

in New York, for example. Like all attempts to draw domestic life back to the simplicity of nature, this manual contains much that is well worth considering. The protest against concentrated food, against the exclusive use of fine flours, the plea for bulk in food as well as for nutritive properties, are all good. As a scheme of life the theory goes to pieces on the assumption that an artificial life in man must be bad and unnatural. But we should like to know what that is good for anything in civilized existence is not artificial? How can we keep our dietetics alone on the low plane of nature, when the rest of life is on the high artificial plane? If these hygienic reformers fairly considered the proposition that civilized life must be an artificial life, and must depend on art for its success and its perfection, they might modify a good many of their positions; as to the use of tea and coffee, for example, as well as of meats and the like.

....Dr. Susanna W. Dodds, of St. Louis, publishes a hygienic cook book, *Health in the Household* (Fowler & Wells), which shows more disposition than most compilations of this school to compromise. The author is content with putting meats of all kinds low down in the dietary scale, but does not wholly repudiate them; and her protest against milk, butter and eggs is feeble. The general alimentary theory of the book, though modified in many respects, remains essentially unchanged. The author struggles bravely with the problem of developing any considerable variety out of the Grahamite material. By a surreptitious use of eggs and milk she produces an imposing array of puddings. The addition of a ten-cent beef-bone to the pot carries her triumphantly through an inviting list of soups. And the common-sense conclusion that, if people must have meat, they should use it in the best way, has induced her to add a pretty full manual for their preparation. The book comes out strong on breads of all sorts, and particularly in those simple, wholesome and appetizing varieties produced from coarse flour, salt and water. As to the hygienic dietary we cannot say much. The fruit diet prescribed would kill many persons. The fresh picked fruit, so strictly insisted on, would, in the majority of families, consume in the breakfast the earnings of the day. The protest against the use of salt cannot be supported by facts; and as to the attempt to maintain it by an appeal to the customs of gaminivorous herds in the state of nature, St. Louis is far enough on the way to the "salt licks" of the plains to leave the author less excuse than if she lived further away;