

LONDON UNIVERSITY.

MR. EISEDELL AND EX-PROFESSOR PATTISON.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—It has probably been a matter of surprise to some of my friends that I have not replied to the charges which Mr. Pattison, in his pamphlet relative to his connexion with the University of London, has so unsparingly heaped upon me. I can assure you, Sir, it was my anxious desire fully to have answered all those accusations, not only because my own character was defamed, but also because I conceive it to be a man's duty (and he does well who does nothing more) to expose and correct abuse and misrepresentation. I was, however, deterred from so doing by the expense it would have been necessary for me to incur, inasmuch as it would require a pamphlet as large as Mr. Pattison's to expose all the fallacies into which he has fallen, and the misrepresentations and misstatements he has made. I felt too that, after the admirable letter of our excellent professor Dr. Turner, the conduct of the students did not stand in need of any further vindication: and being confident that it would not require any further exposé of the nature of Mr. Pattison's "*facts*" to enable the proprietors to come to a correct judgment on the matter, I refrained from appearing before the public. I shall not now trouble the readers of *THE LANCET* with any lengthened analysis of Mr. Pattison's "*Statement*," especially as you, Sir, have, with so much ability, undertaken the task. Permit me, however, to occupy your pages with one or two remarks on that part of the "*Statement*" which more immediately refers to myself.

To Mr. Pattison's first charge, that of "*deplorable ignorance of anatomy*" as a student, as the charge has reference to my anatomical knowledge more than twelve months ago, I am perfectly ready to submit,—in so far as it only relates to certain points of descriptive anatomy. I had, however, even at that time, obtained sufficient insight into the higher departments of that science,—by attending the lectures of our learned professor of comparative anatomy, Dr. Grant, in whose class I obtained the gold medal,—to convince me that Mr. Pattison, independently of the superficial manner in which he gave his demonstrations, by almost wholly omitting to treat of that department of the science called "*general anatomy*;" in neglecting to indicate the pathological changes to which the various tissues are subject, and in failing to reveal to us the researches of Tiede-

mann, Meckel, Serres, Geoffrey, St. Hilaire, and others, into the laws of organization,—did a wrong to the cause of science, which could only be obviated by his removal from the chair of anatomy. This conclusion was forced upon me more particularly by one circumstance amongst others, viz. the "*deplorable ignorance*" Mr. Pattison manifested of the stages through which the brain passes in the progress of its development, when he gave his class to understand that every part was developed simultaneously. Dr. Grant was present when this statement was made, and has confirmed the truth of the allegation.

It is not my intention to pursue the subject of Mr. Pattison's incompetence, my only object being to vindicate my own conduct.

The charge of "*presumption*," as it is shared by the great majority of my fellow students and by those of the highest standing in the school, it is not necessary for me to rebut.

The other charges which affect me I would dispose of by saying, that there is scarcely a reference to my name; but there are connected therewith the most erroneous and exaggerated statements and misrepresentations. The proof of this assertion I could easily supply, were it not that it would occupy too much space in your valuable publication.

In conclusion, allow me to hope, that while I have not lost the good opinion of my fellow students, as has been testified by several of their acts during the last session, or the good-will of the medical profession, I shall not suffer in the estimation of my friends, and the public in after life, from being thought guilty, by the ex-professor, of "*presumption*"—"malevolence"—"*misrepresentation*" and "*insubordination*," of which frightful catalogue of crimes there is not one he can substantiate against me.

I am Sir,

Your obedient humble servant,
Sept. 6, 1831. NATH. EISEDELL.

MR. PATTISON.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—It might be naturally supposed, that so humble an individual as he who has now the honour of addressing you, would pause ere he ventured to enter the lists against the champion of medical reform, the renowned editor of *THE LANCET* and *BALLOD*, the late popular, and I regret to add, unsuccessful, candidate for the coronership of the county of Middlesex, and last, though not least, the founder of the "*London College of Medicine*."

But, Sir, these high-sounding, and, in some respects, honourable titles, will not deter me from what I conceive to be the duty of every honest man, viz., to defend, as far as in him lies, the character of those he believes to be unjustly aspersed, however high in public estimation the calumniator may stand. The Editor of *THE LANCET* has undoubtedly done much good for the profession, but he would, with as little doubt, have effected much more, were it not for his unconquerable attachment to that spirit of *party*, which is the "*madness of many for the gain of a few*," and the pursuit of which has obtained for him such numerous and powerful enemies, and lost him a multitude of valuable friends.

This crying vice, joined to the still more noxious one of a delight in abusing those who may happen to fall under the ban of his displeasure, has been the means of negating, in a great measure, the good effects which would have resulted from the fearless manner in which corruption has frequently been exposed by the Editor of *THE LANCET*.

The above remarks have been elicited from me by the perusal (in the leading article of this day's *LANCET*) of the unmerited sarcasms cast upon the late unfortunate professor of anatomy in the now-disgraced University of London.

One charge against this gentleman you, Sir, deem of so heinous a nature, as to require eleven columns to elucidate it; and what is the crime thus dilated upon? neither more nor less, than that Mr. Pattison has no right to complain of injustice, having been himself grossly unjust in deserting at various times his pupils, by obeying that call for advancement which his talents as a lecturer had caused to be made upon him. Why, Sir, you might about as reasonably charge any reverend divine with a neglect of the spiritual welfare of his flock, should his talents point him out as a fit object for promotion to a bishopric, and which he would of course accept, or (to use an illustration which may strike a little more home) you might as reasonably accuse Mr. WAKLEY of injustice in neglecting the interests of his patients by abandoning a practice which must have been incalculably beneficial to them, and entering on a less arduous, but more profitable engagement. So much for Mr. Pattison's selfishness and injustice.

But it is in the latter end of your remarks, as in the postscript of a lady's letter, that the nucleus of the professor's offence is to be sought for. How dared he (not having the fear of Wakley in his eyes) to lay bare the interested unworthy conduct of one whose name should have been sacred, being one which *THE LANCET* delighted to honour? No one who has had an opportunity of see-

ing the late lamented Mr. Bennett in the dissecting room, can entertain a doubt of his splendid anatomical attainments, nor has any person been more willing to acknowledge the fact than Mr. Pattison, as witness his *voluntary* surrender to the above-named gentleman of a portion of his professorship, in order, if possible to restore harmony. Acknowledging then, as I do, Mr. Bennett's talents as an anatomist, I do most unequivocally condemn his conduct towards Mr. Pattison, as altogether unworthy his high character; still more do I condemn the conduct of the Council, in placing in a subordinate situation a man of such high repute in the anatomical world; still, having accepted such a situation, it was undoubtedly his duty to have acted with all becoming deference to his *superior* in *office*, instead of fomenting disturbances against him. Again, Sir, you accuse the Professor of incompetence to teach anatomy, forgetting that the very body whose proceedings you attempt to justify, have themselves declared, in the very minute of Council which announces his dismissal, that "nothing that has come to their knowledge, has at all tended to impugn the moral or professional character of Professor Pattison."*

In conclusion, I have only to deprecate your endeavours to create in the minds of students a spirit of insubordination towards their superiors in years and attainments, and whose disgraceful conduct in the present instance towards their highly-talented and shamefully ill-used Professor, you not only attempt to justify, but absolutely to applaud; which conduct, as Professor Pattison most justly observes, would in any other University in the world have been punished by their instant dismissal, and has well nigh been the ruin of an institution which at first seemed to promise incalculable blessings to the rising generation.

I am Sir, your obedient servant,

G. BUTTER,
A Student, but not a Pupil of
Mr. Pattison.

London, Sept. 3d, 1831.

EXPOSURE

OF QUACKERIES IN DENTAL SURGERY.

By J. L. LEVISON, Esq.

SIR,—As your valuable journal is devoted to every branch of surgical practice, I trust you will favour me by inserting the following remarks, which are intended to expose the nefarious practices of mercenary char-

* Not having Mr. Pattison's pamphlet before me, I merely quote from memory; I believe I am right in substance, if not in the exact terms.