can be recognized." Dixon Mann (1893), Strassman (1895), Vibert (1896, 4th Edition), Hoffman, Taylor, Liman and our other standard authors do not refer to it. Roussin indeed recommended for examining seminal stains the use of solution of iodine and iodide of potassium, but only for the purpose of staining the spermatozoa, and the fluid which he recommended (iodine 1, iodide of potassium 4, water 100) does not give the Florence reaction. Apart from Florence's work there is practically no literature on the subject except the older work of Orfila as to the odors obtained upon heating the stains or treating them with nitric acid.

Florence states that he started with the firm conviction that so unusual a fluid as semen, which had such well-marked physical peculiarities, must contain some characteristic chemical substance. Acting with this hypothesis in view he proceeded *seriatim* to test seminal stains with all the ordinary reagents used in obtaining chemical reactions, especially those found of value for recognizing alkaloids and those generally employed in physiological chemistry. By trying these one after the other he discovered several which gave him positive results, and among these he selected the ter-iodide of potassium as the one best adapted for medico-legal requirements.

During the past three months I have been making some observations on cadavers (22 cases) upon the occurrence of this reaction in connection with the secretions from the prostate, seminal vesicles, testicle substance and the post-mortem ejaculations from the meatus, with a view of determining whether the prostatic ingredient of the semen or the semen proper was chiefly concerned in giving the reaction. The material was obtained for the most part by allowing it to dry on cotton-wool swabs, so as to obtain a condition comparable with those under which seminal stains ordinarily come under medico-legal examination.

Pressure of other work has prevented me making these examinations with sufficient thoroughness to make their publication in detail seem advisable until I have gone over the material again more carefully, but the general results are as follows: Drying does not appear to interfere with the reaction materially within the time limits I have mentioned; and, in fact, I have often obtained the reaction more satisfactorily from moistening the dried secretion than from the original fluid. Decomposition, such as is met with in drowned bodies and bodies long exposed to the air, appeared to interfere with it to some extent, contrary to what Florence's observations would lead us to expect. The semen from the meatus or from seminal stains gave a better reaction than that substance obtained from the regions where the prostatic and testicular components of the semen had not yet mingled. Semen expressed from the prostatic duct into the urethra gave prompt and characteristic results, while these were much harder to obtain from the testes or the contents of the vesicles. So much was this the case that at first I thought the reaction might be due to the prostatic element of the secretion and not to the strictly seminal part. In some cases, however, typical results were obtained from the contents of the seminal vesicles and from the substance of the testicles. In two cases the reaction was imper-