

Zulu campaign. One half of this company was attached to the First, the other half to the Second, or General Newdigate's Division.

For the valuable assistance rendered to the wounded by Surgeon-Major Stafford's "Half Bearer Company," under a galling cross fire inside the square at the battle of Ulundi, and of which I was an eye-witness, I would beg to refer you to General Newdigate's Ulundi despatches.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

F. B. SCOTT,

Surgeon-Major (late) Head-quarter Staff.

Army and Navy Club, Feb. 10th, 1880.

## HYDROPHOBIA OR RABIES.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—The case of hydrophobia or rabies communicated to you by Mr. Moore is most interesting, and will, I trust, call forth the latent experience of the profession on the subject of this fearful malady. Mr. Moore has evidently mastered the literature of the subject, but it may interest him to hear of what I conceive to be a genuine case of *Hydrophobie imaginare*. I much regret the details of the case are so excessively meagre, and that it did not come under my personal observation, as it occurred some miles from me.

In August, 1877, about the time when rabies was very prevalent, an excitable young man, the son of a well-to-do farmer, was suddenly seized with violent pains in the head, and his manner was "very strange." He gradually became worse. In short, symptoms of hydrophobia became developed. His usual medical attendant saw him and considered it a case of hydrophobia. He called in another practitioner of large experience, who coincided in the opinion. A London physician was obtained who quite agreed with the diagnosis. I believe the patient was treated by hot-air baths. He recovered, and is now perfectly well.

It appears two years before his seizure he was bitten by a surly spaniel, but forgot the circumstance until the papers were daily recording cases of rabies. There he read with a morbid avidity and no doubt gave way to a morbid dread, of the disease which eventually resulted in the development of "hydrophobic imaginaire." I may add that the dog was alive and well at the time of his seizure, which was two years subsequent to the bite.

With regard to my own experience of rabies, I have a short and simple case to put on record which was undoubtedly genuine, as the dog three days after biting the boy evinced, all the usual signs of the disease, and was destroyed. This I heard when the boy was taken ill.

On May 10th, 1877, a boy aged twelve was brought to me who had just been bitten by a dog. He was playing hockey with a companion in a narrow lane, and while he was flourishing his stick the dog came by and flew at him, inflicting a rather severe lacerated wound of the left temple. I freely canterized it and brought the edges together by wire sutures; the wound healed favourably, and, as far as I was concerned, the circumstance was forgotten.

On August the 9th I was called to see the boy who was bitten. His mother said he had been "queer for some days, and for some time his appetite had been very voracious but no fear of fluid." When I saw him he was flushed, quite sensible but with a look of extreme anxiety and horror, and complained of difficulty of breathing. The poor lad was very tractable, and with great resolution he drank a little milk. He said he knew he should die and go to heaven. The sight of a dog which happened to come in caused extreme terror. I injected half a grain of morphia, but owing to his restlessness I do not think he had the full benefit of it. I called again in two hours, and heard that he had run about on his hands and knees and barked like a dog. He was when I saw him comparatively quiet, and I persuaded him to take a small draught containing half a grain of morphia. He lay down and soon fell into a profound sleep, which lasted about three hours. He then awoke with well marked risus and opisthotonos and his struggles were violent. He was very much relieved by whiffs of chloroform, which lessened his sufferings considerably; but being a delicate boy the constantly recurring paroxysms soon exhausted him, and he died about twelve hours from the time I first saw him. Of course, the

treatment in this case was purely palliative; but I was glad to have it in my power so much to mitigate his suffering by simple means.

I am, Sir, yours truly,

Woburn, Jan., 1880. A. WARREN, L.R.C.P. Edin., &c.

## ARMY MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—That "Verax" is trying to cover a weak position by a cloud of words is the impression I derive from a perusal of his last letter. This I will try to prove, if you can permit further discussion of the subject in your pages.

After admitting generally the liberality of the new scale of pay and retirement, I made an important exception, in the case of "Surgeons-Major of twenty years' service and upwards," and stated that they receive, under the Warrant, "only one shilling a day of additional pay," which amounts to the paltry sum of £18, and not of £45, a year. Does "Verax," with the Warrant before him, wish to dispute this?

My statement that an increase of pay was "unasked for" by the Department generally, to which the remark manifestly applied, I need not defend before the readers of THE LANCET.

Though exceptional demands may have been made on their behalf, and may now be dragged into argument, it seems a waste of time to repeat that pay was not one of the "causes of the unpopularity of the service."

I stated that the medical officers referred to, "after a quarter of a century's service," get an increase of pension of only "two shillings and sixpence a day." Before this Warrant was framed officers of twenty-five years' service, on retirement, got £1 a day, and now, unless "selected," they get only £1 2s. 6d., with a new and serious condition added.

Does "Verax" wish to dispute this? What may be a *summum bonum* to men looking forward to retirement at twenty years is evidently nothing of the kind to those who have completed that period, and who may look to retirement at twenty-five years. "Assertion" is scarcely the term to apply to a remark of mine about "residence" and "commutation," which was carefully qualified by the reservation "so far as we know." But is it an unreasonable idea that the authorities may have retained such a power of restriction as I suggested, and may at any time bring it into use, "Verax's" opinion to the contrary notwithstanding, which is not "official"?

The "loyalty and patriotism" of medical officers are so far beyond all doubt that it was clearly unnecessary to bind them down to serve on "national emergency." Why then the retention of their names on the active list of the army?

Half-a-crown a day is a poor retaining fee, considering that the "rank and file" referred to by "Verax" get a fifth of the amount after only six years' service.

On the subject of "sick leave" "Verax" is not clear. He says: "Before Nov. 27th medical boards could not recommend more than six months' leave for medical officers," implying, one would suppose, that they can do so now; but Clause 44, which he quotes, shows that the second period of six months will be recommended by the Director-General. Now, why not a board in the second instance? It "goes without saying" that boards "recommend" and that the Commander-in-Chief "grants" leave.

About exchanges. An editorial in the last *Army and Navy Gazette* may be read by "Verax" with profit.

During the present trooping season, as formerly, exchanges were made before the appearance of the Warrant. Clause 33 is as vague as clause could be, and "exceptional circumstances" may yet be found a useful official expression, when it may be wished to "apply pressure."

Again, to be told "officially" what everybody knew before, and some to their cost, did not add to the stock of the world's knowledge. "Verax," I suppose, does not wish to deny that he was aware of the three years' Indian service rule. Then why all this "war of words"?

He asks four questions about "soldier servants," in rapid succession, three of them apparently taken from the children's game "How do you like it, &c. &c.?" In answer, I refer him to G. O. xlv. "Soldier Servants," 18th May, 1878, and trust he will forgive my expressing surprise that