of intellectual endowment. In most professions there are several ways of getting home. What would the handwriting of lawyers tell if you did not know which were mostly common law and which equity lawyers? Or, to give a more striking example, if the handwriting of different painters differs as much as the style of their paintings, how is one to find the common characteristic indicating the essential qualities of a painter. I do not question that the individual character of a painter comes out, often very clearly, in his painting, and that his character is what determines his individual style, and that it will probably determine his handwriting in a similar manner, but that admission is really a denial of the assumption that what is revealed is some abstract character of the painter in general.

The limited time at my disposal does not allow me to give an account of the excellent observations of Aristotle on indications of character, or of the famous character delineations of Theophrastus, which are very valuable, on the question of the behaviour test of character, or of the observations industriously accumulated by the celebrated physiognomist, Laveter, or of the work of Lepelletier de la Satté, who wrote a "*Traité Complet de Physiognomie*," or of that of S. R. Wells, who published a "*New Physiognomy or Signs of Character*." I must also pass over Dr. Gall and Spurzheim, who founded the now discredited system of phrenology. But this much should be said of the contributions of all those named, that the characteristics with the indications of which they deal are for the most part those

with which a practical characterology is most concerned from an immediately practical point of view. From that point of view the contributions of modern science are mainly interesting as raising a hope.

Of the modern scientific works on the subject the best is Kretschmer's "Physique and Character." He recognises "three ever-recurring principal types of physique" which he calls the "asthenic," the "athletic" and the "pyknic." The general impression of an asthenic type of physique is that of "a deficiency in thickness combined with an average unlesened length." "The male athletic type is recognised by the strong development of the skeleton, the musculature and also the skin." "The pyknic type, in the height of its perfection in middle age, is characterised by the pronounced peripheral development of the body cavities (head, breast and stomach), and a tendency to a distribution of fat about the trunk, with a more graceful construction of the motor apparatus (shoulders and extremities)." These physical types being recognised, Kretschmer approaches the general problem of the relation between physique and character by investigating how the two great psychopathological types of manic depressive or "circular" insanity and schizophrenia (dementia præcox), which had already been distinguished by Kraepelin, are distributed between the three physical types mentioned. As a result of his investigations he has come to the conclusion, first, that "there is a clear biological affinity between the psychic disposition of the manic depressives and the pyknic body type," or, in other words, that "circulars" are generally pyknics; secondly, that "there is a clear biological affinity between the psychic disposition of the schizophrenes and the bodily disposition characteristic of the asthenics, athletics, and certain displastics." Then, getting back from the manic depressives or circulars, and the schizophrenes, he reaches, on the way to the normal, the cycloid and the schizoid temperaments, and again he finds a similar and corresponding distribution. From these he descends to average men, whom he divides into cyclothemes and schizothemes. These are the two normal types out of which the abnormal types arise, and here again he finds a corresponding distribution. Thus, if a man is a pyknic he may be taken to be more or less of a cyclotheme, if an asthenic or athletic more or less of a schizotheme. But as there are many varieties of cyclothemes and many varieties of schizothemes, and as the difference is not described in any broad, general terms, they are not adequate for a practical characterologist who

would be expected to say much more than whether a particular person was a cyclotheme or a schizotheme.

The researches of Kretschmer have the advantage of setting out from definite data both on the psychic and physical side. But as yet the material handled is somewhat small. I wish that this Society would use any influence it has to urge that in all mental asylums and prisons accurate anthropological records should be kept. In the course of a very few years the statistical material that would be accumulated could hardly fail to be most valuable. This is especially desirable owing to the prevalence of mental disease in this country.

The first criticism which I have to offer on the conclusions drawn by Kretschmer is that the correlations are not as convincing when we come to the region of normality. Here we are not given actual figures as to the distributions. Besides we are not told what steps were taken to ensure accuracy of classification as to cyclotheme and schizotheme temperament. As I have already explained, this is a very difficult question in normal cases. Some persons are much more temperamental than others. Is it clear that a person with a perfect constitution and enjoying perfect health should have a temperament predominatingly of any one kind? It seems to me that a neutral temperament, or one that adjusted itself perfectly to changing circumstances and occasions, would be the desideratum. Is there not a perfect temperament which represents the vanishing-point of all peculiar temperaments?

Then, however striking the relational frequencies in the abnormal cases tabulated by Kretschmer, the fact that as many as nine circular or maniac depressives were noted in cases where the physique was asthenic, athletic or asthenico-athletic seems to be a striking and disturbing fact. If over ten per cent. of the maniac depressives, in whom a pyknic physique is to be expected, have a contrasted type of physique, one would confidently anticipate that a larger percentage of those who were not maniac depressives, but only persons with a cycloid temperament, would have the contrasted physique, and that a much larger percentage of merely normal cyclothemes would have a physique in contrast to what would be expected. Conversely, the physique from which at least a schizotheme temperament would be expected would in quite a large proportion of cases be associated with a cyclotheme temperament. Suppose that anticipations were astray in 25 per cent. of the cases the test, with all its elaborate preliminary investigations, would not be worth much for practical charac-

terology. As far as my personal experience and enquiries go, any distinguished graphologist could do much better. I am confident that there are half-a-dozen graphologists whose margin of error—and on points which are of much more importance for practical characterology than classification as a cyclothyme or schizothyme—is nothing like 25 per cent. Further, if the graphologists were, like Kretschmer, put to the test on abnormal cases I should be greatly surprised if their margin of error was 10 per cent. Souques would, I am sure, not claim to be allowed any such margin. The failure of congruence may probably, as Kretschmer suggests (p. 94), be explained by an hereditary mixed basis, one basis coming through predominatingly on the physical side and the other on the psychic side. But the explanation does not make the fact any the less disturbing.

Kretschmer says that "the athletic type among women, as far as it is recognisable, corresponds to the male form, with certain characteristic deviations." The words "as far as it is recognisable" seem to me to suggest a loophole for criticism. Kretschmer's athletic type is an essentially masculine type. But if his classification is adopted in the case of the female physique there is among female types no typically feminine female type corresponding as a correlative to the masculine male type. We have instead a masculine female type. But are there not a typically male type of physique and a typically feminine type, and are they not well illustrated in the "Discobolos" and "Venus" of Milo? These reflections suggest that the views so brilliantly advocated by Otho Weininger in his *Sex and Character* have not been sufficiently weighed by Kretschmer, and that the distinction between the masculine and the feminine is, as Apfelbach has since suggested, at least a contrast in one dimension. While admitting that Kretschmer's three types are three distinct types, which anyone with ordinary powers of observation can recognise as familiar once they have been pointed out, it is difficult not to feel that the whole classification, considered from the point of view of adequacy and completeness, is coloured by special interest in and familiarity with the material which the investigator's clinic has provided. It is doubtful how far the distinctions are instructive in normal cases. Suppose that a sculptor were allowed to inspect the competitors at the Olympic Sports and select, say, a hundred whom he considered beautifully made men, and suppose, then, a composite photograph of these were obtained by Galton's method of superimposition, we would get a figure

(of hypothetical value as a standard) from which the physique of actual individuals would vary in different degrees. A "beautiful" example of the asthenic type—using the word "beautiful" in the sense in which a surgeon would speak of a beautiful ulcer—would certainly deviate most markedly from our hypothetical standard. Now, considered from this point of view, it would be interesting to know if there is any difference in the statistical relational-frequency which Kretschmer examined, according as the particular type was or was not very pronounced. For instance, was the pyknic type more than usually pronounced in those who were circulars? In other words, if you are a pyknic is your chance of being a manic depressive just the same whether you are a very obvious or only a hardly recognisable pyknic? If you are of the athletic type does it make any difference to your chance of being a schizophrène whether, metaphorically speaking, you are a scratch-man or a limit handicap man? For some of us this question has a personal interest. Perhaps I should remark that not all famous athletes (perhaps not 40 per cent.) belong to Kretschmer's "athletic" class. Kiely certainly does; Horgan was a typical pyknic, so was Vigne, and O'Connor is, I would say, an asthenico-athletic.

Kretschmer's three types of physique and what he says of them from a psychological point of view seems to correspond fairly closely with the physiognomists' three types of hands, viz., the long bony hand, the short fleshy hand, and the small slender hand, and what they have to say of these types. Consequently, if a distribution table on Kretschmer's lines were worked out in reference simply to the familiar classification of hands, it seems probable that the results would be substantially the same, and, however distasteful it might be to the eminent scientist, it looks probable that the contest would only result in a draw. But the physiognomist insists on going into greater detail and noting a number of distinctions, such as the shape of the finger nails and finger tips, whether conical or spatulate, and so on, and in that way forming a number of sub-classes. It would be interesting to know how a contest would result in respect of the fuller and more informative statements of the physiognomist. Anyway, the conclusion which I desire to draw from these reflections is that when records are being made out by means of such a chart as Kretschmer's no pains should be spared to have the details as complete as possible. A glance at the elaborate chart which he draws up shows that he would be the first to agree to this. Well, then, first of all I would suggest that in each case a speci-

men of handwriting should be observed and that a graphologist's observations on the handwriting should be obtained. Secondly, I suggest that physiognomists might be asked if they had any further details to suggest for recording. Also, would it not be worth recording the subject's preferences as to colour; for example, that he likes most blues and greens, but dislikes most browns, a certain shade of magenta, and the yellow of a sunflower? Also, besides the physical chart, should there not be an elaborate chart on the psychological side? And should not the psychoanalytical school be allowed to say a word on the preparation of this? The details for statistical investigation should be as little as possible coloured by presuppositions and the theories of particular schools.

For the purpose of ordinary practical characterology the main importance, to my mind, of recognising the general type of physique of an individual lies in the fact that such recognition is necessary in order to ascertain whether a particular physical characteristic belongs to the individual simply as an example of such and such a physical type, or belongs to him as a particular or individual modification of the general type. In the latter case it seems to me to be much more significant than in the former. Thus, suppose that two individuals, A and B, have a physical characteristic which observation has shown to be generally associated with some psychic characteristic X. Further suppose that the physical characteristic is in itself more pronounced in A than in B, though comparatively less pronounced than in B, if A is compared with those of his general physical type and B compared with those of his general type, so that in B the characteristic has, as an individual modification, come through and against the general type, whereas with A it only comes with the general type, and weakly for the type, then the psychic characteristic X will be more evident in B than in A. In other words, the basis of the type does not appear to be as significant as the individual moulding. This view, however, I only put forward on the strength of my own personal observations.

I have not left myself time to deal with the psychological effects of the secretions of the ductless glands, as to which there has been so much recent research. The influence of the endocrine system on the temperament has been proved. Operations on the thyroid and other glands have well-known effects. As Roback observes, we are brought back to something reminiscent of the old theory of the "humors" with which those acquainted with Burton's "Anatomy of Melancholy" will be familiar. "If the old

terms are no longer used in discussion of the effects of the ductless secretions, the manes of Hippocrates and Galen can still point with triumph to their speculative child and say their 'I told you so.' " The main criticism which I have to offer as to these, as also to the former researches, is simply that they do not carry us very far towards a practical characterology. For they only furnish correlations with respect to temperamental varieties, whereas mental endowments and character are of most interest from a practical point of view.

I should also have liked to give a full account of the important results, very recently published, of the researches of M. Souques on the subject of handwriting. He is a scientist and is employed by the French Government, and he has shown that many diseases, both mental and other, and also certain criminal tendencies, may be accurately diagnosed from the handwriting. Mr. Jacob, as I have mentioned, is employed by the Canadian Government. Handwriting must, therefore, for the future be taken seriously.

But it must be admitted that much of what is written in cheap popular works on handwriting seems to rest mainly on guesswork corroborated by a very insufficient amount of research work, and is quite untrustworthy. The writer, where he does not simply borrow from recognised authorities, often seems to arrive at general conclusions, in the first instance, by endeavouring to put himself into the frame of mind that would probably express itself in the handwriting examined. Then in many cases suggestions seem to be derived from what appears to be little better than a pun. A writer slopes his words backwards. The graphologist then says that in his writing he turns back on himself and is, therefore, too self-conscious. But if graphology is to be taken seriously it cannot be allowed to base itself on flashes of intuition of this kind. I do not think, however, that it would be surprising if it turned out after the strictest investigation that there is a considerable amount of sub-conscious natural symbolism involved in the expression of character by handwriting. Modern psychoanalysis has revealed the existence of this symbolism in the case of dreams, and it is quite possible that such symbolism may find another channel of expression in handwriting. But that is a matter for strict investigation. It may turn out that there is nothing in the suggestion.

I do not think I can conclude my remarks better than by citing Roback's review of the general position. In his "Psychology of Character" (pp. 108, 109) he says: "The

time is now ripe for further experimentation on temperamental dispositions, and by the aid of further tests and questionnaires and the co-operation of public institutions, we may anticipate in the not distant future a body of data which would be of incalculable value not only theoretically *per se*, but practically in the reduction of the amount of unhappiness caused so frequently by the following factors: (1) the entering into relationships without sufficient insight into one another's natures, (2) misunderstandings due to unfamiliarity with temperaments other than our own, (3) obstacles in the way of terminating fundamentally incompatible relationships, (4) temperamental adjustment in the industrial system, (5) the effects of various foods, drugs, alcoholic beverages, etc., on one's temperamental disposition." If this estimate is sound we need not look farther for arguments in favour of a more definite recognition of characterology, since the desired co-operation on the part of various public institutions cannot be expected until the recognition is accorded. Such co-operation is essential, because what is most needed is extensive statistical material. As Kretschmer puts it: "The only question is this: are there statistical relational-frequencies between certain forms of physique and certain psychical dispositions? Here, in numerical relational-frequencies, lie the fixed provable facts" (p. xiv.).