that Clover had the large practice which he deservedly enjoyed for a good many years.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,
London, W., March 28th, 1913. F. WILLIAM COCK.

THE GENITAL FUNCTIONS OF THE DUCTLESS GLANDS IN THE FEMALE.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Owing to an unfortunate concatenation of circumstances my first Arris and Gale lecture, which appeared in your issue of March 22nd, was published without being properly revised. For one thing, the lecture was published a week sooner than I expected, and as a result the corrected proof can only have reached you while THE LANCET was passing through the press—probably earlier than usual owing to the advent of Easter.

Apart from verbal and other small corrections, I regret to say that there are errors in some of the figures in Table I. These, of course, make the averages at the foot of Table I. (which should really be Table II.) inaccurate, although they do not affect the general results in any way. Further, it is obvious that the section dealing with the "Clinical Observations of the Effects Produced on the Thyroid by Ovarian Insufficiency in Women" should follow that on "Effects of Oophorectomy on the Thyroid." As I believe no one can be too careful in the matter of accuracy either of style or scientific detail, I have felt it necessary to call attention myself to what has happened rather than leave it to someone else to do so. If anyone should be sufficiently interested in the subject and desire to have the correct figures I shall be glad to furnish him with one of the revised reprints which I hope will be available shortly.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,
Liverpool, March 22nd, 1913. W. BLAIR BELL.

A REVISED NOMENCLATURE IN PHTHISIS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Amongst the remarks you make about my article on sanatorium benefit in East Essex you say "the term 'early case' has gradually become almost synonymous with a 'favourable case,' and this is to be regretted since an 'early case' may be an acute case and quite unsuited for treatment in a sanatorium, a hospital being the more suitable institution." With this everyone must agree. Do you not consider that the time has come when the whole nomenclature in phthisis pulmonalis ought to be put on a definite footing, and that a fixed classification ought to be used throughout the country?

Now that the State has undertaken the crusade against consumption all the statistics will be of enormous value, and unless these are comparable in every respect this will be of little real value. If a committee was formed of such men, say, as Sir R. Douglas Powell, Sir T. Clifford Allbutt, Sir William Osler, and Dr. Arthur Newsholme, of the Local Government Board, a scheme acceptable to the whole profession could be formulated. The nomenclature could be adopted in the medical schools, &c., and would prove, I think, of the greatest use to those interested in sanatorium benefit. I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

J. D. MACFIE,
Tuberculosis Officer to the Essex County Council.
Chelmsford, March 31st, 1913.

AUTO-VACCINATION IN TUBERCULOSIS BY THE X RAYS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—While agreeing that for a man to have a grievance is abominable, it is with no view to self-advertisement that I desire to draw your attention to the plagiarisms of the original article on the above subject contributed by me to THE LANCET in January, 1907, garbled versions of which appear from time to time as abstracts from foreign journals in the medical press of this country, where the credit for this particular research is ascribed to foreign authors, who do not hesitate to use expressions that I have found it necessary to

coin, without so much as citing the source of their information.¹

I trust, therefore, that you will pardon my writing at length on this matter. Conspicuous amongst these is a Swiss practitioner in the *Correspondenz-Blatt* of Basel, who contributes an original article to that journal "On the Conservative Treatment of Tuberculous Glands."² In that article he uses the expression "auto-vaccination," which has been interpolated by the translator into "some kind of auto-inoculation."

My object in using that expression was to connote a physiological as distinguished from a pathological process, such as auto-inoculation so often is, and consequently fraught with danger. While the author cites one British author (Gulland) in the usual manner, he curiously cites Dr. Peter Paterson (whom I cited in my article) without giving the clue to Paterson's article by any footnote, spelling his name in the German or Norwegian fashion (Patersen) he omits reference to my article, the one with which he seems to have been mainly concerned.

It is not for me to exaggerate the importance of my research, which has not yet been repeated in this country, but I can assert from my experience that the operation for the removal of tonsils alone would thereby be reduced 80 per cent., with the greatest advantage to the sufferers, from the point of view of restoring immunity, when applied before the suppurative stage has set in. One dare not publish them on account of the *odium theologicum* that unfortunately exists. But a careful study of the results that have been obtained in Berlin, Paris, and Basel, to mention a few, goes strongly to support my contention. Quite apart from the mere results, these researches throw light upon the lymphoid and lymphatic mechanisms of the body in their bearing upon pathological processes of an undreamt of kind, such as will before long establish "the logan stone" of our science upon surer foundations.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,
Harley-street, W., March 31st, 1913. H. D. McCULLOCH.

A QUESTION IN LUNACY CERTIFICATION.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Dr. Robert Jones, in remarking on the slackness of justices in the matter of lunacy certification in your last issue, might very well extend his valuable advice to the medical profession in general. It is astounding how ignorant are medical men on the mere bare facts of the Lunacy Acts. It is excusable, too, since it is only in private and public mental hospitals where the practice of the laws of lunacy can be thoroughly studied. And the pitfalls are many, even to those who are in the actual practice of lunacy, so it is not surprising to learn of the errors of the unprofessional and unpaid layman, the justice. In my opinion every medical man in general practice should hold a certificate in psychology or give proof of a sound training in this branch of his profession. The provision in the Lunacy Act, 1891, on the matter of the text of this letter, was undoubtedly a convenience to meet such cases where other justices than the judicial authority had signed the reception order. And the wording of the Lunacy Act, 1891, Section 24 (3), is simple enough, for it says:—

A reception order made after the passing of this Act shall not be invalid on the ground only that the J.P. who signed the order shall appear to have not been duly appointed under Section 10 of the principal Act, if the order is within 14 days after its date approved and signed by a judicial authority.

But surely it is the duty of the certifying physician to see that this is in order, for is there not a circular letter by the Commissioners in Lunacy, embodied in Archbold's "Lunacy," pointing out that all persons concerned with lunatics should make themselves acquainted fully and textually with the provisions of the Lunacy Acts? And as medical men are paid for signing lunacy certificates, and justices receive no remuneration, excepting the stipendiary, should not the former know their business, whatever may be the failings of the latter?

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,
JOHN FREDK. BRISCOE.
Westbrooke House, Alton, March 31st, 1913.

¹ Brit. Med. Jour., Feb. 10th, 1912; Ibid., March 22nd, 1913; Ibid., March 29th, 1913.

² xlii. Jahrg. 1912, No. 20, Basel, 20 Juli, pp. 729-741.