

petent successor who would feel both a pleasure and a pride in faithfully discharging the important offices which *his* sense of duty would impel him to fulfil? This is by no means an extravagantly conceived, or imaginary exemplification, either of contempt of obligations seriously imposed, or of human depravity, as exemplified in our medical locusts. I could, in support of my argument, name, if necessary, an individual who has *practically* illustrated by his conduct for the last twenty years the truth of the position I here lay down; and I could likewise mention three or four instances of *salutary exchanges* which have taken place in hospital appointments, although they were effected chiefly by *private* arrangement. Give me leave to add that, in my opinion, the man who obstinately perseveres in *monopolizing* an important medical situation, and will, in the dog-and-the-manger fashion, neither do the duty, nor resign, but takes advantage of his spurious interest and vitiated influence with a corrupt committee, is much *more* culpable than a person who would vacate even for a pecuniary consideration. As long as the present system is permitted to continue in operation, and human nature remains what it is, *moralize* as we may, *nepotism*, *patronage*, and *money*, will exert a preponderating influence in determining medical appointments, both in Great Britain and Ireland, and the "infamous traffic and practice" will go uninterruptedly on, until restrained by the powerful arm of legislative enactment. It appears to me that the adoption of the principle of the concours in reference to hospital appointments in these countries would be the most efficacious method of putting a stop to the "flagrant abuse" complained of; and that it is only by rendering the commission of "the crime" impracticable, that "the weapon" can be effectively wrested from "the aggressor." This is the opinion I expressed, and the doctrine which I endeavoured to promulgate, when delivering my unimportant sentiments on the important subject of MEDICAL REFORM.

I have the honour to remain, with great respect, your obedient humble servant,

ANDREW ELLIS.

47, William-street, Dublin,
Nov. 28th, 1835.

DELIRIUM WITH TREMOUR.

To the Editor.—SIR,—Your correspondent respecting *Delirium Tremens*, in your last number,—and who need not have appeared anonymously in the matter,—is certainly correct in supposing that I have inadvertently overlooked the reference I have made to Dr. Elliotson's lecture. I find that his lecture was published on the 12th of January 1833, and that my article on the subject was in the printer's hands at the time; this and other references having been afterwards added

in the proof. Upon referring to my article, I observe, that the names I have suggested among the *synonyms* are, "*Idiopathic Delirium*;" "*Delirium Tremefaciens*;" and I have accordingly placed the word "*author*" after them. As to the pathological doctrine and division I have claimed, I remain of the same opinion as before. Upon looking into my friend Dr. Elliotson's able lecture, I found that part of it which is devoted to delirium tremens methodically arranged into "*Symptoms*," "*Causes*," "*Diagnosis*," and "*Treatment*;" but I could not find the distinctions in question under either of the heads "*Symptoms*" and "*Diagnosis*," where I expected to find them; and it was not until I had arrived nearly at the conclusion of the "*Treatment*;" that I found the subject adverted to, and there only in an incidental manner. I may take occasion to state, that the first case which directed my attention to the distinction in question occurred in a dispensary patient in 1821; and that, about ten years ago, I attended, within a few months of each other, three cases of the disease, with Mr. Houlton, of Lisson Grove, a gentleman well known to Dr. Elliotson and myself for his extensive literary and scientific acquirements, as well as for his experience; and one of those cases presented the inflammatory characters, and occurred under the circumstances which I have detailed at length. I do not dispute that the distinction was made about the same time by Dr. Elliotson and myself; but that I have been indebted to his lecture I unequivocally deny. Whoever will first read Dr. E.'s lecture, and immediately afterwards my articles on "*Delirium*," and "*Delirium with tremour*," will find internal evidence of my originality. If I may judge from my feelings and habits, I should infer that, in glancing—for I can do no more in many instances, even where I make references—over this lecture, I perceived nothing which particularly struck me, otherwise I would have taken further notice of it; and that the topic in question should have escaped me is not surprising, when the head under which it was noticed, both briefly and incidentally, is taken into account.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

JAMES COPLAND.

Bulstrode-street, Nov. 30, 1835.

CORRESPONDENTS.

WE have received another communication from Mr. ROGERS, in reply to the letter of Mr. G. Bury, relative to the proceedings at the late inquest at Farnham. We think we shall best consult the ends of justice by excluding from our columns any further remarks on the subjects in dispute until we have obtained on official copy of the depositions taken at the inquest. It is not necessary to say one word in justification of the conduct of Mr. ROGERS. He has manfully stepped forward to protect the character of an innocent man; and in doing so, will obtain the approbation of every just intelligent member of society.

WE have not space for the letter signed C., but we give insertion, for the satisfaction of the writer and the information of his friends, to the following passage, which is strictly applicable to the case, from the excellent work of Jervis on the office and duty of Coroners. Nothing can be more evident than the fact that no inquest should have been held on the occasion in question:—

"The *dying suddenly* is not to be understood as relating to a fever, an apoplexy, or other visitation of God, and Coroners ought not in such cases, to obtrude themselves