

believes there is a kind of chronic tetanus from which the patient recovers with little or no treatment; and the case referred to as having occurred in Paris was regarded as being chronic. Mr. De Méric had had in his practice a case of recovery from chronic tetanus. The patient had had a very severe crush of the leg by a railway accident. Amputation was performed just below the knee. Sloughing took place, but the case seemed going on well, when trismus set in. This continued some time, but was only accompanied by contraction of some of the muscles of the neck. It was debated whether the end of the bone should be removed, but it was decided not to do this. Narcotics (morphia, chloroform, etc.) were given. The patient after a time began to show symptoms of amendment, and at last recovered. In regard to the use of woorara, it must be remembered that it is said to have no effect when taken into the stomach, and yet in the French case it was partially administered in this way. If it be resolved to try this agent in tetanus, it must be observed that there is a species of woorara which does act through the stomach, and which should be first administered to an animal. It should, when applied, be at once injected into the cellular tissue: little or no good is likely to arise from merely sprinkling it on the wound, or giving it by the stomach.

A discussion followed, with regard to the supposed source of woorara and the experiments of Sir Benjamin Brodie, in which Mr. CANTON, Mr. STREETER, Dr. ROUTH, and Dr. BIRD, took part.

Editor's Letter Box.

THE JOURNAL.

LETTER FROM HUMPHRY SANDWITH, M.D.

SIR,—A passage occurs in Mr. Dix's letter of last week, which has excited my astonishment. It is the following:—

"My opinions were endorsed, my arguments seconded, and my resolution heartily supported by such men as the two Sandwiths," etc.

This statement is certainly at variance with what occurred at the meeting in Beverley, *so far as I am concerned*; as all who were present can bear witness. So far from endorsing Mr. Dix's opinions, or seconding his arguments, I called both in question, excepting only his financial statements. I distinctly stated my conviction, that, in these days of railway speed in thought and action, the Association could not exist without a JOURNAL to maintain a ready intercourse among its branches. I also demurred to his mode of reasoning on the merits of our periodical, more especially his argument founded on the analysis of the contents of a single journal. I moreover strongly objected to the tone and spirit of his paper, which I said was too satirical to be in harmony with so grave an inquiry, satire being a hindrance rather than a help to the discovery of truth. I regret much, that we had no short-hand writer to take down my words, of which the above is but a meagre outline. In truth, my speech, as reported in the JOURNAL of October 8th, being cut down to two lines, conveys no idea of my actual opposition to Mr. Dix's proposal. This I much regret, because a full and correct account of it would have shown that I was not prepared to join Mr. Dix in his crusade against the JOURNAL. My remarks were addressed to the meeting immediately after Sir Henry Cooper's speech on seconding Mr. Dix's resolution. Having thus offered a decided opposition to some of the opinions and arguments, as well as to the tone of the paper, I *at first proposed my resolution, as an amendment upon that of Mr. Dix*. I was induced, however, by his urgent request, to withdraw my direct opposition, from his wish to ventilate the subject of his paper, and to secure attention by a *virtually* unanimous vote. I therefore contented myself with afterwards bringing forward my resolution (slightly modified) as a secondary and independent one, which also was carried without any opposition, except on the part of Mr. Dix. I now regret, that through courtesy I yielded a reluctant consent to Mr. Dix's request, because on that he has founded the statement of which I complain. Nor should I have so readily retreated from my first position, had I not felt myself unprepared to grapple with the financial part of the argument. The idea of a vast debt hanging over our heads, was the cause of my proposing a fortnightly, instead of a weekly JOURNAL, coupled with a strong persuasion that the Association, in order to do justice to itself, requires an annual volume of

Transactions for more elaborate essays, as well as a journal for reports of meetings and various other matters demanding a more rapid circulation.

If I have erred in occupying so much space in your pages on a matter chiefly personal to myself, I submit that Mr. Dix must divide the blame with me. But it is not wholly a personal matter, because it is clear that Mr. Dix employs the names of Sir Henry Cooper, Mr. Hill, of Cave, and others, including my own, as an auxiliary proof of the irresistible power of his argument. The object of this letter is to extricate myself from the false position in which Mr. Dix's sweeping statement places me: for, after the part I took in the debate, to represent me, as he has done, as *endorsing his opinions, seconding his arguments, and heartily supporting his resolution*, simply because I did not formally vote against it, is a mistake not in keeping with his usual logical acuteness.

In conclusion, I must compliment yourself, Mr. Editor, on the manly course you have pursued in an affair demanding great forbearance, tact, and judgment. Your strictures upon Mr. Dix's paper were dignified, temperate, and for the most part just. You were obviously aware how much the success of any cause depends on the superiority of moral tone, no less than of intellectual power in its advocates.

I am, etc., HUMPHRY SANDWITH.

1, Albion Street, Hull, October 22nd, 1859.

P.S. As to the part my brother took in the matter, his opinion, founded on the assumption that the JOURNAL absorbed all our income, was, that a monthly JOURNAL might answer every purpose. At the same time he remarked, that the weekly JOURNAL had mightily improved under its present management. I can only account for Mr. Dix's unqualified statement respecting my brother and myself, by supposing that, in the self-abstractedness of his own ideas, or in the confusion of tongues, he did not hear what we said.

THE JOURNAL.

LETTER FROM SIR HENRY COOPER, M.D.

SIR,—As the seconder of Mr. Dix's proposition, which has again raised the "JOURNAL question", I may be allowed a few remarks in explanation of my own views. I will make them brief, as I see that the discussion is already assuming portentous dimensions.

And first, I would remark, that the resolution of the meeting at Beverley was *not to discontinue* the JOURNAL, but to diminish the frequency of its issue; the extent of the change being purposely left an open question. This at once disposes of the great mass of the argument which has been used, and which merely goes to prove that it is desirable the Association should have some medium of communication between its members. It also disposes of the invidious and unpleasant discussion on the merits of the JOURNAL at the present time, since such merits or demerits are merely the accident of the time, and may be changed if found necessary. If we are to have a JOURNAL, it rests with ourselves whether it be a good or a bad one. The question is then narrowed to these limits,—Is it desirable to have so frequent an issue of the JOURNAL? and if it is, can we afford to have it, consistently with other and more important calls on our funds?

I have long been of opinion that the facility afforded for rapid communication of opinions, and even of facts, in matters of science, is far from being an unmixed good; at least, I am quite sure that the benefit derived is not in proportion to the facility afforded. To rapid journalism we owe the enormous accumulation of crude and unused material which lie buried in our serials for many years back, and which, for want of arrangement and generalisation, are almost valueless to science. What is wanted is more condensation and utilising of existing material, and less encouragement to hasty publicity and "vain repetitions". Conceive a *daily* medical journal! What hunting for materials! what hasty undigested communications! what personal disputes, and discussions on matters of ephemeral interest! The whole affair would be of and for the day, and not for the permanent advancement of science, or the interests of the body which published it. No man would be bold enough to advocate such a scheme, even were it a paying concern; and yet, if the argument for unlimited frequency of publication is worth anything, it ought to stand this test. The truth is, there is a limit here, as in all other matters, at which the maximum of good and the minimum of evil is attained; and it is this limit, in this case, that we have to find.