

version of it,) I stated that Champeau died from the supervention of gangrene: and I would ask any candid man, if the constitutional symptoms of the last thirty-six hours were not those of gangrene. Should any one have been led into error by Dr. H.'s ignis fatuus like prudence, I would beg of him to read over a second time, with attention, my statement of the case; the Doctor's memory is as treacherous as his vision is imperfect, if he assert that I stated to him that C. had sat in an arm chair during his illness. I did tell him distinctly that C. had passed the night after the injury in an arm chair, but that I found him in bed at my first visit, which he never left till carried to the grave.

Dr. H. asserts that there was a bruise of four inches—well measured no doubt—but that had C. lived there would have been considerable sloughing. Let me ask the doctor what constitutes a slough, and if it be not sphacelus or gangrene? He also says that the lumbar region had been immersed in poultices, as though these had been constantly applied; but the moment collapse set in the poultices were replaced by cotton wool; moreover the said poultices had been principally applied to the abdomen; where there was neither bruise nor mortification. He denies that the lumbar region was gangrened; does he really forget that there was vesication there, that there was a constant oozing of bloody serum and bubbles of air from the lateral wound? Does he forget that the cuticle peeled off when touched, and only at that particular spot, exhibiting the whole lumbar surface of a dark chocolate colour? and on cutting into the part, that it was found decomposed and infiltrated? Does he forget that he attributed these appearances to "gravitation?" and has it escaped his recollection, so tenacious in other matters, that I laid the opposite side open, and that all was normal there, no blood, no infiltration, no peeling off of the cuticle, and consequently no gravitation. Can Dr. H. have forgotten that I called his attention in an especial manner to this fact? The quantity of bloody fluid issuing from this part was so great that the cloths placed under it to absorb the matter were frequently removed to prevent its staining the floor.

Dr. H. states that the appearance of the peritoneum, where the point of the bayonet rested, was due to the colour of the parts shining through this membrane, and not to the state of the membrane itself. Now the doctor did not dissect off this part of the membrane, and evidently did not desire to give it a thorough examination. How then can he be so positive that the peritoneum was really not affected, and that it was "so diaphanous." It is indeed painful for me to be compelled to refute so many incorrect assertions. He admits, however, that the stomach was inflamed; but mark that this had nothing to do