DR. TUOMY.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I shall beg leave to call your attention to the following circumstances connected with the appointment of Dr. Tuomy to the professorship of the practice of medicine in the School of physic.

Dr. Tuomy was, in the year 1812, a fellow of the College of Physicians, when the College refused to continue Dr. Whitley Stokes, S.F.T.C.D., in that professorship; it was admitted that the duty had been performed in the most exemplary manner, but that it was expedient to hold an election, in order to ascertain his relative merits, in comparison with those of other persons who might be candidates. At the election Dr. Stokes was dispossessed, and Dr. Tuomy appointed to his professorship by a casting voice. I cannot, therefore, see that Dr. Tuomy has any just ground for complaint, because a system is continued, without the adoption of which, he could not have been elected. For Dr. Stokes is still alive and resident in Dublin, although he was not amongst the candidates at the late election.

ARISTIDES DUBLINIENSIS.

Nov. 20, 1828.

INFLAMMATION OF VEINS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Perceiving in your LANCET of last week, (No. 273,) a case of “inflammation supervening upon venesection, and followed by death,” I was led to notice Mr. Lawrence’s remark, at the end of the article, that he had never known an instance where the patient recovered in such a case. As you passed the expression without comment, I naturally conclude you coincide in the remark.* Allow me to offer you the following case for consideration. In the month of December, 1823, I was on the coast of Africa, in the ship ———, and had occasion to abstract about sixteen ounces of blood from the master. Next morning he complained of a sense of tightness in the arm, with lancinating pains extending as far as the axilla. On removing the bandage, I perceived the orifice in a state of suppuration, with inflammation to a considerable extent. In the course of the day, erysipelas extended over the whole of the forearm. On the third day I discovered a sinus to have formed from the orifice along the median basilic, to the extent of, at least, an inch and a half. As the above case is from memory, I cannot give particulars of method of cure; except that, by the appli-

cation of poultices, with saturine solutions, and paying particular attention to the bowels, the patient recovered. He was, at the same time, under the influence of mercury, which had been exhibited for an affection of the liver.

Your obedient servant,

J. W. MILLER.

Limehouse, Nov. 27, 1828.

SURGEONS AND “PURES.”

SIR,—Permit me to inquire from some of your numerous, and often excellent correspondents, answers to the following enquiries.

1st. When a consultation is desired by a patient, and, as is frequently the case, the choice is left to the general practitioner, why does he select a “pure” to one of his own class?

2d. Why does the “pure,” when so consulted, make such repeated and often successful attempts to appropriate the patient, in order to introduce a friend of his own; or, order the prescription to be sent to some druggist named by himself?

3d. Why does the “pure” seek to lessen the general practitioner, in the estimation of the patient and his friends, by an arrogant or supercilious demeanour, by a want of punctuality in keeping his appointments by desiring that he may be again sent for, if it should be necessary; by complaining of being consulted too late! &c.

4th. Are the “pures” so greatly superior to the general practitioners, as to make it a merit on the part of the latter to endure the treatment above described?

5th. Is it just, to be accessory to the robbery of poor patients, who are frequently obliged to pawn their apparel in order to satisfy the rapacity of the “pure?”

6th. Is it politic to advocate or recommend this misapplication of the money of the patient, who, in consequence of the sacrifices made to obtain the better advice (?) of the pure, is incapacitated from satisfying the juster claims of the general practitioner?

7th. Were not the most conspicuous and clamorous demandants of surgical reform, Messrs. Lawrence, Tyrrel, and Key?

8th. Is not this trinity composed of two “nervies” of the “worthy baronet,” and an integral portion of the corrupt body, in the person of Mr. Lawrence?

9th. Are the general practitioners justified in expecting any zealous endeavours from these gentlemen, for ameliorating the oppressed condition of the “largest and most useful class?”

I remain yours, &c.

Δ.

* We have seen patients who have recovered from these complaints.—ED. L.