

care for many months, during which time she was once (June 13th, 1864) seen by Dr. A. Farre in consultation with me. Shortly after this interview she called upon me in the greatest distress, to inquire if anything further could be done, as all the means hitherto recommended had only given her temporary relief, and had failed to cure her distressing affection. I then informed her that Mr. Isaac B. Brown had advocated and practised the removal of the irritable parts in such cases, and, as he had affirmed, with the best results, but of the effects of which operation I had no personal experience. From October, 1864, to the following May, I saw nothing of my patient, when she called at my house and expressed her *firm determination* to have the part cut out, at the same time requesting me to arrange a consultation with Mr. Brown. At that consultation Mr. Brown not only strongly advised the operation, but promised it would effect a cure. On being appealed to by the patient for my opinion, I again repeated, and in the presence of Mr. Brown, that I could not express an opinion, as I had no experience of its effects. Three days after this interview clitoridectomy was performed by Mr. Brown, and proved a lamentable failure, the poor sufferer herself stating, in a note written to me January 6th, 1866, that "the irritation had returned with its wonted force all over, up the front and back passage, and that her general health was not so good," which was probably due to the large loss of blood she sustained at the time of the operation. After this truthful detail of facts, I still maintain that it cannot be said, by any impartial judge, that I recommended the removal of the clitoris for self-abuse. Thus Mr. Isaac B. Brown has fallen into the very trap he set for another. The profession, I may here observe in passing, will do well to take note that Mr. Isaac B. Brown is in the habit of pigeonholing letters he receives, to be used as occasion may require against the writer.

It is not my intention to follow Mr. Isaac B. Brown, step by step, through the rest of his violent diatribe against me. Mr. Brown must be blind indeed when he persists in dwelling so forcibly on my visits to the "Home," as he only obtrudes on the public my peculiar competency to form the opinion I have felt it my duty to record on its merits. But let that pass. It may be very convenient for Mr. Isaac B. Brown to ride off from the general issues of the question to particular details about myself, and thus avoid facing the censures of an indignant profession, and the verdict of an outraged public. I am bold to assert, however, that he will one day find that neither the public nor the profession will be deluded by such arts as these into a forgetfulness of the real ground of the debate. If the operation with which Mr. Isaac B. Brown is so anxious to associate his name were capable of working the good which its champion so assiduously parades—if insanity, epilepsy, catalepsy, and hysteria, in females, and other evils to which humanity is heir, could be made to yield to the knife he wields with a dexterity I am forward to admit—Mr. Brown would have no warmer supporter than myself. My contention, however, is, that Mr. Isaac B. Brown's practices are founded upon erroneous views, and in no case that I am aware of have they effected a cure; in some they have produced the very mischief they pretend to remove or avert. My contention, also, is, that women have *unwittingly* been made the victims of operations of the nature of which they were totally ignorant; and that the profession at large are bound to repudiate, as strongly as they can, practices so fatal to their good name and fame.

Mr. Isaac B. Brown may affect to doubt that I have stated my true reason for ceasing to visit the "Home." Perhaps he may be able to explain the numerous resignations of consulting physicians and other members of the staff. The recent resignation of Mr. Chambers, noticed in your last issue in the following terms—"We congratulate that gentleman on the laudable step he has taken, in which we feel sure he will have the support of all right-thinking men—and women," reminds me that Drs. Handfield Jones, Priestley, J. Hall Davis, and Messrs. Skey and Nunn, all honourable men and true, were once on the consulting staff of the Surgical Home. Why are they not there now?—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Grosvenor-street, Jan. 7th, 1867.

ROBERT GREENHALGH.

\* \* This personal controversy must here terminate. We strongly urge upon the Council of the Obstetrical Society that a committee of three or more should be appointed to investigate the subject of clitoridectomy, which involves so many questions of professional ethics. The matter is one which the Obstetrical Society is most competent to deal with, and we trust that all parties will abide by its decision.—ED. L.

## THE "PALL MALL GAZETTE" AND DR. HUNTER.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—The spirited conduct of the proprietors of the *Pall Mall Gazette* in protecting the interests of the public and the honour of the profession in the article upon Dr. Hunter, and in the defence of the case *Hunter v. Sharpe*, has already been the subject of favourable comment in your pages.

Several members of the profession and a few other gentlemen think it desirable to show some mark of their appreciation of this conduct, and propose to join in a limited subscription, the disposal of which shall be hereafter determined. We beg to request your assistance in making known their intentions, and in furthering the object they have in view.

G. D. Pollock, Esq., 27, Grosvenor-street, and T. H. Hills, Esq., 45, Queen Anne-street, have consented to act as treasurers; and subscriptions may also be paid to the Argyll-street branch of the Union Bank.

We are, Sir, your obedient servants,

G. W. CALLENDER,  
47, Grosvenor-street.

J. C. PARKINSON,  
Arts Club, Hanover-square.

January 7th, 1867.

### First List of Subscribers.

Professor Bentley	...	£1	1	0	F. Mason, Esq.	...	£0	10	6
Dr. Brodie...	...	1	1	0	Dr. Murchison	...	1	1	0
Dr. Black	...	2	2	0	John Morgan, Esq.	...	2	2	0
Professor Hughes Bennett	...	2	2	0	Dr. Martin	...	1	1	0
G. W. Callender, Esq.	...	2	2	0	Hugh Owen, Esq.	...	1	1	0
G. Critchett, Esq.	...	2	2	0	G. Pollock, Esq.	...	2	2	0
Holmes Coote, Esq.	...	2	2	0	J. C. Parkinson, Esq.	...	1	1	0
T. B. Curling, Esq.	...	2	2	0	Dr. Paget	...	2	2	0
Dr. Drutt	...	2	2	0	James Paget, Esq.	...	2	2	0
Sir W. Fergusson, Bart.	...	2	2	0	Oliver Pemberton, Esq.	...	2	2	0
Dr. Garrod	...	2	2	0	J. Propert, Esq.	...	2	2	0
Dr. Greenhalgh	...	2	2	0	James Rouse, Esq.	...	1	1	0
Dr. Gull	...	2	2	0	Henry Rogers, Esq.	...	2	2	0
D. B. Hanbury, Esq.	...	1	1	0	Professor Rolleston	...	1	1	0
Dr. Harling	...	2	2	0	W. S. Savory, Esq.	...	2	2	0
E. H. Hills, Esq.	...	2	2	0	Thomas Smith, Esq.	...	1	1	0
T. H. Hills, Esq.	...	2	2	0	Dr. Southey	...	2	2	0
Ernest Hart, Esq.	...	2	2	0	Dr. Sibson	...	2	2	0
Luther Holden, Esq.	...	2	2	0	Henry Thompson, Esq.	...	2	2	0
John Hilton, Esq.	...	2	2	0	T. Turner, Esq.	...	2	2	0
R. Leigh Holland, Esq.	...	1	1	0	J. Soelberg Wells, Esq.	...	2	2	0
Dr. Horace Jeaffreson	...	1	1	0	Dr. Forbes Winslow	...	2	2	0
Dr. Geo. Johnson	...	2	2	0	Rev. M. C. Walrond	...	2	2	0
Dr. Jenner	...	2	2	0	Alfred Willett, Esq.	...	2	2	0
Arthur J. Lewis, Esq.	...	2	2	0	W. Foster White, Esq.	...	2	2	0
T. Lawrence, Esq.	...	2	2	0	Erasmus Wilson, Esq.	...	2	2	0
C. De Morgan, Esq.	...	2	2	0	Sir T. Watson, Bart.	...	2	2	0

## LITHOTOMY AND LITHOTRITY.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I send you the following facts for publication. The calculation is made from the "Statistical Tables of Patients treated in Guy's Hospital." They are arranged by the superintendent, and printed by the authority of the governors of that hospital. The total number includes those patients only upon whom either the crushing operation or the cutting was performed.

During the twelve years, 1854 to 1866 inclusive, two hundred and eleven patients underwent one or other of the operations above-mentioned. This gives very nearly an annual average of eighteen cases.

I remain, Sir, yours faithfully,

Green-street, Grosvenor-square, Jan. 8th, 1867. JOHN BIRKETT.

## THE ARMY AND NAVY MEDICAL WARRANT.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—The new Warrant for the Officers of the Army and Navy Medical Departments was promised to be published on the 1st of January, and the increase of pay to take effect from the 1st of April.

We are now some time past the 1st of January and no Warrant has appeared as yet, and the 1st of April seems rather an *ominous* day on which to found any hope of the increase of pay.

Next month the examination for candidates takes place, and if the authorities can get a goodly number of "crammed" applicants for commissions we may give up hope of seeing the Warrant in 1867.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Jan. 8, 1867.

TOO OFTEN HOAXED.