Correspondence.

"Audi alteram partem."

DR. TUKE'S EVIDENCE.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In a few lines I shall be able to answer Dr. Tuke's last letter.

I affirm, without fear of contradiction, mental reservation, or qualification of any kind, that his statement with regard to myself has not even the semblance of truth for its foundation. I never received from Townley a scrap of paper relating to his alleged confession. Dr. Tuke says, unfortunately for him, his witness (Dr. Seymour) is *dead*; fortunately for me, my witnesses are *living*. I never saw Townley except in the presence of Mr. Sims, the governor of the gaol, and Mr. S. Leech, of Derby, the prisoner's solicitor. These gentlemen are in a condition to state that the prisoner did not "put into my hand," as Dr. Tuke asserts, "an extraordinary document" referring to his conversation with Miss Godwin "previously to his brutally murdering her."

I also emphatically deny that I had any conversation with Dr. Tuke in reference to this "lucid confession." His statement in regard to the matter is an entire romance. I never saw Dr. Tuke at Derby except in the public streets, and in the crowded Court during the day of the trial; and on both these occasions we had no conversation. On returning to London, I met Dr. Tuke and Dr. Seymour in a railway carriage, in company with a barrister (a stranger to me), who had been attending the trial. It was, I presume, in this gentleman's presence, and in the railway compartment, that the alleged conversation referred to by Dr. Tuke took place.*

Let me for one moment consider the probabilities of Dr. Tuke's story. I was a witness on Townley's behalf, and had just left the Court, after declaring upon oath that he was, in my judgment, in an insane and irresponsible state of mind. According to Dr. Tuke, a few hours had scarcely elapsed, when, in a public conveyance, I spoke openly of an "extraordinary," "lucid," and "consistent" document, which I said Townley had drawn up, and which Dr. Tuke alleges he (the prisoner) had "put into my hand."

I ask whether, on the face of the matter, the story does not bear palpable and unmistakable evidence of being a myth and a fiction? Having just deposed to the prisoner's insanity, I should indeed have been an egregious idiot if I had, in hot haste (particularly to Dr. Tuke, who would have been—had the opportunity presented itself—an adverse witness), made an admission of Townley's having written a "consistent," "lucid," and "extraordinary" confession, and that too in the presence of a stranger who had only a short time previously heard me on oath state that "the prisoner was a person of unsound mind." This conversation, I distinctly assert, never occurred.

Considering the marvellous faculty of invention with which Dr. Tuke is evidently endowed, and the unbridled sway which his exuberant fancy appears to exercise over his judgment, reason, and moral sense, need I be surprised if he were, on some future occasion, with due solemnity, to affirm that I accompanied Townley into the garden and assisted him in murdering his victim, and that he (Dr. Tuke) witnessed the perpetration of the foul deed?

I owe your readers an apology for intruding at such length on your valuable space in reference to a matter so personal to myself. If I had recollected the advice which a great ancient historian gave to a friend who had been libellously attacked in his day, I should, in all probability, have left Dr. Tuke in the undisturbed enjoyment of his invective and vituperation. "*Spreta exolescunt; si irascere, agnita videntur*," says Tacitus: "Contempt disarms abuse; resent, and you adopt it."

I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

Cavendish-square, May 1st, 1866.

FORBES WINSLOW, M.D.

* A conversation undoubtedly did occur in the carriage between Dr. Tuke, Dr. Seymour, and myself; and it originated in the following way:—*Appropos* of nothing, Dr. Tuke, addressing himself to me, said, "What sum of money will you take to retire from practice?" He then, with great self-complacency, added: "You are the only man who stands in my way!" Staggered by the impertinence of Dr. Tuke thus interrogating me in the presence of a stranger, I jocosely replied, "£50,000." "Fifty thousand pounds," said Dr. Seymour; "that is a large sum." The "stranger" who heard this conversation is a *living* witness of the

SYPHILITIC INOCULATION IN 1865.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Dr. Boeck having undertaken a journey to England at his own cost, and to his great practical inconvenience, is far too liberal-minded to wish any cases treated by him to become the exclusive property of any one individual, or to be interpreted exclusively by any particular school. He would be the last man to acknowledge such advocacy. Dr. Boeck, I feel sure, wished what he did to be open to the whole profession. Could I for a moment have thought otherwise, I should not have ventured upon forbidden ground. I would also strongly deprecate any attempt to shift the argument from the facts of the case to a consideration of personal "respect" to Dr. Boeck. Those who have had the pleasure of knowing that gentleman can entertain but one sentiment of esteem and regard towards him; and it would at once close all fair discussion, as far as they are concerned, if a free inquiry into his views were to be construed into a want of personal respect towards himself. Nor have we at present anything to do with what Dr. Boeck might have proved, had he had the opportunities placed at his disposal which he had reason to expect. With regard to the facts themselves, referred to by Mr. James Lane in your last impression:—

1. It appears from Mr. Lane's statement that on the 16th of December Dr. Boeck "pronounced that immunity had been obtained" in the two patients whom I subsequently inoculated; and on the 6th of January, 1866, Mr. Lane considered that one of the patients had "obtained an immunity from inoculation with syphilis." Mr. Lane, however, now (April 28th, 1866) says that "an immunity as complete as can be expected was obtained." He also states that "an approximate rather than an absolute immunity was all that was aimed at by Dr. Boeck." Now it was precisely to demonstrate this point—that the immunity was not complete—that my experiment was undertaken. Whether we call the immunity "relative" or "approximate," or "no immunity at all," so long as patients can be inoculated so long will they be capable of receiving this kind of disease and of transmitting it to others. I feel satisfied that I could now again inoculate these patients as I did previously.

2. With regard to the length of time over which the inoculations extended, Mr. Lane states that they were commenced on the 5th of September, and I have a note, that on the 9th of January, 1866, "two inoculations by Mr. Lane presented circular spots of suppuration." So that even if I had conveyed the impression that the inoculations extended over four months I should not have been very wrong.

3. The number of patients which Dr. Boeck himself considered had been properly subjected to syphilization in the Lock Hospital was nineteen. This Dr. Boeck informed me on the eve of his departure. I made a note of the circumstance at the time, and have that note still by me. Mr. Lane states that the treatment was discontinued in one case only. If it were again "worth while to allude to such a circumstance at all," I could give the details of four cases in which the treatment was discontinued—viz., 1, Mr. Dunn's case; 2, the case of the patient who first died in the Lock Hospital; 3, the case which was compelled to leave the hospital; 4, a case in private. The want of accuracy does not here rest with me.

4. Mr. Lane states that it "is not the case" that the women subjected to this treatment believed that they "would not be liable to receive or to communicate the disease;" on the other hand, I have it from three different sources—one an inoculated case—that such was the impression of at least some of the patients.

5. With regard to the number of deaths that have occurred Mr. Lane here does me the justice to say that my statement is "undoubtedly correct." I am glad to have this opportunity of mentioning that my only reason for referring to the second case (that in which syphilization was attempted) was, that I found that it was being confounded with the first case (Mr. Dunn's) in which syphilization was carried on for a considerable time. Upon this head Mr. Lane will probably have shortly something more to communicate to the profession. As far as

fact. This is not the first occasion on which Dr. Tuke has taken, privately as well as publicly, most unwarrantable liberties with my name. He will, no doubt, recollect, during his journey from London to Derby the day before Townley's trial, he spoke freely of me in the presence of a stranger, and that this gentleman, turning to Dr. Tuke, said: "May I ask whether your conversation refers to the case of a man who is to be tried at Derby tomorrow for murder?" "Yes," says Dr. Tuke. "Then," responded the stranger, "it is as well you should know, considering the character of your remarks, that I am that prisoner's counsel, and that Dr. Winslow is my friend."