

Here there is a confusion made of an act and its product. The act (Hæmaturia) cannot plug the ureters; but its product (extravasated blood) may. The continuance of the act implies that the escaping material is in a fluid condition, and in this state forms no mechanical obstacle; for, admitting it to be poured forth in quantity so abundant and so quickly as to fill up the urinary reservoir with its aqueducts, the distention would provoke contraction, and the whole would be speedily afterwards expelled. Where, however, the bleeding is in less quantity, it is not improbable a portion of the liquid may be so circumstanced as to undergo coagulation, and the clot becoming entangled with the mucous lining may constitute a veritable obstruction and so plug the ureters. But this is altogether different from what is to be made out of the superjacent extract. There, instead of the physical occurrence being ascribed to its real cause, the product effused; it is expressly spoken of as due to the act of hæmorrhage itself since this (hæmaturia) forms the nominative throughout.

Leaving this, our next inspection opens up a nest of curiosities, some dull, some meaning'less, some perversa, some stunted.

"*Differential diagnosis.* Cancerous tumor of the kidney may be supposed, when the enlargement is of the *liver*. The renal swelling however, if there be no anatomical displacement, is in the lumbar region. * * * An enlarged kidney is not moveable; were the tumor of splenic origin it would extend higher up into the chest and its anterior, notched edge is frequently distinguishable."

Now we ask, what is meant by the first declaration? "*Cancerous tumor of the kidney may be supposed, when the enlargement is of the liver.*" Are we right or are we wrong in understanding thereby that in a given case when the liver has been found enlarged, cancer may be suspected to exist in the kidney, in other words, that cancer of the kidney is denoted by an enlargement of the liver. If we are wrong in this deduction, how are we to know it—how are we to ascertain this is not what the writer implies? He evidently considers his statement self-expressive, for the context does not seem to render it more lucid and certainly not more impenetrable. But if we are right, can we believe the author to be serious and truthful, or shall we not rather hold him guilty of perpetrating a preposterous absurdity in the face of simple honesty. Enlargement of the liver a diagnostic sign of a Cancerous Kidney! Incredible!! Prodigious!!!

The second sentence is also mystical. Taking the aid afforded by the commas, and eclipsing what they include within their em