

of captious fault-finding with respect to everything passing in London; but the beam in the medical eye of Edinburgh has quite escaped attention. This is hardly as it should be, and we beg to call the notice of the gentlemen to whom we have referred, to their duties as editors and professors. Let them bestow their pens for a while north of the Tweed, and let us have the pleasure of congratulating them upon the removal of the scandal which now deforms their veteran University.

WE have just time to insert the following answer returned by the Senate of the University of London to the Committee of Graduates, respecting the declaration addressed to the Senate by this body, upon the future constitution of the University:—

"The Senate of the University of London has taken into consideration the Declaration of Graduates of the University of London transmitted to the Registrar on the 10th of February, 1851.

"It seems to the Senate, that the question raised by that Declaration is not one which the Senate can with propriety discuss. The Members of the Senate have, under the present Charters, been selected by the Crown. They act under the superintendence of the Secretary of State. It is, in their opinion, not for them, but for the authority which appointed them, to determine whether the fundamental constitution of the University does or does not require alteration."

THE ANALYTICAL SANITARY COMMISSION.

In consequence of an unavoidable accident, the continuation of the report of the Analytical Sanitary Commission on cocoa cannot be inserted until next week.

Since our last publication we have received the following communications from Mr. Abbiss and Mr. Relfe:—

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In your remarks upon my letter at page 530 in THE LANCET, you conclude thus:—

"We entirely acquit Mr. Abbiss of any participation or knowledge of the adulteration in question, and we advise him to institute a rigorous investigation, in order to ascertain whether he may not himself have been deceived or imposed upon."

The communications which you have received and published are the result of that investigation; and I now beg to call your special attention to the important fact, that the coffee and chicory have been traced from the *raw state*, through the processes of *roasting, nibbing, grinding, and packing*; that *every person* through whose hands they have passed, both on my own premises, as well as on those of the "Patent Desiccating Coffee Company," is ready to make oath, that no admixture of "wheat farina" was ever effected, *in any stage of the preparation*.

Thus you have the evidence of ten persons, being ALL who were concerned in the preparation of the coffee and chicory *from first to last*; and whose united testimony goes to prove, AS FAR AS HUMAN TESTIMONY CAN PROVE, that the Analytical Commission must have erred in the matter.

With this mass of conclusive evidence before you, I must call your attention to another quotation from THE LANCET of Saturday last, p. 557:—

"We will only state, that we shall always be infinitely more prompt in affording redress, if at any time our reports should unfortunately contain an error, than in the infliction of an injury."

I have now to add, that having acted upon your suggestion, (quoted above,) and the results having been perfectly satisfactory and conclusive to my mind, I cannot for a moment doubt but that they will be so to yours.

With respect to your proposal, that I should submit the sample handed to me to the examination of some eminent microscopist, it appears to me, under the circumstances, that no satisfactory results would be obtained by that course, as, being driven by the foregoing evidence to the conclusion that there must have been some error with respect to the sample (notwithstanding the certificate of the commissioner to the

contrary), the sample handed to me would naturally participate in such error; and being thus doubtful as to the authenticity of the sample, any results from it must necessarily be unsatisfactory. In saying this, I do not for a moment intend to impute deception to any one, but I submit, it is one of those errors, such as you admit may, and probably will occur, in the course of your investigations.

Having thus fully, fearlessly, and impartially reviewed the matter, I leave the attested facts before you, and it now remains for you promptly and frankly to acknowledge the error into which, by some unfortunate circumstance, your commissioner must have fallen.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
Gracechurch-street, City, May 21, 1851. JAMES ABBISS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

Patent Desiccating Coffee Company, George-yard,
and 10, Osborn-street, Whitechapel.

SIR,—Supposing your columns to be conducted on fair and honourable principles, I claim (as a right) your permission to be heard in my own defence. Whatever may be the result of the "Analytical investigation" now in progress, and on which you appear to attach so *much* importance, I am satisfied that the more full and complete investigation you choose to make into my establishment, the more you, or your "commissioner," as you term him, will be satisfied that all my transactions with the trade are arranged upon honourable and equitable terms.

I think your objection to my designation as a "coffee-roaster" is untenable—that is the *bulk* of my trade; and in so designating it, I am not aware that I am excluded from the privilege of roasting chicory, if sent to me, as it is by many of the *largest and most respectable* traders in coffee &c.

In acquitting Mr. Abbiss of any participation in the adulterating process, you indirectly accuse me with mixing other materials in chicory; such an insinuation I hold to be both unjust and unreasonable, until you are prepared to prove your assertion.

When I took the establishment, which has now, I am happy to say, a large and extensive patronage among the most respectable of the wholesale and retail dealers, both in London and the country, there was a notice on the gates, that no one should be admitted, except on business; that notice I immediately withdrew; and I now invite you, and all other inquisitors, to inspect my establishment at all times. Your charge is not against the mixture of chicory with coffee, but the insinuation is, that I mix deleterious or inferior articles with them. My reply is to you, come and see; witness for yourself, but do not by mean and paltry insinuation attempt the destruction of character of one who is striving with uprightness and integrity to maintain a respectable and honourable position.

The legitimate office of THE LANCET is to probe, that it may cure the ills of the body politic—not to stab, that it may wound private reputation.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
J. RELFE.

May 17, 1851.

N.B.—In consequence of the large increase of business, the roasting and grinding department is removed from No. 10, Osborn-street, to Goldie's, late a distillery in George-yard, Whitechapel. I merely mention this, that you may be under no mistake, should you think it desirable to favour me with a visit.

We cannot state that we are at all satisfied with the contents of these letters: Mr. Relfe speaks of "mean and paltry insinuations." We have made no insinuation: our statement is distinct and unequivocal. Our Commissioner alleges, in terms as plain and simple as can be used, that in two samples of canister coffee purchased at the shop of Mr. Abbiss, both contained chicory and roasted wheat farina. Mr. Abbiss positively denies the adulteration, and adds that his chicory is bought by him in the raw state, and has been roasted at the establishment of Mr. Relfe. Mr. Abbiss does not deny that chicory was mixed with the samples of coffee which our Commissioner purchased, but he has produced strong evidence to prove that there was no admixture of wheat farina in the samples of coffee obtained at his establishment. Now, our Commissioner makes no insinuation—he asserts positively that the samples do contain roasted wheat farina. Since our last pub-

lication that gentleman and Mr. Abbiss have had an interview, and before they separated it was agreed that the samples were to be examined by persons of competent ability, one to be chosen by the Commissioner, one by Mr. Abbiss, the two thus named to choose a third, and the result of their investigation to be published in *THE LANCET*. Mr. Abbiss now thinks "that no satisfactory results would be obtained by that course;" we think otherwise. If Messrs. Abbiss and Relfe decline such a scrutiny the fault will not rest with us, but with themselves. After the bold statements made in the first letter of Mr. Abbiss (*THE LANCET*, page 530) we cannot discover how he can properly withdraw from such an investigation. *It is a question of fact.* Does the coffee purchased, as before stated, contain roasted wheat farina? If not, our Commissioner is wrong; if it does, how did it get there? These are questions which ought to be solved conclusively, and a doubt on the subject should not remain on the mind of any person. We now challenge a further scrutiny.—ED. L.

The following letter has been received by us from Mr. TEETGEN; we shall notice the subjects mentioned in it next week:—

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In a number of your publication, issued on May 10th, I find my name there mentioned as selling chicory adulterated with acorns. In justice to myself, I therefore beg to state exactly how I manage the coffee and chicory portion of my business, and you will then have an opportunity of judging, and give the public an opportunity of judging also, whether I do not do all I can in my power to sell a good and genuine article. My coffee I buy of the first houses, and of the best quality I can get. My chicory I buy in two ways. The principal part I buy in the raw state, and of the choicest in the market; this I have roasted and nibbed by the best man I can find, and mix it with my coffee, and have both ground together. This kind forms the principal part of my chicory trade. I send occasionally to Taylor Brothers, Brick-lane, for twenty-eight or fifty-six pounds of ground chicory, as it very much blunts the coffee-mill to grind chicory alone. This is sold when ground chicory is asked for, and never mixed with any coffee. I have here sent you Taylor Brothers' invoices, and a sample of the ground chicory bought of them, and also a sample of my chicory nibs. I endeavour to do all I can to get the best articles of each kind, and what can any man do more?

In order that your publication above referred to may not unjustly injure my reputation and business, I now beg the favour that you will insert in your next number the whole of this letter; and I further most particularly beg of you or your commissioners, or all of you, to visit and inspect the whole of my stock and business, and then I will ask you if I can do more to secure a good article? Will you also be good enough to let me know which of the two samples now sent is like the one you purchased at my shop?

For the sake of honesty and justice to all parties, I hope you will afford every facility to respectable tradesmen to maintain their reputation unspotted. Your publication has of late contained names of some of the most respectable men in the trade, such as Messrs. Hawkins and Co., Mr. Abbiss, &c., whose acquaintance I have the pleasure to possess, and it really appears a sad thing that good and honest members of society should be injured by statements which want fully explaining.—I am, Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

154, Whitechapel Road, May 17, 1850.

A. TEETGEN.

Correspondence.

"Audi alteram partem."

DR. MURPHY AND HOMŒOPATHY.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In reply to the leading article of your journal for May 17th, in which my name is mentioned, you will permit me to observe that it would have been more consistent with strict justice (I ask for no courtesy) to have informed me of the facts in your possession previously to their publication. I should at least have had the opportunity of asking you to suspend your judgment upon them until the whole truth was placed before you.

However, you have been pleased to adopt a different course;

you have not only assumed the truth of all that has been stated to you by your correspondent who signs himself "One who will not touch Pitch lest he be Defiled," and who, I must say, has sufficiently defiled himself by making such a slanderous attack under the anonym he has chosen, but you have made it the subject of comments of a very severe character.

I am therefore obliged to request your readers not to decide upon this matter as you have done, but to withhold their verdict until the whole question is placed fairly before them. This I shall lose no time in doing.

For the present I shall only say that homœopathy has nothing whatever to do with the question. Before I was sent for I knew nothing of the gentleman nor his mode of practice. His treatment of the case in dispute was not homœopathic, neither was that which in consultation it was agreed upon should be adopted. In our discussion on the case, there was not one syllable said about homœopathic treatment. I may further observe, that the gentleman alluded to is not an "irregular practitioner," but is fully qualified to practise his profession. If, like other well qualified and well educated medical men, he be bitten by the homœopathic mania, it is no concern of mine; he has a right to his own opinions, and if he ask for my assistance, it must be on the presumption that he is willing to take my principles of treatment in place of his own, otherwise he would have no right to send for me. Permit me also to add, that the history of the case as you have related it, is, as I am informed, altogether erroneous. This, however, shall presently be seen.

In conclusion, I beg to state that these observations, and any that I may have hereafter to make, are offered as a very humble member of the medical profession. But with reference to the Medical Society of London, and the position I have the honour to hold as its president, I wish it distinctly to be understood that in that capacity I shall not notice any criticisms that the medical journals feel it their duty to make.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

EDWARD W. MURPHY.

Henrietta-street, Cavendish-square, May 19, 1851.

THE SCHOOLS OF MEDICINE IN MANCHESTER AND UNQUALIFIED PRACTITIONERS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—We are instructed by the Committee of the Manchester Medico-Ethical Association to forward to you the enclosed correspondence for publication in the columns of *THE LANCET*. We are further directed to state that the plan developed in the memorial of the committee was suggested with the view of superseding the necessity for prosecution, but that its signal failure leaves them no alternative but to proceed actively with that project.

We are, Sir, your obedient servants,

JOHN AIKENHEAD } Hon. Secs.
W. C. WILLIAMSON }

Manchester, May, 14, 1851.

To the Registrar and Lecturers of the Pine-street and Chatham-street Schools of Medicine.

GENTLEMEN,—At the last annual meeting of the Manchester Medico-Ethical Association, held Jan. 17, 1851, it was voted unanimously,—"That the important proposal of submitting to the medical officers of the hospitals and medical schools of this town, the propriety of not allowing persons practising whilst unqualified, to attend the practice and lectures of these Institutions, be submitted to the early consideration of the Committee, that they may take the necessary steps in the matter."

Increasing and wide-spread complaints are continually being made concerning the injurious effects upon the profession, of students practising medicine with a view to emolument during their pupilage and attendance on lectures, and the Committee of this association believe that the complaints are well-founded, and that the dissatisfaction engendered is just and reasonable.

Appointed to conserve the honour and interests of the profession, that Committee believe that you, as the registrar of the Pine-street and Chatham-street schools, will, with your colleagues, take this subject into your serious consideration.

It is, of course, well known to you that a considerable number of students entering the schools of late years are at the time druggists, and practising medicine as a profession. The Committee believe that many of them are actuated by