

tively insignificant in name and position, not only take exception to this theory of causation, but assert that articular maladies are excited exclusively by local causes, and that the constitution bears no part in the causation. They further maintain that where the constitution suffers, it suffers from the ulterior effects of the local disease.

As long as etiological views on this subject so widely diverge, there can be no uniformity of treatment; nor can a compromise be effected between views so diametrically opposite. The only way of deciding between two, of which only one can be right, is to analyse the grounds upon which they are respectively placed. I hope the venture on my part in doing so will not be deemed presumptuous, for the conflict of etiology exists, and its settlement is certainly desirable. Too much has been already conceded by the old school to warrant a proud denial; and no party can feel aggrieved when appeal is made to the decision of "stubborn facts."

Scrofulosis, rheumatism, gout, syphilis, scarlatina, pyemia, and other diseases have been enumerated as constitutional causes of joint affections. To strumous disease, however, has been assigned the first rank, inasmuch as it has been linked with the numerous and diversified cases that happen during childhood. From my own experience I have to infer that not less than ninety per cent of all articular affections occur before puberty. Inasmuch as scrofulosis is not limited to childhood, and is supposed to extend beyond puberty, a few more per cent may be added to the original proportion, making a percentage of about ninety-five. Thus the theory of constitutional causation narrows itself down to the theory of strumous causation, and with this we shall have essentially to deal.

In entering upon our investigation, gentlemen, we meet with the singular fact, that notwithstanding the general acceptance of, and acquiescence in, the stated theory, nobody seems to know accurately what strumous disease really is. There are certainly no two writers that fully agree in its definition, nor does scrofulosis rest upon any firm pathological base. Even its clinical character is rendered so indefinite that implicit faith and a goodly stretch of imagination are required to realize its attributes. This is the status of modern literature on the subject, and in extending our researches over a more remote literary period, we are not less surprised to find that the scrofulosis of the present is a materially different malady from that of the past. The pathological school of the humoralists has identified this disease with a distinct morbid principle, a *materia peccans*, contaminating nutrition throughout, and stamping all other incidental lesions with its peculiar unalterable