

eyes, nose, and throat. Professor Hill of Cambridge considered that the idea of establishing a limit to the degree to which arsenic may exist in wall-papers was faulty, from the fact that there is no reason for the use of arsenic at all in the manufacture of wall-papers. Colors can now be obtained which are free from arsenic as an impurity, and those colors should certainly be employed in all papers. Dr. Chadwick offered the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted: "*Resolved*, that it is the opinion of this meeting that the clinical evidence already adduced in this and other countries establishes beyond doubt the fact that arsenical wall-papers will, in many instances, produce symptoms of poisoning by arsenic in persons occupying the rooms whose walls are covered by such papers."

#### THE MEDICO-LEGAL ASPECTS OF HYPNOTISM.

A. BINET, one of the leading French authorities on hypnotism, has written an appreciative but critical notice of the work of Campili that gives an excellent view of the French and Italian standpoints regarding this subject that is assuming so much importance there. Dr. Campili has had the advantage of numerous memoirs in France and elsewhere. M. Legeois has shown the possibility of making the hypnotic suggestion serve a criminal purpose, but has not discussed the subject. MM. Binet and Féré set themselves to determine the conditions under which the reality of the hypnotic suggestion may be admitted by a tribunal—the judicial proof, in other words. Dr. Campili presents the problem from the point of view of the two schools of criminologists in Italy, the classical or spiritualistic school, and the anthropological school, which differ not only in their theoretical conceptions but also in their practical conclusions upon the application of punishment. Upon the question of hypnotism, however, the two schools admit the same conclusion. Dr. Campili examines what the civil and penal responsibility of the hypnotized subject is when criminal acts have been committed or obligations have been assumed under the influence of a hypnotic suggestion. According to the classical legal school, the hypnotized subject is not responsible, since he has not committed a voluntary and conscious offence: there can be no punishment where there has been no fault. The anthropological school, which does not assume this subjective point of view, but considers that the judicial institutions have the simple function of social preservation and

defence, arrives at the same conclusion, but by a different way. In a very detailed discussion the author arrives at the conclusion that the needs of social defence only demand the repression of criminal acts when these are the expression of the personality of the agent, and since in the hypnotic subject the individual reaction is abolished, the acts that he does under the influence of a hypnotic suggestion are simply those of an automaton. These conclusions are at least debatable, says Binet, and rest on premises that contain an error of fact. The belief is too common to-day that it is possible to characterize the psychical state of hypnotism in a single word and say it is a condition of automatism. In a vast number of cases the subject preserves his intellectual and moral identity: when he receives a suggestion to act, he may resist if the act is in contradiction with his character, and he may examine the order and even absolutely refuse to obey. Campili seems to have seen this difficulty, for he recalls that in an ingenious article M. Bouillier has admitted a moral responsibility in dreams, but he meets this objection with an argument of little weight, that the hypnotized subject does not preserve his personality in the same way that a sleeping person does.

Binet holds, on the contrary, that the closest connection exists between the effects produced by suggestion and the state of dreaming. The hypnotic suggestion is nothing else than a dream produced and directed by assistants. In fact, the somnambulist is not an automaton, he is an *individual*, and, from the purely theoretical and moral point of view, he may be held partially responsible for his acts. These conclusions are in direct accord with those of M. Bouillier.

But what is the practical point of view? Has or has not society the right to defend itself against the crimes of hypnotism? Will it suffice for the assassin to show that he was under the influence of a suggestion for the judges to grant him his liberty and allow him to begin his work again? Clearly a uniform toleration is out of the question. Until recently hypnotism figured only accidentally in judicial proceedings, but now all this is changed, and hypnotic suggestion may readily enter into criminal proceedings. This is exactly what has happened in Turin, where, says Lombroso (*Revue scientifique*, June 19, 1886), there is a veritable epidemic of hypnotism. Society must protect itself against such a danger. Garfalo, in his remarkable work on *criminologie*, argues that we must apply to the criminal who has committed a punishable act in a state of hallucination or of somnambulism the same treatment that we give to those who have committed a crime in an epileptic or hysteric attack or from

*Il grande ipnotismo e la suggestione ipnotica, nei rapporti col diritto penale et civile.* By G. CAMPILI. *Revue philosophique*, October, 1886.

the effect of impulsive mania; that is, seclusion in a criminal asylum for an indefinite period until a complete cure is established, or until the patient passes into some other condition that renders a repetition of the act an absolute improbability. Campili thinks that it would be difficult to apply the same punishment to an hypnotic criminal, since he did not commit the crime of his own accord but under the influence of a third person, who is the true culprit: the hypnotic subject is simply an instrument of crime in the hands of the hypnotizer the same as a revolver or a knife, and it is he who ought to bear the responsibility of the act. This is a subtle distinction. The hypnotic subject, like the epileptic, is a dangerous person, a veritable *malade*, since he allows a very simple manoeuvre to make him commit a crime. It is absolutely necessary to put him beyond the possibility of doing harm. Moreover, it is probable that the dread of punishment exercises a restraining influence over the minds of those who submit voluntarily to be hypnotized: in fact, Binet holds, many persons who are slightly hypnotizable may resist hypnotization successfully, and ought to be responsible for consenting to submit themselves to the experiment. There is the strongest reason for this conclusion if the subject knows in advance, before going to sleep, that a criminal suggestion will be given to him. There is one curious hypothesis that Campili has not anticipated, and one which well-known facts render extremely probable, and that is that we may find some day in some band of thieves or assassins a hypnotic subject who of his own accord yields himself to criminal suggestions: the usefulness of hypnotic suggestion under such circumstances is easily understood, for those who are under the control of a suggestion have more audacity, more courage, and even more intelligence, than when they act of their own accord. There are patients who, dreading to be put to sleep by some one that they dislike, offer to the hypnotic suggestion of one of their friends a power of resistance that they do not have naturally. Others, wishing to accomplish some act, and fearing that their courage will fail at the last moment, suggest themselves the act that they wish to do. In these circumstances the subject should be punished as the principal and the hypnotizer only as an accomplice.

The Paris correspondent of the *Medical record* writes last December that an epidemic of hypnotism prevails there, and he paints the prevailing distemper in exceedingly dark colors. Every steamer brings some new book on hypnotism or mental suggestion, and the amount of literature that has accumulated within the past year is enor-

mous. Public exhibitions of hypnotism have been interdicted in Germany, Italy, and Austria. This is but one side of the shield, however, and brilliant therapeutical results have been reported by the skilled coterie of French physicians that has advanced our knowledge of hypnotism so much within the past few years. Yet on the whole, perhaps, it is a matter for congratulation that the more stolid American mind has been little affected by hypnotism up to this time, not even to the extent of furnishing sufficient subjects for the Society for psychical research. It may be that the 'mind-cure' is our cross, and at any rate the connection between this and hypnotism offers a promising field to the investigator.

WILLIAM NOYES.

#### PALEOLITHIC MAN IN LONDON AND ITS NEIGHBORHOOD.

EVER since Dr. John Evans, in the year 1860 (*Archeologia*, xxxviii. 301), showed that the object was a genuine paleolithic implement of the Chellean type, which, under the disguise of 'a British weapon found with elephant's tooth near Gray's Inn Lane,' had been lying for years unnoticed in the British museum, a peculiar interest for prehistoric archeologists has attached to the quaternary gravels of the valley of the Thames. This noteworthy implement seems to have been discovered some time at the close of the seventeenth century, and an account of it, illustrated by a rude engraving, had been printed so early as 1715. Consequently the city of London may lay claim to be the site of the first recorded discovery of the earliest implements of mankind. Similar discoveries have continued to be made in different parts of the valley of the Thames, especially in that portion of it lying within the county of Middlesex. Mr. Worthington G. Smith, in particular, published in the *Journal of the anthropological institute* accounts of finding paleolithic implements in the little tributary valleys of the Lea and the Brent. But in 1883, after five years of patient research, he made known the interesting discovery (published in the same journal, xiii. 357) of a 'paleolithic floor at North-east London.' He showed that a stratum of worked flints of the paleolithic age lay spread for many miles a few feet beneath the present surface of the ground. The majority of the implements contained in it were found at the height of about seventy-five feet above the present level of the Thames. "As a rule," he says, "every implement and flake is as

*Paleolithic man in north-west Middlesex. The evidence of his existence and the physical conditions under which he lived at Ealing, and its neighborhood, etc.* By JOHN ALLEN BROWN. London, Macmillan.