

proving this contention. To continue this line of argument to the *reductio ad absurdum*, it may with equal truth be said that, under certain conditions, the eruptions of inoculated cowpox and smallpox greatly resemble each other, therefore smallpox is strictly analogous to syphilis! Where is the line to be drawn?

But even granting what, although inclined to believe, I cannot in any way hold Professor Crookshank to have proved, that cowpox and smallpox are two distinct diseases, this does not lead to the conclusion here drawn, that therefore inoculation with the one cannot protect against the other. It shows an ignorance of recent observations—not so recent, however, that Professor Crookshank might not have incorporated them into his work—to state that the “protection from one disease by the artificial inoculation of a totally distinct disease,” is “a principle which was not, and which has not been since, supported by either clinical experience or pathological experiments.” There are such experiments by Pawlowsky, Gamalela, and others, with reference to the antagonistic action of the erysipelas and anthrax and other micro-organisms, and I hold it quite possible that by working along these lines it will be eventually possible to reconcile the present divergent views upon the pathology of vaccination.

To conclude, we regret, as doubtless he himself bitterly regrets, that Professor Crookshank should have decided to bring out a work so inconclusive and immatured—a work which, with every allowance for honesty of purpose, cannot be said to add to the reputation of its author, either as an acute reasoner or as a profound pathologist.

J. G. ADAMI.

“Cyclopædia of Diseases of Children.” Edited by J. M. KEATING, M.D.
Philadelphia: Lippincott and Co. Edinburgh and London: Young
J. Pentland.* (Second Notice).

PART II. opens with a paper, by Dr. Pasteur, of the North-Eastern Hospital for Children, London, devoted to a general consideration of fever and its treatment, which, though full of interesting matter, strikes us as being disappointing and unsatisfactory. There is no denying that the temperature is more sudden and erratic in its variations, and more easily influenced by slight causes in children than it is in adults, but we think that Dr. Pasteur unduly depreciates the value of temperature observations. We fully agree with him as to the necessity for frequent observations; a night and morning reading only is often absolutely misleading.

* The English Publishers desire us to call attention to the fact that this work is being published in England and America simultaneously.