

NICHOLSON
(W.P.)

Both Sides xx
Sudley on the bandage

W. H. Nicholson



BOTH SIDES.



Extract from the Transylvania Journal of Medicine and the Associate Sciences, Vol. I. No. 14, November 1828—page 532.

DUDLEY ON THE BANDAGE.

"It is rather a singular fact, that on a subsequent occasion, another individual, who had been under my charge, for an injury done the head of the fibula, some time after leaving me, became the patient of the professional character, who had failed in the treatment of the case just recited; and when this very simple case eventuated in the loss of the limb, the patient was taught to ascribe that loss to his treatment, while under my charge.

The history of the case is as follows. In attempting to mount his horse, the patient was thrown with the inferior and outer part of one knee on a piece of timber. In a few minutes I was called, and upon examination, the head of the fibula gave to my hand the sensation of an egg-shell crushing between the fingers; no other part of the limb received the slightest injury. The patient was in great pain, which was attributed in part to the injury sustained by the peroneal nerve. The bandage was applied, extending from the toes until it passed the knee, notwithstanding a variety of imprudences, committed by the patient, in rolling in bed, in eating and drinking secretly, articles of the most injurious kind, whereby two severe attacks of fever were produced, and in interrupting the dressings; yet about the twenty-second day from the injury, he was well enough to leave me and go to the country.

He was not long in the country, before I was informed that he was again ill, and that his leg was swelled and painful near the ankle. The individual who could lend the weight of his word to propagate error and do injustice, in a case, the history of which affords sufficient evidence in favour of the treatment instituted, only exposes his own weakness and folly to the derision of the intelligent in the profession.

Had the bandage been judiciously continued after leaving me, (*I will here remark that the bandage was continued until the day my limb was amputated; probably not with that judicious power in which it was first applied,*) the patient might have been the subject of fever for months in succession, from improper indulgence in eating and drinking, without necessarily losing his limb. Nothing can exceed the folly and the stupidity of the charge against the use of the bandage in that case; the more especially as the patient was well enough after two attacks of fever, induced by imprudence, and the in-

jury done his knee and the head of the fibula, to leave town in twenty-two days. It must be manifest even with the tyro, that the evil effects of the bandage, when they do occur, are speedily made known. Swelling, inflammation, deep seated abscesses, suppuration and sloughing, are incompatible with its direct action on any part. Its tendency is immediately opposed to each of these states of the system. The law whereby constitutional diseases are inclined to spend their force on parts rendered prematurely weak and excitable by violence or otherwise, seems to have escaped attention.

It is from that law, a solution of the case in question, is to be drawn; while from ignorance or neglect of it, the patient ultimately lost his limb. By means of the bandage, I have been enabled to save more limbs, the removal of which had been determined on by other physicians, than all the cases of amputation together would amount to, in which I had the least agency, either immediately or otherwise, for the last fourteen years.

To the Editor of the Transylvania Journal of Medicine and the Associate Sciences.

SIR—On perusing one of the late numbers of your Journal, I perceived several statements of cases therein, intended to illustrate the utility of tight bandaging, under the signature of Dr. B. W. Dudley, the professor of Surgery in the Transylvania University.

The case which particularly arrested my attention, is the one that he most fully dwells on, in the 532 page of the 14th number, for Nov. 1828, which is evidently intended as a representation of my own case. Presuming that your Journal was established to promote the science of medicine, to impart correct information to the student, and to enlighten the community at large, by publishing to the world facts, and correcting or exposing errors, I have therefore deemed it necessary to address you, in answer to Dr. Dudley's statement of my case as alluded to above. Had he confined himself to the facts it actually presented, without descending to the gratuitous task of commenting upon my habits at the expense of truth, in violation of his duty as a professional man, and at the sacrifice of the ordinary courtesies of life, I should not, at this late day, have trespassed upon your attention, or claimed the public ear. But, as he has thought it to accord with his principles as a gentleman, and reputation as a surgeon, to add insult to the injury he has already inflicted upon me, through his culpable ignorance of the nature of the injury I had received, and want of judgment in the treatment of my case, and seems disposed to exculpate himself from censure, by the heralding forth his good fame, at the expense of my reputation, as well as that of others, justice requires that I should arrest the current of erroneous impressions, which it is too evidently the wish of Dr. Dudley to impose upon the public. Were his statements destined to be seen alone by those to whom we are both known, or by those who could have an opportunity of informing themselves rightly as to facts, I should have treated his production with that contempt, which, from its malignity and falsehood, it so richly merits; but as such is not the case, I must be indulged while I rescue my character from the insidious stab of one, who avails himself of official station, to injure an individual whom he, by his want of skill, has rendered a cripple for life.

To begin then with Dr. Dudley, and his statement. I am really at a loss to conjecture to whom he alludes when he says, that "I was taught to ascribe

the loss of my leg to his treatment, by a professional character, into whose hands I fell subsequently to being under his charge." In his published history of my case, he states, that "in attempting to mount his horse, the patient was thrown on a piece of *timber*." Now the fact is, that in attempting to mount the horse, my cloak caught, and I could not gain the stirrup, and in jumping off I sprained my leg, as will appear in the sequel. I fell on a grass plat; but as to the piece of *timber* the Doctor alludes to, if there, it must have been buried under ground, as it was neither visible to the sight, nor tangible to the touch. His notice is the first intimation I ever had of it. He then says, that "upon examination of the head of the *fibula*, it gave to his hand the sensation of an egg-shell crushing beneath his fingers; no other part of the limb received the slightest injury." It certainly cannot have escaped the memory of Dr. Dudley, as well as that of several other persons, who were present when I met with the accident, that not more than ten minutes elapsed before he was present, and that after pulling off a tight boot, and examining the limb, he observed it was only a sprain; but upon a more close examination, he said both bones were broken about three inches below the knee, and employed two gentlemen in holding the broken bones, while he was preparing the bandages, which he applied in the following manner: he first tore off five or six small bandages about two and a half inches in width, and about two feet long; these he saturated with whiskey, and bound over the knee; he next applied the long roll-bandage, (which was also saturated in spirits,) beginning at the toes and extending upwards nearly to the hip-joint. Being thus bandaged up like a harlequin and placed upon a bed, but a very short time had elapsed before I felt the most excruciating tortures, and observed to those present, I could never stand it; that the pain created by the blood endeavouring to force its passage to the extremities of the injured leg, was beyond endurance. I felt the pain just above the knee joint, and in the tendons underneath the knee.

My friends taking it for granted that the Doctor ought to know best, notwithstanding the remonstrance of the Reverend George C. Light, who wished to relieve me, suffered me to remain in the situation I have described, until I became delirious, under the baneful effects of the tight bandaging. While in this situation, I may have been guilty of the imprudence of rolling in bed, as reported by Dr. D.; but agreeable to the representation of my friends, Dr. D. was sent for three different times during the first night; the first time he sent a message to this purport—that I must endeavour to bear the bandages, and that they ought not to be removed (I think) for two weeks. To the second message he returned a note, stating that he would not have the bandages removed for one hundred dollars, and that the cause of my extreme pain arose from the circumstance of the fracture extending into the knee joint, and that he could compare it to nothing else than egg-shells beat in a mortar. The third time he was sent for, he came, and observed, he was astonished I had no more philosophy. Philosophy! Philosophy in a man partially deranged by tight bandaging, which prevented his blood from circulating? Had Job, with all his patient forbearance, been driven to madness by the empiricism of his physician, I question very much whether his philosophy would have availed him much more than mine did me. In the morning of the second day, when he came to see me, Dr. D. loosened the bandage to the knee joint, and if I mistake not, it was relieved again the same day by Dr. Webb, by the consent of Dr. D. The bandaging from the knee to the extremity of the foot, was not removed for several days, and always reapplied as soon as wet with spirits, as before. In this situation I was kept for twenty-six days, (Dr. D. says twenty-two.) Whether the variety of imprudences as ascribed to me by Dr. D., such as rolling in bed, &c. arose during

the first forty-eight hours, when labouring under delirium, brought on by his want of judgment, I know not; it is, however, a pitiful subterfuge for him to take shelter under such a flimsy covering, from the well deserved censure, consequent on his ignorant treatment of me. The next items in his list of my imprudences, are his charges against me of *eating* and *drinking secretly*, articles of the most injurious kind. This is evidently an after thought, eminently worthy of one so skilled in surgery. Is it not too ridiculous for serious refutation, that an invalid, who was unable to move from off his bed, could procure articles of food and drink *secretly*? But if they were so secretly disposed of, how came the fact in the possession of Dr. Dudley? Did he discover a knowledge of it, by the same penetrating eyes that enabled him to discern the *timber*, on which his *imagination* so ingeniously broke my leg? He certainly should have explained the name, and quality of those injurious articles, in which I indulged, as also how and by whom he obtained his information. By whom was I furnished with them? wherefore the necessity for secrecy? I was not in a situation to demand of me a resort to any such means, to gratify my appetite. I had arrived at the age of maturity, and was surrounded by those, whose hospitality, kindness and attention were only equalled by their sympathy for my sufferings, and solicitude for my relief—whose indulgence would have precluded the necessity of resorting to secrecy, to procure either the necessaries or luxuries I might have needed or desired. Instead of its being necessary to practice covert devices to procure articles of “a pernicious kind” to indulge in, it was not an unfrequent, though a painful duty I had to perform, in refusing the numerous little messes provided by the generous thoughtfulness of those, by whom it was my good fortune to be surrounded. I say the duty was a painful one—it was truly so to me, to be compelled by a sense of propriety, in obedience to the directions of my surgeon, to reject the proffered kindnesses of those whose greatest pleasure it was

“To bind up the wounded heart,
And pillow the aching head.”

It is well known that I neither ate nor drank any thing out of the common prescriptions given by Dr. Dudley, for my guidance, without consulting him, except in one or two instances, which I shall notice, during the whole course of my confinement, while under his charge. I recollect a few days after the accident occurred, of asking for a glass of *wine sangaree*, which was handed me, though *not secretly*. I had scarcely tasted it before Dr. Dudley came in, and pointing to it, I asked him whether it was proper for me to drink it; and on his replying that it was not, I desisted from doing so. Again, about eight or ten days from this period, I drank about a tumbler of cider without his consent; but this was done openly and *not secretly*. About the third week after I met with my accident, and after Dr. Dudley had pronounced that I would *soon* be well, (although my leg was then as scaly as the back of a fish and smelt, as I was told, very offensively,) I did, as he states, perhaps imprudently, eat a few *oysters*. These are the only times that I recollect of having either ate or drank any thing out of the range of Dr. Dudley's general prescriptions. It is perfectly within my remembrance, that after I had eaten those oysters of which I have just spoken, upon Dr. Dudley's being informed of it, that he said they were the most injurious things I could have eaten, and that a person present observed to him, “Doctor, when I was so ill, you recommended them to me.” “Yes,” was his reply, “but those that I recommended to you, *were cured in their own liquor.*” He was then informed that those I had eaten were also cured in their own liquor, and not with *vinegar*. After this explanation, he admitted they were innocent. Notwith-

standing this admission, in his desperation, like a drowning man catching at straws, he has continued to harp upon this oyster business. I feel satisfied, after this candid detail of facts, that the intelligent part of the community will conclude, that the reason assigned by Dr. Dudley as the cause of his failure, is no less impotent than unjust, and but serves to expose "his weakness and folly to the derision of the enlightened in the profession." I recollect but once of having any considerable increase of fever, except what was induced by the cause already assigned, while under Dr. Dudley's care, when at my request he gave me a dose of medicine. This was some time after the "*egg shell fracture*" took place. I am the more certain of this circumstance, because of my having asked him if the medicine was not *calomel*, and observing to him that I was in the habit of taking from fifteen to eighteen grains. His reply is distinctly within my recollection; it was, "if ten grains would not have the desired effect, fifty would not."

I shall now notice the journey I performed, which, as the Doctor says, was about the 22d day, but which, in fact, was on the 26th day. He says, "nothing can exceed the folly and stupidity of the charge against the use of the bandage in *my* case, the more especially as the patient was well enough after two attacks of fever induced by imprudence, and the injury done his knee, and the head of *his fibula*, to leave town in twenty-two days." Here the Doctor is at points with himself. He certainly must have forgotten that in giving a history of the case, at the commencement, he says, no other part of the limb received the slightest injury except the *head of the fibula*, which was like the crash of egg-shells; but when he recites my journey, performed on the 22d day, in order to impress the public with the idea that the case was a very desperate one, (which, unfortunately for me, was made so by his mismanagement,) and that consequently the case was bordering on the miraculous, he recollected of a sudden that the knee was injured.

Now in all human probability, if the Doctor had written another paragraph, he might have recollected the circumstance of his giving two gentlemen the trouble of holding *two bones*, which he represented as being broken, whilst he was preparing and applying the bandages. It is unfortunate for the success of the Doctor, that he is not able to continue this delusion, as with the aid of those two bones, which were never broken, except in his imagination, he might be able to make out a tolerably specious case. Facts, however, stand too strongly arrayed against him, and he has been compelled to yield to circumstances. Owing to his wretched misapprehension of the nature and extent of the injury I had received, and barbarous application of the bandages, the flesh sloughed off, and exposed the bones to view, when it was discovered that there was not the slightest crack perceptible—no evidence of *broken bones*.

This can be established by some of the most eminent physicians, as well as by several respectable gentlemen in and around Lexington. Thus driven to the wall, the Doctor has very prudently dropt the *broken bones*, conscious that so flagrant a mistake would be received as proof of his defective judgment, and as a reflection upon his skill as a surgeon.

A more gross misconception of the character of an injury, I think I might venture to assert, is not to be found in the books; nor never did any individual suffer more through stupidity than I have done; for, by what other name shall I designate that condition of the mind, which mistakes a simple sprain, for an injury of the complicated kind, as ascribed to mine by Dr. Dudley? I will return to my case. The day succeeding the one on which I met with the accident, Dr. Webb, as before premised, came to see me, and observed that if the bandage remained in its then situation much longer, I must either lose my limb or my life; and if I mistake not, it was at his suggestion the bandage was loosened the first time to the knee, by Dr. Dudley. About

the second week, my friends, finding my situation growing worse, called in another physician, Dr. Pindell, in consultation with Dr. Dudley, to whom Dr. D. represented the "broken bones" and the "egg shell fracture," observing to him, that he should not like to remove the bandages. Dr. Pindell did not insist upon their being removed, but replied that he should have preferred putting my leg in a box, and advised the application of warm vinegar, which was poured over the bandages, with the approbation, as I presume, of Dr. Dudley. After this, Dr. P. made two different appointments to meet him in consultation, but Dr. D. both times failed to make his appearance, which occasioned Dr. P. to desist visiting me, and I never saw him again until after my removal from Lexington.

After a day or two, Dr. Dudley stopped the application of the vinegar, observing it was of no use; that the application of the bandages was all that was necessary; and that the reason why most of the physicians were so averse to using them, was because they did not know how to apply them. That they were like a set of old dray horses, (I think he said,) that could not be got out of the old beaten track. If I am not egregiously mistaken, he also stated that the old fashioned mode of using *splints* in cases of fracture was entirely abandoned, being superseded by the application of the bandage, by the first surgeons in Europe.

My limb, in a very short time after this, became very offensive, and Dr. Dudley will recollect, he was asked the cause. What he attributed it to, I was not informed until some time after my removal to the country, whither he was not invited, his services not being desirable. It must, I think, be obvious to all, that mortified pride has driven him to the unenviable task of accounting by means of slander and falsehood, for consequences arising from his own mal-treatment of me, and hence springs his charges of the secret use of articles of a pernicious tendency, which he has so uncharitably trumpeted forth to the public against me.

It may be proper to remark in this place, that whilst under the direction of Drs. Pindell, Sutterwhite and Webb, my course of diet was altered, and instead of restricting me, they gave me stomachics to increase my appetite. This they deemed necessary to counteract the ill effects which were likely to result to my general system from the copious discharges of my leg, it being their opinion that if my appetite failed, I could not survive many days. I would here ask, is it probable that a little *wine sangaree*, a tumbler of *cider*, and a few *oysters*, used during a period of twenty-six days, could have produced such unhappy results? If so, what could have produced that scrofula appearance and purple spots, before I either drank the cider, or tasted the oysters. Surely it was not barely taking a mouthful of wine sangaree to wet my lips, and moisten a parched throat. No, the cause is to be traced to the application of the bandage, and to that alone, notwithstanding "the law whereby constitutional diseases seems to have escaped attention, and the fourteen years experience" (of Dr. Dudley,) "in the application of tight bandages."

But to proceed; knowing I was trespassing upon the generous hospitality where I was then unavoidably confined, I was anxious, as well as my more interested friends, to remove to the country, and Dr. Dudley must surely recollect being questioned as to the propriety of the measure; if he does not, I perfectly remember his answer, which was, that I had better remain a few days longer, that I would *soon be well enough*. I waited patiently several days, in hopes *well enough* would arrive; but instead of getting better, I evidently grew worse. Dr. Webb at last insisted upon my removal, stating he could not, with propriety, interfere while I remained under Dr. Dudley's charge; and without consulting him, I was removed the distance of two and a half miles from town. Dr. Dudley would fain have the public believ-

that when removed to the country, my leg was nearly well, than which nothing can be farther from the fact. I will describe the manner of my removal, from which it will be perceived that I was as low as I well could be. Dr. Webb removed me in a carriage, on the bottom of which a bed was placed. I was taken from the chamber in which I was confined, and carried to the carriage, and carefully laid on the bed provided for my reception. Thus situated, I was conveyed by slow travelling to the residence of M. T. Scott, Esqr. lifted out of the carriage, and carried to a bed previously prepared for me.

So much for Dr. Dudley's Flemish account of my being well enough about the twenty-second day, to leave him and go to the country. The day after my removal, after I had somewhat recovered from the fatigue of this wonderful journey, Dr. Webb removed the bandages, when it was discovered that there were several purple spots, and one black one, about three or four inches below the knee, on the outer part of the leg, from which a copious stream of the most offensive matter immediately issued, nearly filling a quart vessel. As soon as it had stopped running, Dr. Webb went to Lexington for Dr. Pindell, who again attended me as a consulting physician. In a short period after this, every muscle in my leg began to decay, and finally rotted off; my heel and part of the toes sloughed off. It was the opinion of the respectable physicians who attended me, as well as that of other intelligent persons who witnessed my sufferings, that the whole was ascribable to the improper application of the bandages, and that during the first forty-eight hours.

In all probability, had the sprain, for it was nothing more, been left to nature, she would have performed a cure in a few weeks; but it was my misfortune to call to my aid a votary of tight bandages, who, to gratify an unhallowed pride of opinion, has compelled me to wear a wooden leg "*as a monument of bad surgery.*" The fact is, that if Dr. Dudley was to put the same pressure upon an uninjured leg, that he did upon my sprained one, the same disastrous results would no doubt be produced.

Again, Dr. Dudley attributes my sufferings and loss of limb to the interruptions of the bandages or dressings while under his care. This is the more strange, as he acknowledged to M. T. Scott, Esq. that during that time, the bandages were never removed but by himself, except once partially, and then by his directions. The Doctor is not, however, over scrupulous in framing excuses; for upon another occasion, in despite of the facts I have detailed, he asserted that if I had remained three days longer under his care, I would have got well. If there had been the slightest ground for such an assertion, how is it possible that the inflammation, deep seated abscesses, suppuration, and sloughing, that immediately followed my translation from Lexington, could have taken place. It will not be contended that this instantaneous change is attributable to the effects of the country air; if not, what was the cause? Nothing more nor less than Dr. Dudley's tight bandages. The excuse which I have just exposed, calls to my mind a conversation which he had with the same gentleman, in reference to the application of his bandages. He gravely contended that if he had the strength sufficient to exert a force equal to the power of ten horses in their application, it would be impossible to injure a limb, provided the bandages were wrapped regularly. I merely mention this to convince the public how carefully the Doctor is to outrage decency and common sense, rather than his favourite hobby should not be sustained. Every one who knows any thing about the matter, must know, that such a force applied to a limb, would grind it in good earnest to an egg-shell substance; it would be better for the Doctor to be candid for once, plead guilty, and abandon his leg-destroying bandages; for unless he does, should he have many cases, he will have much to answer for; for each one will have

cause to bear testimony against him. The Doctor really seems to have set out with the determination to run a tilt after dilemmas, as will appear from the following. He says, "He (I) was not long in the country before I (he) was informed that he was again ill, and that his (my) leg was swelled and painful near the ankle."

Now it so happened that my illness had not intermitted. But why should he particularise the pain as being "near the ankle?" The fact is, there were many other parts of the leg which caused me infinitely more suffering and pain. To me it seems somewhat singular, that the Doctor's information should be so precise at this remote period as to enable him to locate the seat of pain; for on reference to a note written by him only 11 months after the accident occurred, he affects to have forgotten both me and my case.

Notwithstanding all Dr. Dudley has said to the contrary, it is an undeniable fact, which can be substantiated by several distinguished gentlemen of the faculty, that my leg was in a state of mortification when my friends removed me from under his care, extending from 4 or 5 inches above the knee to the end of my toes. To the skill of the physicians who attended me, after my removal, together with the unceasing attentions of my friends, am I indebted for my recovery. To Dr. Webb, who scarcely ever left my bed side during a period of five months; to Drs. Pindell and Satterwhite, (the two latter attended in consultation,) I owe a debt of gratitude, I fear I never shall repay.

In about five months after my accident, my situation being considered extremely precarious, Dr. Scott of Chillicothe, (now of Lexington) was written for; but having unfortunately met with an accident the day before his intended departure with a view of visiting me, he was prevented from coming, and I of availing myself of his services at the time.

In the month of June following, Dr. Webb, being anxious of returning to Ohio, by the advice of Dr. Scott, and the approbation of Dr. Pindell, who were consulted upon the occasion, I was removed to Chillicothe, a distance of 150 miles. It was considered by my physicians, that in my low and doubtful condition, a change of air might be serviceable to me. At the period of which I am now speaking, five months after the accident, notwithstanding the Doctor, in his report, alleges I was "well enough" to leave him and go to the country about the 22d day, I was so reduced that my back and hip bones had come through the skin, and I was wholly unable to help myself. I was so low that it was found necessary to fix the bed on which I was laid, on a springy board in the carriage; I was lifted in and out as occasion required. Mrs. N. and a servant, besides the driver, accompanied me in the carriage, to render such assistance as might be requisite, and Dr. Webb and his brother accompanied on horseback. On my arrival at Chillicothe, Dr. Scott examined my leg, and then pronounced it as his opinion, that it would never be of much service to me; but that after it should have been healed, I would be the better able to judge, and if it should be necessary then to have it taken off, I would be in a better situation to undergo the operation. In about four weeks from my arrival in Chillicothe, I had so far recovered as to be able to set up, and occasionally to walk with the aid of crutches, and a stirrup suspended from my neck, so as to support my skeleton of a leg. In the month of August following, by the advice of Dr. Scott, I returned to Kentucky to avoid the autumnal fever which had prevailed for one or two years in Chillicothe.

In the month of November, I had so far regained my strength, as to be able to leave Kentucky for Baltimore, my leg being supported on a pillow in the carriage.

Thus after eleven months of the most intense suffering, I was enabled once more to reach my home, with a mutilated limb, produced from the want of skill and judgment in my medical attendant at the commencement of the

On my arrival in Baltimore, Dr. Buckler, who is my family physician, called to see me, and on examining my leg, said it did not appear that any bones had been broken, but that it would never be of any use to me, and advised amputation; at this period my leg was nothing but skin and bone, there being nothing left but the artery to nourish it, the little flesh and muscles it used to have, having rotted off.

At Dr. Buckler's request, Drs. Davidge and Jamison, were called in on consultation. On examination, the latter gentleman coincided in opinion with Dr. B. and recommended amputation; the former agreed as to the first point, but recommended amputation to be deferred for a time to see the effect the efforts of nature might produce. Desirous, if possible, of saving my limb, I awaited the operations of nature until the 24th of April following, when despairing of recovery, on that day the amputation was performed by Dr. Buckler and Dr. Gibson, and in the presence of Dr. Lyon, now demonstrator of anatomy in the medical college of this city, Dr. Keerl who is now in Europe pursuing his studies, and Drs. Coskery, Caldwell, Pearce and Handy; those gentlemen, who dissected and examined the limb after it had been taken off, told me there was no sign of fracture that they could discover. Thus ends the history of the case of the "broken bones," the "egg shell crash, and the injured knees," after seventeen months of the most excruciating torture. It is unreasonable to presume for a moment, that effects so extraordinary could have proceeded from a simple sprain, unless superinduced by improper treatment. To Dr. Dudley's want of judgment and tight bandages, I am indebted for all my suffering and the loss of my limb.

In about six weeks after the operation was performed, I walked to my office, distance probably a quarter of a mile—so much for a skilful surgeon. In the month of November following, I mounted a wooden leg, and have visited Kentucky three times since then; during the last summer and fall, I spent the most of my time in and around Lexington, and never heard a word of my case, until the day previous to my leaving Lexington, when I was informed it was preparing for the press. A few days after my return here from Kentucky, I received a copy of his publication through the medium of the post office. To me it is inexplicable what fatuity could have beset Dr. Dudley, after an elapse of four years, to publish my case; much less can I account for the worse than savage pleasure he seems to indulge in, while unprovokedly assailing me. Had Dr. Dudley stopped after giving his imaginary statement of my case, erroneous as that was, I should have permitted him to have enjoyed his laurels undisturbed; but as he has calumniated me, and called my morals in question, I have felt myself bound to expose the grossness of his professional errors, and to throw back the foul aspersions upon my reputation, as unworthy of me, and becoming only him, in whose malevolent heart it was nurtured. In a word, I defy him and the miserable beings whom he has employed, or those who gratuitously lent their aid, to propagate the charge of eating and drinking to excess against me, to substantiate it, by the evidence of a solitary individual entitled to credit in the estimation of honourable men.

In conclusion, I will appeal to the public, and ask them, admitting for argument sake, that Dr. Dudley's representation of my case was correct, which I deny—I say I ask them, I ask the intelligent of the medical profession, whether under the circumstances of the case he has made out, he was justified in the application of tight wet bandages? I ask them did they ever see, hear, or read of such treatment, except by Dr. Benjamin W. Dudley, in a case of egg-shell fracture, in Europe, Asia, Africa or America? And whether it succeeded? I have done with the Doctor.

I am the public's ob't serv't,

W. P. NICHOLSON.

CERTIFICATES.



The following is in answer to a letter I addressed to Dr. Buckler some time after my limb had been amputated.

COPY.

Dear Sir—In answer to your note of the 24th, in which you desire to know "if I could discover any appearance of fracture in the bones of your amputated limb, more particularly of the head of the fibula and knee cap," I state, for your satisfaction, that no trace of such injury was discoverable in either of these bones, nor could I perceive any sign by which I could infer that the larger bone of the leg or tibia had been fractured.

May, 30th, 1826.

Respectfully, &c.

J. BUCKLER.

My object in procuring the annexed certificates is merely to show that Dr. Dudley was entirely mistaken in the nature or extent of the injury I received.

We, the undersigned, were present at the amputation of Mr. Nicholson's limb, and have again examined it this day, and do not perceive any signs of fracture.

Signed,

S. H. LYON, M. D.
S. H. CALDWELL, M. D.
W. D. COSKERY, M. D.

WITNESS, W. A. SCHEFFER.

Baltimore, Jan. 9th, 1829.

We have examined the bones of a leg, handed to us by Mr. Nicholson, and do not perceive any evidence of fracture in either of them; and the head of the fibula appears perfect.

Signed,

GEORGE S. GIBSON, M. D.
MAXWELL McDOWELL, M. D.
MICHAEL DIFFENDERFFER, M. D.
JOSHUA I. COHEN, M. D.
GEORGE FRICK, M. D.
WM. DONALDSON, M. D.

We have examined the bones of a leg, which was handed us by Mr. Nicholson, and particularly the head of the fibula, and do not perceive any evidence of fracture.

Signed,

JOHN J. MCKENZIE, M. D.
S. BIRCKHEAD, M. D.
ALEXANDER CLENDINEN, M. D.
ASHTON ALEXANDER, M. D.
SAMUEL BAKER, M. D.
W. FISCHER, M. D.

I do hereby certify, that I buried Mr. Nicholson's limb, and at his request took it up again the other day, cleaned it, and gave it to him, and that the limb now before me is the same one.

Witness my hand, this 9th of Jan. 1829.

JOHN C. BROWN, *Sexton of Christ Church.*

State of Maryland, City of Baltimore, sc.

On the 9th of January, 1829, before me, the subscriber, a justice of the peace for the said city, personally appeared John C. Brown, Sexton of Christ Church, in said city, and made oath on the Holy Evangely of Almighty God, that the several facts contained and set forth in the above certificate, are respectively true as they therein stand stated.

Sworn and subscribed before me the day and year first written.

W. A. SCHÆFFER.

I certify that I was present when John C. Brown buried Mr. Nicholson's limb, and also when he took it up again, and that the limb now exhibited is the same one.

WITNESS, W. A. SCHÆFFER.

W. T. PEACHEY.

Baltimore, 9th January, 1829.

"I was called, and upon examination, the head of the fibula gave to my hand the sensation of an egg-shell crushing between the fingers. No other part of the limb received the slightest injury."

Dr. Dudley's Statement.

I do hereby certify that I have read the foregoing and find it to be a true and correct copy of the original as the same appears in the records of the office of the Secretary of the State of New York.

JOHN B. BROWN, Secretary of the State of New York.

State of New York, City of New York, 1881.

JOHN B. BROWN, Secretary of the State of New York.

JOHN B. BROWN, Secretary of the State of New York.

JOHN B. BROWN, Secretary of the State of New York.

JOHN B. BROWN, Secretary of the State of New York.

JOHN B. BROWN, Secretary of the State of New York.

JOHN B. BROWN, Secretary of the State of New York.

JOHN B. BROWN, Secretary of the State of New York.

JOHN B. BROWN, Secretary of the State of New York.

JOHN B. BROWN, Secretary of the State of New York.

JOHN B. BROWN, Secretary of the State of New York.

JOHN B. BROWN, Secretary of the State of New York.

JOHN B. BROWN, Secretary of the State of New York.

JOHN B. BROWN, Secretary of the State of New York.

JOHN B. BROWN, Secretary of the State of New York.

