thoric, a few leeches to the upper part of the thighs, applied two days before the expected period, will be desirable. With this, a piece of flannel about fourteen inches wide, and folded twice, should be wrung out of a hot and strong decoction of poppy-heads, and wrapped round the pelvis, and covered with oiled silk. This fomentation may be renewed three times a day; and its application should be had recourse to for two or three days prior to the expected suffering, and continued steadily during the period. Of medicines, none, I believe, answer better to relieve the pain than nauseating doses of ipecacuanha, combined with opium, and the extract of stramonium, if the symptoms be very severe. During the interval, no preparation answers better than steel; but care must be taken that such doses and such forms only be given as the stomach will readily assimilate. The following formula is sometimes very useful for the purpose.

(Ph. Lond.) R. Ferri sulph., zinci valerianat., a gr. i; ext. nucis vom. gr. $\frac{1}{2}$; ext. belladon. gr. $\frac{1}{4}$ ad $\frac{1}{2}$. M. Fiat pilula. To be taken three times a day.

[To be continued.]

COLD INJECTIONS INTO THE UTERUS.

By A. G. ROPER, Esq., Croydon.

THE following cases of *post partum* hæmorrhage testify to the success of cold water injected into the uterus in this serious disaster. This proceeding I have adopted for some years, with the same unvarying result of the immediate check of the flooding and the permanent contraction of the uterus.

I have also found cold injection either into the vagina or uterus, of much service in those troublesome hæmorrhages which accompany or succeed abortions in the earlier months.

CASE I. Mrs. M. was confined May 20th, 1863, with her first child. The labour was natural. Two hours after the birth of the child, I received a message, stating that Mrs. M. was in great pain, and was faint; but that there was no hæmorrhage. Suspecting the nature of the case, I took my elastic syringe with me. My patient was faint, pallid, with cold extremities, and nearly pulseless. There was no external hæmorrhage; but the uterus approached in size to the full term. I injected cold water. Many clots were expelled; the hæmorrhage ceased; and the uterus remained permanently contracted.

CASE II. Mrs. M. was confined with her first child on April 24th, 1864. The labour was natural. The placenta was cast into the upper part of the vagina with the last expulsive effort of the uterus in the birth of the child. The removal of the placenta from the vagina was followed by excessive flooding. External pressure effected nothing more than a partial check to the hæmorrhage; and my patient became rapidly pallid and faint, the flooding being greater than I have ever witnessed. This ceased immediately on the injection of cold water; and the uterus remained permanently contracted.

ARTIFICIAL LEGS. The United States Government has increased the pay heretofore allowed for artificial legs furnished to soldiers. At the present rate (\$75), the manufacturers can afford to furnish their best limbs without extra charge. The liberality of the Government, and the necessities of many thousands maimed heroes, have stimulated the inventive powers of the ingenious, and the substitutes for lost limbs are reaching a high degree of perfection. (*Med. and Surg. Rep.*)

Reviews and Notices.

BENEFACTENCE IN DISEASE. An Introductory Address delivered at St. Mary's Hospital. By JOSEPH TOYNBEE, F.R.S. London: 1865.

MR. TOYNBEE endeavours, in this Address, to prove what he calls the "beneficence of disease". We think he fails in the attempt; and fails in consequence of having confused together the symptoms of disease and the disease itself. Mr. Toynbee says that disease is the result of an injury done to the body: "an impression has produced an injury to the body, and disease is the result." Now, to our view, the injury is the disease. Fire burns—i. e., injures—flesh. The burn—the injury—is to all intents the disease. The impression fire has produced an injury, and this injury is the disease. The disease cannot be separated from the injury which represents, and is, the very disease itself.

But Mr. Toynbee has himself given illustrations of his views which clearly show the fallacy lying at the bottom of his argument.

"Thus," he says, "at the outset, I think it must be manifest to every medical man, that, in many instances at least, disease, instead of increasing, in reality repairs the injury from which it arose. A cough, obviously, often seems to remove the source of the injury which causes it—e. g., a foreign body from the windpipe. Vomiting, again, often answers the purpose of ejecting noxious matter from the stomach. Accordingly, we look upon these diseases as of a reparative character," etc.

Now the fallacy here is transparent. Neither cough nor vomiting are diseases; they are simply reflex actions. They are just of a kind with that spasmodic closure of the glottis which is induced, for example, by the attempted inhalation of pure carbonic acid. Cough is not disease; it is merely one of the symptoms of disease, and may depend upon a score of different diseases. Does cough in any way cure tubercle of the lungs, or aneurism, or a laryngeal ulcer? The "impression" spoken of by Mr. Toynbee, in the case he here gives, is manifestly the foreign body in the windpipe; and the "injury" is the irritation, etc., excited by its presence. The "disease" here is assuredly the local injury caused by the foreign body. In no sense can the cough be called the disease, as Mr. Toynbee has it.

Then again says Mr. Toynbee: "An attack of scarlet fever seems to rid the system of the poison causing the scarlet fever, etc." Now surely, if this argument is to hold good, we might equally well speak of the beneficent effects of poisons. An attack of hydrophobia, Mr. Toynbee might equally argue, seems to rid the system of the poison causing the hydrophobia.

Mr. Toynbee also naturally draws illustrations of his position from his own department of surgery; and one or two of these we may add.

"In truth, so commonly is it manifest that diseased processes terminate in the reparation, partial or complete, of injuries, that the thought can hardly fail to suggest itself, whether, in these instances, the fundamental character of disease be not exhibited; whether, in fact, diseases may not be regarded as Nature's processes for repairing or lessening injuries? I have thought it well to bring before you some facts,