

in reality one and the same. But experience, however, we believe, proves the opposite. We contend that between pure cases of both there is as broad a line of demarcation as subsists between any two dissimilar conditions, and that the pathological states in which they respectively occur in no way correspond. Less pure examples certainly are heard, such as that called "pectoriloquous bronchophony," by Walshe, but these are merely intermediate links, and such as subsist between all great divisions. If this be not allowed, then, we have only to take a step or two onwards in absurdity, and assert that a lion is a plant, or the oak a stone, because between vegetables and animals, or vegetables and minerals, there can be no distinction, as the *phytozoa* belong to either of the former classes, and some of the *algæ* to either of the latter. We have considered the statements which have led to the opinion that these two are the same, but have failed to find in them anything conclusive. Both are admitted to have their analogies in the respiratory murmurs—bronchial and cavernous. The machinery of the one is that of the other only operated upon either by the agencies of the voice or the breath; wherever alteration of voice consequently exists it will be associated with the same alteration of breathing—bronchophony with bronchial respiration and pectoriloquy with cavernous respiration. Skoda, however, does not take this view of the subject, for he does not carry out the same divisions of the respiration that he did of the voice, as he should to have maintained his principle and upheld his consistency. His division proves this, whatever he may say to the contrary. Thus he divides respiratory murmurs into four: vesicular, bronchial, amphoric, and indeterminate—a sort of *genus incertæ sedis*. The want of correspondence between these and the vocal signs tells, we fear, against the general applicability, and, inferentially, of the correctness of the doctrine of consonance.

The foregoing exhibits some of the divisions used in the work under notice, which, it will be observed are those of Lannec considerably meddled with. We have only space to notice an additional one. The *rales* are singularly allocated together, as the vesicular, consonating, indeterminate and sonorous or sibillant. Now, we were at a loss to imagine for some time what the second meant, and naturally felt anxious to know what single *râle* had been dignified in contradistinction to the rest by the name of the author's theory. As some of our readers may feel the same curiosity, we quote from page 165:—"This *râle* is clear and high, is formed by unequal bubbles, and accompanied by resonance, which has neither an amphoric nor a metallic character." "It indicates the presence either of pneumonia or of tubercular infiltration, being seldom observed in pleuritic effusion." It is difficult to say what old-fashioned *râle* this is; we would have concluded it to be the mucous or its diminutives the