are of a personal nature, and appear to be introduced only for the purpose of exciting prejudice, is totally unjustifiable. Whatever I have stated in my writings is open to Dr. Dick's remark; and if any of these statements require explanation, I shall be very happy to afford it. In the present instance the remarks of your correspondent are the less excusable, because I have avowed myself a phrenologist; and the views taken by the disciples of this science regarding the moral sentiments are matter of notoriety. As, however, Dr. Dick appears to be ignorant of what these views are, I take this opportunity, although I cannot flatter myself that it can be a matter of the slightest interest to the readers of *THE LANCET*, to relieve his mind, by assuring him that the suspicion which he so "unwillingly" entertains is entirely without foundation.

I am anxious to intrude as little as possible upon your space, but the following remarks are imperatively called for. In his first letter Dr. Dick charged Mr. Combe with having fallen into a "laughably incorrect analogy," by supposing that certain motions which he had observed in the brain of a young girl at New York arose from "muscular action," or something analogous to it. I showed to Dr. Dick that Mr. Combe had expressed no supposition of the kind, and I referred to the page of the work on America, by which he would ascertain that he had fallen into error. Dr. Dick takes no notice of this exposure of his inaccuracy, but alludes once more to the case in question only for the sake of giving forth another misrepresentation. He now says that Mr. Combe obviously meant to prove that the movements of the brain which he observed were "owing to the mind acting on the brain *directly*," independently of the heart and lungs. I deny it to be the case that Mr. Combe "obviously" meant to prove any such thing, and I request Dr. Dick to quote to me the words of that gentleman which would lead to any inference of the kind. Meanwhile I call upon him, as he values a reputation for candour, to acknowledge the error into which he was betrayed, when he stated that Mr. Combe fancied the movements of the brain in the above-mentioned case to proceed from "muscular" action.

In conclusion, I beg to remark, that so long as Dr. Dick's communications upon the subject of my views find place in *THE LANCET*, I shall feel bound, out of respect to its readers and editor, to correct any misrepresentations which these communications may contain; but you must at the same time allow me to protest against what I conceive to be some objectionable characteristics of Dr. Dick's singularly emphatic style, and to express an idea that a scientific journal should not be made the medium of charges against any one of "artifice" and "dis-

ingenuous reasoning," coupled with the holding of views which are "wild," "visionary," "shocking," "ludicrous," and "dreadful," unless these charges are accompanied by something like an attempt at demonstration. If Dr. Dick will point out any passage in which I have misunderstood, and consequently misrepresented, his ideas, I shall hasten to make the requisite correction. My sincere desire has been to arrive at a clear understanding of his views. That this has been a task of some difficulty (either owing to slowness of apprehension on the one side, or to a confused mode of reasoning on the other,) I do not hesitate to confess. I am, Sir, your very faithful and obedient servant,

M. B. SAMPSON.

Clapham New Park, Surrey,
April 11, 1842.

MR. SIMPSON'S KEPHALEPSALIS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Permit me, through the medium of your valuable Journal, to request your correspondent, Dr. Davis, to betake himself to the ware-rooms of those cutlers in London who are in possession of Mr. Simpson's kephalepsalis, and impartially compare that instrument with those contrivances for which it is but natural Dr. D. should be an advocate; and thereafter communicate to you his unbiassed opinion of the respective merits of the kephalepsalis and the osteotomist.

It was not until after these contrivances had been carefully examined by many of my brethren here, that I ventured to communicate to the professional public a description of Mr. Simpson's highly useful invention, which is as superior to the osteotomist, not only in point of utility, but also in as far as regards the facility with which the object of the practitioner may be attained, as a very sharp instrument can be to a blunt one. I must do Dr. Davis the justice to suppose that he could not have seen the kephalepsalis before communicating the article in the last number of *THE LANCET*.

WM. CAMPBELL, M.D.,
Lecturer on Midwifery, &c.
Picardy-place, Edinburgh,
April 12, 1842.

NOTE FROM DR. COOKSON.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—If Mr. Hill thought his letter of any importance, why did he not publish it himself when he published Mr. D. K.'s answer? The omission is his own, not mine.

Your readers will at once perceive that Mr. Hill's letter which appears for the first time, and Mr. D. K.'s letter which appears

for the *second* time, are both irrelevant, both perfectly *nihil ad rem*; seeing that the question is not respecting Mr. D. K.'s insane ravings, but respecting Mr. D. K.'s solemn and repeated asseverations when restored to reason.

Mr. K.'s statements are borne out by *facts*; but if Mr. Hill, with a knowledge of all the suspicious circumstances of the case, is satisfied in his conscience as a governor that all is right, I do not wish to disturb his equanimity: he must, however, permit me to hold my opinion, until I find just cause for changing it. In closing this correspondence, allow me, Sir, to remark, that it is the duty of every governor of an hospital for the insane to have a *craving appetite for abuses*. Suspicious circumstances cannot be too carefully or too rigidly sifted; decisions which may compromise the safety and welfare of patients cannot be too cautiously arrived at. Every man who undertakes that most responsible office, ought to do so with a firm determination to use his own eyes, to depend upon his own judgment, and to pin his faith upon no man. Abuses, Sir, are not encouraged by those who do their best to expose them, but by those who substituting words for things, cover up the most astounding facts in trite common places and sentimental appeals, who are easily satisfied wherever it is pleasant to believe, but who resist the most direct testimony when it accords not with their preconceived wishes, their favourite doctrines and opinions. With best thanks for your attention to my communications, I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

W. D. COOKSON.

Lincoln, April 18, 1842.

PRACTICE.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Having seen the handbill circulated in this town by a Dr. Carter, and not for a moment vindicating physicking by the million, I do think that medical men should look a little at home before they complain of others, as in a parish attached to a certain union, when the medical man then attendant upon it requested of the guardians a small increase for the year ensuing, another offered himself, privately, to one of them, saying, that he “would undertake the duty for the same sum, or even for nothing, rather than that any one else should be chosen.” By the by, is it in unison with the sentiments of the poor-law commissioners, that the guardians should thus fill up a vacancy privately? Such a proceeding amongst older practitioners, affords a bad example to would-be monopolists.

AN OLD SUBSCRIBER.

April 5, 1842.

THE LANCET.

London, Saturday, April 23, 1842.

THE *Society of Apothecaries* continues to enforce the law against unqualified practitioners, with a prudence which does its legal advisers infinite credit. The result of the late action (*The Master, Wardens, and Society of Apothecaries v. Roberts*), tried at the last Gloucestershire assizes, is satisfactory, as it establishes, beyond a shadow of doubt, the fact, that the law of England, expounded by the highest judicial authorities, interdicts, in strict conformity with the law of reason, the “medical” practice of chemists and druggists, as well as of other unqualified persons. The lives of the sick can no longer be tampered with.

The circumstances of the trial were briefly these. Mr. ROBERTS, a chemist, of Cheltenham, to whose doings, if we recollect rightly, we called attention some time since, took upon himself to act as a medical practitioner: of this the Apothecaries' Company received formal notice in January, 1841. A letter was addressed to Mr. ROBERTS without effect; and in December their attention was again aroused by the reported death of a victim, and the verdict of a coroner's jury. Upon inquiry it was found that, notwithstanding Mr. ROBERTS's ignorance of the human frame, and of its diseases, he had been prescribing for, and administering medicines extensively to, the poorer classes, whose unsuspecting credulity marks them out as the ready prey of the quack who has presumption enough to promise them relief from their sufferings. In several cases Mr. ROBERTS had given his advice as a medical man, with the slight exception that his charge had been nominally for his drugs only. Mr. Serjeant TALFOURD, who conducted the case very judiciously, suggested, with a tenderness which we have no doubt was suggested by his instructions, that as the chemist's office is to compound prescriptions, Mr.