

within a short time. The consequences of severe accidents cannot be predicted even by medical experts, and it constantly happens that a man who has good prospects of recovery dies in consequence of some unforeseen complication. If his death is in the end really caused by the accident his representatives ought not to be deprived of their right to compensation because he was not killed on the spot. Article 3 seems to have this case in view when it provides that sums paid by way of compensation for incapacity are to be deducted from the compensation for the death. I am inclined to think, therefore, that in article 26 the words "aggravation of the disability of the person injured" must include his death.

The demand for revision is quite different from an appeal, and cannot be employed as an indirect method of reopening questions which have been decided by the original judgment. If, for example, it was decided that the injury from which the workman suffers was not caused by an industrial accident, and this judgment has been confirmed on appeal, or no appeal has been taken within the delays prescribed by the Act, this finding has become final and cannot be reconsidered upon a demand for revision. (1)

The demand for revision must be based upon a change in the condition of the workman which has supervened since the amount of the compensation was fixed. An incapacity which was at first considered to be temporary may have become permanent, or a partial and permanent incapacity may have become more serious than it was at first. Inasmuch as the claim is based upon a change of circumstances there may be several actions of revision within the four years, and the rejection of one claim is no

---

(1) Req., 25 mars, 1908, D., 1908. 1. 385; Bordeaux, 31 juillet, 1902, D., 1904. 2. 108.