to all active medical treatment from the beginning, and resorted to simple drinks and injections. The most skilful of the medical faculty in this city were constant in their attendance upon him, and we had two or three physicians with him constantly, both day and night. The interest excited, and the exertion made to save the life of so valuable a man, were sincere and great on the part of his friends. Everything within their power and reach was done for his relief, but, alas! in vain.

"His death has cast a gloom over our city. It is not lamented with cold formality, but has excited grief of the most poignant character. Although he had been with us but a few weeks, his virtues and worth were known and acknowledged.

"His body has been examined by the medical faculty, and embalmed. This was thought advisable in case his relations should have a desire to remove it. Casts of his head and brain have been taken, and his heart and lungs are also preserved.

"On Saturday next (Nov. 17), the last solemn offices are to be paid to his remains in a public manner. A eulogy, by Dr. Follen, German Professor of Harvard University, will be delivered, and other services suitable to the occasion will be performed."

"Boston, Nov. 15, 1832."

[Dr. Spurzheim was born in 1776, at a village near Treves, in Germany.]

DISTRIBUTION OF UNCLAIMED BODIES.

LORD MELBOURNE.—LETTER FROM MR. DERMOTT.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In answer to a letter of the 14th inst., which I addressed to Lord Melbourne, soliciting his attention to the unequal distribution of subjects, and that he would be graciously pleased to exercise his influence with the parochial authorities for the purpose of a more equitable distribution of subjects, his lordship honoured me with the following prompt and satisfactory reply :

"Whitehall, Dec. 15th, 1832.

"Sir,—I am directed by Viscount Melbourne to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of yesterday's date, and to acquaint you, with reference to the subject to which it relates, that his lordship is anxious to accomplish the objects which the legislature had in view in passing the Anatomy Bill; and will do his utmost, by communications with the several parishes, and by all other means in his power, to promote the

interests of all the schools of anatomy in the metropolis. I am, Sir,

Your most obedient, humble servant,

S. M. PHILLIPS."

As this letter reflects great honour on Lord Melbourne, by exhibiting the just and impartial sentiment with which he intends to be actuated, and as, were it not for his interference, the present disgraceful system must have terminated in the ruin of myself and some other lecturers, I consider it my duty to request the insertion of this in your journal.

In reply to a paltry lie asserted by a *green journalist*, that the memorialists who petitioned Lord Melbourne a few days ago to enforce an impartial administration of the law, "belonged to a private school, in which their number is not more than a dozen," I beg to state that my class consists of not less than sixty pupils, and that the number who signed the petition was nearly three hundred. The same journalist says, that "the bill has worked with astonishing facility," (in favour of whom,—the monopolists?) "considering the very short period it has been in operation; and if those who have been most fortunate *would* but assist those who are less so, there would nowhere exist any cause of complaint." But, Mr. Editor, how significant this word *would* is! The voracity of some few anatomical teachers to monopolise all dead human flesh to themselves has been more like ravening wolves than intellectual beings. Certainly for having thus attempted to crush other anatomical lectures by abusing the law, they deserve a well-marked reprimand, and one thing I will promise them, that their conduct shall be well watched, and my pupils' studies shall not be interrupted by them with impunity. The law acknowledges all anatomical teachers equally, and was intended to administer to the necessities of *all, equally*. Are not, then, those teachers who have been kept without dissection by these monopolists, and consequently without the means of getting their bread, in the strictest sense, robbed men?

With regard to the disturbance (so often referred to by the same journalist) which disgraced the late meeting of pupils at the Albion Tavern, the blame does not rest with those who convened it for the purpose of peaceably petitioning Lord Melbourne to remove their grievances, but with those who riotously opposed their proceedings. And as "nothing can have a more injurious effect in the eyes of the public than variance and disunion," let the *cause* be removed, by no teacher striving to continue the monopoly as an individual any longer, in any degree whatever, either openly or clandestinely, or he will entail upon him-

self the "ridicule," "disgust," and *censure* too, not only of the profession, but the community, who are now too enlightened not to see and acknowledge the necessity of anatomy. I remain, your obedient servant,

G. D. DERMOTT.

30, Francis-street, Bedford-square,

Dec. 18, 1832.

REPLY OF MR. COSTELLO TO MR. WALKER.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—It would have spared me a good deal of idle disputation, had you given a place in your valuable pages to the paper which I read before the Westminster Society. Mr. Walker bears the reputation of an impartial and just man, I therefore regret to see him among a knot of partisans, who on all occasions have endeavoured to vilipend, depreciate, and misrepresent my labours. He says, I presented my instrument to the Society as my invention; in this he misrepresents me. He ought to have paid more attention. I presented the original defective and dangerous percussor, and having done so, I showed the steps which I successively took to improve it; and I carefully stated the advantages of my present instrument. It was then observed to me, "Your instrument is the very same as that of M. Heurteloup; it is a copy of it, it is a mere fac-simile of it." It was possible that M. Heurteloup might have hit upon the same improvement as I had done, I therefore asked, was it constructed on the same mechanical principle? I was answered in the affirmative. To repel the charge of copying from him, I then asserted that I had not seen his instrument, clearly meaning that if M. Heurteloup's was on the same principle as mine, I had not seen his improvement; yet here Mr. Walker endeavours to find me in contradiction with myself, and tries to prove it by a quotation from my own letter, which, if he had reflected on it at all, would have shown him, how much he mistook my meaning.

I wished the instruments to be compared for the benefit of the science, and acting upon this motto,

"Si quid rectius istis cognovisti
Candidus imperti; si non
His utere mecum."

I should have given mine or adopted his, and would not stain my hands by monopoly in such a matter. When I saw that M. Heurteloup's instrument retained many of the defects of his first one, I felt relieved from the charge of having copied him; indeed my submitting my instrument to the

Academy of Sciences, is a proof that I had nothing to fear from a comparison: yet, singularly enough, because I present a better instrument to this learned body, Mr. Walker founds upon it a charge of indelicacy against me.

Mr. Walker finds fault with me for not using a screw, instead of a hammer. Is he not aware that as much power may be obtained by the one as the other? And who has said that the screw may not be employed? If a longer quotation had been made from my letter, he would have found, that though Ammon, and the Monk of Cîteaux, employed percussio, although Dr. Civiale and myself have percussed fragments of calculi as well as M. Heurteloup, that I have not thought of making the principle a matter of contestation with him: of this he may satisfy himself by the following quotation. After totally denying his claim to invention, I say, "If M. Heurteloup can lay claim to any merit in this matter, it can only be that of having proposed percussio with a hammer, instead of pressure by a screw. If it be a merit (and that is the entire question), I shall grant it to him willingly; what matters it to me whether it be M. Heurteloup or M. Civiale, or any other person, who is the author of an operative process which really possesses advantages over that which has been already so usefully and so extensively employed? I can use it surely as well as they. All I desire is, that these advantages shall be real and well established, not chimerical or full of risk; and that at each announcement of a new instrument, or a new process, we may not have to deplore some new experimental mishap, produced by this mania of innovation." In England, we are anxious to show to foreigners how very liberal we are; this is a very proper feeling as long as it is kept within the limits of justice towards a fellow-countryman. I have the honour to be, Sir, yours, &c.

W. B. COSTELLO.

7, Parliament-st. 18th Dec. 1832.

LONDON HOSPITAL.

OPERATION OF LITHOTOMY—NO STONE
DISCOVERABLE.

J. W., ætat. 8 years, was admitted into this hospital, under the care of Mr. Scott, with symptoms of stone in the bladder; he complained of frequent desire to water, and of great pain in voiding his urine, particularly at the end of the penis; the urine was frequently bloody, and sometimes it would stop while in the act of voiding it; had pain in the loins, and in fact every symptom of stone in the bladder.