

I shall re-quote the passage as contained in Dr. N.'s paper, and must admit the skill with which it is adapted to enlighten the judgment of the "uninitiated."\*

1st. "The changes and morbid products may take place either within a short space of time—that is to say, five, six, or eight days."

The obvious tendency of this extract is to have it believed that these changes could not have been met with in Champeau, inasmuch as he lived only three days. Now to know our author's meaning, let us contrast Dr. N.'s quotation with the passage in Craigie :—

The changes and morbid products may take place in a short space of time—that is to say, five, six, or eight days.

The changes, &c.—*and with symptoms and symptomatic fever more or less violent—or within a much longer space of time, and with very trifling and obscure symptoms of general disorder or local uneasiness.*

Is it not evident that this passage, so far from being in favour of Dr. N., is at variance with him. It is intended merely to show that "these products" are to be met with not only in acute cases, (which Dr. N. denies can be,) but also in chronic. The two are contrasted by the violent symptoms and short duration of the one, and the obscurity and lingering nature of the other. The passage, in fact, completely refutes Dr. N.'s assertion, that effusion "takes place when the inflammation has been in part subdued and assumed the chronic character."

2d Extract.—"When inflammation takes place in the peritoneum, it may, under energetic measures promptly employed, terminate, there is reason to believe, without giving rise to effusion"—add "of albuminous exudation."

The intention of this extract must be to show that Champeau having been treated energetically and promptly, the treatment had prevented the effusion.† What would have followed? Craigie says: "No adhesion takes place; the over-loaded vessels gradually return to their usual capacity: the natural circulation and secretions are re-established." He then adds, "This is the only termination by resolution." The case, then, is one of cure. Was Champeau cured? If this were a case similar to Craigie's, what becomes of the highly injected, turgid, and engorged vessels he saw in C.? Was this "the return to their usual capacity"? Again, if we allow, in consequence of the "promptness" of Dr. N.'s treatment, that the disease had terminated in resolution, how can he blame me for not seeing what he had succeeded in

\* These extracts are not from a continuous passage, but isolated passages taken from pages 161, 162, 175.

† Observe the inconsistency which, if this extract was intended to be of any use, takes place. This extract is given to show a cause without which there would have been no effusion: while in others it is intended to prove that none would take place.