HEMISECTION OF THE SPINAL CORD :

AN EXPLANATORY NOTE.

BY WILLIAM ALDREN TURNER.

As it has been represented to me, since the publication of my paper on "Hemisection of the Spinal Cord," in the Winter Number of this Journal (vol. xiv., p. 496), that I did not refer to a paper on a similar subject by Dr. F. W. Mott in the *Proceedings of the Royal Society* or to certain statements that were made at a meeting of the Neurological Society in June, 1891, when three monkeys on which hemisection of the spinal cord had been performed were exhibited, I am prompted to write the following explanation :—

The research, the results of which are recorded in my paper, was suggested after perusal of the abstract of a paper by Dr. F. W. Mott published in the "Proceedings of the Physiological Society," in the *Journal of Physiology*, January, 1891. In that paper Dr. Mott controverted certain of the views regarding the paths of sensation in the spinal cord which had been more or less accepted by physiologists and clinical observers since the publication of the well-known researches of Dr. Brown-Séquard. It appeared to me, therefore, as facts had been advanced by Dr. Mott in opposition to Brown-Séquard, that the subject required re-investigation, and Dr. Ferrier kindly put his laboratory and the necessary material for a research at my disposal. The experiments and observations which I recorded were commenced on April 11th, 1891, and were conducted at intervals almost up to the end of that year. On June 10th, 1891, three of the animals, on which experiments had been performed, were exhibited by Dr. Ferrier and myself at a meeting of the Neurological Society. A short paper was read by me at the same meeting, and the conclusions, which I believed to be warranted, were stated. In the course of the discussion Prof. Schäfer and Dr. Mott took excep-

tion to certain of the observations which we had made.¹ I did not consider it necessary to state their objections in my paper in BRAIN, as I could not hold myself responsible for the observations and opinions of others, but thought it better to leave it to themselves to publish their criticism in a form which they might think suitable.

On June 18th, 1891, Prof. Schäfer communicated to the Royal Society a paper by Dr. Mott, entitled "Results of Hemisection of the Spinal Cord in Monkeys." At the time when my paper was written I did not know that an abstract of this communication had appeared in No. 302, p. 120, of the *Proceedings of the Royal Society*, issued on August 28th, 1891, and it was not until nearly the end of January of this year that I was made aware of its publication. I have since read the abstract, and can now state that the points of interest summarised in it correspond very closely with those given in Dr. Mott's communication to the *Journal of Physiology*, to which reference has already been made. I, therefore, feel that the perusal of that communication had, so far as is possible in a *résumé*, put me into the position of ascertaining in what respects his conclusions differed from those formulated by Brown-Séquard. I should mention that I was present at the meeting of the Royal Society when Dr. Mott's paper was communicated, and that I received a print marked "uncorrected proof exclusively for the use of the Fellows at the Meeting of the Society," containing an abstract of it. In preparing my paper for the press I was unaware that I was entitled to quote or even refer to a proof so marked. Had I known that the abstract had been published in the above number of the *Proceedings*, or that I could have made public reference to the "uncorrected proof," I should certainly have done so, as it was far from my intention to ignore or neglect Dr. Mott's researches in this department of neurology, or to show any want of courtesy to him.

¹ Dr. Mott, to whom I have submitted this explanation, desires me to state that he and Prof. Schäfer, having previously tested two of the animals, denied the existence of anaesthesia on the non-paralysed side. The third animal was not tested.