

ples and fears being put quite out of the question—there is not a surer character of a skilful and honest practitioner than the straightforward use of the means he possesses to alleviate or remove disease.

Gentlemen, appearing for the first time before you as a recognised teacher in the medical school of this University, my observations have necessarily been confined to the connexion between veterinary and medical science; otherwise I might have shown the importance of these lectures as a portion of general science, and as connected with agriculture; as unfolding those principles on which a judgment of the exterior of horses and cattle depends; their beauty; their general utility; their adaptation to particular purposes; the proper management of them, and the enjoyment of profit we may derive from them. These will be points that I shall never lose sight of; all my descriptions of structure or disease will have this as their grand aim and object.

I have addressed myself to-day to the medical student; but I am free to confess, that my lectures will be equally, or indeed more anxiously, composed for other classes—the veterinary pupil and the possessor of horses and cattle; that the one may be prepared for the exercise of his profession, and the other for the management and enjoyment of his agricultural property. So far I may be considered as occupying a kind of border-ground between the two schools, and I must endeavour to accomplish the difficult task of adapting myself to the character of each—to render my lectures sufficiently scientific to satisfy the veterinary and medical student, yet not so abstruse or intricate as to cease to interest the general inquirer.

I am painfully sensible of the extent as well as difficulty of that which I have undertaken. While nine professors, of whom as a collective body this University and the medical world may well be proud, unite their labours in unfolding the principles of human medicine, on one poor individual is thrown the task of teaching those of veterinary practice. Well, I must apply myself in good earnest to my work. A sense of its extent and importance must stimulate and not depress; zeal and industry must supply the place of other requisites, and, perhaps, at some future period, and the sooner the better for the interests of science, and I do trust of this Institution too, other and abler men may be permitted to unite with me in demonstrating, that in the importance of its object, and its connexion with science—*Ars veterinaria, post medicinam, secunda est.*

## UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.

REPLY OF MR. EX-PROFESSOR PATTISON TO THE LETTERS OF DRs. TURNER AND THOMSON, AND THE STRICTURES OF THE EDITOR OF THE LANCET.

*To the Editor of THE LANCET.*

SIR,—I prefaced my communication at p. 225, (last vol.) which contained an examination of the facts of Dr. Turner's letter, by stating that the letters of Drs. Turner and Thomson are to be considered as joint productions, and consequently that the charges or denials contained in either are to be considered as having been made by both parties. This fact being borne in the mind of your reader, I now take up the review of

### DR. THOMSON'S LETTER.

I have accused Drs. Turner and Thomson of having been engaged in "a most wicked conspiracy" to drive me from the University of London, and of their having been active agents in caballing with the warden, and certain of the students, to accomplish that object. As might be expected, these individuals deny the charge. It is natural for them to do so. It is one of a very heinous character, and if it can be substantiated, their reputation for gentlemanly feeling and moral principle is for ever forfeited. I think you will admit, Sir, that if you happened to be placed in the jury-box at the Old Bailey, your belief as to the innocence or guilt of a prisoner brought up to the bar for trial, would be in no degree affected by his entering the plea "Not guilty." Or if you had been fortunate enough to have succeeded in the object of your ambition, and had been appointed one of the coroners for Middlesex, your judicial decisions would have been dictated by the impressions received from the evidence presumptive or positive adduced on any particular investigation, and not from the declaration of innocence, however loudly pronounced by the accused party. I repeat that the charge which I have brought against Drs. Turner and Thomson is a very serious one, and I would insist, that on every principle of law and justice the question of their innocence or guilt ought not to be decided by their denial of the charge, but by a deliberate and dispassionate examination of the evidence on which it is supported.

I shall support my charge as to the guilt of Drs. Turner and Thomson, 1st. By the confession of a party in the conspiracy, Dr. Alexander Thomson, who admits that he was employed as a "tool" to accomplish my ruin, and who, to use his own language, became "king's evidence." To prevent

cavil, I shall quote the passage where he makes the confession :—

"If Professor Bennett is angry at his letters being published, he must remember that the 'galled jade will wince;' that when men *conspire* with one another (as the professors have done), and then desert their *tool* through a grovelling fear even of Mr. Brougham's thunder, he can only defend himself by turning king's evidence."—*London Medical and Surgical Journal*, No. 29. p. 441.

2d. I shall adduce, in further support of the charge, what I conceive to be strong presumptive evidence,

1st. The following statements are made by this said witness, Dr. Alexander Thomson, in a communication which he published in the Number of the Journal above referred to. And be it observed that this "king's evidence" is the son of my late colleague, Professor A. Todd Thomson. It is scarcely possible to believe that a son would exaggerate the truth for the purpose of criminating the character of a father.

"In the meantime the professors" (alluding to Drs. Turner and Thomson) "took every occasion to blame the supineness of the medalists to make complaints personally to the members of the Council to cultivate the dissatisfaction of the pupils."—p. 439. "Mr. Bell had already tendered his resignation, and had explicitly stated, or been understood to state, in his valedictory lecture, that unless one teacher was removed, he would not again have the honour or pleasure to address his pupils."—p. 440. "That several of the professors declared unequivocally, publicly, privately, unreservedly, that they would leave the institution if Pattison remained; and one went so far as to say to the clerk in the robing-room, before all the menials of the institution, that unless Professor Pattison was dismissed, he might consider his five shares in the market."—p. 440.

I might quote from this document other passages to the same effect, but the above I consider sufficient. The next facts furnished by the king's evidence, Dr. Alexander Thomson, are taken from a letter which he published and circulated. They, if possible, establish the fact of a conspiracy having existed against me, and of Drs. Turner and Thomson having been parties in it, more conclusively than the foregoing :—

"That Professors Turner and Thomson asserted in my presence, and in that of many others, that unless the 'odious man' was dismissed, they would leave the school; and that I might assure Eisdell and the others, that they would assist them to the utmost in procuring his dismissal. Remember the promises, the faithless woman-like promises, you made to Eisdell, the painful earnestness you listened to, and cultivated the dissatisfaction of the pupils," &c.

These two passages are particularly worthy of attention, for the fact of Mr. Eisdell, the ringleader of the riotous students having been incited by Doctors Turner and Thomson to play the part which he performed in the transaction is corroborated in both of them. Dr. A. Todd Thomson declaimed most loudly at the late meeting of the proprietors against my cruelty and unkindness in outrag-

ing the feelings of a father, by the republication of the confessions of his son. In answer to such declamation, I would ask—Do I owe Dr. A. Thomson any kindness? If a man attacked you on the highway, and attempted your life, would you hesitate a moment to blow out his brains, if you had the means, because you knew he was the father of a family, and that by doing so you would render his wife a widow and his children fatherless? To a professional man, his reputation is surely as dear as his life; and when Dr. A. Todd Thomson, as I have proved in my "Statement," has done all that in him lies to ruin mine, can I with justice be blamed for exposing his conduct, though I may be compelled, in doing so, to bring forward the confession of his own son?

2d. The *presumptive evidence* which I shall adduce in support of the charge is to the following effect :—During the whole of last session, and particularly during the period when the riots were going forward in my class, Drs. Turner and Thomson continued in the most intimate connexion with Eisdell, and with the other leaders of the rioters. This is a fact of perfect notoriety, and my colleagues can prove, that day after day these professors were to be seen communing with Eisdell, and the other pupils who had rendered themselves most conspicuous from the insults they had offered to their professor. Putting the fact of my competency or incompetency out of the question, it will surely be conceded, that it was the duty of all the professors to have discountenanced the system of riot and insubordination which was in operation last session, and which has left an indelible disgrace on the character of the University of London. It is proved, however, that during the whole progress of the riots, Drs. Turner and Thomson continued to treat with *marked* civility and attention those young men who were the most prominent actors in the scenes of riot and insubordination. The moral operation of this conduct on the part of those professors it is easy to appreciate, and it requires no argument to prove that its effect must necessarily have been to encourage the pupils to persevere in the line of behaviour they were pursuing. The charges which Eisdell and the other fifteen students had been induced to bring against my competency as a teacher of anatomy the previous summer, had been so perfectly and satisfactorily refuted, that the Council had, *without any solicitation on my part, appointed me to an additional professorship*. Yet, although the charges of these pupils had been proved to be frivolous, vexatious, and utterly without foundation, still no mark of disapprobation had been inflicted on the complainants; on the contrary, they were distin-

guished by Drs. Turner and Thomson as having performed an acceptable service in impeaching the character of their professor, and Mr. Eisdell was rewarded for the leading part he had performed by being invited to every conversazione held during the session, a mark of distinction conferred only on him and a few of the others who had associated with him in impeaching a professor. It may be supposed that Eisdell's superior eminence as a student outweighed every other consideration, but the reverse is the fact. By his written examination, delivered a few days before he had the boldness to charge the Professor of Anatomy with being incompetent to teach that science, he is convicted, although a student of two years standing, of ignorance which would have disgraced a pupil who had only attended lectures for three months. Indeed he has the effrontery to confess it, in a letter addressed to you and published at p. 763.—“To Mr. Pattison's charge, that of ‘deplorable ignorance of anatomy as a student,’ as the charge has reference to my anatomical knowledge more than twelve months ago” (he it observed this was the time he came forward to declare the incompetency of his professor), “I am perfectly ready to submit, in so far as it only relates to certain points of descriptive anatomy.”

Whether Mr. Eisdell has since acquired some knowledge of anatomy, as he would wish it to be inferred, is a matter which has nothing to do with the present question. It may, however, be remarked, that if the fact is so, it is rather remarkable that at the last examination, in May last, he did not gain even an honour, which requires only a very low degree of acquirement in either the late Mr. Bennett's class or my own; and although he had been a pupil at the University since its foundation, three years ago, the only evidence of his medical proficiency which he was able to obtain was an *honour* in the class of the practice of physic, and another in the class of botany, where there were *only* four competitors, and in which the medal was carried off by Mr. Douglas, who had only attended lectures for *six months*!!!

But the fact of Doctors Turner, and Thomson, and Grant, caballing with the students, is established by stronger evidence than that which may be inferred from their marked attention to the riotous pupils. They were actually detected by my late colleagues, Messrs. De Morgan and Key, assembled in conclave on a holiday, when they did not expect that any of the professors would be about the building, plotting in the professor's room with the insubordinate pupils.

This is the evidence on which I found my charge as to the guilt of the parties whom I have accused of having been en-

gaged in a conspiracy to ruin a colleague. I shall leave it without comment for the profession to examine and deliberate on, and having done so, as a grand jury, let them return their own verdict.

2nd. The next point in Dr. Thomson's letter which I shall notice, is his assertion that Dr. Birkbeck became convinced of the necessity of my removal from my professorship, and that he actually consulted “a medical friend as to the question, whether Dr. Jonas Quain or Mr. Grainger would be the proper successor to Mr. Pattison.” The best mode of answering this gross misrepresentation is to publish the following letter, received from Dr. Birkbeck:—

“50, Broad Street, Sept. 2.

“My dear Sir,—If any-thing that happens about the London University could surprise one, it would be the use which is made of my name in the silly letter of Dr. Thomson. I have, however, thought it right to send him an answer, of which the following is a copy:—

“Sir,—I have this moment seen the pamphlet issued by Dr. Turner and yourself. In page 13, I am stated to have considered Mr. Pattison's ‘removal necessary,’ when the truth is that I have never considered it otherwise than unnecessary and unjust. I never ‘consulted a medical friend as to the question, whether Dr. Jonas Quain or Mr. Grainger would be the proper successor to Mr. Pattison;’ but I have repeatedly said, both in the Council and elsewhere, that either of them, if joined with Mr. Pattison, would be an excellent *coadjutor* in conducting the anatomical, surgical, and dissecting departments. I remember differing in opinion with Dr. Davis, I preferring Grainger to Quain; but as to the two individuals, knowing well their respective qualifications, I never consulted any one as to their merits. The whole is an absolute misrepresentation, calculated to make me appear inconsistent in a point from which I have never swerved.

“In the letter from Mr. Horner to Mr. Hogg, as usual, Mr. Horner has contrived to give the matter an aspect unfavourable to Pattison. I was desired to request Mr. Pattison to resume his attendance, *discontinued on account of his persecutions*, not to speak to him respecting his non-attendance, which I did not in the slightest degree refer to. When the absence of Mr. Pattison was mentioned, I stated that, situated as he was, it was not likely that he would attend; but I assured the Council, that if the state of the dispensary, and its present difficulties, were mentioned by me to him, he would be so good, notwithstanding, to proceed with its duties. With this request he cheerfully complied.

“These explanations I have deemed it necessary to send to Mr. Pattison. I am, yours, &c.

“GEORGE BIRKBECK.”

“Of this letter in your address, or elsewhere, you will make what use you please. If you do not notice the first mis-statement in your appeal, I must do it.

“With great regard I remain,

“Ever faithfully yours,

“GEORGE BIRKBECK.

“To G. S. Pattison, Esq.”

So far was my friend Dr. Birkbeck from having ever contemplated the necessity of my removal from the University, that he was, in the Council and out of it, most consistent in the expression of his belief, that my continuing to be a Professor in the institution was not only essential to its honour, but likewise to its success; and in his opinion, at least (and be it observed he was

the only medical member of the Council), I have ever been considered both in talent and acquirement, not second to any of my medical colleagues. After the death of Mr. Bennett, another appointment became absolutely necessary, for it was not to be expected that I would have undertaken the whole duties of the anatomical and surgical departments. It is but doing justice to Mr. Grainger to state, that he never was a candidate.

3d. The statement which is insinuated in both of the letters, that my friend Dr. Davis became at last convinced of my incompetency, is equally false. That gentleman not being a proprietor himself, requested Mr. De Morgan publicly to contradict this statement at a late meeting of the proprietors, and further to declare that he had the highest opinion of my talents, acquirements, and capacity for the discharge of the duties of my professorships; and he has since, on the occasion of a dinner given by the Veterinary Club, come forward himself, and most nobly vindicated my reputation, declaring, "that in his opinion my talents and capacity are of the highest order, and that had I not been subjected to heartless and unceasing persecutions, generated by a most base conspiracy, of which I had been made the victim, I would now have been one of the most distinguished and useful professors in the University." It is painful for me to be forced to repeat a eulogium which a friend, perhaps a partial one, has uttered, but, to repel slander, I am constrained to do so; and I may be further excused in correcting an impression which has been most assiduously circulated, viz., that my talents and character were held in very low estimation by my colleagues. This is a gross misrepresentation of the truth, as I shall easily be able to prove. The Professors of the University of London may be divided into two classes, 1st, Those whose duties and hours of lecturing bring them into daily and intimate communication, and, consequently, enable them to form a correct estimate of each other; and, 2dly, Those whose duties seldom bring them into communion with their colleagues. The following Professors may be named as belonging to the first class,—Drs. Conolly, Davis, Lardner, Grant, Thomson, Rosen, Turner, and Messrs. De Morgan, Key, Long, and McCulloch; now out of these eleven Professors, it will be found, that with the exception of Drs. Grant, Thomson, and Turner, whom I have accused of having been parties in the conspiracy against me, all the rest have been my warm friends and supporters, and have both publicly and privately offered the strongest testimony in favour of my talents and character. These gentlemen would, I believe, have no hesitation in testifying as to their belief in my having been made the

victim of intrigue and cabal; some of them, indeed, have declared publicly their conviction of this fact, and have stated their opinion of my qualifications as a teacher, as the following extracts from their published letters will prove. Dr. Conolly in his letter says,

"I am grieved, but not surprised, to learn that your enemies have at length almost gained their object, of driving you from your professorship. The unremitting efforts which have been made to make you unpopular with your class, would have overwhelmed any man. No words can convey the indignation and contempt with which I have witnessed the proceedings of those who have laboured to effect the ruin of your reputation and your prospects," &c. "As a stranger in England, your lectures have, I know, been frequently attended by practitioners from distant parts of the country. Many of these have expressed to me the satisfaction with which they have heard you, and concurred with me" (Dr. Conolly attended regularly, during an entire session, my lectures on anatomy and surgery), "and all your former pupils, in thinking that, in a clear and animated description of the most important parts of anatomy, and in the power of associating anatomical and practical knowledge, you were eminently distinguished. But, my dear Sir, it is in vain to represent all this. Intrigues appear to have been long since commenced against you from selfish motives, and they have been continued from mere malignity and party spirit. The excitable feelings of inexperienced young men have been artfully wrought upon, your pupils, chiefly the least distinguished amongst them, have been engaged in scenes of disturbance,—odium has been thrown on you and your lectures, and no rest or interval of peace has been permitted to you," &c. &c.

In conclusion, Dr. Conolly observes,

"But the conviction on my mind will always be, that you have been the victim of a most wicked conspiracy, and that if you had only been allowed to pursue your duties unmolested, you would have been one of the most useful teachers of anatomy in Europe."

Dr. Lardner, in a letter which he addressed to the Council, and which is published in my "STATEMENT," makes the following observations. Speaking of my lecturing, he observes,

"His" (Mr. Pattison's) "style of lecturing appeared to me to be unusually clear and impressive; he possessed uncommon fluency and propriety of language, and his illustrations were copious and prompt. The perspicuous manner in which he unfolded the details of a very complicated subject, was to me unequivocal evidence that he thoroughly understood what he taught," &c. Again, "If I were to speak of Mr. Pattison comparatively with others, I do not know that I could point out any lecturer whom I consider superior to him in these general qualities of an instructor, which an individual ignorant of the science which the teacher is enabled to appreciate. Entertaining the opinion which I do of Mr. Pattison's qualifications, I would deplore his removal from the University, as an event which would be more injurious to it than the loss of almost any other Professor; certainly more so than the loss of any of his medical colleagues. It is greatly to be lamented, that some of his medical colleagues did not devote their time and attention to the improvement of those qualities in which Mr. Pattison is so conspicuously their superior, instead of engaging in the ungracious and unworthy task of accomplishing the ruin of their most respectable and gifted colleague, by giving countenance and encouragement, as I understand they did, to those riots amongst the students which have disgraced the institution,"

Such are the opinions entertained and expressed of my character by the most distinguished of my colleagues of the first class, and of my having been sacrificed to the intrigues of an infamous conspiracy. The gentlemen of the second have, so far as I know, taken no part in this transaction, but I believe I may be permitted to say that they have never uttered any sentiment derogatory to my reputation. Drs. Grant, Thomson, and Turner, it would therefore appear, are the only members of the Professorial Body who have ever defamed my reputation as a teacher. If I have succeeded in convicting these individuals of having been engaged in the cabal, which it is admitted did exist, to "drive me from the University," any expression unfavourable to my talent and capacity coming from them can be considered of no value. But allowing for a moment that their characters for fairness in this transaction have been in no degree impeached, still the circumstance of their having expressed an opinion unfavourable to my qualifications as a teacher, cannot be considered as sufficient to prove in the face of other evidence that I am not really an able and useful lecturer. Men's opinions may be very much divided as to the kind of instruction which it is most valuable to convey to a class of medical students. Allowing to Drs. Grant and Thomson all the honesty and integrity of purpose which their warmest friends could ask for them, still I would insist that the fact of my mode of teaching not having found favour in their estimation, is very far from proving that my system of teaching is a bad one.

I hold that neither Drs. Grant nor Thomson are good judges of the best instruction which a professor can convey to his pupils, and I think this will be admitted from the statement of the following facts:—One day when I was in the habit of visiting Dr. Grant, having called on him he directed my attention to a large work which was lying on his table and made the following observations:—"Pattison, if you could only produce a work like that, you would render your name immortal. The GREAT MAN who has published it devoted his whole life to its preparation" (I think he mentioned forty years), "and I should be content to die if I could only leave such a legacy behind me." Anxious to examine the nature of the book which had excited so warmly Dr. Grant's admiration, I opened it, and to my amazement I found that the single subject treated by the author was the anatomy of the beetle!!! In Dr. Grant's opinion the man who spends his whole life on the anatomy of the beetle renders himself immortal, whilst in mine he is convicted of the wilful waste of his existence, which was surely bestowed

on him for other and more important purposes. Dr. Grant may therefore honestly believe that because my lectures on anatomy were all made to bear on the great, and to the medical practitioner, the all-important doctrines of practice, that I am an incompetent teacher of anatomy. That I had devoted my time and attention to the idle and unprofitable speculations of some of the German anatomists, and for example, spent nearly the whole session in the attempt to prove an absurdity, viz. that all the bones of the skull are vertebræ, I should then have merited and received the mead of his approbation.

To give the profession an idea of the calibre of Dr. Thomson's mind, and to enable them to judge of the value of his opinion as to what constitutes effective teaching, I shall only state that I have been informed by his pupils that in his lectures on *materia medica* he devoted five of them to the article SNUFF!! The opinion of a man who could do so, as to the best system of lecturing on anatomy, can scarcely be allowed to have much weight. In his own opinion there is no professor in the University of London who stands so high as Dr. Thomson, but unfortunately in that of his colleagues there is no man whose talents and capacity are held in such low estimation. I would recommend to his attention the lines of his countryman Robert Burns,

"O would some power the giftie gie us,  
To see ourselves as others see us."

The last remarks which I shall offer on the letters of Drs. Turner and Thomson, will apply to the charge which is contained in their appendix, and which refers to my irregularity of attendance at the University Dispensary. But before doing so, I would beg leave to call the attention of the profession to the evidence which the fact of the Council furnishing them with the documents affords, of the system of *fairness* adopted by them in relation to me.

When I began the preparation of my "Statement," I addressed a letter to the Council, requesting them to furnish me with certain minutes and other documents in their possession which were essential to my defence. Now although some of these were *private letters addressed to myself*, which I was certainly entitled to demand, my request was refused, as the following note will prove:—

"University of London, July 30, 1831.

"Dear Sir,—I laid before the Council your letter to them of yesterday, asking for certain documents in their hands; and I am directed to inform you that they decline giving them to you for the purpose of publication as specified in your letter. I am, my dear Sir, very faithfully yours,

"THOMAS COATES.

"G. S. Pattison, Esq."

The Council refused me copies of the documents in their hands, when they were asked, for the purpose of vindicating my character, but the minutes of the Council are given without hesitation to Drs. Turner and Thomson, "*for the purpose of publication*," when they are requested by my late colleagues to use in slandering my character.

Last summer, eight of my colleagues and myself addressed statements to the Council, for the purpose of "explaining the evils which existed in the University, and to assign the remedies for these evils." I had occasion in my "Statement" to advert to this charge about the Dispensary, which Drs. Turner and Thomson, although in possession of my apology, have again brought forward, and in answering it now, I shall merely quote the explanation which I then gave of my conduct as it related to the irregularity of my attendance at the Dispensary.

"The next tangible complaint which was made against me, was one for which I admit there was some foundation. What I complain of was the manner in which the inquiry was gone into; instead of asking me if the fact of my irregularity of attendance at the Dispensary was true, and if I had any reason for it, no intimation was sent me of the complaint. The apothecary of the institution was *privately* sent for, and examined by a *finance committee*, and some most severe animadversions were made on my conduct, and addressed to the medical faculty, before I had had an opportunity of pleading a word in vindication. Now I conceive I am entitled to complain of such a procedure. If the finance committee, on having the complaint communicated to them by the warden had only sent for me, I think I could in ten minutes have shown them that my irregularity did not proceed from any want of zeal in the service of the University. I would have proved to them that the reason why I had not been very regular in my attendance arose from the conviction, that from the trifling nature of the surgical cases which presented themselves, my services would be more useful in the University than at the Dispensary; and I had generally, when I did not go myself, sent my private pupil to Mr. Hogg to inquire if there was any case which it was desirable for me to examine; and if so, that I was at the dissecting-room, and would at once visit the patient. I could likewise have proved to them that whenever cases of interest did occur, no man could have been more zealous in his professional attendance; that in more instances than one I had left my bed, and visited patients at that distant part of the city; and that in some cases on which I had operated, I had made as many as three visits in one day. I say, if this open and friendly vindication had been allowed me, my feelings would have been spared the pain of unmerited suspicion, and the interests of the University would not have been compromised."

As to the charge of irregularity, as it applies to this summer, Dr. Birkbeck's letter to Dr. Thomson answers it. When impeached by the Council, and when proceedings were going on for my expulsion, it was not to be expected that I should continue my attendance at the Dispensary. When, however, my friend asked me to oblige him by doing so, painful as the duty was, I did not shrink from it, and I conti-

nued most regularly to perform my duties there, until I was dismissed from my professorship by the most unjust sentence delivered by the Council on the 23d of July last.

I shall have the honour next week of addressing myself to the strictures which you yourself have made on the facts of my statement.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

GRANVILLE S. PATTISON.

120, Regent Street, Sept. 24th, 1831.

---

ON THE  
CAUSES AND TREATMENT OF  
DEAFNESS.

No. VI.\*

By W. WRIGHT, Esq., Surgeon-Aurist,  
London.

---

GALVANISM AND ELECTRICITY.

GALVANISM, like all newly-discovered remedies, was considered capable of affording relief in almost every disease. In many cases it failed, through the incapacity of the professor, and, in more instances, the hopes of the afflicted, which had been highly excited by the interested statements of individuals who made a species of trade of the practice of electricity and galvanism, were disappointed through the inefficiency of those agents to perform what was expected from them. At the present day we continually see in periodical medical works, accounts of cures effected by some medical electrician or galvanist, and new diseases are continually subjected to their treatment with "complete success;" at least so say these would-be scions of Æsculapius.

Galvanism, or electricity produced by oxidation, like that produced by attrition, has been used very generally in cases of deafness; for small works, or rather books full of cases, of Mr. A., Sir O. B., or Mrs. Q., have been very extensively circulated, and patients seeing an account of cures which have been performed (upon paper) on persons *old*, *infirm*, and who had been deaf *forty years* or upwards, are attracted by the statements, and become the dupes of the charlatan. This has led the professional world to the conclusion, that no dependence is to be placed on electricity or galvanism; and really the opinion is not to be wondered at, as most of those who have

---

\* See last volume, in further reply to Dr. Frobroke's paper, No. 7, in THE LANCET, April 9, 1831.