

by the number of applicants who present themselves, notwithstanding a very severe standard of examination. The University of Dublin also has for many years granted a similar diploma which has a very high reputation.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully.

F. J. B. QUINLAN.

Lower Fitzwilliam-street, Dublin, Nov. 28th, 1898.

"THE STATE SERVICE IN ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL."

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—Your correspondent, Dr. Angus Campbell,¹ is troubled in his mind that he sees that bugbear of the medical profession "Advertisement" stalking at large at the yearly service of the Guild of St. Luke. Is it not time that someone asked the question, Why should medical men be so hypersensitive as to taboo any mention of their brethren in the public press? Can anything be more absurd to suppose that our profession is "lowered in the eyes of the intelligent" because a large number of medical men attend the service in state at St. Paul's? Where is the mysterious law written that is supposed to decree that medical men are to shun all publicity and live in seclusion, only to appear if accident discovers them? Why should not your correspondent also attack the guests at the Lord Mayor's banquet to the medical profession for "advertising," because their names appeared in the daily press? Is the Harveian lecturer guilty of "advertising" because his name is quoted in the newspapers? Is the physician who speaks on some social subject at a public meeting "advertising" because the press report his remarks and do not ignore his name? The fact is there is a growing general interest in medical matters, and as a consequence in medical men. The public press therefore supplies any medical news that is likely to interest readers. I fail to see any cause for regret in this growing interest, but regard it rather as a subject for congratulation. If a surgeon performs successfully some new operation, why should not humanity be at once informed and the fortunate operator be publicly accorded the credit which is due to him? Why should acknowledgment be delayed as long as possible? Why should it be considered unfair to others that he should immediately gain thereby?

Not long ago we had the spectacle of a well-known politician accused of the infamy (?) of "advertising" because he mentioned in an interview that he was also a medical man and showed how hard he worked to do his double duty. Could anything be more preposterous than to accuse such a man of "advertising"? The question of signing bulletins is another point which has attracted adverse criticism. On what grounds does anyone object to the appended names? If the fact be an advertisement why should it be begrudged to those concerned by others less fortunate? Dr. Angus Campbell quotes the Scriptures against the Guild of St. Luke. Let its members retort with equal appropriateness from the gospel of their Patron Saint: "No man when he hath lighted a candle putteth it in a secret place, neither under a bushel, but on a candlestick, that they which come in may see the light."

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

Nov. 25th, 1898.

FREDERIC VICARS, M.D. Brux.

"GOUT; ITS PATHOLOGY AND TREATMENT."

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—I should not ordinarily venture to make any comment on the extremely kind review of my book on "Gout; its Pathology and Treatment," published in your issue of Nov. 26th, were it not that in the interests of my professional brethren as well as of individuals suffering from gout I think it desirable to call attention to a sentence the context of which is not made quite clear in the review. In referring to the treatment of gout as dealt with in my book the reviewer states that "a mixture of 30 gr. of chloride of ammonium and 15 minims of dilute nitro-hydrochloric acid is also advisable." I think the inference drawn by a reader of the review would be that this is the treatment, or part of the treatment, of acute, subacute, or chronic gout as advised

by me. Such, however, is not the case. The clause referred to is taken from p. 220 of the book and a reference to that page will show that such a medicine is specifically advised as part of the treatment of gouty glycosuria and gouty diabetes. I should not think of advising the use of such a mixture in the treatment of acute or subacute gout.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

Weymouth-street, W., Nov. 28th, 1898.

ARTHUR P. LUFF.

"INJECTION OF SALINE SOLUTION IN SHOCK."

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—In my article on this subject published in THE LANCET of Nov. 26th, at the foot of the first column of page 1390 there occurs an error due to an oversight when correcting the proof. I appear as stating that "a teaspoonful of common salt to a pint of water makes 1 in 875"; it should have been 6 in 875, which is near enough to 6 in 1000 for all practical purposes.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

Liverpool, Nov. 29th, 1898.

W. THELWALL THOMAS.

THE CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—May I suggest that magistrates should have some uniform tabulated list of questions for the above—something like the following, for instance: 1. How many cases and what authorities have you read on the subject? 2. How many cases of vaccination have you seen? 3. How many cases of small-pox have you seen? 4. On what ground have you formed your objections? 5. As you are such a conscientious man, have you any regard for the feelings of your neighbours who on good ground differ from you in opinion and have equally strong conscientious objections to small-pox? 6. Do you plead ignorance or obstinacy? The magistrates may thus possibly be able to satisfy themselves as to the conscience of the objector.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

W. WOODWARD, M.D. St. And.,

Late Public Vaccinator to Worcester District.

Worcester, Nov. 11th, 1898.

"VITALITY."

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—Dr. Beale says: "It would not be profitable just now to discuss what happened many millions of years ago," but as the question is, Can life proceed from non-living matter and forces? and as there was a time when this earth consisted of these only, one would like to know how Dr. Beale explains the first appearance of life upon it. Believers in abiogenesis give an explanation, whatever it may be worth; Dr. Beale gives none. One hopes that what at present is merely a belief may some day, by experiments similar to Dr. Bastian's, become a demonstrable truth; but until living things have been produced from non-living in the laboratory abiogenesis must remain a pure matter of belief and quite outside physiology—like belief in a resurrection of the body and a future life. All we can assert at present is that, however life and mind may have originated, we know them only as associated with matter and cannot conceive them as separate and independent.

Dr. Beale asserts that growth or increase in living things is always by addition to their centres, in non-living things to their superficies, so that the latest deposit is always innermost in the former and outermost in the latter, or, as we may say, growth is endogenous and exogenous respectively. But in such living things as trees we find one mode of growth or increase in endogens and the opposite in exogens. He also says: "There is no analogy between growth by aggregation or accretion and growth in living things." In the growth of Mount Vesuvius and that of an oak tree I see a great similarity; in the former the molten lava rises from base to apex, flows over the crater and down the mountain, giving it a new layer; in the oak tree the sap rises from base to apices and streams down its branches and stem, adding a new ring of wood every year to the outside of that of the previous year. Lastly, Dr. Beale

¹ THE LANCET, Nov. 12th, 1898, p. 1293.