

replied, that the immediate cause of death was effusion or congestion of the brain, caused, in my opinion, by the shock which the nervous system received from the long-continued pain the child suffered from the abscess. And I added, as another cause, that it was possible that absorption of matter might have taken place, producing a similar result, and that this of course might have taken place quite independent of any pressure.

In answer to the next question, relative to the bandages, I replied that of course the bandages, by their pressure, increased and kept up the pain. And I now ask, what other opinion could I have given as to the cause of death, in the absence of any other *apparent cause*? for you will be pleased to bear in mind, that there had been no *post mortem* examination made, except of the affected part. I never, however, meant to convey by that opinion, nor did I think that the jury could infer, that it was Mr. Hicks's treatment that had caused the death of the child. I was not asked a question by the coroner that would have elicited a favourable reply; and, unfortunately, Mr. Hicks had no legal adviser to cross-examine the witnesses. I strongly urged on Mr. Hicks, jun., the expediency of procuring one, but he refused. Subsequently, seeing the impression apparently made on the jury—not by my evidence, but by that of the mother—I urged upon Mr. Hicks the propriety of his going home, that, in case an adverse verdict should be returned against him, he might get out of the way for a few days, until he could procure bail. For this humane and charitable advice, given to an old man bordering on seventy years of age, the coroner expressed his regret to some of my friends, and appeared much mortified that he had not been made acquainted with my advice to Mr. Hicks sooner, for he said that if he had, he would have certainly sent me with Mr. Hicks to prison, as an accessory after the fact, in *aiding and abetting* in that awful case of manslaughter.

Up to this period, I had never heard of an injury which, it appears, the child had received from a fall, nor of a *dislocation* of the head of the fibula, for which it now appears Mr. Hicks had treated the child; and *not for a fracture, as had been represented to me*, nor did I hear of the injury or of the dislocation until after Mr. Hicks had been committed to prison. Now, I cannot say whether or not there had been a dislocation. Not having any idea that I should be called upon to give evidence before a jury, I did not make that particular examination which I otherwise should have done; consequently, a dislocation of the head of the fibula might have escaped my notice, not expecting to find such an injury. Admitting, then, this to be the case, Mr. Hicks's treatment was perfectly justifiable and correct. I presume that he did not anticipate the formation of an abscess, which might have been produced either by the accident, or by a general bad state of health.

It is a matter of surprise why Mr. Hicks did not make known the above circumstances to the jury; but the only explanation is, that Mr. Hicks is *very deaf*, and *I believe did not hear one word of what was said in the inquest-room*. Mr. Hicks, jun., being a very young man, was so bewildered by the unexpected charge brought against his father, that he had scarcely power to make any explanation, or offer any observations.

In conclusion, I must a second time *repel*, as wholly untrue, the statement that I had been actuated by any unkind or vindictive feeling towards Mr. Hicks, in the part I was compelled to take in that inquest. Mr. Hicks has never injured me, nor I him purposely or wilfully; and all persons (whether medical or non-medical) who know me, are aware that I am wholly incapable of such base and dishonourable proceedings.

Begging you to insert this in your next number,

I am, etc.,

PATRICK BENSON.

Luton, Bedfordshire, March 14th, 1853.

#### PYÆMIA.

LETTER FROM HENRY LEE, ESQ., TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,—Mr. GAMGEE, an able writer in the ASSOCIATION MEDICAL JOURNAL of the 4th inst., has noticed my work on the *Origin of Inflammation of Veins*. He observes, "To argue, as Mr. Lee does, from the fact that, out of the body, blood coagulates round pus, therefore such a combination cannot circulate in the living body, is about as warrantable as it would be to predicate, from the observation that pure blood coagulates (in an unusual manner) in a basin, that it therefore cannot remain fluid in the ventricles of the heart." The opportunity was afforded me only yesterday of inspecting a preparation from a case, in which suppuration, to a limited extent, had taken place

in the pericardium; and in which the auricle and ventricle of the right side of the heart both contained a firm decolourised mass of fibrin. That in the ventricle weighed upwards of three drachms, was firmly adherent, and terminated in a long, slender process, which extended several inches into the pulmonary artery. Analogous cases are not very uncommon; and some such have been published in the work referred to. You will, therefore, be prepared to admit, to a certain extent, the truth of the above criticism. The only modification required, is the substitution for "pure blood", of "vitiated blood", to which alone my remarks applied.

I am, etc.,

HENRY LEE.

13, Dover Street, Piccadilly, March 11th, 1853.

#### EDITORIAL APPROPRIATION WITHOUT ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF THE REAL SOURCE.

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR OF THE DUBLIN QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF MEDICAL SCIENCE TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,—In the ASSOCIATION MEDICAL JOURNAL for February 18th, a translation of a paper on the "Iodide of Sodium", from an Italian journal, is stated to be abridged from the *Chemist*. This translation was made originally for my journal, and was published in the number for November 1852: it was thence quoted without acknowledgment by the Editor of the *Chemist*, I suppose, through inadvertence. You could not, therefore, have been aware of this fact.

I shall feel obliged by the insertion of this note in your Journal.

I am, etc.,

THE EDITOR OF THE DUBLIN QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF MEDICAL SCIENCE.

[In accordance with our universal plan, we gave the *immediate* source of our information. As to unacknowledged appropriation, we might say a good deal, as we are often amused to see the impudent and clumsy way in which our own pages are pilfered from. Our critical remarks being often blended with our abstracts are frequently cited as if translated from a foreign journal which we may have incidentally mentioned.—EDITOR.]

#### NEWS AND TOPICS OF THE DAY.

HOSPITAL FOR SEAMEN. During the past year, 2,316 patients were admitted on board the DREADNOUGHT, and those supplied with medical assistance and stores, as out-patients, amounted to 1554, making a total of 3870. £130 was received by the subscription-boxes under the care of the shipping-masters, which was contributed chiefly by seamen. The society received three legacies during the year—£300 from Mr. Benjamin Hill, £100 from Mr. Boucher, and £10 from Lady Colville. There were under cure, or convalescent, on the 31st of January last, 159. Of the 2316 admitted in the present year, there were discharged cured 1653, convalescent 181, relieved 88, not cured 10, deaths 75.

The patients of different nations received were in the following proportion:—Englishmen, 39,734; Scotchmen, 8199; Irishmen, 6035; Frenchmen, 249; Germans, 913; Russians, 871; Prussians, 1346; Dutchmen, 233; Danes, 907; Swedes and Norwegians, 2299; Italians, 639; Portuguese, 520; Spaniards, 313; East Indians, 1142; West Indians, 1167; British Americans, 918; United States, 1322; South Americans, 149; Africans, 391; Turks, 16; Greeks, 64; New Zealanders, 35; New South Wales, 36; South Sea Islanders, 226; Chinese, 42; born at sea, 137; total, 67,903.

In what service employed:—Her Majesty's navy, 3215; Hon. East India Company's service, 1798; merchant vessels of different nations, 62,890; total, 67,903.

The receipts for the year amounted to £8135: 14: 11; and the expenditure to £7716: 11: 4; leaving a balance of £419: 3: 7.

CHRIST'S HOSPITAL. The widow of the late Dr. Rice was, at the last meeting of the Governors, voted an annuity of £200.

ACADEMY OF MEDICINE IN PARIS. The following distinguished members of the medical profession were, on March 1st, elected foreign associates of the Academy of Medicine in Paris: M. Buffalini, of Florence; Dr. Valentine Mott, of New York; Professor A. Retzius, of Stockholm; Professor Riberi, of Turin; Professor J. Y. Simpson, of Edinburgh; M. Vleminckx, of Brussels; and Dr. Warren, of Boston, America.