

the wishes of a great portion of our readers in this arrangement, we feel confident their benefit will be better consulted by presenting, as much as possible, Dr. Beck's own ideas which happily seldom if ever, afford room for criticism or even illustration, although our limits compel us to be more concise.

The chapter on *wounds on the living body*, deserves our earliest attention, as it may tend to throw some light on the various questions which may occasionally present themselves in the several departments of the science under consideration. The term WOUND, in legal medicine, is understood to comprise all kinds of accidents, such as bruises, contusions, fractures, dislocations, &c. &c. The cases of recovery from the most dreadful wounds, and instances of death from apparently slight ones, may influence the medical witness in urging that a dangerous wound has proved fatal through ignorance or neglect. Here Dr. Beck says: "Such power is too extensive and too important to be granted to every medical witness, and whatever we take from his hands, and refer to sound principles and general rules, is a solid gain to the cause of truth and justice."

A wound may not be mortal by itself, but become so by accident, and *vice versa*, thus, a small portion of the omentum, or the fat of the intestine, may so place itself in the mouth of a wounded blood-vessel in the belly, as to prevent a hæmorrhage, while, if not thus obstructed, it would be mortal. Bohn remarks that it has never been demonstrated, and indeed in the nature of things it can never be proved, that a wound from which there is a recovery, is precisely similar to one which has proved fatal, although externally, they may be similar in every respect. In the one case, there can be no dissection to prove its nature, and, in the other, there may have been many peculiar circumstances not attendant on the former. This observation is in itself a sufficient