

suit of "gravitation;" by the way, why did not this same gravitation appear on the opposite side and other parts? No, courteous reader, the whole of the vesications, the peeling off of the cuticle, the lividness and swollen state of this *identical* part, resulted more than 30 hours *after death*. Hence, according to Professor Holmes gangrene is not a vital process, not at all; mortification takes place after death!!! The doctor asserts that I attribute the gangrene to the collapse. This assertion is infinitely disingenuous. A certain other physician may confound *effect* with *cause*, and invert the accepted order of reasoning; but Dr. H. seems to possess unique powers of ratiocination; for the love of peace let him enjoy this peculiar privilege. Thus it came to pass, he was induced to peep into the man's stomach, and then had proof positive that he had been "addicted to liquor," and to maintain this *dictum* and as corroborative of the discovery, he brings in my friend, Dr. Sewell of Washington! The indignant friends refuted this outrage on the poor man's memory, and quickly and effectually made it public, and yet the doctor dare harp on the state of the stomach! He seems to be innocent of all knowledge of the "complications which so frequently attend on peritonitis in particular; nor is he more guilty with regard to the doctrine of Metastasis, and the natural mode of inflammation from a serous to a mucous surface. The doctor might find his difficulty about the state of the stomach solved by perusing some of the late French writers on Pathology, if they are worthy of his notice.

The doctor is doomed to be overturned by his own "war elephants;" the poor animal being straddled by one, "uninitiated," tumbles him into the mud, in return for a most "unscientific" application of the goad. The said elephant is personified in the extract from Mackintosh, of which I took so much, as went to prove that peritonitis has not been properly understood till recently; I did indeed mean it to have some application to Dr. H., yet he chuckles over this and accuses me of want of fairness forsooth. Now let us see how the Doctor himself fares on that very subject:—In the *very next* paragraph, Mackintosh makes the following remarks, which I quote as well for the Doctor's edification, as for his information, and which he could not afford to transcribe, as it would have overturned his airy visions: "The *absence of vascularity* is no proof of the non-existence of inflammation; Pathologists rather trust to the well-known *results* of that action, which have also been established