have gone on for another year, and I do not know how much longer.

Dr. STOKES.—And what harm?

Dr. BROOKES.—And Dr. Stokes asks, "What harm?" Either you are practising your profession dishonestly, or I. If you believe in homœopathic practice, I must be a rogue.

The PRESIDENT.—I deny it.

Dr. BROOKES.—The moment Dr. Stokes commenced to practice as an homœopathist, if he had been honest and fair to the members of the Gloucestershire Medical Association, he should have said, "I have gone from the regular system of practice;" if he has that honesty of purpose, he will not go out of this room a member of the Gloucestershire Association.

The PRESIDENT.—Dr. Brookes has impugned the council of neglect of duty. Now, I mean to say the council have taken no notice of the subject he casually brought forward and talked over. It did appear to the council it was not necessary to take any steps; it did appear they did not think with him or feel with him.

Dr. BROOKES.—I am sorry if the council are such a set of men that they do not feel with me on this point.

Dr. WRIGHT.—I say, as a member of the Association, that Dr. Brookes has made a wrong charge. The council is only empowered to initiate proceedings; the fundamental rules of our society do not contemplate or constitute the council as an *imperium in imperio*, to inquire into the mode of practice of the members; it lies with the members of the Association. If I had been the doctor I should have sent in my resignation, fearing that some individual like Dr. Brookes should get up and make such observations. The council had no power to do this; it would have been impertinence on the part of the council to do anything of the sort. Although no notice is necessary, out of courtesy Dr. Brookes ought to have given notice.

Dr. EVES.—I fear, from what the President has said, it will be thought it has been discussed in the council. It has never been talked of or discussed.

Dr. BROOKES.—Dr. Wright has said it is no business of the council.

Dr. WRIGHT.—There are the duties.

Dr. BROOKES.—There are no duties for the council to perform, if this is not their duty. I decline, *in toto*, having any courtesy, anything like meeting with any gentleman who practises homœopathy. I came here independently. I say that as regards courtesy, I fling it away. I have no courtesy with homœopathic practitioners, and I expect none.

Mr. WILTON.—Some time since, I asked Dr. Stokes the question whether he should like me to read a letter he had sent to me then. Dr. Stokes said he would explain. This is dated March 28th 1851. Since that time, there has been a meeting of the Association at which I was not present. The resignation remained in my hand for a future occasion. (Mr. Wilton then read the letter from Dr. Adrian Stokes, tendering his resignation as member of the Association).

The PRESIDENT.—We know that was not produced, and there were motives for it. Every man may have his own idea on therapeutics: if he has passed through the education and the gradations, there is no reason why he should not be a member. If an homœopathic doctor ought not to sit down with Dr. Brookes—Dr. Brookes ought not to sit down with him; it is just as broad as long. I don't see why men should quarrel about it. I think they ought to give way to each other.

Dr. BROOKES.—Am I to understand that is a resignation?

Dr. EVES.—I beg leave to move that Dr. Stokes's resignation be accepted.

Dr. BROOKES seconded this proposition, which was carried.

Correspondence.

"Audi alteram partem."

DR. GREGORY AND HIS PATIENT.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—The article in your number of the 19th instant, in which you allude to my late work on Mesmerism, only came to my knowledge yesterday. It is there stated, that one of my mesmeric pupils, as you call them, now openly declares that all I have said of him is a mere dream of mine, well cooked up to serve the end. From the context, and the reference to the delicate health of the patient, this must apply to the case given under the initials J. D.

When I published the results of my observations, I knew that they would find no favour with you, and I should never think of noticing any criticism, however severe, in which only difference of opinion was enunciated. But the above statement implies that I have knowingly attempted to deceive my readers, and cooked up a dream of mine as a statement of facts.

This charge is utterly unfounded. J. D., the young gentleman in question, was easily thrown into the magnetic sleep, in which he saw and described various visions, which I have accurately recorded from notes taken at the time. But when awakened, he had no recollection of what had passed in his sleep, except when I commanded him, in the sleep, to remember on waking certain things, and these he remembered. But such cases were few. I purposely abstained from speaking to him, when awake, of his visions, that I might not suggest ideas to him. As a general rule, he had no knowledge whatever of what he had said while asleep; and I should never, for that very reason, have applied to him for confirmation of my statements, for which I alone am responsible. I am always unwilling to assume any unfair or disingenuous proceeding, and therefore I conclude that your informant has been told by J. D. that he (J. D.) has no recollection of what I have recorded. Indeed, I have stated in my work that he had not, save in the few instances above alluded to. But how this perfectly true statement should prove that I had dreamt it all, or how, if I had done so, Mr. J. D. should know it, I confess I cannot see. In cases, like this, of divided consciousness, the subject has no recollection when awake of what passes in his sleep. Mr. J. D. has just left me, and authorizes me to say, that he has never made any such declaration as you mention, and that he has only said to one friend that he had no recollection of certain things related by me, while he remembered others perfectly well. This he is ready to testify, and also to declare that he never for a moment entertained the idea that I had dreamt or cooked up any part of what I have published concerning him, and is fully satisfied that I have truly recorded what passed. He is also quite aware of the absurdity of supposing that he should be able to tell, in his normal state, anything about what passed in his sleep, seeing that, except when desired to remember, he never did remember anything of what passed, and of course can say nothing about it. So much for the magnetic sleep and the clairvoyance of this case.

As to the electro-biology, J. D.'s performances in the conscious state were seen by hundreds, and minutely examined by Sir D. Brewster, Dr. Simpson, Dr. Bennett, and many others. It is therefore impossible that I should have dreamt them.

Since you have been led by your informant to make so serious a mis-statement, and to bring against me, on the authority of Mr. J. D., who repudiates it with indignation, so grave a charge, I expect that you will, in simple justice to me, and to the truth, insert this letter in the next LANCET. You are welcome to entertain any opinions you please on mesmerism; but you must see that you are not entitled to make charges of falsehood, even against mesmerists, on grounds so untenable as in the present instance, and that, having been led into error, you are bound to publish the truth as it really is. I make no charge against you, save that of having too hastily adopted an erroneous report; but as that report, and your remarks on it, are highly injurious to me, I expect, as the only reparation in your power, the immediate insertion of this letter.

I remain, yours, &c.,

July 28, 1851.

WILLIAM GREGORY.

MR. FLETCHER'S CASE OF RUPTURE OF THE POPLITEAL ARTERY.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In the very able report of a case of Rupture of the Popliteal Artery, in your last number, by Mr. Fletcher, he states, towards the conclusion of his remarks, that he is not aware of having ever seen any similar case to the one he has recorded. Mr. Guthrie, however, who has probably seen every form of injury that can possibly be inflicted upon the human body, has related a case in which the cause of the injury, the consecutive gangrene and sphacelation, treatment, and appearances presented on dissection of the limb, are very similar. Sir B. Brodie, in his Lectures on Pathology and Surgery, article, Mortification, p. 314, quotes this as a case in point to illustrate the subject he is describing in the following words:—

"But in other cases mortification is not confined to the part actually injured, but may extend to the greater part of the