one kind of pathological process, and a condition amenable to only one description of climatic treatment. He may be right, in a large number of instances, in recommending consumptive patients to avail themselves of the health resorts of their own country, but his wholesale condemnation of foreign warm climates cannot be sanctioned. It is fully justifiable to hold and to seek to prove the hypothesis of the malarial origin of phthisis, but it will need a very different course of proof and argument than furnished in this volume to secure its acceptance.

Transactions of the Obstetrical Society of London. 1 — The present volume is a handsome record of the year's work of one of our most flourishing medical societies. It contains a number of valuable papers, and, what is often of equal importance, the discussions elicited by them and by the exhibition of specimens and new inventions. Moreover there is here recorded in compact and permanent form the instructive discussion which took place before the Society last summer, on the subject of Puerperal Fever. Among the more noteworthy of the papers are the following:—Report of two cases of Cephalotripsy, by Dr. Braxton Hicks; two papers on Epithelioma of the Cervix uteri complicated with pregnancy, by Dr. Savory, and by Dr. Edis; inversion of the uterus after delivery, by Mr. Gervis; and two papers on Rupture of the Vagina with Recovery, one by Dr. Heywood Smith, and the other by Dr. Wiltshire. Both these cases are remarkable; in the latter, the rupture had occurred spontaneously before assistance could be rendered.

Some of the specimens exhibited were of unusual interest e.g. Dr. Wynn Williams's of intra-mural calcareous tumour impeding delivery; Mr. Oliver Barker's, of an anencephalic fetus (dere-encephalic variety of Geoffroy Saint Hilaire); and Dr. Godson's of curious pigmentation of the breasts of a girl, of which an admirable coloured plate is given.

The discussion on puerperal fever was of great value in enlightening many on a subject concerning which very vague notions were prevalent among the bulk of the profession.

Although it cannot be said that the difficulties were, by any means cleared up, yet their true character became plainly apparent; and it is not too much to say that newer and truer ideas were inculcated in the course of the prolonged debate on puerperal fever which took place. The very form in which the subject was so ably introduced by Mr. Spencer Wells, suggested new lines of thought to numbers who had been accustomed to look upon "puerperal fever" as an entity, and not as a term representing a variety of very different diseases having but one thing in common, viz. their occurrence in puerperal women.

1 Transactions of the Obstetrical Society of London. Vol. xvii, for 1875. London, 1876.
This was no small gain, for it opened the eyes of many to the numerous channels by which "puerperal fever" might assail the lying-in woman, e.g. erysipelatous, diphtheric, scarlatinous, cadaveric, and such like poisons on the one hand, and the autogenetic conditions generating or accompanied by a pyrexial state on the other, such such as cellulitis, retention of placental or other tissues, &c. Although it was granted on all hands that all these varied causes, infecting or other, were attended by a very similar train of symptoms in the lying-in woman, being governed by the puerperal state, yet there were but few advocates of the view that puerperal fever is a separate and distinct disease.

Dr. Fordyce Barker, of New York, most ably and eloquently advocated this view in a brilliant address; but opinions leant to the other side. The discussion well deserves reading carefully in spite of the occasional interpolation of some crudities by ambitious speakers. It has been admirably summed up and reviewed by the President, Dr. Priestley, in his annual address delivered at the January meeting of the Society.

The volume is in every way creditable to the Society and to those responsible for its year's work.

Aveling's Memorials of Harvey.\(^1\)—The smallest contributions towards helping us to rightly appreciate so illustrious a man as Harvey, and to understand his works and his claims as a great discoverer, must be welcomed, and to Dr. Aveling belongs the credit of hunting out some minor incidents in the life of Harvey which his biographers do not appear to have noticed. Dr. Aveling also presents some facsimiles of Harvey's writing and autograph which in themselves are interesting; but we fancy he is in error respecting the great rarity of specimens of Harvey's handwriting, and that greater research will soon bring to light many considerable examples of it. For instance, we are told in the life of Harvey, prefixed to the College of Physicians' edition of his works, that his treatise on anatomy is deposited in the British Museum library; a statement which we read as referring to the original manuscript. Moreover, it is presumable that, remembering how largely Harvey was engaged in controversy with opponents both at home and abroad, more or less of his extensive correspondence, in his own handwriting, still exists. And should a satisfactory biography be written, such as Dr. Aveling desires, it would be desirable to make diligent search among the MSS. preserved in foreign libraries, especially in those universities with which Harvey's friends and adversaries were connected.

\(^1\) Memorials of Harvey: including a letter and autographs in facsimile. By J. H. Aveling, M.D. 1875.