d quites of Medical Jurisprudence alone, and Laville the provents of influence of the control of

and which require minute legal investigation in the limit of list. Insanily.—Of all the defects to which the human species can be subject, none if believe exceed that dire affliction—the loss of reason; which in its perfect state, must be considered not only the noblest attribute of God, but the greatest characteristic of man from the brute creation;—by its loss are embittered all the enjoyments bequeatly brute as, and will even suppress the tender feelings of consanguinty, friend-ship, and love. It is, however, greatly to be regretted, that where the management of fortune is attainable, we often see mercenary minds (always ready to gratify advantages over human weakness) will be prone to pursue the most unnatural and degrading alternatives, for enforcing a judgment of alternation of rund against the nearest of relatives, when in fact there will sometimes exist but a partial derangement of the intellectual powers.—For let it be well considered that a few acts of irrationality committed by a person, should never, lead us to pronounce a total privation or incapacity of mind against him; nay, thumanum est errare," and as Tilliot well observes:

it is this want of judgment which should deprive one of administering or of acting in affairs immediately interesting himself or his family. It is, however, necessary to resort to every precautionary measure, so as not to be induced to deprive him (without well-founded proofs of fatuity) of one of our noblest rights; "convout of person and property." The Romans even fully appreciated this inestimable right, as may be seen by their laws: "Observare protocent operation of the cui temere citra,

causæ cognitionem plenissimun curatorem.

This calamity exists in a variety of forms, and to define it would be a difficult task, but the best, and the one sanctioned by authority, is that "it consists in reasoning well on false premises," but it must seem to every one, (with Dr. Adams) that, in order to apply this doctrine, we must be previously acquainted with the character and external circumstances of the man. Fox and Pitt both reasoned well, and on the same premises, yet we accuse neither of them of madness, though each drew a different inference. If interest should be suspected to have warped either, the same cannot be thought of Clarke and Lebnitz: As to partial insanity, it is when the patient may have a competent use of his reason on various subjects, and can speak and argue rationally upon all, excepting the one under which the peculiar hallucination of his mind labours, and where it appears entirely distracted from its chain of