to the most, something usually recognized as amusement is necessary. . . . It is quite in accordance with the dictates of the soundest judgment at least sometimes to take no thought for the morrow, and sometimes the truest wisdom is not to be wise at all.¹ There is room for much judgment in the selection of amusements, and in the proportioning the use of them according to the patient's condition; they must be such as to take hold of the mind, and yet not too deeply—playfully to ripple the surface, and not to stir it to its depths."

We may add that there is no greater mistake, and yet one very often made, than to advise those who are exhausted by mental work to seek refreshment in violent physical exercise. Work is work, whether of the mind or body, and exhausts nerve force as surely in one way as in another; and it is no more reasonable to tell a student to seek relaxation in chopping wood or in digging, than it would be to advise a day-labourer to refresh himself with Maclaurin's theorem or a Greek play.

The following sentences contain a great deal of truth: "Some patients with considerable, though perhaps rather latent strength of constitution, on adopting an abstemious rigid regimen experience an extraordinary feeling of lightness and elasticity. . . . But this feeling, like the similar one which some find to follow mercurial or other purgatives, as well as the application of leeches or the operations of cupping and bleeding, now almost confined to text-books, is dangerous. I have known the feeling produced by the latter to cause a physician to bleed himself to death, so the sensation of relief following the former sometimes leads a resolute patient under self-treatment into the adoption of a course of diet which is in the end not sufficiently nutritious."

In conclusion, we would cordially recommend Dr. Morris' little volume to our readers as containing a good deal, which, though perhaps not very new, may yet be read with advantage by both doctors and patients, and which is, moreover, very pleasantly put together, and very modestly delivered. J. A. JR.

ART. XXXV.—*On the Results of the Operations for Cicatrices after Burns.*

By J. H. JAMES, F.R.C.S., etc. etc. 8vo. pp. 32. London: John Churchill & Sons, 1868.

MR. JAMES, as we learn from recent British Journals, is no longer a living author; hence criticism is in a measure disarmed at the outset, and hindered from too close an examination of his pamphlet. In the third volume of Holmes' System of Surgery, published nearly seven years ago, is a paper by Mr. Holmes Coote, advocating the use of mechanical extension instead of operative interference in cases of contraction after burns. While we have no doubt that as a general proposition Mr. Coote's view is correct, there have been so many cases of successful operation reported from time to time by various writers, that we should have supposed it scarcely necessary at this late day to make the matter the subject of a controversy. Mr. James' cases, the first of which dates back more than fifty years, are sufficiently interesting, and show (if it be necessary) that good *may* be done with the knife in cases of cicatrices.

We must protest against the use of the word "*rhinoplastic*," as applied to operations for deformities of the neck and chin (pp. 15, 28, 29). *Anaplastic*, or *autoplastic*, or simply *plastic* operations are what are meant, *Rhinoplastic*, is a term solely applicable to the operation of Taliacotius. J. A., JR.

¹ "Who stay at the door where others walk in, keep watch where others slumber, and have the folly to be wise where others have the wisdom to court folly."—*Anastasius*, etc., by T. HOPE, vol. i., Baudry's ed., p. 333.