that it will be unavoidable, on account of the limited time at our disposal, that a large number be read in abstract.

OPENING ADDRESS IN THE SECTION ON OBSTETRICS.

BY ALFRED H. M'CLINTOCK, M. D., LL. D.,
President of the Section.

In opening the obstetric section of this Seventh International Medical Congress, the first and most gratifying duty that devolves upon your President is to offer an earnest and hearty welcome to those obstetric members who have come from other nationalities, and from distant British colonies, to take part in this, the largest convention of medical men that has ever, perhaps, assembled together at any one time or place.

I present this cordial salutation, not only on the part of the officers and council of the particular section over which I have the honor to preside, but also on the part of the obstetricians and gynecologists of England, Scotland, and Ireland.

We are proud and happy to meet here on British ground so many of our brethren from various parts of the civilized world, but especially from Germany, France, and America, and to accord them a friendly greeting, not only out of respect to their individual merits and high reputation, but as representing those great obstetric schools over which the names of Mauriceau, Levret, Baudelocque, and Dubois; of Roederer, Siebold, Naegele, Kiwisch, and Scanzoni; and of Bard, Dewees, Meigs, and Hodge, have severally shed such imperishable lustre!

Not the least of the important objects contemplated in this Congress is the interchange of friendly feelings among its members. I am fully persuaded that our reunions will be attended, not alone with benefit to us all by the attrition of mind with mind,—but that new friendships will be formed, and old friendships confirmed, and that sentiments of mutual respect and regard will be developed, so as to strengthen the bond of brotherhood which should unite us as fellow-workers in the same department of medicine.

Allow me, before going further, to express my deep sense of the unexpected, unmerited dignity which the Congress has conferred by putting me into the position of President of this important Section; I feel it to be the highest and most flattering honor of my long professional life. Such a compliment more than repays one for forty years of labor and devotion; for it sets the seal of approval by contemporaries on my past life, and leaves nothing further or higher to aspire to in the way of professional distinction. At the same time, gentlemen, this feeling of just pride and exaltation is mingled with a very poignant sense of incapacity, and I might well shrink from the responsibility of the post, but that in the discharge of its duties, I shall have the aid and cooperation of such accomplished men as those who constitute the Vice-Presidents and Council of the section; they in truth are the giants on whose shoulders I am raised to the exalted position it is my good fortune to occupy in this Congress.

Inasmuch as this is the first occasion of the International Medical Congress meeting in London, it may not be inappropriate if I pass in review some of the more prominent among the many eminent obstetricians who lived and practiced in this city, who by their writings, teaching, and discoveries have contributed in no

small measure to the development of midwifery and gynecology, as well as to the medico-chirurgical fame of London.

I must, however, study brevity, being desirous, if possible, to keep within the fifteen minutes allowed for the readings of communications, so as to set an example of obedience to the rules of the Congress.

In this retrospective glance, I find only one name standing out in the sixteenth century, Thomas Raynald, the translator of Eucarius Rhodion's celebrated treatise, *De Partu Hominis*. The original English edition, by Raynald, appeared about 1540, and was the first distinct treatise on Midwifery in the English language, and for over a hundred years was the sole guide and text-book of obstetric practitioners, male and female.

In the early part of the seventeenth century, the immortal William Harvey (*tanto nomini nullum par eulogium*) stands forth conspicuous, the splendor of his fame increasing as years roll on. He spent most of his time here, being physician to the King; and he delivered courses of lectures, at the Royal College of Physicians, on anatomy and surgery. As a practitioner we know from the testimony of his contemporaries that Harvey excelled in midwifery, and in the treatment of female diseases.

Before the publication of his celebrated exertations on generation, parturition, conception, etc., there were, according to Dr. Aveling, "but three works on midwifery in our language; these were translations from Rhodion, Rueff, and Guillemeau. His was the first book on midwifery written by an Englishman, printed in our own language, and the influence which it had upon the practice of the time would with difficulty now be estimated. His claim therefore to eminence in our department of medicine is beyond question." With this conviction on our minds, we shall the more heartily yield our applause when his magnificent memorial statue is unveiled at Folkestone, the place of his nativity, on Saturday next,—a ceremony, I may remark, which has with good taste and judgment been purposely so arranged that this great Medical Congress may take a part in showing honor and respect to the memory of one of the greatest discoverers in the science of medicine, and, consequently, one of the greatest benefactors to the human race.

Contemporary with Harvey was another remarkable man, Peter Chamberlen, the inventor of the midwifery forceps, indisputably the most valuable instrument of the whole *armamentarium chirurgicum*. Unfortunately for him, however, the brilliancy of his reputation is obscured by the unworthy selfish conduct which caused him to keep the instrument a secret for the aggrandizement of himself and family. He was father of Dr. Hugh Chamberlen, the translator into English of Mauriceau's works. There is a handsome monument to the memory of this Dr. Hugh Chamberlen in Westminster Abbey, erected by his patron and friend, the Duke of Buckingham. No less than five generations of the Chamberlen family were eminent in the medical profession here; and Dr. Peter, who attained a great age, had been physician to five English sovereigns.

Towards the close of this (seventeenth) century, Richard Wiseman, "Serjeant Chirurgeon" to Charles I., published his treatise on surgery, in which he gives an excellent description of pelvic abscesses, consequent on parturition. He thus anticipated Puzos' essay on the same disease, and put forward much more rational and correct views as to its pathology.

The eighteenth century was destined to see a marvelous development of midwifery, as well as of many other arts and sciences. As might therefore be expected, London can boast of several eminent obstetricians at this period.

In chronological order, the first to be mentioned is Dr. John Arbuthnot, F. R. S. and F. R. C. P., physician to Queen Anne. Although he has left no enduring evidence of obstetric superiority, yet he was an eminent accoucheur in his day, and reflected infinite credit on our order by his rare literary talents, his deep scholarship, and his exalted social position. He was skilled in everything that related to science, and held a prominent place among the ablest writers and wits of that Augustan age; one of whom (Swift or Pope) alludes in his poetry to

"Arbuthnot's soft obstetric hand."

A man who was considered a friend and an equal by Parnell, Gay, Bolingbroke, Swift, and Pope could not fail to adorn any pursuit to which he devoted his vast intellectual powers. Speaking of him, Swift said, "He has more wit than we all, and his humanity is equal to his wit." A higher tribute could not have been paid him.

The next to be mentioned is Dr. John Maubray, not on account of any peculiar merit in either of his works, — *The Female Physician*, and *Midwifery brought to Perfection*, — but because he is reputed to have been the first public teacher of midwifery in this country. He lectured, Dr. Denman tells us, at his house in Bond Street, so far back as the year 1724.

Nearly cotemporary with Maubray was Dr. Edmund Chapman. He was the second public teacher of midwifery in this city, and is entitled to our lasting gratitude for having been the first to publish to the world a description of that "noble instrument" (to use his own phrase), the obstetric forceps, the secret of which the Chamberlens kept to themselves for over fifty years. This he did in the *Edinburgh Medical Essays*, and subsequently in his treatise *On the Improvement of Midwifery chiefly with Regard to the Operation*: the operation meaning the application of the forceps. The first edition of this book came out in 1733.

About this same period also lived Sir Richard Manningham, F. R. S., a man of considerable learning and of great reputation as a successful midwifery practitioner. He was author of some obstetric works of temporary consequence, and his claim to remembrance arises from the circumstance that in the year 1739 he opened a ward in the Parochial Infirmary of St. James', Westminster, exclusively for the reception of parturient women, which was the first thing of the kind in Great Britain. Shortly afterwards the idea was taken up and enlarged upon elsewhere, and the great Lying-in Hospital of Dublin was founded by Dr. Bartholomew Morse, being the first hospital of the kind in the British Dominions.

The very same year that Sir Richard Manningham opened his obstetric ward in St. James's Infirmary, as we have just seen, a surgeon from a small country town in Scotland established himself here in London as an accoucheur, who ultimately effected the greatest reformation that had yet taken place in the principles and practice of obstetrics. This man was William Smellie, a name always to be respected wherever midwifery is cultivated as a science. For twenty years

Smellie practiced and taught here, and published the first volume of his celebrated treatise in 1751, and his splendid anatomical plates in 1754. Amongst his pupils who later on became eminent in the same branch of medicine were William Hunter, Denman, David McBride (of Dublin), John George Roederer (subsequently Professor of Midwifery at Göttingen), Dr. James Lloyd, of Boston, U. S., and Dr. William Shippen, afterwards Professor of Midwifery in the Pennsylvania University: these last being, according to Professor Parvin, "the two first American obstetric practitioners." Most gladly would I linger over the life and works of this great man, but I must content myself with a few sentences.

Smellie possessed a wonderful capacity for work, and a clear judgment; but beyond and above this he was endowed with a singularly accurate perception of facts, which made him a correct as well as a close observer of nature. Herein lay the secret of his unrivalled success as a reformer and improver of midwifery. He himself felt this to be so, for in reviewing his practice, he says, "I diligently attended to the course and operations of nature which occurred in my practice, regulating and improving myself by that infallible standard." (Case 186, Sydenham Society Edition.) Truly, he was, in the words of Dr. Hugh Miller, a "noble character and an example of earnest living."

A couple of years after Smellie settled in London, there came to live with him a young man from the Scottish county — Lanarkshire — of which Smellie himself was a native. This young man was no less a person than William Hunter — a name familiar to you all — whose plates and descriptions of the human gravid uterus have gained their author a foremost rank among obstetric writers. By his great reputation as a lecturer and as an anatomist, aided no doubt by his prepossessing appearance, polished manners, and cultivated mind, Hunter proved a successful competitor of Smellie's in practice. Like him, he also gave special courses of lectures on midwifery, MS. notes of which are to be found in many libraries. Dr. Matthews Duncan tells us the College of Physicians possesses two pretty complete volumes of such notes.

In 1748, Hunter was appointed surgeon and man-midwife to Middlesex Hospital, and soon afterwards to the British Lying-in Hospital; for though the Physicians claim him as belonging to themselves, yet it cannot be disputed that Hunter was a surgeon, and a member of the Corporation of Surgeons of this city.

Besides being a rival, he was in some respects a contrast to Smellie. The school of obstetrics founded by the latter was not inaptly described by the late Tyler Smith as the mechanical school, from the importance it attached to the resources of art in aiding parturition. Hunter, on the other hand, placed extraordinary reliance on the powers of nature, and trusted too much to tincture of time. Hence his followers have been designated the physiological school; and through the influence of his commanding authority, they formed a large section of the profession, and could boast some great names.

Although we may regard Hunter as one of ourselves, and appropriate much of the glory with which his name is invested, "yet it is necessary (as Dr. Duncan observes) with a view to justice to point out that his obstetrical fame is chiefly anatomical, and that his greatest claim on our admiration and gratitude arises

from his anatomical work and influence." (Harveian Address, 1876.)

It is a just boast of the English school of midwifery that what, in the truest and strictest sense, is "the most conservative of all the resources of our art," was first formally admitted a place among obstetric operations, in this city and about the year 1756. The recognition by the profession of the artificial induction of premature labor was the outcome of a medical conference held at the time and place just mentioned. Who was the first or most strenuous advocate of the operation at that conference does not appear; but we do know that the first to put it in practice was Dr. Macaulay, a midwifery practitioner of this city. It is natural and just, therefore, to identify his name with this most beneficent measure, and to accord him a prominent place among the many distinguished accoucheurs who lived and practiced here.

One of the greatest ornaments of that physiological school of accoucheurs — founded we may say by William Hunter — was Thomas Denman, a man of remarkably sound judgment, great prudence, and of the highest moral integrity. Throughout half a century he lectured and practiced in this city. His work, entitled *An Introduction to the Practice of Midwifery*, is well known to most of you. It has many peculiar excellencies, but to my mind the chief is his classification of labor, which is at once comprehensive, pathological, and practical, and thereby serves the highest purposes of any system of classification.

Did time permit, I could multiply these brief sketches so as to include many other London obstetricians who lived since the commencement of the present century, of less note, it is true, but yet men who stood far above mediocrity, and who, by their writings, their teaching, and their practice, materially aided the advancement of midwifery and gynecology. I must content myself, however, with a mere recital of their honored names, namely: John Clarke, Orborne, Leake, Bland, Merri-man, Charles Clarke, Gooch, David Davis, Blundel, John Ramsbotham, Marshal Hall, Robert Lee, Robert Ferguson, Rigby, jun., Francis Ramsbotham, Granville, Ashwell, Lever, Locock, Waller, Murphy, Tyler Smith, Oldham.

These men all lived so near our own times (at least those of us who, like myself, have reached the grand climacteric), that the bare mention of their names at once recalls the titles and the nature of their respective contributions to the funded capital of our professional knowledge.

Of the living obstetric celebrities, who make this city the scene of their work and their influence, I purposely refrain from speaking: —

"My thoughts are with the dead; with them
I live in long past years,
Their virtues love, their faults condemn,
Partake their hopes and fears;
And from their lessons seek and find
Instruction with an humble mind."

(SOUTHEY.)

But, to a more worthy occupant of this chair at some future meeting of the Congress, after we have played our little parts in life's drama, I bequeath the grateful, pleasing task of supplementing the above list with the names of those eminent London obstetricians and gynecologists, whom to meet and to know is assuredly the most gratifying of the many privileges connected with this great international gathering.

"THE MUSEUM OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS OF ENGLAND."

INAUGURAL ADDRESS IN THE SECTION OF ANATOMY.

BY PROF. W. H. FOWLER, LL. D., F. R. S., F. R. C. S., ETC.,
President of the Section.

While thinking over various subjects for an address with which to open the business of the section over which I have the honor to preside, it has occurred to me that the time which has been allotted by the arrangements of the Congress for the purpose, may be made most useful to my hearers, if, instead of entering upon a discussion of any abstract question, I were to ask your attention to a subject upon which I may possibly be able to give a little information of practical use to members of the Congress during their visit to this city.

No class of persons can appreciate so fully the importance and value of museums as those whose occupation it is to study the form and relations of the various parts of the body, whether of plants, animals, or man.

Our science would make little progress if the objects of our inquiries, once used for examination or description, were then thrown aside, and those coming after were denied the opportunity of which we have availed ourselves. A museum is a register, in a permanent form, of facts, suitable for examination, verification, and comparison one with another.

Hence, ever since serious attention has been awakened to the interest of anatomical studies, museums have always been important adjuncts to their successful prosecution, and the preservation of the various structures of the body has occupied the attention of very many anatomists, since the time of the great Italian teachers of the early part of the seventeenth century, with whom, apparently, the art commenced.

We have in London, as you are all aware, a museum which stands, in some respects, in a peculiar position, differing perhaps from any in the world in its origin, its scope, its method of maintenance, and its relation to the profession and to the state, in which, for very nearly twenty years, it has been my privilege to pass my days. It has occurred to me that a few words in explanation of the history, arrangement, and contents of that museum might add to the interest and profit of those visits which I trust every one here will find time to pay to it during the meeting of the Congress.

The great mind of John Hunter, far in advance of his age, — and, it may be, even of ours, — saw at one glance the vast importance of biological science, and the best means to further its pursuit. To this end he founded his museum, and directed by his will that it should always be maintained in its integrity. Whenever civilized men are gathered together there are now minds who feel what Hunter felt. The necessities of such minds have created in every country in Europe, and the enlightened parts of the New World, museums designed to serve in their different degrees the same functions as our Hunterian collection. Such museums are evidently national needs; they have already come, though not by any means to the extent they will in future come, to be looked upon as an essential portion of the educational machinery of the state. Such museums are, in almost every capital of Europe, supported directly at the expense of the state, or are connected with some great educational institution dependent upon Government for aid. In England alone the need has

¹ Slightly condensed from the advance sheets.