

ease which in olden times was deemed incurable. It is fortunate for the patient that he became the subject of surgical treatment, before his life was sacrificed by certain doctors who are noted for "rubbing bottles." As the heart and arterial system otherwise appeared to be sound, no obstacle presented itself to the performance of the operation; and although the patient was not under the same restraint and control as he would have been in an hospital, every care and attention was bestowed to prevent an unfavourable termination, occasionally threatened by the injudicious adoption of full diet and stimulants, in spite of our remonstrances to the contrary, and which, in all likelihood, caused the inflammation of the edges of the wound. Although the ligature was not detached till the thirtieth day after the operation, I considered that circumstance favourable to the patient's ultimate recovery, as it afforded an additional argument for keeping him quiet, and under a regulated regimen, which salutary restraints he would have broken through at an early period, had not the dread of instant and fatal hemorrhage, before the detachment of the ligature, been almost daily impressed on his mind. Some slight numbness of the leg of the affected side existed for a time after the operation, but this gradually disappeared under the use of stimulating and anodyne embrocations. No trace of the aneurismal tumour now remains, and the limb performs its wonted duties without pain or fatigue. The artery feels like a firm chord for two or three inches below the original seat of the aneurism.

Manchester, Aug. 3, 1833.

---

#### THE PROTO-IOIDE AND DEUT-IOIDE OF MERCURY.

---

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—As the following extract from a lecture at the Westminster Dispensary may be useful in showing the decided difference in medicinal activity between the *proto-iodide* and the *deut-iodide* of mercury; also the necessity of stating in a prescription the one that is to be employed, I beg your insertion of the same.

Yours in well-wishing,

JOHN EPPS, M.D.,

Lecturer on Materia Medica, &c.

89, Great Russell-street, August 5, 1833.

---

"I have, Gentlemen, now to draw your attention to a new preparation of mercury. It is the *iodide*. This preparation has been

employed in the removal of tumours, and with considerable effect. I have tried it both *internally* and *externally*. From my own experience, I have more confidence in its *external* application than in its *internal* use. I have used it with success in *scrotal* tumours. I have been disappointed in some instances. These disappointments I am inclined to ascribe (from one circumstance that has lately occurred) more to the *preparation* of the medicine than to the medicinal agent itself.

"In illustration I shall mention a case. A patient who had been taking the tincture of iodine, without any effect, for a scrotal tumour, applied to me in the month of February in this year. I prescribed for him the following:  $\mathcal{R}$  *Iodid. hydrargyri* ʒi; *Ung. cetacei* ʒi; ft. ung. pro usu. At the next visit from my patient, I found that no effect was produced upon the tumour; in fact, no effect at all, either general or local. This I thought strange, because I knew that the iodide of mercury produced great heat and irritation. I then ordered an increase of the iodide to two drachms. Still the patient complained of no effect being produced. I then ordered him to go to some other chemist. He went to John Bell, in Oxford-street, and returned to me in astonishment and anxiety two days after, stating that the ointment which he obtained there from the presentation of the same prescription was of a beautiful bright red, whereas the one he obtained at the other chemist's in Oxford-street, was of a yellowish green. And not only did he notice the difference in colour but the difference in effect; for after applying it on going to bed to the scrotal tumour, the red ointment produced so much irritation that he was obliged to rise in the night and bathe the part.

"In order that I might be fully satisfied, I desired him to take the same prescription to the two chemists, and have the ointment made up at both; and to bring me the same, which, Gentlemen, I now show you; and one, you see, is a yellowish green, the other a bright red.

"Now, Gentlemen, I am willing to allow that I am in part to blame, as the following explanation will prove. There are *two* iodides of mercury; the *proto-iodide* and the *deut-iodide*,—the former composed of one equivalent of iodine and one of mercury; the latter of two of iodine and one of mercury. The former is of a yellowish green colour, the other is of a bright red. I should have written in my prescription the *deut-iodide*; but, notwithstanding, you will perceive that the one chemist introduced the *proto-iodide*, the other the *deut-iodide* in making up the same prescription.

"In addition, let me remark, that the

deut-iodide softened the tumour, and as a proof of its effect upon the system, in addition to the irritation produced upon the part to which it was applied, the patient noticed another and an interesting fact, namely, that he *tasted* it the day after rubbing it on the scrotum.

"Thus, Gentlemen, you will perceive that it is our duty to avoid even the possibility of a mistake, and I trust you will observe this additional illustration of the great difference in the properties of a medicine produced by the addition of an atom."

## LONDON PHRENOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

LETTER FROM MR. BURKE, COMPLAINING OF INACCURACIES IN A REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY.

[THE following letter was received many days since, as its date indicates, but its publication was delayed in order that such of the statements contained in it as demanded notice might be replied to by our reporter. It was, accordingly, handed to that gentleman, who has furnished the comments subjoined in the form of notes, prefacing them with the annexed remark:—

Were the space which can be allowed in the pages of THE LANCET sufficiently large to furnish a long and full answer to Mr. Burke, I would show that instead of having been inaccurate and partial, as he alleges, I have been too favourable to him. Indeed, many members of the Society have, I learn, complained of my indulgence towards Mr. Burke. Sympathy with so rash an innovator in the domains of science is rather to be excused than justified.—REP. L.]

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In the report of the proceedings of the London Phrenological Society, given in THE LANCET of the 22nd of June last, there is a notice of some papers which I have read to the Society. As some of the observations and statements in that notice are marked by extreme inaccuracy, I am induced to trouble you with a contradiction of them, to which I trust your kindness and candour will allow a place in the pages of your Journal.

My reason for not noticing this sooner is, that I have lately been affected by an indisposition which rendered an almost total cessation from study of every kind indispensable.

The first passage to which I shall direct attention, is that in which I am reported to have astonished the Society, by announcing that I had discovered *sixty-three new organs* in the head. Now, Sir, instead of this, I stated most explicitly, not that I had discovered sixty-three *new* organs, but that I made the *whole number* of the cerebral organs *amount* to sixty-three, which makes my alleged discoveries amount but to twenty-five, or, at the very utmost, to twenty-eight. Now this announcement was not made extemporaneously, but from a written essay, and the whole paragraph in which it occurred is of such a nature as to have rendered a mistake next to impossible at the time, however the correct number might have been forgotten afterwards.\*

There is also an inaccuracy in what is said respecting my promising to produce, at the following meeting, casts and skulls in illustration of my propositions, but as several members understood me to that effect, I shall not complain. What I did say,—at any rate, what I meant to say,—was, that I should adduce proofs and observations, and that I hoped to be able to refer to au-

\* I have spoken to several members of the Society with regard to the number of *new organs* proposed by Mr. Burke, and find that all of them understood that he had invented *sixty-three new organs*. In fact, I remember in particular, when Mr. Burke submitted his "discoveries" to the notice of the Society, that the Marquis Moscati could scarcely keep his seat, from impatience at the declarations then made; and at the termination of Mr. B.'s paper, the Marquis, in a speech replete with censure, declared that Mr. Burke must either have lost his senses, or did not understand phrenology. M. de Moscati added, "that *instead of sixty-three new organs*, if he were to treat phrenology *metaphysically*, as Mr. Burke had done, he would soon find out *sixty-three hundred*." This was not then corrected, and Mr. Burke himself admits that he has discovered *twenty-five, or, at most, twenty-eight new organs*. I am sorry for the numerical misapprehension; but it makes the case no worse for Mr. Burke than if the excess had been but ten organs. The rapid discovery of eight-and-twenty by a young phrenologist, is to my mind as ludicrous as the discovery of sixty. When a man says he once ran away with the Monument on his shoulder, one may be pardoned for imagining that he also said it had St. Paul's hanging from one end of it.—REP. L.