

It appears I was right, then, so far as the peritonitis was concerned, in stating that the body did not exhibit sufficient evidence to account for death.

But it turns out that the case published as an exquisite case of peritonitis, was one in which the peritonitis was a comparatively unimportant accident, and that the chief role was played by an external inflammation. If Dr. N. had not made the peritonitis of such importance at first, it would have saved him and myself considerable trouble; him, in producing quotations; and me, in shewing that they were either distorted from their true meaning, or entirely irrelevant. Dr. N. now lays all the blame of the death on the gangrene, and the collapse was not induced by the peritonitis; but, "verily, it was the gangrened state of the lumbar region."*

It is marvellous strange that this collapse, caused by the gangrene of the lumbar region, should have commenced thirty-six hours before death, and yet Dr. N. be so ignorant of its cause as not even to know of the bruise till examination of the body took place. It is marvellous strange that external gangrene should have commenced thirty-six hours before death, and yet eight hours after death be marked by no external appearance. The "gangrenous vesicles" even of Dr. N. did not exist at that time, and were only noticed at the post mortem, twenty-eight hours after.

Dr. N. recalls to my recollection, that I attributed the infiltrated state of the lumbar region to gravitation, and that in consequence he opened the opposite side. The difference was enough to convince me that the left side was in a state of disease consequent upon inflammation; and hence my conclusion, in accordance with his own, viz. "the left side of the loins was in the state of a bruise,"—(see my evidence.) But if the gangrene had existed thirty-six hours before death, followed by thirty-six hours more of decomposition after death, is it credible that the appearance of the part would have permitted any doubt as to the nature of its condition?

So much for the case. I am perfectly willing to allow Dr. N.'s "position" to be judged as he desires, by his first communication, illustrated, as it has been, by the remarks I have appended.

It is particularly agreeable when we find we have so conducted ourselves as not only to avoid blame from those opposed, but virtually to force them to praise. I am fortunate in having by anticipation per-

* Dr. N. states, perhaps to explain the differences which I pointed out between his evidence and his case, that his testimony published in the *Minerve* is the only correct one. I beg to inform him, that my authority is even more authentic than the *Minerve*, inasmuch as it is the evidence signed by his own hand, and deposited in the Prothonotary's Office.