

## NEWS AND CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. WANSBROUGH'S REMEDY FOR GOUT AND RHEUMATISM.—*To the Editor.*—Sir: I think it proper to state, through the medium of your pages, that immersing the part affected in water at a temperature *as hot as can be endured* acts as a powerful adjuvant to my "Remedy for Gout and Rheumatism" (*LANCET*, vol. i., 1842, p. 547). Local vascular turgescence is thereby relieved, the action of the capillaries (by determination to the surface) is increased, and rapid absorption, producing speedy termination of suffering, is the gratifying result. Always observing, as a precaution against metastasis, the primary potation of hot brandy and water, with thirty minims of the mixture. Careless neglect of this nearly gave a *quietus* to, Sir, your obedient servant,  
T. W. WANSBROUGH.

King's-road, Chelsea, March, 1843.

*To the Editor.*—Sir: Seeing the letter from your correspondent "A. B. C.," page 14, respecting Mr. Girdwood's paper on menstruation, I am induced to send you the following observations, tending to prove that not only was Mr. Girdwood unacquainted with the researches of Kirkringius in 1672, but that more modern discoveries and anatomical investigations are unknown to him. At page 827 of *THE LANCET*, of March 4, 1843, Mr. G. makes the following statement: speaking of the barbarous nomenclature that is in use by physiologists, he says that the circumstance of "the same expression being used by different authors in different meanings, has been another great means of obscuring this subject. 'Graafian vesicles' and 'ova,' are used as if they were different things." Does Mr. Girdwood suppose that ova and Graafian vesicles are *the same* things, contrary to the opinions of all teachers and anatomists? For it has been clearly proved that a Graafian vesicle and an ovum are different things, as distinct, for instance, as are a pill and the box in which the pill is contained. A Graafian vesicle is the case in which an ovum is contained. The ovum is placed within the Graafian vesicle, and escapes during the menstrual period into the cavity of the Fallopian tube, and the ruptured Graafian vesicle remains in the structure of the ovary, to be connected with the true or false corpus luteum. Unless Mr. Girdwood corrects this mistake will not his reputation as an anatomist be injured? I am, Sir, your obedient servant,  
March 31, 1843.

LUCINA.

IMPREGNATION.—*J. H. H.* had an eccentric old hen that would never associate with either hens or cocks, and yet laid her usual quantum of eggs. To test the soundness of John Hunter's theory that "one single tread of the cock is sufficient to impregnate all the forthcoming eggs of the season," *J. H. H.* introduced her to the male bird at three dif-

ferent times, viz., *prior* to the laying, at the commencement of laying, and after the *fifth* egg was laid. She sat on eleven eggs and produced three chickens, the remaining eight eggs were addled, not having even a single vestige of a dead chick in them. This, and other experiments which *J. H. H.* has tried, induce him to believe that with the barn-door fowl the doctrine does not stand good, if, in fact, with any (or few) of the feathered tribe, although it does with animals, without reference to the amount of progeny. In the sow, for example, *J. H. H.* has seen one ride of the boar produce a litter of twenty-seven pigs.

*To the Editor.*—Sir: The following quotations, amongst others, refer to the fact of unimpregnated fowls laying eggs:—In Blumenbach's "Physiology," vol. ii., page 779,—"The hens of poultry lay eggs (incapable, indeed, of being hatched) although separated from the cock." In Willis's translation of Wagner's "Physiology," part 1, page 68, "Among birds, the general rule is that no eggs are laid unless fecundation by the male has taken place; still, it often happens that the common fowl lays eggs without having been trodden by the cock; these eggs, however, are unfecundated, and not proper for incubation; they spoil rapidly, instead of producing a chick, when set under the parent." In Dr. Baly's translation of Muller's "Physiology," vol. ii., page 1491, "Since the ova of birds separate from the ovary quite independently of fecundation, &c." And in page 1468 of the same volume, "The separation of the ova from the ovary may take place independently of impregnation. Such is the case, for example, in frogs and birds." In Carpenter's "Principles of Human Physiology," page 624, "It is well known that among many of the lower animals the ova are entirely extruded by the female before the spermatic fluid of the male reaches them, and that even in birds this occasionally takes place." These extracts show that the general opinion among physiologists is that a female bird may lay an egg without previous coition, but that such egg cannot be hatched.

GALLINA.

FEES AT INQUESTS.—Sir: I was sent for by a coroner to assist at a post-mortem examination. The surgeon who had attended the deceased having no instruments, I was requested to take mine. The examination being finished, three surgeons were sworn at the inquest, viz., the gentleman who had attended the deceased, one who wished to be present at the post-mortem, and myself. The gentleman who had attended the deceased gave his evidence, and we were each called on to corroborate it. Pray, Sir, was I entitled to any fee, and if so, whether to two guineas or one guinea? The coroner has refused to pay me any, having paid two guineas to the gentleman who attended the

deceased. Your's, faithfully, M.R.C.S.L. Yorkshire. \* \* \* Many points for remark occur in this statement, but as our attention is specially directed to one only, we reply simply, that if our correspondent made the examination without having first received the order, signed by the coroner, which is described in the schedule of the Medical Witnesses' Act, he has no legal claim on that functionary for the payment of any fee. If he did receive such an order, with the direction in it uncancelled, to make the examination, he was himself entitled to receive two guineas, without deduction. As medical witnesses seem to be continually falling into error with regard to the law on these subjects, we have twice copied the Act, with express marks of its leading directions, into this Journal, the last time on Feb. 11th, 1842, page 717.

To the Editor.—Sir: In the discussion at the Medical and Chirurgical Society on the subject of gangrene of the face, published in the last number of your Journal, Dr. Marshall Hall, when speaking of my paper, is reported to have said, "The odour has been erroneously described by the author of the first paper as resembling the odour observed in ptyalism." I am anxious to point out that Dr. M. Hall must have very much misunderstood the reading of the paper, as it did not contain such an expression; on the contrary, I wished to show that there was *none* of the symptoms of *ptyalism* in spontaneous gangrene. Had I heard the above remark, I would have corrected the error at the time, and not have occupied your space with this note. I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

April 10, 1843. HENRY OBRÉ.

A correspondent writes, "I am happy to find that Dr. Lacock has turned his attention to the effect of electricity on vital phenomena. I believe that some electric peculiarity in the Torquay atmosphere, in which I reside, has quite as much to do with the absence of phthisis, as an endemic, as has the comparative mildness of the climate. Thunder-storms occur here very rarely indeed, and the old inhabitants are the most unexciteable people I ever met with.

An Old Army Surgeon.—We do not give advice to correspondents relative to the treatment of medical cases.

An Apothecary.—Some medical practitioners, keeping open shops, received printed notice, signed by the solicitor of excise, stating that informations had been laid before the commissioners of excise against them, rendering them liable to the full penalty of 50*l.*, excepting preserved from its infliction under the clause 9th Geo. II., cap. 23, s. 12, which runs as follows:—"Provided always that this Act shall not extend to any physicians, apothecaries, surgeons, or chymists, as to any spirits or other spirituous liquors which they may use in the preparation or

making up of medicines for sick, lame, or distempered persons only."

Mr. Ed. H.—Well satisfied that the insertion of the kindly-meant eulogy of the personal qualities of the deceased surgeon—engaged wholly, we presume, in private practice—is not required, to extend his well-merited posthumous fame, already so efficiently sounded in his own locality, we withhold the tract from publication. Under other circumstances it should, with pleasure, be placed in our columns.

LIVERPOOL SCHOOL.—Mr. R. T. Lodgie, wishes, in reply to the statement of "X. Y. Z.," page 908, to state that his letter was most certainly *not* as "X. Y. Z." has intimated, "the production of the professor of medicine referred to; and that that gentleman had not any share in the framing of the letter, or knowledge of the present denial." "The reply," Mr. Lodgie adds, "which he then thought necessary to make, was purely his own, and the statements therein contained he still maintains to be facts." We beg to add, that no further communication on the subject will be inserted without its authentication by a real name and address.

The questions propounded by H. P. might form interesting subjects of speculation between him and his medical friends, but they could not be noticed in this place with any advantage, in the absence of all testimony, negative or affirmative, on either point mooted.

The pamphlet of Dr. Dickson will be examined in connection with the paper of Dr. Laycock, and our opinion on the question raised by Dr. D. given in another number.

Replies similar to those sent by Mr. Edw. Gurney were inserted before the letter of Mr. G. was received.

Mr. Wm. Elton.—There is, or was lately, a society in London which received propositions from medical practitioners for emigration to Syria as professional men.

A Hater of Quackery.—We might be condemning the author for the act of the bookseller. We had rather confine our remarks to the *undoubted* operations of the author, namely, those avowed in the book itself.

X. Y. Z.—He need not be a M.R.C.S. according to any legal enactment relating to the duty to be performed.

COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS.—A correspondent informs us that the following gentlemen passed their examinations at the Royal College of Physicians in London on the 31st of March last, viz.:—Samuel Mason, Esq., of Rock-place, City-road; James Atkinson, Esq.; Richard Dawson, Esq., of Stockton-on-Tees; William Odlam, Esq., of Antigua; and Job Lockyer Seale, Esq., of Bath.