

*natura.*" The attainment of scientific therapeutic precision can only proceed *pari passu* with the retrogression of empirical procedure and can most surely follow the strenuous study of physiology and pathology.

It is not a question of pills or knives or electricity—but rather of interference and non-interference with nature's processes; the correct adjustment of the delicate relationship between these two habits should be the aim of the judicious therapist.

As regards the application of these principles to the treatment of diseases of women, it is necessary that the procedure must be subject to modification on account of the peculiar nature of the field of work. A very important objection to the use of electricity is the frequency with which applications require to be made.

It is decidedly objectionable to make twenty or thirty applications of electricity to a woman's genitalia, when the same results can be obtained by other means. The reviewer condemns all therapeutic treatment which involves frequent examination of the pelvis, and he considers just as reprehensible the pernicious habit of subjecting women to long courses of local tinkering, whether of the nature of electrical or digital touches, tamponings or swabbings.

In many cases, therefore, the knife may prove to be the true conservator; though, in making this statement, the reviewer by no means desires to condone the excessive use of this instrument prevalent in many quarters.

Were electricity as potent as its advocates claim it to be, there might be some excuse for allowing to it extra license in gynæcology. But it has failed to take rank in the opinion of the majority of scientific gynæcologists. In Great Britain, surgically the most conservative among the leading nations, it has scarcely taken a foothold. Not even the great name of Thomas Keith could suffice to establish its claims. His advocacy of electricity was received in amazement by the whole gynæcological world, and though several, through his influence, were led for a time to give an extended trial to Apostoli's methods there was afterwards an extensive abandonment of them.

It is interesting to note, also, that, at a recent meeting of the American Gynæcological Society, in which a discussion on this subject took place, very scant recommendation was given to electricity as an important therapeutic agent in gynæcology, and even its most pronounced advocates placed limitations to its employment far below those accorded to it by the Apostoli school.

The attitude of the leading German gynæcologists is a matter of notoriety.

In criticising Dr. Massey's book, the reviewer has endeavoured to express his honest opinion, believing that its influence can only be prejudicial to the development of rational therapeutics in the department of diseases of women.

J. C. W.