

**A MONOGRAPH
ON MENTAL
UNSOUNDNESS**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649051595

A Monograph on Mental Unsoundness by Francis Wharton

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

FRANCIS WHARTON

**A MONOGRAPH
ON MENTAL
UN SOUNDNESS**

A

MONOGRAPH

OR

LANE LIBRARY
MENTAL UNSOUNDNESS.

BY FRANCIS WHARTON.



PHILADELPHIA:

KAY AND BROTHER, 17 AND 19 SOUTH FIFTH STREET,

EAST SIDE, FIRST STORE ABOVE CHESTNUT.

LAW BOOKSELLERS AND PUBLISHERS.

1855.

B

YHARELL DMAI

ENTERED according to Act of Congress, in the year 1855, by KAY and BROTHER, in the Office of the Clerk of the District Court of the United States in and for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

PRINTED BY HENRY B. ASHMEAD.

W 3 3
1855

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE following pages form the First Book in a Treatise on Medical Jurisprudence, about to be published by the present writer, in connection with Dr. Moreton Stillé, of Philadelphia. They are issued in this shape for private circulation only, and this opportunity is taken, to state the indebtedness the writer is under to Dr. JAMES PAUL, for the valuable notes received from him, comprising translations and abstracts from some of the more recent French text writers; and to Mr. CHARLES GOEPP, for similar aid in connection with the German Psychologists.

F. W.

Philadelphia, June 10, 1855.

A

MONOGRAPH

ON

MENTAL UNSOUNDNESS.

ANALYTICAL TABLE.

CHAPTER I.

MENTAL UNSOUNDNESS IN ITS LEGAL RELATIONS.

- I. WHAT DEGREE OF UNSOUNDNESS INVALIDATES A CONTRACT OR WILL, § 2.
As to Lunatics or Idiots, § 2.
General legal principle is, that contracts or wills of idiots or lunatics will not be enforced,
Cases where there is a sufficient degree of sanity to create responsibility for crime, and yet when a contract or will will be avoided,
1st. IMBECILITY GENERALLY, AND HEREIN OF FRAUD AND COMPELSION,
Fraud itself vitiates a contract, and in this the contracting party's intellect becomes an essential item for consideration, § 3.
Lord Portsmouth's case, § 3.
Acts and contracts of persons of weak understanding will be held void, when such persons have been imposed upon by cunning or undue influence, § 4.
In cases of wills this is peculiarly the case, § 5.
The testator must have had a *disposing* memory, § 5.
Over-importunity of controlling friends may destroy capacity, § 5.
The question in reference to contracts and wills does not depend upon mere subjective capacity, and hence no positive definition can be given, § 6.
Idiocy, to make it a positive incapacity, must be shown to have been accompanied with business disability, § 7.
The question of capacity will be greatly affected by the reasonableness or unreasonableness of the act attempted to be set aside, § 8.
The inquiry in many cases is, whether the testator or grantor had capacity or information enough to comprehend and disregard any attempt at fraud or coercion, § 9.
Difficulties in such cases from conflict of medical opinion, § 9.
A distinction is taken between the cases where the court is asked to *annul* an *executed* contract, and where it is asked to execute an unexecuted one, § 11.
Weakness of intellect, from extreme old age, works a disability, § 12.
But great caution should be exercised in this respect, the object being to *protect* old age, not to render it still more defenceless, § 12.
How far the deaf and dumb are thereby incompetent, § 13.

2d. PARTIAL INSANITY, § 14.

Rule in this country is, that unless the contested act is the product of an insane delusion, it is not vitiated by it, § 14.

The present English rule, however, seems to be that the existence of an insane delusion destroys testamentary capacity altogether, § 15.

Opinion of Lord Brougham on this point, § 17.

Objections to this view, § 18.

Compatibility of hallucinations with sound disposing memory, § 19.

Instances of existence of hallucinations in persons otherwise sane, § 21.

3d. LUCID INTERVALS.

When *habitual* insanity is shown, the presumption is, that the act was committed in an insane period, § 33.

The character of the act goes a great way in determining whether it was committed in a lucid interval, § 35.

4th. INTOXICATION.

When actually existing renders a party civilly incompetent.

A party, however, cannot use his drunkenness as a means of imposition, § 36.

Difference in this respect between executed and unexecuted contracts, § 37.

In actions for torts, drunkenness is no defence on the merits.

Drunkenness avoids a will when acted on by fraud or imposition, § 38.

II. WHAT IS NECESSARY TO BE PROVED, IN ORDER TO DEPRIVE A PARTY OF THE MANAGEMENT OF HIS ESTATE, § 40.

When a party is incapable, the practice is to appoint a committee, who take the alleged lunatic's place, § 41.

In what way the question of lunacy, under such circumstances, is tried, § 42.

General and not *partial* incompetency must be shown, § 42.

The test is, is the respondent capable of managing his own estate? § 42.

What in such cases is required of medical witnesses, § 43.

The same process lies in cases of habitual drunkenness, § 44.

The test here is, is there a fixed habit of drunkenness? § 44.

III. WHAT DEGREE OF UNSOUNDNESS AVOIDS RESPONSIBILITY FOR CRIME, § 45.

The difficulties in this respect have arisen from mistaking *dicta* given in particular cases for general and absolute rules.

Ill consequences arising from looseness of citation, § 45, n.

The true doctrine is, that medical science is a part of the common law of the land, and is to be treated as such, § 45, n.

1st. CASES WHERE THE DEFENDANT IS INCAPABLE OF DISTINGUISHING RIGHT FROM WRONG IN REFERENCE TO THE PARTICULAR ACT, § 46.

Under this head fall cases of idiocy and imbecility, § 46.

2d. CASES WHERE THE DEFENDANT IS ACTING UNDER AN INSANE DELUSION AS TO CIRCUMSTANCES, WHICH, IF TRUE, WOULD RELIEVE THE ACT FROM RESPONSIBILITY, OR WHERE HIS REASONING POWERS ARE SO DEPRAVED AS TO MAKE THE COMMISSION OF THE PARTICULAR ACT THE NATURAL CONSEQUENCE OF THE DELUSION.

An act committed under a bona fide belief of its necessity in self defence, will be regarded as if there really was such necessity, § 47.

And the gauge here is the *defendant's* capacity, § 47.

An honest insane delusion is to be viewed in the same light, § 48.

But the delusion must have been the *cause* of the crime in order to excuse it, and not *collateral*, § 49.

3d. CASES WHERE THE DEFENDANT IS IMPELLED BY A MORBID AND UNCONTROLLABLE IMPULSE TO COMMIT THE PARTICULAR ACT, § 53.

The doctrine of homicidal mania has been recognized by the courts of this country, § 53.

Chief Justice Shaw, § 53.

Chief Justice Gibson, § 54.

Chief Justice Lewis, § 55.

Chief Justice Hornblower, *contra*, § 57.

The right and wrong test is impracticable as an absolute rule, § 60, 61.

IV. HOW FAR INTOXICATION AFFECTS RESPONSIBILITY FOR CRIME, § 62.

1st. INSANITY PRODUCED BY DELIRIUM TREMENS AFFECTS RESPONSIBILITY IN THE SAME WAY AS INSANITY PRODUCED BY ANY OTHER CAUSE, § 62.

- 2d. INRANITY IMMEDIATELY PRODUCED BY INTOXICATION, DOES NOT DESTROY RESPONSIBILITY WHERE THE PATIENT, WHEN SANE AND RESPONSIBLE, MADE HIMSELF VOLUNTARILY INTOXICATED, § 66.
- 3d. WHILE INTOXICATION IS PER SE, NO DEPENDENCE TO THE FACT OF GUILT, YET WHEN THE QUESTION OF INTENT OR PREMEDITATION IS CONCERNED, IT IS MATERIAL FOR THE PURPOSE OF DETERMINING THE PRECISE DEGREE, § 70.

CHAPTER II.

MENTAL UNSOUNDNESS CONSIDERED PSYCHOLOGICALLY.

Classification of Dr. Ray, § 74.

" " Flemming, § 75.

" " Ellinger, § 76.

" " Present Treatise, § 77.

I. GENERAL THEORIES OF MENTAL UNSOUNDNESS, § 78.

1st. PSYCHOLOGICAL THEORY, § 79.

2d. SOMATIC THEORY, § 80.

3d. INTERMEDIATE THEORY, § 81.

Difficulties attending each of the first two, § 82.

Question as to moral responsibility of Lunatics, § 83.

Views of President Edwards, § 84.

Of Dr. Barlow, § 85.

II. HOW MENTAL UNSOUNDNESS IS TO BE DETECTED, § 86.

1st. BY WHOM, § 86.

Medical expert necessary for this purpose, § 86.

Great skill and experience needed, § 87.

Dangers of an inexperienced examiner being baffled, § 88.

Responsibility in law of medical examiner, § 89.

Importance of examiner adopting his manner to patient's condition, § 90.

Important that legal and medical officers should, in such cases, act in concert, § 92.

Manner in which medical witness is to be examined on trial, § 94.

2d. AT WHAT TIME, § 95.

(1.) Time of act, § 95.

(2.) At trial, § 97.

(3.) At and after sentence, § 98.

3d. BY WHAT TESTS, § 100.

(1.) Physiognomy, § 100.

Relations of the different features, § 101.

(2.) Bodily health and temperament, § 102.

State of bowels, § 102.

Physical disorganization, § 103.

Insensibility to pain and cold, § 104.

Irregularities in action of senses, § 105.

Change in disposition, § 106.

(3.) Hereditary tendency, § 107.

Importance of this test, § 108.

Admissible in point of law, § 108.

Opinion of Gibson, C. J., § 108.

(4.) Conversation and deportment, § 110.

Necessity of great circumspection in this respect, § 110.

Cases illustrating this, § 111.

(5.) Nature of act, § 112.

(a) Insensibility, § 112.

(b) Its incongruity with antecedents, § 113.

(c) Its motivelessness, § 114.

(d) Its inconsequentiality, § 115.

III. FROM WHAT MENTAL UNSOUNDNESS IS TO BE DISTINGUISHED.

1st. Emotions, § 116.