terior part of the alveolar process, and with swelling of the gums; after an incision in the latter, the pain diminished; no pus was found; but within a few days, three molar teeth were protruded; and two months afterwards, another appeared. Since that time the patient has enjoyed very good health; no more teeth have been formed, but the new ones have remained in good condition.—(*Graefe u. Walther's Journ.*)

CASE OF GALACTORRHEA AND ANOMALOUS MENSTRUATION.

A female, who, with the exception of some tendency of the blood towards the head, had always enjoyed good health, married in her fourteenth year; the menses appeared a year afterwards, and returned regularly, but were always accompanied by violent pains in the belly. In her sixteenth year, she became pregnant; the menses, however, continued until after the second month, when they ceased; but, in the seventh month, reappeared. Her labour was very easy, and there was an abundant secretion of milk. Two months after delivery, she again menstruated; at this time she was attacked with illness, induced by violent mental emotion, from which she recovered after the occurrence of bleeding from the nails and the gums. During this illness, however, she suckled the child, and continued to do so for two years, during which time the menses flowed regularly. After she had weaned it, a real galactorrhœa began; the breasts continually secreted milk, which was abundantly discharged by day and night. Her general health did not seem to be affected, and the menses continued regular. In this state she remained for six years, having, in order to get rid of her burden, constantly suckled several infants. A practitioner, to whom she applied at this period, bled her very freely from the arms and feet; the flux of the milk was almost immediately arrested; but, in its stead, blood began to be discharged from the breasts, with violent pains extending to the shoulder and neck, and increasing if the bleeding only ceased for a short time. The blood was very dark-coloured, thin and fœtid; it flowed almost continually, day and night, as the milk had done. The menses, which remained regular, had no effect on its quality and quantity, and her general health was unimpaired.

When Dr. Jacobson, who relates the case, saw the patient, she looked very healthy, and even plethoric; the breasts had, since the time when the galactorrhœa ceased, considerably diminished in size; they were soft, and without any sign of inflammation, but so extremely sensible, that they could hardly bear the pressure of the clothes; the nipples were well formed and

indolent; the quantity of blood discharged daily was from three to eight drachms; it could not be squeezed out of the mammae, the pains in which were almost intolerable, and, whenever the discharge of the blood ceased, or the weather changed, increased to such a degree, as totally to deprive the patient of rest; the pulse was slow and soft, the skin dry, and the bowels regular. Menstruation, which had always regularly appeared, having now, for the first time, failed to do so, violent congestions in the head ensued, followed by hæmoptœ and hæmatemesis, with vertigo, and painful tension in the pelvis. Cooling medicines relieved these symptoms, but did not prevent their recurrence. Leeches to the labia pudendi, and bleeding from the feet; semicupia and foot-baths; digitalis, prussic acid, and aperients, were employed without any effect; and not only during the menstrual period the hæmatemesis and hæmoptœ regularly continue, but they also occur on the least affection of the mind. From these hæmorrhages, the patient always very rapidly recovers, and her general health does not seem to have suffered from them.—(*J. Complem. July, 1828.*)

ON FOOT LAMENESS IN HORSES.

By Mr. CHARLES CLARK, *Veterinary Surgeon.*

IN the *Sporting Magazine* for August last, there appeared a long article on foot lameness, by Nimrod, its chief contributor, whose opinions on such a subject are supposed to be highly valued by a certain class of his readers, because he is considered to understand the *science of fox-hunting*, and, of course, all that in any way appertains to it. The veterinary profession will be willing to bow to this mighty hunter's skill as a sportsman, but when he comes forward to pronounce on the causes of foot lameness, or lay down dogmas respecting shoeing, he becomes a poacher, amenable to the laws of criticism, and must be treated as he would treat an unqualified person sporting on his own manor.

Nimrod, whoever he be, is a man of facts and close observation, but, for want of understanding the true construction and elastic nature of the foot, a knowledge of which can alone enable us to reconcile the difficulties of shoeing, he is led into the wildest reasoning, appears to be without principles, and, in a heap of assertions, mystifies the matter. He several times speaks of being bewildered; as for the thinking part of his readers, I conceive they were never at a greater loss in their lives, than how to account for foot-lameness when they had read his essay. Now it has been truly observed, that men puzzled are half persuaded; and,

setting this aside, if the opinions of this writer are erroneous, his experience and gratuitous knowledge will give them undue influence; while, on the other hand, should they be really valuable, a few comments will do them no injury.

Nimrod begins by announcing his intention to take rather high ground, having paid particular attention "to this branch of grooming," meaning, I suppose, "foot lameness." He wisely adopts also the dialogical style, which gives a writer who pursues no settled argument or course of reasoning, a convenient opportunity of changing his ground whenever he rambles into difficulty.

Page 273, "Why should I be deprived of vanity, that choicest gift of heaven? We are all subject to speculative errors, and, doubtless, I am not without my share; but here I shall speak the powerful and practical language of experience, and facts shall be the basis of my reasoning."

Page 274, "No horse ever was, or ever will be lamed, from merely wearing an ill-constructed shoe." "*Bad shoeing* will alter the natural form of the foot, but not once in a hundred times will it of itself produce lameness." Here we see the folly of those ill-defined and optional terms, *good* and *bad* shoeing. The fact is, that as contraction and lameness ensue in consequence of confining the elastic foot in a fixed iron shoe, it matters not greatly whether this piece of iron be rough or smooth, (i. e. *good* or *bad*;) for, if the nails are driven as usual, the same effects will inevitably ensue from either. Therefore it happens, that many gentlemen of great practical experience in horses, pay least attention to their shoeing, on finding that no care or expense on their part can avert the evil, and that some secret cause, which they do not understand, is operating to thwart their best endeavours. Nimrod's observation has so far taught him right; but now, to what causes does he proceed to attribute foot lameness, "principally to these, natural mal-conformation, or, rather, weak organisation of the internal parts of the hoof; inflammation and fever, produced by excitement of high feed, and hard riding or driving; concussion from beating the ground on the road and *at grass*; irregular and unprepared for work; improper position of the limb, occasioning an uneven tread, and, above all, *the pace*,—"it is the pace that kills." Amidst all these plausible excuses, not one of which he can explain, the true reason, the unnatural confinement of the common shoe, is completely overlooked. I shall inquire whether we are justified in imputing diseases which never occur to horses in their state of nature, to *natural mal-conformation, weak organisation, or improper position of the limb*, &c. As to "concussion from beating the ground on the road *and at grass*," it

would never take place, if the foot were not prevented from relieving itself in its natural way of expansion, by the vile fixed shoe, which, a little further on, he states "is not the general cause of foot lameness." Great men are often singular in their opinions. Nimrod seems to prefer a contracted foot for work, and has "never seen a solitary instance of contraction occasioning lameness." "Asses, mules, and ponies," he observes, "bear me out here, for they are never lame in their feet, though they are contraction exemplified." After this, there can be no doubt that he does not know a good foot from one that is contracted, at least it is evident by his comparison of the feet of these inferior animals, asses and mules, which are hard, upright, and *naturally* narrow, with that of the noble horse, wide spreading and elastic by nature, and only contracted by *artificial* means, that he is wholly ignorant of its true form. The veterinary profession must be at a low ebb, when a writer, without even the rudiments of foot knowledge, can set up to decide on its diseases.

With such slender information to rest on, he does right to assume *high ground*; pretensions are nothing, unless maintained with confidence. Thus he tells his imaginary inquirer, A, "I mean to imply this, you shall keep your horse five years without shoes, and doing nothing but running wild in his pasture; I will keep my horse shod, doing work, and in the stable, and at the end of five years, the feet of my horse shall be not only as sound as those of yours, but in a firmer and better state," &c. All which may do very well to tell a Cockney sportsman, and might lead him to believe that Nimrod has the secret. Shoeing, that is, his mode of shoeing, he also defines to be cultivating, following, and embellishing Nature!! Passing over much redundant language about feet defective from birth, we arrive at his opinion, that it is the "telling pace," and not the iron defence of a shoe, that lames one half of our horses. As this is a plausible and very popular excuse, I shall take the trouble to provide the explanation for it. That horses in fast work have the worst feet, is a correct observation, and for a very sufficient reason, because they are generally light made, well bred horses, and, as a necessary accompaniment, have invariably highly elastic feet, which suffer from the contracting tendency of the shoe and nails in a far greater degree than the coarser horses employed in slow work. Nimrod, and such superficial observers, looking only at the fact, ascribe mischief to the pace they go at, which is, in truth, the result of their more delicate organisation. There are many blood horses that do but little work, and are yet ruined as speedily as those that do, and,

on the contrary, we find many of coarse breed that go a fast pace, the mail cart horses, for instance, yet are rarely lame in the feet; in fine, the difference in suffering will be found dependent on this rule of comparative elasticity. Therefore I care not what pace the horse goes, let him be properly shod in expansion shoes, and his feet will not contract at any work, or in any place that Nimrod can put him, provided the foot is uninjured when they are first applied.

Nimrod considers a perfect foot "as one of the finest specimens of the plastic art;" his recipe for a good foot is curious and concise: "it should be made of firm materials, and able to resist disease.* This, however, can only be proved by experience." Then of what value is this advice to choose a good foot of firm materials, and able to resist disease, (that is the contracting tendency of the common shoe,) and give no rule by which this good foot is to be known or chosen?

In speaking of expansion shoes, the ideas of this writer are most crude and ill-digested, but expressed in off-hand and sportsman-like phrase, taking little pains to conceal his ignorance of these subjects, on which he assumes, nevertheless, an unbounded right to pass judgment. It is the business of all men who write with fluency on a subject they do not understand, to level all distinctions in one unmingled censure, and then proceed to erect the superstructure of their own opinions, with the materials they find among the ruins.

For instance the following: "that there is no general system to be pursued in shoeing, is best proved by the well-known fact, that all system-mongers and their systems have gone to pot together, and we now hear no more of them." Further on the dialogue continues.

"A. But is it not generally supposed that concussion, increased by the resistance of an iron shoe, is the general cause of foot-lameness?

"B. I should soon bewilder you and myself, (that is to say, he can neither disprove nor explain it,) were I to enter fully into this subject. Mr. Bracy Clark has told us, that so long as we have an inflexible unyielding substance affixed to a flexible elastic foot, so long shall we have lame horses, and Mr. Bracy Clark does not stand alone here.

"A. Why, then, has not the ingenuity of man found out a remedy for the evil, by inventing elastic shoes, giving way to the extension of the foot?

"B. What! have you never heard of the various patent expansion shoes of Mr. Bracy Clark, and others?

"A. What is become of them?

"B. Did I not tell you that the systems and system-mongers were all gone to pot together? Expansion shoes have been tried, and not found to answer; therefore it is fair to conclude, that mere concussion is not the root of the evil. Furthermore, '*never having tried them*, I can give no opinion of the effect of what are called expansion shoes!'"

"*Never having tried them.*" It is sufficient, most mighty hunter! without this admission; that you have asserted more than you know, is manifest in every line. You read the funeral service with much *sang froid* over all the systems, but whatever may have befallen others, the *expansion shoe* of Mr. Bracy Clark, greatly *improved, but not altered in principle*, is used more extensively than ever; and without being at any pains to prove that principle right, I openly challenge any person who doubts its truth and utility, to contravene them. For the practical proof, let him make fair trial (not upon diseased feet only) of the effects of this system, and be guided in his judgment by the result. This, and this alone, can give a man a right to speak positively on such a subject, and a capacity for doing it without making blunders. When Nimrod tells us of the "various patent expansion shoes of Mr. Clark;" it must be supposed that he has some ground for so speaking? The fact is, that Mr. Clark never took out a patent for an *expansion shoe*, though strongly pressed to do it by many who saw the value of the invention. Above twenty years ago, he secured the patent right of a certain kind of removable defence for horse's feet to be taken off at night, or in the stable, and for a share in which he was offered considerable sums, but never attempted publicly to promulgate it. Indeed he observes, p. 33 of the *Stereoplea*, "I used many of them on the road with considerable satisfaction, but thought them, on the whole, too complex to recommend for general use." This also was before his discovery of the structure of the foot, upon which is founded the present system of expansion shoeing, and for this, I repeat, he never took out even a caveat to justify the statement of "various patents" imputed to him by Nimrod.

Another passage, and I have done with this part of the subject:—

"I very well remember the noise that was made about Mr. Bracy Clark's *jointed shoe*, which was to preserve horses' feet to the latest periods of their lives; on the principle, *a just one truth*, of imparting to the shoe the same degree of elasticity that the foot itself possesses. This was to have formed 'the basis for the repose of the profession,' but the dream was of short duration."

This style will never do, Nimrod. Mr. Coleman must quietly bear the sarcasm

* Query; ought not the whole body to be formed on the same principles?

that you pass on his frog-pressure system, because, I believe, he cannot answer it; but I have strong proofs of vitality to oppose to your pretended post-mortem observations on the *expansion shoe*. The hope expressed, at the conclusion of Mr. B. Clark's work on the foot, that the principle he had there explained respecting it, "might form a basis for the repose of the (shoeing) art," had no direct reference to the expansion shoe (Nimrod has copied the phrase from a misquotation); but, in either case, it is literally fulfilled; the French and continental veterinary colleges* have adopted his nomenclature and exposition of the foot; these principles are admitted and practised in Russia, and no where denied but in England, which is a further proof that a prophet is not without honour, save in his own country. Moreover, as a slight accessory fact, it may be observed that I am personally engaged in shoeing horses on the expansion principle, am well supported by the public, and do not even despair of making Nimrod a convert to the system. At present I am well pleased with his admissions, p. 280, "that he has *never tried expansion shoes*;" and, 282, "that the *principle of their application is just*;" this is enough, and may form the basis of a better understanding on both sides.

With the frog-pressure system, which comes next under "the hunter's ken," he observes rather more ceremony, bringing various proofs of its fair trial and universal failure, which are wholly dispensed with in his previous summary judgment on the expansion shoe. The agency of the shoe in producing foot-lameness, Nimrod has, in great measure, denied; and gone near to assert, that contraction of the foot is beneficial; it is not fair, therefore, to quit this article without examining some of the arguments he brings forward to account for it. The chief of these appears to be, p. 286, that nature has, in many instances, given the animal "badly constructed limbs," or "twisted forelegs," but it is a fault "not always visible," and so uncertain a criterion to trust to, that until the ruin of the horse nothing can be known, "as it is possible that, despite of the twist in his forelegs, the tread may be even, and thus his feet have been preserved." This is on a par with his previous sapient advice to choose a good foot, but giving no rule to do it by; it actually amounts to nothing; for the present, therefore, I shall attribute foot-lameness, be the forelegs twisted or straight,

to mischievous art, and exculpate Nature. Such assertions are excellent loop-holes for ignorance; but, in default of all these, rather than admit the real evil of contraction, he has adopted that famous and conclusive decision of the ancient farriers to wit:—that "when diseases of the feet cannot be traced to any specific cause, they are fairly attributable to ailment of the whole system dropping into the legs!"

As I before stated, Nimrod, like most men who have tried many plans, all having the same common principle of fettering the foot, and, consequently, the same bad effect, is inclined to attribute but little of foot lameness to shoeing. After recounting various other imaginary causes, "the twisted legs, the telling pace, the high keep, &c. &c.," he thinks to settle the matter by referring to the hind-foot, which is, he says, "more unfavourably shod;" and yet it is not upon record that a horse was ever groggy, or foundered in a hind-foot. "Now, I think, no one will dispute these facts: first, the hind-foot is a *fac simile* of the fore-foot." By no means, Nimrod; they differ as much, comparatively, as the human foot and hand; and for the same, or a similar reason, because their purposes are very different. Anatomical demonstration can alone show this properly; however, it is very easy to see, in a trotting horse, that the fore-feet perform the more arduous part of bearing the chief weight, and receiving the shock of the animal, while the hinder ones fulfil the simple office of projecting the body forward. The former are found naturally flexible, spreading, and highly elastic, the latter more upright and concave, much less elastic and smaller, so that any man accustomed to handle the hoof, ought readily to know them apart in the dark, and the argument would disgrace any veterinarian. I shall argue no further with a man whose knowledge of these things is so shallow, as to lead him to assert, that two organs so different, and performing such opposite functions, as the fore and hind foot of the horse, are *fac similes* of each other. He challenges any one to dispute it, calling it a *fact*, and using it to support a bottomless theory of his own. Could Nimrod suppose that Veterinary Surgeons, we whom he enrols in a late number among the "curses of horse-flesh," would allow him, a mere sportsman, to intrude on our department without reproof? or did he imagine that the same language which passes current on sporting subjects, would carry him through when treating of matters relating to our profession? On practical points, it is more than likely that his remarks may be worth hearing, and he should have confined himself to these.

* See the works of MM. Girard et Vatel, Professeurs de l'Ecole Royale Veterinaire d'Alfort, also the "Recueil de Medicine Veterinaire."