

investigations taken as a whole, which have been carried on in different quarters of late years, there are others which, so far at all events as my own insight goes, are more important, and they have at all events been more helpful to me. I refer to the wider conclusion, that not only the cardiac nerves, but all nerves (*i.e.*, all centres), are in some sense trophic; and that this follows from the view that function and nutrition are but different phases of the one thing—the general metabolism of the body. The results for the heart are quite in harmony with those arising from the section of the nerves supplying other tissues and organs; so that these investigations in cardiac physiology have been stepping-stones by which we have been enabled to reach a generalization which, as it seems to me, is destined to work profound changes in our views of both physiology and pathology. It appears now to be a radical error to separate “function” and “nutrition” except as a matter of convenience; and I much question if it would not be better to alter our nomenclature in the near future to bring it into harmony with the new conception. It would not only result in a broader view of vital processes, but would greatly simplify our classifications of physiological and pathological processes. It would be well if the work on the sympathetic and depressor nerves could be repeated. It is hazardous at present to attempt to interpret it. Hitherto the depressor has been regarded chiefly as an afferent nerve for impressions from the heart to the vaso-motor centre. Sewall thought it also had a similar relation to the cardio-inhibitory centre, a view which he supports by experimental evidence. If the depressor should be shown to contain no efferent fibres, then the conclusion that “nutrition” depends on afferent as well as efferent impulses would appear legitimate. This I fully believe follows as a result of a host of facts, though additional evidence of the kind this paper of Fantoni’s furnishes would be very welcome. I beg to call attention to the rapidity (forty-eight hours) with which these changes were, I will not say initiated, but actually accomplished so as to be visible to the naked eye. If we believe in a constant neuro-metabolic influence this is intelligible and this alone. The changes so pronounced in nucleus and around it also is additional evidence of the importance of that body on the whole cell-life, a truth that the most modern