

ciatrizing and muscular texture degenerating from altered nutrition and perpetual labour effected with a handicap. I do not require to be informed that such a view has not the sanction of a new "school" of thought in such matters, the views of which *should*, if they do not obtain permanent acceptance, when regard is had to its vigorous propagandism and ingenious advocacy by crisp and confident exponents.

By these remarks I in no way desire to rob the myocardium of its long acknowledged importance in the mechanism of the circulation, but I hope I do Dr. Lewis no injustice when I state that he appears to me unduly to depreciate the consequences of inflammatory disease and deformity both of the valves and pericardium. May not his admittedly transient "block" signs of myocardial involvement be neural interferences with conductivity which do not necessarily indicate myocardial lesion of even a fleeting nature? We know how difficult it is experimentally to induce heart-block without complete division of the common stem of the so-called auriculo-ventricular bundle, and how insistent some myogenists have been that undisturbed ventricular action, in the presence of disease of the bundle, merely indicates that the structure has not been completely involved. Under these circumstances it is difficult to accept a little congestion of the bundle, even in the presence of dropped beats and other clinical evidence of heart-block, as the essential cause of the phenomenon. The value, therefore, of such a sign in itself, as an indication of myocardial involvement in infectious disease, seems at least questionable.—I am, etc.,

London, W., March 24th.

ALEXANDER MORISON.

RECENT ADVANCES IN THE DIAGNOSIS, PROGNOSIS, AND TREATMENT OF HEART DISEASE.

SIR,—In 1911, as Chairman for the year of the Folkestone Division of the British Medical Association and Folkestone Medical Society, I invited Dr. Price to give an address on cardiac disease to the members. He kindly came down on November 2nd of that year and gave us an address. I was in the chair on that occasion, and in his discourse Dr. Price enunciated the theory and practice of modern heart therapy and described very carefully and defined the extra-systole, etc. Dr. Price explained that he could not publish his lecture then as he was going to give it in other places.

This lecture is the only one I have heard, and Dr. Mackenzie's work on the heart is the only medical work I have read on modern heart theories. When I read Dr. Price's 'Toronto address' it was at once apparent to me that it was the same address he had delivered to us at Folkestone.

I remember quite well some of the phrases Dr. T. Lewis quotes out of this address. If I looked at these things in Dr. Lewis's way I should certainly have considered, had I read his book published in the spring of last year, that his information was derived from these two sources named. I cannot suggest that Dr. Price about a year and a half ago copied information from a book only published about twelve months ago.

It is sufficient for any one reading Dr. Mackenzie's works to judge how very many similar phrases occur in Dr. T. Lewis's book. I take it one must use correct definitions, symptoms, and terminology in describing the same set of ailments, and naturally the same things occur to all accurate observers and must be stated in similar terms. The affinity of great minds is proverbial.—I am, etc.,

Folkestone, March 22nd.

LENNOX WAINWRIGHT.

SIR,—In his letter appearing in the last issue of your JOURNAL, Dr. Price mentions that so long ago as early in 1911 I was cognizant of the text of the address he delivered before the Toronto Academy of Medicine in October of last year. This statement I confirm.

I feel some explanation of the circumstances under which the paper came under my notice is called for from me. Some time about the end of May, 1911, I was asked by Dr. Hawthorne, the Chairman of the Polyclinic, to

give a course of instruction there on modern methods in heart disease. I understood Dr. Mackenzie had mentioned me as one likely for the work. At the time I was not aware Dr. Price was the appointed lecturer for this course, but was unable to act because of illness.

Subsequently Dr. Price wrote to me on the matter, and forwarded for my guidance the typescript of the lectures he had purposed giving. I made no use of the paper, as I considered it better to adhere to the syllabus of my previous classes.

I read Dr. Price's paper carefully, and I can vouch that the subject was dealt with substantially in the same manner and order as in his recent address, but at greater length. I cannot, however, remember particular phrases, niceties of diction, or the order of words used in describing facts. The only paragraph of the paper I recall is that relating to pulsus alternans, in which I am greatly interested. I noticed that this pulse rhythm was described as being often difficult or impossible to detect by the finger, except at times when alternation was continuous.

I was under the impression that this was my copyright, and flattered myself Dr. Price had probably troubled to read a paper of mine in the *Lancet* incidentally dealing with this subject; but I found this was unlikely, and concluded that, perhaps after all, this and most other statements of fact in the paper were derived from the source from which all writers so far have had to draw so freely. No one has yet worked long enough to revise from his own experience all the observations in Dr. Mackenzie's classical writings.—I am, etc.,

Southall, W., March 21st.

J. D. WINDLE.

SIR,—I am glad to confirm Dr. Price's letter of March 17th. I had the pleasure of listening to his lecture at Brighton in October, 1911, and when I read his Toronto address I was surprised to find nothing which I had not heard before. To refresh my memory, I have looked up the notes made by the honorary secretary of our society; they begin with a mention of aconite and finish with $\frac{2}{5}$ of a grain of strophanthin intravenously. It is more than probable that Dr. Lewis and Dr. Price have both unconsciously adopted the phraseology of Dr. Mackenzie, the one great master of modern cardiology.—I am, etc.,

Brighton, March 23rd.

WALTER BROADBENT.

SIR,—I have read the correspondence in your JOURNAL concerning Dr. Price's address at Toronto last year. Dr. Lewis appears to think it was written after his book was published. I do not know the exact date of the publication of Dr. Lewis's work, but on reading Dr. Price's address in the JOURNAL of March 8th I at once recognized it as having been delivered at the Polyclinic on February 28th and 29th, 1912. More than twelve months having now elapsed, I cannot remember all the words and phrases to which Dr. Lewis has drawn attention. However, I distinctly remember some of the passages which Dr. Lewis has italicized—not every word, though very nearly so—and of course the meaning conveyed was identical.

It appears to me only right, under the circumstances, to state those facts.—I am, etc.,

London, W., March 22nd.

JAMES CHUTE.

MEDICAL ILLUSTRATORS.

SIR,—I have nearly finished a volume on *Medical Men as Illustrators*, for I found that scanty credit had been given to many such either in the early folios or in the modern works—indeed, very often no mention was made at all.

I am giving a short life of each man, also his portrait and a specimen or two of his work. This was easy with regard to the earlier writers, as I have been a collector of first editions of medical works for the past thirty years, but I have some difficulty in getting portraits of such men as McClise, H. V. Carter, J. Howship, etc.

I would be most grateful for new names for my list, also sources where the human side of the man is given in biographical or autographical form. Curiously, near relations seem the least able to supply such details.—I am, etc.,

HOWARD A. KELLY, M.D.

Baltimore, Maryland, U.S.A., March 14th.