because I do not wish to waste paper in chaffing an old Cambridge friend.

I am sorry that my letter has caused a reply from any Cambridge man, for there is nothing to be said. I know all the facts of the case better, I believe, than "Cellula," and merely wished to give outsiders a view of the comparative situation of the two Universities in regard to natural science. It is simply untrue (a mistake, of course, on "Cellula's" part) that the Cambridge Museum excels in comparative anatomy of the vertebrata. Mr. J. W. Clarke, curator of the museum, will tell him, as he has told me, and as I know by experience, that the vertebrates are among the worst parts of the collection, there being no good series, which can be used by a student, of such organs, in fishes, reptiles, birds, and mammals, as the heart, alimentary canal, brain, &c.

Professor Stokes does *not* lecture on experimental physics, but on mathematics. Professor Willis lectures *only* on applied mechanics. I said nothing against the abilities of Professors Sedgwick, Liveing, Humphry, Newton, and Babington, whom I know personally, and greatly regard and respect. I said, and still say, that these professors have no proper assistants, and hence the "staff is inefficient." Professor Sedgwick pays an assistant (Mr. Seeley) out of his own pocket; and Dr. Humphry's stipend as Professor is so small that he felt it right to retain half his practice on accepting the professorship, instead of giving up his whole energies to the chair. Dissection of human bodies is quite in accordance with the traditions of University life; in fact, at one time, Oxford and Cambridge were great in human anatomy.

Having corrected thus one or two of "Cellula's" mistakes, I wish to protest against misrepresentation. I look at medicine with no jaundiced eye, and do not require to be told of the excellence of the profession, being myself a medical student. And further, as to "pointing with scorn" at Cambridge, I could not do so, for I retain the strongest affection for her, and those with her; but I do despise those who withhold from her the means, or money, she has a right to. Were "Cellula" as anxious for the *real* success and progress of his University as I am, he would be ready to admit deficiencies, instead of quite irrelevantly puffing and flattering certain professors, whose merits require no introduction from him.

Finally, I have a more personal grievance to speak of. "Cellula" denies me anything homologous with a liver; and in the last Cambridge Natural Science Tripos papers, I see that the examiner asks why *Lumbricus* has no perivisceral cavity? I am afraid, Sir, if my anatomy is so little understood at Cambridge, my intentions in writing to you have but little chance of being appreciated there. I do possess what is called "hepatic tissue," and, like all other worms, rejoice in a "perivisceral cavity."

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
LUMBRICUS.

Oxford, Jan. 1868.

DR. GRAILY HEWITT'S PLUG-PESSARY.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Permit me to make one remark on Dr. Aveling's letter in THE LANCET of the 18th instant, on the plug-pessary described by me in THE LANCET of Jan. 4th.

My friend, Dr. Aveling, is in error in supposing that I consider it "necessary that the stem should be kept rigidly at right angles to the disc." The instrument, as generally used by myself, consists of two distinct parts so adjusted that the stem enjoys a considerable degree of both lateral and forward or backward motion on the disc. It is, in fact, a sort of universal joint, and the separate construction allows of its more ready insertion. On the other hand, it is occasionally convenient, when the instrument has to be worn for some time, to more rigidly connect the two parts previous to introduction; the angle must then be suited to the requirements of the case.

For the rest, it is very gratifying to me to find that in regard to the mechanics of this subject, my views are in accordance with those of such an able man as Dr. Aveling.

I remain, Sir, yours &c.,

Jan. 20th, 1868.

GRAILY HEWITT.

TAPEWORM IN BIRDS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—The observation of tapeworm in the sparrow by Mr. Gentles is interesting; mostly, however, on account of the

curious fistula. How to account for that is really a puzzle, unless we imagine that the worm may have been developed in the cellular tissues directly from the cysticercus, a condition which is extremely improbable. Tapeworm is by no means uncommon in birds. I have seen it in young rooks, and grouse frequently have it. Not many years ago there was an epidemic of it on some of the northern moors; and I heard more than one shrewd keeper give an explanation of it which I think will apply to Mr. Gentles' unfortunate sparrow,—viz., that the birds have partaken of dog droppings. Dogs, and in my experience more especially setters, are frequently troubled with tapeworm; their motions are laden with the ova, and frequently joints of the entozoon, so that it is not unlikely that birds would get it from such a source, more especially rooks and sparrows. To the heather-eating grouse the explanation scarcely applies so well; but still it would not be difficult to imagine their accidentally partaking of some food to which ova were attached.

I am, Sir, yours, &c.,

Wakefield, Jan. 1868.

LAWSON TAIT.

P.S.—I am quite certain that Von Siebold is right in ascribing the "sturdy" in sheep to the ova of the *tenia serrata* (*solium*) dropped from dogs; and it would be interesting if some experimenter would tell us if a hen fed upon the proglottides of the tapeworm would have the worm instead of the cysts developed in her.

L. T.

SULPHURIC ACID BATH IN YELLOW FEVER.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—With reference to the communication of "An Army Surgeon," which appeared in your issue of the 28th December last, I beg to state that when I suggested and used the sulphuric acid bath in the treatment of yellow fever, I had not seen Sir Ranald Martin's work, or any other publication on the subject. I am glad, however, to learn that a similar mode of treatment had suggested itself to a person of Sir Ranald Martin's observation and experience.

I believe that the mineral acids, applied endermically, will be found not only to allay febrile excitement by a diaphoretic action, but also to exercise their special therapeutic effects more surely and more safely than if administered internally in such a disease as yellow fever, where there exist great irritability of stomach and disorganisation of the mucous surfaces; and I hope that this method of using them may be further tried and reported upon.

I am, Sir, &c.,

J. M. GRANT, M.D.,
Deputy Inspector-General.

London, Jan. 21, 1868.

PARISIAN MEDICAL INTELLIGENCE.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

THE good people of Paris are now having some rest and relaxation after the terrible weather which prevailed here, and to combat which all the vital forces of the organism were strained. Your readers have doubtless had from other sources some account of the frosty days which opened the year in this quarter of the world—how the Seine was completely congealed; how nothing of the like had been seen since 1843; how some strong-minded, indomitable people would persist on walking over the river, notwithstanding the perils of the undertaking and the timely oburgations of friends; how the Government, with paternal solicitude, placed a *cordon sanitaire* of policemen along the quays to save these indomitable individuals from a very cold ducking, if not worse; how there was delight for the Skating Club, and agony for the wretched poor; how in the streets of Paris nothing was to be seen of the human face but blue noses, half hid by huge comforters, and stuck upon shivering figures either bent upon stamping out the cold, or stealing hurriedly along the walls, &c. Enough of this has been said; and I shall content myself with noting that old King Frost, notwithstanding his popular reputation for clearing up the blood and invigorating the spirits, has created his usual havoc among the young and the aged, and has brought a large number of fractures in the hospitals of Paris, the Hôtel Dieu of Lyons, St. André of Bordeaux, &c. We are now