

on "Rötheln," "Chlorosis," and "Scrofula." Dr. Hartshorne has also inserted (within brackets) in the body of each article whatever annotations or addenda the late progress of science or special American experience has appeared to render necessary in order to make each article *au courant* with the times. Part Two commences the consideration of Local Diseases, and, in this volume, deals with "Diseases of the Nervous System." Here the American editor has intercalated sections upon "Hystero-Epilepsy" and "Athetosis." Of the individual articles we need scarcely speak, and shall content ourselves with saying that each is excellent throughout. Indeed, in view of the names of their authors (including Aitken, Anstie, Bastian, Begbie, Bristowe, Buzzard, Chambers, Fox, Garrod, Gee, Gull, Harley, Hutchinson, Hughlings Jackson, Maclean, Maudsley, Parkes, Radcliffe, Russell Reynolds, Ringer, Wm. Roberts, and Henry Sutton), further criticism would seem to savour of temerity. The publisher's work has been, in all respects, done well. The office of American editor has been no sinecure; but we cannot congratulate Dr. Hartshorne upon the self-imposition of a task so unfair in its outcome towards the Old Countrymen.

In view, therefore, merely of the merit of the articles themselves we would strongly advise all those who have not the English edition, and whose consciences are not tender on the subject of literary piracies, to possess themselves at once of this invaluable work now offered at an astonishingly low figure.

*A System of Midwifery, including the Diseases of Pregnancy and the Puerperal State.* By WM. LEISHMAN, M.D. &c., &c. Third American edition, revised by the author; with Additions by John S. Parry, M.D. Philadelphia: Henry C. Lea; Toronto: Hart & Rawlinson. 1879.

That this book possesses real merit is sufficiently attested by the call for a third edition in so short a time, and those who have read the former editions will not be surprised at the general praise it has received. But while there is much in it that is worthy of admiration, yet we must take exception to some points in which

we think the author is not as positive as he should be in fundamental matters of doctrine. We are glad to find the plates representing the positions of the child's head in the pelvis correctly numbered, as from a mistake in that respect the works of Hodge, Tyler Smith, and even Playfair, are all calculated to mislead the student; but when the author says that "albuminuria of pregnancy is comparatively an innocuous disease," we hardly think he does justice to himself, for in the next line he says "that childbed mortality is directly or indirectly increased in some measure by the presence of albumen in the urine is a fact which no one in these days will gainsay;" and when he goes on to say that albuminuria not only increases childbed mortality but is supposed to be a factor in the production of such childbed accidents and complications as convulsions, hæmorrhage, headache, disorders of digestion, phlegmasia dolens, perimetritis, and possibly puerperal fever, we submit that it can hardly be considered such a harmless or innocent complication. Again, we think the author is too sweeping in the assertion, that in cases in which the expulsion of the placenta is left to nature it will almost invariably be found that it is not the foetal surface but the edge which presents, as described by Lemser, Cazeaux, and Matthews Duncan.

We are satisfied, from repeated observation, that in quite a large number of cases the foetal surface of the placenta does actually come first, inverting the bag of membranes precisely as if withdrawn by traction on the cord, and we are inclined to believe that the position of placental attachment determines whether the foetal or uterine surface comes in advance, when no traction is made on the cord.

In speaking of the treatment of funis presentation he does scant justice to Dr. Thomas, by leaving the inference that nothing but position is recommended by him in his postural treatment; and in speaking of post-partum hæmorrhage, in September, 1879, we think he might have been more definite in regard to the value of hot water injections, than to say incidentally that "in some cases in which cold has failed the injection of water at 110° F. will sometimes produce the most favourable results."