facts have been adduced to show that those who believe doctrines not because they are true, but because they are fashionable; who build on precedent when they ought to appeal to reason; and who pin their faith to great names: even these persons, and their name is Legion, must acknowledge that phrenology is not so universally scouted as they suppose, and that the rejection of phrenology is not a necessary sequence on the possession of intellectual eminence. I am, Sir, yours truly,

E. J. HYTCHE.

12, Brunswick-terrace, Islington,
May 9, 1842.

PHRENOLOGISTS AND ANTI-PHRENOLOGISTS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I had hoped that the controversy in which I was lately engaged had closed in all respects: but certain modes of expression of a correspondent (Mr. Heurtley), in the last number of your Journal, require me to solicit the insertion of two letters which will explain themselves, and to which I shall subjoin a very few remarks. I am altogether certain that your remarkable regard for fair dealing, will induce you to indulge me in this fresh call on your and your readers' patience, the necessity for which I did not anticipate when I last wrote to you. The letters above referred to are as follows:—

"9, Upper John-street, Golden-square,
May 15, 1842.

"Sir,—Although inadvertently, by *first* employing the word 'misrepresent' in reference to the communications of Messrs. Sampson, Davey, and Hytche, I thereby deprived myself of a right to object to *their* making use of the same term in regard to *my* communications, yet it must not be supposed that I can consent that you or any other person, to whom I have given no such ground, should employ that word, in its offensive meaning, towards me. I therefore request to be informed, as speedily as convenient, in what sense you make use of the phrase 'misrepresentations brought home,' which occurs in your paper in THE LANCET, May 14. As this note and your answer to it must be published, whether the correspondence terminates here or not, I beg that your reply may be concise; the more especially, as I absolutely decline all further argumentation of the question to which your paper relates. I am, your obedient servant,

(Signed) "ROBERT DICK.

"R. W. Heurtley, Esq., Kensington.

"I direct according to your address as given in THE LANCET, knowing no one more particular."

"Kensington, Monday night,
May 16, 1842.

"Sir,—I am favoured with your note of yesterday's date, requesting an explanation from me relative to certain expressions made use of by me in my letter to the Editor of THE LANCET of the 10th inst. In reply, I beg to state that I employed the words "misrepresentations brought home" to express simply what I conceived to be a *plain matter of fact*. My whole meaning lies on the surface. By "misrepresentation," I mean misrepresentation and nothing more—not wilful perversion, nor deliberate mis-statement. An utter stranger to you personally, I am necessarily unqualified to judge of your motives, and I could have neither the wish nor the intention to impugn them. In adopting the term 'misrepresentation,' I made use of one that had previously found a place in one of your own letters, and in those of your correspondents; one which, as used by gentlemen, I had accepted in its most *obvious, direct, and unobjectionable* sense. To that term, when employing it myself, I attached a similar value.

"The familiar phrase 'brought home to him,' simply expressed my idea of the convincing character of Mr. Sampson's explanations addressed to you: your silence respecting those explanations warranted, I conceive, the inference which I drew, and which in no wise depends on the origin of the misrepresentations before named.

"I have furnished this explanation because I desire to be clearly understood; but I do not for a moment admit the right of any one party to a public controversy—a controversy open to all who may choose to take part in it—to call in question the use of a term by *one* opponent, previously employed by *himself* with reference to *other* opponents, and allowed when retorted by them. I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

(Signed) "R. W. HEURTLEY.

"Robert Dick, Esq., M.D."

I have only two observations to make. I would first call attention to the gratuitous, and, to me, injurious assumption of Mr. H., that I am actually convinced of misrepresentations having been brought home to me,* and withheld, by want of candour alone, from acknowledging that conviction. Had your correspondent allowed charity to operate, he would have reflected that it was at least possible that the only reason why I had not acknowledged these alleged misrepresentations, was just because I was not at all convinced that any such had been proved! It is surely the most possible thing in the world, that what may be proved

* Mr. H.'s words—"Dr. Dick's want of candour appears in his shrinking from acknowledgment and apology, when misrepresentations are brought home to him."

to the satisfaction of Mr. Heurtley, may appear destitute of proof to the writer of this note!!

As regards Mr. Davey and Mr. Hytche, I wish my use of the word "misrepresented" to be understood in an unobjectional sense. As regards Mr. Sampson, I request him to put on *my* use of the above phrase towards several of *his* statements *precisely* the same construction which he intends should be put on his own use of it in regard to mine. Faithful to my promise, I abstain from renewed discussion; yet, since my attention has been once more, and unexpectedly, called to the subject, I cannot help remarking, that your correspondent "Spectator," in expressing it as his opinion that phrenology leaves the question of human responsibility where it found it, virtually adopts the very view for which I have been contending, passing, at the same moment, a verdict of condemnation on that of Mr. Sampson; while, in characterising the dogma that phrenological development should release from responsibility "a most dangerous doctrine," he employs language of greater severity than I myself had done. I am, Sir, your obliged and obedient servant,

ROBERT DICK, M.D.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE HOSPITAL.

CASES OF STRANGULATED FEMORAL HERNIA TREATED BY OPERATION WITHOUT OPENING THE SAC.

CASE 1.—E. C., aged 73, was admitted March 20th under the care of Mr. Liston. She is married, and the mother of ten children. Nine years ago she had a violent fall, since which she has been the subject of femoral hernia of the right side after any exertion: up to the present time it had always been completely reducible. After walking some distance on Sunday the hernia descended larger than usual, and was irreducible; soon after she felt great pain in the abdomen, and applied for relief at the St. Pancras Infirmary, from which institution she was immediately sent to the hospital. On her arrival she was placed in a warm bath, and the taxis used for some time without effect. Enemata were given during the night without producing an evacuation; vomiting came on, and the tumour became more tense and painful; the abdomen also was tender. Mr. Liston was sent for at seven o'clock on Monday morning, and on his arrival proceeded to operate.

The patient being placed on the operating table, a fold of integument was taken up between the finger and thumb, and a scalpel passed through. It was then divided from within outwards, so as to make the incision parallel with Poupart's ligament; another incision was then made by raising the lower

flap of integument and passing the scalpel beneath it, and cutting from within outwards, so as to make it fall at right angles with the preceding one. By careful dissection the sac was then exposed, but *not opened*, the stricture divided, and with a little manipulation the portion of strangulated intestine easily reduced. The lips of the incision being then brought together by sutures, a compress and spica bandage were applied, and the patient carried to bed.

21. Two, p.m. Bowels have not yet been opened; has vomited since the operation. A copious enema of soap-suds was administered by the forcing syringe.

Eight, p.m. Bowels have been once opened; abdomen tender on pressure. Eighteen leeches to be applied.

22. Has passed a good night; pain relieved; no vomiting; sutures of wound removed; it was dressed with strips of isinglass plaster, a compress, and bandage.

23. No pain or tenderness of the abdomen; tongue moist, rather coated; pulse 90, and soft; wound looking well.

24. An erysipelatous blush around the wound; tongue dry, and rather coated; pulse 100; has slept well; fomentations to the part. To have the following mixture:—

R *Extract of aconite*, gr. j;
Sulphate of magnesia, ℥ij;
Antimony wine, ℥ss;
Mint water, ℥viij.

Two tablespoonfuls to be taken every four hours.

25. The erysipelas has extended, and two or three vesicles have formed; considerable hardness around the incision; tongue furred and dry; bowels open; complains of no pain; pulse 90. A solution of nitrate of silver to be applied.

26. The erysipelas has not extended since yesterday; tongue brown and dry; thirst; bowels open; no pain or tenderness. There is considerable discharge from the wound, the edges of which are very much indurated. A large poultice applied over the wound; pulse 100, and very weak. To have beef-tea and wine.

27. Not so well this morning; erysipelas extending towards the left groin; pulse and tongue as yesterday; bowels not open.

28. Bowels have been opened once; she seems altogether better than she was yesterday. Wine and beef-tea continued.

29. The wound has assumed a sloughing character; there is considerable discharge, which is rather foetid. A slight sore has formed over the sacrum; the patient was, therefore, placed on the water bed; in other respects she is better.

30. The parts around the wound that have been affected with erysipelas are beginning to slough. A large poultice to be applied over the whole, with a little solution of the chloride of lime. To take beef-tea and wine frequently.