

40. This definition quite meets the general idea thereof. Never, whether among the illiterate or the learned, has death resulting from illness been called violent, however terrible and violent the agony preceding dissolution.

But the ignorant with difficulty realize that a peaceful death, caused by a narcotic, may be, as the learned maintain, a violent death; they grant, however, that it is not a natural death.

If it is not the result of a natural and ordinary cause, it is, as a consequence, a violent death, according to the above definition, understood in the common parlance of all civilized countries.

41. It is thus understood by medical science.

Lacassagne, in his treatise on Medical Jurisprudence, p. 202, gives as violent death "death by external causes".

And all the treatises on Medical Jurisprudence, whether English,—as those of Taylor or Wharton,—or French,—as those of Fodéré, Dévergie, Lataud,—contain a chapter dealing with attempts upon life by violence, leaving apparent external traces, and by violence leaving no external trace upon the corpse. They treat all of contusions, lesions, wounds, burns, leaving visible exterior traces; of asphyxiation, suffocation, submersion; of death by external heat, by cold, by poisoning, by gas, or by poisons leaving no outward trace. They give all these means as acts capable of causing violent or unnatural death; which is all one to them.

Needless to inquire what is said in the treatises of *savants* of other countries; the same theory will be found in their works.

42. It is thus indeed that the law understands it.

For want of exact statutory text, if recourse is had to Common Law and jurisprudence, as established by precedents in England, the following will be found:—

The Statute of Edward I., to designate persons dying violent deaths, makes use of the Latin word "*occisos*", "slain"—that is to say, deprived of life otherwise than by illness.

Blackstone in his Commentaries, Vol. I, p. 348, employs the word "slain".