MR. FOX'S CASE OF ONE LIVING
AND ONE BLIGHTED FŒTUS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR:—THE LANCET of the 17th September contains an interesting fact of the expulsion of a full-grown male child and a small blighted fœtus; and Mr. Fox, the gentleman by whom the fact was communicated, remarks, that the patient expected to be confined at least three months previous to the event happening. The case, as it now stands, is incomplete, and no practical deduction seems to arise from it; but if Mr. Fox would obtain a few more particulars, he would both greatly enhance the value of the case, and, I doubt not, much oblige the numerous readers of THE LANCET.

The following queries seem to embrace the points upon which information is defective.

1.—Did the patient date the pregnancy from the last act of menstruation which preceded delivery, supposing it to have happened about a year previously?

2.—Assuming this to be answered in the affirmative, did the signs which are common to the early weeks of pregnancy take place, and did they continue during an unusual length of time?

3.—Was the patient conscious of having quickened at any particular time?

4.—Did the blighted ovum present the characters of a distinct and separate ovum, quite unconnected with the placenta of the full-grown child?

This case must have been either a double conception originally,—one of the twins perishing at an early period of gestation,—or a second conception, three months subsequent to the first—thus raising the question of superfœtation. I hope that Mr. Fox will, by kindly supplying what appears to me to be defective, enable us to arrive at a probable conclusion as to the nature of the case. I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

J. T. INGLEBY,

Lecturer on Midwifery at the
Royal School of Medicine,
Birmingham.

Birmingham, 23d Sept. 1836.

MEDICO-CHIRURGICAL SOCIETY.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR:—We have got two notoriously bad readers as secretaries at the *Royal Medical and Chirurgical Society*. Indeed, Mr. Liston was so afraid of his paper being murdered in the reading by one of them, that he very judiciously stood over his shoulder to keep him to a correct version, and yet with all this trouble the paper was emasculated. Now, without meaning to imply what some

others, by the way, do, that Mr. Partridge can at pleasure read worse than usual, I yet am inclined to suggest either that authors be permitted to read their own papers, if they choose to do so, or that two secretaries be elected who can read fluently. In truth, a regulation to change the secretaries every three years, would not only be fair to the Fellows individually, for the office is considered a post of honour, but it would be a great service to the Society generally, by giving it the chance of finding out two men who are capable of reading manuscript generally without difficulty. I am, Sir, yours respectfully,

“A FELLOW OF THE SOCIETY.”

“Sept. 24, 1836.”

The reply of Mr. Robertson to Dr. Sigmond does not appear to contain any thing imperatively demanding insertion, (we must close the *controversial* part of this dispute,) except a copy of the letter of Dr. Sigmond, dated July 2, 1836, the “original” being preserved in, evidence of the *date*, by the receiver:—

“24, Dover-street, July 2, 1836.

“MY DEAR SIR:—It gives me great pleasure to add my expression of the feeling the medical officers of the Charing-Cross Hospital entertain towards Dr. Golding, as the founder of an institution which I hope may be a lasting monument of his perseverance and benevolence. Faithfully yours, my dear sir,
G. G. SIGMOND.

“To John Robertson, Esq.,
Hon. Sec. C.-C. Hosp.”

With regard to the pamphlet forwarded to us last week by Dr. Sigmond, we judge, from the letter of Mr. Robertson, that the publication of any part of it would only lead to “refutations” and denials almost endless in number. The subject is now ready for the dissecting-knife of the Parliamentary Medical Committee, or some other possessed of equal anatomic powers. Before such a tribunal alone can the truth and honesty with which the inscription on the tablet at Charing-cross Hospital was indited, be appreciated:—

“BENJAMIN GOLDING,

In Miseros Benignus,
Hos Nosocomium nec non Medicinæ Scholam
Suscepit et Fauste Exegit.”

Some correspondents who have favoured us with communications respecting the complaint from Glasgow, will find a letter alluding to the statements at page 47. The letter of “M.D., Jun.,” so far as Mr. C. was concerned, simply amounted to the republication, in *London*, of an article which had already appeared in print in *Glasgow*.