

the effect that he stabbed his wife while she was asleep, and afterwards wounded himself.

Dr. Whitwell, of Shrewsbury, in cross-examination, said the prisoner, in his opinion, was suffering from epileptic mania, of which an irresistible homicidal impulse was one of the features.

By Lord Justice BRAMWELL—By homicidal mania I mean a disposition to commit homicide. It is a kind of delusion.

Lord Justice BRAMWELL—You mean a morbid appetite to do wrong.

Witness—I think the prisoner was acting under real or fancied provocation.

Lord Justice BRAMWELL, in summing up, said everybody was presumed to be sane until proved to be the contrary. Nor was it enough that a man was mad to entitle him to an acquittal. If an insane man knew he was committing murder that man was responsible. It was not enough to have an homicidal mania. The object of the law was to guard against mischievous propensities and homicidal impulses. A man might be suffering under a just sense of some grievous wrong or outrage which would impel him to violence, but that strong impulse, sane or insane, would not entitle him to an acquittal. He said this to the jury in order to disabuse their minds of a mischievous impression which existed, and which he believed had reached mad people themselves. He did not believe in uncontrollable impulse at all, and had never heard of such an impulse leading to action where the means of prevention were present. Having made these observations on what would not be sufficient grounds for an acquittal for insanity, his Lordship proceeded to tell the jury what, in his judgment, would be good grounds. A person would be not guilty on the ground of insanity if he did not know the nature of the act he was committing, or, if he did know it, if he did not know he was doing what was wrong. If a man stabbed another, and did not know he was inflicting hurt, that was insanity which the law recognised; and a person would not know that he was doing wrong unless he knew he was doing what the law forbade, or that his act was injurious to the person he attacked. His Lordship then referred to the evidence, pointing out the want of motive, and the absence of any indication of ill-will on the part of the prisoner against his wife, and observed that, undoubtedly, there were many circumstances in the case which would warrant the conclusion that he was insane in the sense he had pointed out.

The jury, without leaving their box, said they found the prisoner not guilty on the ground of insanity.

Lord Justice BRAMWELL—It would have been impossible, gentlemen, for such a man to be executed—too shocking and cruel. It is a very sad case, and the man is deeply to be pitied. His Lordship then directed the prisoner to be retained during Her Majesty's pleasure, and the prisoner, who had preserved a calm, self-possessed manner throughout, was removed.—*Times*.

THE NEW COUNTY BOARDS BILL AS IT AFFECTS ASYLUMS.

In asking for leave to introduce the County Boards Bill in the House of Commons on the 18th March, Mr. Sclater-Booth made the following remarks in regard to how it would affect the Government of County Asylums. They show that the action of the Medico-Psychological Association last year has not been without result. "In the third place, the County Boards would have the very important power of reviewing the workhouse accommodation of each county, and of providing for the accommodation in the workhouses of imbecile and idiot paupers, whether children or adults. He wished this power had been granted long ago. He did not provide in this Bill for any direct power over the lunatic asylums, but the Boards would be empowered to inquire into the lunatic asylums and enabled by their influence to check their future enlargement. It was proposed last year to give the County Boards a considerable share in the

management of the lunatic asylums, and he had no doubt that before long some plan would be devised by which their management would be given to these County Boards. But long familiarity with the Public Lunatic Acts had convinced him of the very great difficulty of dealing with those Acts by means of a few clauses in a Bill of this kind. It would be most unsatisfactory, without a review of those Acts, to place the administration of the lunatic asylums in the hands of the County Boards."

HEREDITARY SUICIDE.

The son of M. Prevost Paradol, the eminent publicist and Minister of France to the United States, has committed suicide by blowing out his brains in the rooms of his tutor in the Rue Douai, Paris. No cause has been ascertained for the extraordinary act of the youth, who was only 17 years of age. It will be remembered that his father put an end to his life in the same manner some years ago.

Obituary.

DR. FOVILLE.

The death of this distinguished physician, at Toulouse, on the 22nd of July, 1878, demands a brief notice of his life and works. We feel this to be the more necessary because his pen has been so long sheathed that there is some danger of the present generation being ignorant of the good work which it once accomplished, and of the important position which he who wielded it, once occupied. As a man, also deservedly respected and beloved, his memory will long be cherished by those who knew him. For many years he was an Honorary Member of the Medico-Psychological Association.

Born at Pontoise, though of a Rouen family, Aug. 6, 1799, Achille Louis Foville was the only son of an only son, and was left an orphan at an early age. Having chosen the medical profession, he pursued his studies in the Paris Schools of Medicine. These completed, he soon distinguished himself by his original researches into the anatomy and physiology of the brain and cord, and the pathology of mental disorders. Thus, when he was only 21, he wrote a *mémoire*, entitled "Sur les Causes et la Siége des Maladies Mentales," which obtained the prize given by Esquirol. The substance of this treatise was used in the "Traité de Ramollissement du cerveau," of Rostan, and in the article "Folie," by Georget in the "Dictionnaire de Médecine."

The functions of the brain possessed a great attraction for young Foville, and so early as 1823 he published the "Recherches sur le siége spécial de différentes fonctions du système nerveux," in conjunction with Pinel Grandchamp. If any one wrote now-a-days to establish the fact that the brain is the seat of the intelligence, he would be ridiculed for asserting a platitude, but it was not so 58 years ago, and we find the author's first position is that intelligence and motion are functions of the encephalon. Going further into detail in regard to the latter, he surmised that the corpus striatum presides over the movements of the leg, and the optic thalamus over those of the arm; also that the cerebellum is the centre of sensation.

If these conclusions show how much advance has been made in the physiology of the brain since this treatise was written, they show also how early an investigator Foville was in this field of inquiry.

How, one asks, came such views to be held in regard to the functions of these ganglia? Were they without foundation? Certainly not. In the light of more recent researches, and following Ferrier, the explanation may be thus expressed. Inasmuch as in cerebral paralysis the most volitional movements are most affected, the arm is more paralysed than the leg. Hence, in a lesion causing paralysis more by functional interference than direct destruction of the motor tracts, the arm would be more affected than the leg; but in a lesion directly invading the motor part of the internal capsule, the leg as well as the arm would be affected. Now a lesion in the optic thalamus would be more or less outside the motor tracts, and would, if causing paralysis, cause a greater degree of paralysis in the arm in accordance with the foregoing generalisation; while a lesion in the corpus striatum would be more likely to cause paralysis of the leg also. And if the lesion invaded both corpus striatum and optic thalamus, of course both would be affected. Apparently, then, the view entertained by Foville, that the corpus striatum is more connected with the leg, was grounded on the greater degree of paralysis of the leg in such cases, and not on the absence of paralysis of the arm. Foville would have said in such cases that both ganglia were affected, but that other facts would show that if the lesions were exactly confined to the corpus striatum, then we should have paralysis exactly limited to the arm—of which, however, proof has not been forthcoming. It is possible that in the lesions described by Foville there may have been many limited to the medullary fasciculi which have been shown to be differentiated, and to have each their own special connection with the motor apparatus, whether of arm, leg, face, &c.