

hands upon a lancet, to employ it in depletion, or never be able to make use of calomel or antimony in the treatment of inflammatory affections. In this matter, we think, he has gone a little too far, and has given the anti-mercurialists strong peg upon which they can hang their chronic grievances of the evils attending the use—mind *not* the *abuse*—of mercury. Upon the *vis medicatrix nature*, Dr. Flint seems to have much faith—and that it is a power that works at times wonders, we will not for a moment deny—yet it would be a doctrine at once pernicious and disastrous, to instil into the mind of the young practitioner to depend too entirely upon the conservative power of nature; and much of Dr. Flint's writings seems to point to that method of treatment.

It is a well known fact, that many physicians believe that diseases have changed their type within the last twenty-five years; among those who hold that opinion is Professor Stokes of Dublin. In speaking of the treatment of acute pleurisy, Professor Flint thus incidentally alludes to this question:

“The opinions held by some, that diseases, and the human constitution have undergone a notable change during the last quarter of a century, and that blood-letting and other anti-phlogistic measures are less appropriate now than formerly on this account. This opinion seems to me not well founded, after a professional experience, extending beyond the period named. I do not hesitate to express a conviction that acute inflammations at the present day are essentially the same as they were twenty-five years ago, and that anti-phlogistic measures were no more appropriate then than now. Were it true that such changes have occurred, the fact would strike at the root of medical experience. If changes requiring a revolution in therapeutics are liable to occur with each successive generation, it is evident there can be no such thing as permanent principles of practice in medicine; the fruits of experience in our day, which so many are striving to develope, will be of no utility to those who are to come after us.”

Upon a question of such importance as this, we think the author has been somewhat unnecessarily brief. It would have satisfied us more had he stated his reasons a little more in detail, for coming to such a conclusion. We do not contradict the opinion he has expressed, for we candidly admit the subject is one involved in a good deal of mystery to us, yet we think had he entered more fully into the reasons, gathered from his long experience, which have led him to this conclusion, he might have exercised considerable weight in influencing minds not biased to either doctrine yet, and with whom his somewhat abrupt dogmatic assertion will have little weight. For instance, Stokes, reasoning for the opposite side, has told us that in certain years, fever raging in Ireland had certain well-marked symptoms, which he described at much length, and he then gradually