true and heartfelt sorrow to be obliged to adopt in regard to you.

I have the honour to be,

Yours, &c.,

J. Y. SIMPSON.

22, Albany Street, Edinburgh,

Jan. 22, 1845.

Since writing the above letter to Dr. Radford, I had occasion to look, for another purpose, into an old and valuable author, whose work I had not previously sufficiently searched. In it I found one case detailed, in which the author decidedly detached and removed the placenta immediately before extracting the child, and probably he may mention others. In the case I allude to, the patient seems to have afterwards suffered from purulent effusion into one eye, the puerperal disease some years ago described by Dr. Hall and others. I take very great blame to myself for not having been previously conversant with this author's valuable case or cases.

IV.—LETTER FROM DR. RADFORD TO DR. SIMPSON.

My dear Sir,

Your letter came to hand this day, but I presume you had not received my paper when it was posted. You will, by this time, be acquainted with my views of detaching the placenta in several cases of placenta prævia. You will find in the paper sent that I have mentioned your case, &c., which I should have done in my lecture, had I not thought by so doing I should have violated the rules of propriety, not having your sanction. You will recollect that you sent a letter dated October 4th, which I answered October 7th, requesting the privilege of citing it; but from that time I did not hear from you, directly or indirectly, until I received a letter from you, dated January 27th, 1844,—this date should be December,—after you had received and perused my paper. Now, Sir, can you, or any of your friends, under such circumstances, complain that I had not noticed your case, or alluded to you in any way in my lecture? I may just mention, that Mr. Kinder Wood's was a practice of *election*, and done for the express purpose of arresting the bleeding, in cases of placenta prævia, attended by exhaustion.

Yours, &c.,

THOMAS RADFORD.

Manchester, Jan. 26, 1845.

V.—LETTER FROM DR. SIMPSON TO DR. RADFORD.

My dear Sir,

I presume you will agree with me, that there is nothing in your note of the 26th, which I require to answer.

Your *second* paper places the matter in a still less happy light than the first.

The gravamen of my complaint is not that an individual case or cases of mine are *not* mentioned by you; it is that the results of all my cases and investigations are mentioned by you, and that without any due acknowledgement.

You complain that I did not (as would appear from your last note) give you the special liberty, which you had wished, to state one special case. I complain, that you have stated the deductions and generalizations from the whole inquiry (as far as you understood them) without asking any liberty of me,—without having my sanction,—or without offering any adequate reason or apology for so doing.

If you can furnish me with any proper clue to Mr. Kinder Wood's particular views or cases, I shall be delighted to do honour to his memory.

Yours respectfully,

J. Y. SIMPSON.

Edinburgh, Jan. 30, 1845.

CASE OF DISEASE OF THE BLADDER AND KIDNEYS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE PROVINCIAL MEDICAL AND SURGICAL JOURNAL.

SIR,

Having just met with a parallel case to the one reported by Mr. Dunsford, in the last number of the *Provincial Journal*, I forward to you a brief description of it, in order that you may give it insertion if you consider it sufficiently interesting.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

Newport, Isle of Wight,

JOHN C. BLOXAM.

January 25, 1845.

The patient, H. Richards, aged 69, had been attended by me with the impression that he laboured under disease of the kidneys, though it was the general aspect of the patient rather than the symptoms which he detailed that led to such opinion. There was neither vomiting nor any obstinate deranged motion of the bowels; the urine was of natural specific gravity, and not rendered turbid either by heat or by nitric acid; he complained of pain above the pubes, which was increased immediately prior to passing water; there was never any appearance of blood in the water.

The *post-mortem* examination took place sixty hours after death. The kidneys were somewhat enlarged, and in such a direction as to make them longer in shape than natural, they were of one universal pale colour, internally as well as on the outer surface; the tubular portions of the organs could be distinguished, but rather by their peculiar radiated structure than by any variation of colour; the pelvis and ureters were much distended with urine. The bladder contained a small quantity of urine, but appeared as if it could readily have retained more. Around the urethral aperture of the bladder, there was a group of encephaloid tubercles, the largest of which was not bigger than a marble. In consistence the tubercles were decidedly softer than the healthy brain; they possessed scarcely sufficient firmness to retain their shape and structure during their excision; the power they had to preserve their shape and bulk, seemed to depend upon a sort of fibrous net-work, pervading their substance; their colour internally was white.

It would appear that this disease had contracted the neighbouring openings of the ureters, and thus given rise to the distention of the canals, for the patient had not experienced any difficulty in voiding the urine, and the bladder, moreover, was not distended. The altered appearance of the kidneys was probably an effect produced by the impeded flow of their secreted fluid.