SPECIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

Report of a Case of Malformation of the Female Generative Organs.

To the Editor:—Without going into the history of the subject or discussing the various classifications of uterine and vaginal malformations, I desire to report the following case:

The patient is 46 years old, married for many years, about 5 feet 10 inches in height, strongly built, and with a decided masculine appearance and voice. Her menstruation has always been regular and easy.

In November, 1890, she had a fall to the ground, alighting in a sitting posture, after which she complained of severe pain in the back and coccygeal region, and from these facts I was led to make an examination. The discovery which I made shed no particular light on the cause of the pain, but it proved to be a matter of interest to me, and explained to the patient the cause of her sterility. In making a digital examination I found the vagina to be roomy, and with two fingers I could reach its upper extremity, but I was wholly unable to find any trace of the cervix uteri. A bimanual examination proved the absence of the uterine body. While conducting this examination a forcible and expulsive contraction of the vagina took place, and at the same time the patient complained of excruciating pain in the back. In a few days I made the second examination, this time with a Brewer's speculum. After the blades were fairly well separated a contraction as above mentioned took place, causing great pain, and with such force that I feared the blades of the speculum would be bent or broken before I could run the button back, allowing the bladder to close.

From the facts recited I arrived at the following conclusion: The vagina and uterus are continuous, and there is no line of demarcation indicating where the vagina and uterus unite. It might be as well to say that there is *no* uterus, but the vagina is supplied with thick muscular walls, which are capable of wide dilatation and forcible contraction.

J. T. MCSHANE, M.D.

Carmel, Ind.

The Present Status of the Koch Treatment in Germany.

To the Editor:—I have just received a letter from Berlin, some quotations from which I think will be of special interest to your readers as indicating the present status of the Koch treatment in Germany. He says: "Dr. Koch's remedy is still with us, but becoming less popular daily, if I may judge from students and others who have an opportunity of witnessing the treatment. Beside the French and not a few German opponents who are animated by feelings of rivalry or the like, some there are of late who, closely observing the matter, do not hesitate to condemn the treatment as both fruitless, dangerous and unscientific, since it seems to diminish the patient's strength and physical resistance by its local and general powerful action, and hence a condition favorable to the extension of tuberculosis. Koch's announcement of January 15, besides the disclosure concerning the composition of the substance, gives little more than a repetition of his first declaration for the worth of his discovery. Quite positive indeed is his renewed assertion, but yet, he gives us no additional matter to substantiate his position and encourage the public. A friend of mine, candid and intelligent, who is taking a private course in physical diagnosis under one of Gerhardt's assistants, and seeing much of the cases, gives very unfavorable reports. An assistant of Bergmann's also informs me that the number of tubercular patients treated in his hospital has decreased from

some hundreds to a small fraction of one hundred. That of three test cases of laryngeal tuberculosis, with but little involvement of the lungs, under observation for some five or six weeks, and considered favorably at the beginning, two have died and the third is fast after them; that recently one case of lupus was operated upon surgically without any accompanying injection treatment. Bergmann says nothing against the Koch method, but this action is perhaps significant. I myself am inclined to place confidence in Koch and his opinion, with all due allowance for his personal bias, and think we should be very slow to condemn it until we know what he knows." At all events, it is better for the public to be disappointed now, even to an exaggerated extent, before more time and strength is spent in vain.

E. FLETCHER INGALLS, M.D.

Chicago, Feb. 10, 1891.

Shall The Journal be Removed to Washington?

To the Editor:—As a member of the Association for thirty-six years, I am in favor of THE JOURNAL being published at Chicago.

CHAS. G. BACON, M.D.

Fulton, N. Y., Feb. 10, 1891.

To the Editor:—Keep THE JOURNAL in the central city of the country by all means. No other city presents better advantages for making it a success than Chicago.

HUGH MCCOLL, M.D.

Lapeer, Mich., Feb. 12, 1891.

To the Editor:—The question of the best location for the publication of THE JOURNAL should be discussed with fair argument and common sense.

Does the advertising department greatly assist the financial success of a medical publication? To this question there is but one answer, and wherever published, its advertising pages would not probably be increased beyond their present number, if equalled.

Would the number of subscribers be increased if removed?

From no city could it be distributed more rapidly nor directly than Chicago.

Would the aspiring, disaffected authors of very important original productions *all* see their names at the head of papers in the first issue after the annual meeting of the A. M. A. if published in Washington, Kalamazoo, or Oshkosh? It seems there has been much nonsense in that line.

Looking at the subject from the standpoint of a country doctor, the editorial work compares favorably with the very best of medical journalism.

Let us keep it in Chicago.

O. A. REA, M.D.

Marmont, Ind., Feb. 12, 1891.

To the Editor:—I have read with much interest the discussion in regard to removing THE JOURNAL to Washington. The scheme—for it is a scheme—is not a new one; I know that certain medical politicians have had it in view since 1886. The chief idea in view has not yet been brought out in the discussion, and perhaps it is just as well to delay the exposure of it until the next meeting, in May. But as yet no one has put forward a single substantial argument in favor of removal.

The most frequently reiterated argument is that as THE JOURNAL is a national journal it should be published at the Capital of the Nation. This is well enough for Fourth-of-July talk, but it lacks a commonsense basis; it is silly, and its silliness has not even the doubtful merit of sentimentality. One may ask, why is none of the money of this country coined at Washington? for the coinage is a National affair. Why not do it all at the Capital of