

sary should be resorted to, thus lessening danger of post-partum hemorrhage, and lessening the danger of retention of portions of placenta and membranes. Septic fever and inflammation would thus be less frequent. Ergot and the systematic use of the binder favor involution by causing contraction. The avoidance of too stimulating a diet and of alcohol unless indicated is important. He commended the hot antiseptic vaginal injections. He believed that the omission to suckle the child favoured subinvolution by the absence of that stimulus to contraction of the uterus. It was a question, too, whether belladonna, so often used as plaster, lotion or ointment in these cases, to prevent mammary troubles, had not some influence in lessening contraction of the uterus and so retarding involution.—(*Brit. Med. Journal*, Sept. 2, '82.)

*The Diagnosis and Treatment of Chronic Inflammation of the Ovary.*—This is the title of a paper by Mr. Lawson Tait, published simultaneously in the July number of the *American Journal of Obstetrics* and the *British Medical Journal* for July 29, '82. I will only allude to the questionable propriety of simultaneous publication of an article in two widely circulated English journals. In this paper the author enunciates some rather novel, startling, and original views, entirely at variance with those previously held and accepted with reference to certain diseases and physiological functions. After referring to the impetus given to gynecology by Thomas Keith when he taught us that our traditional fear of the peritoneum was only a bugbear, and that it would serve us as well as any other part of the body, if dealt with fairly, (the mortality of Keith's and Tait's own practice being now as low as three per cent. since renouncing Listerism), the author states that the new practice has had many good results, not the least of which is that it is shedding a whole flood of light on the pathology of pelvic disease, and is even helping us to understand the physiology of the female sexual organs. "Thus my own practice, the detailed results of which will shortly appear in a special work, have convinced me that the usually accepted doctrine of the coincidence of ovulation and menstruation is wholly erroneous. The ovaries have nothing