question:—If the members of the College deserve to suffer the penalties of a “criminal prosecution” for having spoken in their own Hall in behalf of naval surgeons, what punishment do the members of the Council deserve for their persecution of Mr. BENNETT?

MR. BROOKES.

WE have just been informed that many of the former pupils of this distinguished and celebrated anatomist have invited him to a PUBLIC DINNER, to be given at the Freemasons’ Tavern, on Saturday, June 25th (THIS DAY), with the intention, as they state in their circular, of “testifying their regard for him, and for the purpose of maintaining that good feeling which always so pre-eminently existed between them.” Dr. BREE is to preside, and the following highly-respectable gentlemen have undertaken the office of Stewards; Mr. A. J. VALE, of Enfield; Mr. T. BELL, New Broad-street; Mr. D. NATHAN, of Edmonton; Mr. J. A. HEWSON, Woburn-place; Mr. W. JONES, of Lutterworth; Mr. J. NORTH, Upper Berkeley-street; Mr. W. SYMES, Tavistock-square; Mr. W. H. SYMONS, of Old Brompton; and Mr. J. E. RIADORE, Tavistock-square, who also acts as Honorary Secretary.

We heartily rejoice at this proceeding, because it is one of those generous testimonials of respect which are so eminently calculated to stimulate public teachers to the honorable performance of their important duties. Mr. BROOKES was not only the instructor, but the companion and the father, of his class; his students, while under his roof, respected and loved him, and now those of them who see him not, revere his name. Mr. BROOKES, in the full enjoyment of health, is now engaged in the active duties of his profession as a consulting surgeon, thus showing that he is still alive to the calls of humanity. Again; at a period of life when most other men are entirely

absorbed with matters of self-interest, Mr. BROOKES has come forward, at the call of his professional brethren, to lend his powerful assistance as one of the committee for establishing the LONDON COLLEGE OF MEDICINE. At no period, therefore, could his grateful pupils have chosen a more appropriate opportunity for testifying their esteem for his private worth, and of showing their respect for his acknowledged talents, and their admiration of the manner in which he is now exercising his abilities for the advancement of the public good. Will the Council of the College of Surgeons be toasted at this dinner—that worthless junto, which has committed the brazen injustice of excluding Mr. BROOKES, immeasurably their superior in a knowledge of anatomy, from a seat in that institution, merely because he instructed his pupils at half the price charged by themselves and their rapacious brother BATS? If the members of the College of Surgeons, generally, were influenced by those feelings which *ought* to characterise men of liberal education, this iniquitous and most barefaced exclusion of Mr. BROOKES would, we must say, of itself, have the effect of bringing down the most severe punishment upon the head of his relentless persecutors.

LEACH’S SELECTIONS FROM GREGORY, &c.

THE following letter was received by us nearly two months since, but was mislaid at the time, and has remained so up to the present moment, or it should have been inserted before. It refers to a review of Mr. Leach’s “Selections from Gregory and Celsus,” which appeared at page 85 of our 398th Number. We will insert the letter first, and then append a few remarks to it, that both Mr. Leach and our readers may see that we are not accustomed to pass a careless judgment, even upon so trifling, though laborious, a work for review as the little volume in question. It was not praised

or condemned without a thorough examination. It is not often that the accuracy or justice of our reviews is called in question, but when the opportunity occurs, it may be worth devoting both a little time and space to prove our attention to both.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I have just seen the review of my Selections from Gregory and Celsus. I am sure you will allow me a word or two in reply.

It was not my intention to refer, in every instance, to the rules in the appendix; and having previously directed attention to those adverted to in the review, I trusted, perhaps improperly, to the *memory* of my reader. “*Vi prædita lethali*” should, undoubtedly, have been referred to rule 20 instead of 55, but “*quo plus tenditur, eo durius*” is sanctioned by Ruddiman, Adams, and Jones.

Ruddiman’s “Rules” are taught in Scotland, and in many celebrated establishments in England. I approve of them, and therefore selected them for reference; they have received the approbation of some of our best teachers, and it is not my object now to enter upon a discussion of the merits of the syntactical arrangement. I would observe, however, that by rule 39, “an” (not “every”) impersonal verb is stated to govern the dative; and that by rule 43, “juvat” is mentioned as governing an accusative. Grammarians, it is well known, are not agreed upon the construction of the gerund.

I object to giving two rules, when one is sufficient; and as the participle is considered by grammarians as a distinct part of speech, I think “*pericula sibimet imminentia*,” and “*Juvenem viribus fidentem*,” should be referred to rule 45, and not to rules 45 and 27.

“Upon the whole,” I am satisfied with the review. I regret that even *one* error should have passed through the press unobserved. I have successfully taught several pupils from this publication, and although sensible of its imperfections, I hope it will prove extensively useful. It has the claim of *priority*, and was the result of midnight application after the labours of a fatiguing day. The lexicon, although desirable, would have delayed the publication. The work was published in about a month after the regulations of the Court of Examiners were communicated to me.

I remain, Sir,

Yours obediently,

S. F. LEACH.

11, Ashby Street, Northampton-sq.,
April 19, 1831.

Now Mr. Leach had given us sufficient authority to believe that it *was* “his intention to refer in every instance to the rules in the appendix,” for rule 45 is referred to in his work no less than twenty-one times; rule 65 thirty-five times, and rule 16 forty times; and as Mr. Leach, in the short space of one page only, referred to rule 19 three, and rule 65 five times (pp. 17, 18, 20, 21, &c.), and as rule 16, after having been repeated no less than twenty-five times in the preceding pages, is referred to three times in about twice as many lines (p. 59, also p. 159); and farther, as rule 65, after having been repeated no less than twenty-eight times in the preceding pages, occurs twice within even one line and a half (p. 155), we had no reason to believe that he wished to “trust to the *memory* of his reader.” It is true that Mr. Leach, as he observes, “had previously directed attention to those two particular instances adverted to in our review” of his volume, but numberless other instances occur in which he had not “directed attention” to them. Thus we meet with several which apply to rule 46; in p. 4, line 9, we read “*uni excogitandum*,” which belongs to that rule, not only *without* any reference having been previously made to that rule, but he does not once refer to it until p. 29, the only occasion on which reference is made to it in the whole volume. Notwithstanding the authority of Ruddiman, Adams, and Jones, we still persist in our former assertion, that “*quo plus tenditur, eo durius*,” ought not to have been referred to rule 19. In fact, we have Mr. Leach’s own authority for our assertion. Rule 19, in his appendix, is thus stated. “The comparative degree governs the ablative, which is resolved by *quam, than*; as *dulcior melle*, sweeter *than* honey; *præstantior auro*, better *than* gold.” Now by this rule, “*quo*,” in the sentence before us, must be governed by “plus,” and “*eo*” by “*durius*,” but this cannot be, because “*quo*” and “*eo*” are only *joined*, not governed, by “plus” and “*durius*,” as signifying the measure of excess. Moreover, by this rule (19), these ablatives, “*quo*” and “*eo*,” must be “resolved by *quam, than*,” but if so, the sentence would be irreconcilable with the context, and make utter nonsense. “*Quo*,” to make sense, must be rendered “by how much,” and “*eo*” translated “by so much,” and by no means “*than* which,” and “*than*

that," as Mr. Leach would have us believe; and by the rule to which he has referred us (19), they must indeed be translated, if his reference be correct. We meet with numerous other errors of the same description in the volume. He very strangely assigns rule 27 (which refers to *verbs* exclusively), for the government of "poetis" by "utilis" (p. 131, line 10), and "imaginationi" by "commune," which are not verbs but adjectives (line 17), &c. Both these instances required a rule not to be found in Mr. Leach's appendix; or at least they belong to rule 16, and not to 27, as he has marked them. Again, he has referred "*morbo id proximum sit*" to rule 15, as if "*proximum*" were a noun partitive governing a genitive plural (as rule 15 expresses), instead of an adjective of similarity, &c., governing a dative. In page 6, we find "*victu utimur*" referred to rule 8, instead of rule 38; in page 5, we find "*homo animantibus pabulum futurus*" referred to rule 10, instead of rule 25, or 45; and in page 10, line 9, rule 14 is used, instead of rule 22. We complained (Mr. Leach thinks unreasonably so) of the brevity of some of his rules. We thought them too concise for *beginners*, for whom, exclusively, the book is intended. For example, rule 27 mentions "*verbs signifying advantage or disadvantage*" only, and yet Mr. Leach has referred to this rule such verbs as "*impero*" (p. 7, line 9), "*parco*" (p. 11, line 15), "*insum*" (p. 23, line 18), "*confido*" (p. 27, line 17), "*persuado*" (p. 35, line 5), &c., all of which, we contend, require for beginners a different rule, or at least a more comprehensive one than that which is herein furnished. The compilers of the Eton Grammar have thought it necessary to insert no less than twelve rules where Mr. Leach has given but one, and even *they* have added no particular rule for the government of *ignosco*, *parco*, &c. But that of which we chiefly complain in Mr. Leach's volume is, that whilst many important rules are omitted, several very unnecessary ones are introduced, as rule 66, &c. In excuse for rule 46, Mr. Leach contends that "*grammarians are not agreed upon the construction of the gerund*," "*Non nostrum tantos inter componere lites*." Still we cannot forbear to hint, that such disagreement does not affect the question. It is very certain that the gerund in *dum* has an *active* signification, and the future in *dus* a *passive*. If, therefore, the examples referred by him to rule 49 *cannot* be translated *actively*, it is at once decided that the words in question cannot be "*gerunds*." Now that they cannot be so translated *actively* is very evident, nor would Mr. Leach, we believe, attempt it—"vivendum est mihi," signifies literally, "it must be lived

by me" (i. e. I must live); "*moriendum est omnibus*," signifies literally, "it must be died by all" (i. e. all must die); in both these cases the signification of "*vivendum*" and "*moriendum*" is passive, and they, therefore, cannot be gerunds in *dum*. Now if they be considered as neuter futures in *dus*, the difficulty of construction vanishes, for a future in *dus* has a *passive* signification. In fact, Mr. Leach seems to have decided the point in our favour, considering them (in rules 17 and 22) as futures in *dus*. If time and space would permit us, we could detect numerous other errors of a similar nature; e. g. by rules 16 and 17 "*adjectives signifying advantage, profit and disprofit, likeness or unlikeness*," and "*verbals in bilis and dus*," are said to govern the *genitive* case exclusively, instead of a dative.

In closing our remarks, however, we may add that Mr. Leach's volume has still not a few advantages. Rule 41 is more correct than the corresponding rule in the Eton Grammar, which, absurdly we think, transforms neuter accusatives plural into feminine ablatives. The work must have been a very tedious labour to him, and we can hardly feel surprised at the errors of which the compiler is occasionally guilty. We are pleased at the avowal made in the first page of his preface, and we wish him success in a laborious and honourable employment, for the same reason that we would discourage the quackeries of modern education.

PULSATION IN THE JUGULAR VEINS

NOT A SYMPTOM OF DISEASE OF THE HEART.

At a time when so much attention has been paid to the state of the heart, both in health and disease, the following observations on a phenomenon hitherto supposed to be attendant on a diseased condition of that organ, may perhaps not be uninteresting. I allude to the pulsation occasionally observed in the jugular veins. This pulsation was supposed by Corvisart, Bertin, and others, to be pathognomonic of disease of the heart, Laennec has even stated it to be pathognomonic of disease on the right side of that organ.

With regard to the immediate cause of jugular pulsation, there are two opinions:—