

hundred guineas by having spent the money in grinding. I beg to inform him I never yet ground for any diploma; but I imagine he must (being so familiar with the expression) have pretty well polished himself at the grinding-stone before he passed the M.D. degree.

This last scurrilous attack of your cowardly, anonymous scribbler is truly pitiable. I again repeat, I will satisfy him my diploma cost me what I state, if he will, in a manly and honourable manner, sign his proper name and address; unless he does so, I shall now decline taking any more notice of him, write or say what he may.—Yours obediently,
Cheltenham, April, 1849. W. PHILPOT BROOKES, M.D.

THE LUNACY COMMISSION.

To SAMUEL GASKELL, Esq., F.R.C.S.E., and one of her Majesty's Commissioners in Lunacy, &c. &c.

DEAR SIR,—We, members of the Association of Medical Officers of Hospitals for the Insane, feeling highly gratified at the selection made by the Lord Chancellor of you, the Superintendent of the Lancaster County Lunatic Asylum, and a member of this Association, to fill the office of Commissioner in Lunacy, take the earliest opportunity of expressing our feelings and congratulations to you; and the assurance that, in our opinion, no one could have been appointed to that office more qualified to discharge its duties efficiently, or more calculated to give satisfaction to those of the medical profession with whom you will thereby be brought into contact.

We fervently hope that you may long enjoy good health to hold the same, and to assist us (in your now more elevated position) in the accomplishment of those objects—viz., “the improvement of lunatic asylums, the treatment of the insane, and the acquirement of a more extensive and more correct knowledge of insanity,” for which the Association was founded.—And we remain, dear Sir, sincerely and faithfully yours,

J. S. ALDERSON, M.R.C.S.	SIR A. MORISON, M.D.
W. C. BEGLEY, M.D.	P. R. NESBITT, M.D.
ROBERT BOYD, M.D.	RICHARD OLIVER, M.D.
J. BROADHURST, M.R.C.S.	H. F. PROSSER, M.R.C.S.
J. C. BUCKNILL, M.D.	ROBERT STEWART, M.D.
W. M. BUSH, M.D.	A. J. SUTHERLAND, M.D., F.R.S.
JOHN CONOLLY, M.D.	SAMUEL S. THOMPSON, M.D.
C. C. CORSELLIS, M.D.	JOHN THURNAM, M.D.
E. D. DE VITRE, M.D.	D. T. TYERMAN, M.R.C.S.
JOHN HITCHMAN, M.D.	F. D. WALSH, M.R.C.S.
JOHN HOLLAND, M.R.C.S.	R. LOYD WILLIAMS, M.D.
JAMES E. HUXLEY, M.D.	J. C. WILLIAMS, M.D.
GEO. T. JONES, M.R.C.S.	F. T. WINTLE, M.D.
J. KIRKMAN, M.D.	JAMES WILKES, M.R.C.S.
WM. LEY, M.R.C.S.	SAMUEL HITCH,
RICH. MALLAM, M.R.C.S.	W. W. WILLIAMS,

} Joint Secs.

APOTHECARIES' HALL v. LOBO.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—These are not times when medical men should fall into troubled waters.

1. Upon what principle of law can the Company depute another to bring an action for the £20?

2. What consequences would be entailed upon the “trading” Company if it did?

3. Can more than one action be brought against the same defendant? If it can, and should be attempted, then by what means could the defendant relieve himself?

4. Could not “grave” questions of the utmost moment to the Company be raised upon a rule nisi?

5. Has it not been settled that an indictment may lie against a Public Company? If so, what would be the consequences in this instance, if found, tried, and verdict had?

6. Of what value is a County-Court decision? quâ County Court?

7. What does the ancient law upon a multiplicity of suits mean?

8. Do not manifold principles at common law (both on the Crown and civil sides) show, if brought to bear on this question, that the soundest and safest plan will be to forget the decision, and obtain a good Medical Bill, than fall back upon a decision that will “ultimately” produce nothing but disaster, by provoking questions that had better sleep? Let the profession think of this, and not push “fanciful” remedies at law “too close,” as, rely upon it, in this instance, “glass is beneath the naked feet.”—Very faithfully yours,
Chancery Lane, 1849.

H. H. PYKE.

ON MEDICAL AND SCIENTIFIC NOMENCLATURE.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Far from calling in question the prerogative of the reviewer of my “Dissertation on Scientific Nomenclature.” (see page 154 of this volume,) on the contrary, feeling gratified by and grateful for the candour and commendatory tone of his criticism, I respectfully offer a few words in explanation of the expressions pointed out by him as not sufficiently intelligible. The first of these is—that I have refrained from consulting “Hoblyn’s Dictionary” and “Palmer’s Pentaglott Dictionary,” for “obvious reasons,” which reasons he holds to be not obvious at all. When the first edition of my book was published I was a student, and ignorant of the existence of the former of these dictionaries. Soon afterwards, my publishers (Carfrae and Son, Edinburgh) one day placed it in my hands, much to my chagrin for the moment, as a work similar to mine. I looked at a page or two, and found, to my great relief, that in purpose, style, and general character, it was essentially different. The plan and arrangement of my book were all my own, and they embrace, as will be seen, many peculiarities, which I believe to be improvements. Knowing how apt the mind is to become imbued, almost unconsciously, with the views of others, and how soon its possessor may adopt, and in time even feel secure in looking upon, them as really and originally his, I determined not to risk being swayed by the perusal of Hoblyn’s, or of Palmer’s Dictionary, subsequently published, at least until fixed in the plan and progress of my own. Both of these works may be full of excellence, and I hope yet to benefit by consulting them, but that very quality, most probably, might have drawn me into some alteration of my course, and therefore I avoided them. Something of this explanation I had introduced into a draft preface to my forthcoming edition, and hence the inadvertent use of the words “obvious reasons” where, in absence of such explanation, they were inappropriate.

The next example of my imputed unintelligibility is this:—“Moreover, they (the faulty terms) are transferred into our English dictionaries, from the humblest in which they are to be seen at all, to that of the newest and loftiest assumption.” Now this, I must say for myself, appears to me, as to some others whom I have questioned, to be clear enough. But I will put my meaning in other phrase, to remove all difficulty. The humblest English dictionary—and the small, cheap, diamond editions of Johnson answer this character—gives “spheroid” as a substantive, “a body approaching the form of a sphere, but not exactly round,” and “spheroidal, spheroidal, of the form of a spheroid,” &c. The “Imperial English Dictionary,” which appears to be a pretty close transcript of Webster, and may be called “of the newest and loftiest assumption,” contains the same erroneous representations, but in vastly greater number, from its comprehensive bulk, and such also is the case with the intermediate works, varying only in number.

The third and last of the objections stated, rests on the following sentence—“And if, in spite of all propriety, the Linnæan titles were to be maintained as nouns feminine, we should have to view the English adjectives as specialties in English scientific terminology; we should have to convert them, therefore, into Latin again, by creating new analogues, in addition to, but the same in at least one gender, as the falsely reputed nouns from which they sprung.” I admit that my subject having become very familiar to me, I may have relied too much on the quick perception of my readers, forgetting that they have not had the same advantage of previous intimacy. Again, I will put the sentence in a different form. Suppose that *Pentandria* were to be maintained as a noun feminine, then we must hold the English adjective *Pentandrious*, as a specialty in English scientific terminology; that is, as having no strictly corresponding term in the Latin. But, as such a Latin adjective is really required, we should have to convert this word *Pentandrious* into Latin again, by creating a new analogue viz.—*Pentandrius, a, um*, in addition to, but the same in at least one gender (the feminine), as the falsely reputed noun *Pentandria*, from which it sprung.

It may be proper to state that I attach a particular meaning to the word analogue as here employed. By it I wish to express, not merely a synonyme, but a closely analogous term, varying, in fact, only in the final syllable, for the most part. Thus *ovoides* is the Latin analogue of ovoid, but egg-like, egg-shaped, oval, oviform, are merely its synonymes.

Trusting I have made myself more intelligible on this occasion, I am, your obedient servant,

Leeds, March, 1849.

R. G. MAYNE.