

formed what Dr. N. considers worthy of approval. This was shewn in my first paper; for Dr. N. having exhorted us "to know how to discriminate before pronouncing dogmatically," I demonstrated that I had anticipated his advice, by shewing him numerous opinions agreeing with my own. Again, in his last essay, Dr. N. offers, as a rule of conduct, "the following pertinent remarks of Dr. Johnson," viz. "The more rigidly the medical witness confines himself to facts, and avoids the hazard of opinionating himself, and the indelicacy of meddling with the opinions of others, the better." Now the rigid compliance I have shewn with the rule here recommended, will be manifest by the following quotation from my former paper, when speaking of the evidence I gave at the inquest: "Imperfectly aware of the course of the case, I conceive I was not warranted in propounding a more decided opinion. As far as I was well informed, I gave a most decided testimony; when I was in doubt, I conceived myself unwarranted in giving opinions."

Quotations, however, though so frequently offered, do not appear to be the Doctor's forte, and in his case resemble the Asiatic war-elephants, which are apt to turn round upon their friends, instead of marching against their enemies.

Dr. N. assures you, Messrs. Editors, that he writes more "in sorrow than in anger." I, too, lament that I must again retort on Dr. N. his allegations respecting myself. "It is very unfortunate," he says, "that a Professor of Medicine should evince so determined a disposition to distort facts, and strive to render the worse the better cause." It is unfortunate when any one, even if not a Professor of Medicine, commits this fault; and that Dr. N. is himself obnoxious to the imputation, I convincingly shewed in my former paper. For instance, did it or did it not manifest a determination to distort, when he clipped off one half of a paragraph quoted from Mackintosh, because it contained a most decided condemnation of the theory he wished to uphold? Was it or was it not distortion, to endeavour to make Craigie and others speak in his favour, while (as I proved) their writings were entirely adverse to his position? But Dr. N.'s "determination to distort," is not confined to his first production; it is exhibited (notwithstanding the correction it received) in his second. For instance, not deigning "to sift" all the quotations with which "the Doctor attempts to bolster up his untenable (!!) positions," he "cannot help examining two of them," and then proceeds to notice a passage from Alison, and another from Hunter, as if I had applied them to the case of Champeau, saying of the latter, "what similarity is there between it and C.'s case?" while he knew these two quotations, with several others, were made not as having a similarity to C.'s case, (for *they* were *indeed*