reduced in number. There were adhesions between the membrana tectoria and reticularis, and periosteal thickenings on the lamina spiralis. Only in one case was one of the chief nuclei found to be degenerated.

Lerner recounts the following case of bilateral tabetic deafness. Six or seven months after the onset of symptoms of tabes the patient began to suffer from rustling sounds in his ears. There was no deafness—rather hyperacousis. He felt as if people were shouting at him, and was occasionally dizzy. A few days later he suddenly became quite deaf in both ears. There was no pain or fever, no evidence of syphilis or drug poisoning. Deafness was complete for the watch and for speech on both sides. High notes were not perceived, but low notes were. "Weber" central; "Rinné" + on both sides, with greatly shortened bone-conduction.

Soon bone-conduction was almost entirely abolished, and only the notes of the very deepest tuning-fork could be perceived through the meatus. Rustling tinnitus troubled him sometimes for days at a time, and also dizziness, and attacks of shooting earache, lasting several hours. Inflation was felt (there was no anæsthesia of the ear), but it had no effect. There was no evidence of previous middle-ear disease. Lerner excludes primary disease of the labyrinth, labyrinthitis, embolism of the internal auditory artery, and syphilis, and concludes that the auditory nerve was at fault, but whether in the nuclei or more peripherally there is no evidence to show. There were no other symptoms of bulbar lesion. The galvanic current relieved the tinnitus often for several days. *William Lamb.*

Spear, E. (Boston).—*Notes upon some New Low-toned Tuning-forks for Clinical Purposes.* "Archives of Otology," vol. xxvi., No. 4.

It is advised that these should be made of bell-metal, like those made by Edelmann for Bezold, and not of steel. *Dundas Grant.*

Zaalberg, P. J. (Amsterdam).—*A Cutting Forceps for Aural Polypi.* "Monatschrift für Ohrenheilkunde," October, 1898.

A punch forceps on the plan of the conchotome, the upper cutting edge fitting within the lower so that bits of tissue can be removed without pulling. *William Lamb.*

CORRESPONDENCE.

REVIEW OF DR. SCHEPPEGRELL'S RECENT WORK UPON "ELECTRICITY IN THE DIAGNOSIS AND TREATMENT OF DISEASES OF THE NOSE, THROAT, AND EAR."

THE editors have pleasure in publishing Dr. Scheppegrell's letter. They submitted the work to a surgeon engaged in our special work, and an expert in electro-physics. Their note is added below.

To the Editors of the London "Journal of Laryngology."

GENTLEMEN,—The February issue of the JOURNAL OF LARYNGOLOGY arrived yesterday, and I have read with no little surprise the criticism of my recently published work on "Electricity in the Diagnosis and Treatment of Diseases of the Nose, Throat, and Ear." As your journal

is one of the most important periodicals published in the interest of diseases of the nose, throat, and ear, I expected a full and detailed review of the work in reference to oto-laryngology, but find this almost omitted, over two-thirds of the criticism referring to the physical part of the work. What little is said in reference to ear, nose, and throat diseases is of a most complimentary character, for which accept my sincere thanks.

It is somewhat inconsistent, however, to have "pleasure in calling attention to this excellent work," and to "confidently recommend Dr. Scheppegrell's work to the profession," and then occupy two-thirds of the review in finding fault. This refers especially to the subject of storage cells, and one would almost judge, from reading it, that the reviewer had some personal grievance in the matter. That storage cells are not adapted for galvanism, electrolysis, and cataphoresis is not only generally admitted, but is proved by the fact that they are not recommended for this purpose by dealers in electro-therapeutic appliances, that they are not used for this purpose by a single physician of my acquaintance, and that in a very complete review of the literature of the subject they were found recommended by one writer only. That the capacity of a storage cell for the above purposes compares favourably with primary batteries is practically absurd.

That physicians on the other "side of the Atlantic" should not understand the term "Edison current" is quite excusable, but that the reviewer should not, when it is carefully described in Chapter II., is not so. The term "constant potential current" is not synonymous with "Edison current," as the latter is a constant potential current generated in a particular manner, and, as stated in the work, the term is used to avoid circumlocution.

The other points at issue could be discussed in the same manner, but, as already stated, I expected the JOURNAL OF LARYNGOLOGY to review the work from an oto-laryngologic standpoint; and the reader is certainly justified in being disappointed when the reviewer fails to point out why he "recommends Dr. Scheppegrell's work to the profession, and congratulates him on its appearance."

The part of the work referring to the physics of electricity has been thoroughly discussed by a number of journals, whose competency in this special department is undisputed, such as the *Journal of Electro-Therapeutics*, *American Electrician*, *Scientific American*, and others, and I am pleased to say that these have not only failed to find the points to which the reviewer of the JOURNAL OF LARYNGOLOGY calls attention, but have been unanimously complimentary in their reviews.

While deeming it my duty to call attention to the inconsistency in this review, I would again express my thanks for the favourable criticism of that portion of the work which is especially in the province of the journal—viz., the nose, throat, and ear.

Yours respectfully,

W. SCHEPPEGRELL.

February 21, 1899.

[The reviewers have had an opportunity of reading Dr. Scheppegrell's letter, and had they known the author desired his work reviewed from a special standpoint, or been acquainted with his manner of conducting correspondence, they would have respectfully declined the honour. They were under the impression, however, that it was customary for authors, when submitting a book, to offer the whole work for review, and to seek criticism from any sincere or honourable standpoint. They note, further, that Dr. Scheppegrell has quoted the names of certain scientific journals of undoubted repute, but they think it better that these should be left out of the correspondence, not seeing any special reason for introducing them. The reviewers were chosen by the

editors, and readers can judge for themselves how far it is in good taste to suggest comparison by insinuation or inference. The reviewers regret that the author was not more explicit when he spoke of two-thirds being devoted to fault-finding. If he referred to the extent of the printed matter he is quite right, but the term cannot be applied to the value of the criticism, or the number of facts referred to therein. On the contrary, the reviewers only called attention to a few minor details, as they took care to mention, by way of suggestion for future editions. Dr. Scheppegrell's remark about the readers of this journal not understanding why the work is recommended is too trivial. The average reader will clearly understand the book was recommended because the reviewers found it worthy. There is no inconsistency when generally praising a work, and recommending it, in pointing out some minor details upon which they could not agree with the author. With regard, however, to Dr. Scheppegrell's remarks about storage cells, they still say they must respectfully differ from him ; either secondary cells are adapted for the purposes referred to or they are not, and this question can be settled by scientific evidence. They note the statements in the letter about the literature and physicians of Dr. Scheppegrell's acquaintance, but these do not settle the question ; and when he condescends in argument to state that a scientific fact is proved by what dealers recommend they decline to follow him. They have used storage cells for years for the purpose referred to, and have no hesitation in saying they found them not only well adapted for such work, but, when available, they do away with all the difficulties, and are much better than primary batteries. In reply to Dr. Scheppegrell's remarks about Edison current, the reviewers would say that he admits it is excusable in physicians not to understand it. They are glad he has done so, as this was their reason for making the remark. He makes the further statement, however, that the reviewers ought not, because the term is explained in Chapter II. They regret they cannot accept his statement, because the author will find the explanation he refers to in page 14 of said chapter. It is true he explains the word "current," but not the name "Edison" which qualifies it. Any reader with a slight acquaintance with electrical terms can understand what is meant by current ; but all the reviewers meant to infer was that the term "Edison current" (which they now learn "is a potential current generated in a particular manner") might not be understood so readily. To avoid circumlocution is commendable, which can scarcely be said when an author writes in such a way as to cause confusion. That is all they meant by their remark, and it aptly comes under the heading of minor details.—REVIEWERS' NOTE.]

REVIEWS.

Sajous's Annual and Analytical Cyclopedia of Practical Medicine. Vol. ii.: *Bromide of Ethyl* to *Diphtheria.* The F. A. Davies Co., Philadelphia, New York, and Chicago.

One welcomes the second volume of this work with much pleasure, although, sad to say, the literature is '96, '97. It contains much that is of interest to us, especially excellent and thoroughly exhaustive articles on Deaf-Mutism, and Cerebral Abscess. This does not strike one as definite enough for a work of reference, and of one of the finest annuals in existence in any language.

Under Cramp we are pleased to see a bacteriological distinction, with somewhat ill-defined clinical differences, made between membranous croup and diphtheria. The tendency is to lay too much down to diphtheria, and to remember too little that whilst one swallow does not make a summer, it requires a large number to prove it is one.

Clark, J. G., M.D. "Johns Hopkins Hospital Reports," vol. vii., No. 4. —*The Origin, Growth, and Fate of the Corpus Luteum as observed in the Ovary of the Pig and Man.* The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore.

Dr. Clark's investigation is characterized by the care and scientific accuracy which distinguish nearly all the work which appears in the "Johns Hopkins Hospital Reports."

The author believed that repetition of the methods of previous