

gitaline. The dog submitted to the fourth experiment was only indisposed; it did not die, much to M. Hébert's surprise, for there had been injected into its subcutaneous cellular tissue alcoholic and watery extracts of the viscera of a person who had been dead a fortnight. Although the parts were in a remarkable state of preservation, it could not be alleged that no process of decomposition had taken place in that time, and the known facts of poisoning by decomposing animal matters completely account for the phenomena observed. With regard to the frogs, M. Hébert observed that these animals were worse chosen than the rabbits, because, according to Stannius, they are exceedingly refractory to the action of digitaline. M. Hébert was astonished at the statement that the number of cardiac pulsations was perfectly equal in the three animals, because in experiments made by him he had found notable differences. The preliminary operation to which they had been submitted, consisting of raising the skin, the abdominal muscles, and sternum, in order to bare the heart, would suffice by the hemorrhage and shock produced to sensibly alter the action of the heart and to diminish the number of its pulsations. In the first frog experimented on by the experts, the pulsations had fallen from forty-two to thirty-six, whilst in one experimented on by M. Hébert they had fallen in thirty-one minutes from fifty-seven to forty-three. M. Hébert expressed himself surprised at the result of the experiment on the second frog, because he had made similar experiments with a solution of exactly the same strength. One frog had received thirty-six drops in six injections without any inconvenience; a second received fifty drops in one injection, and was but slightly indisposed, and soon recovered.

Two other objections were especially urged by M. Hébert. One was that the experts had not, for comparison, poisoned a dog with digitaline in the same manner that the dog was poisoned with the extract of the vomited matters. The other was that they had not repeated the experiment on the dog which recovered by administering a stronger dose of the extract derived from the stomach and intestines. M. Hébert concluded by insisting on the following points:—1. That there was no chemical evidence of poisoning. 2. That the experiments made on animals not only were insufficient to demonstrate the presence of digitaline in the vomited matters, but, on the contrary, proved positively that the vomited matters did not contain it. 3. That no animal was poisoned by the extract of the organs of the deceased, and that the symptoms observed in the dog inoculated with it were attributable to the action of putrefied organic matter. He concluded that the existence of poisonous matter supposed to be digitaline had not been demonstrated, and that the facts alleged