

The next time I saw Mr. Greenwood, some three months subsequently, was at the Billington Asylum, when the question of his liberation from restraint was about to be raised before the visiting magistrates. You may believe me, that I went to this examination with the utmost possible care and anxiety. I spent, I think, about three quarters of an hour with Mr. Greenwood *alone*, and then sat in company with him and others, in Mr. Pinder's dining-room, for about the same length of time. The conclusion forced upon my understanding was both clear and strong, and I left Mr. Greenwood's company *perfectly satisfied* of his insanity. In my private examination, I found he had still the delusion with respect to his brother Robert; he did not know the nature of the institution in which he was placed; he did not know how long he had been there. He persisted that a gentleman (whose company we afterwards joined) had, a few months ago, knocked out three of his teeth. When asked to point out the empty space previously occupied by these teeth, he pointed to the teeth themselves. I placed before him sixpences, shillings, half-crowns, half-sovereigns, and sovereigns, requesting him to put together the coins of equal value; then to tell me their relative value; and some other things of a similar kind. *He utterly and entirely failed in every one of these operations.*

Now, Sir, I ask you, what conclusion, in all fairness and honesty and singleness of purpose was possible to me but the one I formed? In accordance with this conclusion my evidence before the magistrates on the following day was framed. I owe it to myself to add here, that on this my second examination of Mr. Greenwood, having in the interval succeeding the first learned something of the general history of the case, I *felt a strong wish* to find him so much improved that I could have borne testimony in favour of his liberation. So much for my share of what you have denounced as the "secret testimony of two medical men."

I should be extremely sorry, by one word of mine, to disparage the ability or integrity of those "highly-respectable medical gentlemen in the neighbourhood" who took a very different view of Mr. Greenwood's case from my own; but unless all the evidence of the many witnesses who spoke in proof of that gentleman's insanity be ignored, surely some of those medical gentlemen had acted inconsistently in recommending every weapon to be removed from Mr. Greenwood's reach, and that he should not be left alone one moment.

Still less is it for me to speak in defence of Dr. Sutherland or Mr. M'Cann. These gentlemen can take care of their own reputation. But, when after making a thoroughly *ex parte* statement, excluding, with a most unusual sedulousness, every word which would oppose the truth of that statement, you proceed to ask "will our readers believe us when we say that we have not over-coloured the picture in this melancholy case." I will take leave to say, as one of your readers and admirers of many years' standing, I believe, on my conscience, you have much over-coloured the picture. And I think you ought, at least, to have quoted the evidence of one "highly-respectable gentleman," who could have no selfish motive in the business, which proves, most distinctly, that Mr. Greenwood, during the late autumn, at Harrowgate, at Buxton, at Blackpool,—thirty, forty, and fifty miles away from his brother, Robert,—still exclaimed loudly and repeatedly that Robert was there, and then in the act of poisoning him.

Let me ask your further indulgence for the few remarks which I shall think it necessary to make, in reference to the "official report" of Sir A. Morison and Dr. Forbes Winslow. The two names are great names. But I hold, with one of the greatest writers of this age, that "great names are not arguments; and that the chief use of great names in controversy, is to balance and neutralize one another, that the unawed and unfettered mind may think and judge with a due self-reverence." So, if you will permit me, we will place, in one column, Dr. Sutherland and Mr. M'Cann; in the opposite, Sir A. Morison and Dr. Winslow.

The report itself is exceedingly ingenious and elaborate. I cannot agree with you that it is a truly philosophical analysis of Mr. Greenwood's case. Much stress is laid, in the report, on the fact that "Mr. Greenwood has suffered from derangement of the stomach and liver, accompanied by great gastric irritability; and that to this cause may be traced the delusion which is said to have existed at the time when the certificates were signed."

Now, this gastric irritation, from the statement of the "official reporters," still exists, and must in fact be much more severe than when I first saw Mr. Greenwood; and yet the *delusion* has ceased to exist.

Is it necessary for me to remind you, Sir, that Pinel has stated it to be the result of his inquiries, that the primary seat of mental alienation is generally in the region of the stomach and intestines, and that from that centre it propagates itself and deranges the understanding.

I hope you will pardon my presumption, because of the strength of my conviction, when I challenge your attention to the result of Mr. Greenwood's case during the next ensuing twelve months—if, indeed, a much shorter period do not determine some fearful catastrophe. All I have seen, and all I have read on the subject of insanity, has entirely misled me, if this case is not one of the most hopeless, as to improvement, that can be witnessed.

In conclusion, I wish to express a hope that if, in the extreme hurry of writing, a single expression has escaped me injurious or uncourteous to yourself or to the medical gentlemen opposed to me in this very anxious and trying affair, it will be attributed to inadvertence, and pardoned.

I remain, Sir, very respectfully yours,

Blackburn, March, 1855.

JONATHAN MORLEY.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—There are some points in your leading article of the 24th of February, to which I feel I am bound to draw your attention.

In the first place, you say that "Mr. Greenwood was confined in this establishment a whole day and night without being certified to be a lunatic." This is certainly an erroneous statement. Mr. Greenwood was not confined, in any proper sense of the term, one hour, before he was properly and (but for the accidental omission of the name of the street and number in which the patient was examined) legally certified to be insane. You then say that "the day after this iniquitous and illegal detention he was taken to a public-house in the neighbourhood, and two medical men residing some distance from the locality were sent for to examine and certify to his lunacy." This is also erroneous. He was taken to the nearest town where two medical men were to be found, and not to a common public-house, or into the tap-room, but to a respectable commercial hotel, and into the commercial-room, and there examined by the two medical men, who reside within two minutes' walk of the hotel. You next dwell upon "compelling him to herd all his days with raving madmen." This was not the case. Mr. Greenwood was boarded with us, and lived as one of my own family, which was composed of myself, Mrs. Pinder, and three daughters, and occupied the best bed-room in the house, and no restraint whatever was placed on his movements, except that the eye of the keeper was occasionally upon him in his walks. You also say that "the picture is not over-coloured in this melancholy case." I say it is an *ex parte* statement throughout, and that Mr. Greenwood could not have given the answers he is said to have done to some of the questions had not the words been put into his mouth. The fact of supposing that he was poisoned by his brother did not arise from a disordered state of his stomach, or was it confined to his brother alone, but to other persons.

Trusting that you will hear both sides of the question,

I am, Sir, yours respectfully,

Billington Retreat, Lancashire, March, 1855.

W. PINDER.

## MR. SYME'S CLINICAL LECTURES.—EXCISION OF THE ELBOW-JOINT.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I have taken great interest in the very excellent Clinical Lectures by Professor Syme now appearing in THE LANCET. In the last number but one, is a Lecture on Excision of the Elbow-joint, in which the Professor takes to himself the credit of the introduction of that operation into this country. I feel that I should not be doing my duty to the hospital to which I have been attached as surgeon for thirty-six years, if I did not again state that that operation had been often performed in the Leeds General Infirmary long before it was attempted by Mr. Syme. Ten years ago the following statement appeared in "Braithwaite's Retrospect," vol. ii. p. 141:—

["In 'Retrospect,' vol. x., p. 134, Mr. Syme says—'Previous to 1829, the operation of cutting out the elbow-joint had not been performed in Great Britain.' Since this paper was published, we have received a note from Mr. Smith, senior surgeon of the Leeds General Infirmary, from which we take the following extract, to show that the operation

was performed in Leeds, by Mr. Stanfield, as early as 1817 or 1818. Mr. Smith says—]

“In 1818, I was town surgeon here, and had charge of the workhouse. During that time, a man about twenty-four years of age, named Jeremiah Butterworth, a chimney-sweep, died under my care, in the workhouse, of consumption. Knowing that excision of the elbow-joint had been performed with success upon him at the infirmary a year or two before, by Mr. Josiah Stansfield, then junior surgeon of the infirmary, I was anxious not only to examine the joint, but to preserve it as a pathological specimen. I asked the Board, and (in consequence of my explanation of the importance of the case) obtained its permission to remove the limb, which I took to my own house. After satisfying my own curiosity by dissection of the limb, I presented the bones of the new joint as a trophy to Mr. Stansfield. This gentleman died in the following January. After his death, Mr. J. P. Garlick had possession of them. I succeeded Mr. Stansfield at the infirmary in February, 1819. At that time excision of the elbow-joint was a recognised operation there, and had been performed by both my seniors,—Mr. Chorley and Mr. Hey. For a time it fell into disuse; but has been performed by both my present colleagues, Mr. Hey and Mr. Teale, as well as myself. The last operation I performed, the case was so unfavourable, that I was recommended, when the operation was half done, to finish by amputation; but I determined to risk the case, and had the satisfaction of succeeding, the cure being complete, with a very good power of flexion, extension, pronation, and supination.”

I have this week called on Mr. J. P. Garlick, who was house-surgeon to the infirmary, in 1818; and he empowers me to say he has a perfect recollection of the case of Jeremiah Butterworth, and remembers its success.

There is another operation which Mr. Syme claims, and which goes by his name—the Division of Stricture by Incision in the Perineum for the cure of Stricture and Fistula in Perineo. That operation also has been performed in all proper cases by the surgeons of the Leeds General Infirmary for forty years past. I have, however, never seen it performed in cases where a grooved staff could be previously passed into the bladder, as we have generally been able to cure such cases by milder measures, without the necessity of so severe an operation.

I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,  
Park-place, Leeds, March, 1855. SAMUEL SMITH.

## MEDICAL ETIQUETTE.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In THE LANCET of the 10th inst. I find you have inserted a correspondence which has taken place between Dr. Aikenhead and myself. In your number of February 24th, I was glad to see that you refused its admission, but as your better judgment has been overruled, I must request a short space in your columns to insert a few remarks upon it, although I am sorry for the sake of the family that the subject should appear in the pages of a public journal.

No right-minded medical man can peruse Dr. Aikenhead's first letter without concluding that he has behaved unprofessionally in the matter. Admitting that Dr. Aikenhead arrived at the house under the impression that he had been summoned at the “suggestion of the nurse,” was he justified, upon such authority, in continuing his attendance, repeating his visit at nine o'clock, and leaving word he would see the child again at noon, without communicating with the medical man already in attendance, knowing, as he must have done, that an infant bereaved of its mother, and only eleven days old, would certainly not be left entirely to the charge of a nurse?

It is unnecessary for me to enlighten Dr. Aikenhead upon the intimate nature of the conjoint attendance of Mr. T—— and myself upon the family in question: suffice it to say, that it has now existed for nearly fifteen years; and I have Mr. T——'s authority for saying that he considers my conduct in the matter as perfectly blameless.

Dr. Aikenhead is secretary to a Society in Manchester, the principal objects of which are, “to support the respectability, and maintain the interests, of the profession; to promote fair and honourable practice;” and, amongst a variety of bye-laws, are the following:—

“No. 9.—When a practitioner is called to, or consulted by, a patient already under the care of another, he shall on no account interfere with the case, but shall request a consultation with the gentleman previously in attendance. If, however, the latter refuse this, or if the patient insist on dispensing with his services, and a communication to that effect be made to him, the

practitioner last consulted will be justified in taking charge of the case.

“No. 11.—When a practitioner is called in on emergency by a family usually attended by another, he shall, when the emergency is provided for, signify his willingness to retire, if the family wish for the attendance of their ordinary medical adviser, whom he will meet, and after one consultation, shall resign the case into his hands, but be entitled to charge the family for his services.”

I leave the profession to judge whether Dr. Aikenhead's conduct has been guided by these rules. Supposing that Dr. Aikenhead's surmises had been correct, that in consequence of the “unhappy result” of my “attendance on Mrs. B——”<sup>\*</sup> I had not been summoned, yet he admits that Mr. T—— had been sent for previously to him, and as he knew that the lady in question had been a patient of that gentleman, in consultation with me, why should he behave to him with equal discourtesy? Although Dr. Aikenhead had not the politeness to inform me that he had been called in to the infant, he will find on inquiry that when I arrived at the house in the morning to see my patient, and was made acquainted with the circumstances, I positively refused to see the child, although earnestly solicited “by the nurse” to do so; and it was not until the arrival of the parent (Mr. B——) that I was prevailed upon, in consequence of his stating that he certainly wished me to attend the infant—that he considered me his medical man—that he had not heard of the child's illness more than half an hour previously, and that he did not even know where Dr. Aikenhead lived. So that Mr. B—— stating that Dr. Aikenhead had been called in on the emergency is proved to be, not a “preposterous absurdity,” but a simple truth.

With regard to Dr. Aikenhead's superior experience, in consequence of his connexion with the Medico-Ethical Association, I am quite willing to award him the honour, as I have certainly not been much mixed up with squabbling people; but I have the satisfaction of knowing that my professional conduct has been such as to gain me the esteem and friendship of every respectable member of the profession in this city, and of which I have on more than one occasion received substantial proof.

Dr. Aikenhead states in his letter to me of March 1st, that Mr. Allen informed him last night that I had recently “publicly” expressed, &c. Observe, the word “publicly” is *suppressed* in Dr. Aikenhead's letter prepared for the press, (probably Dr. Aikenhead retained only a “rough draught” of this letter as well as of the first.) Now, the insertion of this word “publicly,” had considerable influence over my answer to that letter. Mr. Allen had no authority to name the subject to Dr. Aikenhead, and instead of its being “publicly” stated, it was a passing remark at a friend's house—one gentleman (not professional), and the two friends with whom we had been spending the evening, being the only parties present.

However I might have been inclined to leave the matter to arbitration, it was not my place to come forward first, when I knew that an *ex parte* statement had been sent to the medical journals and refused admission, and it was certainly no business of Mr. Allen's to retail a private conversation, nor to interfere in any way.

Mr. Allen's letter is dated February 27th, and in a communication I received from him on the 5th of March, he says, “I send you the copy of a note I addressed to Dr. Aikenhead on the 27th ult.” Now, it is remarkable that Mr. Allen and I did not meet until the evening of the 27th, and did not separate until twelve o'clock on the morning of the 28th. On the evening of this day (the 28th), a *conversazione* of the Medico-Ethical Association took place at the Queen's Hotel, at which both of these gentlemen were present.

Had these discrepancies in dates and statements not been overlooked, the “series” might have appeared more plausible.

I leave the profession to judge when and for what purpose the letter dated February 27th was written.

“Truth is simple, requiring neither study nor art.”

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Manchester, March 12th, 1855.

JOHN HATTON.

## THE ARMY MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I think it but right and proper to call your attention to the fact of there having been no medical arrangements whatever made by the far-seeing medical head in this country for the 20,000 Turks which are to be commanded by British officers

<sup>\*</sup> I must here state that the lady's death was not in any way connected with her confinement, and that I have the family's full assurance of their entire satisfaction with my treatment.