

## ON THE SEAT OF THE SUGAR FORMATION IN THE ANIMAL BODY.

By Dr. J. Molesehoff.

As it is well known Bernard (comptes Rendus XXXI. p. 572, 573) has shown the existence of sugar in the liver, not only of all vertebrata, but also in that of the gasteropoda, acephala and decapoda. Frerich's (article "Verdaung" in R. Wagner's Handwörterb d'Physiol, p. 821) has confirmed these observations for the liver of man and many animals; Vander Brock (Nederlansch Lancet, p. 103, 110) for that of dogs and rabbits; Bannert (Erdmann's Journal, liv. p. 359) for that of the fox, the dog, the cat and the sheep; and Kunde and Lehmann (Kunde, Dellepatis, ranarum exstirpatione, Diss. Berol., 1850, p. 11) for that of frogs.

I selected twelve frogs for my investigations, and notwithstanding the smallness of their livers, so much sugar appeared that it was easily shown by Trommer's test. Bernard and Lehmann regard this sugar of the liver as grape sugar.

The question arises, is this sugar of the liver derived from the blood or is it formed by the liver proper? Bernard advocates the latter view, since he has thus obtained the sugar wholly independent of the food, with the carnivora and herbivora, with animals furnished during hibernation and with the fetus in utero. Frerichs, Vander Brock and Baumert have repeated these observations and confirmed them.

Still more important is the result obtained by Bernard (loc. cit.) and Lehmann (Erdmann's Journal, LIII. p. 213, 215,) that the portal blood of the dog and horse contain little or no sugar, while the blood of the hepatic vein contains, like no other vein in the body, this substance in considerable quantity.

To these data I would add a fact of some import. If the sugar is not found in the liver but is only strained off, as it were, by this last from the blood, then the blood of those animals whose liver had been removed would be found surcharged with sugar, exactly as the blood is filled with urea in animals whose kidneys have been removed. But with frogs, some of which had been without the liver for fourteen days, others for three weeks, I found no sugar in the blood, flesh, gastric juice, urine, nor finally in the water in which twenty-six of these animals thus mutilated had passed two days.

From all these facts it appears to me indubitable that the sugar contained in the liver is formed by the liver itself.—*Muller's Archiv*, 1853, *March*, p. 86.

## PROSECUTION OF MEDICAL MEN.

Within the past year several suits have been commenced and carried through against medical men for malpractice. Among those in this vicinity we may mention the trials of Dr. Hammond, of Nashua, and Dr. Sargent, of Rochester in this State, and more recently that of Dr. Kittredge, of Andover, Massachusetts. In the first case, Dr. Hammond was acquitted, not more in consequence of the ability of his counsel than the honesty and independence of the surgeon called to testify for the plaintiff. In Dr. Sargent's case we are informed that the verdict was given for the plaintiff in the face of the most explicit testimony from medical men. The same was true in Dr. Kittredge's trial, in which, as we understand it, after an injury to the arm in which there was rupture of the brachial artery, the attending surgeon was brought in guilty for causing the arm to slough off by tight bandaging. The community should be made to understand that by encouraging such prosecutions they are endangering their own safety, and surgeons will be compelled in self-defence to require beforehand a bond that they shall not be prosecuted, whatever may be the result of the treatment. From several recent trials we feel warranted in saying that the chances are altogether better for the acquittal of an ignorant, uneducated pretender to medical knowledge, who is really guilty, than for that of an intelligent, well-educated surgeon to whom no fault can justly be charged.—*New Hampshire Journal of Medicine*.