

The Diverse and Changing Categories of Deafness

Abstract The very broad nineteenth century umbrella notion of ‘deafness’ covered various kinds of differential auditory experience, among which being ‘hard of hearing’ was just the most pervasive. We explore how understandings of deafness developed and multiplied as the manifold causes of acquired deafness in disease and aging developed further differentiations, including the advent of ‘war-deafness’ in the global conflict of 1914–1918.

Keywords Changing categories of deafness · Identities · War-deafness

When Harriet Martineau published her ‘Letter to the Deaf’ in 1834, what kind(s) of ‘deaf’ constituency was she addressing?¹ Her readers might have anticipated from her broad general title, and her self-categorisation as a ‘deaf’ person that she was speaking to all kinds of ‘deaf’ people. But in recommending that they share her practice of using hearing trumpets to enhance or restore their conversational capacity it was clear she was only addressing those with some residual hearing. Like Martineau’s readers then, we cannot take for granted what any given reference to ‘deafness’ meant in the nineteenth century. And following Irene Leigh’s recent focus on the multiplicity of ‘deaf’ identities in the Twenty first century, we explore in what follows some of the diverse historical meanings of deafness as they intersect with understandings of hearing loss.² Whether Martineau’s readers actually identified with her

particularised partial notion of ‘deafness’ is indeed an open question. At the time she was writing there was no tidy taxonomic differentiation of ‘hard of hearing’ as a gradually acquired mild-severe condition versus ‘deafened’ as a severe-profound loss. Nor indeed was there a fixed understanding of whether capacity for aural conversation necessarily accompanied any sort of ‘deaf’ condition as Martineau appeared to presume.

This chapter aims to historicize such issues by showing the contingent and changing nature of the categories of deafness used up to the First World War in all their untidy and non-consensual complexity. We explore how different kinds of deafness are historically and culturally specific in their reference along a rich and continuous spectrum of human experiences. Thus, in what follows we explore first the meanings of hearing, then of ‘deafness’, e.g. in the common nineteenth-century association of the word ‘Deaf’ with ‘Dumb’ for the non-speaking, and ‘Stone Deaf’ used to refer to complete hearing loss, but without implying any lack of speech.³ Then we look at the changing categories that arose to modify the spectrum of meanings of deafness in the early twentieth century. This includes the twentieth century eugenic concern to differentiate ‘hereditary’ deafness and ‘acquired’ deafness, as well as a new sympathetic concern for those who were extrinsically ‘deafened’ by the explosive effects of the First World War. The chapter thus closes with a discussion of how early in the twentieth century new experiences of combat-induced deafness brought a new category into existence and a new sympathy and respect for at least some among the broad constituency of the deaf.

1 ‘HEARING’ VS HEARING LOSS AS A FORM OF DEAFNESS

In the nineteenth century, as now, the status of ‘hearing’ vis-a-vis deaf was rarely examined, since in general the hearing population have not been compelled to characterise this normalised condition. Yet a perceived departure from this ‘norm’ for those experiencing various kinds of deafness becomes clear from the evidence of those who experienced hearing loss. It was characteristically an emotionally isolating phenomenon, as everyday relationships became gradually more challenging for those who could not sustain a tacitly ‘normal’ performance of hearing. With the possible exception of hearing loss induced in wartime combat, British society/culture has not generally been as sympathetic to the loss of hearing as the loss of sight. Rarely was the onset of hearing loss considered to be a ‘tragedy’ akin to the trauma of loss of eyesight.⁴

If anything, as we examine later, loss of hearing was popularly represented as somewhere between irritating and comic rather than tragic.

One common stigmatizing trope discussed below was that the supposedly ‘deaf’ or ‘hard of hearing’ could in fact hear more effectively than they claimed, but simply *chose* stubbornly not to hear. This unsympathetic representation of the hard of hearing has long been marked by a lack of empathy within the Hearing world which has treated them as ‘infirm’, for example, weakened by old age, or emasculated for men. The sense of loss experienced was therefore exacerbated by a loss of agency and a sense of inexorable transition into old age and dependency on the assistance of others. To further heighten the sense of isolation, those who became hard of hearing as adults rarely connected with the experiences of the c. 2% born deaf or who became deaf in early life and who managed communication typically by learning to sign without necessarily being aware of any ‘lost’ capacity for hearing. Hence, although those with a late-onset hearing loss identified themselves as Hearing, they have fallen into a cultural/social limbo between Deaf cultures and Hearing cultures, not clearly belonging to either.

Jennifer Esmail has argued that in seeking to understand Victorian conceptualisations of deafness that ‘hearing Victorians’ conventionally understood deafness as a pathology, believing that people who experienced complete deafness were suffering under a ‘heavy misfortune’, and thus presumptively needing ‘pity and charity.’⁵ As Jan Branson and Don Miller have shown, however, this was not so at the start of the nineteenth century. When charitable and philanthropic voluntary organisations gave non-hearing deaf people religious instruction, they treated them as having ordinary needs while simply being different within a wider community. For the latter part of the nineteenth century Branson and Miller identify a shift in the categorisation which led to this constituency increasingly being pathologised and treated instead as if impaired, i.e. as ‘disabled non-hearing people’. They were thus excluded from mainstream society in specialist schools and asylums, without access to conventional education or employment opportunities. Such pejorative cultural constructions of deafness did not just impinge on those who were deaf all through their lives: they would also have had a considerable impact on the life quality of any hearing Victorian who acquired some significant degree of deafness after childhood.⁶ For our purposes the risks could be lost prospects of employment or marriageability, as well as social isolation from hearing society.

This alienation from conversational life was often not apparent to those who had no experience of lacking the communicative resource of hearing. The sound world of pre-industrialized societies could be overlaid with meanings that were self-evident only for those with full hearing capacities. For the case of nineteenth century France, Alain Corbin's classic study has explored the history of the meanings attaching to the sound of pealing church bells—warnings, celebrations, calls to prayer or to marriages or funerals. The collective emotional import of a peal of bells could overwrite all other concerns until the advent of secularisation brought the rise of written over auditory forms of authority. Yet, both he and his primary sources take it for granted that everyone could hear the bells and hear them equally. This raises questions not addressed by Corbin concerning how a loss of hearing entailed loss of access to the local soundscape and the consequent loss of informational knowledge and emotionally-fraught sense of displacement.⁷

In the British case to recapture the emotional tenor of that experience of lost access to a sound world, we must turn typically to religious and literary periodicals. These sources are one of the few repositories of narratives of loss of hearing discussed openly by writers who lived through it. After all, to receive some interest or attention from others, those who had lost (some) hearing had to turn their experiences into some culturally aesthetic form easily consumed, whether by deaf or hearing cultures. And it was poems in particular that could concisely convey the emotional tenor of those experiences.⁸ Instead of direct complaint, they attempted to establish the poignancy of hearing loss through such recurrent tropes as the increased inability to perceive the sounds of Nature, music, childhood and God/Church. *The Literary Gazette* of 13 July 1850, for example, carried 'The Lament of the Deaf Lady' by Emily Varndell which described a litany of lost sounds: song, the lark 'carolling', church bells (now unable to call her to prayer), the sea, the wind (and, we infer, an Aeolian harp), the bee, the watch dog, a child's lisp, gentle voice. Poetry like this was meant to elicit reflection among the hearing as to their good fortune—thanks due to God that they were not in the subject's position—in order to garner their charitable intervention to assist her.⁹

The Rev. J. Lancaster Ball's poem 'A Deaf Man's Monody in Spring' carried by *The Wesleyan-Methodist Magazine* in May 1886 depicted a man who has lost his hearing and thus access to birdsong, the 'sounds from grove or stream', music, gentle conversation, and 'still small voices'.

This offered a highly evocative and personal account of the experience of hearing loss late in life: ‘I still see long-loved faces by/I *see* them speak, but know not what/I see them smile, but know not why/Yet I will be glad and murmur not’. He thus reflected that divine benevolence had left him with the ‘greater gift of sight’.¹⁰ Thus we see vision and hearing were placed within a hierarchy with the former ability typically privileged over the capacity to hear. From this we can understand the common—if later contested—nineteenth century perception that loss of sight was a greater tragedy than loss of hearing; by contrast the latter was regrettable, and either irritating or comical depending on context.

Indeed, it was not the poignancy of writers mourning for lost hearing that we find in other kinds of media representations. Instead the hard of hearing were cast much more harshly as irritating in their failure to uphold conversational norms or laughable in the mistakes that they made in attempting so to participate. These alternative tropes fuelled comic depictions in *Punch* and the *Spectator* that characterised hearing loss narrowly as an affliction specifically of bodily deterioration in later life, and one that required a hearing trumpet to remedy. Some such depictions could be strongly gendered: where the hearing trumpet user was a middle-aged male there was a common theme of emasculation in the putative infirmity of deafness. In the satirical mode of these two publications comic effect was created through captioned misunderstandings achieved by mishearing crucial consonants. For example, in the punningly titled ‘A Matter of Hearing’ that was published by the *Spectator* in 1908, the Witness examined in court declares: ‘I’m a bad liar, am I? Then what are you?’ to which The Beak (magistrate) replies: ‘I asked if you had it on hire?’. Silence in court is then demanded to halt this communicative mishap.¹¹

Other cartoons carried in the press sometimes reiterated the trope that the supposedly hard of hearing were being lazy, disingenuous or outright fraudulent: they could actually hear but simply chose not to do so. This supposedly voluntary deafness appeared figuratively in phrases such as ‘turning a deaf ear’ akin to ‘turning a blind eye’ in its implications of selective or even irresponsible indifference. This pejorative association was harnessed for political satire by the weekly *Fun* on 9 July 1890 in ‘Deaf As a Post: the raikes’ [sic] progress *versus* the Post Office pilgrims’ progress’. The Postmaster-General Henry Cecil Raikes MP (who served in that office under Lord Salisbury 1886–1891) was depicted with his head atop a post box body, ears and eyes closed to the

loud complaints of his employees represented as a single post-man burdened by a huge sack of ‘grievances’.¹² Such a representation in a popular, progressive publication could only have reinforced the common lack of sympathy for those who had genuinely lost hearing.

2 HEARING LOSS AMONG THE ‘STONE DEAF’ AND THE ‘DEAF AND DUMB’

The derogatory discourse of hearing loss as voluntary deafness can be contrasted to two other subcategories of deafness in the nineteenth century. People who were genuinely and absolutely deaf were known as the ‘stone deaf’, subsequently re-categorised as the ‘Deaf’ in the sign-language narratives of the twentieth century. And there were those who did not speak—the so-called ‘mute’ or ‘dumb’. This association was epitomised in one of the titles of the deaf-owned publication *Deaf and Dumb Times* (see Chap. 6); it is significant that this title changed several times owing to the evident dissatisfaction of some of its readers, among other reasons.¹³ The way in which all of these forms, along with hearing loss, could be categorised by Victorians under the rubric of ‘deafness’ illustrates the range of terms and elasticity of the word ‘deaf’. This can make it difficult for historians to access the distinct experience of those who considered themselves to have a hearing loss. For example, those categorised as deaf-mute could themselves have previously had hearing and then experienced sudden traumatic loss, as was a supposedly ‘deaf-mute’ telegrapher in the USA who was reported in 1878 as having lost his hearing suddenly after completing training.¹⁴

The category of ‘deaf and dumb’ was used very widely as a bureaucratic phrase in British Parliamentary papers and reports on all kinds of official texts such as the decennial census, which enumerated the deaf in a category with that heading from 1851. For example, consider Boyles’ Report to the ‘Commission on the Employment of Children, Young Persons, and Women in Agriculture’ (1867) which addressed the appropriateness of field labour for girls and women. Of girls who did not enter farm service at the ages of 12–14, but remained employed instead in agricultural labour, a typical observation was that there was ‘generally something against them’ being either ‘deformed or deaf and dumb’.¹⁵ It was thus assumed that the status as ‘deaf and dumb’ for such young women was akin to (physical) ‘deformity’ in unfitting them for the

socially superior employment of domestic service, so that they were only permitted to do lower status work in the field.

Both this version and an alternative reification of the category of ‘deaf and dumb’ were utilised in *The British Deaf Mute*, (1895–1896), albeit without fixed protocols and also with separability of terms. This was an activist publication that directly paralleled the circulation of other very active internationalist groups at the time, such as the trades unions and suffrage societies. For example, this publication reported occasionally on such distinctive items as ‘Deaf-mute Lady Entertainer’, and ‘Deaf-Mute Football League’ on also on the ‘Jews’ Deaf and Dumb Home’. Nevertheless, somewhat subverting its own title, reference simply to ‘the deaf’ (capitalized in the titles of articles) was much more commonplace, e.g. ‘The African Deaf’, ‘Church’s Care of the Deaf’, ‘the New Institute for the Adult Deaf’, ‘Orally Taught Deaf’, ‘Schools for the Deaf’ and for the ‘Deaf and Blind’, ‘Educators of the Deaf’. On the other hand the conjunction of deaf and dumb were deconstructed in one article titled ‘Deaf Children not Necessarily Dumb (“in the Beginning”)’). As these headings might suggest, ‘deaf’, even without ‘mute’ or ‘dumb’ attached, was rarely used alone. In a publication that followed all things ‘deaf’, no one it appears was ever purely ‘deaf’ (whether explicitly or implicitly signalled), and only in relation to the stone-deaf was there an implication of no hearing capacity.

In headings like those just given, or others such as ‘the Indian Deaf’, ‘Pictures by Glasgow Deaf Artists’, and ‘Proposed Deaf Trades-Union’ we see how multiple forms of deaf identity emerged by intersections with gender, religion, class, maturity (child vs. adult), ‘race’ and or blindness. This suggests that the term ‘deaf’, far from being associated just with ‘dumb’ as in the official category, or ‘mute’ as in the periodical’s title, had a wide range of uses and associations among those who experienced any degree of hearing loss, and that the preference for any one of them might vary depending on context even for a single individual. Indeed, working for a British publication interested in promoting unity among the deaf worldwide, the partially-hearing house journalist George Frankland¹⁶ flagged this up quite explicitly in *The British Deaf Mute* in a piece titled ‘By What Name?’ in November 1895. There was real dissatisfaction with the situation among [t]he deaf, the dumb, and the deaf-and-dumb or deaf-mutes’ who were then ‘agitating’ for a designation ‘comprehending all these classes’ since to be described as ‘Deaf and

Dumb' was unjust to those who were either but not both. Using explicitly Darwinian language he commented that these were all 'really names of species' for which an overarching genus was needed. This was a difficult matter as the proposed broad category could not be as broad as the 'Infirm' since that could 'include the blind, lame, and idiotic', nor so narrow as 'Deaf' which would 'leave the poor dumb out in the cold'.¹⁷ Accordingly Frankland discussed—perhaps in part, satirically—some possible neologistic alternatives to overwrite all these: 'Silentians' and 'Owrotics' combined from 'aurotics' and 'orotics'.

Such was the difficulty of this point that Frankland felt unable even to start discussion on how far this taxonomical debate could include the concerns of those who were, like him, neither stone-deaf nor mute, but not fully hearing either:

Possibly many would like neat verbal distinctions between the "Hard of hearing," "Partially deaf," and "Stone deaf," as well as between degrees of dumbness, but I think this question had better be postponed.¹⁸

Evidently the prospect of unifying all the varieties of the deaf-hearing experience under one banner was a long way off, and Frankland's proposals for an all-encompassing term did not succeed, and he made no further efforts to differentiate between the 'Hard of hearing' and the 'Partially Deaf'.¹⁹

Soon it was not just the heterogeneous deaf community that was discussing the categorisations of deafness/partial deafness/partial hearing. In the medical domain there were attempts to link the categorisations of deafness to biomedical and environmental causation, decoupled from the lived experience of hearing loss.

3 MEDICALISING HEARING LOSS: ACQUIRED DEAFNESS AND WAR-DEAFNESS

Within a decade of that unresolved debate in *The British Deaf Mute*, the rise of eugenics—a concern promoted particularly by Alexander Graham Bell—posed new threats to the identity and autonomy of people without (full) hearing.²⁰ The new eugenic quest was to *eliminate* deafness as if an 'undesirable affliction': the causes of deafness would be eliminated to preclude further deleterious economic consequences for the taxpayer who had to support the institutions for their care. This brought into medical

forums new questions about the organic and economic categorisations of deafness/hearing loss. The degree or kind of deafness or the subjective experience of hearing loss was of less interest to clinicians who sought to account for the origin of the condition in reductively medical terms. The newly enhanced medical professional interest in framing deafness and hearing loss in terms of the aetiology involved a focus on hereditary versus acquired deafness. Eugenicists were particularly keen to eliminate the former and to minimize the latter by environmental health management. As we shall see, however, new means of acquiring hearing loss in the First World War shifted the debate into a new medicalized framework.

One particularly aggressive promoter of eugenic ideals was Percival MacLeod Yearsley the Ear Surgeon and London Schools Inspector on otological matters. Since 1893 the education of deaf children had become the responsibility of the taxpayer.²¹ As a eugenicist he was committed to pinpointing the extent to which deafness was passed on by intermarriage in order—following Bell’s example—to eliminate this costly ‘burden’ to the London taxpayer.²² In doing so, Yearsley was methodologically committed to discerning which London school children had non-hereditary forms of deafness both so as to exclude them from his eugenic statistics, and (less centrally for him) to pinpoint which were the diseases and infections that needed most medical attention to minimize future cases of acquisition. His own figures showed that cases of acquired deafness (c. 97.3%) were much more commonplace than those that he claimed to be hereditary (c. 2.7%).²³ As we will see in Chap. 6, however, MacLeod Yearsley devoted vastly more than three per cent of his research time to hereditary deafness.

However, once the First World War began in 1914, rather different forms of acquired deafness among adults became much more of patriotic interest to the medical profession. As Coreen McGuire demonstrates in her Ph.D. thesis, both medical and social attitudes to hearing loss in Britain were significantly changed during the First World War as the deafened, especially the ‘war-deafened’ emerged as a new category of sympathetic concern. Just a few months into the war in November 1914, The National Bureau for the Encouragement of the Welfare of the Deaf offered its services to the War Office to deal prospectively with ‘soldiers and sailors who may suffer from deafness’. Specifically, it considered a major new source of hearing loss would be the way that the ‘heavy percussion of modern artillery was likely to affect hearing’. Indeed, this subject came up regularly in the Bureau’s minutes during the early years

of the war, although the Bureau was not alone in seeking to highlight this concern, and ultimately was not as influential as a newly galvanized medical community.²⁴

Strikingly, then, the pre-war pre-occupation with the economic cost of non-standard hearing due to ill-health or inheritance was now set aside to devote energy instead to the new blameless and indeed morally valorised category of the 'War-deafened'. While this group was later defined by self-identification in post-war compensation claims, initially the public identification of this group was a medical interest expressed through publication in clinical journals. For example, in September 1917 Macleod Yearsley noted in the *Journal of Laryngology, Rhinology and Otology*, that over the preceding 3 years many cases 'illustrating the effects of modern high explosives upon the organ of hearing' had been collected from the battlefield in France and Belgium. Cases he had seen ranged from temporary shock-related deafness to a 'permanent injury' to hearing. Yearsley deemed those 'lucky' who had only acquired temporary deafness due to middle-ear conditions; and indeed this was the group for which medical intervention had the strongest prospect of providing assistance. Those rendered permanently deaf were, as ever, beyond the scope of medical care to heal.

However, the title of his piece 'An Air Raid Case' indicates it was not only male soldiers at the battle front who encountered this condition. By June 1917, when the bombing of London by zeppelins had been succeeded by deadly German Gotha bombers, even ordinary civilians otherwise visibly uninjured by falling missiles could find themselves subject to the effects of brutal wartime explosions. In ways that contrast to the general indifference of the medical profession to factory and other workplace explosions in the preceding decades, there was a moral imperative to capture the experiences of the war-deafened as a special category and valorize them with detailed medical attention. Yearsley related the case of Miss X, a teacher in an east London school aged 27, who 'although not injured at the Front, suffered nevertheless in the service of her country.' During the air raid that month she was ushering her class into the school basement when a bomb landed near the closed front door where she was standing: the explosion burst the door open and she was knocked down, injuring her head. Her experiences of resulting hearing problems were recorded by Yearsley in some detail.²⁵ This new interest is presumably one of many reasons that MacLeod Yearsley's concern with the eugenics of deafness had all but disappeared by the post-war period.

The war-deafened,—during the war at least—unarguably constituted a new general category of deafness to be investigated and cared for. While ‘war’ was the notional causal factor rather than ill-health or inheritance, this condition covered all kinds of deafness from mild reversible hearing loss to absolute and permanent loss of hearing. *The Lancet* and *The British Medical Journal* among other journals dedicated much interest to cases of such ‘war deafness’, albeit to publish research wherever no medical amelioration could be accomplished. While the British Government provided some pension provision support for them, it was, as Coreen McGuire shows, charities such as the dedicated Deafened Ex-Service Men’s Fund to whom many looked to find ways of coping as War Veterans. When the postwar Industrial Training Scheme was launched in 1919 the National Bureau especially emphasised the virtues of ‘deafened workers’. Experience had apparently shown that their ‘freedom from the distractions of talk and noise’ tended to make them more productive than others.²⁶

Yet as the Bureau’s successor body noted in 15 years after the war, the overall situation of the ‘war-deafened’ had not been helped by the advent of widespread telephony and wireless that had ‘revolutionised life’ for many. Even as long respected subjects of hearing loss, the deafened war veterans faced a world in which even their military heroics gave them no equal footing with the blinded for whom these purely acoustic media had been a great boon.²⁷

4 CONCLUSION

The categorisation of deafness as a form of hearing loss before or during the First World War covered many sorts of experience. While various vocabularies for understanding deafness as hearing loss emerged these were closely entangled with the contexts of social position, and the broader politics of who would represent the concerns of the ‘deaf’ as an overall group. While the deaf/hard of hearing themselves were concerned with degrees and kinds of deafness and the various means of communicating (hearing or otherwise) open to them, the medical profession was more professionally interested in understanding the causation of deafness and hearing loss: ill-health, inheritance and latterly combat. Certainly, however, there were some key changes in our period. It is significant that the former group dropped ‘deaf and dumb’ from their lexicon, while the medical fraternity introduced the category

of ‘war-deafened’. Most obviously not all categories of deafness seen as hearing loss were equally valued: we can see from the stories above, those linked to disease or hereditary factors were less broadly valorised than war-induced forms.

NOTES

1. Harriet Martineau, ‘Letter to the Deaf’, *Tait’s Edinburgh Magazine*, April 1834, 174–179.
2. Irene Leigh *A Lens on Deaf Identities* (Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 2009).
3. We are grateful to Mike Gulliver for permission to see his piece, “‘Deaf-mute vs. Semi-mute’: Debating deaf abilities, identities and destinies on the eve of Oralism’ that is currently under consideration for publication.
4. For research on the ‘tragedy’ of blindness, see Julie Anderson *War, Disability and Rehabilitation in Britain: ‘Soul of a nation’* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011).
5. Jennifer Esmail, *Reading Victorian Deafness: Signs and Sounds in Victorian Culture* (Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 2013), 9.
6. Jan Branson & Don Miller, *Damned for their Difference: the cultural construction of deaf people as “disabled”, a sociological history* (Washington D.C.: Gallaudet University Press, 2003), 145. Esmail, *Reading Victorian Deafness*, 4.
7. Alain Corbin, trans. Martin Thom, *Village Bells: Sound and Meaning in the Nineteenth-Century French Countryside*, (London: Papermac, 1999), 40, 92–93, 95, 194, 288, 307. For other examples of scholarship on sound worlds that take standard hearing capacity for granted but mention hearing loss in passing, see Daniel Morat (editor) *Sounds of Modern History: Auditory Cultures in Nineteenth and Twentieth century Europe* (Oxford & New York: Berghahn, 2014).
8. For a discussion of poetry by the non-hearing deaf, see Esmail, *Reading Victorian Deafness*, 22–68.
9. Emily Varndell, ‘The Lament Of The Deaf Lady,’ *The Literary Gazette: A Weekly Journal of Literature, Science, and the Fine Arts* no. 1747 (Jul 13, 1850): 478. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/5134212?accountid=13651> (last accessed October 22, 2015).
10. Lancaster J. Ball, ‘A Deaf Man’s Monody In Spring.’ *The Wesleyan-Methodist Magazine* (05, 1886): 370. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/3041221?accountid=13651> (accessed October 22, 2015).
11. David Low, ‘A Matter of Hearing,’ *Spectator*, (New Zealand) July 23, 1908, p. 5.

12. 'Deaf As a Post: the raikes' progress *versus* the Post Office pilgrims' progress, *Fun*, July 9, 52 (1890), 15.
13. The periodical itself had many changes of title—later *British Deaf Monthly*, but previously the *Deaf Chronicle*, *Deaf and Dumb Times*. These changes of title reflected both the diplomatic difficulty of naming in an inclusive fashion and also the financial significance of engaging as large a purchasing readership possible. See discussion in Chap. 6.
14. *The London Reader* published an article in 1878 about an American 'deaf-mute telegrapher' who had become deaf just after he had completed his training, and went on to work in telegraphy very successfully for the rest of his life. 'A Deaf-Mute Telegrapher,' *The London Reader: of literature, art, science and general information*, April 6, 1878, 536.
15. In the evidence to the same Report, we read that of three women employed on one farm, one was a single woman aged 35 'deaf and dumb'. 1868–1869 [4202] [4202-I] Commission on the Employment of Children, Young Persons, and Women in Agriculture (1867). Second report of the commissioners, with appendix part I, 186, 658.
16. George Frankland was later the author of texts such as *The Pure oral method in relation to the environment of the deaf* (1901). See biographical details in *British Deaf Mute*, 5 (1896), 290-1 and Dominic W Stiles, 'George Frankland, Deaf Journalist (1866–1936)'. <http://blogs.ucl.ac.uk/library-rnid/2016/06/10/george-frankland-deaf-journalist-1866-1936-brilliant-scholar-deep-thinker-and-one-of-the-finest-writers-of-prose/>.
17. George Frankland, 'By What Name?' *The British Deaf-Mute* Vol. 5, 1895–1896, 11–12.
18. Frankland, 'By What Name?', 11.
19. Frankland, 'By What Name?', 11. As an indication of the mood for unity, this article was followed immediately by one on the newly-formed National Association of Teachers of the Deaf, with the stated aim of bringing together all those who taught in deaf schools, across 'all systems; the pure oral, the oral, the sign-manual, the combined, the dual' W.S. Bessant, 'The National Association of Teachers of the Deaf,' *The British Deaf Mute*, 5 (1895–1896) 12–13, 13.
20. Brian H. Greenwald, 'Taking Stock: Alexander Graham Bell and Eugenics,' *The Deaf History Reader*, ed. John Vickery Van Cleave (Washington D.C.: Gallaudet University Press 2007), 136–152.
21. Peter W. Jackson, *Britain's Deaf Heritage* (Edinburgh: Pentland Press Limited, 1990), 128–129.
22. See Chap. 6 of this volume for further discussion.
23. His figures were 'Infective Diseases' 34.4% and 'infectious Fevers' 72.9%, with measles and scarlet fever by far the most common causes. Macleod

- Yearsley ‘The Causes Leading To Educational Deafness In Children, With Special Reference To Prevention’, *The Lancet* July 27 1912, 228–234.
24. The topic of ‘Soldiers & Deafness’ is cited on p. 147, 151–153, 162, 170, 174, 190, 193, 203, 304 of *The National Bureau for Promoting the General Welfare of the Deaf and National Institute for the Deaf Minute book*, Volume 1 (1911–1926). Source: Action on Hearing Loss Library.
 25. Very soon after the incident ‘Miss X’ found not only tinnitus but also reported to Yearsley that she was ‘markedly deaf’, especially in her left ear. While the tinnitus had mostly gone at her next consultation with him a week later, her ‘deafness was diminished but very little’ and she could not differentiate between lower frequency tones and distant sounds. It is unclear to what extent her hearing was restored, for Yearsley’s main concern was to correlate this to two purportedly similar cases of male officers ‘from the Front’. Percival Macleod Yearsley, ‘An Air Raid Case’ *Journal Of Laryngology, Rhinology And Otology* 32 (1917), 18–19.
 26. See discussion in Coreen McGuire ‘The “Deaf Subscriber” and the shaping of the British Post Office’s Amplified Telephones 1911–1939,’ unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Leeds, 2016.
 27. ‘The Deafened by Disease’ in the *Report of the Executive Committee to the Council*, Year ended March 31st, 1933. Minute book of the National Institute for the Deaf, at the Action on Hearing Loss Library. Thanks to Coreen McGuire for this reference.



<http://www.springer.com/978-1-137-40687-3>

Managing the Experience of Hearing Loss in Britain,
1830–1930

Gooday, G.; Sayer, K.

2017, XX, 126 p. 2 illus., 1 illus. in color., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-1-137-40687-3

A product of Palgrave Macmillan UK