

term Peritonitis, I mean inflammation of the serous lining of the intestines," and so on. With regard to the peculiarity of the work, we have only to remark, that if the volume was intended for the profession, as one embodying the writer's views, however peculiar he may have thought them in many respects, such definitions of the names by which diseases are characterized were altogether supererogatory, and if, on the contrary, the work was intended for students of medicine, we can only say that it pays but a poor tribute to their literary or rather classical acquirements, however much it may contribute to a correct appreciation of those of the author.

Throwing these objections aside, but which have obtruded themselves strongly on our mind, we can perceive nothing in the work which does not correspond with our usually received opinions as regards either the "principles or the practice of medicine." The author's reasoning is good whenever he attempts it, and his practice is equally good wherever he recommends it. One objection against the volume lies mainly in the fact, that no matter to what extent the author's "professional career had been one of activity," something more is demanded from an author "on the Principles and Practice of Medicine," than an active professional career during a few years, and the temporary occupancy of a chair on that branch in a college, assuredly not one of the most eminent in the United States. A writer of such a work requires opportunities, and extensive ones, such as are afforded by access to large hospitals, independently of the advantages of a private practice of the largest character, in the former of which the author has been signally deficient.

We must say that we regret to find ourselves compelled to make these observations. The science and practice of medicine, as well as those of its collateral branches, are at the present day far beyond the art of mere book-making. We have stores of information collected in works of the most valuable character, on the three branches of Medicine, Surgery and Midwifery, and unless something new can be added, or some new arrangement of old matters effected, which would prove of service to the profession, works of a profitless character should be reprehended. While therefore we cannot but admire Dr. Maxson for his industry in compiling what is in reality a by no means bad treatise on "the various ills that flesh is heir to," we cannot approve of the taste which has induced him to publish it, and this merely because we cannot perceive that he has added anything whatever to our previous stock of knowledge, which ought to be the aim and object of every publication.

With the manner in which the esteemed publishers have completed their duty, nothing can be said except in terms of the highest commendation.

---

ART. LXII.—*Transactions of the Obstetrical Society of London, vol. 2, for the year 1860, with a list of Officers, Fellows, &c.* London, Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1861, p. 368.

This Society, which has passed its second year of existence, is progressing most favorably in the opinion of the profession of England, if we may be permitted to judge by the large acquisition of new members. The papers which the