

breach of trust confided in [the extra examiners, equally honourable men ?

The animus shown by "A London Teacher" against the University of Edinburgh is so apparent, that anything he may have to say will be properly valued by all right thinking men. All his letter suggests to me is the fable of the fox and the grapes. Can it be that he has a fellow-feeling with this fox ?

Into the good or bad taste shown by Professor Schäfer in discussing a matter of internal economy of the University of Edinburgh in a public journal, I need not enter.

With all the defects of the University of Edinburgh there are men all the world over, who are proud to be able to subscribe themselves as I do, and am,

August 10th.

AN EDINBURGH GRADUATE.

SIR,—From a "London Teacher's" letter on Scottish education, he seems strangely biased and ignorant on the subject. It is true that I have heard Edinburgh professors discourage standard works and wide reading, on the principle that wide reading can be done after qualifying, and that large standard works are too extensive for men to cram their brains with, and that their lectures will contain all that a man needs, replete with the latest information from any and every source, and what is more, showing out prominently the most salient points on every subject; but it is true likewise that many of us only jotted down the salient points, kept to standard works and passed on standard works, myself amongst the number. On a par is the tradition or bogey of each professor's fads impressed on every green student. The fact is, if a man knows his work he will pass, and if a man takes on himself to quote another authority, let him beware that he quotes it honestly and with understanding, otherwise if quoted and that wrongly to hide ignorance it will go against him. I have never known another authority when quoted but to be treated with respect so long as the student knew what he was talking about; as for books, nearly all the standard books read in Edinburgh are by London men; all along for every subject I used works by London men, and ignored my written lectures, like dozens and dozens—yes hundreds—of other men, and passed well. "London Teacher" has evidently got his information from some unsuccessful pupil or pupils; if wasters from London think they have only got to go up to Edinburgh and pass by bluffing they are mistaken; we see plenty of them in Edinburgh, and it is often there that they learn to work for the first time. As to fees, "London Teacher" is grossly ignorant; for many years University professors have received fixed salaries; for instance under the old fee system one professor received £4,000 a year; under the new system he now receives £2,000, and so it is with the others. Perhaps "London Teacher" has not discriminated between the College and the University; the College teachers receive their own fees, and what is more, are absolutely untrammelled practically or theoretically by traditions of fads, professional or otherwise. I think that "London Teacher" is, to say the least of it, ungenerous in his mercenary insinuation as to the professors, whatever it was in the past and what school was free from it, no stain can be now attached in that direction. I will also say this: in Edinburgh and Scotland professors are paid to teach, and Professor Schäfer, when he took over the Chair of Physiology, had that impressed on him; and what is more, you are taught all they know, and by men whose whole life is devoted to the perfecting of their teaching powers. In London my experience was that when the advertised teacher could not lecture, and that was very often too, some one else took it on temporarily; furthermore, that the lectures were often perfunctory, and the clinical classes feeble. The teaching in Edinburgh is second to none, and I found far more opportunity for independent clinical work, and got more individual attention there than I could obtain in London. I may add I have spent four and a-half years at Edinburgh University (new regulations), and have still my Final to complete, and am reading standard London authors for it. I have spent a year and a-half at London schools, and find that it is not the school so much as the man, and if "London Teacher" has lazy students he should be old enough now in experience not to be bluffed with their

stale excuses for their non-success. Outsiders are not barred, but wasters bar themselves everywhere.—I am, etc.,  
August 10th. M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P. LOND.

\* \* We cannot insert any more letters on this subject.

#### "CANCERODERMS" AND CANCER INFECTION.

SIR,—I beg to express my sense of indebtedness to Dr. Sykes for the trouble he has taken and the haste he has displayed in assuring you in his letter published in the BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL of August 2nd, that in his opinion, I am mistaken in "two statements of fact" made in my address on the Etiology of Cancer.

Naturally, I repudiate his suggestion, and even go so far as to say that it is Dr. Sykes who, in his haste to criticize, is mistaken.

Passing over his brusque insinuation of want of familiarity on my part with the recent literature of cancer, I would point out that, in referring to the evidence I adduced of experimental inoculation as "one or two equivocal statements which do not bear critical investigation," and that "the whole of the evidence available is strongly opposed to the possibility of experimental inoculation" of cancer, he not only expresses a discourteous negation, but also begs the question at issue.

The evidence I gave of accidental inoculation, at any rate, is entirely unequivocal, and such inoculation is to all intents and purposes experimental if unintentional. The success of this accidental inoculation is undoubtedly due to the fact that it was made upon the genus homo.

Cancer, like small-pox, is pre-eminently a human disease, though both can be transmitted to the lower animals—especially the domesticated ones—by contagion. With improved methods and greater facilities, as suggested in my unabridged address, I cannot doubt that experimental inoculation of cancer will show uniformly successful results.

I beg to point out, farther, that Dr. Sykes is also mistaken as regards the other statement he finds fault with. I did not state that the subject of angiomas of the skin found in connexion with cancer has not been previously noticed since de Morgan's tract until Leser drew attention to it last December. I simply said, and I beg to reiterate it, that I had been unable to find any literary notice of the subject except de Morgan's tract, which I quoted.

At the same time I am obliged to Dr. Sykes for unearthing Mr. Sheild's reference to it. I sincerely hope that Dr. Sykes is not also mistaken in his diagnosis of his patient's condition, but, as a fact, neither his diagnosis nor the presence of angiomas can alter the nature of the disease.

In my opinion, simple ulcer of the stomach is a condition precedent at the least, and therefore a vulnerable point, and, under the circumstances narrated, the presence of angiomas is, to my mind, of sinister significance.

The term "canceroderms," which I have ventured to coin, was a convenient one for my purpose. Unquestionably, many angiomas are congenital; but, whether those found in aged people are congenital or not, is for them to say.

By "canceroderms" I mean the angiomas, conspicuous in size and number, which rapidly appear in certain people who are not aged, and which are, beyond all possibility of cavil, intimately connected with malignant disease—a fact which has been verified by observers other than myself.

For such angiomas the term "canceroderms" commends itself to me as the most conveniently descriptive possible; but there is no necessity for others to make use of it unless they choose, and it is open to anyone to suggest a better.

I regret that absence from home has prevented an earlier reply.—I am, etc.,

Aberdeen, August 11th.

A. T. BRAND, M.D., C.M.

#### MEDICAL MEN AS WITNESSES.

SIR,—Since writing my letter, so courteously printed by you in the BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL of August 2nd, I have received from one of our leading county courts the table containing the Allowances for Expert and Scientific Witnesses, and I would ask you kindly to allow me, by giving it, to complete the contrast thus exhibited between these and what are termed "ordinary witnesses," the latter including professional men of all kinds and merchants, bankers, etc.