

is not given in Dr. Gray's summary, we think it will interest our readers. The most important part of it will be found in "Notes and News." It is a careful statement of the law of insanity in America at the present time.

We have in these observations confined ourselves to the question of Guiteau's responsibility. But in this, as in many other criminal cases, we cannot but feel that the character in these cases offers to the psychologist a rich field for study. We are sadly ignorant yet of the various types of human character, especially of those abnormal ones which border on the region of well-recognised mental aberration. When understood, it will be seen to what precise category we are to refer such moral or immoral monstrosities as Guiteau. No physiognomist can look at the outlines of face and head depicted in the remarkable photographs which accompany Dr. Folsom's paper without recognising something extraordinary. They must mean *something*. We should lose the psychological lesson which such peculiar developments are calculated to teach, as contributing to the right comprehension of mental characteristics, were we to throw them aside when we have satisfied ourselves that they cannot constitute a sufficient plea for acquittal on the ground of insanity in criminal cases. They still remain specimens of human nature which are of great interest, and ought to be pressed like rare plants in our *collectanea psychologica*. ✕

Case of Lamson.

In proportion as we estimate the importance of the plea of insanity in criminal cases, as in that of Maclean, ought we to be jealous of its abuse, and recognise the danger of the application of a just principle to shield the guilty and responsible from merited punishment. In our opinion, it would have been a serious miscarriage of justice had the almost unparalleled efforts made on behalf of Lamson proved successful. We have no intention of reproducing the alleged proofs of his insanity or morphia-mania, because it is impossible to distinguish between reliable and unreliable evidence, produced with surprising prolificness, and under conditions eminently favourable to false affidavits and statements more or less manufactured for the occasion, on demand. Even granting that a considerable number of these were true, the evidence would not relieve a man so circumstanced from responsibility. It is not surprising,

therefore, that when all hope was over, and a clever lawyer had played his last card, the wretched criminal, a deplorable disgrace to our profession, should have not only confessed the crime of which he had, appealing solemnly to Heaven, declared when sentence was pronounced that he was innocent, but acknowledged that he merited the punishment which he was about to undergo. The Home Secretary in this case, as in that of Lefroy, acted in a manner which has commended itself not only to the judgment of mental physicians, but the common-sense of mankind.

Case of Maclean.

The case of Roderick Maclean has given rise to no psychological immoralities, because it was one upon which neither self-interest nor love of notoriety could hope to gain a hearing. The indications of mental disease were from the first transparently clear. Letters written so far back as May, 1880, showed the disordered state of his mind at that time. They are worthy of preservation in this Journal, and will be found with other matter in "Notes and News."

The motives he assigned for shooting at the Queen are probably true, and if so, it is clear that he was not acting under any homicidal impulse pure and simple. The day after the attempt he wrote thus:—"I am not guilty of the charge of shooting with the intention of causing actual bodily harm. My object was, by frightening her Majesty the Queen, to alarm the public, with the result of having my grievances respected, viz., such as the pecuniary straits in which I have been situated." His grievances are referred to in the same way in another letter written on the day of the attempted assassination. "I should not have done this crime had you, as you should have done, allowed the 10s. per week, instead of offering the insultingly small sum of 6s. per week, and expecting me to live on it." His delusions of persecution, combined with some mental weakness, amply accounted for the act he committed without reference to any homicidal impulse. He is one of the class of dangerous lunatics at large who ought in some way to be under supervision—that element of danger in our midst to which the Earl of Shaftesbury referred in such strong terms in his evidence before the Select Committee of 1877.