

the perfect state in which the plant was preserved, and immediately ordered a tincture to be made. But there being no formulæ for such a preparation I ventured on the following:—

R *Lobelia inflata*, 1 pound; *Rectified spirits of wine*, o iv; *Spirit of nitrous ether*, o iv; *Spirit of sulph. ether*, ʒ iv. Macerate for 14 days, perfectly excluded from the light.

Supposing, as experience has proved, that the addition of the ether would materially increase its anti-spasmodic properties. The medicine in this form was sent to *St. Thomas's Hospital*, and there, under the judicious direction of Dr. Elliotson, prescribed with singular success, to whom, alone, in my opinion, the profession and the public are indebted for whatever portion of human suffering has been, or may be, diminished by its introduction as a medicine.

As to Mr. Whitlaw's pretensions to a knowledge of the preparation of the plant, I may just observe, that on our separation last November, he was, until then, unacquainted with the ingredients composing the tincture. The mode of preparing it was then, at his own request, written out for his future direction. Although the respectable house of Messrs. Bell and Co., Oxford-street, may not have had any of the tincture or herb from Mr. Whitlaw since his removal to Argyll-street, yet they are, and have been, ever since the introduction of the medicine, supplied with the tincture as prepared by me from the plant imported from America. I am, Sir, with great respect, your obedient servant,

CHARLES WHITLAW, Surgeon.

14, Finsbury-place, South,  
May 24th, 1837.

P. S. I observe that Dr. Sigmond, in a lecture reported in *THE LANCET* of May 13th, when speaking of the effects of tobacco in disordered respiration says, "At the time that the lobelia inflata was the subject of great panegyric, and that clinical lectures appeared in the periodicals extolling its virtues in asthma, there was not a particle of it in the market." Whether any of the above plant was in the drug-market at that time, I have no means of ascertaining, but when the medicine became a "subject of great panegyric," and when "clinical lectures appeared in the periodicals extolling its virtues," (vide *LANCET*, Jan. 26th, 1833,) Dr. Elliotson had been, for several months previous to all this, prescribing the tincture prepared by me, and at that time a large quantity was in our possession.

## CLINIC AT GUY'S HOSPITAL.

To the Editor of *THE LANCET*.

SIR:—In consequence of the very sensible and satisfactory explanation given in a former number of *THE LANCET*, why our "respected teacher," Mr. Morgan, had delivered only two instead of thirty clinical lectures during the whole of the winter session, viz., that Mr. Morgan thought it better to deliver them in the summer, when the majority of students were in the country; and as this explanation appeared to have been given either by Mr. M. himself or by one of his friends, some few (though, forsooth, a very few) of the students expected that promise to be fulfilled. Five weeks of the summer session have now elapsed, without any probability of such being the case; and you will, perhaps, be surprised to learn, that in *Guy's Hospital*, containing between five and six hundred beds, although there are never less than a hundred students up in the summer, it is not the custom for either physician or surgeon to deliver one clinical lecture upon any case, however rare. Should Mr. Morgan's promise be fulfilled,—nay, if he give only one lecture during the summer,—making three lectures in 12 months, I will not, in justice to Mr. M., fail to communicate the fact to you and the public, before the issuing of the next *STUDENTS' NUMBER* of *THE LANCET*. I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

A PUPIL OF GUY'S.

June 1, 1837.

## MR. LYON'S REJOINER TO MR. DASENT.

To the Editor of *THE LANCET*.

SIR:—I am very unwilling to take up the pages of *THE LANCET*, by protracting a controversy which has originated, I fear, in the wilful opposition of certain parties to facts which they themselves have signed and recognized. If Mr. Dasent repents of his innocent imprudence in affixing his attestation to the successful treatment of Dr. Turnbull, he might surely give utterance to his sorrow in a more comfortable way than by knocking his head against facts. The personal abuse of myself I treat with the contempt which all similar unprofessional conduct deserves. It is not the way to foster improvements in medicine, or in any other department of human knowledge. In his first letter, Mr. Dasent says, "I refused to sign the report, in consequence of the inaccuracy of its conclusions;" and in his second, "the fact is, that my testimony refers merely to the simple history of the cases, exclusive of Dr. Turnbull's con-

clusions;" and he further adds, "I have only to observe that he (Mr. Lyon) has no writing of mine in his possession which is inconsistent with the tenor of my letter."

The facts I challenge Mr. Dasent to disprove are:—*First fact.* Mr. Dasent, in my presence, *signed separately each report* from beginning to end, not only of the history, but also of the *conclusions* of *eight* of the *eleven* cases given for trial to Dr. Turnbull at the Roy. West. Ophthalmic Hospital, and related in Dr. Turnbull's late work on Diseases of the Nerves and Eyes. The history of the three other cases was drawn up by Mr. Dasent, and the *conclusions* added and signed in my presence by Mr. Baillie, the house-surgeon of the Roy. West. Ophth. Hospital, at the time Dr. Turnbull's trials ceased.

*Second fact.* The *separate reports*, containing the *conclusions* of *eight* cases, *signed by Mr. Dasent*, and the other three signed by Mr. Baillie, are *in my possession*, and may be seen by any one calling upon me at my residence.

Where the truth rests, disinterested parties can have no difficulty in ascertaining. My facts are before the public; they stand on their own merits: but, whilst stating this, I cannot too severely reprehend the reckless statements made by Mr. Dasent, and the painful sacrifice of truth to petty jealousy they evidently involve. I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

I. LYON, M. R. C. S. L.

25, Montague-street, Russell-square,  
May 27th 1837.

## DR. CLANNY'S EMPLOYMENT OF CARBURETTED HYDROGEN.

*To the Editor of THE LANCET.*

SIR:—This day only, I received No. 7 of the present volume of THE LANCET, in which I observe a communication signed "A CONSTANT READER," which contains several incorrect and unjust remarks upon a communication of mine which was inserted in the previous number of THE LANCET. I am well aware that I am not called upon to reply to this or to any other anonymous correspondent, but for the cause of truth I think it expedient to request that you will be pleased to reserve a place in a number of THE LANCET for a few remarks, by way of reply—premiting that I wage not war with anonymous scribes.

The first sentence of the above-mentioned communication runs thus: "In the last number of your valuable journal there is a case of phthisis pulmonalis recorded by Dr. Clanny of Sunderland, in which he states that a cure was effected by the inhalation of carburetted hydrogen gas." Now, I fearlessly

assert that I never wrote or said any such thing; nor am I answerable for the surmises of this or any other writer. All that I desire is, that any of your readers who think differently will take the trouble of again perusing my paper, and form their own conclusions.

The next sentence of this "CONSTANT SUBSCRIBER" is as follows:—"That this patient was even the victim of consumption remains to be proved." It is evident that the writer does not know the meaning of the word "victim." I stated formerly, and now repeat, that my patient is not the victim of any disease! I observe that this "CONSTANT SUBSCRIBER" has the arrogance to refuse me the credit of understanding the nature of the disease under which my patient laboured. I hereby challenge him to proceed to her residence and prove the truth of his assertions, or appoint a substitute, if the former plan be inconvenient.

I admire his modesty in quoting my description of my patient's disease, and then condescending to afford us information, by which he infers that we shall be enabled to discriminate between phthisis pulmonalis and chronic bronchitis; and concludes, *without having seen the patient*, that her disease must have been chronic bronchitis. In my concluding paragraph I used the following words:—"Being pinched for time I write *currente calamo*." This at once explains that I had not time to give a lengthened history of the case of my patient.

The last paragraph of the "CONSTANT SUBSCRIBER" is equally remarkable for candour and truth. It is as follows:—"It is mentioned that Dr. Clanny's mode of treating phthisis, by inhaling carburetted hydrogen is new. A very little research will prove that this is far from being the case." Now what is the fact? I will explain in a few words. In no part of my communication have I stated that the plan was new: the reader was left to draw his own conclusions. And, in reply to the second assertion contained in this paragraph, I unreservedly assert that I have never read or heard reported by any individual that carburetted hydrogen gas, or mixtures of that gas and of atmospherical air, have ever before been employed therapeutically, under the form of inhalation. All I desire is, that any competent person, whose judgment is not warped by prejudice, will please to read the accounts of *attempts* which were made to inhale mixtures of carburetted hydrogen gas and air by those eminent philosophers Davy, Turner, and Christison, and then the truth will stand revealed.

In my paper, which was recently published in the sixth number of this volume of THE LANCET, I gave my reasons for making trial of weak mixtures of carburetted hydrogen gas and air, under the form of inhalation; and no doubt remains in my breast that I had taken a proper view of the subject. (*Vide*