

rious; he was bled, had leeches to the neck, and was ordered mucilaginous potions, which he took with some reluctance. Having been brought to the Hotel-Dieu on the 18th, at nine o'clock in the morning, he was soon afterwards seized with convulsions, and all the symptoms of hydrophobia; he violently pushed back all fluids and bright bodies, and struck at the persons around him, so that it was necessary to confine him with the strait-waistcoat. He talked much about his having been bitten by a dog, and earnestly entreated those who came near him to kill him. At half-past ten he began to spit around him; the secretion of saliva was very abundant, and continued to be so till the last moment of his life; it was white, viscous, and spumous; he used much effort to throw it off, and it frequently ran over his chin. He was also frequently seized with sickness and nausea, but without vomiting. MM. Petit, Cailhard, and Bally, decided on the injection of warm water into the veins; and the operation was performed at eleven o'clock by B. Sanson. Above a pint of blood was previously taken, and between seven and eight ounces of warm water were injected. No accident took place during the operation, and the patient appeared to be somewhat more calm immediately after it. This improvement was, however, transitory; the convulsions speedily returned, and he died at about three o'clock, without much struggle.

The *post-mortem* examination offered nothing of interest. A few hours before death an emphysematous swelling had been observed at the anterior surface of the neck, and this was found to extend as far as into the mediastinum. The brain, cerebellum, spinal chord, and nearly all the principal nerves, were carefully examined, but did not exhibit any morbid alteration. The heart was flabby, pale, and empty. The larger vessels, and the veins of the arm, were healthy.—*Lanc. Franc.*

CONGENITAL DISLOCATION OF THE RADIUS.

A very curious preparation was shown at the amphitheatre of the Hôtel-Dieu in February last. It consisted of a dislocation of the head of the radius, in both arms. At least an inch of the upper extremity of the bone lay behind the humerus. No difference existed between the dislocations on either side, and they were probably congenital. M. Dupuytren remarked, that about twenty years ago he observed a similar case, which he thinks was also on both sides and congenital. A violent torsion of the arm inwards might, however, cause the dislocation in question.—*Journ. Univers. d. Sc. Med.*

LONDON UNIVERSITY.

PROFESSOR PATTISON.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In the absence of my friend Professor Pattison, who is now at Paris, I have to request that you will give early insertion to the following brief quotation, from a pamphlet published by that gentleman ten years ago, in “refutation of certain calumnies” brought against him by Dr. Nathaniel Chapman, republished in your LANCET of last week. The entire pamphlet of Mr. Pattison furnishes, in my opinion, a most triumphant answer to *all* the charges brought against him by the American physician. But without the opportunity of consulting my friend, I shall content myself with a mere republication of the following document.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Yours faithfully,

DAVID D. DAVIS,

Prof. of Midwifery in the University of London.

5, Fitzroy Square, August 9th, 1830.

“The last proof which I” (Professor Pattison) “shall adduce in refutation of the third charge, is one which seems to me conclusive. Prevented by the reasons already mentioned from entering into discussions of this disgusting affair in the present pamphlet, and with the view of entirely obviating the necessity of it, I requested the four following gentlemen, who, in rank, intelligence, and respectability, are inferior to none either in this or in any other country, to examine the documents in my possession relating to this transaction; pledging myself at the same time to publish in this, my defence, whatever they should afterwards say was their impression of my conduct in it, should it be in favour of, or against me.

“Robert Smith, Esq., late Secretary of State to the United States.

“The Rev. John M. Duncan.

“The eminent Counsellor at Law General W. H. Winder.

“The Honourable Judge Nisbet.

“I did not select my friends, for they might be partial. I did not fix on my colleagues, for they might feel disposed to support me against an attack so cruel and dishonourable. But I requested judges, to whom I was almost a perfect stranger, I begged them to consider me guilty, until I had proved to them that I was innocent. When I had gone over my documents, I requested them, if they did not consider the proofs of innocence such as no other evidence could possibly controvert, to call on Dr. Chapman to

produce every thing which he conceived would criminate me. They unanimously declared that they were satisfied that the charge made against me of an adulterous intercourse with Mrs. Ure, was wholly destitute of foundation, and expressed their readiness to sign any paper to that effect which I might desire. Accordingly the following certificate was made out and signed by them.

“ CERTIFICATE.

“ Being requested by Granville Sharp Pattison, Esq., Professor of Surgery in the University of Maryland, to examine a series of letters and documents relative to the causes of his coming to the United States, with the view of becoming Professor of Anatomy in the University of Pennsylvania; and also in relation to a charge made against him by Dr. Andrew Ure, of Glasgow, the undersigned examined said letters and documents, and are satisfied, first, that said letters and documents are genuine, and were written and made at the *time* and in the *manner* they respectively profess to be; and, 2^{dly}, That the charge of adulterous intercourse between Mr. Pattison and Mrs. Ure, is wholly destitute of foundation.

(Signed) “ R. SMITH.
“ JOHN M. DUNCAN.
“ W. H. WINDER.
“ A. NISBET.”

EXAMINATIONS AT EDINBURGH FOR THE DEGREE OF M.D.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—The example I gave in publishing the questions proposed to me, when a candidate for the degree of M.D. at Edinburgh in 1819, has, I find, by No. 362 of THE LANCET, been followed by a graduate of this year, Dr. Fosbroke. My reason, though unassigned at the time, was *single*, viz. to offer the means of comparison between the questions proposed to Cambridge candidates (see LANCET, 1827-8, Vol. II), and those of Edinburgh. Dr. Fosbroke avows a *double* motive, viz. to allow a comparison between the examinations of 1819 and 1830, and to afford instruction to future aspirants. I shall not attempt, but leave to more competent and impartial critics, the useful exercise of drawing up a *comparative view*; at the same time I would remark, that even should the result be in favour of a greater difficulty in the queries of 1830, yet that alone will not decide any superiority in the graduates of this year. That a more accurate estimate may be made, I will readily, if you deem it desirable, transmit to you the answers to my questions, &c., such exactly as

they stand in my memorandum-book, in which they were entered at the time; and perhaps Dr. Fosbroke may also feel disposed to furnish similar additional grounds of comparison and instruction.

In my time, the usual period of examination was *one hour*, which time was frequently extended to an hour and a half, and even sometimes to two hours; the proficiency of the candidates being rated inversely to the time occupied. Now on reference, I find the number of my questions 140—time, *one hour*; Dr. Fosbroke's questions 117,—time *nearly two hours*.

I can hardly account for this, unless by supposing that the much-to-be-deprecated custom of holding the examinations in Latin continues, and that Dr. Fosbroke is not a very good Latinist; this of course is a gratuitous supposition, but it is the only explanation that suggests itself to me.

In the event of your thinking it desirable that our answers be also published, I hope you will add your request to mine, that Dr. Fosbroke will favour us with his. I am leaving town for a few weeks, and shall not be able, in case of your wishing the answers, to furnish them till my return.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

MEDICUS EDINENSIS.

[We do not see that any advantage could be derived from publishing the “answers,” because, if correctly given, they are to be found, of course, in books which are in the possession of the generality of practitioners and students.—ED. L.]

DINNER TO THE PRINCIPAL, AND THE MEDICAL PROFESSORS, OF THE EDINBURGH UNIVERSITY.

ON Monday last, about fifty gentlemen who had received their Medical education at Edinburgh, took the opportunity of testifying their respect to their professors, by giving a dinner to the deputation now in London, which a few days ago presented an address to their Majesties on their accession to the throne.

Dr. Roget presided, and was supported by several eminent graduates of Edinburgh. The very Rev. Principal Baird, Professors Monro, Alison, and Balfour, were present, and severally acknowledged the compliments paid by their pupils. The Principal made a very feeling reply to the Chairman's toast, “Prosperity to the University of Edinburgh,” and produced a considerable impression by his elegant and feeling address.

After a variety of suitable toasts and speeches, the meeting separated at a late hour, every one much pleased with the arrangements, which, it is but justice to the Stewards to say, were of the first order.