little pocket money. The disease is now epidemic, according to a report quoted by the *Allg. Med. Ct.-Ztg.*, in sixty places and in every province. About 90 per cent. of the cases terminate fatally, and as is readily seen from the official reports given weekly on the last page of THE JOURNAL, the condition is serious and growing worse. The prospects of the first Egyptian Medical Congress, organized for December of this year, are already blighted.

Correspondence.

Gastroptosia not Gastroptosis.

NEW YORK CITY, Sept. 15, 1902.

To the Editor:—In answer to the letters of Drs. N. O'Donnel Parks and William J. Robinson in THE JOURNAL of August 23, instead of writing a long letter I wish to refer to my paper "Greek in Medicine," read before the Book and Journal Club of Johns Hopkins University and published in this year's May number of *Johns Hopkins Hospital Bulletin*, translated also into Greek, German and Dutch. The translations appeared in Cyprus, Munich and Utrecht. It shall give me pleasure to send a report of the original or some of the translations to any colleague who will honor me by writing for them.

Here are some passages which are applicable to what my opponents have said:

"Twenty years ago, in an article which appeared in the *Berliner Klinische Wochenschrift*, Virchow said: 'Is it not justifiable at the present time to remind the physicians that they should use all possible exertion to show their scientific training in all, even in apparently small things? Is it not the first characteristic of a man of science that he should understand how to employ the language of science? The first thing by which the expert demonstrates his qualification is the correct use of technical terms; this especially causes respect for him, and nothing more enhances his utility'; and he closes his remarks with the wish that his views might be generally adopted. If we address this admonition to the medical profession at large we shall have to say: Would it not be justifiable at the present time to remind the profession to prove our science by establishing a scientific onomatology? The incorrectness of many of our medical terms can not be denied, but the extent of this incorrectness is larger than most of us have ever conceived; the evil is increasing every day, and the remedies thus far suggested have only brought confusion; they are not, and have not been, taken seriously; they have only brought discredit.

"It is not necessary to enumerate all the vain attempts at reformations of our onomatology; a single one, and I select the one which is most conspicuous at present, will suffice. We shall see why they were all of no avail, but we shall also see how we really can secure scientific onomatology which will stand as long as our science is taught, and which will be beyond all criticism."

I have to refer to the paper itself about the plan I have suggested.

"The facts I have presented to the Book and Journal Club of the Medical and Chirurgical Faculty of Maryland will, I am certain, find an echo in the medical profession. There exists a well-pronounced demand by all true men of science for purity and correctness of medical language. Professor R. Kossmann of the University of Berlin, whose name as a gynecologist is familiar to you, but who is not only a gynecologist, but has also distinguished himself as a philologist, says: "In forming our pathological and surgical technical terms we can by no means dispense with Greek, and so long as we admit that the retention and introduction of Greek synonyms for pathological and surgical expressions is a necessity, we have for the sake of correctness and beauty of language to decide to go a step further, to do away with hybrid terms and establish pure Greek synonyms in their place. Whoever has familiarized himself with classical literature will find it more and more intolerable to name a scientific conception by a Greek- or Latin-like sounding word-monstrosity, especially when he knows the real Greek name.'"

If my opponents will look up the literature on the question of atonia gastrica they will see that the agitation for correctness of medical terms has not only a scientific but an eminently practical importance.

Further, if the gentlemen will look up the voluminous literature on this question since I have introduced it—if they will read the views of some of the most prominent men of our profession, they will certainly change their ideas and will perhaps regret to have pronounced them.

A. ROSE.

ASHTON, R. I., Aug. 28, 1902.

To the Editor:—Recurring to the inane controversy about appendicitis and perityphlitis, the latter word is itself a confession of ignorance on the part of those who use it. The word means inflammation in the neighborhood of, *περί*, about the cecum, *τυφλον*. "There is an inflammation somewhere," they say, "we do not know where, but it has reference to the cecum, anyway." They ignore the appendix, a rudimentary organ which has no other apparent object than to create trouble by exciting inflammation (perityphlitis). They fight about words, mistake the effect for the cause, temporize, mistreat the case, and the patient dies.

In another case a practical surgeon, unskilled in philology, is called in. He at once pronounces the case to be appendicitis, neither knowing, perhaps, nor caring for the derivation of the word, nor casting a thought on it or its meaning. He promptly operates, removes the peccant organ, cures his patient and saves a valuable life to the world.

To those philologists who object to the word appendicitis as being mongrel I would suggest a term which I fear will not be adopted. It is *ekphynoskolekoeiditis*, *εκ*, out of; *φύω*, to grow; *σκώληξ*, a worm, and *ειδος*, form, which is almost a literal translation of appendix vermiformis from Latin into Greek, plus "itis." I am loth to assume the parentage of this word; it is uncouth; let it go: let appendicitis stand.

N. O'D. PARKS.

P. S.—In your issue of August 23 you made me sign myself H. instead of N. O'Donnel Parks. The man who printed my letterheads is responsible for this. The N does really look like H.

N. O. P.

Quack Advertisements and Religious Papers.

RIDGWAY, PA., Sept. 20, 1902.

To the Editor:—This last summer I drafted and presented to the official board of the First M. E. Church of this place, being a member of the board, a set of resolutions, drawing attention to the falseness of statements and dishonesty of purpose of various advertisers of "patent" medicines, and condemning the publication of such advertisements by the publishers of our church periodicals. The resolutions were passed, but two members of the official board voting against them. I took the ground that it was detrimental to the interests of the church that the papers should receive a profit from so false a business. Copies of the resolutions were sent to the various church publications circulating in this district. If necessary this move can be followed up to the annual and general conferences.

J. C. MCALLISTER.

Queries and Minor Notes.

ANONYMOUS COMMUNICATIONS will not be noticed. Queries for this column must be accompanied by the writer's name and address, but the request of the writer not to publish his name will be faithfully observed.

SODIUM GLYCOCOLATE IN DISEASES OF THE LIVER.

SHERWOOD, MD., Sept. 12, 1902.

To the Editor:—I have received a number of letters from readers of THE JOURNAL since the publication in the August 16 number of the article by Dr. T. W. Keown of Baltimore, entitled "Sodium Glycocolate in Diseases of the Liver," in which he mentions three cases of gallstones cured by me by the use of this remedy. The letters make inquiry of the particular preparation I have used in the treatment of these cases. Dr. Keown did not state in his article that the remedy I used was not a pure salt of soda and glycolic acid but a mixture of salts formed with soda and all the bile acids. The preparation used by me is made by Dr. Herbert Richardson of Mt. Hope Retreat, Md., from the fresh liver of the bullock, and