We are glad, however, to note that on every subject he has been careful to incorporate all that is important in recent medico-legal literature. It is no disparagement to a work on medical jurisprudence, to say of it as has been said of Dr. Tidy's present volume, that it is largely a compilation from the works of other standard authors. As a work of reference, we can highly recommend this volume to our readers. It will form a very valuable addition to the libraries of medical and legal practitioners.

A Dictionary of Medicine, including General Pathology, General Therapeutics, Hygiene, and the Diseases peculiar to Women and Children. Pp. 1,816. Edited by RICHARD QUAIN, M.D., F.R.S. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1882.

THE aim of this work, as stated in the preface, is to bring together, in a form to allow of ready and easy reference, the latest and most complete information as to scientific and practical medicine, the facts and observations in regard to which are diffusely scattered in journals, monographs, scientific treatises, and transactions of learned societies. It is not, however, to be regarded as only a dictionary, "but also as a treatise on systematic medicine, in which the articles on the more important subjects constitute monographs in themselves, whilst definitions and descriptions of matters having less claim to extended notice, are given as fully as is required. Thus, an endeavour has been made to supply, in a clear, condensed, and readily accessible form, all the information that is at present available for the use of the practitioner of medicine." With such a scope, the volume is necessarily large and unwieldy, and the type disagreeably small; but these drawbacks are compensated for by the excellence of the substance.

In its production, Dr. Quain has been assisted by a staff of about 160 writers, including Lockhart Clarke, Spencer Cobbold, Matthews Duncan, Sir Joseph Fayrer, Sir William Jenner, Charles Murchison, Sir James Paget, &c., while the majority are men whose names are favourably known to the profession. We are inclined to think, however, that this number is unnecessarily large, when we note that such intimately related subjects as Typhus and Typhoid Fevers are by different writers, and that Inflammation, Hyperæmia, and Cirrhosis of the Liver have been committed to three separate hands. Possibly this has arisen to some extent from the fact

that many of those who were Dr. Quain's colleagues when the work was commenced did not live to see the conclusion of his labours, their places being taken by other men. In this way we may account for the absence of Murchison's signature under the various articles on the continued Fevers and on diseases of the Liver, to which we referred in the hope that we might still find something from his valued pen. The only article by him that we have seen is that on Jaundice, and it is such as to cause regret that he did not live to contribute more largely to the pages before us.

With such a numerous band of writers, it is only to be expected that there should be various degrees of excellence, literary and otherwise. But it may be said in general that the method adopted, and the careful editorial supervision, have combined to produce a tersely and clearly written work, which will take a valued place in the practitioner's library. It is somewhat difficult at times to see the principle on which space has been allotted for the various articles; thus, Gout gets 15 pages, while Kidney Diseases, including the articles on Bright's Disease and Albuminuria, are dismissed in 20. When under the heading Typhus we find no description of the course of the temperatures, and an unqualified statement to the effect that "the amount of rash is of little moment, and is no guide to the severity of the attack," we are inclined to wish that a little more space had been allowed, so as to admit of a fuller description, and of less dogmatic statement of opinions contrary to those held by men of the largest experience in fevers. Many of the articles are simply brief definitions, usually with references to general articles where the subjects are discussed in detail. But among these we look in vain for Crossed Paralysis, Alternate Paralysis, Anthracosis, Decubitus (in the sense of Acute Bed sore), Parovarian Cyst, &c.

A special feature of the work is the giving of the derivations of words, and this part seems to us to have been hastily done and imperfectly revised. For instance, we find the following:—"Lymph (λύμφη, a nymph, water);" "Lymphangeitis (λύμφη, water or lymph, and ἀγγεῖον, a vessel);" "Lymphangiectasis (lymph, and angiectasis, vascular dilatation);" "Adenoma (ἀδὴν, a gland, and ὁμός, like);" "Erysipelas (ἐρύω, I draw, and πέλας, near)." It is impossible to account for such a mistake as λύμφη, but angiectasis may be supposed to refer to an article given in the dictionary as angiectasia. In the case of adenoma, an attempt has been made to account for the termination, but in deriving sarcoma, carcinoma, and other similar words, this attempt has wisely been abandoned, as it

fails to account for the fact that Greek words with that termination end in *ωua*. All that can be said about it is, that the termination has been adopted to signify a tumour. With regard to *erysipelas*, a reference to Liddell & Scott would have shown the writer that there occurs in early Greek medical writings the word *ἐρυσίπελας*, which is derived from the root of *ἐρυθρός*, red, and *πέλλα*, the skin.

We know that the publication of such a work must have involved enormous labour, and details, when comparatively unimportant, are apt to receive but slight attention. It is but right, however, that in succeeding editions such mistakes should be remedied; and from its nature, the work is one whose value can be maintained only by frequent revision and extension. Frequent editions will undoubtedly be called for, as the volume in large measure comes up to the expectations that had been formed of it, and will no doubt commend itself to students, but especially to practitioners, as meeting a want in the shape of a ready work of reference of moderate dimensions, and up to date.

The Relative Mortality after Amputations of Large and Small Hospitals. By HENRY C. BURDETT. London: J. & A. Churchill. 1882.

THIS is a reprint of a paper read by Mr. Burdett before the Statistical Society, and is the result of inquiries which he sent to 160 cottage hospitals. Answers were received from ninety-two, into thirty-one of which no cases requiring amputation had been received. The amputations under review were performed in sixty-one hospitals, from their institution until the end of the year 1878, a period of twenty years. The total number is 326, the deaths 58, and the mortality 17 per cent. To prevent his statistics being impugned, as Sir James Simpson's were, Mr. Burdett gives details of the cases, and has only collected actual figures, which could be definitely verified from the books kept by the medical staff of the different hospitals. He also gives the causes of death so far as could be ascertained, and these include pyæmia and tetanus, formerly the scourges of our great hospitals. For purposes of comparison, Mr. Burdett is content to take the statistics of Sir James Simpson, published so long ago as in 1869, and those of Mr. Erichsen in 1874, of the large Metropolitan and Provincial Hospitals; but we submit that he ought also, in fairness, to have brought