common weal. Let us have no more of such charters as were granted by HENRY the EIGHTH, the JAMESSES, and GEORGE the THIRD; but a comprehensive law, which shall be noble in its design, and equable and efficient in operation.

We shall be at some trouble to make ourselves acquainted with the amendments of the charter sought for by Sir HENRY HALFORD, and take up the subject the moment we find ourselves in possession of the requisite facts.

Bust of the late Joshua Brookes, F.R.S.

WE are enabled to speak of this miniature performance in the highest terms of praise, in relation to the two points which constitute the real value in all such works of art, viz., the fidelity of the resemblance to the original, and the beauty of its execution as a work of art. Mr. Brookes was known intimately by hundreds of the profession, and thousands of his professional brethren knew him slightly. Now, of these we believe there is not an individual who saw him more than once who would not instantly recognise his features struck off by the skilful and correct hand of Mr. McCarthy. Few mementoes can be more grateful to the feelings of those gentlemen who derived a knowledge of anatomy under the kind, we might say the father-like, attentions of Mr. Brookes, than the elegant bust before us. It is very portable, handsomely mounted, and protected from the dust by a bell-shaped glass, and furnishes, independently of agreeable reminiscences, a pleasing object to the sight as an ornament on the mantelpiece. In short, as the striking general character of the likeness induces us to place much value on this bust, so are we disposed to give it our warmest recommendation.

SIR CHARLES BELL will deliver a course of fifteen lectures on Comparative Anatomy in the Theatre of the Royal College of Surgeons, Lincoln's Inn Fields, during the present month and part of April, commencing on the 5th instant.

MEMOIR OF DR. ARMSTRONG.

LETTER FROM DR. BOOTT.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In the last number of your journal you impute to me an unintentional misrepresentation respecting the publication of Dr. Armstrong's Lectures in it. I should be very sorry to think I had made one, even through ignorance. As you have very graciously noticed my memoir, and called upon me to amend my statement in the second volume, perhaps you will allow me to say at once, that you have put a construction upon two passages in the work which they do not bear. As I have entered upon the consideration of the facts connected with marsh fever, which will occupy my second volume, I could not easily recur to a subject which has no connexion with the discussion of the probable sources of fever.

In the letter of April, 1824, Dr. Armstrong evidently alludes to a report that his lectures were to follow those of Sir A. Cooper. There is nothing in the mere statement of this rumour which is inconsistent with the facts you have given. It was natural that those who knew the value of his lectures should suggest to him the probability of their appearing in *THE LANCET*, and that he should express to me an apprehension upon the subject. He certainly felt it, and though you had at the time never thought of publishing the lectures, he believed that sooner or later they were to appear in your journal. They did appear within six months. That he had occasion to congratulate himself afterwards on the effect which their publicity had upon his reputation and success, I have no doubt; and that he furnished you with reports of them, your testimony is abundant proof.

In the other passage you object to my saying, that much of the practical information with which his lectures abounded is lost, and would insinuate that I aimed it against the accuracy of the reports of them in *THE LANCET*. I disclaim any such intention. If you will turn to the passage, you will see, that in speaking of his lectures, I allude to my having in my possession all his note-books, from which he lectured, and that I remark these "are generally wholly unintelligible to me, as they consist of words without any immediate connexion. Many of his lectures are comprised in a few pages, and the names of persons frequently occur whose cases he detailed in illustration of his views and treatment of disease. It is much to be regretted, that the valuable practical information with which his lectures abounded is thus, in a great measure, lost, for though there is a report of

ome of them in *THE LANCET*, and a valuable MS. copy taken in the lecture-room by a very intelligent pupil, Mr. Rix, of St. Neots. We have lost much of that eloquent style, and that *copious reference to particular facts*, which make them so attractive and instructive to his hearers."

I am sure you will acknowledge at once the propriety of these observations, for you must see, that they were principally applied to the reports of his lectures, as compared with his MS. note-books. Dr. Armstrong was usually occupied one hour and a quarter at least over each lecture, and sometimes two hours; and if you will compare this period of time with that occupied in reading his lectures, and consider that that copious reference to particular cases which gave such admirable illustration of his general views, is necessarily wanting in your report, you will not say that my statement requires amendment. The general accuracy of your reports, &c. I have always admired, and I have only regretted they were so concise.

You acknowledge that the lecture on mania did not appear in *THE LANCET*. I do not find that on erysipelas, those on the use of purgatives in acute diseases, and several of his lectures on chronic disorders are brief extracts. I, therefore, spoke of "*some*" of his lectures being published in *THE LANCET*. I trust, therefore, that you will consider I have sufficiently noticed your criticism, and will do me the justice to acquit me of any covert design against the reputation of *THE LANCET*.

You have been pleased to speak in terms of commendation of the memoir, and courtesy requires that I should say I am your obliged humble servant,

F. BOOTT.

24, Gower-street, Feb. 24, 1833.

*** Our thanks being due, are hereby returned, to Dr. BOOTT, for the candid acknowledgments contained in the foregoing letter. We entirely and willingly acquit Dr. BOOTT of any covert design against the reputation of *THE LANCET*. In fact, from what we have heard of the integrity of his character, we exonerate him from desiring to do anything covertly. On comparing the lectures in *THE LANCET* with the manuscript notes, we can readily believe that Dr. BOOTT felt himself justified in stating that "*some*" of Dr. ARMSTRONG's lectures had been published in *THE LANCET*, more especially as he was incapable of finding the lectures on mania, erysipelas, the use of purgatives, and acute diseases. Still, Dr.

BOOTT does not inform us whether he knew at the time he was writing that the manuscript of the lectures was forwarded to this journal by Dr. ARMSTRONG himself. It is this fact which throws the entire circumstances into a position altogether different from that which, at first sight, they appear to maintain in the memoir. As Dr. BOOTT admits, which he does most cordially, on our own testimony, that the copies of the lectures were sent to this journal by the lecturer, surely he will not so decidedly question Dr. ARMSTRONG's judgment as to believe that the teacher forwarded the least valuable part of his lectures, and retained the most important portions to occupy the recesses of his bureau! As the publication of the entire course was left wholly to the discretion of the lecturer, it is fair to presume that Dr. ARMSTRONG himself did not consider that those discourses which were withheld contained much information, either in theory or practice, which ought to be submitted to the searching criticism of the profession.

ST. THOMAS'S HOSPITAL.

GLANDERS IN THE HUMAN SUBJECT.

"A new disease is opened to us," said some of the medical officers of this hospital, after examining the body of one of Dr. William's patients on Monday, February the 18th, in the dead-house. Drs. Williams, Elliotson, Roots, and Bright, and Mr. Travers and Mr. Youatt (London University), with several other professional gentlemen and a crowd of students, were present on this occasion. The corpse was that of a man, who had been admitted ten days or a fortnight before, for we hardly know what, nor could learn. The case progressed up to Thursday the 14th, when a symptom appeared which Dr. Williams supposed to be "gout in the head." The attention of Dr. Elliotson was soon after called to the man, who, when seen by that gentleman, presented the following diseased characters. Several large phlyzaceous pustules appeared on the face and neck; a profuse stinking discharge issued from each nostril; there was swelling and bright redness of the eyelids, so as to close the eyes, and gangrenous inflammation of the right temple and adjoining part of the nose; soft fluctuating swellings, some red, some livid, some pinkish, arose in the upper and lower extremities, and one of great size was on the