Marquis of Blandford, M.P.; Lord Shelmersdale; Sir Robert Harry Inglis, M.P.; Sir Michael Shaw Stewart, Bart.; Sir John Warrender, Bart.; Major Gen. Sir Henry Watson; the Rev. Thomas Dale, Canon of St. Paul's; The Rev. Charles Baring, M.A.; the Rev. Thomas Fuller, M.A.; the Rev. Joseph Hamilton, M.A.; Benjamin Bond Cabbell, Esq., M.P.; James William Freshfield, Esq., M.P.; William Cotton, Esq., F.R.S.; James Bentley, Esq.; John Pepys, Esq.; John Labouchere, Esq.; Charles Elliott, Esq., F.R.S.; James Gordon Murdoch, Esq.; Robert Keate, Esq., Serjeant-Surgeon to the Queen; Dr. Locock, Physician to the Queen; Dr. Forbes, F.R.S., Physician to the Household; Dr. Ferguson, Physician to the Queen; Dr. Seymour, F.R.S.; Dr. Babington; Dr. Mayo, F.R.S.; Dr. Henry Davies; Dr. Roots; George James Guthrie, Esq., F.R.S.; Dr. Conolly, Hanwell; Richard Dugard Grainger, Esq., F.R.S.; Dr. Holland, F.R.S., Physician extraordinary to the Queen; Dr. Graham, Epsom; Henry Peter Fuller, Esq.; Nathaniel Henry Clifton, Esq.; Sir John Fife, Newcastle; John Bowling, Esq., Hammersmith; J. Tayler, Esq., Brighton; Dr. Webster, Dulwich; James Stedman, Esq., Guilford; Thomas Martin, Esq., Reigate; George Fincham, Esq.; George Beaman, Esq.; James Clayton, Esq.; Isaac Hargraves, Esq., Tonbridge Wells; John Propert, Esq."

5th Resolution.—Moved by Dr. J. Arthur Wilson; seconded by Charles F. Lord, Esq.:—

"That Robert Gosling, Esq., be requested to accept the office of Treasurer."

6th Resolution.—Moved by Benjamin Bond Cabbell, Esq., M.P.; Seconded by Sir Thomas Phillips:—

"That the following gentlemen be requested to accept the office of Trustees, viz:—James A. Wilson, Esq., M.D.; Robert Lee, Esq., M.D., F.R.S.; William Fergusson, Esq., F.R.S.; John Bacot, Esq.; Benjamin Phillips, Esq., F.R.S."

7th Resolution.—Moved by Henry P. Fuller, Esq.; seconded by Dr. Aldis:—

"That the president, vice-presidents, and the following gentlemen do constitute the Council, viz:—Sir Thomas Phillips; Henry Pownall, Esq.; Rev. John Jennings; Rev. Edward Scobell; Rev. George Pocock; John Henry Cancellor, Esq.; John Chippendale, Esq.; Dr. Beattie; Dr. Sutherland; Dr. Todd; Dr. Sibson; Dr. Goodfellow; Dr. Gream; Dr. Moore; George Pilcher, Esq.; Henry Sterry, Esq.; Francis L'Estrange, Esq.; Robert Dunn, Esq.; Charles F. Lord, Esq.; William Meates, Esq.; Francis Godrich, Esq.; Richard Edgcumbe, Esq.; John Perry, Esq.; Dr. Barnett; John Lavies, Esq.; Theodore Campbell, Esq."

8th Resolution.—Moved by the Lord Bishop of Ripon; seconded by Dr. John Forbes:—

"That full power be, and is hereby given to the Council to take such steps as it may deem advisable for carrying out the objects of this Institution."

9th Resolution.—Moved by John Bowling, Esq.; seconded by John Henry Cancellor, Esq.:—

"That the present estimated cost of the erection or building of the proposed College, appears to amount to the sum of £18,000, and it is deemed expedient, and the Council are hereby instructed not to commence such erection or building until the funds subscribed for such purpose shall amount to the sum of £12,000, or two-thirds of any further estimated cost of the erection of the proposed college, should the existing estimate be hereafter reduced or increased in amount."

10th Resolution.—Moved by Nathaniel Clifton, Esq.; seconded by the Rev. J. Jennings:—

"That the cordial thanks of this meeting be presented to J. Propert, Esq., for his kindness and benevolence in suggesting the establishment of the Medical Benevolent College; and for the energy and ability displayed by him in the arrangements for the present meeting."

11th Resolution.—Moved by John Propert, Esq.; seconded by Dr. Allison.

"That this meeting expresses its high appreciation of Dr. Graham's liberality, and hereby returns its best thanks to him for placing at the disposal of the Society a site for the College upon terms which render the offer munificent."

Correspondence.

"Audi alteram partem."

THE NORWICH CONSULTATION.

[LETTER AND STATEMENT FROM DR. COPEMAN.]

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—From an impression that I ought not to allow the discussion on the late "Norwich Consultation" to proceed farther, without some endeavour on my part to render clear and intelligible what at present seems confused and intricate, I trouble you with some remarks upon Mrs. Gladstone's case; not simply with a view of setting forth the truth respecting it, but also of rendering it instructive to the profession. A gentleman, high in professional status, a practitioner and professor of obstetrics, has given an opinion upon it at variance with that of most others competent to judge; and it would be very gratifying to me to find him able to set himself right in the estimation of his professional brethren. I feel that he has built his superstructure upon a wrong foundation; and if I prove to him the instability of his premises, I trust, for the honour of the profession, he will have the manliness to acknowledge and rectify his error. As the matter now stands, the written opinion of Dr. Murphy is not only the shield by which the homœopath protects himself, but also the weapon by which the reputation of a most intelligent, competent, and respectable practitioner has been wounded.

On Wednesday, April 30, 1851, I received a note from the Rev. J. E. Gladstone, as follows:—

"Dear Sir,—My beloved wife is alarmingly ill, and my present medical adviser wishes to have a further opinion and consultation as to the case. You will confer upon me the greatest possible obligation if you will meet him here at either five o'clock or seven o'clock, or any other hour convenient to you. Will you oblige me with an answer by bearer, if possible."

"Yours, &c.,

"J. E. GLADSTONE."

Having accidentally heard a few days before that Dr. Bell was attending Mrs. Gladstone, and presuming he was the "present medical adviser," I wrote as follows:—

"Norwich, April 30, 1851."

Dear Sir,—I am extremely sorry to receive such a bad account of Mrs. Gladstone, and should be truly glad if I could be of any service to her. It would be quite convenient to me to visit her at seven o'clock; but if, as I understand, Dr. Bell be her present attendant, such is the difference between our views of the treatment of disease, that a consultation with him must necessarily be entirely useless, and would prevent the satisfaction I should otherwise have in exercising my best judgment and attention for the relief of the illness you so despondingly refer to. * * *

Yours, &c.,

"E. COPEMAN."

In consequence of this answer, Mr. Gladstone called upon me to ascertain why I would not meet Dr. Bell, and pressed me to do so. I told him I objected because Dr. Bell was an homœopathic practitioner, registered so in the "Medical Directory," and that consultations between practitioners of such opposite principles could lead to no good result. I also remarked upon several other irregular practices of Dr. Bell, such as having allowed his name to be affixed to a druggist's handbill, and visiting a country town twice a week to give advice at a druggist's house; and the fact of two of the most respectable practitioners in Norwich having recently refused to meet him. Mr. Gladstone told me Dr. Bell would consent to retire, if I would not meet him, provided my advice were preferred; but said he was under obligation to Dr. Bell, and felt he must either offend him, or sacrifice his wife to professional etiquette. Still I declined to meet Dr. Bell; and as Mr. Gladstone was going away, he told me his wife's case was an attempt at abortion, and that something remained in the womb which put her life in great danger. He also told me Dr. Bell had the day before put his wife to such torture that she went into hysterics; and that the same operation must be done again, but that she must have chloroform, and he could not do it alone. Upon hearing this, I felt there was immediate necessity for careful attention to the case; called Mr. Gladstone back to my study, and requested him to allow me to ask Mr. Cooper (his former medical attendant and friend) to go with me in the evening; at the same time advising him to accept the offered retirement of Dr. Bell, rather than risk his wife's life by any possible

mismanagement. I told him I did not wish to reflect upon Dr. Bell's treatment, as I did not know what it was; but that probably no one in Norwich would meet him. This arrangement he consented to, but soon after he wrote me the following note, which of course prevented our going:—

"April 30, 1851,

"Dear Sir,—Arriving at home, I found my dearest wife and under the hands of Dr. Bell and a stranger whom I do not at all know; they are now with her, and should you and Mr. Cooper come you will find them here: so that since they are unable to leave her for an instant, and since the evil is being, I hope, naturally removed, it will not be needful to put you to the trouble of seeing her. Will you accept my earnest and warm-hearted thanks for the sympathy you expressed to me under my great distress?

"Yours, gratefully and faithfully,

"J. E. GLADSTONE."

On Thursday, May 1, Mr. Cooper called upon me, and told me a lady, a mutual friend of his and the Gladstones, had informed him that Dr. Bell had attributed the present attack to a portion of placenta having been left after her last confinement, and implied mismanagement on the part of Mr. Cooper, who attended upon that occasion. Mr. Cooper assured me she had had a most propitious labour, and had got about again in an unusually short time; and that she had then had no untoward symptom whatever. As he had been on the most intimate terms with the family, I advised him to call on Mr. Gladstone, as a friend, and make personal inquiries as to what had been said and done. Mr. Gladstone received him in a friendly manner, repeated to him the reason given by Dr. Bell for the present mischief, and told him when he returned home from my house the night before, he found Dr. Bell and the stranger with his wife, both in their shirt sleeves, pressing with great force upon her abdomen, and occasioning excruciating pain; that this pressure was continued for many hours, until she was so exhausted she could bear it no longer, and that they said it was necessary in order to expel the contents of the uterus. It was also stated that Dr. Bell had, of his own accord, telegraphed for Dr. Murphy, of London, who was expected to-day. In the evening, Mr. Cooper received a pressing message from Mr. Gladstone to visit his wife, and to take me with him. We obeyed the summons, and found that Mr. Gladstone had dismissed Dr. Bell and his friend; that Dr. Murphy had been, and had given an unfavourable opinion of the case; and Mr. Gladstone requested us to undertake the future management of the case.

[Here we omit the detailed particulars of the medical progress of the case. Our readers are aware that subsequently to this a mass of hydatidous placenta and a small ovum were discharged, so no doubt now exists as to the nature of the case.]

On reviewing all the circumstances, it will naturally be inquired why Dr. Murphy was sent for without the knowledge and concurrence of Mr. Gladstone? The answer is, Dr. Bell was in difficulty, and knew no one here would meet him. And why did he request Dr. Murphy to give him a *written* opinion of the case? Because he feared questions might arise as to the propriety of his treatment. Would it not have been an exercise of proper caution and prudence, on the part of Dr. Murphy, to have hesitated ere he gave a written opinion, based upon the *ipse dixit* of a practitioner whom others refused to meet, and who had sent for him without the sanction of the patient or her friends?

With respect to the treatment having been judicious, &c., had not Dr. Murphy said so, I should have made no remarks upon it. But does Dr. Murphy really intend to sanction the principle, that in cases of abortion all general measures calculated to restrain hæmorrhage should be, as they were in this instance, omitted, and recourse be had at once to the forcible dilatation of the uterus and artificial removal of its contents, especially when the hæmorrhage has been neither profuse nor severe? I believe the doctrine to be a dangerous one; I believe that it is right practice to resort to every possible means of restraining hæmorrhage, even by plugging, rather than attempt to dilate a uterus not in a state easily to admit of dilatation; and if I be right in adopting this view of the subject, I cannot help offering a remonstrance to Dr. Murphy, not to allow his name to be quoted, or his authority to be used, in favour of an almost impracticable and certainly dangerous mode of procedure.

The observations I have felt myself called upon to make have necessarily run to a greater length than will, I fear, quite suit your convenience for insertion; but I cannot allow

the opportunity to escape, of pointing out to one in a high position a danger he may easily avoid; nor refrain from endeavouring, by a just representation of circumstances, to secure against harm the reputation of a deserving man, and displaying the proceedings of those who think they are justified in quitting the beaten track of legitimate medicine for the highways and byways of quackery.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Norwich, June 10, 1851.

E. COPEMAN, M.D.

[LETTER FROM MR. COOPER.]

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—The statement with regard to the "Norwich consultation," promised by Dr. Murphy, having made its appearance in the columns of your last week's journal, has induced me to trouble you again with a few remarks in answer to some of the assertions it contains. It would be presumption in me to dilate upon the loose and particularly accommodating notions with regard to homœopathic consultations displayed by Dr. Murphy, after the very excellent strictures upon that subject in your leading article; but I may be permitted to express my opinion,—that there appears to me to be no single point in that statement calculated to impress the profession generally with a more favourable idea of the extraordinary and unprofessional opinion given by Dr. Murphy, or to satisfy me for the injury, which, after all his assertions to the contrary, I feel he must have known *would*, and I can prove *has*, accrued to my professional reputation: not with my professional brethren, truly, for they one and all acknowledge the opinion given as erroneous and unjust, *but with the public*, ignorant as they must be of the circumstances of the case.

Dr. Murphy says that in my correspondence with him, I commented on Dr. Bell's treatment, in a manner which seemed to him perfectly unwarrantable. I am at a loss to conceive what this means. I merely stated what the treatment was, and expressed surprise at his opinion with regard to it, doubting whether he could have been fully acquainted with it.

The anonymous letter which has so disturbed the equanimity of Dr. Murphy, you are aware, did not emanate from me; I have never written anonymously, nor was I aware of your being in possession of the history of the case, until just as your leading article of May 17 was going to print. But, after all, what is there in this letter for Dr. Murphy to complain of? It merely states the fact of his meeting a homœopath; the scandal, if any, which he speaks of, reverts on Dr. Bell, and although the history of the case was not furnished by me for publication, the only inaccuracy I can find in it is, that the catamenia appeared twice, instead of once, as there stated.

The truth of the previous facts, exclaims Dr. Murphy, rests with Dr. Bell and Mr. Cooper; he has all the way through preferred Mr. Bell's statement as best suited to the opinion he gave. I should be glad to show you, and the profession generally, what sort of person his gentleman is, whom Dr. Murphy, in all his communications with me, has desired to have treated so courteously, handled so tenderly, and in whose veracity he places such implicit confidence. Since my last letter to you I have been able to obtain a copy of one of the documents I there alluded to, which I now subjoin, and also a letter from the Registrar of the London College of Physicians.

MEDICAL CERTIFICATE.

(Copy.)

I, William Bell, Esquire, being a Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians in London, hereby certify that I have this day personally examined Sarah Boughey, the person named in the statement and order, and that the said Sarah Boughey is an insane person, and a proper person to be confined.

(Signed,)

WILLIAM BELL, M.D.

Dated, 27th day of June, 1848.

Blickling Lodge.

LETTER FROM DR. F. HAWKINS.

(Copy.)

London, June 6th, 1851.

"SIR,—I have received your letter of the 4th inst., and can only say, that the person named William Bell, alluded to in that letter, is in no way connected with the Royal College of Physicians in London.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

FRANCIS HAWKINS.

So much for this truth-loving person. Surely this must disclose a vast deal to Dr. Murphy as to the reliance to be placed on his (Mr. Bell's) statements.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Norwich, June, 1851.

WILLIAM COOPER.

(LETTER FROM DR. MURPHY.)

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I regret very much that any language of mine should give pain to Mr. Gladstone; and still more, that he should have allowed himself to be at all entangled in the discussions now going forward. I therefore hasten to assure him that I never intended to attack his character for truthfulness, or to imply that he stated anything that was false. I cannot, however, say so much for his consistency. If Mr. Gladstone could for a moment place himself in my position, he will better understand the meaning of the terms "contradictory" and "irreconcilable," and, perhaps, might arrive at the same conclusion respecting these attested statements that I have done.

In the correspondence I had with Mr. Cooper, I was called upon by him to believe that Dr. Bell treated Mrs. Gladstone very improperly. I did not please to adopt Mr. Cooper's account as the true one; inasmuch as having at that time had no communication with Dr. Bell, I could not do so until he was given the opportunity of defending himself. Besides this, Mr. Cooper could have no knowledge of Dr. Bell's treatment but by hearsay. Mr. Cooper was offended at my hesitation, and thereupon forwarded to me the following statement, not in Mr. Gladstone's handwriting, but simply attested by him as correct.

[Here we omit the two statements of Mr. Gladstone, which are given at length, and in which some discrepancies occur.]

I am, &c..

EDWARD WM. MURPHY.

June 17, 1851.

* * This correspondence cannot be continued. It has already diverged into questions quite distinct from the object which led to its introduction in our columns. On the questions then raised, we believe there are not two opinions in the profession.—ED. L.

HOMŒOPATHY AT BRIGHTON.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Will you do me the favour to find room in your next number for the enclosed notes, occasioned by my refusing to consult with Dr. Malan, Homœopathic M.D.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Brighton, June 18, 1851.

JOHN LAWRENCE.

(COPY.)

Doctor Malan presents his compliments to Mr. Lawrence, and having observed yesterday, to his great surprise, Mr. Lawrence's total ignorance of one of the most important branches of medicine, he begs to recommend to his reading the works of Hahnemann, the numerous theoretical and practical works on homœopathy, the *British Journal of Homœopathy*, the *Homœopathic Times*, the Reports of the Hahnemann and London homœopathic hospitals, and those of the many homœopathic dispensaries in London and elsewhere. He takes also the liberty of enclosing the list of most of the medical men now practising homœopathy in Great Britain, in order that Mr. Lawrence may get acquainted with the names of eminent men in the profession; and he hopes that it is not *infra dig* for a London physician, a British graduate and M.D. of several universities, a physician of a London hospital, and a master of arts, to give advice to a general practitioner in a provincial town.

London, June 11, 1851.

(COPY.)

Mr. Lawrence presents his compliments and informs Dr. Malan, in reply to his note of June 11, wherein he so considerably recommends him to peruse the works of Hahnemann and others, on homœopathy, that not having any time to throw away upon the study of homœopathic nonsense, he readily forgives Dr. Malan's surprise at his ignorance upon such subjects. Mr. Lawrence trusts that his reputation is sufficiently established to bear any amount of odium from such as Dr. Malan. The statements of Hahnemann, and other writers on homœopathy, do not incline Mr. Lawrence to deviate from the ordinary rules of practice; nor could they in his mind, under any circumstances, justify him in using the diploma of regular constituted bodies, as cloaks in the practice of any kind of quackery. Mr. Lawrence begs to draw the attention of Dr. Malan to THE LANCET of May 31, p. 606, wherein he will learn the estimation in which such practitioners as himself are held by the profession in Edinburgh; and, in conclusion, regrets that amongst the many titular trivialities so pompously paraded by Dr. Malan, he had not obtained a degree in good

manners, the omission of which must create contempt in the minds of all who lay claim to the title of gentlemen, whether residing in the provinces or elsewhere.

74, Grand Parade, Brighton, June 13, 1851.

ON THE INCISION OF STRICTURE OF THE URETHRA.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In the report of a lecture by Mr. Guthrie, on Stricture of the Urethra, in THE LANCET of last week, there are some remarks of an apologetical character respecting an accusation preferred by M. Civiale in his late work on "Urethrotomy," which I shall show were unnecessary. As the charge, that his "voisins d'outre mer" claimed inventions for themselves which really belonged to the French, is principally brought against myself, I trust I may be allowed this opportunity of answering it.

It is necessary, in order to understand this question, to know that, in an appendix to the last edition of my work on "Stricture of the Urethra," I made an examination into the claims of M. Civiale and others for the invention of lithotripsy, or rather, for the invention of a mode of extracting stone without cutting the bladder; and if I am not much mistaken, I think I proved very clearly, that the operation first suggested in that book, and soon afterwards performed by Sir Astley Cooper with much success, was the origin of the recent improvements in this department of Surgery. The modification of this operation, termed lithotripsy, I likewise showed to be anything but an improvement of it; nor can I doubt that the irritation and disease of the bladder so often caused by lithotripsy will ere long bring about the restoration of the original proceeding, in which the breaking of the stone was intended to be subsidiary, and in certain cases only, to the slow and painless dilatation of the posterior part of the canal.

It is in allusion, doubtless, to this investigation, that M. Civiale remarks, (page 9,) "that one may justly reproach Mr. Arnott for not rendering that justice to others which he claims for himself;" and the remark is prefatory to the statement, that I had given credit to Hunter for the invention of an operation which was really of French origin. And, again, in acknowledging the revival and recommendation in my work of incision in certain cases of stricture, he adds the sarcasm, that I had advised certain methods, "sans trop me préoccuper de ce qui avait été fait."

The utter want of foundation of the accusations contained in these two passages will appear from the following extracts from my Treatise on Stricture. The first has reference to the operation of *boutonnière*, or the external incision of stricture. Now, though I certainly mention a peculiar kind of such incision, applicable to a specific case, as a proposal of Hunter's of *boutonnière* generally I speak in the following words, page 183, "It was once the usual practice, in obstinate cases of stricture, and may still be necessary in some very rare instances, to cut down upon the obstruction from the outside, divide it with a knife," &c.; and in the preface the following passage occurs, prefatory to the quotation of a severe condemnation of this operation, and censure of English surgeons for adopting it, from an article on Urethrotomy, in the "Dictionnaire de Médecine et Chirurgie Pratique;"—"The French, with whom this practice, under the name of *boutonnière*, was in former times not uncommon, now speak of it in such terms as the following," &c.

That the second passage in M. Civiale's book has as little foundation as the first, will be evident by a reference to the chapter of my work which treats of the incision of stricture. The piercing of impermeable stricture is there expressly mentioned as an operation "recommended in books of surgery." Slitting or incising stricture, by a lancetted stilette, I say, "has been proposed for the purpose of accelerating the cure;" and I go on to describe a particular instrument intended for the purpose, of which "I had read somewhere." It is an amusing circumstance, and shows how easily a reputation may be gained by a little prudent silence respecting the books or propositions of others, even of one's own contemporaries,—that an English writer, whose work appeared several years after mine, should be generally considered, not as the reviver only, but as the inventor of the internal incision of stricture!

In the second edition of the Treatise on Stricture, I have remarked that the several methods of cutting stricture there described, "may have been better received than perhaps they deserved, from the notion that they were new; but although a