

It has been observed by some writer, but I do not remember whom, that a sound, precisely similar to the crepitous rattle, may be produced by rubbing a lock of hair between the fingers, close to the ear. Who would seek to explain the production of the sound heard in pneumonia, which cannot be distinguished from this, by the passage of bubbles of air through an aqueous fluid? Who would tax his credulity so far as to force himself to believe, that similar sounds are produced by such dissimilar causes? I repeat, that I believe the pulmonary crepitous rattle is produced by the friction of air against the preternaturally dry surface of the air-cells, and by the friction of opposite surfaces of the air-cells against each other, occurring during respiration.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN WHITE, M.R.C.S.

St. Neot's, Dec. 19th.

EFFICACY OF CUBEBS IN GONORRHOEA.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In your Number for Nov. 28, in a critique on Dr. Titley's work on Diseases of the Male Genitals, when speaking of gonorrhoeal affections, you express your opinion of the inutility of cubebs in that disease.

Knowing you have ever evinced a readiness to give place to the results of any medicinal remedy, permit me to say, that having used the cubebs with invariable success in more than three hundred cases, I feel myself bound to enter a protest against the sweeping anathema of yourself and the learned Doctor, although at the risk of incurring the charge of presumption, and to endeavour to restore that valuable remedy to the rank it justly merits. I am perfectly satisfied that the frequent failure of the cubebs proceeds from its not being exhibited in a proper state, or from the doses given being too small. The aperient I use, if one be necessary, is the Rochelle salts in ʒss. doses, and I strictly prohibits the use of Epsom salts, which patient will frequently take in large quantities, unless particularly cautioned not to do so. I give the cubebs combined in the following manner:—

R *P. cubebæ*, ʒiij.;
P. G. acaciæ, ʒj.;
P. potass nitras, gr. vj. M. ft.
 pulv. capt. 4tis horis ex infus.
 sem. lini.

And I have not had occasion to use an injection in a single case, nor have I found the cubebs, so combined, productive of any of the injurious effects of which the Doctor accuses them; but if the cubebs be given ʒjss. or ʒj. doses, *uncombined* with the

nitre, &c., then the enlarged testicle, irritable bladder, and paralysis, will most probably ensue. I have never had occasion to give more than ʒiij. for a dose, in the most obstinate cases, followed up every four hours, but it is particularly necessary the interval should not be longer.

In conclusion may I remark that the cubeb should not be kept powdered, but *unbruised* until wanted, in a stone jar in a cold dry place, nor should the cubeb be wrapped in paper, or its utility will ever remain questionable; that its efficacy depends on its essential oil is generally believed, but my own practice does not warrant an inference of that nature, as I have found the oil nearly valueless, although I believe it to be genuine; nor is the powder, deprived of the oil, of any service; which leads me to conclude that there resides in the cubeb a principle unknown, which is lost in distillation, and by atmospheric exposure in a bruised state. Should any of your readers have opportunity and inclination to give it a fair trial according to my plan, and will state the results through the medium of your invaluable Journal, they will confer a favour on your most obedient servant,
 E. MOORE.

Dudley, Staffordshire, Dec. 5, 1829.

WESTERN HOSPITAL.

REPLY OF MR. BRODIE TO MR. SLEIGH.

[The following letter was received last week, but in consequence of the length of Dr. Ayre's on the same subject, we could not find room for it.—ED. L.]

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

Royal Western Hospital,
 Jan. 4, 1830.

SIR,—I hope you will allow me a small space in your next Journal to refute the calumnious aspersions thrown on my character by Mr. Sleigh, in his letter which appeared in THE LANCET of the second instant, purporting to be a reply to my former communication; but which is, in fact, a tissue of calumny, and unfounded assertion; but first, allow me state, that neither Dr. Ayre nor Mr. Truman knew one word in my letter until it appeared in THE LANCET.

In Mr. Sleigh's professed reply he does not even endeavour to exculpate himself from the charges of deceiving me by writing a wilful falsehood, or of shameful neglect in delivering his lectures; both of these statements being uncontradicted; he merely says "he had every reason to expect the College would have long since recognised the hos-

pital;" and accuses me of malice, for stating that he must have been well aware that it could not have been accomplished; but what could he expect, when, from 1st October 1828 to April 1829, there were altogether but 160 patients admitted into the hospital, as may be proved from the hospital books; nor could it contain more than *half* the number of patients, promised by Mr. Sleigh, in his letter to me in September 1828, *insuring* 110 beds, constantly filled with patients.

As to my dismissal from the office of House Surgeon, its injustice was so scandalous that the other medical officers refused to sign it; the only reason that could be given was, disrespectful conduct to the senior surgeon! But how could I respect a man by whom I had been so duped, and whom I found was carrying on the hospital without any adequate means of defraying its expenses. With respect to the certificate Mr. Sleigh gave me "out of regard to the public," he knew that I intended to expose his scandalous behaviour long before my letter appeared; he had other reasons, which if he choose he may publish; for I told him my opinion of his transactions in rather too plain English; but I am convinced that his certificate will prove nothing but his own spite and malice. I have numerous certificates to prove that my character is unexceptionable in every respect; little reliance will be placed on the testimony of a man, who, for the purpose of obtaining pupils, did not scruple to use the most wilful misrepresentations.

With respect to his lectures, which he avers have been most scientifically taught, he publishes a vote of thanks by his pupils at another school in 1827, (most unequivocal testimony to show that his lectures in 1828-9 were well delivered.) I did not state that his lectures were not scientific, in fact his surgical lectures were so purely scientific that we had no practical part.

As to Mr. Sleigh's statement, that he never charged one fraction for hospital attendance, his charge being simply for lectures, the following extract from one of his letters, will show the ambiguity and craft of this assertion—"My charges for my lectures *including* hospital attendance, medical and surgical;" this shows clearly that it formed part of that for which he charged; besides, his lectures were not so much the year before. But whether he charged, or did not charge, those pupils who depended upon his honour and assertions, that the practice would be received at the College, must remain in London another year, and attend another hospital. If Mr. Sleigh has in his character one spark of justice or gentlemanly feeling, he would find those pupils that hospital practice at his own expense.

I am, Sir, your obliged servant,
G. I. H. BRODIE.

SECOND REPLY FROM MR. SLEIGH.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Although the letter I addressed to you on the 18th ult., exposing, in self-defence, the conspiracy of Messrs. Ayre and Truman, contained *twenty-three* distinct statements, yet they have not, in their verbose communications of Saturday last, attempted to disprove but one of them. True, they have denied them, which is only what any person at all acquainted with their principles would expect; but denial even from men who have some regard for truth, is by no means a *refutation*. I only fear your readers will not have patience to read those gentlemanly letters in which they have substituted sophistry for fair argument, and Billingsgate language for replies to my charges; weapons, it is well known, had recourse to only in a vile and defenceless cause. The reflections they have cast on the committee, of which a clergyman of the Church of England was chairman, are not to be wondered at. What criminal, on being found guilty, does not impugn the motives, &c. of the jury which find him guilty? Besides, their false aspersions are only consonant with the deistical principles of the one, and the Jewish principles of the other. As to the retirement from the Committee of Mr. Johnson, who is this Mr. Johnson? Brother-in-law of Sir Charles Scudamore, knight; and be it known, that Sir Charles is equally deep in *the game* against me, but plays *his cards* with more *whist* sagacity. I shall not reply now to what they have said of me, for were I to do so by mere assertion, without proof, I would be doing what I now censure; and were I to go into proof, then my letter, if it would not tire your patience, would certainly that of your readers. But as I shall afford Dr. Ayre very shortly, a public opportunity of proving his slander, in a place where truth is generally extracted, if not by the fear of God, at least by the fear of the pillory, I shall be content till then, when I pledge myself to prove those two gentlemen to be as great economists of truth, and as deep and designing characters, as ever graced the medical profession. I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

W. W. SLEIGH.

25, Upper Seymour-st., Portman-sq.,
Jan. 11, 1830.

P.S.—By-the-by, Dr. Ayre need not feel so sorely at the conduct of the committee of the Royal Western Hospital in having expelled him, as I understand it was not the first time, even in this metropolis (we know nothing of elsewhere), that he, Dr. Ayre, was, according to his own *oily* interpretation of the word expulsion, under the very agreeable necessity of "tendering his resignation" at another public institution.