

sitting up in bed; the face was œdematous, the pulse quick, and the respiration greatly accelerated; the child complained of oppression on the chest and pain in the abdomen. The fits of coughing were innumerable, with frequent bleeding from the nose and mouth. I ordered a laxative enema, and a teaspoonful of the cochineal mixture every three hours. I also desired the child's father to reckon the number of fits carefully. No less than eighty-one fits occurred during the twenty-four hours, and of these twenty-three were attended with vomiting, and the discharge of blood from the mouth.

On the second day the number of accesses fell to sixty-five; the vomiting was less frequent, but the hæmorrhage increased. On the third day no change worthy of notice occurred; on the fourth the fits diminished to forty; and from this time they gradually declined to the ninth day, when they were twenty-one. The pain in the chest had now disappeared, but it was impossible to induce the child to take the medicine any longer.

With regard to the mode of administration of this remedy, a few remarks are necessary. From the tendency of the cochineal to become putrid, no more should be dissolved than is required for thirty-six to forty-eight hours. After a few days, and especially when the bottle has been frequently opened, the color becomes changed, and a sour smell is perceived. Cochineal is not dissolved by cold water; a warm solution is, therefore, required, and the color of this is clear red; the tint is deeper when a portion of the bitartrate of potass is added to the solution; I have no experience to determine how far the addition of this salt may influence the action of the remedy.

In conclusion, I may remark, that many of my colleagues have employed the cochineal mixture with the best effects in cases of hooping-cough; and Dr. Weinke has remarked, that it is very efficacious in the cough which so frequently accompanies measles.—*Med. Jahrbücher*, October, 1842.

PROVINCIAL MEDICAL JOURNAL

SATURDAY, JANUARY 21, 1843.

"Raro antecedentem scelestum
Deseruit pede, pœna, clauso."

The office of critic is in truth an ungracious and unprofitable one. If you adhere to the "medio tutissimus" of the poet, you are set down as an insipid and insignificant quill-driver. If you praise the production of rising talent or pay a just tribute to long established reputation, you are a slave and a sycophant—unjust and partial—cut by one friend for not laying it on sufficiently thick and abused by the rest of the "genus" for your charitable desire to conceal their infirmities. On the other hand, you may as well declare yourself "non compos" and walk straight to St. Luke's as attempt to exercise the ancient privilege of the critic in an independent manner. A modern author has as little idea of submitting to the rod as a li-

berated black. If you expose a single delinquency or pluck a single feather from a self-decorated bird, the whole rookery is in commotion and you are hunted, with a kettle to your tail or a wisp of straw on your horn, beyond the pale of civilised life.

Fully sensible of the force of the proverb, "give a dog a bad name," &c.—and abhorring the olden cry, "fenum habet in cornu," we are ever unwilling to awaken the susceptibilities of the "irritable race," and have shut our eyes on many a literary offence of foul origin. But we are not permitted to exercise our little brief authority after our own fashion. Readers, now a days, have become almost as irritable as writers, and if they suspect any laxity of critical virtue, hesitate not to fall upon the backsliding reviewer, or to accuse him by inuendo of ignorance and incompetency.

The preceding reflections have been suggested by a letter recently received from Norwich, and which we would gladly have consigned to the flames without publication, were it not from fear of our correspondent's wrath, and because its perusal has excited a portion of our long dormant indignation. Here is the epistle—

"Norwich, Jan. 13, 1843.

To the Editors of the Provincial Medical Journal.

Gentlemen,—Having seen in your Journal a very favorable notice of a work by Dr. Burgess on Diseases of the Skin, I was induced to purchase the same. A few days afterwards I lent the book to a friend, who brought it back to me and said that it was exactly the same as a "Compendium of the Diseases of the Skin," published several years back by Dr. Jonathan Green, of London. On looking over the two works I was struck with the singular degree of similarity between them, and, as we are unable to account for it, my friend and myself beg that you will let us know whether MM. Cazenave and Schedel borrowed from Dr. Jonathan or Dr. Jonathan from them.

Your obedient servant,
F. P."

There is no escaping from the question thus plainly put by our correspondent; and we feel compelled to answer it, although our answer disclose one of the most extraordinary examples of plagiarism that has, perhaps, ever occurred in the history of medical literature. The compendium of Dr. Jonathan Green, published as an *original* work, dedicated to Sir Henry Hallford and highly lauded by every section of the medical press, is a *mere translation from beginning to end* of the "Abrégé Pratique des Maladies de la Peau," by MM. Cazenave and Schedel. A few original cases, it is true, have been added by Dr. Green, and here and there, at the commencement of a chapter, we find a few lines of introductory matter; but with these exceptions, the whole work, from beginning to end—the arrangement of cutaneous diseases—the description of symptoms and treatment—the order of the several chapters—and the well-known essay on the

syphilides—the *whole*, we repeat, is a mere translation of the work of M. Cazenave.

How any man pretending to a literary reputation, or to reputation of any kind, could have been guilty of such wholesale appropriation of another's goods, we cannot pretend to divine, nor explain how this transaction hitherto escaped the notice of our brother critics. It is, in truth, curious to see how the borrowed experience of Dr. Green was lauded in the "Edinburgh Journal," the "Medico-Chirurgical Review," the "Medical Gazette," the "Lancet," and in other excellent and well-conducted reviews. The editor of the "British Review" informs us that "Dr. Green's work is complete and worthy of its author's good reputation."

Dr. Johnson affirms that "Dr. Green's Observations on impetigo and porrigo are certainly the most judicious we have ever read; they are derived from sound pathological views."

Even the learned and acute Dr. Willis was deceived, notwithstanding his special knowledge of the literature of cutaneous diseases. In a note to his translation of Rayer, Dr. Willis says, "There is another work published in England so recently, that Dr. Rayer could not be aware of its existence. As a manual it is every way superior to the synopsis of Bateman, and has the advantage over the *abregé pratique*, in having been written by an individual intimately acquainted with the subject; this is a practical compendium of the diseases of the skin, by Jonathan Green, M.D., 1835."

In truth, this is too bad. So a man's brains may be picked out in Paris, and dressed up by an English cook, and we are to believe not only that the said brains are much better than when in their original skull, but that the thief is "an individual intimately acquainted with the subject."

THE MEDICAL CHARITIES' BILL.

We feel sincere pleasure in announcing that this obnoxious bill has been abandoned by the Irish government. The bill "for the better regulation of the Irish medical charities" will not be introduced during the present session of Parliament, at least, under the auspices of Lord Eliot and with the support of the government.

At the weekly meeting of the guardians of the South Dublin Union, held on January 12, Mr. Hall, an assistant-commissioner, announced "that it was not the intention of the government to introduce, in the course of the approaching session, any legislative enactment whatever, having reference to the medical charities of Ireland. The government were fully cognizant of the fact, that a very great disparity of opinion existed upon this subject in Ireland, and they did not consider that the question was one which required

to be disposed of in a very summary and expeditious manner. In conclusion, he would only add that the decision of the government not to take any steps in the matter, during the approaching session, met with the warmest accordance of the poor-law commissioners. Nothing could be more agreeable to their wishes."

This, it must be confessed, is a very handsome and honorable capitulation. Nothing more agreeable to *their* wishes! Nor to *ours*, also. We fear, however, that this sudden conversion bodes no good, and we trust that the friends of our professional independence in Ireland will not allow their vigilance to relax. It is clear that the commissioners have yielded before the noble and determined expression of feeling put forth by the united profession of Ireland. There was "no very great disparity of opinion on the subject," as Mr. Hall pretends; for it is notorious that, with *three* or *four* exceptions, the medical profession of Ireland resisted to a man the attempt of the poor-law commissioners to destroy their independence and bring them under a detested and degrading yoke. As long as any hope remained, through corruption or intimidation, of exciting discord or creating division amongst the ranks of the profession, the commissioners persevered in their plan, and they only retired from the field when a declaration "against the proposal of placing the medical charities of Ireland under the control of the poor-law commissioners" had been signed by almost every dispensary medical officer in the kingdom:

Great, indeed, must have been the sense of wrong and the apprehension of evil, when nearly *one thousand* medical men were found to subscribe a declaration of principle within the space of a few weeks.

REVIEWS.

Methodus Medendi; or, the Description and Treatment of the Principal Diseases incident to the Human Frame. By HENRY M'CORMAC, M.D., Consulting Physician to the Belfast Hospital, and Professor of the Theory and Practice of Medicine in the Royal Belfast Institution. London: 8vo. pp. 574.

In a brief preface, consisting of four very short paragraphs, Dr. M'Cormac announces the plan of his work, and the principles that have guided him in its composition, stating that his object has been, by embodying a considerable amount of new and interesting matter from British and foreign authors and his own experience, to supply the want created (notwithstanding the number and excellence of the treatises on the practice of physic) by the constant progress of medical science, and expressing a hope that, in accomplishing his task, he has condensed much useful information, and conveyed it in "language at once perspicuous and precise."

There is certainly in the present day no dearth of medical authors; yet, amidst the heaps of medical