patient's and her husband's sanction for the operation could not be obtained until ten, p.m., at which time she felt very much exhausted; on this account we thought there was only the shadow of a hope for her life, and consequently urged it more, especially for the sake of the child, although she had not felt it move for twelve hours.

A little after ten, p.m., I commenced the operation, the patient lying on her back in bed, with her head and shoulders elevated with pillows; and the bladder and rectum being previously emptied, I commenced by making an incision from the umbilicus to the symphysis pubis and a little to the right of the linea alba; this incision to a small extent exposed the uterus, the abdominal parietes being very thin; the uterus being fully exposed by enlarging the incision divided by the fingers, upwards and downwards, was then cautiously opened in a similar manner to the extent of about five inches. There was now much hæmorrhage and the pulse scarcely perceptible (brandy diluted was now administered). The hand was then introduced and the child and placenta extracted as speedily as possible; the child, however, was dead. The uterus was but slightly contracted, and the hæmorrhage continued, but in much less quantity. Three sutures were now inserted in the external wound, which was afterwards simply dressed with adhesive plaster; a pad was then applied over the uterus and a bandage placed round her, so as to cause firm pressure over the uterus. From this time she gradually sank, and died from internal hæmorrhage at two, a.m., having survived the operation about three hours. I felt sorry the husband would not permit a post-mortem examination.

ON THE

TREATMENT OF HOOPING-COUGH BY COCHINEAL.

By Dr. C. WACHTL, Vienna.

Every medical man is aware of the obstinate nature of hooping-cough, and that, in spite of the various means employed in its treatment, it will persist, with little or no change, for four to six weeks. During the last few months I have had an opportunity of trying cochineal (a notice of which I first saw in the English "Courier") in nine cases of hooping-cough, and I have found the results to be so favorable that I would earnestly entreat my brethren to give it a trial in this disease.

Hooping-cough, as is well known, may be distinguished into two periods, the catarrhal and the spasmodic, and a different mode of treatment is required for each; but I have found the remedy just mentioned highly useful in both.

CASE I.—The first trial was made on a boy, ten years of age; the disease was drawing near to its close, and he had only four or five accesses of cough during the day. He was ordered to have a teaspoonful of the following mixture in the evening:—Cochineal, ten grains; bitartrate of potass, twenty grains; sugar, one ounce; water, six ounces. On the next day the child had only two fits of coughing, and on the third was perfectly well.

CASE II.—A girl, eight years of age, had suffered from hooping-cough during eleven weeks, three years

previously at Dresden. In the winter of 1840 she was again attacked, and the disease yielded in about four weeks under the usual remedies. Last winter I was again called to see this child, and to my surprise found her laboring under hooping-cough for the third time, and in a very severe degree. The child was of scrofulous constitution, and very weak; the face and lower extremities were œdematous, the respiration very much accelerated, and the febrile symptoms running high. The expectorated matter was streaked with blood, and the number of fits amounted to more than sixty in the twenty-four hours. The most powerful remedies were given without any benefit. I therefore determined on trying the cochineal again; its use was followed by the best results. After the fifth day the number of accesses of coughing was reduced to two or three, and the child was perfectly well on the eleventh day. It is worthy of remark that the grandmother of this child, who slept in the same bed with her, was seized with the disease; but the remedy had no effect whatever on it.

CASES III., IV., V.—Three strong, healthy children, of two, five, and eleven years, had labored under the disease during fourteen days; various remedies had been employed, first by the parents and afterwards by a medical man, without any effect. The cochineal was now administered, and they were all well in seven days.

CASE VI.—Mary B., a girl three years and a half old, of scrofulous habit, was attacked by hooping cough. Three or four doses of the remedy were given without effect; on the contrary, the pulse and respiration were more accelerated; the child complained of darting pain over the sternum and in the region of the false ribs, on the left side. The use of the cochineal mixture was therefore suspended, and some calomel, with an oleaginous mixture containing nitre, ordered in its stead. The unfavorable symptoms subsided in about twenty-four hours, but the accesses of cough amounted to more than twenty during the day. The use of the warm cochineal mixture was now resumed, the number and intensity of the accesses quickly diminished, and the disease had completely disappeared in eight days.

CASE VII.—The infant (four months old) of an English engineer was attacked by the disease; after the third or fourth dose of the medicine considerable improvement took place, and the parents were enabled to continue their voyage on the second day.

CASE VIII.—The subject of this case was ten months old; the father described her as laboring under a spasmodic cough, having two fits during the day and four at night. As the case was somewhat doubtful, I ordered some insignificant medicine; on the following day, however, I saw the child during a fit, and ascertained that the disease was hooping-cough. The child had had nine fits since the previous day. The cochineal mixture was now given; in the next twenty-four hours the number of fits diminished to five; on the fourth day to two; and on the fifth day the child was quite well.

CASE IX.—A weakly, scrofulous child, eight years old (who had previously suffered from chronic cough when three years of age), was attacked by hooping-cough. Various remedies were tried without effect, and when I saw him, on the 8th of June, I found him

sitting up in bed; the face was œdematous, the pulse quick, and the respiration greatly accelerated; the child complained of oppression on the chest and pain in the abdomen. The fits of coughing were innumerable, with frequent bleeding from the nose and mouth. I ordered a laxative enema, and a teaspoonful of the cochineal mixture every three hours. I also desired the child's father to reckon the number of fits carefully. No less than eighty-one fits occurred during the twenty-four hours, and of these twenty-three were attended with vomiting, and the discharge of blood from the mouth.

On the second day the number of accesses fell to sixty-five; the vomiting was less frequent, but the hæmorrhage increased. On the third day no change worthy of notice occurred; on the fourth the fits diminished to forty; and from this time they gradually declined to the ninth day, when they were twenty-one. The pain in the chest had now disappeared, but it was impossible to induce the child to take the medicine any longer.

With regard to the mode of administration of this remedy, a few remarks are necessary. From the tendency of the cochineal to become putrid, no more should be dissolved than is required for thirty-six to forty-eight hours. After a few days, and especially when the bottle has been frequently opened, the color becomes changed, and a sour smell is perceived. Cochineal is not dissolved by cold water; a warm solution is, therefore, required, and the color of this is clear red; the tint is deeper when a portion of the bitartrate of potass is added to the solution; I have no experience to determine how far the addition of this salt may influence the action of the remedy.

In conclusion, I may remark, that many of my colleagues have employed the cochineal mixture with the best effects in cases of hooping-cough; and Dr. Weinke has remarked, that it is very efficacious in the cough which so frequently accompanies measles.—*Med. Jahrbücher*, October, 1842.

PROVINCIAL MEDICAL JOURNAL

SATURDAY, JANUARY 21, 1843.

"Raro antecedentem scelestum
Deservit pede, pœna, clauso."

The office of critic is in truth an ungracious and unprofitable one. If you adhere to the "medio tutissimus" of the poet, you are set down as an insipid and insignificant quill-driver. If you praise the production of rising talent or pay a just tribute to long established reputation, you are a slave and a sycophant—unjust and partial—cut by one friend for not laying it on sufficiently thick and abused by the rest of the "genus" for your charitable desire to conceal their infirmities. On the other hand, you may as well declare yourself "non compos" and walk straight to St. Luke's as attempt to exercise the ancient privilege of the critic in an independent manner. A modern author has as little idea of submitting to the rod as a li-

berated black. If you expose a single delinquency or pluck a single feather from a self-decorated bird, the whole rookery is in commotion and you are hunted, with a kettle to your tail or a wisp of straw on your horn, beyond the pale of civilised life.

Fully sensible of the force of the proverb, "give a dog a bad name," &c.—and abhorring the olden cry, "fenum habet in cornu," we are ever unwilling to awaken the susceptibilities of the "irritable race," and have shut our eyes on many a literary offence of foul origin. But we are not permitted to exercise our little brief authority after our own fashion. Readers, now a days, have become almost as irritable as writers, and if they suspect any laxity of critical virtue, hesitate not to fall upon the backsliding reviewer, or to accuse him by inuendo of ignorance and incompetency.

The preceding reflections have been suggested by a letter recently received from Norwich, and which we would gladly have consigned to the flames without publication, were it not from fear of our correspondent's wrath, and because its perusal has excited a portion of our long dormant indignation. Here is the epistle—

"Norwich, Jan. 13, 1843.

To the Editors of the Provincial Medical Journal.

Gentlemen,—Having seen in your Journal a very favorable notice of a work by Dr. Burgess on Diseases of the Skin, I was induced to purchase the same. A few days afterwards I lent the book to a friend, who brought it back to me and said that it was exactly the same as a "Compendium of the Diseases of the Skin," published several years back by Dr. Jonathan Green, of London. On looking over the two works I was struck with the singular degree of similarity between them, and, as we are unable to account for it, my friend and myself beg that you will let us know whether MM. Cazenave and Schedel borrowed from Dr. Jonathan or Dr. Jonathan from them.

Your obedient servant,
F. P."

There is no escaping from the question thus plainly put by our correspondent; and we feel compelled to answer it, although our answer disclose one of the most extraordinary examples of plagiarism that has, perhaps, ever occurred in the history of medical literature. The compendium of Dr. Jonathan Green, published as an *original* work, dedicated to Sir Henry Hallford and highly lauded by every section of the medical press, is a *mere translation from beginning to end* of the "Abrégé Pratique des Maladies de la Peau," by MM. Cazenave and Schedel. A few original cases, it is true, have been added by Dr. Green, and here and there, at the commencement of a chapter, we find a few lines of introductory matter; but with these exceptions, the whole work, from beginning to end—the arrangement of cutaneous diseases—the description of symptoms and treatment—the order of the several chapters—and the well-known essay on the