of time so inestimable as the East, where the rapid approach of the rainy season renders the time for effective warfare comparatively short; and when, if a general keeps the field at this season, it must be under a frightful sacrifice of life and property. On the speedy termination of the campaign referred to, in the Deccan, and to which we perceive ANNESLEY contributed so material an aid, depended vast political and social results—thousands of lives and millions of money!

These tributes to the merits of a distinguished military surgeon are alike just and generous. ANNESLEY, along with great knowledge and experience, possessed an unwearied industry, and a most active humanity. Where a sick or wounded soldier remained unattended, he would receive neither rest nor refreshment, and in his whole life he affords us a bright example of the true soldier-surgeon. He was a true follower of MARS and ESCULAPIUS. He had nothing so much at heart as the welfare of the army, and the honour of the medical department.

But what was his recompence? What his reward? Backed by so noble a career, his memorial to the East India Board received the following reply:—

“East India House, April 18, 1844.

“MY DEAR SIR,—It affords me much gratification to acquaint you that, in consequence of the communications made to the President of the India Board by my predecessors in the chair, Major-General Sir J. L. Lushington and Mr. Cotton, representing your long and distinguished services as a member of the medical establishment of the Madras army, *Her Majesty has been pleased to signify her intention of conferring upon you the honour of knighthood.* (!)

I have the honour to remain, my dear Sir,

Yours very faithfully,

James Annesley, Esq.’”

JOHN SHEPHERD.

Forthwith, he was created a knight; accepting, as he did, that distinction, not for himself, (for he sought it not,) but for the sake of the medical department of the Indian army, which it was thought might suffer by his refusal to accept even this small honour. While serving with the troops in his long career, he had received his formal pay, but when he asked, after such length of honourable, dangerous, and valuable service, for some mark of honour, he was rewarded after the lowest scale of civil life! He received from the hands of his sovereign the honorary distinction frequently bestowed upon respectable tradesmen, and such as was once actually awarded by a Lord Lieutenant of Ireland to his butler!!!

But even this is not the most humiliating part of the transaction, for we find that after a distinguished course of thirty-seven years’ service, ANNESLEY had to *solicit* the beggarly honour of civil knighthood! while every field-officer, even the most common, who may happen to command a battalion in action, and to have been within hearing of musketry, receives, as a matter of course, the honour of the Bath. A man, of our own profession, and in the army, of the most elevated character, who has devoted a long life to the most useful and honourable service, and who has risked his life a hundred times, receives nothing more, we repeat it, than a trumpery civil knighthood, and that too with reluctance. It is to injustice and inequality such as this, affecting the medical branch of the army, that we would direct the earnest attention of the profession, and, through them, of the public.

A VERY small discussion has recently been raised on the point of the rejection or non-rejection of Dr. LEE’s paper on the

nervous system of the heart, by the Royal Society. In some strictures on the secret and irresponsible committees, published in THE LANCET of Nov. 27th, 1847, we announced for the first time,—“Dr. MARSHALL HALL and Dr. ROBERT LEE have each again presented papers to the Royal Society, and these papers have been refused a place in the ‘Philosophical Transactions.’” The members of the Physiological Committee now come forward, and declare that Dr. LEE’s paper was not rejected, but that it was withdrawn by Dr. LEE himself. The facts are these:—In a report, bearing date August 8th, 1847, and surreptitiously published, the physiological committee, to whom Dr. LEE’s paper had been referred, concluded their remarks in these words,—“We do not recommend this paper for publication in the ‘Transactions.’”

This was a virtual rejection of the paper, quite sufficient to justify us in the remarks we penned upon it at the time. It is quite true, however, that Dr. LEE, becoming aware of the existence of this report between the date of its adoption by the Physiological Committee and the time when his paper would have been formally blackballed by the Council, did (very unadvisedly, as we think) address a letter to the Council, begging that he might be permitted to withdraw his paper and drawings—a proceeding which the Council permitted. It is also quite true that Dr. LEE wished us to contradict our statement that it had been rejected, but we declined to join in the finesse which withdrew a paper *after* it had virtually been sentenced by the Physiological Committee. To our minds it appeared, and still appears, the merest special pleading to maintain that the paper in question was not rejected. The words of the report are tantamount to a rejection. It was as much rejected as the paper of Dr. MARSHALL HALL, though the latter did not, to his credit be it spoken, step in between sentence and execution—become, as it were, a suicide, to avoid public execution.

CHANCERY.

MOTION FOR AN INJUNCTION MADE BY SIR JAMES CLARK, BART., TO RESTRAIN THE USE OF HIS NAME IN CONNEXION WITH THE SALE OF A QUACK MEDICINE.

LETTER FROM THE SOLICITORS OF SIR JAMES CLARK TO THE EDITOR OF THE LANCET.

15, Bedford Row, Feb. 2, 1848.

SIR,—We beg, as solicitors of Sir James Clark, and with his sanction, to call your attention to the report in the accompanying paper of an application made by him to restrain the use of his name by a chemist who has been extensively advertising it, (we need not say without his sanction.)

We also send a copy of the advertisement, showing as impudent and audacious a fraud as is seldom seen, and coupling the royal arms and name with that of Sir James, for very obvious reasons.

Sir James Clark appears to be almost without any remedy, certainly without any power to prohibit the unauthorized use of his name; and having done his duty to the profession in endeavouring to vindicate his right to the exclusive enjoyment of his own name and reputation, it becomes a public question, which deserves consideration in your influential journal.—We are, Sir, your obedient servants,

BIRCHAN & COOK.