

of age, from twenty-five to twenty-seven years since, she was bitten by a favorite house-dog of her own, while it was laboring under some species of fits, with which it died, or for which it was killed, she thinks the latter.

Of these facts the immediate family have no recollection, except that they possessed such a dog.

This case, it appears to me, calls up several questions of great interest, among which are the following :—

Was the gangrene spontaneous, or the sequela of the previous disease ?

Was the convulsive condition at the close, true hydrophobia, or traumatic tetanus ? If the former, it is remarkable as to the time that the virus remained inactive ; if the latter, it is equally so as to its simulating hydrophobia.—*Proceedings of the Ohio Med. Convention.*

DR. INGALLS'S CASE OF TUMOR.

[Communicated for the Boston Medical and Surgical Journal.]

THE object of my communication, which was published in the Journal of June 24th, was to attract the attention of medical men to the great variety of quackery now prevalent. I alluded to but two forms, one of which (homœopathy) seems to be distinguished for its impudence and absurdity. In offering some reasons for pronouncing it a humbug, reference was made to the communications of Wm. Ingalls, M.D.

The gentleman says I have made a "misstatement," and in the abundance of his generosity he is kind enough to attribute the error to "an allopathic dose of stupidity." I wish to assure him that the sentiments contained in his article in the Journal of July 8th, are duly appreciated, and the importance of their source fully recognized. The allopathic doses of contumely which he has dealt out for me, compel me to doubt his faith in the principles of homœopathy.

It is not my purpose to acknowledge any misstatement in my former communication, and the subject is alluded to now only for the purpose of saying that it does not appear to be his object to "caution surgeons," so much as to sing praises to homœopathy.

He says that "in a tumor which bore a strong resemblance to an osteocele, of a most intractable character," the pain was soon relieved and the tumefaction disappeared, after the use of two globules of plumbum, and then asks if the infinitesimal dose of plumbum produced its resolution ; plainly intimating that it did, and then shouts his praises in behalf of his idol. I leave it for the common sense of every reader of our articles to say whether I have misrepresented his sentiments. My "hebetude" [?] of intellect must be my excuse for my opinion, for I utterly deny any "dishonesty of purpose."

It is doubtless true that the inherent power of the human system to overcome disease (call it by what name you may) is frequently overlooked, and remedies may be given unprofitably ; but in cases when this power overcomes the disease, so entirely unaided as it must be by some

of the homœopathic treatment, I am in favor of giving the credit to the proper source. Let a just discrimination decide in any given case whether it needs any artificial aid, and when it is needed, render it; when it is not needed, the system should not be encumbered with any agent, certainly not any possessed with the potency *claimed* for homœopathic remedies, and let the praise of the cure be awarded to the agent that deserves it. It is said that the wounds made by friends are grievous to bear. How many such wounds are inflicted upon the science of medicine by some of those who were formerly its friends, and may have been "professors of anatomy, surgery," &c., in some of our schools, but are now advocating a system which has been justly characterized by Dr. Johnson as "the most impudent insult on the common sense of men that has ever been offered to it in any age or in any country."

I wish to suggest to your correspondent, Dr. Leonard, that if he wishes to treat homœopathically any more cases of "constipation," he can find very high authority in the practice of Wm. Ingalls, M.D., for the use of "five globules of muriate of soda." L. WOODRUFF.

New Britain, Conn., Aug. 11, 1846.

EXCISION OF THE OMENTUM.

To the Editor of the Boston Medical and Surgical Journal.

SIR,—If the following will be of any use to you, it is at your service.

I was called to a man, aged about 30 years, some years since, who, in a fit of delirium tremens, had prepared a dirk-knife, with which he had made an incision into the abdominal parietes, extending each way from the umbilicus six inches, making in the whole extent one foot. Through this aperture, being in an erect position at the time the accident occurred, the omentum majus protruded. Drawing this out with the left hand, he cut off the protruding portion, which measured one hundred and forty-four square inches.

Treatment.—The patient being placed in a recumbent position, the protruding portion was returned into the abdominal cavity, by introducing the four fingers of the right hand; then four stitches taken with a curved needle armed with white silk thread. Over this, strips of adhesive plaster were applied, leaving an aperture at the most dependent part of wound, to admit of the discharge of blood, matter, &c. Applying a compress and circular bandage, I directed him to lie as nearly upon his face as he could well endure, in order to favor the discharge of matter from the wound. At the time I was first called, I gave him two ounces of castor oil, directing the same quantity every third day following, as long as confinement, dressing wound every second or third, as the occasion required. This was the treatment in the main, excepting the precaution of using a pad and bandage upon the part, when first beginning to exercise. Diet—gruel, porridge, roasted apple, &c.

At the end of four weeks the patient was up and well. His strength has appeared in no way affected, at least not lessened, nor his digestion