

# THE LANCET.

LONDON: SATURDAY, JANUARY 8, 1887.

THAT there must soon be a considerable reform in all that relates to the office of coroner in this country cannot be doubted by those who have paid any attention to the subject. The office is one of the greatest antiquity, but, unlike some other ancient institutions, it does not admit of the sweeping reform of abolition. On the contrary, it is a most important office, which in the very nature of things must, reformed or unreformed, endure as long as humanity itself; for it must always happen that deaths will from time to time occur under circumstances calling for an inquiry into their cause. We cannot hope for a time when there shall be no sudden or violent deaths. It follows therefore, that there must be some official appointed to make inquiry into the cause of all those deaths which from the surrounding circumstances demand it. It is true that in cases where a charge of murder or manslaughter is made there is an investigation before the magistrate; but while this has the inconvenience of a double inquiry, it is no argument, as some contend, for abolishing the office of coroner. There are many cases in which a death has occurred the cause of which is unknown, and can only be ascertained by a searching inquiry into all the circumstances, including medical evidence and a post-mortem examination, but which do not go beyond the coroner's court. As an illustration of this, we may mention the case which occurred more than forty years ago, and was generally known as the "Hounslow flogging case." The late Mr. THOMAS WAKLEY, the founder of this journal, held an inquest and made a searching inquiry into the death of a soldier who had died soon after receiving the punishment of flogging. Although no specific charge against any individual was involved in the verdict of the jury, and though the case did not go beyond the coroner's court, the inquiry was one of the most important ever held, and led to the abolition of flogging in the army. Other instances might be given. It is plain, however, that there must be a preliminary inquiry into the cause of some deaths, and even in countries where there is no coroner's inquest there is a modification of it, to which we shall allude presently. It being clear, therefore, that the office of coroner must remain, What are the reforms needed? To answer this let us see what are the defects of the present system?

The principal one is a total want of uniformity, from the mode of election to the close of the coroner's career, whether the latter end with his office or with his life. Judges, recorders, and magistrates are appointed with some regard to uniformity; so are sheriffs. But town and city coroners are elected by the local municipal council, those of Oxford and Cambridge by the University, and the Admiralty coroner by the Crown or Lord High Admiral. There is still another mode of election. The county coroner is elected by the freeholders. Dr. MACDONALD, M.P., one of the candidates at the recent election of coroner for the eastern division of

Middlesex, intends to bring in a Bill to amend this mode of election, and will no doubt be heartily supported. Passing on to the qualifications for the office, we find still the same want of uniformity. No peculiar qualification is now required, though in HAWKINS' "Pleas of the Crown" the author seems to express an opinion that the persons chosen, though not knights, must be "of good substance and credit." Practically, however, the office is now held chiefly by barristers, solicitors, or members of the medical profession. Of a total of 286 coroners whose qualifications are stated, 238 belong to the legal and 48 to the medical profession—a disparity which cannot be justified in these days. We have always contended that, as the primary duty of a coroner is to ascertain with the aid of a jury the cause of death, such duty comes more within the province of a medical man than of a lawyer. The old objection to a medical coroner, that his duty is not so much to ascertain the cause of death as to find out who caused it, never had any real foundation, and at the present time is wholly untenable. It will not strengthen the case for legal coroners to argue, as some do, that they understand evidence and legal formalities better than medical men, for inquests held even by lawyers have been quashed for legal informalities. And that the average solicitor is by no means well posted up in the law of evidence is well known both to judges and counsel, the depositions of legal coroners having frequently been complained of as being most unsatisfactory. Besides all this, there is the most formidable objection of all to legal coroners, that the duties are extremely repulsive to the average lawyer, and the office does not attract those who are likely to be successful in their profession. On the other hand, the most repulsive part of the duties—that of viewing the bodies and taking medical evidence—is what most medical men have been well trained to, while the office has attracted and still attracts medical candidates with the highest qualifications. Nothing can be more trying or disheartening to medical witnesses than the impatience with which their evidence is too often received by legal coroners. The late CHARLES DICKENS was a severe critic of our profession and its members, but in the serio-comic narrative by the "Uncommercial Traveller," "On a Coroner's Jury," he gracefully alludes to "the Coroner who was nobly patient in receiving the evidence, and humane: he was the late Mr. WAKLEY ..... for which," he adds, "I ever afterwards felt grateful to him, as I do now to his memory." Continuing the defects of the present state of the law, county coroners are appointed for life, and cannot resign, like most officials. An antiquated procedure, the writ *de coronatore exonerando*, has to be obtained, and by this means only can a county coroner be relieved from his duties, old age and infirmity notwithstanding. Again, on the death of a coroner his deputy cannot act; the duties must be performed by another coroner at considerable inconvenience both to himself and others.

But where uniformity is most wanting is in the manner in which inquests are held. Coroners are paid by fees, upon a three years' average; thus there may be an inducement to multiply inquests. Some coroners hold inquests in every case of sudden death; others exercise a discretion. Some require the jury always to view the body; others have dispensed with this legal requirement in a few

cases, thus rendering the inquest null and void. Some coroners have a beadle or officer; others depend on the police for information of deaths requiring an inquest. Some, especially medical coroners, require medical evidence at almost every inquest; legal coroners dispense with it as much as they can to save the rates. All this confusion arises partly from the very antiquated statute under which coroners still act—the 4th EDWARD I., stat. 2,—a statute passed six centuries ago; partly also because the sources whence the coroner derives his information are various. He may learn it from his beadle, from the police, from a medical practitioner, from a registrar of deaths, or from a relative or friend of the deceased.

The obvious remedy for most of these evils is to provide for greater uniformity, care being taken that the new system shall possess all other needful reforms. In Scotland, where the duties of coroner are performed by the procurator fiscal, complaints have arisen that many cases which ought to be inquired into are withheld from him, and we have had a recent instance of the defect of the Scotch system in what was known as the Carlisle poisoning case. The body of the unfortunate woman, who was poisoned by some ham which she had eaten at her own wedding breakfast, was removed from Edinburgh to Carlisle for burial without the knowledge of the fiscal authorities. Hence arose a deadlock when the full particulars were fully known. The Edinburgh Procurator Fiscal could not act, as the body had been removed out of his jurisdiction; the coroner for Carlisle could not act, because the death occurred beyond his district. It is, moreover, a source of complaint that the inquiry of the Procurator Fiscal is a secret one. A similar secret mode of inquest prevails in the Channel Islands. In the Isle of Man inquests are held by the high bailiffs of the four principal towns; the inquiry is public and with a jury. In Ireland the system is the same as in England, though the proportion of medical coroners is, we believe, greater than in England and Wales.

Coroners should be permitted to resign at a reasonable term of notice, and deputy coroners should act on the death of the coroner until his successor be appointed. The claims of medical candidates should be duly considered, since experience has shown that medical coroners have discharged their duties with the greatest satisfaction, and to the interests of all concerned. The Births and Deaths Registration Act should be further amended, so far as deaths are concerned. It should be required that notice of every death be given to the registrar within a certain interval after death, and that all violent or sudden deaths be notified directly to the coroner of the district. More stringent regulations are required as to the burial of still-born infants, as recently noticed in these columns; printed forms of certificates of still-birth should be issued to all medical practitioners, and forms of declaration to all certified midwives. The rights of general practitioners should be strictly respected; a second medical witness could be called in cases where a criminal charge is preferred against any one; and preference should be given to skilled pathologists and medical jurists, the general practitioner first called-in making the post-mortem examination in conjunction with the former.

These reforms would ensure considerable improvements,

with but little expense or inconvenience to anybody. Other improvements would suggest themselves, and by a little mutual concession, coroners and medical practitioners working together for the common weal, we should get rid of all the defects and abuses now prevalent, and coroners' inquests would become what they ought to be, solemn and searching inquiries.

THERE is a paper in the January number of the *Contemporary Review* by Mme. ADAM, who has long posed as "the enemy" of PAUL BERT, while trying to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds in relation to the movement which BERT is alleged to have inaugurated against the clerical party in France. The doctrine this lady philosopher lays down is that the two castes, the religious and the scientific, should be "equally excluded from all participation in politics." While affecting to cherish an intelligent respect for both Religion and Science, Mme. ADAM holds that the one is necessarily idealistic and the other materialistic, that they cannot possibly be reconciled, and that they must accordingly be manipulated, as elements in the national constitution and life, by statesmen who are neither priests nor scientists, but superior to both. The argument is plausible, and it is effectively stated by the advocate, but the premisses are bad; and when we come to look closely into the facts the inferences must be seen to be fallacious. "The equilibrium of a society," writes Mme. ADAM, "depends on the equal proportion of the scientific and the religious element in it. When the priests tip over the balance on their side, society suffers in its material needs, and is impoverished; when science gets ahead of religion, society grows rich, gives itself up to luxury, and soon becomes corrupt. The men of science sacrifice everything to the play of forces, the acceleration of movement. Reason and logic are the only compass they steer by, and their ideal for the individual is the facing of difficulties and the achievement of success. But in all this, goodness (which is instinctive religion), heroism, self-devotion, the love of one's neighbour, go for nothing." It is very plain that the view propounded, and the starting-point from which this conclusion is reached, are narrow and mistaken. Was there ever a grosser libel on science, particularly the science of Medicine, which is Mme. ADAM's *bête noire*, than to say that it excludes, nay does not foster, heroism and self-devotion? It is a matter for thankfulness that the doctrine taught has not been turned to worse purposes than that to which Mme. ADAM has striven to apply it—namely, the subordination of facts to theory and the glorification of a particular sort of cleverness at the cost of depreciating the value of true knowledge. The essence of the idea is that "politics" consists in government as something apart from the nation governed. It is the *reductio ad absurdum* of the Platonic notion of a bureaucratic system of administration. Mme. ADAM's fundamental proposition embodies an idea which is at once the pride and weakness of the French system, and has run through successive developments of Monarchy, Imperialism, and Republicanism. Statesmanship is regarded as a profession across the Channel. Government is the supposed work of genius. The notion of a State having its affairs administered on constitutional principles, without some constructive ulterior purpose to which

everything else is subordinate, is one that has no place in the philosophy of the grand nation. Statesmanship is a function apart from all else, and statesmen compose a class or caste, the highest in the land, and from this order, according to Mme. ADAM, priests and men of science ought to be rigidly excluded because they represent elementary and constituent parts or principles. They may contribute plums to the pudding, but they may not be cooks, and it is for the cooks exclusively to determine how much or how little of each particular ingredient is to be compounded. Now, we directly join issue on this ground, and must take leave to characterise it as an unwarrantable assumption, based on, or excused by, a total misconception of the very first principles of self-government. The bare fact that such a notion is widely tolerated among the thinking classes in France is a proof that her people are not ripe for self-government. The truly intelligent classes among our neighbours, as among ourselves, must see that Mme. ADAM's idea—which is unhappily the idea of a very large proportion of the more active people across the Channel—is fatal to the realisation of true *liberty*. It involves a transference of power from one section of the "governing caste" to another, the real business classes of the people being systematically denied a share in the control of public affairs. So far from its being true that priests and men of science should be excluded from the government of the State, these classes ought to be duly represented in the governing body. Although we cannot go so far as AUGUSTE COMTE, and affirm "that a State should be governed by men of science," we are very far from thinking with Mme. ADAM that no "falsely theory of government ever entered a wise man's head"; and we believe that it will never be well with progressive States until the claims of science to a larger voice in the administration of public affairs is recognised, and allowed to take effect in the formation of Governments and Cabinets.

The phrase "science in politics is politics in science," on which Mme. ADAM seems to plume herself, has no precise meaning that we can discover. She contends it implies "a very bad warping of the mind twice over." Her notion seems to be that the method of inductive reasoning by which the true scientist ascertains his facts and draws and corrects his inferences is inapplicable to the system of government. A nation must not have its affairs administered on natural principles. There must be no attempt to reason from the known to the unknown, or to guide the vessel of State on a course projected on scientific principles. The statesman must, like the poet, be born, not made. He must evolve the schemes of government with which he rules the nation from his inner consciousness or gain them by inspiration. The science of political economy is to minds of the class represented by this gifted lady a crude and pitiable attempt to formulate what ought to be treated as the sublime outcome of genius. It is to the ascendancy of such ideas as these our neighbours owe the fact that there is no distinctly practical and business-like policy underlying their system. They are not "a nation of shopkeepers,"—because the commercial classes, which form the backbone of other nationalities, and which must needs be represented adequately in their Governments, are excluded from the function of states-

manship. When we speak of the commercial classes, we include the whole composite body of producers and manufacturers, and the classes that exercise an active influence on the constitution of society. Among these classes must needs be included the "priests" and ministers, who supply the religious element to the national organisation, and conserve the morals of the people, and the "men of science" to whose enterprise and achievement every branch of industry in these modern times owes its precision and success, and without whom the body politic would be disintegrated in spite of the supreme sagacity of the most gifted order of professional statesmen. PAUL BERT was a medical scientist, and it is against the special class of workers in science he represented that the animosity of Mme. ADAM is particularly directed. Underlying her antagonism to the scientists there is, of course, the anti-vivisection idea. Mme. ADAM is especially aggrieved by the demonstration of the grafting process. She brings it in at every twist and turn in this article, and would seem to have alluded to it in nearly every conversation she had with GAMBETTA or PAUL BERT. It is a "fixed idea" with her, and obtrudes itself so frequently as to break the thread of every argument. We strongly recommend those of our readers who have not read the paper on which we are commenting to do so. It cannot fail to afford them amusement directly, and instruction indirectly. Madame ADAM's hatred of PAUL BERT—not personally, perhaps, but as a representative man—is as GAMBETTA had the honesty to tell her, "truly feminine."

In one regard Mme. ADAM differs from some other lady agitators—namely, in favouring, or affecting to favour, the idea of religious education. The sort of "religious education" permitted under the *régime* she would establish is not, indeed, likely to be very satisfactory to those who desire religious instruction for the rising generation, but Mme. ADAM's recoil from the Materialistic School, as represented by PAUL BERT, has been so violent that she is perforce driven back almost, if not quite, into the arms of the clerical party. This is what we mean by saying she has tried to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds in relation to the anti-clerical movement. She throws the whole responsibility of Article 7 of the decrees of March 29th upon PAUL BERT, and then taunts him with wanting "just that element in which his scientific experiments have been wanting too—success." She contends that "you cannot reckon among the assured acquisitions of science discoveries which are neither incontestable nor uncontested." This remark is in itself conclusive evidence of Mme. ADAM's incompetency to discuss the subject of PAUL BERT'S achievements and failures, or to form an accurate estimate of his work as a whole. She is ignorant of the fact that not a few of the most priceless treasures of science have been found among the ashes of exploded ideas. The very fiascoes of the honest and earnest scientist are more productive than the chimerical dreams of the theorist. Mme. ADAM may be excused for not knowing this, for it is manifest that her acquaintance with even the history of scientific discovery is extremely limited; but she cannot so readily be pardoned for the bad taste of an article which

seems to have been indited on the novel and, let us hope, exclusively French idea—*De mortuis nil nisi—malum*.

It would be interesting to know the number of those who are prevented from visiting our theatres because of their unwillingness to encounter the stifling atmosphere which as a rule prevails in them; and it would, we have little doubt, much astonish theatrical managers if they could realise the amount of hard cash which is kept out of their exchequers by those absentees who weigh the pleasures of the evening against the morning's headache, and arrive at the conclusion that these few hours' pleasure is not worth the price in physical suffering which is paid for it. We are well aware that our pleadings for ventilation may be met by the objection that the theatres mostly fill well, and that this may be taken as an indication that the public is satisfied in all particulars. The success of our theatres—the long runs and the crowded houses—is due, however, in a great degree, to the extension of our railway system, and to the enormous influx of visitors from the suburbs and the distant country, who come to London for their theatrical pleasures, and are willing to brave a few nights of suffocation for the sake of witnessing performances the recollection of which serves to relieve the dulness of the country. It is notorious that many London residents, and notably the professional classes, to a large extent, keep away from the theatres because they find that after stewing in some overcrowded and heated theatre on the previous night their brains are not sufficiently clear in the morning to allow of the faithful performance of their duties. We say it with all humility, but with the certainty that we are right, that theatrical managers are thus deprived of the most intelligent and most discriminating portions of their audiences, and that the lack of patronage of theatres by the professional classes must tell against the best interests of the drama, for every educated person must admit that there are dramatic interests which are higher than pounds, shillings, and pence. We doubt if any theatre has yet been built in London in which the question of ventilation has been considered of prime importance by the architect. Theatres have been built in New York and on the Continent (notably, we believe, at Frankfort) in which the ventilation has been efficiently provided for, and in which the visitors get fresh air of a regulated temperature without draughts.

Surely the ventilation of a theatre is no very difficult matter. The Board of Works now compels every theatre to have outlets on every side, and where there are outlets for visitors there must be room for inlets of fresh air. The vertical delivery of fresh air (if the tubes be large enough and in sufficient quantity) may be managed without causing draughts, and no building lends itself better to the escape of foul air than does a theatre, provided holes be made for its escape. The central sunlight of a theatre is a most efficient outlet for foul air, and there ought to be no difficulty in providing other outlets of a similar kind in the lobbies and above the stage, and at the back of the dress circle, boxes, and galleries. Outlets, of course, are not alone sufficient; there must be inlets; and if these be provided in the proper place and proper quantity, there ought to be no draught when a door is opened, which is now one of the greatest nuisances experienced in our

theatres. In our variable climate it is necessary that the temperature of the in-coming air should be regulated, and in this there ought to be no difficulty with the aid of steam coils and ice. It is needless to say that every theatre ought to have an officer whose special charge it should be to regulate the ventilation and temperature of the house. This is very necessary, because of the constant variation in the numbers present in the house and the extreme uncertainty of the outside temperature in our climate.

There is no doubt that something has been done to improve the condition of our theatres by the introduction of the electric light. This does not foul the air as does a gas light, but it does not assist—at least to the same extent as a gas light may be made to assist—in carrying off the exhalations from the 1200 or 1500 persons who are crowded into a very confined space. We feel tolerably sure that if the sum (a very large one) which is spent upon the electric lighting of a theatre were spent upon its ventilation on a rational plan, and the supervision of it, the gain in comfort and health to the public would not fail to be appreciated and would result in a gain to the manager.

THE *Liverpool Mercury* for Dec. 31st, 1886, contains the report of the committee to be submitted to the governors and subscribers to the Hospital for Women, Liverpool, upon the practice of frequent spaying in this institution. The members of the committee appear to be laymen, and when they came face to face with this question they found themselves in a very uncomfortable position. The funds fell away, subscriptions did not come in, and what appeal could be made to the public on behalf of an institution in which a noticeable part of the work done was the removal of the uterine appendages? Under these circumstances the committee appears to have lost its head, and to have sought guidance chiefly from those who either claim to be inventors of the operation, or who are regarded as adepts in its performance. The replies of several of those who were consulted are given in the report; they all, with one exception, tend in one way—that is, to justify the frequency with which spaying was performed in the hospital. The exception was the reply of Sir SPENCER WELLS, which appeared in our columns last year. He stated that he regarded the statement that 111 (it should be 169) of 347 in-patients were subjected to abdominal section as so shocking as to be almost incredible. The committee endeavours to lessen the value of this letter by the statement that the number operated upon was really taken out of 3800 patients, and that all in-patients might have had to undergo abdominal section. Hospital patients, however, in Liverpool, differ but little from those in London and elsewhere; they suffer from the same diseases, and the proportion of those requiring abdominal section is much the same in every large town. Sir SPENCER WELLS is intimately acquainted with this class of patient in a hospital for women in London and his criticism must be considered to have much weight.

As soon as the question of the too frequent resort to the operation came before the committee, it at once gave every assistance and facility for inquiry to the committee appointed by the Medical Institution, and at the same time passed a resolution calling upon the medical officers of the hospital "to keep a record of

the operations performed, stating the circumstances of each case, the name of the medical officer asked in consultation, and the fact that the patient or her relatives have been informed of the nature of the operation performed." The committee accepted the report of the committee of the Medical Institution (which appeared in our columns on Dec. 11th), and, with a view to carry out its recommendations, resolved that "no operation of a dangerous character, or that involves abdominal section, shall be performed (except in extreme emergency), without previously summoning a consultation of the consulting and acting surgeons for in-patients."

These resolutions are good so far as they go, but they are insufficient. It is not enough to tell the relatives and friends what the operation is; the patient herself, being of adult age, should be told, and have the opportunity to consent or refuse to undergo the operation, after a full explanation of its nature has been given to her. Further, it is not enough to describe the operation in words the patient cannot understand, and the consequences of it as sterility. Women do not know what the removal of the uterine appendages, ovaries, and tubes means, or what it involves; when told it would prevent conception, many think it on that ground alone a highly desirable operation. They should be made to understand that the operation is really spaying, and thus be placed in a position to refuse or consent to it. Should this recommendation be carried out, we shall look with interest to the future records of spaying in the Hospital for Women, Liverpool.

---

## Annotations.

"Ne quid nimis."

### THE FELLOWS, MEMBERS, AND COUNCIL OF THE COLLEGE OF SURGEONS.

WE would once again draw attention to the petition now being circulated by the Association of Members of the College of Surgeons amongst the Members of the College throughout the country, and urge on them the desirability of at once sending in their signatures and their adhesion to the principle for which it contends—viz., the right of Members of a certain standing to vote in the election of Council, and to be themselves directly represented on the Council. The latest action of the present Council, in polling the Fellows on questions not actually raised by the Members, or raised by them in a different sense, looks so suspiciously like an attempt to influence their voting in a manner prejudicial to the interests of the Members, that nothing, we fear, now remains but for the latter to rely on that "self-help" which, after all, is the mainspring of every real success. It seems very improbable that the Council will make any such concessions as will satisfy the Members, or meet their just aspirations. Hence, the Members must take the matter seriously in hand and act on their own behalf. Under these circumstances, the sooner this petition is presented the better for its success; and it is important that it should be well and universally signed. We hear, with pleasure, that many of the larger towns, such as Manchester, Bradford, and Shrewsbury, have already responded with something very like unanimity. Nevertheless, many names are still required in order to get even a majority of the total number of Members at present enrolled, and this can only be done by a fairly general signature of surgeons at home, seeing that a large number of Members of the College are established in the

colonies or are on foreign service. We would therefore impress diligence on all the local secretaries, as much for the purpose of securing signatures as of expedition and the saving of unnecessary expense. The statement of accounts for the past year shows a "balance deficiency" of £5, with outstanding liabilities for printing &c. of a further £20. Such a work as the present cannot be carried on without funds; and while we may congratulate the Association on the work they have already accomplished at so small an outlay, we must impress on all those who have not yet sent in their contributions, that as the advantages which will be gained by this movement are to apply to all the Members of the College, it is only fair and just to the promoters that Members should at least guarantee them against pecuniary loss in the proper carrying out of this work.

---

### FEVER CASES IN GENERAL HOSPITALS.

AN animated meeting of the governors of the Sussex County Hospital was held on Dec. 29th, under the presidency of the Mayor of Brighton, on the question whether the hospital should be utilised in the future for the reception of cases of scarlet fever, typhus fever, and measles. A resolution for the exclusion of such cases was moved by Mr. Furner, seconded by Mr. Boxall, and supported by several governors. It was, however, somewhat strenuously opposed by other speakers, mainly on the ground that the hospital was a county one, and should be open to all classes of disease. It was pointed out that since the hospital was founded sanatoria had been established in Brighton and Hove, where such cases can be treated; and seeing that the hospital cannot afford special accommodation for fever cases, or furnish a special staff, the meeting did well to adopt the resolution, which it did by 66 votes against 22. It is needless to dwell upon the undesirability of admitting contagious fevers into a general hospital where provisions for complete isolation do not exist; and in arriving at this decision, the governors of the Sussex County Hospital have only followed, although somewhat tardily, an example which has been set them years ago by the majority of such institutions. It is, of course, another question whether a fever block could not be added to the existing buildings, so as to remove the reproach that a county hospital could not provide accommodation for all classes of disease; but this is a matter involving a considerable outlay. Moreover, in the case of Brighton there seems to be sufficient accommodation for fever patients at other institutions in the town: and if this be not the case the Corporation should not delay to make the necessary provision.

---

### MELANOTIC SARCOMA.

THE study of pigmented new formations can hardly as yet be said to have resulted in a thoroughly clear and satisfactory explanation of the reason for their pigmentation or its source. It is admitted that such growths are almost invariably sarcomas, and that their primary seat is in connexion mostly with tissues that normally contain pigmented cells—e.g., the retina and choroid, and the rete mucosum of the skin,—although it may be remarked, in passing, that these are not invariably mesoblastic tissues. But even the source of the pigment is questioned. All body pigment comes, we suppose, from the blood; but in melanotic sarcoma this may be either direct (i.e., actual hæmatin) or indirect (i.e., melanin), due to the special operation of the cells composing the neoplasm. The subject has lately received fresh investigation at the hands of Dr. Oppenheimer of Berne (*Virchow's Archiv*, Bd. 106, Hft. 3), who proves that cases of melanotic sarcoma may be ranged in two groups. In the one, the pigmentation is