practitioner than if he were ignorant of the results of physiological experiments, as performed by himself.

To such experiments, in the hands of Sir Charles Bell and Mr. Shaw, we owe the distinction between mere facial and cerebral paralysis—a distinction which has lightened many a heart and replaced gloom by consolation.

Now, the experiments of Sir C. Bell and of Mr. Shaw (see "The Nervous System," third edition, p. 24, 81, 85, &c.) were tenfold more severe than that by Dr. Marshall Hall, on which the reviewer in the *Medico-Chirurgical Review* has commented. What shall we say then? Shall we regret their performance? Shall we not, rather, in the spirit of a true and real humanity, regret that it is only in this way that the knowledge of certain points in physiology, pathology, and the administration of remedies, can be certainly and rapidly advanced.

Now, I will not believe that there was anything cruel in the nature of Sir B. C. Brodie, or of Sir C. Bell and Mr. Shaw, any more than I can believe there was any such thing in the breast of Professor Alison, when he suggested and witnessed some of the experiments of Dr. J. Reid. The *idea* is a calamity.

And yet, how difficult is it to lay bare a nerve deeply seated in the tissues of the neck—how much more difficult and inflictive of pain and suffering than to denude the cerebrum!—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

A FELLOW OF THE ROYAL MEDICO-
CHIRURGICAL SOCIETY.

London, Feb. 1847.

PROPOSAL FOR TREATING PULMONARY DISEASE.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—The cases recorded in your valuable journal, of the inhalation of ether to prevent bodily suffering during the performance of surgical operations, induce me to believe that the apparatus used for that purpose might also be applied to the cure of consumption, and other diseases of the lungs, and thus be the means of conferring a permanent blessing on mankind.

Let the medical substance—say iodine, dissolved in ether, sufficiently diluted with water to prevent its intoxicating effects, ammonia, chlorine, or other of the many appropriate ingredients to be found in the mineral and vegetable kingdoms—be placed in the apparatus, in a fluid or other state, so that the air inspired through the tube by the patient may become impregnated with the substance, and thus at once be applied to the diseased surface. And I see no reason why consumption—the opprobrium of our art—which generally selects for its victims the fairest portion of the creation—may not be arrested in its fatal course.

Let draughts of medicated air be inspired every few hours, and those general remedies administered which are necessary to give strength &c. to the constitution, and I feel certain, if my medical brethren, particularly those whose professional pursuits are more especially directed to diseases of the lungs, will fairly try its effects, that ere many months have elapsed, numerous cases will be recorded of its vast power in controlling and curing pulmonary diseases.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

RICHARD GRIFFIN, M.R.C.S., &c.

Weymouth, Feb. 1847.

PLAIN QUESTIONS ADDRESSED TO DR. FORBES.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—If you think the following plain questions likely to advance physiological science, I shall be obliged by a little space for them in THE LANCET—that advocate of every good cause.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

JUSTITIA.

Query 1.—Your friend Prochaska has designated certain parts of the cerebrum, extending to the spinal marrow, by the term "sensorium commune." Can you inform me—why? Is it because it is *in-sensorial*, this being your version of his doctrine; as a grove is called *lucus*—a non lucendo; or, as if I were to apply to you the epithets, good, wise, able, generous, benevolent?

Query 2.—Prochaska also speaks of certain *sensorial* nerves, and "nerves appropriated to *sense*," and instances the *olfactory* and the *optic*, as connected with his insentient sensorium. Is this for the same reason? And do you find instances of this "surprising accuracy," and of this "complete anticipation of Dr. Marshall Hall's doctrines," in Dr. Hall's own works?

Query 3.—Prochaska speaks of his "sensorium commune" as not including *the whole* of the cerebrum, but only certain parts of it, as the *crura cerebri*, and *cerebelli*, and *part of the*

thalamus optici, and as *EXTENDING* to the medulla oblongata and spinal marrow. Is this the opinion of Dr. Marshall Hall? Is it of "surprising accuracy," and a "complete anticipation" of his views?

Query 4.—Prochaska speaks of sneezing, of cough, of vomiting, giving them as instances of sensorial impressions reflected into motory; and you call these actions *physiological*. Is this idea of yours *physiological*? Or is it, rather, an instance of a *pathological* condition of intellect?

Query 5.—Prochaska adds to these instances, the case of winking on the sudden approach of a finger to the eye, though he is persuaded it is a feint. Is this, in your physiological idea, an event of the same *nature* as the others? Would Dr. Marshall Hall so view it? Is it anticipatory of his doctrines? Would he not, rather, consider this as an action induced by a sensation, a perception, an emotion?

Query 6.—Next, Prochaska enumerates the action of the heart, (really ganglionic;) the movements of *respiration*, (really true-spinal;) the *raising of the hand* of an apoplectic patient to the head, (really cerebral;) as acts of the *same* kind. Does this appear to you to be of "surprising accuracy"? Especially is it "complete" as an "anticipation" of Dr. Marshall Hall? Does Dr. Marshall Hall entertain or promulgate such absurd confusion of things so different.

Query 7.—Prochaska next speaks, as of events of the same class, of the movements in chorea, and of the rigor in ague. Do you find such things in the works of Dr. Marshall Hall.

Query 8.—Then the effects of *fright*, the *movements of the intestines*, are associated together in like manner! And these things, too, are viewed with wonder, as of "surprising accuracy," and as part of a "complete anticipation" of one of the most careful and cautious writings in physiological science!

Not one word will I add of vituperation or epithet. But, assuredly, the system of the distinct spinal marrow, and its own peculiar incident and reflex nerves, in essential connexion with it, the exclusion of *all* that is *cerebral* in substance or nerve, of *all* that is *sensorial*, of *all* that is *ganglionic*, &c., &c., is very different from all this, and of a different kind of "accuracy," and not quite "anticipated."

If a bright torch ever were given into the hands of the practical physician, to aid him in his diagnosis of a class of diseases, formerly obscure, it is that afforded by the distinction of the true spinal system, its functions and its symptoms, from the cerebral and the ganglionic.

Why, Sir, if Dr. Marshall Hall had done nothing more than detect and assign the proper function of the *pneumogastric*, that single and sole achievement ought to protect him for ever from such mean and vulgar attacks as those which have crowded your imbecile Review.

I can make one excuse for you. I verily believe you do not, to this day, understand the thing you are talking, or rather writing, about. It requires accuracy of mind to comprehend it distinctly,—how much more to have hunted it out? But why, if indeed they yet understand it, does not Professor Alison, or Dr. Carpenter, come forward and show as much readiness to defend, as they did at the first to attack it and its laborious author?

Query 9.—You speak of Dr. Marshall Hall's "bitter nature," &c. Has Dr. Marshall Hall a Review? Has he attacked you, journal after journal, writer after writer? Whose, then, is the "bitter nature"? Take my parting advice: let Dr. Marshall Hall alone, and he will let you alone. You say, speaking of his immortal work, "it is grievous to write it down." Doubtless the viper said, or thought, "it is a grievous task to devour a file!"

Query 10.—And lastly, may I ask you, what you have done, especially for physiology, that you should set yourself up as a great critic and judge in these matters? Did you ever bring forth one new idea, or add one new fact to our store? Be warned then. Try to know yourself. Give up this puppyism of authorship and judgeship. Be advised!

February, 1847.

ETHERIZATION.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Suffer me to occupy a corner in your journal, that, through the medium of it, I may offer a few words of caution to the profession on the all-engrossing subject—narcotism by ether. It is devoutly to be hoped that an agent so undoubtedly valuable in suspending sensation, and lessening the sufferings of the afflicted, may not be brought into disrepute and consigned to oblivion by its incautious and injudicious use; and my object in these brief remarks is to state that I have known great cerebral derangement produced in a highly