On Monday last Sir James Paget presided at the distribution of prizes to the successful students of the Dental Hospital of London. The ceremony was held at Willis's Rooms. The spacious new premises of the institution, together with the excellent teaching staff, will not fail to attract an increasingly large number of pupils.

THE examinations for the certificate in State Medicine, instituted by the University of Cambridge, have been held this week. We believe about twenty-eight names are on the list of candidates. We hope soon to announce the result of the examinations.

ENTERIC FEVER is reported to be increasing in one quarter of Glasgow. Numerous cases continue to be reported, some of a very severe type, although the mortality is as yet small. It is estimated that about 20 per cent. in this particular part of the city have been attacked with typhoid.

THE guardians and other officials of Cannock have been called to account by Dr. Ballard, on behalf of the Local Government Board, by reason of the unsatisfactory state of vaccination in the district.

Correspondence.

"Audi alteram partem."

MEDICAL EXPERTS IN THE DAILY PRESS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I trust you will allow me to notice a letter inserted in your last number signed "F. R. C. P.," especially as reference is made to myself in what I consider to be an uncourteous and unjust way, and I am duly entitled to reply to it.

Allusion is first made to a letter of mine under the "sensational" heading "Homicidal Lunacy." This refers to a letter entitled "Criminal Lunacy in Scotland," which I sent to *The Times*, commenting on the "Cambuslang Murder." The editor, however, thinking the term "Homicidal Lunacy" more appropriate, substituted it for the one I had chosen.

The *Glasgow Herald*, containing a fully detailed report of the case, was forwarded to me by my friend Dr. Browne. He was aware that the *Psychological Journal* [thus in original!—ED. L.], then passing through the press, contained a few remarks upon "Murders by Madmen," and I, therefore, naturally thought that it was sent to me to comment upon in my journal. This I should have done had not the report arrived too late and when all matter was in the press. I considered the case, however, to be of such importance in a medico-legal aspect that I decided to send my comments and opinion to *The Times*.

I did not for a moment suppose that anyone could have inferred from the words used in my letter, "to express an opinion," that I intended the opinion for Dr. Browne, who is one of the greatest living authorities in lunacy. I am sure there is no statement in my letter from which such inference could be drawn, and there was nothing further from my thoughts at the time. The opinion was *pro bono publico*, but "F. R. C. P." has put his own construction on my letter in order to serve his purpose and raise a sneer.

Tierney had been tried, found guilty of murder, and sentenced to death, the jury recommending him to mercy in consequence of the excitement which might have existed from previous attacks of insanity. From the wording of the verdict the case appeared to me to be one in which doubt existed in the minds of the jury. Such being the case, I had a perfect right, especially as I considered the verdict an unjust one, to express an opinion on the case.

I must remind your correspondent that lunacy is a subject of interest not only to the profession, but to the world generally, and the columns of the press are open for discussion in disputed cases of insanity.

I cannot imagine how your correspondent can be under

the mistaken impression that a physician is *not* entitled to express his opinion in a case of lunacy except he has actually seen the lunatic. An opinion formed upon careful and deliberate analysis of the full details of a case is surely entitled to some consideration, especially as it is the special province of psychologists [thus in original!—ED. L.] to frequently base their opinion upon written statements.

It is, however, a great satisfaction for me to know that the Home Secretary, in his subsequent investigation of the case, formed the same opinion as that expressed by

Your obedient servant,

Cavendish-square, Oct. 5th, 1875.

L. S. FORBES WINSLOW.

SYMPATHETIC OPHTHALMIA.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In "A Practical Treatise on Diseases of the Eye," recently published for me by Messrs. Macmillan, there occurs the following passage, which forms part of my observations on the channel through which sympathetic ophthalmia may be excited in a previously healthy eye by injury to its fellow:—

"Mr. Vose Solomon accuses the optic nerve, but only on the ground that, in a single instance, sympathetic ophthalmia followed enucleation of the eye in a patient of his own, whose optic nerve, on account of some imperfection in the scissors employed, was bruised at the place of division, instead of being cleanly cut."

In writing these words, I believed that I was correctly stating the substance of a case which Mr. Solomon had himself communicated to me some years ago, and also the substance of his own inferences from the facts related. Mr. Solomon, however, repudiates both the circumstance which I have mentioned, and the opinion which I have attributed to him; and I am unable to lay my hand upon the written history with which he furnished me.

On referring to an article, mainly on sympathetic ophthalmia, which I contributed to the *British and Foreign Medico-Chirurgical Review* for January, 1868, and in which Mr. Solomon admits that his own views are correctly stated, I find that the incident of the contused optic nerve and the subsequent sympathetic disease is described in a passage which I translated from the *Ophthalmiatriche Beobachtungen* of Dr. Mooren; and hence it seems probable that my recollection has played me false, and that I have fallen into an error in attaching the name of Mr. Solomon to a statement which is in all other particulars correct. I have arranged with Messrs. Macmillan to add to the present list of *errata* in my book that the name of Dr. Mooren should be read instead of that of Mr. Solomon in the passage referred to, and I shall be much obliged if you will give publicity to this explanation, and will at the same time allow me to express, both to Mr. Solomon and to yourself, my regret that the necessity for so troubling you should have arisen.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Wimpole-street, October 4th, 1875.

R. BRUDENELL CARTER.

LIVERPOOL.

(From our own Correspondent.)

THE opening proceedings of the winter session at the Liverpool School of Medicine were on this occasion rendered additionally interesting by the presence of Prof. Humphry, F.R.S., who, at the request of the Council, kindly undertook to preside and distribute the prizes gained during the two previous sessions. The proceedings commenced with the reading of a report by the registrar of the progress of the school during the past twelve months. An important feature in the report was the announcement that, by the will of the late Roger Lyon Jones, a sum of £2000 had been left for the purpose of founding scholarships. It was also suggested that these scholarships might be devoted towards encouraging and assisting students to work for the higher degrees, such as those of the University of London.

Dr. Dickinson's introductory address then followed. It