

tance of the subject:—That it is important that the profession form definite, uniform and correct ideas as to the nature and effects of an article of such efficiency and general use as the one in question, all must agree.

A state of inflammation, and that depressed state of the nervous and vascular systems caused by a pure *sedative*, are so opposite, and the remedies to counteract such states so unlike in their effects, as to make it most proper to set the point at issue unmistakeably and at once before the reader.

The limits of this article will not admit, neither is it necessary to enter upon, a definition of the term inflammation, or to relate all the circumstances necessary to constitute that state; nor need we attempt any disquisition as to the state of the system, or any locality, when under the effect of a sedative.

It will suffice for our purpose merely to call to mind the increase of nervous excitement or energy, and consequent increase of arterial action in the inflammation, contrast it with that diminished or depressed state of the nervous and vascular systems, when under the effect of a pure sedative.

No two medicinal agents can be more diametrically opposite in their effects than a stimulant and a sedative.

Tartar emetic we consider a pure sedative. And yet we often speak of it as stimulating the stomach to evacuate its contents; and books, with greater absurdity, treat of emetics, at the head of which tartar emetic stands, under the head of “Local Stimulants.” Such loose and inconsistent expressions, together with the fact, that we are often unmindful that almost every article in use, as sedatives, are for most cases beneficially alloyed with anodyne or narcotic properties, has had the effect to leave the mind with crude undigested notions of the *modus operandi* of an article so uniformly purely and primarily sedative as tartar emetic. We say *primarily*, not only because its sedative is not preceded by any anodyne nor stimulatory effect, but because its emetic, diaphoretic and other effects are secondary, a consequence of the primary sedative impression.

Having premised thus much of inflammation, and the opposite sedative action of tartar emetic, we will now refer to the symptoms and appearances upon dissection, and see how far they go to support the opinion that death was the result of inflammation, excited by the tartar emetic, or from its sedative effects.

The father of the boy says, that after the ointment had