THE Natural History Society of Eastbourne have issued a pamphlet giving a list of the mammalia, birds, reptiles, amphibia, fishes, molluscs, insects, &c., found in the neighbourhood of the town, supplemented with a catalogue of the local flowering plants, ferns, mosses, lichens, and algæ. A few of the other more pretentious provincial societies and associations would do well to follow the example set by the naturalists of Eastbourne.

WE are sorry to learn that the last Hospital Ball at Brighton showed a considerable falling off in the attendance, with the result, of course, of a diminution of funds to be handed over to the Brighton Hospital.

THE subject selected by the Council of the Apothecaries' Hall of Ireland for the annual prize of five guineas, to be competed for by apprentices in May, 1874, is "The Metallic Preparations of the British Pharmacopœia."

IN Edinburgh, Professor Traquair, of Dublin, has been appointed Keeper of the Natural History Department of the Museum of Science and Art, lately held by Dr. Wyville Thomson.

WE regret to learn that Baron Meyer de Rothschild has been seriously indisposed during the last week. The latest accounts, however, represent his condition as improving.

FROM the last report of Dr. Barclay to the Chelsea vestry it would appear that the milk, tea, flour, sago, and arrow-root sold in the district are pure and unadulterated.

HOSPITAL SUNDAY is now a successful institution in Australia. We are impatient to hear of its being established in the United States and Canada.

DR. TILT, President of the Obstetrical Society of London, has issued cards for a *conversazione* to be held at his house on Friday, the 5th of December.

Correspondence.

"Audi alteram partem."

DR. BELL PETTIGREW ON VITALITY.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I have not had an opportunity before to-day of reading Dr. J. Bell Pettigrew's able lecture "On the Relation of Plants and Animals to Inorganic Matter," or I should most certainly have entered a protest before now against the manner in which he misrepresents Prof. Huxley's views. Prof. Huxley claims for protoplasm a threefold unity—a unity of faculty, a unity of form, and a unity of substance. The *unity* for which Professor Huxley contends is converted in the hands of Dr. Pettigrew into *identity*. He thinks that the potentialities which lie dormant in protoplasm prove that, even when it is homogeneous and identical in all its parts to the eye and sense, yet it is not so to the eye of reason, and this he appears to regard as a sufficient refutation of Prof. Huxley's views. This conclusion, however, instead of conflicting with those views, is one which Prof. Huxley would readily endorse; and yet maintain that protoplasm has a threefold unity. Unfortunately I have not Prof. Huxley's lecture "On the Physical Basis of Life" near me at present; but if I remember well, he distinctly states that the unity for which he contends is perfectly compatible with an indefinite number of special modifications. Dr. Pettigrew draws attention to the important fact that all "science, like all truth, is one." He could therefore, with the utmost propriety, speak of the *unity of science*; but surely this would not commit him to

the opinion that chemistry is identical with physics, and that both are identical with biology. Although it is found on comparison that the sciences present fundamental agreements, this by no means implies that the special sciences present no special differences.

The reason that Dr. Pettigrew misrepresents Professor Huxley is probably owing to the fact that he receives his impressions of that gentleman's opinions, not directly from his own writings upon this subject, but from those writings as epitomised by J. Hutchison Stirling, LL.D. But Dr. Stirling has himself fallen into a similar error to the one I am commenting upon, and Professor Huxley has, in his own vigorous language, exposed the fallacy in his essay "On Yeast," which appeared in the *Contemporary Review* for December, 1871. "Dr. Stirling," he says, "winds up his paper with the following paragraph:—'In short the whole position of Mr. Huxley (1) that all organisms consist alike of the same life-matter, (2) which life-matter is, for its part, due only to chemistry, must be pronounced untenable—nor less untenable (3) the materialism he would found on it.' The paragraph," Professor Huxley continues, "contains three distinct assertions concerning my views, and just the same number of utter misrepresentations of them. That which I have numbered (1) turns on the ambiguity of the word 'same,' for a discussion of which I would refer Dr. Stirling to a great hero of 'Aufklärung,' Archbishop Whateley. Statement number (2) is, in my opinion, absurd, and certainly I have never said anything resembling it; while as to number (3), one great object of my essay was to show that what is called 'materialism' has no sound philosophical basis." The ambiguity of the word "identity," and its substitution for Prof. Huxley's "unity," has misled Dr. Pettigrew, as that of "same" misled Dr. Stirling.

I notice that Dr. Beale has already lodged a complaint in your journal against what he conceives to be Dr. Pettigrew's misrepresentations of his views; and I do not think that it would be difficult to show that he is equally unfortunate with regard to the views of Haeckel and Tyndall. I have not got any of Tyndall's works beside me; but I have just read the last chapter of the second volume of Haeckel's "Generelle Morphologie," entitled "Gott in der Natur," and I must say that Dr. Pettigrew's representations of his opinions are misleading. Haeckel contends for the unity of God and of nature. He represents God as immanent in nature, and as acting from within, and not from without; and he regards what we call physical laws as expressions of His mode of action. This appears to be identical with the opinion of Goethe, one which is endorsed by Carlyle in "Sartor Resartus," and is very different from the gross materialism attributed to Haeckel by Dr. Pettigrew.

I am, Sir, yours truly,
JAMES ROSS, M.D.

Waterfoot, near Manchester, Nov. 22nd, 1873.

"LITHOTOMY EXTRAORDINARY."

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—The commendatory character of the notice in your issue of Nov. 8th of my recent operation for stone at St. Peter's Hospital evinces a kind wish that I should have appeared in London "under more favourable auspices."

It might suffice to inform you that I have for many years pressed upon various hospitals, metropolitan and provincial, the acceptance of my scheme of procedure for making lithotomy speedy and safe, and that in every instance the proffer has been disregarded, evaded, or flatly refused.

In that institution which you say has "never been fully recognised by the profession" I found gentlemen animated by enthusiastic devotion to surgical science, and professional cordiality of the most liberal character.

I received from them a request that I would exhibit my method and peculiar implements before them. I heartily responded by the act of November 3rd, as you have described.

I had no misgivings or doubt of the respectability of an institution founded by my friend Mr. Spencer Wells, supported by a subscription list of a thousand a year, and further approved by a gift lately of ten thousand pounds by an anonymous benefactor.

I have to offer to my medical brethren in particular, and to the world at large, now and for all time, a solution of the greatest problem in surgical science—one that has engaged the attention of surgeons for two thousand years without having as yet been demonstrated.

I have spent half a hundred years in fathoming the principle enunciated by Cheselden, and have not only discovered the reason of his shortcomings, but have supplied the deficiencies of his mechanical appliances.

The practical application of those principles which I may justly claim as my own has issued in successes far surpassing any on record in past or present times. I have brought lithotomy so near to perfection as to have reduced the common average of failures from 20 per cent. to 4 per cent.; and have shortened the period of painful endurance almost from minutes to seconds.

You encourage me to ask the aid of your powerful pen in procuring for me a place where I can broach my scheme under auspices as much more favourable as you can devise. One place there is, of all others, to which I am entitled by every rule of propriety and principle of justice to look—St. Thomas's Hospital.

The lineal descendant, professionally considered, and true heir of Cheselden's genius may confidently claim to occupy the place where his disembodied spirit should be the *genius loci*, and where his great name is professedly cherished and adored.

The pretence that threescore years of age means decrepitude, as practically declared in that hospital, assorts well with the belief that the treasures of wisdom and monuments of skill which only "old experience doth attain," are valueless and nugatory.

My late honoured preceptor, Sir William Lawrence, acquitted himself well in this operation when the snows of fourscore winters crowned his brow; it is possible, therefore, that one not quite a septuagenarian may be not absolutely effete.

The world must surely be in its dotage when it becomes an established principle to "wrong the ancients," and fix a rule of criticism that would pronounce Harvey a dreamer, Euclid a deceiver, and Solomon a fool.

I fancy myself entitled to choose my own manner of imparting to the world my discoveries, capable as they are of being fixed mathematically, and with precision scarcely less than that of the law of gravitation; and I feel myself at liberty to diffuse the light I have kindled in any other part of the world than that where millions, and millions upon millions, are periodically spent on engines of death and sacrifices to Moloch, and where also high science is synonymous with dry bread.

My last appeal to my country may be through Parliament. A continued rejection of my offer may prompt me to seek some continental capital, or to forsake the banks of the Thames for the Mississippi, and to consign the fruit of my labours to that New World which a great statesman said he "called into existence to redress the evils of the old."

I will ask for space in your next number for this letter, and will look with hopeful expectancy for that liberal and enlightened advocacy which has ever characterised your paper throughout the last half-century of time.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

THOMAS GUTTERIDGE, M.R.C.S.

Calthorpe-road, Birmingham, Nov. 19th, 1873.

ON AN EXTERNAL ANATOMICAL SIGN AS A GUIDE TO THE SIZE OF THE TESTES.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Having for many years observed the remarkable difference in the size of the occipital protuberances in different individuals, as well as the variableness in the size of the testes, it occurred to me that there might be some law by which such differences could be accounted for. Extending my observations over a series of years, and having examined soldiers, sailors, and emigrants, for which my occupation as surgeon of emigrant vessels gave me ample opportunities, and also for the last ten years in private practice, I have come to the conclusion that a large occipital protuberance will almost invariably co-exist with large testes, and *vice versa*, indicating great vigour of the mind and body

or the reverse. Where these are large they point out such as the true phallic propagators of the race and the dominant factors in the struggle for existence. Every variation may occur under this law—e.g., a male with large occipital protuberance and testes may be endowed with great intellect and great vigour of body, and if mated to a female with the same distinguishing characters, the offspring will be powerful and continuous; but if united to a female deficient in these signs of vigour, the offspring will vary—some will be strong and others weak. If both parents have these distinguishing characters small, then the offspring will be deficient. Again, a male may have great intellect with small occipital protuberance, and if mated with a female of great vigour the offspring will vary in physical power; but, as a rule, great intellect with small occipital protuberance is generally deficient in the number of offspring, or else a physically weak one. In examining the head of the gorilla in the Royal College of Surgeons, it will be seen that the occipital ridge and protuberance is enormous, as well as in all the descending species, and I have seen a monkey not more than sixteen inches high with testes bigger than those of the human adult. It can also be followed out in the cock and the sparrow, and in all those animals and birds remarkable for their prolific powers.

Any young enthusiastic physiologist taking up this subject and working it out would be amply repaid for his trouble. I will briefly sum up as follows:—A large occipital protuberance in both sexes indicates great vigour, and a numerous and physically strong offspring; a deficiency on either side, a variable offspring; a deficiency in both parents, a physically weak offspring. A large occipital protuberance and large testes, with deficient frontal development, may be combined with gluttony and sensuality; a large cerebellic development, with low retreating forehead, and small occipital protuberance and testes, indicates brutal sottishness. I have only pointed out in a very unmethodical way some of the facts that have come under my own observation, leaving to those who feel inclined to extend this investigation the further elucidation of the subject. I may remark that the medical man can frequently gain an insight into a patient's sexual propensities, and without giving any offence, by merely feeling this bump—at least, I have been credibly informed of this by several professional brethren to whom I have mentioned the subject; thus, this knowledge is essentially practical. Knowing the value of your space, I have not lengthened these remarks, and, believing the idea to be original,

I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

Shaw-street, Worcester, Nov. 22nd, 1873.

W. STORY.

PROFESSIONAL REMUNERATION.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—As a physician in practice in this town, I beg most emphatically, as far as I am personally concerned, to plead not guilty to the accusation brought by Mr. W. Swain against the consultants in his neighbourhood. I am not, and never have been, in the habit of paying four or five visits for a single guinea fee.

On commencing practice here I made it my business to inquire, from the seniors in the profession in this district, what was the regularly accepted scale of fees for consulting practice.

When I mention, among others, the names of Mr. Whipple, ex-president of the British Medical Association, and the late Dr. Yonge, men whose characters as gentlemen and positions, the former as a general practitioner, the latter as a consulting physician, stand deservedly so high, I am sure my authority will not be called in question by any medical man here.

The following is the scale I found in general use:—

1. In consultation with another practitioner, one guinea, for which a second visit if required is given.

2. In attending private patients alone, one guinea, for which fee three visits, including the first, are given.

To these charges I have scrupulously adhered. They are charges sanctioned by long use in the profession, and understood by the public.

Mr. Cutcliffe has certainly a strong grievance against those consultants who, on certain days and at given hours,