

appearing before the public, especially at his then advanced age.

I am glad the subject has been brought forward by the Sheffield Medical Society; for, observing the importance which has been attached to this case, and being convinced that it is a fabrication, I have long been anxious to have the matter explained, and believing that I possessed stronger evidence with respect to it than any other person living, I have felt that the responsibility of undeceiving the profession rested especially with me. Still I do not know that I should have written to you after the full explanation given at the Sheffield Medical Society, but for a letter I have just seen in the Journal, from Dr. Cockburn, of Ross. The courtesy due from one member of the profession to another requires that when a positive statement is made by one party it should not be contradicted by another, except after due investigation. Had Dr. Cockburn given himself the trouble to refer to Dr. Short's paper in "*The Medical Essays*," he would have seen that the name was spelt differently from that of Dr. Shortt; he would have seen, also, that the Dr. Short referred to was a physician in Sheffield, and not in Edinburgh; moreover, he would have found that Dr. Short's case occurred in 1720, just one hundred and twenty-six years ago! But even if Dr. Cockburn did not think it necessary to refer to Dr. Short's paper, he ought at least to have read with attention the statement he undertook to contradict. Had he done so, that statement alone would have told him that Dr. Short's case was published in 1735, one hundred and eleven years ago! and that, therefore, the Dr. Short spoken of at the Sheffield Medical Society could not have been the Dr. Shortt whom Dr. Cockburn had known "intimately for many years."

ARNOLD J. KNIGHT.

Liverpool, Nov. 25, 1846.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE PROVINCIAL MEDICAL AND SURGICAL JOURNAL.

SIR,

I find that I have been led into a mistake by the similarity of names, as to the individual, *Dr. Shortt*, who was reported at the Sheffield Medical Society as having published fabricated cases of epilepsy.

Feeling hurt at the supposed imputation on a deceased friend, I wrote to you, as Editor of the Journal, two or three days ago. Since then I have, however, by comparison of dates, discovered that the cases alluded to were published in 1752, (in the 4th edition of the *Medical Essays*), and were by a Dr. Thomas Shortt, of Sheffield. I accordingly hasten to withdraw my former letter; but as many of your readers may, like myself, neglect to look into the date of the reported cases alluded to, and attribute them to the late well-known Dr. Thomas Shortt, of Edinburgh, I am sure it will oblige all who respect his memory, if you will kindly explain that the person alluded to was a Dr. Thomas Shortt, who practised in Sheffield in 1720, and not the late Dr. Shortt, of Edinburgh.

Yours obliged,

ARCHIBALD W. COCKBURN.

P.S. As the cases were quoted by Van Swieten,

attention to *his* date would have prevented my mistake.

A. W. C.

Ross, Herefordshire, Nov. 23, 1846

[This letter from Dr. Cockburn was not received until after the publication of the Journal in which his former letter appeared.]

ATTACK ON THE PROVINCIAL MEDICAL AND SURGICAL ASSOCIATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE PROVINCIAL MEDICAL AND SURGICAL JOURNAL.

SIR,

I had much pleasure in reading the letter of your Suffolk correspondent of the 6th ult. It is an excellent reply to the charges brought against the Provincial Association. I take leave, however, to suggest to the gentleman I refer to and to your readers, the improbability of any of the members having written the note signed "*Unus Quorum*." The postscript, "I owe a guinea, but do not mean to pay it," must be a pure fiction. I cannot believe that any gentleman of our profession would so far compromise his character as to be guilty of such dishonourable (not to say dishonest,) dealing.

Without wishing to impute motives to the *Medical Times*, I would ask if the *Provincial Journal* is viewed as a rival medical hebdomadal, which must be annihilated to extend the influence and enrich the pockets of another? Such ideas are very dreamy. Let us for a moment suppose the Provincial Association to be dissolved, and it requires little foresight to predict, that the profession is prepared to re-construct another Association on a broader basis. A British Medical and Surgical Association would arise out of its dispersed but energetic elements. The present Journal must then be expanded into a *Metropolitan and Provincial Medical and Surgical Record*.

In reflecting on the growth and vigour of the Provincial Association, I cannot contemplate any approximation to decay. It defies the rude gusts of slander. Like the oak, it will only become firmer rooted after the storm.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant.

Southam Nov. 21, 1846.

J. P.

ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS.

Gentlemen admitted Members on Friday, November 27th, 1846:—W. Meehan; J. Newell; D. Wilson; M. Ledger; G. Baddeley; J. F. Jackson; H. H. Tribe; F. Manger; J. J. Halls; R. Graveley; J. G. Mushet.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Communications have been received from Dr. Chambers; *Amator versus Artis Medicinæ*.

It is requested that all letters and communications be sent to Dr. Streeten, Foregate Street, Worcester. Parcels, and books for review, may be addressed to the Editor of the Provincial Medical and Surgical Journal, care of Mr. Churchill, Princes Street, Soho.