13. Is he subject to any affection of the larynx, trachea, bronchi, or lungs? If so, state the nature of such affection.	Not to my knowledge.
14. Do the digestive organs properly perform their functions, especially the liver	I believe so.
15. Is he subject to gout, rheumatism, stricture of the urethra, hæmorrhoids, stricture of the rectum, or fistula in ano?	He has had a slight attack of rheumatism, but is not subject to it.
16. Has he hernia? If so, of what kind?	No.
17. Are the functions of the kidneys and bladder quite natural?	I believe so.
18. Has he any organic disease, or is he the subject of a constitutional taint of any description?	I am not aware of any.
19. Is he corpulent or emaciated? Has any change in these respects, or in his complexion and appearance, taken place within the last year or two?	Neither. His appearance and condition have, I think, improved of late.
20. Are his father and mother living? If not, at what ages did they die, and of what complaint?	His father is, but not his mother. She died about twenty years since, of uterine hæmorrhage, as it is reported.
21. Has he lost a parent, brother, or sister by consumption, or from any other disease deemed hereditary?	Not to my knowledge.
22. Do you consider his life eligible as one of the <i>best</i> description?	No.
23. Do you consider his life eligible as one of an average description?	I think not.
24. Do you consider his life to be <i>more</i> than usually hazardous?	I think so.
25. Is it a life that you would <i>reject altogether</i> ?	Not with certain arrangements.
26. You would oblige by adding any further remarks which you may deem necessary	

Signature (at full length) _____

Address _____

Qualification _____

Date _____

The _____ is an office which refuses medical fees, and which has resisted their payment in a court of law. It is not likely they would obtain a medical report after a personal visit similar to the above. The result was, that the directors of the _____, after a brief examination, accepted the life at the healthy rates of assurance; the directors of the New Equitable, after a careful appreciation of all the circumstances, declined to insure the life, except at a fair increase of annual payment beyond that required upon healthy lives.

Correspondence.

"Audi alteram partem."

PREGNANCY AND ABDOMINAL DISEASE.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In sending my paper upon the above subject to your widely-circulated journal, I did so simply with the view of adding my testimony to that of others, almost daily appearing, as to the difficulties attending such cases, and the necessity for extreme caution. The theme being a delicate one, I endeavoured to couch it in such language as would become a physician. But it seems, from a letter in your journal from Mr. Partridge, that I am taxed with making "an attack," and of being "*incorrect and illiberal*." As to the charge of "an attack," &c., it is quite unworthy of notice; but in regard to correctness, I must positively reiterate that both the patient and her friends assured, and the latter do still assure me, of the opinion formerly passed; and that Mr. Partridge did further confirm their report, by explaining to me that the opinion was advanced "to save professional reputation."

The former history of the case, as in all other cases, was given upon the joint statements of the patient herself, her friends, and the surgeon. How any impression should exist that I required Mr. Partridge's "*sanction*," or the sanction of any person except the nearest friend of the deceased, to speak of my own case, I am at a loss to imagine. In the face of the report, I take all the responsibility upon myself, and place none upon him. In fact,

when the mother of the patient called at my house to desire my attendance, I had never before seen her or any of her friends; besides which, another practitioner had been attending for an interval of three or four weeks after the former physician had ceased to be called in. She placed the case entirely at my disposal on that occasion; but as I have ever followed the rule of recommending the employment of the ordinary attendant in fit cases, Mr. Partridge, at my suggestion, was recalled, and gave his account of the case as I have related.

As to medicines in connexion with the profuse menstrual discharge which had occurred, I handled that part of the subject only casually in my paper. I scarcely inserted it as a statement, but only as an obscure parenthetical hint. As it is said to be "*incorrect*," however, I am drawn out to speak more distinctly. It happened, on one occasion, that both the patient and her mother asked me if the swelling could ever come away suddenly and entirely, and on answering in the negative, they said that a contrary opinion had been expressed, and that medicines had been exhibited to act in that way, and that they should watch for it, as it might come away in the night-time. On the prescription being shown to me, I did certainly observe that an emmenagogue of the most powerful kind had been ordered to be employed at short intervals,—namely, the ætherial tincture of ergot.

Another allegation of "*incorrectness*" remains to be answered in regard to the statement that Mr. Partridge was present at the microscopical inspection. In truth, when Dr. John Wright told me that Mr. Partridge had brought the specimens to the hospital, and that they had been duly examined, I naturally inferred, from his interest in the subject, that he had remained to see the appearances. As this is not the fact, I now owe him and tender him an apology for the hasty, and, perhaps, "*illiberal*" conclusion. I certainly felt, and was advised of others, that, from the peculiar circumstances of the case, either my diagnosis would be called in question unless demonstrated, or some such equivocal argument as the present would be raised; hence I called Mr. Cox to operate; hence, under opposition, I insisted upon the autopsy; hence I had as many persons present as possible; and hence I published the case.

I now leave the profession to judge who has made an "*attack*," and who is "*incorrect and illiberal*." It is a lamentable thing for the profession, when the petty, private feelings of individuals are permitted to rise up, and divert the mind from those great and important views of a subject which ought alone to guide us in recording and studying cases. To the medical eye alone was the paper submitted, with no more particulars than such as were required for verification; and I repudiate the notion that any other feeling, except a sense of the vast importance of the *quæstio vexata* to myself and the profession, animated me in publishing it. Surely Mr. Partridge does not suppose that his letter is to have the effect of stifling important professional reports; because in some case or other an individual may have committed an error, the mention of which he takes as an offence, even while his name is withheld. Much more readily might Dr. Locock be offended at Mr. Lynch's report in the same number of your journal, not to mention scores of instances besides.

Mr. Partridge should be more cautious in assigning motives to any professional man, especially when he can see, as in my case, that successful and unsuccessful hospital cases are indiscriminately placed before the world. If I have bordered, in any degree, upon being discourteous to him in this letter, let him look back upon the terms of his own, and calmly consider their import. I do hope and believe, however, that some one else, besides himself, has not merely "*sanctioned*," but incited him to such a strange course, as I have formed a very different opinion of Mr. Partridge from what his letter may convey to others.

With these observations I now leave my paper to be judged by the general body of your professional readers, and shall take no further notice of any personal or irrelevant remarks.

I remain, Sir, yours very obediently,

D. NELSON, M.D.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Having observed in your last number a statement in the letter of Mr. Partridge, saying that he was not present at the microscopical examination of the specimen in Dr. Nelson's ovarian case, (reported in a former number,) I beg most positively to affirm that he was present at that inspection; and further to show the interest he felt in the case, he brought the parts himself to the hospital. I know nothing as to the merits of the case either one way or the other; but how Mr. Partridge could put forth such an assertion I am at a loss to imagine.

I remain, Sir, yours respectfully,

JOHN WRIGHT, M.D.,

Queen's Hospital, Birmingham, Dec. 1851. Resident Medical Officer