

Adreon (S.W.)

A
DISCUSSION
OF
CHARGES PREFERRED IN THE DUGAN CONTROVERSY,

BEING A

REPLY

TO A PUBLICATION OF DR. FRANKLIN KNOX,

ENTITLED,

“A VINDICATION OF CHARACTER, & C.”

BY S. W. ADREON, M.D.

St. Louis :

T. W. USTICK, PRINTER, 57 MAIN STREET,

.....
1846.



A

DISCUSSION

OF

CHARGES PREFERRED IN THE DUGAN CONTROVERSY,

BEING A

REPLY

TO A PUBLICATION OF DR. FRANKLIN KNOX,

ENTITLED,

“A VINDICATION OF CHARACTER, & C.”

~~~~~  
BY S. W. ADREON, M.D.  
~~~~~

Surgeon Gen's Office
LIBRARY
26872
Washington D.C.
St. Louis :

T. W. USTICK, PRINTER, 57 MAIN STREET,

.....
1846.

INTRODUCTION.

A proper sense of what is due to public opinion, to my own character, and to those who have innocently been involved in the gross attacks of my foes, calls upon me to assume the onus of defence, and, if possible, place the seal of silence on slanderous tongues. This, I own, is almost a forlorn hope; for the words of the traducer multiply by opposition, and malice is ever self-generative in the heart of a defeated and vindictive foe. Writhing under the disgrace reaped by their agency in the late suit of *Mary Dugan vs. Beaumont and Adreon*, my former assailants have, since the trial, kept up, by publications, a succession of assaults on Doctors Beaumont, Reyburn and myself; by what motive impelled, cannot be conceived, beyond that of gratifying their defeated malice, and satisfying their implacable revenge. I have a dislike to controversy of any kind, more particularly when it involves professional character, and is kept up by a disgraceful engagement in personalities: I have more than a dislike to it when my antagonist is my avowed enemy. With such an opponent one acts wisely not to harbor a captious spirit; for be the merits of the dispute what they may, the sense of having made an attack to reap defeat, is a motive with the disputant to repeat his assault, and each succeeding word is sure to be more bitter than those which preceded it.

It is to silence the tongue of such a malignant traducer, that I now appeal to my readers.

INTRODUCTION.

A proper sense of what is due to public opinion, to my own character, and to those who have innocently been involved in the gross attacks of my foes calls upon me to assume the tone of defence, and, if possible, place the seal of silence on slanderous tongues. This I owe, almost a solemn hope; for the words of the trader multiply by opposition, and malice is ever self-generated in the heart of a defeated and vindictive foe. Withdrawing the distance respect by their agency in the late suit of Mary Dugan vs. Bennett and Adeson, my former assailants have, since the trial, kept up, by publications, a succession of assaults on Doctor Beaumont, by him and myself, by what motive impelled, cannot be conceived, beyond that of gratifying their spite and malice, and satisfying their implacable revenge. I have a dislike to controversy of any kind, more particularly when it involves professional-character, and is kept up by a disagreeable engagement in personal-ities: I have more than a dislike to it when my antagonist is my sworn enemy. With such an opponent one acts wisely not to harbor a captious spirit; for be the merits of the dispute what they may, the sense of having made an attack to reap defeat, is a motive with the disputant to repeat his assault, and each succeeding word is sure to be more bitter than those which preceded it.

It is to silence the tongue of such a malignant trader, that I now appeal to my readers.

TO THE PUBLIC.

Dr. Knox having put forth an "Extra," as he states, through a "decent self respect," implying, of course, that if certain charges against him be true, he would have forfeited even this—I hereby proceed to give the proofs by which those charges are sustained. A critic tells of a literary man, who felt himself under the necessity of occasionally going abroad to preserve his self respect; and if the Dr. be of the same sensitive class as the hero of the critic's anecdote, I fear that he will only be able to preserve his self dignity by enjoying change of air.

Referring to the late statement made by Dr. Knox, in his publication relative to Mary Dugan's disease in 1840, and comparing it with his sworn testimony, it would appear that the scrupulous Dr. recognizes in his moral code two kinds of truth: one applicable to the solemn ends of justice, and circumscribed by the obligations of an oath—the other to be employed in the ordinary affairs of life, admitting of the greatest latitude in defining facts, and to be governed by the circumstances of the occasion. The first to be used in Courts of Justice, where the penalty of false swearing would consign him to a change of residence. The second to be applied where a professional brother's character is to be attacked, and where it is necessary to sustain an accusation by false and malicious statements. In illustration of the foregoing, I will quote Dr. Knox's recent statements, and compare them with his sworn testimony.

"I examined Mrs. Dugan carefully," says Dr. Knox in his late publication, "Dr. White standing by my side at the time. *There was one clear distinct opening into the bowel, its orifice about in the usual situation of 'the right external abdominal ring,' and running upwards and backwards in the direction of the inguinal canal, about an inch or an inch and a half; from which the matter usually found in the smaller intestines was discharging. There was no pus or other admixture with the matter usually found in the bowels, and no other opening, sinuosity or swelling, except a very slight one around the edges of the orifice before mentioned; and no appearance of gangrene, or the extensive sloughing, which it appears afterwards took place, from the testimony of witnesses for the defence on the trial.*

"On questioning her as to the opening, she said it had been made by the lancet of her attending physician. I asked her when the tumor, which had been lanced, first appeared; she said 'about seven years before; that it had gradually enlarged since that time, and had given her much trouble; that it was usually soft, and, *by pressing upon it, it readily disappeared;* but that sometimes it became hard and immovable, and then she suffered intense pain with it; that she had sometimes been obliged to call a physician to obtain relief."

Now, this story of Dr. Knox's differs materially from his evidence on the trial, and no doubt has its origin in the necessities of the occasion. Having discovered that his medical character is at stake,

and that some necessary links in the chain of testimony were wanting, to make out a clear case against those he was sworn to persecute, he adroitly extemporizes the necessary falsehoods wherewith to fill up the chasm in the evidence against them.

As a witness in the case of *Mary Dugan versus Beaumont & Adreon*, Dr. Knox was sworn to tell the whole truth, and nothing more or less than the truth. The grounds on which any physician forms his opinions of disease are his own observation and the statements of the patient; Yet, when on the witness's stand, Dr. K. did not refer to several important facts now brought forth by him, and as these facts were admissible testimony, yet then unacknowledged by him, we must conclude they are his after-thoughts, which he now attempts to palm off as truths. The Dr. has been so long dealing in such coinage, that I have no doubt he manufactures facts with great facility. He made no admission of ever having heard the previous history of her disease from the patient, and this history was called up in his examination. Mrs. Bardo, (the daughter of Mrs. Dugan,) on her examination, gave the following history of her mother's symptoms before the operation of 1840: "She had complained of her side for several years, and had cramp colics. A swelling would often arise there. At times it would be quite large, and could be put back. When plaintiff would work hard, or lift, it would bulge out, and *witness had often rubbed it to get it back, when it would go back with a gurgling noise.*" This testimony of Mrs. Bardo does not substantially or medically differ from the present statement of Dr. Knox, yet, when he was questioned in regard to it, on the trial, he did not corroborate it, or acknowledge that he had ever heard it before. He testifies "*Mrs. Bardo's statement* (which he had heard in court) *described hernia, but would not say it was hernia from that testimony alone, but would want to know it from personal examination, or from a person capable of deciding. No other disease I know of answers the description.*" Now I would ask any candid reader, if the present statement of Dr. Knox had ever been given him by the patient, as he avers, whether he would not have so stated in the court, and have come to definite conclusions on the case. With such a statement made to him, and with the opportunity of examining the patient, any intelligent physician would have asserted the disease was hernia, but the following quotations from his testimony before the court will show how wide of any such conclusion were Dr. Knox's views, and how contradictory of his present statement was his sworn testimony :

"From what witness saw, could not say the patient had hernia at that time," (April, 1840.)

"When witness first saw the patient, does not know she had hernia. No one could tell from an examination of the opening whether it was from a hernial sac or an inflamed cæcum," (Page 534, May No. St. Louis Med. & Surg. Journal.)

"No one could tell, from the appearance, whether intestine had been there in the form of hernia and been cut, or not." (Page 535 *ibid.*)

"Witness never saw an ulcer, that opened without being cut, that presented the appearance of this." (Page 534, *ibid.*)

"*Witness did not probe it.*" (Page 533, *ibid.*)

This testimony is convincing that Dr. Knox had not received any history of her disease from the patient, that would lead him to an opinion on her case. He could not say it was hernia, or even that the orifice was an incision, and he did not probe it; yet he now gives both the depth and direction of the opening. The Dr. has made two statements of the case of Mrs. Dugan, diametrically opposed to each other. Now which of these statements is to be believed? I am inclined to place more reliance upon his sworn testimony. The fear of consequences restrained him from stating, what, under other circumstances, he would have done. There are men who do not scruple to make any statement, no matter how foreign to truth, provided there is no attendant legal liability. The Dr., it appears, is one of this class.

Dr. Knox cannot plead that his testimony is mis-reported, as he corrected it before it went to press. Moreover, I compare his present statement, with two sets of notes of testimony of the trial, taken by Messrs. Polk and Whitelsey. The Dr.'s ignorance in the premises is shown by his admission on oath—"that he knew nothing worth mentioning of perforative ulceration of the cæcum." He was truly an admirable consultant on a disease of which he knew nothing.

Now, I will quote Dr. White's contradiction of Dr. Knox, given on oath, and it will be remembered Drs. White and Knox visited the patient at the same time:—"There was a lesion of the integuments 1½ inches long; whether resulting from *sloughing* or a cutting instrument, witness cannot say. The orifice was *sloughing* and irregular. *There were two openings, one over the crural arch, the other over the inguinal canal. There had been sloughing when witness first saw the case.*" Here is a positive contradiction of Dr. Knox's assertions. Dr. K. says there was but *one* opening in the groin—Dr. White says *two*. Dr. Knox says there had been no *sloughing*—Dr. White asserts the contrary. That Dr. White was more willing to tell the truth, on some points, than Dr. K., may be inferred from further statements made by him on the trial:—"Witness did not ascertain the depth of the incision—*did not probe it.*" "Witness does not know positively that there was hernia in April, 1840, but infers there was." In the face of his own and Dr. White's sworn testimony, Dr. Knox pretends to give the depth and direction of the incision, though he acknowledges that he did not probe it. How could he tell all this except by probing? I suppose by his usual method—guessing. Dr. Knox may explain, quibble, or equivocate, as he pleases; he cannot evade these contradictions of himself, by himself and Dr. White. If he tell the truth now, he violated his oath at the trial; for he did not then tell many important circumstances which he now asserts he knew, and neither Dr. White nor Dr. K. mentioned on the witness-stand, having heard the previous symptoms of her disease from the patient.

This concludes all that I have to say, at present, on the medical portion of this controversy. I shall now discuss the ethical points at issue with Dr. Knox, previous to which, let me state what I know of Mary Dugan's case.

In April, 1840, I was called to visit a poor woman—Mary Dugan—then living in the garret, or loft, of a one-story frame house, at the corner

of Florida and Main Streets, near the Mound. She was in the utmost destitution; every thing around her betokening the most squalid poverty and wretchedness. My services were solicited, and cheerfully given as a charity; my own purse supplied some of her necessary wants during her sickness, and her neighbors also assisted her. Her health, from her own account, had been very precarious for several years; and her appearance indicated the prolonged ravages of chronic disease. I attended her for several weeks, and, with her concurrence, then temporarily suspended my visits, as she was recovering. In a few days, Mrs. Dugan again sent for me; and, as before, I rendered her every attention. Her symptoms were of a somewhat uncommon character; but to ensure her every chance of recovery, to clear up whatever doubts existed in my own mind in relation to her disease, I solicited the counsel of Drs. Beaumont and Sykes, who were admitted to be the highest surgical authority in the city. Their services were rendered, through courtesy to me, and charity to the patient. Her evident poverty solicited their interest, and every attention was given her by them. At this period of her illness, on making my usual visit one morning, I learned my patient had been visited by Drs. White and Knox, who had endeavored to prejudice me with the patient, condemning my treatment; alarming my patient, and wished to induce her to discharge me, &c. Incensed at this unjust and unwarrantable interference, (for Mrs. Dugan never acknowledged having sent for these physicians,) I offered to leave the case, if my patient felt any want of confidence in me, or wished to place herself under the care of any other person or persons, and stated that I should certainly retire from the case if I was interfered with in future.

Mrs. Dugan begged me, in the most earnest manner, not to leave her, stating that she had unbounded confidence in my skill; was grateful for my attention, and with tears in her eyes solicited me to continue my visits, "and not to mind what those fellows said or did." I had just grounds for complaining of this interference, for it was countenanced by some persons around her, who might have felt authorized to interfere to my prejudice, because they were her friends, but not mine.

Previous to this time, I had (as I before stated,) induced Drs. Beaumont and Sykes to give her the benefit of their opinions. I had thus taken every precaution to guard against any error of judgment in relation to her disease; had done as much as was required of me in any case, and really more than in reason and charity could have been expected of me; and the reward reaped for these services was defamation, clamor, and excitement, propagated by those who had attempted to interfere in my case. In order to put down the slanderous reports against me, in addition to those already invited, I requested Drs. Carpenter, Brown, and Reyburn, to visit the patient, and from their own examinations, form an unbiassed opinion of her disease. All of these gentlemen coincided in the opinion that the disease was perforative ulceration of the intestines, with an abscess pointing externally. Dr. Sykes saw the patient in the earliest stage of the disease, before any external local disorganization appeared; at a period when, if hernia were present, it could with certainty have been distinguished. Thus,

with Dr. Sykes and myself alone, opposed to Drs. White and Knox, there is, *at least*, a balance of medical testimony in relation to her disease. But Dr. Beaumont also saw the case before Dr. Knox, and Drs. Carpenter and Brown saw it about the same time. All concur in opinion that there was not hernia. Reflecting, then, on the period of the case, when those who hold the opposite opinion examined the patient, and bearing in mind the concurrence of numbers against them, the testimony is conclusive that no hernia existed.

Drs. Beaumont, Carpenter, Brown, Sykes, and Reyburn, also received from the patient the representations I have made of the unprofessional and ungentlemanly course pursued by Drs. White and Knox in the case; and in quoting them as endorsers of the truth of the charges I have brought, I do it with their full and acknowledged authority.

The right of a physician to hold an opposing opinion, I do not call in question; but when such opinion is made the ground of public abuse, excitement, defamation, and persecution; when the results of opinion are thus carried beyond all professional and social duty, it becomes properly the subject of condemnation and rebuke. The case of Mrs. Dugan was a charity case; I had done for her all that my professional duty and humanity required, all that human judgment could suggest; all that the best professional aid could effect, was gratuitously obtained for her, and even if there were an error committed in the case, I had done every thing to avoid it, so that I was not morally or professionally delinquent, or deserving of the bitter censures heaped on me.

So bitter was the malignity of my persecutors, that they sought an indictment against me before the grand jury, in 1840, and again in 1844. Mrs. Dugan had not, at the former period, any part in the prosecution. She was then confined to her bed, daily attended by me—seemed to be grateful for my services, and my warmest advocate against my slanderers. I can only suspect, then, to whose malignity this attempt at indictment was owing. I attended Mrs. Dugan until July, 1840, when she voluntarily left the city, quite well, and has been since, (as shown in the testimony on the trial) in as perfect a state of health as circumstances would admit, or human agency could effect.

In the Spring of 1844, Mrs. Dugan returned to this city, when the agitation of her case was renewed, the long dormant slanders revived, and suit entered against Dr. Beaumont and myself—damages laid at \$10,000. The legal process was served on us in Autumn, 1844, when she was under the protection of those who had interfered with her when under my charge in 1840; and my professional persecutors sought to drum up witnesses against me, among physicians specially invited to see her. In this last object, however, there was a complete failure. The woman had been rehearsed in the tale she was to tell, but the directing power in the scene was recognized, and the well composed dialogue failed of its intended convictions. That the woman is a maligner, disgustingly exaggerating the real state of her disease, I assert, and can prove. Physicians who have seen her, bear me out in this charge; and the officer who served the summons at her dwelling, represented to me that she appeared to be in good health.

Certain it is, that though laboring under occasional attacks, as she was also before 1840, her health now is better than when I first called to visit her. After nearly two years' threatening and preparation for the event, the trial came on in April last, and occupied nearly a week. All that could be drummed up by my enemies, in the shape of truth or falsehood, was by them used; able counsel conducted the prosecution, and argued the case; every thing that could be said or done to procure conviction was employed;--the result was an honorable acquittal.

It would have been supposed that the mortification of a public trial would have satisfied and silenced my accusers; but no, the cup of their malice was not exhausted; its dregs yet fermented to acid; defeat but the more embittered my enemies, as I was not yet hunted to the death. The trial over, persecution has followed me in the publication of slanders, sustained by falsification, perjury, and scurrility, as clearly and unanswerably exposed in the late publication by Dr. Reyburn. Every art by which false impressions could be created, every issue or assertion by which prejudice could be generated, have been used; the smallest points have been amplified and wire-drawn; facts have been fraudulently perverted, and witnesses have been suborned against me. As the degraded witnesses had not sworn away my character on the trial, they re-appeared in pamphlet, with new testimony, (which, though relevant and admissible on the trial, they dared not then assert,) as if bent on swearing without mercy and without stint, so that the gratification of my pursuers' hatred and revenge was attained. These base attempts on others' characters have recoiled on the instigators, and they have reaped the disgrace due such infamous, cowardly, relentless, vindictive falsifiers. Thus, for more than six years, I have been subjected to a most relentless persecution, growing out of the unprofessional interference with my patient in 1840. Those then associated with me in the case have shared in my oppression, for rendering charitable aid to a degraded, perjured pauper, who has been the tool of others' malice, seduced by the glittering bait of \$10,000 damages.

This is the history of Dr. Beaumont's and my connexion with Mary Dugan's case, and it will enable my readers to understand the position of all parties in the issues involved.

I will now take up the other portions of Dr. Knox's pamphlet. Dr. K. speaks of "mysterious whisperings" against him without foundation, and were you to believe all he says, he is charity's sweet self, and never in his innocent life did anything to harm any mortal being. You could never suspect, from his words, that he combines within himself aught than the mild qualities of the lamb, with a considerable touch of the dove, and not a dash of the crocodile, or the least possible suggestion of the very mildest seasoning of the serpent. Oh! no, the Dr. is quite amiable always; a jury of twelve men, sworn to do it, could not try his temper; and all the milk of human kindness in his bosom has afforded others but the very richest cream.

Now every physician then resident in St. Louis, knows, that at the time of the alleged mal-practice in Mary Dugan's case, in 1840, the case was talked of as having been improperly treated, and, I

would ask, who endeavored to establish and circulate this impression? Certainly not the attending and consulting physicians, whose characters must suffer by such a course: they alone, it is presumed, would consider themselves entitled to judge of the treatment; none others were cognizant of any of the circumstances of the case, except Drs. White and Knox, and their names, as authors and retailers of the slander, have been repeatedly given up to me.

Dr. Knox next proceeds to detail the reasoning Mr. Light used, to induce Dr. Knox to accompany Dr. White to my case, and if his assertions of Mr. L.'s conduct be true, then is Mr. L. very unfit for his sacred calling, and this I will proceed to show, although, as Dr. Knox implies, we are of the same religious belief. It appears from Dr. Knox, that Mr. Light stated his impressions, that my leaving the case proceeded from an idea on my part that "I could not benefit the woman, and *because she was unable to pay for my visits.*" Will Mr. L. tell me upon what circumstance of my life he founded the impression of such sordidness on my part? The woman herself, in her affidavit to Dr. White, avers a contrary course of conduct, and upon what precept in that volume, which his ministry should make the text book of life, he found himself justified in violating that mandate, "judge not that you shall not be judged," or that threat, "in what measure thou shalt mete out to others, shall it be meted out to you." With all the uncharitable impressions of my motives, which Dr. Knox asserts Mr. L. raised in his own mind, and infused into the minds of others, he was most certainly a fit person to prepare Mrs. Dugan to appear before that Judge, whose great precept is universal charity. If Mr. L. only succeeded in infusing into her mind the impressions which Dr. K. asserts he gave him, I must say, that in my humble opinion, it is an instance of "the blind leading the blind," and his conduct at the bed-side of her he considered the dying, that of a fomenter of rash judgment, uncharitableness and vindictiveness.

According to Dr. Knox's further showing, both Mr. L. and Dr. K. attributed to the woman far more vindictive feelings than her conduct proved; or, to view it in a common-sense light, if they speak truly of the woman's expressions at the time, they must have been convinced she was a hypocrite. Dr. K. says Mr. Light told him "that the woman would not see him [myself] again, at any rate,—that she thought he [I] had inflicted an irreparable injury upon her, and she would not have me visit her again." Dr. K. further asserts that the woman said to him, "No, he [Dr. Adreon] shall never come into the house whilst I live. He has ruined me, and I will never have him if I have no physician, or words to that effect." By Dr. Knox's and Mr. Tabor's own showing, I resumed the case the next morning, and no further ill-feeling on the woman's part, up to the time she returned to the city, three years after, is even attempted to be proved by any party. Does not this go far to show, that with "the croaking of these birds of ill omen," the ill-feeling subsided. Dr. Beaumont, whom even Dr. Knox allows character for veracity, substantiates this in his letter published by Dr. Reyburn. The re-kindling of her wrath and spirit of revenge is fully accounted for by the holding out of a hope for \$10,000 damages, and as "to the victors belong the

spoils," a prospect of division may probably account for the share of others in the late trial.

Dr. Knox shows a want of justice on the part of Mr. Light, in his refusing to inform me of the state of affairs, the propriety of doing which Dr. K., it seems, suggested to Mr. L. These questions of Mr. Light's conduct must be settled between Dr. K. and Mr. L. I was not aware of these circumstances until the publication of the late paper, which also gave me the first information of Mr. Light's denial of the interview, as spoken of by Dr. Reyburn, in which Mr. L. apologized. Mr. William Smith, one of the witnesses, is dead long since, but Drs. Beaumont and Sykes will substantiate my assertion, that Dr. Reyburn's statement is perfectly correct.

Dr. Knox further states that he told Mr. Light he "did not wish to visit the case, because Dr. Adreon had for a good while been constantly slandering, and abusing me on all occasions. [Cry here.] I had reason to believe he would endeavor to misrepresent and injure me if I had anything to do with it, and therefore I wished him to procure some other person." This plaintive description of Dr. Knox's sufferings reminds me forcibly of the fat boy, in *Pickwick*, giving Miss Wardel the account of Mr. Tupman's kissing Miss Arabella: "And did she allow it?" says the fat boy, "she likes it." Why yes," says the fat boy, "she likes it." Why yes, the amiable and long-suffering Dr. "likes it." There seems a strange fatality in the fact, that the two physicians who have been so positive in their assertions of the mal-praxis, should, from their own showing, have actually been the victims of their yielding dispositions, and should, in spite of their better judgment, have been forced to take charge of my case, although they knew (judging, I presume, from what would be their own course in similar circumstances,) that I would misrepresent and injure them. By Dr. White's confessions, he has been suffering slow martyrdom from his brother physicians for the last 14 years, and Dr. Knox's sufferings from me, "for a good while," are pathetically described on page 4 of the *Extra*. I was really affected by the recital, (although the executioner,) and could only say, with Prince Lachrymosa in the pantomime, "give me another pocket-handkercher." All I have to say on this point is, that I fancied Dr. Knox had been slandering me a good while, but, as I do not speak of my sufferings, to priest or layman, the benefits of complaining have been lost to me, and I must continue to suffer in silence. (Cry here.)

Dr. Knox gives a long quotation from a part of Dr. Reyburn's late paper, and italicises, among other sentences, the following: "The mind of the patient was kept in continued alarm, by the croaking of these birds of ill omen," &c. He then states that every charge brought against him, in this and every other part of the paper, is false. If Dr. Knox will examine the opinion he gave the patient, he will find he was guilty of croaking, and is guilty of falsehood. I will repeat the consolation he gave the woman, that my readers may judge whether she was likely to be more tranquil under the mild inflictions of the Doctor's visit. It will be borne in mind, that she was considered in a dying state by Dr. K. at the time he gave his opinion. "I told her that persons *had* recovered (the *had* is italicised,

and was no doubt emphasized for proper effect,) *in a similar situation, but it was not at all likely the hole in her side could be healed; that the question of her living depended very much on what part of the bowel was connected with the opening, and whether the entire contents were passed by the opening or not.*" It will be remembered that Dr. K. says that Mrs. Dugan, and other persons in the room, when I made my visit, told me there was a *profuse* discharge of the contents of the bowels *immediately* on the introduction of the Doctor's lancet. However, there was no croaking here—the patient could not have been alarmed at this. Mr. Light, Dr. Knox says, told him "that he did not suppose the woman could be cured." He said that he presumed that Dr. Adreon did not expect her to live so long, or he might have visited her again." The woman, according to his own shewing, was in such a state that the least excitement or alarm might have proved fatal. But all this was not croaking. Indeed the charge of croaking is entirely false,—her comforters only seem to have attempted to frighten what little life, which according to their own shewing remained in the woman, out of her. But I should not complain of this, for they have actually made me out a monument of skill; the woman is living now, six years after, and Dr. Henry testified on the trial that "the hole in her side was, in 1844, lower down than that existing in 1840, so that the opening in the side did heal, notwithstanding Dr. Knox's admission of croaking against such a likelihood. Perhaps the Doctor's "medical education, picked up in those out-of-the-way places, Philadelphia and Boston," enabled him to foresee that another perforation would ensue. If he did, he certainly beat me at guessing.

Dr. Chase, in his letter published by Dr. Reyburn, says: "I made an examination of Mary Dugan in 1844, and did not find hernia, or artificial anus. I placed her in several positions, yet did not discover any protrusion of intestine or omentum." Similar testimony was given by other physicians, on the trial. Here then is evidence that this pitiable sufferer has, at one time, been free from any disease. Dr. Knox, being good at guessing, probably expected me, from having been once in attendance, to divine when the woman is to be again threatened with disease, and, by foreseeing, avert it. This, I confess, my medical education does not enable me to do. After all this croaking, Dr. Knox talks of his truth and sincerity, "having nothing to fear from friend or foe, and being willing that all should see his hand." Had he acknowledged, when I called on him at that time, the attempt to frighten my patient to death, or shake her confidence in me by false opinions, which he discloses in his late paper, I think the world would think me justifiable in letting him *feel* my hand.

Dr. Knox denies that he ever behaved towards me in an ungentlemanly and unprofessional manner, by reflecting on the treatment of this case. I would ask, if telling the woman that her life depended on what part of the bowel was connected with the opening, was not tantamount to telling her, that if a certain principle were true, I had killed her by making that opening? There is a class of people who have need of good memories, and Dr. Knox belongs to that class.

Would Dr. K. be such a simpleton as to assert, or rather would he expect to be believed, if he asserted, that any other physician, going to a patient of his, without his knowledge, and giving such an opinion of the state of the case as he admits he gave, would be acquitted by him of the charge of impropriety? It will be observed, that in his explanation to the patient, he did not, by a single remark, lead her to suppose that death would be the result of her disease, but plainly told her it would be the consequence of the opening I had made. In the profession, it is considered unprofessional and ungentlemanly to reflect upon the treatment of a physician who may have preceded you in the case, although that physician may have been discharged, from not having given satisfaction. In the charges of ungentlemanly conduct made against Dr. Knox, such as this especially referred to, he has published to the world his confession of such guilt.

Dr. Knox affects to ridicule pretensions to professional courtesy and gentlemanly conduct, in every circumstance of life, for which Dr. Reyburn is an advocate, at the same time that he does not question Dr. R.'s practice of these points. His whole publication shews that he is galled to the quick by the reflections cast upon him, for the vulgar, abusive tone of his note to Dr. White, and which he now attempts to say was meant to reflect upon me, and not on Dr. Reyburn. The truth of the business is, Dr. Reyburn is quiet and retired in his habits, and it was probably thought that he could be assailed with impunity; but, as he has proved the contrary, Dr. Knox is now forced to the step of turning on me, although I have been abusing him "a good while." I need not say a word for Dr. Reyburn. He has practised in St. Louis since his graduation, and his diploma dates a year or two after that of Dr. K. During that time, he has been before his professional brethren, and until the late "start of the hounds," who made a vain and futile attempt "to hunt him down," the community knew him but as a quiet, unobtrusive, high-minded, and honorable man, and the profession spoke of him in terms of the highest respect. Dr. Reyburn had before him, at the time he penned his remarks relative to Dr. Knox, the proofs of his ungentlemanly conduct. Why Dr. Reyburn did not detail the circumstances, I cannot say. Dr. R. seems to have intentionally given Dr. Knox a chance of escape before the public, by his paragraph commencing "If I have done injustice to Dr. Knox," &c.; but Dr. K., unable for a moment to conceive that any man would forbear to injure another when it was in his power, supposes Dr. R. only refrained because he could not prove the misconduct of Dr. K., and thereupon he turns a torrent of abuse on Dr. Reyburn, for the few hints as to being more careful of his honor in future, which he gives Dr. K., when he might so easily have proved, that the Dr. had not left himself any to take care of. Dr. K. seems perfectly charmed with a note from Dr. Simmons, in which he states, "he was not invited by Dr. K. to visit Mrs. Dugan," and further states, that Dr. S. had intended accepting Dr. White's invitation to the case. Although in his note Dr. S. expressly states, that Dr. R. may have honestly taken the impression he stated, yet Dr. K. implies a doubt of it. That Dr. Simmons' reservation in favor of Dr. Reyburn's veracity is just, may be gathered from the fact of Dr.

White's never giving an invitation to the case, without using the name of his "cats-paw," and that others than Dr. Reyburn, may have taken this impression from Dr. Simmons' statement, is proved by a note to Dr. R. (written since the publication of Dr. Knox,) from Dr. B. R. Mitchell, of this city, stating the same impression to have been taken by him, from Dr. Simmons' relation of the circumstances, as that stated by Dr. R. Moreover, Dr. R. can refer to another physician in proof of the correctness of this assertion. The facts of the matter, as lately detailed by Dr. Simmons to Dr. R. are these: Dr. S. was invited to see the case, and not knowing the nature of the interference, consented to visit the patient the following day. In the interval, having ascertained the true state of affairs, and knowing the impropriety of such conduct, he called the ensuing morning, to state to Dr. Knox, his reasons for declining to fulfil his engagement. Dr. Knox then and there stated to Dr. Simmons—what he since did not confirm when on oath—that there was no doubt the woman had hernia; that Dr. Adreon had maltreated the case; had cut an intestine; in fine, Dr. Knox told Dr. Simmons all that Mrs. Dugan asserted Drs. White and Knox said to her, concerning her recovery and treatment, which she told me, the very morning on which Dr. Knox told it to Dr. Simmons.

Dr. Knox admits, that Drs. Beaumont and Reyburn may have once believed the charge; made against him. What reason have they now to change their opinion? Dr. Simmons' account cannot clear Dr. Knox; Mary Dugan's present testimony only convicts herself of falsehood. She gave the same history of Drs. White and Knox's conduct which she gave to Dr. Reyburn, to Drs. Beaumont, Sykes, Carpenter, and Brown, not only as to the remarks condemning my treatment, but as to the endeavor to persuade her to retain Drs. White and Knox, and discharge me; Drs. White and Knox promising as an inducement, to obtain the attendance of many more physicians; and their invitations to Dr. Simmons, Henry, &c., goes far to prove their wish of convincing the woman of their ability to fulfil their promise. Mrs. Dugan gave this account at a time when her interests were likely to suffer by it, for Drs. White and Knox had been called in by those who were supplying a portion of her wants, and I had, according to Dr. Knox, been bitterly censured by these persons.

That Mrs. Dugan had not authorized any one to call in any physician but myself, was sustained by the conduct of Mr. Light, for when he apologized for himself, he did not attempt to place on Mrs. Dugan any share in the transaction, even to the charge of my neglect, nor did he say a word to vindicate Drs. White and Knox from the charges Mrs. Dugan had made against their conduct. So Dr. K. here adds one more to the catalogue of his falsifications, when he asserts that I knew from Mr. Light, that he was innocent of the charges. Mr. Light only took on himself the responsibility of having called in Drs. White and Knox; he did not attempt to excuse their conduct during the visit. Moreover, Mrs. Dugan invariably held firm to her representations of the conduct of Drs. White and Knox, while she then lived in the city, and we may suppose she did not swerve from this statement, until the glittering bait of \$10,000 was

held out to induce her to change. Had the trial come on within two or even three years after the occurrence, the testimony against Drs. White and Knox would have been overwhelming. Death, as I have shewn, removed one important witness, and the fluctuations of population, and other changes of time, have removed others. However, let Dr. K. persuade Mrs. Dugan to acknowledge that what she said of him to Drs. Beaumont, Sykes, Carpenter, Brown, Reyburn, &c., was false, and let him account for a portion of her statements agreeing, so exactly, with that which he gave Dr. Simmons, on the same morning she gave it to me, and he will advance some steps in proving his innocence. The fact of Drs. White and Knox never seeing the case after their interference, and not being able to tell on the trial a word about it, from the time they interfered until the time she left town, although Mr. Light and other friends of theirs were frequently with her, goes far to prove that Mr. Light, as well as his friends, thought it better "to keep dark," until the noise of the affair had blown over.

Dr. Knox, in 1840, did not excuse himself for intruding on my patient, on the grounds he now advances. When I then called on him, demanding whether he had knowingly interfered with my patient, telling him I had been so informed, and that his opinions had been given to my prejudice, he having said I had maltreated the patient, cut the bowel, and that she would die, &c., he denied knowing it was my case, or that he had made remarks against me, or had ever given an opinion. He said he had been called to the case by Mr. Light, (without naming Mr. Light's having the patient's authority to call him in,) that he had refused to go at Dr. White's request, as, from his knowledge of Dr. White, he suspected he would inveigle him into some difficulty,—he supposed misrepresentations would be made by him, and, to shield himself from censure, he (Dr. Knox) exacted the *written note* from Mr. Light, as the semblance of authority by which he acted. This was the substance of his representations to Dr. Martin and myself. I believed at the time that he used falsehood, to avoid the penalty he evidently apprehended for his conduct, but I was induced to give him the benefit of his turpitude, and his late confessions show how correctly I estimated his baseness.

Dr. Knox discovers the discrepancy of a day or so, in the time given by Dr. Reyburn, as that in which the operation was performed, and that given in Mr. Light's letter. Dr. Reyburn was absent from St. Louis before the operation, and did not return until some time after. I am not as good at guessing as Dr. Knox, so never imagined all that was to follow. When asked by Dr. R., at the time he visited the patient, I gave him dates as nearly as they occurred to me. Had I known his intention of making notes, I might have taxed my memory more closely. However, we have nothing to oppose to Dr. Reyburn's statement of time, but the date of Mr. Light's letter, and the evidence of Dr. Knox. The note was never spoken of nor shewn until the trial, so no one knows when it was written,—probably, first for the occasion. The meaning of other letters, has been falsified to suit circumstances, and why not the date of this note?

In generating the necessary material for his defence, Dr. Knox

hits upon the two following falsehoods, namely, that Dr. Reyburn proved Mary Dugan guilty of perjury by his own testimony, and that Dr. White "utterly disproved the allegations contained in Dr. Reyburn's pamphlet." These assertions are without the shadow of support, beyond the assertion of Dr. K., whose prejudice, stupidity, or turpitude, will account for whatever wild assertions he makes. Dr. Reyburn clearly shewed, by comparison of Mrs. Dugan's affidavit with the sworn testimony of her own daughter, of Dr. Knox, and of nearly every physician sworn for the prosecution, that she was grossly and foully perjured, on points which no error of the understanding would excuse. She swore that she could have brought "witnesses to prove that she had *hernia* seven years before the operation, and *which still exists to the present day.*" Mrs. Bardo testified that "there was no lump on her mother's side after the operation like what there was before." Drs. Johnson, Pope, McDowell, Henry, Stevens, and others, testified that there was no evidence of *hernia* in June, 1844. Mrs. Bardo's testimony also contradicted her mother's statement, "that her side had never closed, even partially, up to the hour she left for the upper country, the disease resulting from the operation, having never been even partially cured." Yet, in the face of a clear conviction, from sworn testimony, of her utterly degraded character, Dr. Knox, without attempting to refute Dr. Reyburn's reasoning, makes the foregoing assertion. But the Dr.'s sympathy for Mrs. Dugan is readily accounted for. They have a joint interest in maintaining the respectability of each other, for, unless it be shewn that Mrs. Dugan is a truthful witness, then Dr. Knox is without an advocate for himself. With Mrs. Dugan's character for veracity falls his own, and the Dr. is left without a solitary witness, to testify to his good conduct towards me.

Dr. Knox expends some time, wit, and legal knowledge, on the point of Dr. Reyburn having published my statement, as evidence of the truth of his (Dr. R.'s) assertions, forgetting, apparently, that Mrs. Dugan's affidavit, and the testimony of her daughter and son-in-law, and that of Mr. and Mrs. Cox, (all interested in the \$10,000 damages,) are all that it has been attempted to bring forward in witness of the truth of charges against me. Dr. Reyburn published my letter, with others from Drs. Beaumont, Brown, and Carpenter, to disprove what had been charged on him, namely, that he had published a false report of the circumstances of Mrs. Dugan's case in 1840. These letters shew that the statement given to Dr. Reyburn was identical with that received by these physicians from the patient, at other times than when Dr. R. visited her, and sustained in the strongest terms Dr. R.'s veracity. As the accusation was against Dr. R., these witnesses are certainly competent to testify for him. The question raised is one of character, and certainly, under the circumstances, I am as competent to testify in the premises as is the truthful Dr. Knox, both being interested to the same extent in the issue.

There is a strong effort made by Dr. Knox to implicate Drs. Henry and Trudeau in the charge of unprofessional interference. This, I suppose, is in illustration of the truth of the saying, that "misery loves company;" but, as I have never heard a remark coming from these

latter gentlemen, reflecting on the treatment or opinions of the attending physicians in the case, I cannot oblige Dr. Knox by including them in his disgrace. Dr. Henry, in his letter to Dr. White, shews that he was dragged into the case by falsehood, and Dr. Trudeau was sent for without knowing the circumstances of the case. Dr. Knox states that "these gentlemen come very near being claimed as friends by the original author of the accusations against them." Does he here mean Dr. White? for his letter to Dr. Trudeau, asking if he were one of the volunteer deputation, is the first charge any one ever heard against them; and, as to their being friends of mine, I have no reason, from their expressions, to believe them otherwise, and I really do not think they will feel themselves flattered by this effort on the part of Dr. Knox to associate them with him and his respectable witnesses. Dr. Beaumont's including Dr. Trudeau with Dr. Knox must have arisen from not knowing the circumstances under which he called. Had I ever heard the assertion from Dr. Beaumont, I would have corrected the impression.

Dr. Knox speaks of Dr. Reyburn as "a tool." When I state that neither Dr. Beaumont nor myself ever knew of his having made notes of the case, until his paper was about being read before the Medical Society, and that whatever he has written was without our knowledge, wish, or suggestion, it will be seen how much he was influenced in the matter by either of us. That Dr. White did make a most pitiable "cat's-paw" of Dr. Knox, is proved by Dr. Knox himself. He told Mr. Light "that he did not wish to go to visit the case,—that I had been abusing him a good while, and would abuse him a good while longer, if he went." Mr. Light said Dr. White would not go alone. Dr. Knox asked him to get some other person, but no, Dr. White wanted Dr. Knox, and White got Knox, and he used Knox, and he earned him some pretty hard knocks too. He never gave an invitation to see the case, without using Dr. Knox's name; he never spoke of the case, except as his and Dr. Knox's. The Dr. says he has seen Mrs. Dugan but once or twice since her return, but no matter for that. Dr. White used him to the extent of his wishes and intentions, all through his yielding disposition, I suppose. He states, in his late publication, that "Dr. White has shown himself competent to manage his own affairs;" that if it were otherwise, "*I have neither cause or disposition to interfere.*" This is but another instance of the rat leaving the sinking ship. This is cruel, Dr.; you might have continued to serve as a "cat's-paw" a little longer; it would not take from the dignity of the character you have earned; it could not injure you much, particularly as I have shewn that you have ventured latterly to contradict Dr. White's statements, and you owed him some amends for this temerity.

Dr. Knox attempts to excuse himself for his silence when Dr. Reyburn's paper on Mary Dugan's case was read in the Medical Society, by asserting he could not learn that the charges of unprofessional conduct, therein stated, were laid at his door. Dr. K. is very slow in comprehension, for he understood he was to be attacked, heard the charges read, with Mrs. Dugan's name quoted in the paper, and it was always avowed by Dr. Reyburn that Dr. Knox was

one alluded to. Every one who heard the paper, (except we will believe Dr. Knox, who was conveniently stupid on the occasion,) knew who was referred to;—no disguise of the fact was attempted, and I defy Dr. K. to bring a single member of the Society to endorse the truth of what he asserts, that he could not know he was alluded to. But Dr. Knox never understands the plainest allusions. He has repeatedly been publicly charged with wilful falsehood, yet would not take the allusion to himself, and neither resented nor disproved the insulting charge. Neither of these alternatives could he adopt, as the necessary co-attribute of lying is cowardice, and he was as incompetent to resent as to disprove. I have never been at all reserved in expressing my opinions of Dr. Knox's conduct in the case of Mrs. Dugan; have brought my charges, not secretly, or in "mysterious whispers," but openly, to Dr. Knox's friends, and perhaps to his enemies, to new comers and old settlers in the profession; and that Dr. Knox knew this, is confessed in page 3 and 5 of his "Extra." The subject of Dr. Reyburn's paper was discussed when it was read. Dr. H. Lane related the cases he quoted on the trial, as occurring in his practice. Drs. Brown, Sykes and others were present, and would then, as now, prove the falsehood of Dr. Knox's assertions.

Dr. Knox calls upon Dr. Beaumont either to prove, or withdraw, the charges he endorses against him, at the same time felicitating himself that no proof is admissible against him, unless given from personal observation; and as Dr. B. had no personal knowledge of the facts on which to form an opinion, the charges are therefore false. This being the notion entertained by Dr. K. of the law and logic applicable to the case, Dr. Beaumont failing to do what Dr. K. says he *must* do, Dr. K. is to proceed to perform a very grand, interesting, and sublime ceremony, over the veritable remains of Dr. William Beaumont. So also with myself; Dr. K. asserts that as I had no personal knowledge of the facts, and as the secret of his behaviour is held between his worthy medical companion, his prostituted witness, and himself; therefore, there is absence of all testimony against Dr. Knox. Now, Mrs. Dugan, at the time of the occurrence, gave me the knowledge on which my statements are founded; and she likewise made the same representations of Drs. White and Knox's conduct to Drs. Beaumont, Brown, Sykes, Carpenter, and Reyburn, so that, though I stand alone as accuser of Dr. Knox, my witnesses are, in number and respectability, above comparison with those on Dr. K's side of the question. Mrs. Dugan did not then acknowledge having authorized Mr. Light to call in other physicians, (but expressly, and in strong language, condemned the act.) She expressed her unbounded confidence in me, declared she did not want the others, that they had told her I had maltreated her, and they sought to prejudice and supercede me in the case; promising as an inducement to her to allow them to attend, that they would get others to visit with them. These facts will be testified to at any time, by the gentlemen I have named, to wit: Drs. Beaumont, Sykes, Carpenter, Brown, and Reyburn. One of the gentlemen (Dr. Brown) to whom I shewed my letter published by Dr. Reyburn, containing in substance what is here stated, said it

was strictly correct, and that the very expressions and circumstances, related as coming from Mrs. Dugan, he had a distinct recollection of hearing stated by her. Mrs. Dugan at this time had no interest in deception, and as she varied not in her tale until her interest was to be served by it, we cannot, even in the face of her perjured affidavit, disbelieve her first statement.

Dr. Knox asserts (page 11 Extra) "he is authorized to state, that it is not for want of effort to procure testimony, that I have failed in proving my accusations against him." This is a base and wilful falsehood, and I care not who may be the pretended authority for it, I pronounce it a vile slander. I have never sought testimony against him, or others, connected with this case, and equally certain is it, that I was never, as Dr. K. asserts, "sent back with a flea in my ear." If the Dr.'s authority for this be a gentleman, and feels himself aggrieved, he can have no difficulty in finding me, and I will pledge myself that he shall have any satisfaction which he may require. There never has been a time when I did not hold myself accountable for every assertion or statement I might make.

In concluding this discussion, I have but to say, that if I could add to the solemnity and force of the assertions, made by me in Dr. Reyburn's publications on Mrs. Dugan's case, I would do it to the fact, that the progressive history of the symptoms and circumstances of the case, as therein given, is true and reliable beyond the possibility of cavil; and that the statements there rendered as given by the patient, were uninfluenced by me or others, so far as my knowledge extends. There is evidence, yet unproduced, to convict me of false statements, if such I have made. Where is my letter, asserted to have been written, urging Mrs. Dugan to leave the city? Why are not the officers of the boat (or the boat's name) quoted, with whom it is said I contracted for her passage? These assertions have been sworn to, yet I defy the production of the slightest shadow of proof of them, beyond the perjured oaths of Mrs. Dugan and Mrs. Cox, and the rest of this prostituted band. The lapse of years has permitted many material proofs to be lost to me. When it was attempted to indict me for mal-praxis, so weak was all the testimony then produced for the prosecution, that not one witness in my defence was required before the grand jury. The prosecution fell, from its own weakness, for then falsehood and perjury were too dangerous a kind of weapon to be used; the case then would not bear perversion of its truth with impunity, and the *interest* of the prosecutrix was not appealed to.

I have thus successively taken up each feature, in the motley group of Dr. Knox's confessions; exposing the falsity of his assertions, determined that no specious pleading, however plausibly put forth, should avail him in the utterance of falsehood. Some of the points I have touched upon, are in themselves trivial, and unworthy of being gravely reasoned upon; but from the commencement of this controversy, strength is attempted to be gathered to the assailants by amplification of trifles, and giving them undue importance, as the excuse for the bitterness of the attack. The entire merits of this controversy can be narrowed down to a very small issue. In regard to the medical points in the case, I shall not engage in debate. These were settled by the testi-

mony on the trial. With the public, the medical question is reduced to this, namely: Whether Drs. Beaumont, Brown, Carpenter, Reyburn, Sykes, and Adams, are not as competent to distinguish hernia as are Drs. White and Knox. The remaining point at issue with Dr. Knox is, did he conduct himself in an ungentlemanly, vindictive, and unprofessional manner towards me in Mary Dugan's case? I assert he did, and herein I have stated the grounds on which I sustain the truth of my assertions. Drs. Beaumont, Sykes, Carpenter, Brown, and Reyburn will bear me out, in the truth of the charges I have made.

So far as I am concerned myself, Dr. Knox might quietly have continued the course he seems to have marked out for himself, that of indulgence in low abuse, and utter disregard of truth; but when Dr. Beaumont, for an act of charity to a pauper patient, and of courtesy to me, and of Dr. Reyburn for merely testifying what he knew of the case, on which we had not exchanged words for years, are put up (as Dr. Knox expresses it,) "as targets for base and poisoned darts," I deem it but an act of justice to them, to give the proofs of the character of their assailants. The style of Dr. Beaumont's letter to Dr. Reyburn, has even been attacked by Dr. Knox, but it seems to me, so far as I am capable of judging, that Dr. Beaumont's expressions were on the order of the plain and comprehensible. If Dr. Knox could not understand them, he was about the only one who could not. I need not say a word in defence of Dr. Beaumont against his slanderers. The evidence of a man's elevation, is the malice of his enemies; his very success lifts him up to be the mark for the impotent shafts of the abusive, the envious, and malicious. I need not claim for Dr. Beaumont this high position, it is a matter of record and public acknowledgment; yet his assailants, placed far below his level in professional and social estimation, would affect to reach him with their envenomed, yet futile attacks. I will not insult him, or gratify them by further comparison. Could they but gain his notice, it would serve in a degree as a certificate of respectability, and gratify that craving for notoriety, which corrupt minds are too apt to indulge in.

There is one important point yet left unsettled, exciting no doubt to the impatience of Dr. Knox. It appears from his "Extra" that the time for Dr. Reyburn to retract his error, and apologize, was after the gross and contemptible epistle given to Dr. White by Dr. Knox. That precious moment for Dr. Reyburn, having passed away without notice, we are forbidden to indulge the hope, that any future breath of Heaven may waft the apology towards Dr. K. and enable Dr. R. to obtain his forgiveness for the heinous crime of believing the truth. But this is not the worst of the affair. Dr. Knox in the very same "Extra," still allows Dr. Beaumont an opportunity of retracting *his* error, and offering *his* apology, or else he is, by Dr. Knox's edict, to stand in the very face of this community, (it would be downright madness to force any one to stand in any body's face, exclusive of all considerations of the instability of his foot-hold, in case he trod on a man's nose, let alone a community of noses,) "with the brand of a wilful, deliberate, and false calumniator, in letters of living light (legibly lithographed, likely,) upon his brow," "which, if he fail to do, *one* of the others he *shall* do." What a terrible threat, and in what tremendously grand, and overpower-

ering language it is conveyed. How lucky for Dr. Reyburn that his precious moment came before Dr. Beaumont's. The words of this terrible denunciation, thunder out like a volley of small artillery, whether it be, that Dr. Beaumont is stunned by the report or not, I cannot say, but certain it is, he is not coming to apologize, and so the grand and fearful ceremony must be performed by Dr. Knox. I have never seen anything of the kind, but it must be imposing, and I shall be among the crowd of witnesses on the occasion. Indeed, I may promise the Dr., that the entire profession will there rally round him, but will they allow the signet to be torn by Dr. Knox from his own brow. These "letters of living light," if to be taken from Dr. Knox, will leave his face unilluminated with the only truth that ever was stamp't upon it. As the Dr. says of himself, "who is Dr. Knox and *what is he* in his father's house?" that *he* should be selected for such an august, imposing, and uncommon operation? Dr. William Beaumont is to be branded by Dr. F. Knox—ye powers defend us!! The Bombasto-Furioso style of Dr. Knox's termination to his Extra is so calculated to alarm my unfortunate associates, that I am compelled in common consideration for the stuff of which men's nerves are made, to come to the rescue by terminating the controversy.

Seriously speaking, this vexatious subject having come before the public, with a novel issue created (as Dr. Beaumont foretold would be the case) each time it has been taken up by my assailants, I deem it proper to assume the onus of defence, give the proofs against those engaged in this holy war, and if possible silence my malignant traducers. I regret being obliged to resort to any expose of Dr. Knox. He is my avowed enemy, and it is almost a thing impossible to quiet the tongue of his hate. Let the controversy terminate as it may, he is the gainer; his feelings are relieved by his utterance of abuse, and his character cannot be much degraded. Falsehood may be, as it has often been, thrown back on him publicly or privately, but he will bear it meekly, and resignedly; he is used to it. This is not the first time I, or others, have been compelled to hurl his falsehoods in his teeth. But he takes such ordinary incidents patiently, never attempting anything in retaliation, or defence, but base, vindictive attempts against the characters of others, in a vain attempt to reduce them to his level. Nothing but his contemptible, cringing cowardice has shielded him from the chastisement he should have received from me on several occasions. With such a man what can you do? There is nothing left, nothing requisite to be done, but to treat his impotent efforts to injure with the silent contempt they merit. "Whatever he now says, will be taken with due allowance for his bitter, intollerant and abusive spirit. His temper forbids him fair judgment." Hereafter, his well known character will be my defence. I should, indeed, have rested thus protected even now, but as his publication has gone abroad where he is not known, it is but right it should bear the stamp of its author; and I have now done all I shall attempt to do, given proofs of my assailant's real merits.

ERRATA.

The reader will please make the following corrections :

On page 13, third line from the bottom, instead of—"That if a certain principle were true," read—"That if a principal portion were cut."

On page 21, third line from the top, instead of—"Sykes and Adams," read—"Sykes and Adreon."

On the same page, fifth line of second paragraph, omit "of," before "Dr. Reyburn."
