peculiar sexual function of the cerebellum, for the ligature affects *all* the brain equally. I do not however, by intimating this, pretend to deny that the cerebellum is the seat of sexual power, for this I think is not yet fully proved. Yours very obediently,

G. D. DERMOTT.

9, Gerrard Street, Soho.

ALLEGED PRODUCTION OF MENSTRUATION BY HANGING.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I beg to trespass once more on the pages of your Journal with some remarks on the effects of hanging. As Mr. Levison intends to remit to you some other illustrative cases, perhaps he will adduce cases more to the point under discussion than those in your last Number. His explanation as to sexual sensation residing in the cerebellum is good. That the cerebellum is the amative organ every novice in physiology knows, but that is not the question at issue. Mr. Levison's observations are correct as far as they go, but though hanging may produce sexual desire, that is no proof of menstruation occurring during the operation of hanging, which is the point to be decided. In the act of coition the catamenia do not generally flow, therefore what Mr. Levison has proved is to little purpose. I should be inclined to doubt very much whether hanging can so affect the cerebellum as to excite the amative organs, because it can act in no other way than by determining blood to that organ, and if that be the reigning rule we might expect the same effects to be produced from apoplexy, from inflammation or contusions of the occiput, or any other mishap in the neighbourhood of the cerebellum, which is not the case. Menstruation is not connected with the organs of amateness, and this accounts for the difficulty in explaining the phenomenon. If Mr. Levison can, therefore, solve the problem by adducing other cases as interesting as those already communicated, I shall feel highly gratified. I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

RICHARD HARDY, Surg.
Islington, Oct. 10, 1831.

ALLEGED CASE OF GLANDERS IN THE HUMAN SUBJECT.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I have just read in the last number of your valuable publication (page 29) a communication from Mr. Levison, entitled

"Case of Glanders in the Human Subject," but in what single particular the disease he has described resembles glanders, I cannot comprehend. Glanders in the horse is a disease but little understood; but it would be foreign to my present purpose to inquire into the various theories and opinions which are entertained upon the subject, suffice it to say, that in many particulars,—in its slow and insidious progress,—its fatal termination,—its post-mortem appearances, &c., it bears considerable analogy to phthisis pulmonalis in the human subject. Having offered this premise, allow me to glance at some of the circumstances related by your correspondent. In the first place I must express my doubt that any virus, or any substance capable of producing either glanders or a similar affection, existed upon the lancet with which he "let out the water." Where does this virus reside, or what is the medium containing the infectious principle? The purulent discharge from the nostrils? Now I know not how "Bill Norbrooke, jun.," could get any of this matter upon his lancet except by accident or direct intent, for the common operation for which worthies of his class use that instrument, of course is bleeding, and therefore assuming that he had been using this lancet to bleed one of his horses *supposed* to have had the glanders, I contend that any matter left on the point of the lancet after such an operation would have no influence in producing glanders, for although this disease may be produced by transfusion, it cannot be produced by inoculation with the blood of an affected horse.

But I will waive this question, and allow that virus did exist upon the point of the lancet, still the symptoms which supervened cannot be looked upon as having any connexion whatever with the introduction of that virus into the system; they do not bear the slightest resemblance to the effects known to follow the absorption of the infectious principle of a glandered horse. It is no argument to prove that cholera is produced by a prick in the finger because a man happens to inflict a slight wound with his penknife previous to an attack of that disease; neither is it any argument to prove that a disease of the brain is produced by puncturing a blister with a dirty lancet, because "Bill Norbrooke, jun.," happened to do so previous to an attack of such a malady. By giving these rough observations a corner in your journal, you will oblige your most obedient servant,

W. SIMPSON, Vet. Student.
London, Sept. 26, 1831.