

nic acid gas, but that it was the effect of serous apoplexy. Dr. Bull added, that he had used a similar stove in his family, and had never experienced any ill effects from it.

The son of the Sexton of St. Michael's Church, a lad about 15 years of age, said he slept in the church on Saturday night, and did not feel any ill consequences from smoke or smell. He saw the deceased about twelve o'clock, at which time he appeared in his usual health, and was quite sober.

The whole of the evidence being concluded, the Coroner, in summing up, said he considered that the weight of the medical evidence went to show that the deceased died from serous apoplexy, and not from inhaling any noxious effluvium from the stove.

The Jury, however, seemed to wish for further evidence, and the inquiry was accordingly adjourned until Friday next.—*Abridged from a Morning Paper.*

The public are pretty well acquainted with the opinions which have been delivered on the merits of Messrs. Harper and Joyce's heating apparatus. An instructive letter on the subject will be found in THE LANCET of Nov. 10th, by Mr. Coathupe, of Bristol. We have no desire to criticise the opinions of medical men who come forward at coroners' inquests, but we doubt whether the gentlemen who examined the body of James Trickey were very familiar with the pathology of poisoning with carbonic acid. The fact is, that matters of this kind will never be properly managed until some competent authorities be appointed, to whom reference may be made in all cases of doubt and difficulty.—ED. L.

ANSWER TO OBJECTIONS AGAINST PHRENOLOGY.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR:—In communicating a case contained in the last number of THE LANCET, Mr. Drawbridge asks how his facts correspond with the doctrines of phrenology? The case which he relates is not an extraordinary one, and many similar facts have been adduced by its opponents to overthrow phrenology. As, however, it contains the usual fallacies with which such cases are pregnant, but conveyed in a courteous tone, in which a desire to learn appears predominant, I shall, with your permission, offer a few remarks on his communication.

Mr. Drawbridge says, that after his patient had a "large portion of the frontal bone and brain, immediately in contact, detached from the remaining portion," she survived four days, with the entire posses-

sion of her "mental faculties." At first sight this would appear to militate against the principal doctrine of phrenology; but to decide the question without further inquiry would be to form a conclusion without an examination of the premises. I would, therefore, ask, if *both sides* of the frontal bone were destroyed; or, in other words, where the destruction commenced, and where it ended? For it should be remembered that every faculty has two organs, although for conciseness of expression, they are usually spoken of as single; and, consequently, that when one organ is destroyed the corresponding one is not thereby necessarily annihilated; no more than when an individual has lost an eye that he is necessarily deprived of sight. On the contrary, when one eye is destroyed the remaining one is usually much more powerful. Thus it is with the brain: an organ on one side of the head may be destroyed, but, if the faculty be active, the remaining organ becomes more powerful,—because it is more exercised than when it performed its function in conjunction with an assisting organ.

There is another remark which I may offer, it is, that Mr. Drawbridge does not state whether the organs *immediately above* the superciliary ridge were destroyed or not. Now, these organs have very important functions to perform, inasmuch as the exercise of observation is more required by society than reflection; and thus, whilst the one can be, and generally is, dispensed with, the employment of the other group is requisite to carry on the ordinary avocations of life. As the reflecting faculties are so little exercised, it follows that a person may have them eradicated without the loss being perceived by his associates; and, consequently, he would still be considered to retain *his* mental faculties, because the existence of those which he had usually employed would still be manifest.

Besides this, it should not be forgotten that the phrase "*mental faculties*" is rather a vague expression, meaning one thing in the estimation of one person, and conveying a different idea to another. The only way, therefore, to properly define the expression, when investigating any point connected with phrenology, is to learn what its disciples mean when they employ the term, and what are the faculties which they acknowledge; for unless this be done, phrenology is liable to be overthrown through want of information or misapprehension. For instance, metaphysicians teach that "*Memory*" is a primitive faculty; whereas, the doctrine of phrenology is, that the power is not possessed by one faculty, but is a quality of various organs. It, therefore, follows, that if the organs of one faculty only be destroyed, the exercise of its peculiar function will alone be prevented, and that the remaining organs will still fulfil their peculiar uses.

Now, Mr. Drawbridge's patient, for instance, might still possess arithmetical talent, whilst the power of tracing effects to causes was destroyed : and thus the only method by which the dispute can be settled is to show that either or both these organs were eradicated, and that yet the functions were still performed. It is, however, more than probable that Mr. Drawbridge's patient manifested the sentiments in her usual manner, and that the ignorance of her friends made them suppose that she retained her mental faculties.

I would, therefore, ask Mr. Drawbridge what organs were destroyed? Were both organs destroyed? And, notwithstanding their destruction, were their peculiar functions developed? Believing, as I do, that phrenology is a true exposition of nature, I am convinced that no fact can destroy, no more than any observation has hitherto overthrown it ; but whilst I say this, we would also say, that should phrenology be shown to be false, that no love of opinion will prevent an acknowledgment of our erroneous conclusions ; but as truth is at stake, we cannot abandon our principles on fallacious grounds and insufficient reasons. I am, Sir, yours truly,

E. J. HYTCH.

New-court, Carey-street,
6th Nov. 1838.

MONUMENT TO MR. LOCKLEY'S FRIEND.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR :—Instead of instituting "a searching inquiry" into the conduct of Sir Henry Halford in the case of the lamented Mr. Lockley, I beg leave to propose for the consideration of yourself and my professional brethren, the propriety of erecting, in some conspicuous place, a statue of *brass* of this high-standard-of-morality physician, with the following well known motto,—"*Homo sum, humani nihil a me alienum puto*," and as full proof of its applicability to Sir Henry, for his unexceptionable benevolence and humanity, let his own letter on this occasion, be engraven on the pedestal. To forward this good design my mite of ten shillings will willingly be forthcoming, and my aid in raising subscriptions will cheerfully be given. I am, Sir,

AN INVALID SUBSCRIBER TO
THE LANCET.

Nov. 16, 1838.

P.S. Since writing the above I have read the leader in the last LANCET. The further facts which are therein detailed clearly evince Sir H. Halford's scrupulous love of truth to be in harmony with the other high moral qualities displayed by him on this occasion.

LITERARY ANNOUNCEMENT.

SIR HENRY HALFORD is, we understand, preparing for immediate publication a Dialogue *De Amicitia*. It will be after the manner of Cicero, and contain many views *entirely new*. The Baronet will show how the doctrines of the ancients have been purified and exalted by Christianity. He will himself be the principal interlocutor, under the mask of *Damon*. Dr. Gordon and other Licentiates who have been *elevated* to the Fellowship, will be introduced. The motto has been mentioned to us by Mr. Murray, as a great secret, which we do not think worth keeping.

Amicus certus in re incertâ cernitur !

OBITUARY.

WE regret to have to announce the death of PROFESSOR BROUSSAIS, which took place at his country seat, near Paris, in the early part of the present week. Professor Broussais had laboured for a considerable time under a painful disease, which was only partially relieved by operation. M. Broussais was well known as the founder of the "Physiological doctrine," which he defended with extraordinary zeal and warmth to the last moments of his existence.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

G. B. The Journal is sent to Birmingham, and all other places, through the wholesale London booksellers and newsmen. The charge in question has not been made by our direction, or in consequence of our interference. We believe that such a charge is unusual.

F. E. The paper on the cerebrum and spinal marrow is left for the author with our publisher ; we cannot undertake to print it in its present form.

Letters have been received from *Mr. G. Boddington, An Apothecary, A Philosopher* (whom we suspect to be a fool), and several other gentlemen.

The missing portion of *Mr. Radley's* excellent paper has been recovered, and will be given next week.

Mr. Barnard's letter next week.

R. Velpeau is informed that such certificates are not received at the Hall.

Mr. Simpson's letter was received too late for insertion this week.