cover, and at last dying, notwithstanding the utmost efforts to restore them. The chance for the recovery of such precocious children is, in my opinion, small, when attacked by disease; and several medical men have informed me that their own observations have led them to form the same opinion, and have remarked that in two cases of sickness, if one of the patients was a child of superior and highly cultivated mental powers, and the other one equally sick, but whose mind had not been excited by study, they should feel less confident of the recovery of the former than the latter. This mental precocity results from an unnatural development of one organ of the body at the expense of the constitution."

The above is in accordance with my own observations during an active practice of ten years.

ARTICLE III.

ON THE PROPRIETY OF ADMITTING THE INSANE OF THE TWO SEXES INTO THE SAME LUNATIC ASYLUM. BY JOHN M. GALT, M. D.

At the present time, when the wants of the insane are so generally recognized and enforced, we can but view it as desirable that particular attention should be directed to every subject in connection with establishments devoted to the care of these unfortunates; for the efforts of those acquainted with the exact nature and characteristics of insanity, which formerly could not be more profitably bestowed than in persuading the public to make due provision for the hapless lunatic by the erection of asylums, may now be given very suitably to attempts at improvement in the construction and management of these charities.

We regard the separation of the insane, so that only those of one sex shall be admitted into any asylum, as a subject of sufficient importance to occupy the attention of all who are interested in the amelioration of the lot of those laboring under the dire calamity of mental alienation.

The primary disadvantage, under the ordinary system, of having both sexes in the same establishment is two-fold. First, the necessity of keeping the two classes strictly apart demands the most ceaseless vigilance on the part of the officers—a vigilance, too, which must be

deemed entirely superfluous—time, indeed, completely thrown away, when we reflect that it is not at all necessary to include males and females in the same institution. Now, there is fully enough to occupy the minds of officers without having their attention engaged in so ridiculous and utterly useless a train of thoughts. Secondly, not only are these precautions requisite, but the liberties of both orders of patients are essentially abridged by the necessity of keeping them altogether apart. In discussing the question of permitting a modified social intercourse between the insane of the two sexes, Dr. Woodward has asserted that he disagreed with Jacobi in regard to the adverse views of the latter. But, whether he be right or wrong, it must be manifest, on reflection, that such association had a great deal better take place, in either case, with sane persons of the opposite sex than with the insane. And this, which we esteem, indeed, a desirable arrangement, like other improvements, as we shall show hereafter, is diametrically opposed to the existing policy of having males and females on the same premises.

But, again, the circumstance of a variety of officers of different sexes being attached to the same establishment has led, we are confident, to far more bickering and strife than would otherwise have occurred: such diversified interests and such conflicting views ensue, that every board of trustees will find a difficulty here. This is a fact so well established, that we could quote more than one writer to that precise effect. And it must be remembered, too, that all evils of the kind are not only unattended by any counterbalancing advantage, but, as merely appertaining to the present false system, cannot be deemed an intrinsic constituent of the incidents attending the management of the insane.

But, moreover, besides this clashing of opinion to which we have referred as very liable to cause strife and confusion, still greater difficulties attend the management of a promiscuous crowd of male and female attendants. We need not enter into minutæ here, but the evils of this admixture are felt in asylums generally, and have often been deprecated. In truth, aside from their relation to each other, the relation of attendants to patients of the opposite sex is sometimes a perplexing matter; and for this reason alone we would urge the proposed change, especially when the opposite is alike feasible and advantageous.

When we look to the principles of progress, we find that the present system causes us to cling to all the obsolete practices and ideas of the past. The moment any new endeavor is to be made, if it suits one side of the house, it is just as likely as not to prove unsuitable to the other. Saying nothing as to the freedom of action with regard to all experi-

ments, which would be acquired by a different plan, the very fact that the minds of the officers would be released from a number of cares and apprehensions, would give a wonderful impetus to their further efforts to better the condition of their afflicted charge.

From the last paragraph the transition is easy to a suggestion of kindred nature, with which we conclude our arguments in this relation, though others might with facility be adduced if they were called for. The argument to which we advert is involved in a principle which holds good not only with regard to the management of lunatic asylums, but is applicable to all institutions for whatever purpose, and, indeed, constitutes an important law of nature. For a great and inherent principle of creation is found in the unity of design pervading the whole "universe of things." The might and power even of the Deity is evinced in the highest degree in this mode of action. When we survey the animal and vegetable kingdoms, we discover a strict accordance with this law in their structure and spheres of action. For example, how well adapted to the purpose of flying—the chief design, as to motion, of a large majority of the feathered songsters of the grove—are the conjoined characteristics—hollow bones, very expansible lungs, and a nervous pinion, all pointing to the one purpose of flight! Again, in the camel, a denizen of sandy plains, what a remarkable suitableness to its habitat do we discover in its capacity of endurance, the shape of its hoof, and the peculiarity of its stomach in containing a reservoir of water! It were needless to multiply instances, as the principle under consideration is evinced everywhere throughout all the fields of nature. And when we turn to man, and examine his acts and doings, his efforts and his institutions, we find the same ratio to exist as elsewhere in nature, between power on the one hand and simplicity and unity of action on the other. This conclusion we, of course, consider as altogether applicable to the measure respecting the insane which we have advised above. But, moreover, it may be observed that this principle has long been fully acknowledged in an important question connected with the management of those laboring under mental disease; for, if we investigate the facts bearing on the question whether lunatics should be treated in the same building with the sufferers from other maladies, and with the poor generally in almshouses and receptacles of the kind, we see that experience is entirely in favor of a separation of the poor lunatic from such companionship. Now, it is but an extension of this idea, when we adopt the plan of providing different establishments for the two sexes, for in each case simplicity and unity are the objects sought.

Another consideration, which may, perhaps, be brought forward in support of the plan of different asylums for the two sexes, is, that we might then venture to accommodate larger numbers, comparatively, in each institution. For the principal argument as to accommodating in one establishment but a limited number of the insane is, that a considerable number cannot be properly attended to by one mind, it being assumed that the best government of a lunatic asylum is that of a medical superintendent placed over the whole establishment. But it must be obvious that when we have got rid of the harassing cares attending the management of the two sexes in a single institution, then the number under supervision in each case could doubtless be enlarged with advantage. And further, the general idea involved in the principles of classification could be far more thoroughly and efficiently carried out when, the number of the patients under the two regulations merely remaining the same, we could double our wards under the new policy; according to the proposition which we have advanced, however, of increasing the amount of accommodation, a still greater potency is conferred on the capacity for classification. Again, by the adoption of the proposed alteration, the buildings would be far more simple, would cost less, and prove more efficient, being directed to the one purpose of treatment, instead of having to be so modified as to guard against ridiculous dangers. Apart from other considerations, the last-mentioned would enable us, too, the more easily and advantageously to increase the number of the inmates accommodated; and the most prejudiced in behalf of small asylums could not gainsay the idea in question. It happens, then, both from the facility in providing for large numbers, and the unity of design in the buildings, a saving in the cost of institutions will consequently ensue. This alone would probably compensate for any pecuniary loss attending the improvement which is suggested, the advantages of which, however, we are free to confess, are not to be measured by dollars and cents.

Having assigned the principal reasons which, in our opinion, prove the propriety of that change of policy in asylums which has been described above, we proceed to touch lightly upon the ideas and experience of others in this regard. And first, as to the actual experience on the subject. Though, from the two prominent examples of the few asylums in which the new principle has been followed—the Bicêtre and the Salpêtrière—more important lessons have emanated than perhaps from any other source; yet we have no design to strengthen our position by any reference to either these or other establishments for the insane, because few great improvements have ever been effected without there

having been partial instances of the change proposed for years, indeed for centuries, elsewhere, and yet no grand results ensued until a radical subversion of an old measure was accomplished. Thus, republicanism and the union of confederated republics had been attempted before the American revolution; and yet, when were there produced such extensive and beneficent effects before our starry constellation of States flashed forth to adorn and guide the present age? Moreover, whilst it might make little difference what were the peculiar arrangements about an institution for the insane, when only a few principles had been established, and whilst the management at an early period was necessarily rude and unsystematic, there might be a world of difference, and every nicety of arrangement might be demanded, when various important principles had been discovered and enforced; and hence, for their being carried out fully, various niceties of arrangement would be required.

As respects the idea of carrying into practice the new instead of the old arrangement, there is not the least difficulty, if, hereafter, those advocating the cause of the insane will simply adhere fully to the truth; for, upon the assumption (now generally supported) that an institution should not contain beyond a comparatively limited number of patients—viz., 200—250, it is evident that, in order to make suitable provision for the unfortunate lunatic, asylums will have to be greatly multiplied. Nor can I believe, now that the good effects of hospital treatment are so widely observed and so extensively recognized, that there will be any backwardness in the public as to doing all which duty requires and compassion urges. In the consequent multiplication of asylums, how easy will it become to separate the sexes! Many still contend that though they allow this division to be best in some instances, yet it is frequently impracticable, giving as a reason the cost of transportation and other arguments founded upon the idea that the insane can be accommodated but to a limited extent. We contend, on the contrary, that the public mind needs but little more of persuasion to induce the construction of a suitable number of asylums, and therefore such arguments are untenable. As an example, however, of this sophistical mode of reasoning, I quote a few lines from the letter of an eminent physician of this country. He says, "I can readily believe that there would be some convenience and advantage in having the insane of the two sexes in different buildings, and on this account, if it was proposed to build two hospitals in the same section of country, I would recommend that one should be for males and the other for females; but, as the conveyance of patients for a great distance, when going to a public institution, is a serious evil, I scarcely think the advantages would be sufficient to coun-

terbalance this difficulty, when one institution is in the eastern extremity and the other in the western part of a large State," &c.

The "*laudator temporis acti*" is so common that we do not think it necessary to quote the opinions of the past on the present subject; suffice it to state, that, as a general rule, writers prefer a separation of the sexes, if, as they say, it is feasible. But we have already pointed out the fact that such a mode of argument is no longer admissible. He who opposes the proposed arrangement must be prepared to defend himself on the assertion of its intrinsic inferiority. Admitting, however, such fancies to stand for what they are worth, we still find the medical world divided as to the matter in question; and this circumstance itself should induce us to lean to the new views, because every one is aware of the prejudices which association weaves about established customs and regulations.* In conclusion, we adjoin the unanswerable remarks of Dr. Maximilian Jacobi, whose testimony is a host in favor of any measure whatever:

"As to the question whether patients of both sexes should be received into the same establishment, although pecuniary considerations in most cases lead to their union, yet I am very decidedly of opinion that, whenever circumstances will permit, such union ought to be avoided. When an establishment is intended for the reception of both sexes, the general difficulty of constructing and arranging the different apartments in such a manner as to secure the attainment of the objects in view, is immeasurably increased, both by the primary considerations relative to the separation of the sexes, and by the secondary, though still important ones relative to the divisions for separating the maniacal and violent patients, so completely as is required, from the rest. The proper location of these patients, in any part of the establishment, so as to prevent them from disturbing the others, has always been a very difficult problem; but when the separation of the sexes requires it to be doubled in the same range of building, the difficulty of its solution is incomparably increased. Embarrassments of a similar nature also occur with respect to appurtenances destined for general use, such as baths and other curative apparatus, gardens, courts, walks, &c. For they must either be made use of by patients of both sexes, under great restrictions, or they must be doubled. Hence scarcely any plan of arranging them can be discovered which is not attended both with great inconvenience and expense, and, besides, much greater restraints on the liberty of the patients than would be otherwise necessary; whilst, at the same time, the communication of the male and female patients, which ought in general to be most scrupulously avoided, can never be wholly prevented. In addition to all these inconveniences, another evil of no small magnitude arises from the great number of male and

* It is said that when Harvey declared to the world his discovery of the circulation of the blood, no physician beyond forty years of age "gave in his adhesion" to the new views. To use the slang of the day, great is the power of "fogyism."

female servants indispensably employed. Intrigues of all sorts are perpetually afloat amongst them, and are productive of much greater injury to the institution than any one would imagine who has not had personal experience of the fact. In reference to the question of expense, which claims particular notice under this head, it is obvious that, when all the requisites in the erection of a new establishment for both sexes are duly considered, no great saving can here accrue, however considerable may be the diminution of the cost in the general administration and the domestic economy."

ARTICLE IV.

BAILLARGER AND FALRET ON A NEW SPECIES OF INSANITY.

REMARKS ON A VARIETY OF INSANITY, THE PAROXYSMS OF WHICH ARE CHARACTERIZED BY TWO REGULAR PERIODS, THE ONE OF DEPRESSION AND THE OTHER OF EXCITEMENT.—BY DR. BAILLARGER.

*Communicated to the Imperial Academy of Medicine, of Paris,
January 31st, 1854.*

There are no conditions which present more striking contrasts than those of melancholia and mania. The melancholic is feeble, timid and irresolute; his life is passed in inaction and silence, and his conceptions are slow and embarrassed. The maniac, on the other hand, is full of confidence, energy, and even audacity; he displays the greatest activity, and his loquacity is unbounded.

It would seem, then, that these two conditions, so opposite, must be strangers to each other; but observation proves the opposite. In many, indeed in most cases melancholia follows mania, and *vice versa*, as if there were a secret union between these two diseases.

These singular transformations have been frequently noticed. Pinel speaks of attacks of melancholia which degenerate into mania. Esquirol says it is not uncommon to observe mania alternate in a regular manner with consumption, hypochondria and lypemania. Indeed, in examining many cases, it is impossible not to observe the phenomena of excitement and depression as following each other in succession, and that these are evidently only two periods of the same attack. The consequence of such an opinion is to infer that the attack is neither