

at once perceive. I shall venture to make some very brief quotations, just sufficient as it seems to indicate my position.

"Excessive emotions overgrowing and dominating the mind cannot correctly be said to *cause* insanity, as sudden fright or grief will cause an attack of mania; properly speaking they *constitute* the disease."

"All medical men of experience now acknowledge the occasional existence of mental disease, without disorder of the intellectual faculties. *The problem now claiming attention is a more advanced and extensive one: namely, whether with certain admitted and well marked exceptions, Insanity does not invariably commence with, and consist in, emotional disturbance.*"

"We believe that, except in these cases [symptomatic of physical injury], convincing arguments can be adduced to prove that *insanity is always in the first instance emotional*; that intellectual disturbance is always secondary; and that Dr. Pritchard's cases were apparently exceptional, because in them the secondary part of the disease did not occur, from the unusual force of a conservative tendency in the intellectual faculties."

"A man may be an idiot from congenital deficiency of this faculty [the intellectual], or may become demented from decay of it; he may be crotchety from its imperfection; *but it appears to us improbable that any condition of the reasoning faculty can produce madness.*"

How far I was enabled to prove these important propositions I leave it to others to say. I venture, however, distinctly to affirm that they never were enunciated before I published them, and that they are in no way contained nor inferred in the pages of Dr. Carpenter's "Human Physiology."

I am, sir,

Your obedient servant,

John Charles Bucknill.

Hillmorton Hall, Rugby, August 6th, 1874.

To the Editor of the "Journal of Mental Science."

Larbert, Stirlingshire, 1st September, 1874.

SIR,—I send two communications which have been made to me, on the subject of boys fostered by wolves.

The first is in reply to a letter sent to the Revd. Mr. Erhardt, about the two boys in the Secundra Orphanage, mentioned in my article "On Children fostered by Wild Beasts," in the last number of the "Journal of Mental Science." Mr. Erhardt states that what appeared in the papers from Mr. Seelye and others, were particulars furnished by himself. As to the question whether the boys had been turned adrift by their parents, he thinks such a thing as possible, but not likely. He says that the last boy was burnt out of a den together with wolves, and was such a complete animal, that he must have been a long time with the beasts. His taste was that of a carnivorous animal—meat and bones—nothing else. The older boy eats now vegetables, formerly he did not. He still smells at his food before eating; the other boy knew only animal food by his smell. Everything else he dropped with the greatest unconcern. The older boy looks an idiot by the formation of his head; but the other (who died after being four months in the orphanage), was the finest boy (I suppose physically) in the institution; his idiocy seemed only acquired. If he had only had time to find out his capacity, Mr. Erhardt has no doubt he might in time have improved more than the older one. The last few months the surviving boy has learned to speak several words, but he will never obtain full sense and power of speech. Mr. Erhardt does not know whether the older boy had marks upon his knees when caught, but the younger one had none; though he could not stand pro-

perly on his legs. "It looked as if they could not bear his weight, but he could run very fast on his hands and knees, so much so, that our boys could hardly come up with him when he bolted one day."

The most noteworthy statement in Mr. Erhardt's letter, is that one of the boys was burned out of a wolf's den; but he does not say on what testimony this rests.

Dr. J. Murray Mitchell has kindly sent me a sheet from the "Lucknow Witness," of June 19, 1874, in which there is a letter about "Wolf Boys," of which the following are extracts.

W. W. IRELAND.

"When the late Sir William Sleeman was resident at the Court of Lucknow, he interested himself much in this matter, and evidently believed that wolves did occasionally carry off children to their dens, and, contrary to their natural instincts, rear instead of devouring them. The writer of these lines whilst employed in the Oudh Frontier Police, received an order from General (then Colonel) Sleeman, to proceed from Sultanpore, Oudh, to Fyzabad, in order to secure a boy then said to have been seen in the latter place who had been nourished by a wolf. On arrival at Fyzabad no trace of the 'wolf-boy' could be found, the search having been rendered all the more difficult by the presence of immense multitudes assembled both at Fyzabad and Ajoodhyah, on the occasion of a grand Mela (fair).

"Whilst on his way back to Sultanpore, the writer heard that a 'wolf-boy' was to be found in the vicinity of Sultanpore itself; messengers were accordingly despatched to the locality indicated, and a boy was brought by them whom the villagers declared to have been reared by a wolf. The poor creature was about 13 or 14 years of age, could utter no articulated sounds, could not walk erect, in fact, crawled on all-fours, and seemed totally deprived of intelligence; presenting, although perfectly harmless, a most repulsive appearance. Now and then he gave utterance to most uncouth and almost frightful cries. He was sent to Lucknow to Colonel Sleeman, and what subsequently became of him the writer cannot tell; but when the Oudh Durbar officials discovered what they considered to be a 'shauk' (desire) of the resident, they hastened to produce several unfortunate idiots, positively declaring them to be 'wolf-boys.' There is no doubt that the natives believed in the existence of these wolf-nourished creatures, and the story of Romulus and Remus would tend to show that the Romans shared in the same belief; nevertheless, the writer must confess to total scepticism in this matter. * * *

"Is it not improbably a true solution of the mystery which, for so many years previous to the annexation of Oudh, has enveloped the history of these unfortunate creatures, to suppose that they were simply idiots who, straying away from the place of their birth, wandered, driven by hunger, from place to place in search of food; their parents or friends, themselves perhaps poverty-stricken, not being over-anxious to search for and bring back to their homes such burdens on their scanty means. It must be remembered that in the days when Oudh was under its own rulers, there existed no asylums in which to shelter idiots, and they roamed about in perfect liberty, supported by the liberality of the people.

And when we consider the great love all Orientals entertain for the marvelous, we need scarcely be astonished that on seeing such an object as the one which was brought to the writer's house at Sultanpore (or still worse one possessing a savage instead of a harmless disposition), the ignorant villagers should have been tempted to believe that such an animal could only have been brought up by a wolf, that animal so much dreaded by themselves that they will scarcely pronounce its name, and to which they attach the superstitious idea that if killed in or near a village, that village will assuredly ere long be deserted.

“True it is that sometimes nature indulges in strange freaks, and supposing even that ‘once upon a time’ a wolf took pity on a child and nourished it, can it be supposed that such a circumstance would be of so frequent an occurrence as the villagers in Oudh would have one to believe?”

“It will most probably be found on inquiry that since the annexation of Oudh no fresh instances of the existence of ‘wolf-boys’ have been brought to notice, and if this is found to be a fact, it will go far to cast disbelief on the weird stories, formerly so current in Oudh, and which apparently had no other foundation than the mere assertions of ignorant villagers, assertions which under the present rule would be subjected to the strictest scrutiny before being accepted as trustworthy.

“O. P. A.

“Musoorie, the 30th May, 1874.”

Obituary.

FRANCIS EDMUND ANSTIE, M.D.

Seldom have we had a sadder duty than to record the sudden and premature death of Dr. Anstie, which took place on 12th September last. He was well known as the Editor of the *Practitioner*, a journal which he established, as one of the Physicians of Westminster Hospital, and as the author of scientific treatises on *Stimulants and Narcotics*, and on *Neuralgia*, as well as for his labours in the cause of Sanitary Reform. Although he was only in the 41st year of his age, he had made himself a name in medical science and literature so great and respected as might well have sufficed to crown the labours of a long life. But high as was his professional reputation in public estimation, it could not equal the esteem which his sincere, genial, and chivalrous nature gained for him from all his friends. If he had any enemies among those who knew him, they were those whose enmity was the highest tribute to his worth, for they were the enemies of an earnest and single-minded devotion to truth and right. He was so pure from reproach, that the poisoned tooth of the slanderer could not harm him; so careless of self in his devotion to the cause which he had at heart, that the jealous eye of envy did not affect him; so fearless in encountering what he believed to be wrong, and in championing what he believed to be right, that no thought of consequences to himself or to his cause ever made his resolution halt; so enthusiastically bent upon the achievement of high moral aims, by the highest moral means, that he could never stoop to unworthy enterprises, or to ignoble warfare. He acted with such nobleness of spirit that, whatever the issue, he could not be shamed. If it was a fault to have allowed one subject to take a too passionate hold of him for the time, and not always to have given sufficient thought to the good which there was in what seemed entire evil, or if, letting feeling sway his judgment, he sometimes made a direct onslaught where more prudent counsels would have dictated a discreeter mode of attack, we may justly say that the fault was truly an exaggeration of the virtues of his character. Few reforms would be accomplished in the world if it were not for men of Dr. Anstie's type of character; and many a good cause has lost in him a champion whose generous zeal and eager energy would have been willingly given to its service. To his many friends it will be a long regret that he undertook so many labours and worked so hard as he did, for they cannot but think that if he had been more careful of his strength a valuable life would have