

PAVESI'S COSMETIC.—The formula for this solution—used for discolorations of the skin—is given in the *Monde Phar.*, Nov. 5, 1888, as follows: Borate of sodium, 10 gm.; glycerin, 20 gm.; rose-water, 150 gm.; alcoholic tincture of benzoin, 15 gm.; let the mass rest for several days and then filter. To be applied twice daily.

TEST FOR ARSENIC.—To the suspected liquid is added, in a test tube, a solution of caustic potash or soda, and then a fragment of aluminium. The mouth of the tube is then closed with paper dipped in a solution of nitrate of silver. If arsenic be present the paper turns black. Aluminium is preferable to zinc, for the latter may contain arsenic, while aluminium is always free from it.—*Farm. Ital.; Arch. de Pharm.*, October 5, 1888.

CASE OF TUMOR OF THE STOMACH CAUSED BY HUMAN HAIR.—Dr. J. Berg, of Stockholm, records a case in the *Nordiskt Medicinskt Arkiv* of a married woman, twenty-six years of age, who for three years suffered from anæmic and dyspeptic symptoms, accompanied by glairy vomiting. Two years before coming under observation a tumor began to form in the epigastric region, which had increased very rapidly during the last six months. On examination this tumor was found to be in the epigastric and left hypochondriac regions, between the middle and left nipple lines. It was as large as the hand, and was concave at its upper and convex at its lower border; it was movable, but could not be displaced downwards. The spleen was in its normal position. An exploratory laparotomy having been made, the tumor was found to be in the stomach, which was accordingly opened by an incision eight centimetres long and parallel to the greater curvature. The tumor thus exposed, being too large to remove in its entirety, was cut up and removed in fragments. It weighed 900 grammes, and was composed of hair tightly compressed. The wounds were sutured, union took place by first intention, and the patient left the hospital quite well at the end of three weeks. The patient herself did not remember to have eaten hair, but her mother said that she had that habit when

quite a child. Dr. Berg has not been able to find more than two such cases reported, one by Schonborn and the other by Knowsley Thornton.

ALLEGED IMPROPER EXAMINATION.—It is to be hoped that the accumulating number of failures, on the part of women, to convict medical men of improprieties when in the discharge of ordinary professional duties will lead quickly to the discontinuance of that easy way of aspersing the good name of practitioners. Another case has ended in the complete discomfiture of the patient and vindication of the defendant—that of Alice Ann Adam, who brought an action for £50 against Mr. Robert James Cooke, practising at Chatham in partnership with Mr. Walter Buchanan, for an assault by an improper examination. The counsel for the plaintiff used that dogmatic statement against the defendant which is still the strange monopoly and privilege of lawyers, and than which nothing needs more to be brought under control. He said Mr. Cooke had committed a breach of professional etiquette, a breach of honor, and unquestionably an assault. Dr. Warren, afterwards called in, thought the examination deposed to by the witnesses for the plaintiff quite right, and said the girl was highly nervous. When the various evidence had percolated through the mind of the judge and jury they made short work of the case. The jury said at once that Mr. Cooke had made a perfectly justifiable examination, and the judge said costs would be allowed if applied for. Mr. Cooke generously declined costs, and the judge justly pronounced his conduct very handsome. It was an easy thought to make £50 out of a respected member of the profession, but it has met with merited failure. With all practical precautions, it is next to impossible for medical men to avoid putting themselves into positions in which hysterical women can construct a theory of assault. But fortunately judges and juries are becoming skilled in estimating such cases. It is, however, very much to be desired that the friends of hysterical patients should think for them before sanctioning such ventures.—*London Lancet*.