

Society (No. 247), an abstract of which was given in your issue of Jan. 29th, and I must confess that I am much puzzled by the illustrations which accompany the preliminary report on this subject. These figures, as Dr. Klein has pointed out, certainly appear to represent a branched mycelium, but they do not in the least recall to my mind the actual preparation which I had an opportunity of examining, and upon which I founded my opinion in May last. It has occurred to me that possibly Mr. Gardiner was shown the very same preparation, and hence his recent opinion that this organism is some involution form.

With regard to methylene blue having been used by Koch, I would refer those interested in this discussion to "Bacteriology," p. 141, where the method is given, as reported in the *Berliner Klinische Woch.*, No. 31 (Conferenz zur Erörterung der Cholerafrage, Juli 26, 1884). In their preliminary report, Messrs. Roy, Brown, and Sherrington state that the particular method they employed was almost identical with that of Löffler, and they add, "So far as we know, Löffler's method has not been employed to stain sections of tissues taken from fatal cholera cases," but here I must add that Löffler's method was precisely the one which I used in staining a great number of sections in July, 1885, as it had been especially recommended for that purpose by Dr. Workman in the *British Medical Journal*, No. 1280.

I am Sirs, yours faithfully,

EDGAR M. CROOKSHANK, M.B.

Manchester-square, W., Feb. 3rd, 1887.

THE FUTURE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—In your excellent article replying to the writer in the *Quarterly Review*, you enumerate University College, King's College, the Science and Art Schools at Kensington, the Technical Institute of the City Guilds, the Royal Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons, and the Inns of Court as bodies which are not, but might be, incorporated in a true University of London. Will you allow me to ask for a reconsideration of this position? It is of immense importance that the wrong ingredients should not be mixed to form the new University. As nearly as circumstances will allow, we want *one* body of professors actually united and organised as a single corporation of teaching examiners or examining teachers to constitute the new University. The attempt which has been made by Sir George Young and one or two members of an Association which has never itself assented to such a scheme—to bring individuals from diverse and very many teaching institutions together as the basis of a new University—is, I venture to assert, a fatal error. A certain small amount of popular support may be obtained for the new University movement by thus widely throwing the net, but it is at the sacrifice of all that is worth obtaining in the foundation of a new University. The Normal School of Science has no *locus standi* in the matter. Its business is to train school teachers and to grant its own certificates. Its lecturers are paid by the taxpayers. The Technical College similarly must stand on its own bottom and grant its own diplomas, and has no claim whatever to take part in the University. Leaving aside for the moment the question of professional degrees in law and medicine, it results that for the general purposes of University training and the granting of degrees in Arts and in Science there are only two bodies in London which can claim the concession to their professors of the special favour and privilege in question. These two bodies are University and King's Colleges. The mere fact that there are *only* two such bodies is immensely important; it results in an absolute certainty that were these two bodies endowed by the Crown with the style and authority of a university, they would gradually fuse with one another and become a single corporation identical with the University. Thus we should at last see in London one powerful and authoritative body of teachers able to claim and to attract endowments whilst teaching and carrying on research on a scale worthy of the richest city in the world. The professional degrees in Law and in Medicine must, I admit, be placed on a somewhat different footing; and in the new University the Faculty of Law and the Faculty of Medicine should consist not of

the professors of these subjects in the University and King's College, but of representatives of the professions of law and of medicine generally. This distinction is necessary for several reasons, but chiefly because in the case of medicine the degree has a special professional significance, and because the teaching of medicine and surgery, strictly so called, is splendidly provided for by the great London hospitals and tested by the great medical corporations. There may be a reluctance on the part of the Crown to grant the power of conferring what would purport to be an academical degree to a purely professional corporation. If so, the objection might be removed by making the new body—whatever its internal constitution may be—which is to confer the degree of M.D. on London students occupy the position of the Medical Faculty of the new University whose Faculties of Arts and of Science are formed by the professors of University and King's Colleges. It will be objected to these proposals that special privilege and favour are to be accorded to University and King's Colleges. But why should such favour not be granted to them? The essence of university foundations is the grant of a privilege of dignity and authority to a selected body. No one can maintain for a moment that University and King's Colleges are not worthy to receive this privilege, or that there is any other body in London which has any claim, except in regard to medicine and law, strictly so called, to share it.—I am, Sirs, your obedient servant,

E. RAY LANKESTER, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S.

Savile Club, Piccadilly, W., Feb. 7th, 1887.

* * We did not instance these institutions as constituent bodies in a new university, but merely to show that the existing University had done nothing to bring them into any closer union than was the case with corresponding institutions in the time of Stowe.—ED. L.

ON THE CAUSE OF MARKED HYPERTROPHY OF THE ANTERIOR WALL OF THE BLADDER.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—At the meeting of the Pathological Society on the 18th ult., Mr. Fenwick drew attention for the first time to the fact that the anterior wall of the bladder hypertrophies much more than the remainder, especially in cases of unrelieved stricture of the urethra. The position of the bladder in the anterior part of the pelvis enables it, when dilated, to expand posteriorly in the direction of the rectum and upwards into the abdominal cavity, but the pubic wall flattens the anterior surface. This affords the true explanation of the phenomenon. If membranes in the shape of spheres of varying sizes enclose fluid, so that the tension is uniformly distributed along each fibre, the thickness of the membrane must by the principles of hydrostatics be exactly proportional to the radius of the corresponding sphere. Similarly it follows that the greater the flattening of the anterior wall of the bladder as compared with the curvature of the posterior and upper walls, the greater must be its thickness, in order that the pressure of the urine in the bladder may be balanced by the same tension of each muscular fibre. Hence the diminished curvature of the anterior wall of the bladder throws a proportionate increase of work on that part of the wall, and a greater thickening ensues. This is, in fact, an illustration of the general law in physics—that every limitation to the free movement of a body throws an increased strain upon the body: the pubic wall impedes the projection of the bladder forwards, and therefore throws an increased strain upon its impeded portion, the anterior wall, and this completely explains the localised thickening to which Mr. Fenwick has drawn attention.

I am, Sirs, yours truly,

Jan. 19th, 1887.

G. N. PITT.

THE LAW RELATING TO CORONERS.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—As I have made a public promise, of which you have been kind enough to take notice, that I should bring in a Bill to amend the law relating to the election of coroners in English counties, I wish, if you can give me space in your valuable columns, to explain why I have not