CONGENITAL MALFORMATION OF THE HUMERUS IN A MUMMY.

By EDWARD H. BENNETT, M.D., F.R.C.S. ;
Professor of Surgery in the University of Dublin, &c.

[Read in the Section of Pathology, November 30, 1888.]

I AM indebted to the Rev. G. T. Stokes, D.D., who has charge of Marsh's Library, for the opportunity of showing this curious specimen, which illustrates the unchanging character of two at least of man's diseases. This bone, taken from an Egyptian mummy, shows a congenital malformation, and also chronic rheumatic arthritis, absolutely the same in their character as we find them in the present day.

The greater part of the skeleton, with the mummy case and parts of the clothes, were found in re-arranging the library, having been probably brought to Dublin by one of its early custodians, who was known to have travelled in Egypt, and to have been interested in such curiosities. The bones of the extremities are complete, so that for our purpose the limitation of the disease to the single bone is established. In no other bone is there defect except in the scapular articular surface, which shows arthritic changes corresponding with those of the head of the humerus, and the bones of the forearm, which are a shade smaller and are of more slender build than those of the opposite limb.

Comparing the two humeri, the left is seen to be perfectly normal—that of a full-sized man; the right is very small and stunted, and at the elbow is remarkably altered from the normal—its width from condyle to condyle is greater than the corresponding measurement of the left bone, while the width of the articular surface is smaller. The shape and appearance of the bone is such that if it were placed by itself before one familiar with the

abnormalities of the skeleton, the first idea as to the cause of its stunted character, its rugged shape, and its abnormal width at the lower end, would be, I think, that it was a rickety bone; but this idea is at once put aside by its association with bones absolutely free of rickets in all other parts of the skeleton. Its arrest of development has not resulted from fracture, for there is no trace of such in any part of it.

In our collection we have a specimen which in all respects repeats these characters, which I myself dissected some years ago. This, for want of a better name, has been placed among congenital arrests of development. One idea suggests itself—that the arrest in these cases might be the result of infantile paralysis; possibly, but against this is the fact that in a specimen of this condition—of which I know the history—affecting the arm only, the changes are unlike those before us.