

- " Sept 27th 1850 Alice born
- " Dec 5th Baby's superfluous fingers cut off by
- " Prof: Syme
- " Jan 9th 1851 This evening observed a small bone
- " projecting from the wound on Alice's hand, & find-
- " -ing it loose picked it off. It seems to be the frag-
- " -ment which was separated by Prof: Syme at the
- " second cutting, having been left in the bed of the
- " wound through inadvertency. Thus the wound has
- " been kept open since Dec 5th in consequence of this
- " unfortunate mistake
- " May 9th 1851. Prof. Syme performed a new operation
- " on Alice's hand to extirpate the basis of the extra
- " finger."

M^{rs} D explains that Syme made two cuttings ^{at}
 the first operation on Dec 5th, which explains an
 expression in the diary for Jan 9th. L

She then ~~it~~ says that Prof. Syme fully agreed with

her father that the stump had grown between
 the operation on Dec 5th 1850 & that on May 9th
 1851. The stump which was removed on May 9th
 included a bone, but bore no nail. She adds
 "we thought that Prof. Lyne felt a little annoyed
 " about the business, as he had tried to cut as close
 " as he could the first time (ie Dec 5th) when he
 " made first one cutting & then another." She goes
 on to say that after the second operation May 9th
 1851 "we could see & feel how much the stump
 " grew afterwards. It is now (for no attempt has
 " been made to remove it again) a rather large ugly
 " excrescence, certainly containing a bone, but without
 " any nail." —

of the point of the hand

I enclose three sketches (1, 2, & 3) drawn by placing
 the hand flat on the paper, with the pencil held vertical.
 There is certainly a considerable projection as compared
 with my wife's hand similarly traced. —

Regrowth of Nail

3

The Hon M^{rs} L (the wife of a well known man
whose name I have promised not to mention) sent
me word a few years ago of a case of regrowth, & I
have just heard ^{from her} the following fuller particulars.

"I am sorry to say that the surgeon who performed the
" operation on my eldest son (Dⁿ Treacle Staff Surgeon
" at Malta) has been dead several years. The extra
" digit (see skeleton ⁴ ~~Fig~~) was cut off with a pair of
scissors, ^{after} ~~with~~ congelation to save pain, in March
1856 when my son was four months old. The ex-
-crescence was simply cartilage, growing a little above
the joint, with a perfect nail as in the drawing. My
son has just made a drawing of his hand as it now
is, with the regrowth entirely covered with nail
quite loose from the bone. [In answer to my queries
she says] The bone beneath does not seem more
prominent than in the corresponding place on the other
hand; and I cannot say positively that the stump
left after the amputation was less prominent than it
now is.

The inheritance was from my grandfather who died at 84 in 1850; his extra digit had been amputated I believe when he was about four years old, and the regrowth was much larger and more clumsy than that in my some hand.

The writer thinks the thumb on the
 1st hand grew for the always speaks of it
 as regrowth, though she will not positively affirm
 about its regrowth. — Her name is Galt
 she is a maid. — It is not the in the
 case, as in that of Mr Chambers, the
 fingers in each case fully believe the
 the thumb to be regrowth. —