Correspondence.

"Audi alteram partem."

DR. THOMAS ROLPH'S DEATH AT PORTSMOUTH.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I am gratified to inform you that the tombstone, with its inscription, reflecting so painfully on the late Dr. Rolph, of Portsmouth, was last week removed from the churchyard in which it was placed. Mr. Ford, chairman of the cemetery committee, called a meeting of their body, and, after the subject was brought before them, unanimously came to the decision to have the stone removed within twelve hours.

Thus you will perceive that the intention to perpetuate a slander on the late Dr. Rolph has signally failed. All honour and praise to the cemetery committee! Shame and degradation to the fiendish mind that originated, and to the puppets that carried out, the revengeful design!

I have no desire to protect from publicity the authors of the letter signed by two names.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
Southampton, March, 1858. JOHN WIBLIN, F.R.C.S.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—We must all deeply regret the truly-distressing and untimely death of Dr. Rolph. It is impossible to alleviate that injured man's sufferings; we have, however, the power to express our sympathy with the poor widow; and, by your permission, I propose presenting her with a substantial testimony of our regret. You have only to appeal to the profession for their support, and I am sure you will soon be able to show us that they have responded cheerfully and with liberality.

I beg to inclose my mite, and have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
Bow-road, March, 1858. S. LAWRENCE GILL, M.R.C.S.
* * Mr. Gill has enclosed a cheque for £1.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Poor Thomas Rolph is now alike beyond the reach of the malignity of his enemies, and the commiserating pity of those kindlier feeling men who accord their sympathy for the loss of one who has been the victim of as *vulgar* and *malicious* a persecution as ever had birth in the human heart: to these latter I conceive it belongs to vindicate the profession from the charge of a tacit acknowledgment of the justice of the acts of his persecutors, to which I think it would be amenable by its silence.

As it appears from Mr. Wiblin's letter, published in THE LANCET of the 27th ultimo, that Mrs. Rolph is left to a widowhood of straitened circumstances, let Mr. Wiblin and other of her friends in her late husband's neighbourhood make an appeal to the members of the profession, for the purpose of securing to her a position of moderate comfort and independence, and I do not doubt that it will be responded to in a manner worthy of the occasion, and at the same time prove that there are those amongst us who not only can sympathise with misfortune and bereavement, but also abhor and repudiate those proceedings by which the life of a worthy and estimable man has been destroyed. I, for one, shall be proud to contribute to so proper and benevolent an intention.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
Guildford, March, 1858. RICHARD EAGER, M.R.C.S.

* * We feel convinced that the noble and generous suggestion of Mr. Eager has only to be made known, when the profession will heartily respond to it. We can only say that we shall be happy to receive any subscriptions on behalf of the poor widow.—ED. L.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—May I ask the question, Why not leave the stone erected to the memory of the late Dr. Rolph's patient, with the verdict and censure of the jury, as it is? prompted as the unhallowed and unparalleled proceeding was by the dastardly and unforgiving spirit of the Doctor's enemies. Why not leave the stone placed over the remains of the patient, with the in-

vidious inscription as it is? I say; *in contrast with a counter stone, in the shape of a monument*, to be raised to the memory of the man's real worth,—victimized by law as he was, and hunted down by a few members of his profession, as was proved by his untimely end. Let the profession meet the required expense. A subscription of 1s. at least, and not to exceed 2s. 6d., from every member of the profession in England and Wales would, without hurting the donor, fully satisfy the ends sought by his brethren now living; and to posterity it would clearly show that in the nineteenth century medical men not only discountenanced professional assailants without just grounds in their own ranks, but that to the memory of a deceased brother practitioner they could and would pay an honourable and respectful tribute, where both honour and respect merited a memento; but, unlike the Portsmouth tombstone, made imperishable by unity and costliness. If ever a period presented itself in the history of the profession to demonstrate the worth of 1s. or 2s. 6d. from each member thereof, now is the time.

I am, Sir, yours respectfully,
Hindley, March, 1858. JEPHTHA HUSSEY, M.R.C.S.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I have no claim upon your columns, not being a member of the medical profession; but the observations in your Obituary of the late Dr. Rolph embolden me to ask space for a few words, to let your readers know that the sad event to which you there referred has filled all classes here with regret and indignation, and well it might, for it would be difficult to remember any occurrence in which the worst dispositions of the human heart have been more wickedly shown or more fully gratified. How are medical men to fulfil their difficult duties otherwise than with fear and trembling, and therefore inefficiently, if they are to be thus watched for, persecuted, and ultimately killed by monsters in human shape. Even though Dr. Rolph had erred in the matter out of which their wickedness has grown, he was, nevertheless, as much their superior in every disposition of the mind as he was undeserving of their spleen and hatred.

Do pray, Mr. Editor, give warning to that profession, whose leader you are, not to encourage, but always in unmeasured language to denounce, those who may by their jealousies, anger, and ill-feeling, doom their victims, if of sensitive and honourable feelings, to misery and death, and perhaps, as in the instance now referred to, deprive an affectionate wife of a husband and a home.

I am, Sir, yours, &c.,
Southsea, February, 1858. A FRIEND.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—The following epitaph from Shakspeare seems peculiarly applicable for poor Dr. Rolph's tomb, and I hope it may meet the approval of his numerous friends:—

"Done to death by slanderous tongues
Was the hero that here lies;
Death, in guerdon of (his) wrongs,
Gives (him) fame which never dies.
So the life that died with shame
Lives in death with glorious fame.
Hang thou here upon the tomb,
Praising (him) when I am dumb."

Much Ado about Nothing, Act 5, Scene iii.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
Feb. 1858. J. H.

THE INFLAMMATION AND BLOODLETTING CONTROVERSY.

[LETTER FROM DR. W. O. MARKHAM.]

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I have lived long enough not to be astonished at anything I hear or see in or out of our profession, but I could not help feeling a small matter of surprise on being informed by your correspondent, Dr. J. B. Sanderson, that Mr. Syme was a giver of mercury in syphilis just as vigorous as the best of mercurializers. During my visit (as Dr. Sanderson calls a three years' residence in Edinburgh), I found Mr. Syme, in practice and in precept, oral and written, maintaining the selfsame doctrine—viz., that mercurialization was inadmissible in syphilis; and in frequent conversations since I have never heard him express any other opinion. How Dr. Sanderson managed to screw such a sentiment out of his writings is beyond me to guess. I only hope he is happier in his