

sinister explanation for each step undertaken by Jenner, and we are left here with the impression that spurious cowpox is but a weapon forged to defeat the early opponents of vaccination.

It is impossible to feel the very highest admiration for Jenner and for his character, yet Professor Crookshank forgets that it is the very traits of that character that allowed him to accomplish all that he did. To be the leader of a successful social movement, in these days, it is absolutely indispensable to have a most complete belief in the rectitude of one's movements: to be determined to advance one's views in season and out of season: to grasp at everything, however minute, that favours the cause: to be by nature blind to whatever seems, at first sight, to contradict one's opinions. The man who possesses these attributes may not be a fine character, but assuredly, if the cause be good, or even if it be bad, such an one is most fitted to advance it and to command success. He who weighs cautiously the pros and cons can never be a leader of men. And in depreciating Jenner's services to the process of vaccination, Professor Crookshank is throughout heedless of the truth that he is entitled to the honours of a discovery, who, by his genius brings together the facts bearing upon it into a connected whole, and who publishes the discovery in a form so clear and so convincing as to render it of service, and acceptable to his fellow-creatures. Others, for example, may have made out individual facts with reference to the blood-flow—we will even admit, for the moment, that others may have previously comprehended the nature of both the systemic and the pulmonary circulation—yet their views had not been so brought forward as to gain acceptance, and it is Harvey, with his work, "*De Motu Sanguinis*," who deserves honour as discoverer of the true nature of the circulation. And with our present knowledge of the facts concerning the general adoption of vaccination, we can unhesitatingly say that Jenner stands *facile princeps* among all the workers in this line of medical research, and that he, of all, deserves honour.

Turning to what Professor Crookshank has to remark upon the pathology of vaccination, here again there is the same distressing want of clearness, although the chapters dealing with this subject are full of most interesting matter, the result of diligent investigation. All that he writes certainly shows that the pathology of cowpox is in a most unsettled condition, yet the evidence that he brings forward that cowpox and smallpox are two distinct diseases cannot be considered conclusive. Following Auzias-Turenne and Croighton, he draws the distinction that cowpox is strictly analogous to syphilis, whereas smallpox is not, yet the simple fact (and practically the evidence brought forward amounts to little more) that inoculated syphilis and inoculated (virulent) cowpox produce a similar succession of primary changes is very far from