

specially studied the diseases of infancy ; surgeons who had specially studied the inoculative diseases ; pathologists of distinguished insight and learning,—men of all these sorts, scores on scores of them, had never in their experience “ had reason to believe or suspect any such occurrence as my question described.” In the alphabetical series to which I have referred there may be read all the most eminent British names of thirty years ago, certifying to such negative experiences ; there may be read, too, that equally negative in Paris had been the vast experience of Chomel and Moreau, Rayer and Ricord, and Rostan and Velpeau ; equally negative at Vienna that of Hebra and Oppolzer, and Sigmund. And in here recurring to that very remarkable mass of testimony. I may repeat the remark which my former review of it suggested to me : “ Obviously one at least of two conclusions is inevitable ; either it is that with reprehensible carelessness as to the source of lymph, vaccination (so long as in any sense of the word it is vaccination) cannot be the means of communicating any second infection ; or else it is the case that in the world of vaccinators care is almost universally taken to exclude that possibility of danger. To the public, perhaps, it matters little which of these conclusions is true. Though it would be the merest idleness to take again, now, the sort of formal census of medical opinion which I took thirteen years ago, I may state that ever since that time I have felt it among my strictest duties to be generally watchful and interrogative on the present subject ; all the more so as the period has been one of extraordinary pathological progress, and especially has brought to light very important new knowledge concerning syphilis ; and I have every reason to believe that a