

or more of them, are combined together. This division then is merely that with which we are already acquainted, as adopted by Lee and Churchill. It excludes, however, inflammation of the uterine appendages, which occupies a prominent place in the latter, and is rendered peculiar by the resolution of metritis into three species: endometritis, exo-metritis, and metritis proper, according as the inside or outside, or entire thickness of the uterus is inflamed. These inflammations above expressed are presumed to be the forerunners and causes of the fever. Dr. Meigs does not express any peculiar view of the *kind* of inflammation, so that we presume he takes it to be the common. He is, as he would style it, a *cis* Humoralist, and scorns the theory of blood contamination promulgated by Dr. Fergusson and his successors. He calls Dr. F.'s book "a gospel-book" on the subject, and mentions it as "the crack English work," but he condemns it as "the most misleading and weakest book" out of Philadelphia! In admitting the unnatural plasticity of the blood during pregnancy, and the liability of women so circumstanced to become febrile, he, nevertheless, considers it can have no connection with the occurrence of any of the proximate causes of childbed fevers, further, perhaps, than remotely predisposing to their inception. He seems to lose all sight of the possible reception of a morbid poison into the circulating fluid, and a consequent vitiation of the entire system in the nutrition of its organic components and the performance of their essential functions. In touching upon the subject of contagiousness, after quotations from various dictionaries, the longest of which is one from Webster! he observes—"I rest deeply convinced that the fever does not take the initiative except in very rare instances; but, on the contrary, that an area of inflammation being first established, the reactions ensue thereupon, and I beg you to observe that in all the truly contagious disorders the constitutional affection leads the train, and brings on the topical lesions after an indispensable preliminary incubation." This is rather circuitous and indirect. There is no direct asseveration or denial of the fact of contagion; the decision of which bears strongly on the symptomatic view of these fevers which Meigs claims. Dr. M. takes up a new position and stands firmly on it, thus:—If childbed fever be contagious, 'Why should it attack the pregnant or *in lying* woman alone?' and thus parodies poor Shylock:—"Is such a creature not a woman still?—hath she not hauds, organs, dimensions, appetite, &c.? . . . —if you prick her, will she not bleed?—if you tickle her, doth she not laugh, &c.?" No one can withstand such conviction; as for us we find ourselves lost in amazement, and wonder why no one has never anticipated Dr. M. in such a view. But seriously, it does appear strange he should have overlooked that a specific internal cause is absolutely neces-