

## REVIEWS AND BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTICES.

**XXV.—*The Etiology, Pathology and Treatment of Fibro-Bronchitis and Rheumatic Pneumonia.*** By Thomas H. Buckler, M.D. Pp. 150. Philadelphia: Blanchard & Lea. Montreal: John Armour.

Surely that critic deserves commiseration, who, flattered by the gain of acquisition, searches its reputed hiding place till, toil-worn, his profitless labors sink into hopelessness, and no other prospect of return awaits him than "the spurns that patient merit of the unworthy takes." We appeal to our readers for their sympathy, for thus have we been rewarded by our exertions in their behalf.

Dr. Buckler, in the middle of the 19th century, would have us confess with him that the only lung affections of which we are certain are three—pleuritis, pneumonia, and bronchitis—and that our knowledge of bronchitis has not improved at all, since the time of Lannec, (p. 20); but we do not join him in these acknowledgments, for they are too singular, and can only be true when put in the singular number and first person. He gives himself the credit of now, for the first time, elucidating the true pathology of bronchitis. With marked precision he divides the disease into mucous, or that known to other folks, and fibrous, or that they have to learn; and this last is separated into fragments such as would suggest themselves to a physician in arms.

Of fibrous bronchitis he is indeed the first elucidator, and in his work is its description ingenuously constructed and cunningly devised, there, and there only, will be found its symptoms, peculiarities and management; recorded cases and their analysis. And yet, despite of all this, we believe that he is destined to stand alone—a forlorn student, unsurrounded by supporters, and without a follower; for in lieu of the conclusiveness of reality, we have only detected the falsity of misconception.

Would it not be improbable that Dr. B., whose knowledge of chest pathology has been illustrated, should recognise a disease of common occurrence that has hitherto escaped the observation of all the great masters of the stethoscope—Skoda, Grisolle, Louis, Stokes, Williams, Davies, and the rest. Would not the improbability be heightened if this disease were the very one that Andral, Recamier, Deziemier, and many others, on the look out for the visceral diseases in relation to rheumatism, had spent many wearied years in search for. Would not the chances against him increase when we knew that he was wholly unacquainted with the microscopical researches of Henlè, Gluge and Vogel, who have revealed the minutest physical conditions of the bronchial tubes in disease. And would not any possibility in his favor lose all tenability when we fur-