the body of the uterus, one before, the other behind, with numerous nerves connected with the ganglia, forming a plexus under the peritonæum.

The utero-cervical ganglion, or "brain of the uterus," as he now also calls it, he describes (*Phil. Trans.*, 1842, p. 175) as nearly two inches in breadth in a uterus at full term, and says "it appears to consist of six or seven smaller ganglia, which are connected together by nervous cords." He complains that Mr. Beck has destroyed this "brain of the uterus" by unwarrantably resolving it into a plexus containing several small ganglia. He also asserts that no ganglia of any kind were ever seen there before the publication of his papers.—(*THE LANCET*, p. 552.) Now, in point of fact, the discovery of ganglia in that situation, "united by nervous cords," (which being matted together by cellular tissue, make up the larger or utero-cervical ganglion,) belongs neither to Dr. Lee nor to Mr. Beck; for these small ganglia had been previously represented by Hildebrandt in his figures, as they really exist—namely, in the midst of a plexus, which he names "plexus gangliosis;" and Weber is even more explicit, giving them the name of "ganglia hypogastrica." (*Hildebrandt's Anatomie*, vol. iii. p. 544.) Dr. Lee, who professes to be well read in the literature of the subject, either overlooked this fact when he made the above claim, which should teach him to be indulgent as regards the mistakes of others, or he must be conscious of discredibly concealing it—a practice in which, if some accounts are to be believed, he is not altogether a novice.

But the discovery of the "subperitonæal ganglia and plexuses" constitutes the most important of Dr. Lee's claims. These structures are described as of great extent, covering a great part of the anterior and posterior surfaces of the uterus, immediately under the peritonæum. They have hitherto been looked upon as merely the superficial muscular stratum of the uterus; and although no one denies that there may be a few nerves among them, as in other muscular parts, yet Dr. Lee was the first to represent them as great plexuses of nerves with large flat ganglia in the centre. For Dr. Lee's satisfaction I may state, that I had an opportunity this summer of carefully examining the structures in question with the microscope in a perfectly fresh gravid uterus; and I have no hesitation in declaring that the flat body represented in front of the uterus, in plate 27 of *Philosophical Transactions* for 1841, is not a ganglion, and that the cords connected with it, and first described by Dr. Lee as forming a subperitonæal nervous plexus, are not nerves. I am still of opinion that they consist of organic muscular fibres and cellular tissue. I have no wish to set my opinion against that of gentlemen whom Dr. Lee may deem more competent judges; but I would take leave to remark, that none of the numerous authorities whose testimonials are produced state that they have examined the really doubtful structures with the microscope, except Mr. Dalrymple, upon whose judgment on such a point it is but just to say, although differing from him, I should be disposed to place very great reliance. The question is important, for on the fate of these subperitonæal ganglia and plexuses depends Dr. Lee's claim to discovery in the anatomy of the nerves.

As to the charge of inconsistency and gross blundering, I might be content to follow the example of others whom he has assailed, and let it rest on Dr. Lee's authority; but it may be as well to remark, that "to find slender bundles of tendinous fibres" in the broad ligament is not necessarily inconsistent with the belief of muscular fibres on the body of the uterus.

My conversation with Dr. Lee, on the 3rd Sept. 1841, has been recorded only so far as it has appeared to serve his own purpose. The version would have been less one-sided had it, in giving my admissions, also stated, that I did not admit the nervous nature of the sub-peritonæal ganglia and plexuses. But we are favoured with a more choice specimen of the sort, in form of a "Memorandum by Dr. Marshall Hall," which it has been thought right to publish, and which, as my name is mentioned in it, I must here quote at length, in order that its true nature may be appreciated. It is as follows:—

"MEMORANDUM BY DR. MARSHALL HALL.

"Professor Retzius observed, having just left Dr. Sharpey and Mr. Quain, that they had said, in reference to Dr. R. Lee's recent dissections of the nerves of the uterus, that there was no doubt that they were nerves. The only question was,—Whether the recent dissections displayed the same nerves as his former ones; and with regard to Mr. Beck's dissections, whether they displayed nerves not previously shown by Dr. Lee. Professor Retzius himself had no doubt of Dr. Lee's dissections being the display of nerves.

"Aug. 15th, 1845."

"MARSHALL HALL.

The conversation referred to took place at the dinner-table, in the house of a friend, where Dr. Hall was not present. The subject of Dr. Lee's nerves was introduced by Dr. Retzius himself. The version given is imperfect, and also erroneous, as Dr. Lee at least must have known; for he well knew, that neither Mr. Quain nor I had seen his "recent dissections of the nerves of the uterus," and consequently we could never have said that "there was no doubt that they were nerves."

These examples sufficiently illustrate the tendency of the practice of recording what passes at private conversations, and publishing the writer's or reporter's version of what was said, without communicating with the other party concerned—a practice which, although avowedly habitual with Dr. Lee, and, as it appears, not disdained by Dr. Hall, is happily not common.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Nov. 23rd, 1846.

W. SHARPEY.

THE SURGEON IN GENERAL PRACTICE.—HIS TITLE.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I propose to offer a few remarks upon the following subject:—By what method of conducting his business may the general practitioner best consult his own interest? And first I may observe, that the injury inflicted by the "chemist and druggist" upon the profession is urgent and severe. Is there a method of remedying the mischief? There is, and most effectually. Every practitioner has the immediate remedy in his own hands, without waiting for any legislation upon the subject. The tables may be no less readily than completely turned in favour of the medical practitioner. To suit the requirements of the community, medical practice will probably be always divided into two classes, consulting and general. Educated, indeed, alike, but subsequently restricting their practice at their own option, and with a different scale of fees, two classes of medical practitioners will probably always exist. While, therefore, the consulting practitioner continues to receive the now customary *honorarium*, let the general practitioner conduct his charge upon the following principle. As general society is naturally divided into three classes, let the following scale be employed:—

First class, (gentry,) for three to five visits, one guinea.

Second class, (trades,) for eight visits, one guinea.

Third class, (artizans,) for twelve visits, one guinea. The medicines to be charged at their true and mere cost, and to be supplied invariably by the practitioner himself.

The advantage which the "chemist and druggist" has over the medical practitioner greatly arises from the impression produced upon the public by the false price which the general practitioner is at present compelled to put upon the doses of medicine which he supplies. But when, on the other hand, the public have become familiarized with the true costs of medicines as charged in the bills of general practitioners under the system proposed, a contrast will be instituted in favour of the medical practitioner, instead of against him, as it now is.

In the conduct of his business, the general practitioner must dismiss the front shop. He must throw open the front door of his residence, and convert his front parlour into an accessible office—that is, into a consulting room and library. His medicines he must keep in his back room. Thus the practitioner will receive with dignity and respectability those who come to consult with him; while the "chemist and druggist," on the other hand, continues to pursue the general retail of drugs and medical sundries, unenvied and unmolested.

It is unnecessary to pursue the details of the individual advantages consequent upon these arrangements; a very little reflection will enable any practitioner to recognise them for himself.

The general practitioner's title.—Members of the medical profession are not unfrequently sensible of a difficulty when they have to append a denominative to their signatures. A general practitioner, holding an apothecaries' licence, generally, and very justly, is conscious of an inward compunction at the sight of his name affixed to a public document thus:—"A. B., Apothecary." All English general practitioners are "apothecaries;" yet how few we see exhibiting this honoured and dignified appellation, publicly added to their names, in their letters, for instance, to *THE LANCET*. So, again, the surgeon-apothecary modestly eschews the public exhibition of the dignity of his apothecaryship, and signs himself "surgeon," which is open to the objection that it is not descriptive of his medical province. While "L.A.C." displays a decidedly milk-sop, puling aspect, "M.R.C.S. Lond." is

clumsy. Therefore, with an eye to these embarrassments, I venture to suggest to those who are interested, certain amendments, as follow:—As the "L.A.C." is a medical licentiate of London, he may very properly sign himself "Licentiate in Medicine," *Medicus Licentiatus Londinensis*, *Med. Lic. Lond.*, *M.L. Lond.*, or *M.L.L.* The surgeon-apothecary may very properly sign himself "Med. Chirurg. Lond.," *M.C.L.*, or *Medico-Chirurgus Londinensis*. The physician appropriately signs himself "Physician." These are official or public designations, while the honorary titles, which are private and personal, as the *Ph. D.*, *M.B.*, and *M.D.*, should, in an official signature, follow the former, if used at all. Probably the taste of some of your readers may agree with mine in preferring the suggested forms to those now in use.—I am, Sir, with much respect, your obedient servant,
Montreal, North Canada, October, 1846. B. HAYGARTH, M.D.

THE PHYSIOLOGY OF THE NERVOUS SYSTEM.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—My attention has been called to an article in your journal of last week, from Dr. Marshall Hall, in which he states, "that he has discovered that the various modes of nervous action are dependent on induced conditions or polarity of the proper nervous matter, or neurine, and that from this view of the subject, the nature of a certain class of nervous diseases, and the just mode of the application of their remedies, appear deducible."

Do me the favour to state, that I have also been engaged in experiments, for a long time, relating to the polarization of the nervous system, and have made known, four years since, to medical men and others, that nervous action was dependent on electrical polarity, and that entire opposite results might be effected by inducing different states of polarity, the one increasing, and the other decreasing, nervous energy; and have also endeavoured to show the importance of paying attention to these conditions in the treatment of diseases generally, as well as in those of a nervous character.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
A. G. HULL, M.D.

Upper Brook-street, Grosvenor-square, Nov. 1846.

* * Dr. Hull's reference to "medical men and others" is not to the purpose. Publication is the only fact to which an appeal can be made in cases of this nature.

THE "BRIGHT'S DISEASE" QUACKS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I was much pleased at the boldness shown by you, in the publication of the names of several gentlemen practising in this department of disease, in *THE LANCET*, of October 24th. There can be no doubt but that they fully appreciate the peculiar honour of having their names announced to the world through so respectable a medium as your journal. I hope, Sir, you will persevere in the course you have adopted, and continue weekly to devote a column to the announcement of the names of all those members of the profession who publish their contributions to therapeutics and practical medicine in handbills and political journals; and I think it is highly desirable that their desire for notoriety should be transmitted to posterity by *THE LANCET*. In the furtherance of this object, also, I would submit to the editors of the "London and Provincial Medical Directories," that, with reference to the contributions of these gentlemen, "the subjects, date of insertion, and the medium," should, on no account, be omitted to be attached to the names of the authors. If you adopt the course here recommended, every worthy member of the profession will gladly assist you, by forwarding to you all such cases of Bright's kidney as they may meet with for publication, and thus assist the efforts of those desirous of the *bright* reputation of the arch-abettor of quackery, who has done so much in this disease, and whom also, *en passant*, I beg to congratulate on the present appreciation of his efforts by the profession and the public. (See *THE LANCET*, Oct. 24th.) However, his servile imitators can scarcely entertain the hope of ever being able to equal *his* enviable reputation.—Your obedient servant,
Birmingham, Nov. 1846. SENEX.

P.S.—Since writing the above, I have read a letter in the last *LANCET* from "Exterminator," who recommends the raising of a fund to assist the Apothecaries' Hall in punishing quackery. This is all very well, and I should be glad if such were adopted; but I should very much prefer the summary

prosecution of quacks. If that cannot be effected by legislative enactment, I would recommend the formation of an "Association for the Prosecution of Quacks," similar to the Associations for the Prosecution of Felons established in various parts of the country. A subscription of five shillings per annum from each member of the profession would entirely exterminate the race, while the expense would be returned to us a hundredfold by the immense sums which now fall into the hands of the quacks annually, passing at once into the legitimate channels of the profession.

A "ROSE" BY ANY OTHER NAME WOULD SMELL AS SWEET.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I was glad to read the note of "Anti-quackery" in *THE LANCET* of last week, and its exposé of Mr. Rose. Surely no poisoned flower of the Medicean age ever exhaled a more deleterious perfume.

Will "Anti-quackery" kindly inform the public if this be the only edition of Mr. Rose's works. I cannot speak as to identity, but a respectable private patient of mine informed me, some time since, that she received a packet from a Mr. Rose, which contained, in addition to a card somewhat like that forwarded by "Anti-quackery," a box of pills, a laconic statement of their virtues, the proper dose for children or adults, and the important addendum, that if the said pills did not cure all the diseases of the household, Mr. Rose gave advice and medicine at home for so much—visit and medicine for so much. These choice morceaux were unfortunately tossed behind the fire by my patient, out of the children's way, or they should have been duly forwarded to *THE LANCET* for analysis.

In the hope, that not merely the weapons of individual skirmishers, but the Editorial great gun, will be directed against quacks in the lists of the profession as well as out of it, I remain, Mr. Editor, truly yours,

London, Oct. 1846.

ANTI-QUACKERY SECUNDUS.

P.S.—Apropos to the "Rose." Some years ago, I was much amused, in passing a medical establishment in Stepney, belonging to a gentleman of that name,—possibly the same individual,—to observe the following significant announcement on the house:—"To the East London Cemetery."

ORNAMENTS OF THE COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS.

"We have said, on other occasions, that, among the moderns, Louis is the model that should be looked for in the physician. What a wide and deep chasm of ignorance and darkness yawns between that able and accurate man and those who are at once his detractors and the abettors of the quack-cheat, Preissnitz!"—*Editorial Article, LANCET, November 14th, 1846.*

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—After having made the above remarks, look with what feelings of disgust you can on the following advertisement, which appeared in the *Times* of Saturday, November 14th:—

"HYDROPATHY.—Dr. G. H. HEATHCOTE, Licentiate of the College of Physicians in London, &c., receives patients at Grosvenor House, Tunbridge Wells, to be treated on the principles of Hydropathy."

This licentiate of the College of Physicians (alas! for the profession) stands No. 141 in the last list of the College. No. 100 on the list stands Ynyr Burges, Brussels. He keeps an hydropathic establishment at Muldbad.

Your obedient servant,

November, 1846.

H. R.

"DOCTORS" BEFORE THE PASSING OF THE MEDICAL-REGISTRATION BILL.

"Dr. WITHERINGTON, of Hayle Foundry, respectfully informs his Patients and Friends, that he has removed from his residence in the Terrace at Hayle, a few doors nearer the New Chapel, opposite the Railway Station, where he may be consulted as usual, *free of expense*, every day, from eight o'clock in the Morning, until One in the Afternoon; and for the convenience of Seamen and the Working Classes, from Six in the Evening until Ten at Night—Dr. W. being anxious that his Patients receive the full benefit of his experience of thirty-four years practice in London, (previous to his removal to Cornwall, in 1844).—A well-stocked Surgery, with Genuine Drugs direct from London, is opened by the younger branches of his family, under his own superintendence; where Patients