is its own cause. Is this not a transposition of cause and effect? If debility were really the cause, since there are such innumerable sources of debility, which so frequently and constantly spring up in the human constitution, should we not as constantly meet with this disease? Whereas it is confessedly a rare disease. Dr. Alexander having laid debility as the foundation, the superstructure raised thereon, namely, *his opinion*, is ornamented with three divisions or compartments, 1st, he says, "I believe the complaint to be essentially a constitutional and not a local one." That the constitution in the progress of disease becomes affected, cannot be denied; but were it only constitutional, why is it one organ alone becomes involved, which circumstance is necessary to constitute the disease, and without which it could not be recognised? Were it like gout or any other constitutional disorder, it would be manifested, not in one organ alone. That other tissues become affected afterwards, is another matter, and does not relate to the present argument. 2d. The Doctor proceeds, "I look upon the mellitic urine as a mere effect of the general disorder." That this peculiar state of the urine is the consequence or effect of diseased secretion, must be admitted, but not, I imagine, the effect of the cause alleged; for if debility were the cause, or to use his own words, "a depraved condition of the whole body," what manufactories of sugar should we not find in the innumerable squalid, depraved habits, constantly stalking in our streets! Surely in this case we need not be indebted to our colonies for our supply of saccharine matter, since every retreat in the various avenues of the "great city" would yield its hogsheads! 3d. Dr. Alexander lastly says, "I deem all local remedies, such as cupping, blistering, &c. in the same light that I should regard opium being applied to relieve cramp in the legs of a person suffering under cholera; or, in other words, as treating effects, and not the causes, which produce them." Now if the kidneys in this complaint be the peculiar seat of the disease, surely remedies to relieve these particular organs, are not to be viewed in so insignificant a light; not as opium in cholera, however important its use, merely to relieve spasms, which are amongst the urgent symptoms, but to remove the congested state of a highly excited organ, without which, I think, general remedies would be less likely to take effect. Every one, Sir, in occupying the pages of your useful journal, or the attention of your professional readers, should ask himself, what benefit do you propose by your observations; or *cui bono*? My object in addressing you, is to show how unsatisfactory Dr. Alexander's theory is, at least to

my mind, but more particularly the treatment it would lead the young and inexperienced practitioner to follow. I do not pretend, nor is it necessary at this time, to enter into a particular history or treatment of this disease, but merely as an outline of practice, beg to offer my opinion, that the organs affected call for first and prompt relief by local and general evacuates, and then the constitutional remedies already alluded to, will be judiciously, and, most probably, successfully administered.

Yeovil, April 24th, 1828.

THE LOST PELVIS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In answer to a letter, signed J. L. Fenner, published in No. 243 of THE LANCET, I have only to remark that, as I cannot doubt Mr. Fenner's statement, of his having been told that "repeated applications were made in vain" to me, for the pelvis which was unfortunately destroyed while in my possession, he has been very much *misinformed*. I never saw Dr. Davis but *once*, from the time I examined the body, to the time he was told that the preparation was destroyed, and that occurred a day or two after I took the pelvis home. So far as I can remember, I met him then at his own house, at one of his morning lectures, when he was told that the pelvis was macerating. If I am wrong, with respect to the place, Dr. Davis is quite at liberty to set me right; but, as for any applications having been made to me for the preparation, Dr. Davis must know very well, that there were none made. Mr. Fenner has been equally misinformed, that "some months had elapsed, when this wonderful story was given in explanation." I informed Dr. Davis of the circumstance the first time I met him, and that, to the best of my recollection, occurred within the period mentioned in my former letter. If there was any neglect, on my part, in not acquainting him sooner with the circumstance, I can only attribute it to my time being too much occupied about other business. Mr. Fenner may rest assured, that had I known the character I had to deal with, I should have acted very differently; for I would never have had anything to do with either Dr. Davis or his pelvis. With regard to Mr. Fenner's other remarks, I beg to refer him to my former letter, wherein is stated everything I know about the pelvis in question. If he disbelieves my own statement, I then refer him to a disinterested witness; and should he doubt his veracity, too, he must remain an unbeliever, for I have no stronger proof to adduce.

Yours, &c.

Hertford May 4.

JOHN DAVIES.