

demic diseases, and, finally, to peculiarities of constitution, which render many individuals absolutely insusceptible of being protected against a secondary attack, either by Vaccination or by inoculated or natural Small-pox.

5. It has been proposed to re-introduce Variolous Inoculation as a certain remedy for the occasional failure of Vaccination, ; but the superior efficacy of the practice is not only questionable, but its indiscriminate employment has been proved to be dangerous, and destructive of human life, and is therefore highly to be deprecated.

6. Revaccination, however, may be prudently recommended, not only as innocuous in itself, but also, on various grounds, as positively advantageous, even by those who question the gradual extinction of the protective influence of Cow-pock.

7. It does not appear that genuine Vaccination has lost any of the efficacy, which at any time really appertained to it; and it still remains to be demonstrated that it is not capable of conferring, to the end of life, complete immunity from the horrors of Small-pox, on a large majority of all the individuals fully submitted to its influence.

8. Even where Vaccination fails to prevent a secondary attack, the consecutive disease, in general, assumes a mild and modified form, although, in some instances, it may be sufficiently severe to leave the countenance marked with scars, and still more rarely to terminate in death : but fatal cases from secondary Small-pox do not seem to be more frequent after Vaccination, than after a primary attack of the natural disease.

9. On the whole, it is respectfully maintained, that Cow-pock, imparted in the most efficient manner of which it is capable, by Vaccination, and, under certain circumstances, by Revaccination, is the most eligible safeguard, within our power, against Small-pox ; and that it will prove effectual in most constitutions, not inherently insusceptible of protection, by any means whatever.

Strangford, Ireland, October 1850.

P. S. Since the first part of this paper appeared in the November number, I regret to learn, on the best authority, that I have unintentionally fallen into an error regarding Dr. Gregory's views, in attributing to that distinguished physician (p. 1051) any change of opinion in consequence of the researches of Mr. Ceely. Dr. Gregory is still a believer in the non-identity of Cow-pock and Small-pox ; and I therefore take this, the earliest opportunity, of rectifying the mistake.

The reader is requested to correct the following

ERRATA.

Page 1042, lines 9 and 21, *for* British, *read* Provincial Medical and Surgical.

Page 1049, line 14, *omit the word* Retrovaccination.

Page 1050, line 5, *for* Cow-pock, *read* Small-pox.