

several times at the same sitting, and again, if necessary, at a subsequent visit. Each puncture is of the extent of a centimetre. If only one be needed, it is made in the most fluctuating point, if several, they are effected about the circumference of the tumor, in a subcutaneous manner and in an oblique direction. Should all the pus not have drained away after a few days, compression is employed, and if the first apertures have closed they are re-opened or new ones added. The advantages of this method are stated to be that of easy and rapid application, less painful than others, productive of more speedy cures and not followed by deformity.

The opinions of Vidal, which we have set forth, are directly opposed to those of M. Ricord, and, in our opinion, justly so. Even Ricord himself has retracted some of his earlier statements, and evinced marked inconsistencies in his views, as published in his *Treatise* and *Letters*: most of the doctrines attributed to him are actually those of John Hunter, and his merit is often only that of a commentator and experimentalist. He has almost been idolized for having, as Gibert says, "extravagantly extolled Inoculation," though B. Bell, and others, employed it years before even America knew him. So open to censure has he laid himself, that even his friend M. Malgaigne has said, "M. Ricord, possessed of a theatre of observation, vast as could be wished, began by rejecting the observations of others; then, adopting a certain theory, he disregards those of his pupils, made under his own eyes, in his own service, and finally, I must say it, he takes no heed of his own when they conflict with his own preconceived views." M. R. denies both incubation and non-consecutive Syphilis. Until lately, he held that Syphilis was peculiar to man, and was not communicable to animals. He confessed, for a time, to Cullerier's notion of transplantation. He contends for the unity of the venereal virus, though, lately, he admits to having failed in proving the doctrine. He asserted that "all men were equal before chancre," that none were unimpregnable. He states that infection can only proceed from the matter of a chancre—that the virus can only enter the system by a chancre, and its infecting properties do not reach beyond the first gland above it, beyond which it can do no harm to others, as it no longer exists as a contagious agent: thus he discarded the transmissibility of secondary disease. He restricted constitutional infection to the true (Hunterian) indurated ulcer. He formerly spoke of his undeviating success with nit. silver, but recently acknowledges almost constant failures. The discovery of *chancre larve* has been taken from Hernandez, and improperly assigned to him. And lastly, "he has pretended by inoculation to distinguish affections apparently similar; to establish the difference between the primitive and consecutive accidents, to aid the cause of justice, and, in fact, to establish a classification, a system; further, still, he