

arrival the little patient fast asleep. Not wishing to lose so good an opportunity, I, with my friend Mr. Gandy, thought it advisable to administer chloroform at once. This was done by pouring ten drops on a piece of lint, and repeating it until one drachm had been given, when the patient was thoroughly under its influence. The operation was then performed, and the patient dressed, not waking till half an hour after. The pulse did not appear to differ from that ordinarily observed during the administration of chloroform. It would be interesting to know if this mode of giving chloroform has been noticed by the profession, and whether in nervous patients and young children it would not be preferable to the shock to the system occasioned by fright and fear of suffocation."—*The Clinic*.

A CASE OF IMPREGNATION WITHOUT INTROMISSION.

BY THOMAS HAY, M.D.,
Philadelphia.

The following case is interesting as illustrating the fact that impregnation can take place without intromission. It shows, too, that a persistent hymen is no evidence in case of rape.

In this case the semen was expended on the external parts, and the spermatozoa, by their peculiar motions, through affinity or attraction, found their way into the uterus, and came in contact with, and fecundated, the ovum.

I was visited by Mr. and Mrs. G., from New Jersey, in consequence of enlargement of the lady's abdomen. A belief was induced that a tumor from disease had made its appearance, and that it was growing inside.

This belief was strengthened and almost confirmed by the fact that the existence of pregnancy was not thought possible, and such opinion was not entertained in her case. She had been married more than four months there never was intromission, and the courses appeared regularly as usual.

The husband was aware of the presence of an unyielding obstacle, and the severe pain at coition made penetration impossible. Modesty and other reasons caused delay in seeking medical advice till the already enlarged abdomen was increased in size, and the pain during intercourse had become so great that it was no longer attempted.

Examination showed a strong, unyielding hymen, attached all round the vagina near its entrance, having a hole above the middle large enough only to admit the tip of the little finger; a vascular tumor of the urethra, and extensive erythema of the vulva; the parts were irritable, and the touch of the finger caused the patient to cry out from pain.

I made a crucial incision into the hymen, cut off the four angular flaps, excised the vascular tumor, and applied caustic.

The opening made was maintained by cylinders of lint. The pelvic cavity was normal, and the parts soon healed.

The lady had been three months pregnant, and as the signs of pregnancy increased, she, as well as

the husband, became better satisfied with my diagnosis; and when, after about six months, she was delivered of a healthy, well-developed boy, both were convinced of its correctness, and, as indulgence in the connubial privilege was no longer a cause of pain, they were quite happy.—*Philadelphia Medical Times*.

CANCER OF THE BREAST.

Prof. Willard Parker, New York—*Medical Record*, Sept. 1, 1873—gives an interesting resume of his experience with cancer of the breast. This extends over forty years, and includes 295 cases. He concludes that—

1. The disease is not hereditary, or if so, only in a very limited degree.

2. The disease begins as a local disease, positively and purely. It becomes constitutional just as syphilis begins as a local disease and becomes constitutional.

3. The disease occurs in those of vigorous health, instead of being connected with those conditions in which consumption occurs.

4. Cancerous parents may beget tuberculous offspring.

5. The moral constitution has a powerful influence on the development or the prevention of the development of cancer.

6. There is a great parallelism and analogy existing between cancer and syphilis. Both begin by local irritation. Syphilis is inoculable, but cancer is not. We have both secondary syphilis and secondary cancer.

A DISCRIMINATING PHYSICIAN.

The following characteristic story is going the round of the Parisian Press at the expense of Dr. Bouvart, a close observer of human nature:—"One morning, on entering the chamber of a French marquis, whom he had attended through a very dangerous illness, the doctor was thus accosted, 'Good day to you, Dr. Bouvart; I feel quite in spirits, and think my fever has left me.'—'I am sure it has,' replied Bouvart dryly. The very first expression you used convinced me of it.'—'Pray explain yourself.'—'Nothing is easier. In the first day of your illness, when your life was in danger, I was your dearest friend; as you began to get better, I was your good Bouvart; and now I am Dr. Bouvart; depend upon it you are quite recovered.'—*Med. Press and Circular*, Jan. 15, 1874.

A STRANGE SUGGESTION.

The *St. Louis New Era* makes the following strange suggestion. We hardly think it will be carried into effect. It would be a fatal advertisement for some M. D.'s:—"In marriage notices it is usual to give the name of the clergyman who performed the ceremony, and with usual propriety, in obituary notices, the name of the attending physician should be given."—*The Doctor*, November 1, 1873.