

and Professor Crookshank. There can be no question that the whole subject of the pathology of vaccinia requires a study more full, more accurate, and more scientific than it has as yet received, and as a means to this end the writings of these two controversialists, and the investigations of the Royal Commission now sitting, are most timely and most welcome, inasmuch as they indicate the direction in which we must turn our attention in order satisfactorily to solve the undoubted difficulties that exist.

The views of Dr. Creighton are by now well-known. His article in the "Encyclopædia Britannica," and his more recent writings, well define his position. A study of the article above mentioned, shows that his main contentions are the difference between vaccinia and variola, and the unsatisfactory nature of the statistics of the supporters of vaccination. The practice is not directly attacked, but the evidence that is against it is carefully presented; whereas that in its favour is little dwelt upon. Yet Dr. Creighton definitely admits its value when properly performed, for he gives the following table:—

TABLE VIII, showing the number and kind of arm marks in 379 fatal cases of small-pox at Homerton Hospital, 1871—80 (Gayton):—

VACCINAL MARKS.	ADMISSIONS.		DEATHS.		MORTALITY PER CENT.	
	Under 10 years.	Over 10 years.	Under 10 years.	Over 10 years.	Under 10 years.	Over 10 years.
4 good	56	247	0	4	0.5	2.5
3 good	44	388	0	12		
2 good	41	523	1	19	2.4	4.1
1 good	43	422	1	20		
4 imperfect	91	317	3	17	3.0	6.9
3 imperfect	107	545	3	48		
2 imperfect	142	930	17	92	12.5	12.6
1 imperfect	138	820	18	129		

It is not, however, my purpose here to discuss at length Dr. Creighton's views. His statements have doubtless been well sifted by the Royal Commission, and we must wait for the publication of the next portion of the evidence given before that body, for what should be an exhaustive examination of those statements. Rather I wish to show here, in passing, that although not a thorough supporter of the practice of vaccination, he does not wholly deny its utility, and that the article in question is not, as too often quoted, written absolutely in refutation of the practice.

Professor Crookshank's work I purpose examining in fuller detail. The two large volumes, containing together close upon 1,000 pages, are like all the books brought out by him, presented in a most admirable form; the paper is good, the letterpress large and clear, the illustrations excellent. There is but one drawback to the reader's content, but that