

In 1788, Fabbioni² reported the case of a man supposed to have hydrophobia, who was treated by the application of a viper to each of his legs. The patient seemed to be relieved for a moment, but died in half an hour.

These are the only cases I can now recall in which this astounding method of treating hydrophobia has been carried out, and it cannot be considered strange that it is not at present generally adopted. Other curious methods of treatment may be found described in many books on hydrophobia and rabies, and not a few are included in a paper on "The Treatment of Hydrophobia Historically and Practically Considered," which I read before the American Medical Association in 1884, and which was published in the journal of this Association on Aug. 16th of that year. A reference to some of the books referred to, or to the paper just mentioned, would save some writers from error as to the originality or practicability of the methods which they propose for the treatment of this disorder.

I am, Sirs, yours respectfully,

Philadelphia, Dec. 25th, 1886. CHARLES W. DULLES, M.D.

RECENT PASTEURIAN DEATHS.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—In the tables appended by your Paris Correspondent to his most interesting letter in your last issue, I find that Arthur Wilde who died at Rotherham after being treated at Paris is stated to have died of pulmonary disease. This is not correct. According to the account given in the *Rotherham Advertiser* the man was mortally ill before any symptoms of lung affection showed themselves, which occurred only a few hours before his death. It was stated that the remains of an old lung affection were found after death, but this could not have been the cause of death. His mother, who nursed him, who is a woman of great intelligence and the matron of an orphanage, assured me that he had nothing wrong with his lungs since he had an attack of pneumonia in his childhood, and that he had enjoyed excellent health afterwards. Her description of his case agreed with that given in the *Rotherham Advertiser*, and also with the description of the cases related by Professor Peter, especially in the commencement of the symptoms at the seat of inoculation—the intense prostration and some frothing at the mouth. These are not the usual symptoms of "congestion of the lungs," of which he is said to have died—indeed, the term is too vague for scientific use; there could have been no pneumonic consolidation, or that would have been mentioned. I observe by the table that M. Pasteur acknowledges the death of Smith, or Goffi, who died at St. Thomas's Hospital to have been due to hydrophobia, though at the inquest the question was left in doubt. It is reported that the rabbits inoculated from Goffi's spinal marrow died of rabies in seven days. According to the statement of M. Pasteur, made after the death of Louise Pelletier, this would prove that the inoculations were the cause of death, and would greatly strengthen Prof. Peter's case. At any rate the facts should be made known without delay, in order, on the one hand, to remove suspicion from M. Pasteur's treatment, or, on the other hand, to warn possible applicants against the risk it involves.

I am Sirs, yours truly,

JOHN H. CLARKE, M.D.

St. George's-terrace, Gloucester-road, S.W., Jan. 31st, 1887.

THE QUEEN'S JUBILEE HOSPITAL.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—Will you permit me to say a few words in reply to Mr. Cheyne's letter, inasmuch as I wish to correct a most important error which I am sure he has inadvertently made—viz., that the proposed hospital is only for the treatment of diseases of the "throat, ear, skin, eye, rectum, &c.," whereas he has omitted to mention "orthopædic surgery" in all its branches, which will, of course, include diseases of the "spine and joints." There is also connected with this institution a surgical appliance department, for the purpose of supplying various mechanical instruments to distressed persons on their obtaining the requisite number of letters from the subscribers to this department, and I venture to think that this branch (surgical appliance department) is most important and of absolute necessity to the poor, who abound

in thousands in the immediate neighbourhoods, such as Chelsea, Fulham, &c., who cannot afford the time to obtain such articles from more distant institutions. It was this branch that induced the promoters to add to their programme most of the special organs for treatment, such as the throat, ear, skin, and eye, and to these they have since added a department for the treatment of disease of the nasal and pharyngeal cavities by the most advanced methods, as beyond the cost of a few inexpensive drugs, the same establishment and employés can be utilised for carrying out the latter, and the medical staff is, of course, honorary. With regard to the in-patients, though the number of beds is somewhat limited, there is every prospect of success of adding more, as a great many influential persons have already promised their support, but who do not and will not contribute to other charitable institutions, for the reason that they are not allowed any privilege with regard to the internal administration of such beyond a few patients' letters of recommendation. Another all-important item is that, by the establishment of this institution, it will afford opportunities to many medical men to become attached to a hospital, and so develop "latent talent which would otherwise lie dormant."

In conclusion, I beg to state that this hospital will be governed by a committee consisting of an equal number of lay and medical members, and that by strictly adhering to all matters of professional etiquette and economy the Queen's Jubilee Hospital will, I hope, be an ornament to the profession.—I am, Sirs, your obedient servant,

THE SECRETARY.

The Queen's Jubilee Hospital, Gloucester-terrace,
Queen's-gate, S.W., Jan. 1887.

* * We are still decidedly of opinion that such a hospital is not needed.—ED. L.

HOSPITALS, THE SICK POOR, AND ALL ENGLAND.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—In a kindly notice of Sir Andrew Clark's original proposal, formulated in a scheme over my signature in *The Times*, for affiliating every parish, congregation, village, or hamlet through its clergyman, minister, local doctor, or other representative, with the Hospitals Association, by the formation of a Hospital Society, you have misunderstood the proposal in one important particular. It is not desired, nor will it be attempted, to assume a kind of Providence over the provincial sick, and to invite them up to fill our London hospitals. On the contrary, the provinces will be left to look after their own sick poor and hospital administration, and all that we propose to do is to bring our intimate connexion with metropolitan and provincial hospitals to the aid of those who come in contact with the sick poor in all parts of England, with the object of locating difficult cases of disease or infirmity in the most suitable institution that may be available, always giving the preference to the one which is easiest of access to the particular case which needs such assistance. The scheme has excited very general interest; the conference in May, under the presidency of Sir Andrew Clark, promises to be a genuine success; and, as the proposal aims at aiding all the hospitals by exciting a wider interest in their work among all classes of the people, Sir Andrew Clark or myself will be very glad to hear, or to receive offers of co-operation, from any member of the profession who may wish to know more of our proposals and intentions.

I am, Sirs, yours truly,

The Lodge, Porchester-square, W. HENRY C. BURDETT.

THE MERE PRESENCE OF BLOOD IN THE PERITONEUM NOT A REASON FOR ABDOMINAL SECTION.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—The novelty and importance of such a question as that dealt with in your leading article on pp. 227-228 induces me to trespass again on your extreme goodness to me in the matter of space in your columns.

I shall pass over the strong objections to the conclusions of Dr. Hunter's thesis as afforded by what we see in the human peritoneum, which proves conclusively that its

² Ibid., vol. ix., p. 69.