

seller, and support. This was forty years ago, and at that time he recognized the change. Often he said to me, 'We cannot bleed this man; we must get him wine;' and the wine was got, and given with an open hand, so long as it was required. He used to say, 'I am not anxious to put these poor people into hospital; they will get on better at home, if we are guided by looking at their constitutional even more than their local state.' This, however, has been well put by Dr. Watson, who dates the commencement of the change from that of the first presence of cholera in London in 1863.

Dr. Christison, in his *Memoir on the Changes which have taken place in the Constitution of Fevers and Acute Inflammation, in Edinburgh, during the last Forty-six Years*, says:—

'Looking at the epidemics of fever in Edinburgh from the beginning of the present century, he shows conclusively that, in 1817-20, and in 1826-29, their characters were those of Cullen's synocha and synochus—inflammatory, relapsing, critical. Speaking of the epidemics of 1817-20, he dwells on the hard, incompressible pulse, the ardent heat of the skin, the florid hue of the venous blood, and the impetus with which it escaped almost *per saltum* from the vein, the vivid glow of the surface, and the distracting pain and pulsation of the heart and chest. Similar phenomena occurred in the epidemic of 1826-29; and, in both, bleeding was largely practised with the happiest effects; so that, in the epidemic of 1817-20, the mortality, which was at first one in twenty-two, fell to one in thirty—a result which disposes of the charge of malpractice against the profession. But, in 1834, Dr. Christison found that probably for two years previously a change had been going on:—synocha had disappeared; synochus had lost the vehement reaction of its early stages; typical typhus was much more common; and what did not come up to Cullen's mark of fully formed typhus was what physicians would now commonly call mild typhus, with more of introductory reaction than we observe now, but with less than in the two epidemics of 1817-20, and 1826-29.'

I have given, I hope, a sounder explanation; less flattering, perhaps, to the rising generation of physicians, but surely more honourable to physic itself, more creditable to medical observation and experience, more consonant with the advanced state of medical philosophy. My own convictions on the subject are so strong, that I regard nothing as more likely, than that in the course of time some now present will see the day when a reflux in the constitution of fever will present it again in its sthenic dress, and again make the lancet its remedy. And in that event it is not impossible that, while we are now charged with giving up blood-letting, because it was discovered to have never been the proper method of cure, we will hereafter