

geon, detailing the history and description of the case of the ex-King, in whom malignant disease had also appeared in the mouth, very near to but not exactly in the same site. From the description given, the conviction was irresistible to my mind that it would be impossible by any surgical procedure to remove the whole of the diseased tissue, and that any attempt of the kind would be attended with such danger as might be followed by immediate death and would undoubtedly shorten the duration of his life. His death followed within a few months that of our honored ex-president. As regards the probable future of the case of the Crown Prince, none but those able men who are in attendance upon him, and who must have a knowledge of many details which are essential elements, but which it is impossible to explain to the world, are competent to form or express any opinion of value. In general terms, I may say that his general health is reported to be very good—that the progress of the disease appears to be slow as compared with some cases, and I may add, if it be decided by his medical advisers that partial or entire excision of the larynx should be performed, we have abundant evidence that in a certain number of cases both of these operations have prolonged life to a period when the probability of recurrence is very small. In some cases entire excision has saved life for a length of time; that gives great encouragement for hoping that the ravages of this terrible disease have been arrested. Two such happy results have been reported in this country and several abroad. Dr. Roswell Park, of Buffalo, in June, 1885, removed the entire larynx on account of the existence of this disease in a patient who was himself a medical man. In a letter, dated November 22nd, he writes to me: "The Dr. has a number of relatives in Buffalo, and, as I frequently see one or more of them, I am kept pretty well informed as to his condition. My latest news is so recent as last week, and to the effect that he is as well as ever."

It must be obvious that all new and important operations are followed by a progressive success in their results as the methods of operating are improved in their details and as the after-treatment necessary becomes better known. The percentage of successful results increases in a ratio in proportion to the experience acquired by the increasing number of the operations. Indeed, I may add that it is my conviction that the progressive number of cures of this terrible curse to humanity is in a more rapid ratio than the progressive increase of the frequency of the disease.

Need I say more in the light of the past to point out what may be hoped for in the future from such a hospital as this, under the devoted zeal of the active staff, whose ability, competency and faithfulness to their duty have already been demonstrated in other positions? Can any one have

a doubt as to the probable service to humanity which will result from the careful observation and study by such competent men of details that can never be acquired except in a large hospital?

I question whether any, even the most sanguine, has more than a feeble conception of the benefit to the victims of the disease to be here treated, and to thousands of others, that will result from the opening of this hospital.—*New York Med. Jour.*

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF JOKING.

I think punning does not receive enough attention. In spite of Dr. Johnson's well-known dictum, we should not despise punning. Sydney Smith says that it is the foundation of all wit. Supposing three degrees of evolution, I submit that (1) punning is the least evolved system of joking, that (2) wit is evolved out of punning, and that (3) humor is evolved out of wit. Everybody has heard of Sydney Smith's remark—that it requires a surgical operation to get a joke into the head of a Scotchman. But he spoke without distinguishing. The Scotch have a great appreciation of those highly evolved jocosities displaying the humorous, although, no doubt, a scorn of simple, lowly evolved jocosities, such as plays on words. It is difficult to form a conception of a Scotch punster; yet I have heard an Aberdonian, a physician of world-wide reputation, make a pun.

Punning is well worthy of the Psychologist's attention. I seriously mean that the analysis of puns is a simple way of beginning the methodical analysis of the process of normal and abnormal Mentation. This, I think, I can easily show.

Vision is stereoscopic; in a sense it is slightly diplopic, for there are two dissimilar images, although there seems to be but one external object, as we call it. To borrow the ophthalmological term, we can say that Mentation is "stereoscopic;" always subject-object, although, we often speak of it as single ("states of consciousness," etc). Just as there is visual diplopia so there is "mental diplopia," or, as it is commonly called, "double consciousness."

Now I come back to punning. We all have "mental diplopia," when hearing the answer to a riddle which depends on a pun—"When is a little girl not a little girl?" Answer: "When she is a little horse (hoarse)." The feeble amusement we have in the slightly morbid mental state thus induced is from the incongruous elements of a "mental diplopia." The word "hoarse" rouses in us the idea of a little girl who has taken cold, and the same sounding word "horse" rouses in us the idea of a well-known quadruped at the same time. We have the sensation of complete resemblance with the sense of vast difference. Here is, I submit, a caricature of the normal process of all mentation. The process of all thought is