

leads the observer into all sorts of erroneous conclusions and practices. My belief is, that when the auscultatory signs, in any given case, are such as not to present to an ordinarily educated stethoscopic observer clear and distinct indications of deviations from health, they are worth nothing as indications of diseased conditions.

I owe one word of explanation more to Dr. Smith and your readers. Thrice in one column he has made me guilty of uttering an unmeaning absurdity; and he has marked it well by the aid of inverted commas, and so made the most of it. I know not where Dr. E. Smith picked up the words "miliary tubercles widely distributed through the tubes of the lungs". I can assure him I never uttered such wild phraseology, and totally repudiate all connexion with any printer's devil that may have put such words into my mouth. What I did say, Dr. E. Smith may find by referring to my own report, published in your Journal, of the case which he criticises.

Commenting on my record of the case, Dr. Smith judicially observes, "there must be something wrong here". I can assure him that I still prefer the evidence of my own senses to his opinion—however much I value it—as to what *must have been*; and I will now leave it to the profession to decide whether there may not possibly be *something wrong there*—in Dr. Smith's logic—as well as here.

I am, etc.,

W. O. MARKHAM.

Clarges Street, April 18, 1857.

THE OPHTHALMOSCOPE.

LETTER FROM HOLMES COOTE, ESQ.

SIR,—The last number of your Journal contains a letter from Mr. Dixon, wherein he says that a statement of mine respecting the ophthalmoscope requires to be corrected. He remarks, that "undoubtedly Mr. Cumming was the first to point out that the fundus of the healthy human eye is not a black, but a coloured reflected surface", and that "this discovery led the way to Helmholtz's invention; but Mr. Cumming himself never constructed or suggested any form of ophthalmoscope."

I believe Mery was the first to notice the bright colour of the bottom of the eye, and the blood-vessels of the retina, in the beginning of the eighteenth century, by accidentally observing the appearances presented in the eye of a cat held under water. Five years after, Lattère pursued the investigation; and, in 1845, an essay on the subject was published by Dr. Kussmaul of Heidelberg. Mr. William Cumming, then, was not the first to point out that the fundus of the healthy human eye is a coloured reflecting surface; but he was, I believe, the first to lay down proper rules for employing light in the investigation of the morbid conditions of the deep-seated structures of the globe. The "merit of discovery" does not belong to those who have constructed complicated or simple instruments, based upon an established principle, but to him who first brought that principle to bear upon matters of practical utility.

I willingly acknowledge that to Helmholtz is due, in 1851, the merit of inventing the complicated apparatus which bears his name. The ophthalmoscope now in use is essentially the same in principle as that shewn to Mr. Wharton Jones by Mr. Babbage, about the year 1847. As Mr. Jones himself observes, "this ophthalmoscope of Mr. Babbage, we shall see, is in principle essentially the same as those of Elkins and Donders, of Cœcius and Meyerstein, which themselves are modifications of Helmholtz's."

I beg to refer those interested in the subject to a very able article by Mr. Wharton Jones, in the *British and Foreign Medical-Chirurgical Review*, vol. xiv, 1854.

In my lecture, delivered at St. Bartholomew's Hospital, on the ophthalmoscope, I wished to shew that which I believe is an ungrateful truth; namely, that we are very apt to overlook merit in our own countrymen, while diligently seeking to find it out in foreigners.

I am, etc.,

HOLMES COOTE.

Norfolk Street, Strand, April 20, 1857.

MR. FOX AND MR. TAYLOR.

LETTER FROM L. O. FOX, ESQ.

SIR,—I hoped the publication of my last letter in your Journal would have induced Mr. Taylor to make public his defence, or to explain his reasons for declining to do so.

It has been suggested, that fear of legal proceedings may prevent his speaking out. To obviate this difficulty, if it exist, I make

the following promise: That, if in the statement communicated privately and confidentially to the President of the Southampton Medical Society by Mr. Taylor, in his own justification, there be anything prejudicial to my private or professional reputation, which, if published, would render him liable to an action for libel (*Does Dr. Oke mean this when he alludes to painful results?*), I hereby promise to indemnify Mr. Francis Taylor from all legal consequences, if he will openly declare the same, provided he can offer the slightest evidence of the truth thereof.

For the last time, I call upon Mr. Taylor, as a member of a noble profession, as a gentleman, and as a man of honour, if he value the opinion of his brethren, to come out in broad daylight, disdaining the dark shadow of the president's chair, and let us read in your bold type what was communicated to Dr. Oke in secret, as Mr. Taylor's defence.

I am, etc.,

L. OWEN FOX.

Broughton, Stockbridge, April 20, 1857.

MEDICAL ETIQUETTE.

LETTER FROM JUKES STYRAP, M.D.

SIR,—The Council of the Salopian Medico-Ethical Society, while regretting the necessity for soliciting so large a space in the columns of the JOURNAL, will feel much obliged by insertion being given to the following correspondence on the subject of the Encouragement of Homœopaths by Legitimate Practitioners.

I am, etc.,

JUKES STYRAP, Hon. Sec.

Shrewsbury, 21st April, 1857.

I. The Secretary of the Salopian Medico-Ethical Society to James Long, Esq.

Shrewsbury, 6th April, 1857.

"SIR,—In accordance with my instructions from the Council of the Salopian Medico-Ethical Society, I beg to transmit for your consideration the enclosed copy of a Resolution, unanimously passed at their Half yearly Meeting held on the 26th ultimo, and approved at a subsequent meeting.

"I beg to add, that, should you feel aggrieved at the implied condemnation of your conduct as a medical practitioner in the case alluded to, the Council will be happy to summon a special meeting of their body for the purpose of hearing, and adjudicating upon any additional explanation you may personally wish to offer.

"I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

"JUKES STYRAP, Hon. Sec.

"James Long, Esq., 3, Hardman Street, Liverpool."

Copy of Resolution.

"After an anxious consideration of the case, and a careful perusal of the correspondence between Mr. J. R. Humphreys, Surgeon to the Salop Infirmary, and Mr. James Long, Surgeon to the Liverpool Royal Infirmary, which has recently appeared in the BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL, relative to an alleged breach of professional etiquette committed by Mr. Long in meeting in consultation a homœopathic practitioner, in the late fatal illness of A. W. Corbet, Esq., of Sundorne Castle, in this county—notwithstanding that Mr. W. J. Clement, a resident surgeon, had previously refused to consult on the case with the said homœopathist—of which fact Mr. Long admits his knowledge,—the Council in expressing their hearty approval of Mr. Clement's conduct throughout the affair, much regret the necessity for recording their deliberate opinion that the explanation offered by Mr. Long is far from satisfactory."

II. Mr. Long to the Honorary Secretary of the Salopian Medico-Ethical Society.

"3, Hardman Street, Liverpool, April 7th, 1857.

"SIR,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of a list of the members on the roll of the Salopian Medico-Ethical Society, and the Resolution which the Council have taken the trouble to pass, and the members to approve of, concerning me; also your note, in which you state, 'that, should you feel aggrieved at the *merited?* (I am not sure of the word) condemnation of your conduct as a medical practitioner in the case alluded to, the Council will be happy to summon a special meeting of their body for the purpose of hearing and adjudicating upon any additional explanation you may personally wish to offer.' I beg most respectfully to decline the above extraordinary proposal.

"I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

"JAMES LONG.

"To Jukes Styrap, M.D., Hon. Sec."

III. *The Honorary Secretary's Reply to Mr. Long.*

Shrewsbury, 11th April, 1857.

"SIR,—In reply to your note—which, though dated the 7th instant, was not received until the 9th,—allow me to request your re-perusal of my former communication, and I think that you will experience little or no difficulty in deciphering the word, specially alluded to, to be '*implied*', and not '*merited*'.

"With regard to 'the extraordinary proposal', as you are pleased to term it, I would beg to remark, that, however much so it may appear to yourself, you will, I believe, on inquiry, find it to be not only in perfect accordance with the laws of medical etiquette, but an acknowledged principle of society at large, whenever a member chooses to deviate from the defined rules of professional, or general etiquette.

"Since, however, you decline to avail yourself of the offer made by the Council of the Salopian Medico-Ethical Society, I am desired by Mr. Humphreys to solicit your attention to section 3, rule 2, p. 13, of the accompanying bye-laws, and to express his willingness to submit the matter in dispute, for adjudication, according to the principle therein laid down, or to any other which may be mutually agreed upon.

"As a slight proof of the Council's anxiety not, in any way, to prejudice you in the eye of the 'medical world', I beg to call your attention to the fact that no public allusion has been made to the following significant extract from a letter addressed (in December last) to myself, as Hon. Secretary, in answer to the Council's inquiry—'Whether you were a member of the Liverpool Medico-Ethical Association?'—in which case, it was intended to prefer a charge against you of a breach of professional etiquette, to be adjudicated upon by the Ethical Society of which you were supposed to be a member.

"I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

JUKES STYRAP, *Hon. Sec.*

James Long, Esq.

The following is the extract referred to in the last paragraph of Dr. Styrap's letter.

"Mr. J. Long of the Liverpool Infirmary was one of the original members of the Medico Ethical Society, but on finding that that body would not admit homœopaths, nor in any way recognise them, he sent in his resignation. It was understood at the time, that this step was taken that he might be at liberty to meet homœopathic practitioners."

IV. *Mr. Long's reply to the Hon. Secretary.*

3, Hardman Street, Liverpool, April 14th, 1857 (night).

"SIR,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 11th inst., and a copy of the rules and bye-laws of the Salopian Medico-Ethical Society. I do not find any law which authorises the council and members to pass resolutions condemnatory of a medical practitioner, not a member of the Society—but I do find the council have a power to censure or expel a member, after such member has received from the secretary seven days notice to attend the meeting, and the nature of the charges to be brought against him. I do find that no member shall practise, professedly or exclusively, homœopathy, hydropathy, or mesmerism, or other than legitimate medicine and surgery. I further find that members are not debarred from meeting duly qualified practitioners (with the reservation, I presume, of bye-laws) until the latter shall have been adjudged by the majority of the members to be practising irregularly. I do not find, by the proceedings of the half-yearly meeting which you transmitted to me, that Dr. Wilkin was a professed or exclusive homœopathist, or that he had been adjudicated to be an irregular practitioner.

"I have already stated that when I telegraphed I would meet George Wilkin, I did not at the time recollect who he was, and that I did not know that he was reputed to be a homœopathist, till I heard from his own lips that a Shrewsbury surgeon had declined to meet him on that ground. I consider the ample statement I have made in the BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL ought to be sufficient for any Society.

"I have already declined to plead at the bar of the Salopian Medico-Ethical Society. I decline equally to refer the subject of your letters to the 'Court Medical' proposed in your last. The council and members have already stated their decision; and I should expect but little favour from a 'Court Medical' composed of three practitioners, one named by me, the other by Mr. Humphreys, and the third by the council.

"I am surprised at the tone of your allusion to the late Medico-Ethical Society of Liverpool; my reasons for seceding from it were no secret, and they were openly stated at the time, in a letter addressed to the secretary.

"I must now beg to decline any further correspondence with the Salopian Medico-Ethical Society on the subject of your letters.

"I remain, sir, your obedient servant,

JAMES LONG.

Jukes Styrap, M.D., Hon. Sec. to the Salopian Medico-Ethical Society."

V. *The Hon. Secretary to Mr. Long.*

Shrewsbury, 20th April, 1857.

"SIR,—I regret the necessity for troubling you, contrary to your wish, with a reply to your last communication, the general tenour of which, I am requested to inform you, leaves the council no alternative but to submit the matter for the judgment of the profession at large, through the medium of the medical journals.

"So far from the council having, as you state, pronounced '*their decision*', you will find, on reference to the '*resolution*', that it was a simple expression of opinion, and left the case open for adjudication—a course perfectly legitimate, and in accordance with the spirit of the '*resolution*' passed at a recent meeting of your Hospital colleagues. And here I would beg to observe that, however satisfactory your statement in the BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL may have been to yourself individually, it does not appear to have been more approved by the medical and surgical staff of the Liverpool Royal Infirmary, than by the council of the Salopian Medico-Ethical Society, in confirmation of which, allow me to refer you to the record of their proceedings published in the same JOURNAL, on the 28th of February.

"At the same time, I beg to assure you that the council—composed of men of established local reputation—can well afford to disregard the imputation of partiality, which you have so illiberally sought to cast upon them. In answer, therefore, to your insinuation against the proposed '*Court Medical*', I will simply remark that the president of the Manchester Ethical Association would have been solicited to act, on behalf of the Salopian Society, in conjunction with the two medical men nominated by yourself and Mr. Humphreys; and a '*Court*', so constituted, ought to satisfy the most fastidious practitioner.

"I remain, sir, your obedient servant,

JUKES STYRAP, *Hon. Sec.*

James Long, Esq., Liverpool."

CONSULTATION WITH HOMŒOPATHIC PRACTITIONERS.

LETTER FROM JAMES LONG, ESQ.

"SIR,—In consequence of the letters which have appeared in the BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL, associating my name with Homœopathy, I have been much misrepresented both here and elsewhere, and subjected to annoying insinuations. I have, moreover, received from the secretary of the Salopian Medico-Ethical Society, a condemnatory resolution, passed by the council, and approved of by the members of that society at their half-yearly meeting, with an intimation, that if I felt aggrieved, I might appear in person to plead at the bar of that society. I declined this; and a proposal was made that I should submit to the arbitration of a "*Court Medical*," composed of three practitioners, one to be named by me, one by Mr. Humphreys, and the third by the council. I need scarcely remark, that I have declined this also.

I do feel aggrieved that, on the 13th of December last, I should have been dragged before the profession, and that on the 11th of April I should receive a proposal to submit to arbitration a matter which I am not singular in thinking, that my statements already published should have set at rest in the mind of any one who was solely seeking after truth. Direct charges may be met; but misrepresentations and insinuations are not so readily dealt with. I therefore now beg, through the medium of your JOURNAL, to state, for the information of those who make such free use of my name, the following remarks, which I hope will satisfy, not only my present traducers, but also those who might otherwise feel disposed to come after them.

When Homœopathy was first introduced into Liverpool, a paper upon that subject was read before the Medical Society by one of its members, a Homœopathist. In conjunction with others, I opposed the new doctrines to the utmost of my knowledge and ability. I adopted the same course when a paper was read, at a subsequent period, by the same gentleman, on the Treatment of Cholera. At this period, the only knowledge I possessed on the subject was derived from the *Organon* of Hahnemann. After the meeting, I was introduced to, and subsequently became acquainted with, an ardent fol-