

girls, the vagina. But in such cases it is always of an acute, and so temporary type; a type which, because of its necessarily concomitant symptoms, is not conducive to contagion. Need I enlarge upon the inferences to be drawn from this array of facts? That the vaginal douche, if used as a curative agent for a presumed specific vaginitis, is useless, must be apparent to all, and in the light of modern science the *strong* zinc or alum for the woman, as a parallel of the *weak* zinc or alum for the man, is a thing of the past. So, too, of boric and bichloride and permanganate, and all of the growing family of curative specifics,—all are futile in vaginal douching. Yet the douche has its place; and wisely used, this is unquestionably a place of the highest importance. What is it? First, it is a prophylactic agent. We recognise how feeble the hope of prevention is, where a lacerated surface receives friction in the sexual act, with a chancre. But not so with the gonorrhœal virus. Here the prompt douchment with a fountain syringe, hot water, and, say a dash of vinegar, may be productive of great good. Here is rational hope of escape from infection; and with statistics demonstrating the cervical canal to be the commonest site of infection, I would, in the abstract, say that a thorough hot douchment of the vagina, the subject recumbent, in every case where risk is incurred, would in its results alone justify the retention of the vaginal douche in genito-urinary practice. Beyond this it has, as a rule, two purposes in gonorrhœa, and two only: 1, for cleansing and disinfection, with, say, carbolic acid or some other of the creasols, or with simply warm water, non-curative but of much worth; and, 2, its use as a means of applying the soothing influences of moist heat to those inflamed and sensitive organs, the uterus and its appendages. Here it may be undoubtedly made fruitful of much good; yet here, unless it be desired in its use to at the same time wash from the vagina the migratory virus, I would suggest that much greater benefit will accrue if the vaginal douche be given *in the rectum*.—E. R. Palmer, M.D., in *The Journal of the American Association*, March 9th, 1895.

Part Fifth.

MEDICAL NEWS.

PRESENTATION TO PROFESSOR SIR WILLIAM TURNER.

ON Tuesday, April 2nd, a most interesting ceremonial took place in the Anatomical Class-room of the New University Buildings, when Sir WILLIAM TURNER, Professor of Anatomy at the University of Edinburgh, was presented with his Portrait by his colleagues and former pupils, in recognition of his services to the cause of science, and to the University of Edinburgh in particular. The Portrait, by Sir George Reid, P.R.S.A., has been on view at the Exhibition of the Royal Scottish Academy. It is a full face, three-quarter length, and represents Sir William Turner in academic robes, leaning lightly against the lecture-table in an attitude which must be familiar to those who

have frequented the anatomy theatre at the University. The presentation ceremony took place in the lecture theatre in presence of a numerous gathering, which was representative of academical and medical circles in the city. A large number of students were present, apparently men who were detained in town for the Second Professional, and the delicious enthusiasm they exhibited when their examiners and their assessors appeared was strongly indicative of the immediately impending orals. Sir James Russell was called upon to preside, and among others present were Principal Sir William Muir, Professors Sir Douglas MacLagan, Masson, Chiene, Crum-Brown, Rutherford, Fraser, Geikie, and Rankine; Joseph Bell, Dr Peel Ritchie, Dr Bishop Dowden; Dr Batty Tuke, Dr Macdonald Brown, Dr William Craig; Mr Somerville, procurator-fiscal; Dr John Murray, etc. Dr Cunningham, Secretary of the Presentation Committee, read letters of apology from Professor Cleland, Glasgow; the Rev. Dr Haughton, T.C.D.; Sir Dyce Duckworth, Professor C. B. Lockwood, Dr David Ferrier, Sir Charles Pearson, Professor Sir Thomas Grainger Stewart, Sir Joseph Fayrer, Professor Annandale, Professor M'Intosh, St Andrews; Professor Redfern, Belfast; Professor Young, Manchester; Professor William Anderson, London; Professor Laurie, Edinburgh; Dr J. Sims Woodhead; Professor Arthur Thomson, Oxford; Professor Thain, London; Professor Reid, Aberdeen; Professor Mitchell Banks, Liverpool; Professor Matthew Hay, Aberdeen; Professor Paterson, Liverpool; Dr Berry Hart; Professor Caton, Liverpool; Professor Charles, Cork; Professor Fraser, Dublin; Dr Lauder Brunton, Professor Windle, Birmingham; Professor M'Fadzean, London. Professor Cleland wrote saying that only the holding of examinations prevented him from attending the ceremony, and no one knew better than Sir William that examinations were as unavoidable as they were detestable. Sir Dyce Duckworth wrote that Great Britain might be proud of the man to whom they sought to do honour. He felt how many generations of Sir William Turner's pupils all over the world rose up daily, and blessed him. Professor Banks wrote:—"Intimate as Turner and I have been and are, I still have in the background just the slightest possible shade of awe for him. If a man has ever taught the femur to another man, the second man knows that, however close the relation may be, there is a great gulf fixed between them which will never be bridged over, not if they were to live side by side for a hundred years."

Sir JAMES RUSSELL said he was in the happy position of representing there the friends and admirers of Sir William Turner scattered all over the world. From almost unknown parts of Africa, from India, from Australia, from America, they had friends and admirers contributing to the small mark of esteem which they were asking Sir William Turner to accept. His splendid services to science had been recognised by universities and learned bodies far and near, and his friends rejoiced in these tokens; but they were there not merely to recognise his eminence in the scientific world, but their esteem and gratitude and regard for him personally. They were grateful to him for his conspicuous services to their *Alma Mater*, not only as a teacher who maintained the fame of their famous University, but as an administrator whose abilities in dealing with University affairs had made him invaluable. Personally they were tied to Sir William by gratitude for what he had done for themselves. It was not given to all of them to achieve distinction in science, but it was open to every one of them to learn those lessons of untiring industry, indomitable perseverance, and clearness of order and method, which he had taught them all. Many of them had to thank him for kindly offices of friendship and assistance and wise counsel, which were constantly called into requisition; and they were all of them bound to him by feelings of regard, which had grown with years. When it was desired to show some mark of that regard, the committee thought they would be best consulting the wishes of many who were anxious to join in paying honour to Sir William Turner by doing something to transmit his lineaments to future generations, and that by availing themselves of the services of their most distinguished artist, they should be able to give pleasure to themselves and, they hoped, to Sir William

and to Lady Turner also. Along with the Portrait they asked his acceptance of a Book of the Signatures of the Subscribers.

Sir WILLIAM TURNER, on rising to acknowledge the gift, was cordially cheered. He should be, he said, the most unsympathetic and unsensitive of men if he were not deeply moved by the ceremony of that day, and by the kind language employed towards himself by the Chairman and many of the writers of the letters which had been referred to. No one could go through an occasion of that kind without feeling that his friends had thought too kindly of him, and had attached too high a value to anything he might have done. The gift had its value greatly enhanced by the fact of the portrait being painted by Sir George Reid, whom he might fairly call the Scottish Apelles, and who added to his genius and artistic culture the very precious possession of patience, as he knew from his experience in sitting for the portrait. The period of the year which had been chosen for presenting that picture was one which conveyed pleasant memories to most of them. To himself it had a special significance. It was the month in which he was married, and it was the month in which, twenty-eight years ago, he was chosen to be Professor of Anatomy in that University, as successor to that distinguished teacher John Goodsir. He had been chosen by Goodsir in 1854 as his assistant and demonstrator, and it was somewhat remarkable that the Chair had fallen upon himself, because he had been a London student and a London graduate; but at the time Goodsir wanted a principal assistant, and he had been selected on the recommendation of the late Dr Sharpey and Sir James Paget. He always considered it the most fortunate event of his life that at a very early age he had come under the influence of a man of such marked personality, of such a vigorous intellect, and a man so original in his conceptions as John Goodsir was. So far as he was capable he had striven to carry out Goodsir's teachings during the many years he had been engaged as a Professor, and what value his work as a teacher might have was largely due to Goodsir's influence. It had been his lot to hold the Chair during a period for many years of which the University had been floating on the summit of a wave of great material prosperity, when in the Faculty of Medicine their numbers ran from 1600 to 1800 students annually. The changed conditions of medical education brought about by the recommendation of the General Medical Council, and by the Ordinances of the Scottish Universities Commissioners, had, to some extent, undoubtedly diminished their numbers; but he had great faith in the vigour of the Scottish University system. He believed in its power of recuperation. This was not the first time in which there had been a wave of depression following a wave of elevation, but always, before many years had passed, the wave once again began to mount upwards; and he thought he could say that it was the intention of the University authorities to keep Edinburgh University in the front rank of medical schools. One of the penalties which a man paid by being a long time in office was that he advanced in years. He willingly gave place to his colleagues there present, Sir Douglas Maclagan and Professor Masson, in the matter of years; but he had a claim to be more than their equal in continuous service in the University. He was the oldest official in the University, his period of service dating from 1854. In his case the progress towards the later stage in life had not been without its compensations. His duties had not been exclusively professional. He had been led from one cause or other to take part in the general administration of the University. Many years ago his colleagues had chosen him as their representative on the General Medical Council, and the appointment had been renewed from time to time. Since the Universities Act of 1886 had come into operation he had sat as one of the representatives of the Senate on the University Court; and he took that opportunity of publicly acknowledging the honours which he had received from his colleagues, and the confidence which they had reposed in him. Another of the pleasures which he had had in life had been to witness the success of his pupils. Many filled places of high distinction, not only in the profession, but in public life. With few exceptions, all his colleagues in the Faculty of Medicine had been members

of that class. He could claim that no fewer than eleven Professors of Anatomy now doing active work in universities and colleges at home, or in the colonies of India, were his pupils, and for the most part were his assistants. He did not think any other teacher of anatomy could point to the same record. More than he could enumerate had been the pupils who held distinguished positions in hospitals and in medical schools all over the world. But outside the medical profession one had been delighted to see pupils and assistants taking an active part in public life. No better example of that could he adduce than their chairman, who had been chosen by his fellow-citizens to the very highest place in the city which they could give him, and they all knew how thoroughly, conscientiously, and well he had filled it. They might think he was biased by his professional pursuits, but he had sometimes thought that a sound anatomical education, if there was superadded to it some experience of teaching the subject, was one of the very best preparations for a business life. And he would tell them why he thought so. There was nothing which, he was sure, conduced so far to methodical and orderly habits of classification and arrangement of facts, to clearness of thought and precision of expression, as going through a course of teaching anatomy. He had detained them too long, but he could not say good-bye without again expressing how much he had felt the proceedings of that day. After forty-one years of service, one felt that the greater and better part of one's life was past, and that what remained for one yet to do was merely a residue; but, God granting him health and strength, he hoped that, so long as he continued to hold the office of Professor of Anatomy, what experience of affairs he might have gained during these many years might still be at the disposal of the University.—*Scotsman*, April 3rd, 1895.

ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS OF EDINBURGH, ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS OF EDINBURGH, AND FACULTY OF PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS OF GLASGOW.—The Quarterly Examinations for the Triple Qualification took place in Edinburgh in April, with the following results:—

First Examination.—Four Years' Course—Of 15 Candidates, the following 9 passed:—Henry Nuttall, Accrington; Joseph Stanislaus Gubbins, Nenagh; Richard Murphy, Blarney; Cyrus Bath Retallack, Australia; Clayton Simpson, Cumberland; John Addison Holmes, Jamaica; William Scott, India; Michael Louis Neylon, Australia; and William Gregory Neill Keith, Ceylon. Two Candidates entered for divisions, and 1 passed. *Five Years' Course*—Of 23 Candidates, the following 12 passed:—Henrietta Fraser Traill, India; Jessie Jane Graham, Dunfermline; Katharine Constance Sampson, Ilkley; John Arnold Petavel, London; Archibald Craig Balfour, Edinburgh; Isabella Ann Watson (with distinction), Mid-Calder; Cecil Charles Murison, India; Robert James Love, County Tyrone; Robert Hugh Russell M'Kean, Chatham; Sidney Pritchard (with distinction), Manchester; Mary Birrell Davies, Liverpool; and Michael Sullivan, Edinburgh. Twenty-one Candidates entered for divisions, and 15 passed.

Second Examination.—Four Years' Course—Of 27 Candidates, the following 16 passed:—Arthur John Pollard, Leeds; William Lanzun Brown, Dalkeith; John Craig, Fife; Thomas Thompson, Ballymoney; Jeremiah Sheehan, County Kerry; Frederic Victor Elkington, Fenny Compton; Johanna Fleck Gilchrist, Shotts; Patrick Pearse (with distinction), Kerry; Walter Belfield Granum, West Indies; William Gordon, Doughery; Thomas Murphy, County Cork; Arno Bhushanam Shreenivassa Charry Morrogh, Madras; Kaval Vittal Rao, Madras; John Napier Williams, Brecon; William Lawson Cockcroft, County Durham; and Charles Owen Wynne, North Wales. Eight Candidates entered for divisions, and 6 passed. *Five Years' Course*—Of 16 Candidates, the following 12 passed:—James Hope, Edinburgh; David Scott Taylor, Alyth; Marcus Hill Babington (with distinction), Londonderry; Richard James Isaac, South Wales; Montague Rust, India; Donald Graham, Ross-shire; William Laidlaw Cribbes, Mid-Lothian; Gilbert Jamieson Meikle, Inveraray; Edith Mary Paton, London; Gertrude Mary Hutton, Benares; Robert James Pearson, Cumberland; and Rosina Jane Gillam, Brechin.

Third Examination.—Five Years' Course—Of 13 Candidates, the following 11 passed:—Walter Hulbert Cox, Ceylon; Augustus John Laurie, Allahabad; Robert William Meikle, Argyllshire; John Cranke, Lancashire; Ethel Louie Starmer, Matlock; Mildred Jane Wallace, U.S.A.; Mary Bowman Wilson, Ochiltree; Euphemia Cumming, Edinburgh; Elizabeth Morton Johnston, Edinburgh; John Rutherford Morris, Aberdeen; and Helen Willett Stanley, Calais. Two Candidates entered for divisions, and 1 passed.

Final Examination—Of 84 Candidates, the following 44 passed and were admitted L.R.C.P.E., L.R.C.S.E., and L.F.P. & S.G.:—Sidney Hugh Langston Archer, Kent; Thomas M'Cormac Adair, County Down; Julio Valentin Abrines, Gibraltar; Alfred Vernon Crompton Holt, Cheshire; Louisa Charlotte Nash, Bombay; Arthur Pearson, Whitby; William Dickson M'Murtry, Belfast; Allan Whitfield, Salop; Charlotte Rhoda Hodgins, Clerghjordan, Ireland; Arthur Joseph Williams, Central India; Aloys Bance, Madras; John Bradbury Winter, Brighton; John Minns, Whitby; William Bell, Birkenhead; Robert John Fullerton, Victoria; Peatrice Garvie, Perth; Maurice Patrick MacGillicuddy, Victoria; Joseph Arthur Clements, Leitrim; David Lawson, Stirling; Frederick Nuttall Clarke, West Indies; Horace Grattan Kelly, Melbourne; Archibald John Young London; Wilfred Curtis, Hampshire; Edward Sidebottom Hamer, Manchester; William Rigby Fisher, Runcorn; John Dearnaley Rhodes, Glossop; Hermann Casey Venis, India; William Francis Macfarlane, India; Edmond Francis Eyre, Limerick; John Easton, Moffat; Ellis Pearson, Liverpool; Joseph Leona Pinchin, Melbourne; John Robert Nesbitt Witherspoon, Durham; David