ART. II.—*Observations on Professor Hamilton's "Deviations,"*
&c. By ROBERT COLLINS, M.D., late Master of the Dublin
Lying-in Hospital.

A SENSE of duty again forces me to *expose* to my junior professional brethren, the *hasty*, and if *generally* acted upon, *mischievous* measures urged by Professor Hamilton, of Edinburgh, for the *artificial dilatation* of the mouth of the womb within twelve or fourteen hours, and the *actual delivery* of the patient within twenty-four hours from the commencement of labour.

I am led thus, a *third* time, to register the most solemn protest against Professor Hamilton's *unnecessary* and *mischievous intermeddling*, in consequence of a letter published by him in the preceding volume of this Journal ; and I state, without hesitation, that the said letter is one of the most perfect demonstrations of his often-exercised powers of evasion ever offered to public consideration.

When stigmatizing Professor Hamilton's doctrine, regarding the artificial dilatation of the mouth of the womb, in a communication made by me in this Journal, March, 1837, I have given the following quotation from Dr. Hamilton's work : " When the pains take place, if the dilatation proves tedious, that is, if the continuance of *strong pains* for *six* or *eight* hours do not advance the dilatation to such a degree as to give reason to expect its completion within a few pains, *it becomes necessary to interfere* lest the patient's health should suffer." In my second communication, September, 1838, (to which Professor Hamilton *pretends* to reply in the last number of this Journal,) I state the following are Dr. Hamilton's own words, upon the *validity* of which the *key-stone* of his *arch* ideas rests, and which, although inculcated by him for a series of years to some thousand pupils, he complains the practitioners in London, Paris, and Dublin *reject*.

"MANAGEMENT OF THE FIRST STAGE OF LABOUR.

"One of the earliest innovations in the treatment of human parturition, which I found good reason to introduce, was the limiting the duration of the first stage of labour to *twelve* or *fourteen* hours, WHENEVER THE UTERINE CONTRACTIONS CONTINUE TO BE REGULAR AND PROGRESSIVE ; and I have stated in my Practical Observations, that the following are the *necessary effects* of the *protraction* of that process *beyond* the *time specified*."

In the learned Professor's reply to my *second* communication, he slips back, cautiously, to the Dublin Journal of Medical science, No. XXXI., where my *first* criticisms are published, and gives the first extract which I have supplied above ; shunning his "innovations," as set before his eyes in the very glaring manner just recorded, as the *key-stone* upon which his ideas rest. In reference to the passage given in my first article, the Professor now, as he thinks, *cunningly* remarks, "In this quotation Dr. Collins has left out certain words, and transposed others, which *completely misrepresent* what I have published ; for, firstly, *I do not state* 'that the full dilatation of the os uteri should be completed within twelve or fourteen hours from the actual commencement of labour, as the natural efforts can no longer be trusted to ;' my statement being in the following words: '*If uterine contractions continue regular* the full dilatation of the os uteri should be completed within twelve or fourteen hours, &c.' This condition, which Dr. Collins has carefully suppressed, changes altogether the proposition which he has thus alleged to be mine." And it is added, "for this misrepresentation he can have no excuse." I ask is it not to Dr. Hamilton's everlasting shame, that I am compelled to thus expose him. Who could read such sleight of hand efforts, without contempt for the writer ?

Have I not proved that the *identical words* were absolutely emblazoned in order to attract notice ; and yet Dr. Hamilton

has had the presumption to accuse me of wilful misrepresentation.*

I have now to expose the Professor's *second* accusation; and in truth it will bear the light badly as the first; but it must be told. The Professor states, "The *second* misrepresentation of Dr. Collins, *in the words quoted*, seems to me still more inexcusable. I allude particularly to the following: 'He (meaning Dr. Hamilton) says, that the patient should almost never be allowed to continue longer (viz. than twenty-four hours) without being delivered.' The following are his own words: 'When the pains take place, if the dilatation proves tedious, that is, if the continuation of strong pains for *six* or *eight* hours do not advance the dilatation to such a degree as to give reason to expect its completion within a few pains, it becomes necessary to interfere, lest the patient's health should suffer.' These words (the Professor adds) have been detached from the sentences which explain them, and afford one of the most perfect specimens on record of a deliberate intention to pervert and misrepresent the doctrines which Dr. Collins has undertaken to controvert."

I would anxiously refer to my *first* communication on this subject in this Journal, March, 1837, page 39, from whence this quotation is *culled*, with Dr. Hamilton's artful tact; it is the *first* sentence in my abstract of his "doctrines," and has reference alone to the *first* stage of labour. The second sentence is, "Since the year 1800, the author has advised his pupils to secure the termination of the first stage of labour within *twelve* or *fourteen* hours from its actual commencement." The *third* sentence is, "Again,

* Doctor Hamilton states, with reference to my *first* extract of his doctrines, that "Dr. Collins has left out certain words, and transposed others, which completely misrepresent what I have published."

This is a *shameless* misrepresentation on the part of the Professor, as I have given the quotation in the *identical* order, and to the very *letter*, as printed in his *Observations*, Part I., page 225.

when treating of LABORIOUS LABOURS, the author feels it incumbent upon him to declare, that when the uterine contractions proceed regularly, without decided interruption ; or when the infant, after the rupture of the membranes, remains in close contact with the passages, the sufferings of the woman should almost never be allowed to continue longer than *twenty-four* hours, reckoning from the beginning of true labour throes."

Could a more deceitful representation of my explanation of the Professor's doctrines be put in print, than this demonstration exhibits? If the *two* latter sentences do not explain the Professor's doctrines to the *very letter*, they *must* have been inserted by "*mistake*"!!! by Doctor Hamilton, in his Observations on Midwifery, Part I. page 195, and Part II. page 42. That the *hasty* and MISCHIEVOUS doctrines given above were REALLY and TRULY the "*innovations and deviations*" INCULCATED by Professor Hamilton, I cannot permit him to *retract*. The following extract, from a letter received by me from Doctor Hamilton, in *explanation** of the doctrines advanced in his work, *proves* without the *possibility* of doubt, that even the hasty measures above recorded, fall *far short* of the *speed* he uses in private, viz., "It appears to me that the only *important* point on which we differ *respects the time* during which, in cases of *laborious labour*, the practitioner should *wait* for the efforts of nature. *According to my solemn conviction that should never exceed from TWO to TEN hours*, and as your experience has led you to believe that the stethoscope unequivocally indicates the death of the infant, if after that event, the pains cease to advance the labour, every hour's delay must add

* Doctor Hamilton states in his letter, that "Doctor Collins referred to the information communicated by him in a *private* letter, on which he has most unceremoniously commented." I totally deny ever having had any private correspondence with Professor Hamilton. I know him solely as an author, and every letter received from him was strictly in *illustration* and *explanation* of his doctrines, as the extracts given amply testify.

to the danger of the patient ; and I cannot help being impressed with the notion, that the cases which you have detailed from page 464 onwards, completely confirm my opinion. I have only to add, that I have never imputed any error in the practice to which I object, to yourself personally, for I have invariably stated, that it is to the modes of practice generally adopted at present in London, Dublin, and Paris, to which my animadversions refer."

Such are my remarks upon two of the charges of wilful misrepresentation with which Doctor Hamilton had the audacity to accuse me, and I leave the impartial reader to detect even a syllable in any of my references to his doctrines not scrupulously in accordance with what he has been endeavouring to inculcate so injuriously for nearly half a century. Truth scorns all kinds of equivocation, and never fears rigid examination. It would have been well for Professor Hamilton had he recollected, that "a goose quill is more dangerous than a lion's claw," before he published "innovations and deviations" so devoid even of the semblance of proofs, and so diametrically opposed to the results of the records of all the largest hospitals in Europe.

The next tale I shall unfold from Professor Hamilton's Letter is told by him at pages 185-6, and I "may" be believed when I solemnly state, that I "never heard tell of, nor ever have seen" a more insufferable and shuffling attempt to *disavow* and *disown* the *very essence* of *every doctrine* he has advanced, on the truly important practical points at issue between us.

Let us examine the wily attempts of the Professor to retract clandestinely *every iota* of what he has advanced on the subject ; and the efforts he makes to create as great a mist as it "may be possible," to prevent his retreat from being discovered. The attempt, however, is miserably paralytic, and unfeelingly depicts his own overthrow. The Professor states,* "Dr. Collins says, page 407 of your Journal, No. 39, two untoward circum-

* See last Number of Journal, pages 185-6.

stances are expressly set forth by Dr. Hamilton, as the necessary effects of the protraction of labour beyond the time specified by him, upon which entirely rests the validity of his reasoning. These constitute the *second* and *third* heads of his doctrines." These five lines the Professor declares contain two misstatements; for firstly, "I enumerate not two, but four, untoward circumstances, as the effects of the protraction of labour beyond a certain period; and secondly, *I do not allege them to be necessary effects.*" The reader will at once judge, (the Professor adds,) for the following are my words.

"Firstly. The powers of the uterus *may*, in the second stages, be inadequate to the expulsion of the infant, with safety to its life, or to the future health of the mother.

"Secondly. After the birth of the infant the uterus *may* contract irregularly, so as to occasion retention of the placenta.

"Thirdly. After the expulsion of the placenta, the contractions of the uterus *may* be too feeble to prevent alarming hæmorrhage.

"Lastly. Supposing the patients to escape all these untoward circumstances, febrile or inflammatory affections of a most dangerous nature *may* ensue, from the previous protraction of pain, and irregular distribution of the blood."

"In all these *four* sentences describing the several consequences of the protraction of labour, *I have used the word MAY*, which, I need scarcely observe, Dr. Johnson defines 'TO BE POSSIBLE.' If the word *must* instead of *may* had been employed, Dr. Collins's inference would have been *correct*; but considering my expressions, he is not warranted to assume, that *I allege* the untoward circumstances enumerated to be the NECESSARY effects, for *I have most particularly declared my opinion to be*, that *they are* the POSSIBLE effects."* I ask

* I should have the latter sentences printed in gold, were it not for the dread that the hair of the printer's head "MAY" turn green, as is found "to be possible;" but Dr. Hamilton is not warranted to assume, that I allege this un-

my professional brethren, "may" not the longitude be discovered as readily as it would "be possible" to find a parallel to the Professor's deviations and abjurations of every shadow of his doctrines, as is here shown by his own record? Yet he has not the firmness to declare openly his error; and the unsoundness of the advice he has been giving his pupils since the year 1800. Doctor Hamilton has at the last hour been forced, by absolute demonstration, to reject (I "may" suppose most unwillingly) one and all the doctrines which he has been disseminating for so many years, as the "necessary effects," "the consequences to be dreaded," which "he became quite convinced were the effects,"* or which "his conviction was, that although there be no injurious pressure upon the person of the infant, nor on that of the parent, the protraction of pain from uterine contractions above a certain number of hours, *must!* (may?!) occasion more or less exhaustion, both of the sensorial and of the muscular powers, and *must necessarily!* (may be possible?!) influence the subsequent process of delivery."† What explanation can Professor Hamilton offer in palliation, to his numerous old pupils, of the unsoundness of all his innovations and deviations? In the inglorious abandonment of principle on the part of Doctor Hamilton above registered, he has had the hardihood to charge me with numerous misrepresentations, which the most juvenile observer, on reading my observations, must declare contemptible on his part. Example first: the professor declares, that in five lines I have made two misstatements, by enumerating only two of his untoward circumstances as the effects of the protraction of labour in place of four! at page 407 of this Journal.‡ My object in emblazoning these

toward circumstance to be the necessary effect of this "innovation and deviation" in printing. See *Med. Gaz.*, Nov. 3, 1838.

* See pages 186-7.

† See First Letter, *Med. Gaz.*, page 7.

‡ The Professor's four untoward circumstances are detailed by me to the very letter, and in the most conspicuous manner possible as the key-stone of his arch-ideas, at page 404. In truth, a more barefaced accusation Dr. Hamilton could not "possibly" pen.

two (now) notorious effects, at page 407, (and which I gave in *italics* as the *second* and *third* heads of his doctrines,) it is well known to Dr. Hamilton, was to exhibit the *artful talent* of the Professor in *culling* cases in support of the doctrines he has now abandoned; the *exposure* of which unjustifiable selections has made, as I then stated would be the case, a lasting impression on the minds of the medical profession; and I have no doubt, had considerable influence in producing the Professor's recantation. Did I not, in these remarkable instances,* clearly and fearlessly prove Dr. Hamilton guilty of the astounding fact of culling the *only single instance* which occurred out of 16,414 deliveries, as the recorded support of the "*validity*" of the second head of his new doctrines and new opinions!!! Did I not in like manner convict him in the same memorable record, of the identical same mal-practice, in his selections in proof of the "*validity*" of the third head of his "*innovations and deviations*," the "*necessity*" of which I at that time regretted, but which has since proved so salutary?

I should think Dr. Hamilton will not forget the explanation just given of the necessity of my exposing, at page 407, the unwarrantable measures resorted to by him, in support of the second and third heads of his doctrines.

I feel that it is almost a work of supererogation enumerating all the unfounded representations Professor Hamilton may advance, which I need scarcely observe Dr. Johnson defines "to be possible." When we reflect that Professor Hamilton *most particularly declares his opinion to be*, that one and all of the *four* untoward circumstances, *hitherto* inculcated by him as the *necessary effects* of the protraction of labour beyond the term specified in his work, are *now barely* the "possible effects," and that the word "*necessary*" had been inserted by *mistake*, *no further condemnation* of their *unsoundness* can *possibly* be *necessary* on my part.

* See Journal, vol. xiii., page 412.

That it is "*possible*" such occurrences "*may*" take place, I allege is neither an "innovation or deviation," as Professor Hamilton flourishingly published, and endeavoured mightily by false reasoning to establish. I have *proved* that the very cases* *culled* and cited with so much deceit by the Professor, as the only recorded support of his *new doctrines* and *new opinions*, clearly and absolutely *demonstrate* the almost *total improbability* of the untoward circumstances, as set forth by Professor Hamilton, *ever* being met with.

The next assertion which Professor Hamilton makes is without the slightest regard to the *facts* before his eyes; and indeed it is truly an "innovation." He states, "of the other injurious effects of protracted labour which I have stated, viz. the death of the infant, and future organic diseases, and febrile and inflammatory affections of the parent, he has taken no notice, conscious as he *must* be (may be ?) that such were really in many cases the consequence of protracted labour, even in the patients of the Dublin Lying-in Hospital." Again, "Dr. Collins, the intelligent reader will see, had good reason for having passed over in silence the first of the untoward circumstances which I have specified, viz. that the powers of the uterus '*may*,' (which I need scarcely observe Dr. Johnson defines 'to be possible' ?) in the second stage, be inadequate to the expulsion of the infant, with safety to its life, or to the future health of the mother."

How would it be possible to demonstrate more fully the nothingness of such may be! *future organic* and *inflammatory affections*, &c. &c., than the following statements, which I adduced clearly prove, viz.† of 16,414 women delivered, only 164 died, or in the proportion of one in one hundred. *Forty-two* only of the 164 who died were more than *twenty* hours in labour. No fewer than ninety-seven out of the 164 deaths arose from causes not the results of childbirth. That the pro-

* See Dublin Medical Journal, vol. xiii. page 413.

† Ibid. page 406.

portion of children still-born, in consequence of the labour being protracted, is comparatively very small, is proved by the fact, that of 1045 cases accurately noted in our hospital, eight hundred and forty-four were delivered within twelve hours; and nine hundred and thirty-two within twenty-four hours; neither is the death of the child subsequent to birth, except in very few instances, comparatively speaking, a consequence of injury arising from protracted labour, as the result of our hospital demonstrates. Thus of the total number dying (284) previous to the mother leaving the institution, the labour in two hundred and forty-six did not exceed twelve hours.*

In support of the above statement, I have referred to the mortality in the hospital for the four last years of my residence, after puerperal fever disappeared; during which period the vast number *ten thousand seven hundred and eighty-five* deliveries occurred; out of which *fifty-eight* died, which is nearly in the proportion of one in every one hundred and eighty-six; and I have declared, that no artificial interference was attempted to effect the delivery, until the safety of the patient demanded such; from which it must be evident to every impartial mind that I am fully warranted, from the results shewn, in stating my decided conviction of the *unsoundness* of any advice calculated to encourage rashness and unnecessary intermeddling, on the part of the medical attendant. I asked Professor Hamilton did he know, or did he ever hear, of any even distant approach to this favourable and happy result in 10,785 deliveries. This “untoward” interrogatory Dr. Hamilton has good reason for having passed over in silence; as in my same communication I proved † the mortality in the Edinburgh Hospital, in the years 1821 and 1822, (the only years I could fish out the deaths,) to be *one* in *twenty-one*, which is even more frightful than the Paris Hospital; and when we reflect that, according to these calculations, *nine* women died in the

* See Dublin Medical Journal, March 1837, p. 70. † Ibid. vol. xiii., p. 119.

Edinburgh Hospital for every *one* that died in the Dublin Lying-in Hospital under similar circumstances, it is evident Professor Hamilton's "*deviations*" from the ordinary mode, if generally acted upon, would be productive of the most disastrous results. Had the mortality in the Dublin Lying-in Hospital, during my *seven* years' residence, been in the proportion of *one* in *twenty-one*, as was the case in the Edinburgh Hospital in the years 1821 and 1822, we should have had the melancholy duty to perform of detailing the almost incredible number of *seven hundred and eighty-one deaths*, in place of 164, which we had the happiness to be able to communicate; or, in other words, *six hundred and seventeen lives were saved*. Do not the incontrovertible facts just recorded for ever exhibit the visionary spectre from which the Professor has struggled so magnanimously to protect us, in the *first* and *last* heads of his "*doctrines*" to be *similar* imaginary ghosts with those which the light reflected at page 74 disclosed the *second* and *third* to be. I "*may*" attempt, "*which I need scarcely observe*, Dr. Johnson defines to be possible," to convince Dr. Hamilton still further of the total groundlessness of his accusation against me, of passing over in silence the *first* and *second* of his *un-toward circumstances*; as, in addition to my own condemnation and proofs, I had furnished him with the following deductions from the excellent papers published by Dr. Edward William Murphy and Dr. Churchill.

Dr. Murphy, in conclusion, states, in reference to Dr. Hamilton's doctrines:

"1st. *No proof* is given; neither do the records of the largest hospitals in Europe, nor their practice, establish that the prolongation of the first stage of labour beyond fourteen hours, so impairs the vigour of the uterus as to become dangerous to the mother and child.

"2nd. That in cases where the pains are continuing often and decided, while the os tincæ is lax, dilatable and thin, the uterus hardly ever fails, unless from some obstruction in the

second stage, in expelling the child with safety to both ; and, therefore, that the practice of hurrying on the first stage of labour is totally unnecessary.

"3rd. That considering the structure of the os tinæ, how readily a derangement in the order of the labour may be produced, and its liability to be inflamed from irritation, such a practice might become actually mischievous.* Doctor Churchill states, in his Second Report of the Western Lying-in Hospital and Dispensary of Dublin, with reference to his tables, 'Further, it will be perceived at once, that these tables have a peculiar bearing upon the interesting controversy lately carried on between Dr. Hamilton, of Edinburgh, and Dr. Collins, of Dublin.' So far as the series of facts I have just presented extend, they are in direct opposition to the expressed opinions of Professor Hamilton, for a prolonged first stage neither rendered the powers of the uterus inadequate to expel the infant with safety to its life, or the future well-being of the patient, nor disposed the uterus to contract irregularly, so as to occasion retention of the placenta, nor too feebly to prevent fatal hemorrhage ; nor lastly, did it give rise to febrile or inflammatory affections of a most dangerous nature."†

I would also particularly refer to Dr. Beatty's Report of the New Lying-in Hospital, in Dublin, in the twelfth volume of this Journal, which most unaccountably escaped my observation in my last communication on this subject : Doctor Beatty's tables, showing the number of cases where the labour exceeded twenty-four hours, with the result to both mother and child, contain the kind of information every physician should anxiously seek for, and *prove* (like all other registries) Professor Hamilton's views to be visionary. Dr. Beatty's conclusions are really practical, and demonstrate clearly the value of

* See Dublin Medical Journal, May, 1837.

† See these statements in Dr. Hamilton's letter as the basis of his "innovations," p. 200, Literary Gazette, May number.

such registries.* All these unquestionable proofs, from sources I have no doubt satisfactory, so graphically illustrative of the justness and propriety of condemning *one and all* of Professor Hamilton's hasty innovations were prominently recorded by me; and yet Dr. Hamilton, with his accustomed recklessness, states, that I had good reason for having passed over the first and last of his untoward circumstances in silence, and selected for illustration only two of his doctrines. If this sample of the Professor's tact in prevarication be not unworthy, and calculated to lower his dignity, I "may be" mistaken; but even Dr. Hamilton could not define this "possible."

With extreme pain and regret I feel it, in the next place, my duty to expose to my professional brethren the Professor's proverbial tact in *scurrility* and I hesitate not to declare, that if a medal were offered for consummate skill in such "innovations," it "must" be voted to him unanimously by every old and young pupil he has instructed "since the year 1800."

EXAMPLES.—The Professor, when adverting to some cases recorded by me observes, "I will venture to say, that excepting the case detailed by Professor Davis, p. 49, of his *Elements of Operative Midwifery*, as having occurred in an English work-house, the medical annals of this empire do not record two more shocking instances of mismanagement than the cases narrated in his *Practical Treatise*, by Dr. Collins, p. 465, No. 210; and p. 481, No. 1038."

* How striking is the difference between the conduct of the Dublin hospital physicians towards their professional brethren, when compared with that of Professor Hamilton. The former make known with the utmost accuracy every occurrence met with; whereas, for half a century, the latter has concealed every iota of the hospital results. We are informed these have been preserved, for the last fifteen years in "ponderous ledgers," but that some of the early records were "abstracted." Surely Professor Hamilton could furnish from his lectures an abstract of the number of children born in the Edinburgh Hospital, the number of which were *still-born*, and the number of mothers that *died*. Is it possible he has had charge of the hospital, and also University Professor, and *both for half a century*, and even a note is not found of these important events?

"One of the most frequent remarks which I have heard young practitioners make,* after reading Dr. Collins's Practical Treatise, is the total disregard to the sufferings of the poor patient, which is so little concealed, that provided the poor woman *struggled through and left the hospital alive*, it would seem that the intensity or duration of the pains she sustained were held of no account."

Were I the most degraded of authors, and in every respect undeserving of the *truly fulsome* adulations heaped upon me for my *candour* by Professor Hamilton (in order the better to cut my throat with my own weapons?) could language more *gross* and *unprofessional* be defined by his authority, Dr. Johnson, than the extracts given supply? Let us now see the reliance to be placed on the Professor's slanderous assertions. First, with respect to the two shocking instances of mismanagement, chosen with the Professor's deepest penetration from a record of 16,414 cases; each of which he has now served up *three times*, accompanied with his most piquant sauciness. I should think, however, that the much esteemed *frog* would be blown upon if thus frequently reproduced.†

* "May be!" these were the very respectable Irish students who were seriously offended at Dr. Hamilton's observations on my animadversions, and caused him so great mortification. See Dublin Medical Journal, vol. xiii. p. 403.

† I copy the following passage from the late Dr. Mackintosh's pamphlet, published in 1823, in reply to observations upon his Treatise on Puerperal Fever. Those who wish to study Dr. Hamilton's *good qualities*, and the good care taken of the patients in the Edinburgh hospital, will be *amply repaid* by the perusal of this little treatise. Dr. Mackintosh states, "The silly sarcasms which are so freely indulged in through the whole of his observations on my cases, I shall pass over in silence, as they are alone calculated to excite unfavourable feelings towards the author,—at least, with those individuals whose good opinion is of any value. I hope I shall be excused (he adds) by those who have not seen the annotator's work, for copying the following extract, as a specimen of its tenor and illiberality:—'Let the reader regard this *most shocking!* case in another point of view. What could have been expected from the treatment?!—Every practical physician will answer,—Effusion of bloody serum into the cavities, *exhaustion*, and *death*; even although the subject of the experiment had been a person of robust strength,—as for example, a bold dragon.'"

In my last condemnation of Dr. Hamilton's deviations, I have given the following remarks by him upon one of these *identical* cases formerly commented upon, viz. :—"I should have applied the forceps and extracted the infant. In the above instances, therefore, it must appear to any candid inquirer after truth, that both mother and child were victims to the practice adopted ; the cause of protraction was evidently the interception of a band of the cervix uteri between the head of the infant and the pubes."

I have replied to the Professor's generous criticism in the following very strong language, viz. :—"This bombastical and presumptuous language is in my opinion truly unworthy in any individual, and still more so from an aged professor, who should certainly not instruct his pupils in scurrility, which every well regulated mind invariably treats with the utmost contempt ; my statement regarding the delivery of this patient is, that after the head was lessened, *almost every bone was removed* before it could be delivered ; and even after it was brought down, *much exertion* was required to free the shoulders and body. The child (a first) was large, and the body somewhat distended with air. *Would* any 'inquirer after truth' have made the unfounded and unprofessional remarks above, with such a detail before his eyes. I cannot avoid stating, that if commentators similar to Professor Hamilton were numerous, who would sit down to cull and distort cases in support of their own doctrines, and at the same time scrupulously conceal the really valuable and obvious results, to the *disadvantage* of the writer, as I unhesitatingly submit I have demonstrated Dr. Hamilton to have done in every instance noticed in this communication, it is my opinion, that physicians attached to hospitals would then be quite justified in reporting the results once in 'half a century.' Fortunately, however, they are rare, as I have met with no other to act so unfairly ; and until Professor Hamilton proves to his brethren in the profession, by a minute detail of the cases under his care in the Edinburgh hospital,

somewhat similar to what I have done from the Dublin hospital, that his practice has been attended, not only with *equal*, but *happier* success, he should be *ashamed* to make such *gross* remarks as have sometimes escaped him; and his criticism upon others, *so long as he hides his own practice* in ‘ponderous ledgers,’ must prove *abortive*.”

As to the Professor's statement, (heard by him so frequently from young practitioners!) of my total disregard to the sufferings of the poor patient, provided she struggled through and left hospital alive; it betrays so much recklessness as to indelibly mark the real traitor.

Dr. Hamilton has indeed a very tender and sympathizing heart towards the sufferings of the poor women under his care in the Edinburgh hospital, and puts *one* in every *twenty-one* really out of pain! which “he holds of no account;” but has he any *conscience*? as if he has, we envy not his feelings. No earthly consideration would induce me to continue to undertake the medical charge of any lying-in hospital, where so frightful a mortality continued to be witnessed. “Is not this highly prejudicial to the public, by the example held out to young men learning the profession?” “Every practitioner of midwifery should sympathise with the feelings of the poor patients (children and relations?) and should employ every *safe means*,” so that they “may” “struggle through the hospital alive;” which I have defined “to be possible;” as in the Dublin hospital, in the vast number 10,786 deliveries, only *one* death in *one hundred and eighty-six* occurred. “It was long ago well observed by Dr. Osborne, that the calamitous condition of the female sex during the progress of parturition, is such, that the humblest of them have the strongest and most complicated claims upon the benevolence and skill of the practitioner. What would have been his feelings if he had lived to read”—this detail of the Edinburgh hospital under the care of the University Professor?

It “may be” the “young practitioners” alluded to by Dr. Hamilton were not informed by him of the comparative mortality

in the Edinburgh and Dublin hospitals;" although he always endeavours in the exercise of his duty to comment on the opinions of others in the true spirit of giving *instruction*, and anxiously avoids indulging in censure!" I venture, however, to prognosticate, my young friends will jog the Professor's *feelings* on this disagreeable subject. What will his ancient professional brethren think of the mean attempt of Dr. Hamilton to skulk behind Dr. John Moir, in order to avoid the "necessary results" of his "innovations and deviations" in the Edinburgh hospital?

The Doctor states, "as my friend Dr. John Moir, Assistant Physician to the Edinburgh General Lying-in Hospital, has undertaken to send to your Journal an abstract of the cases which have occurred in that hospital, since the year 1823, I shall take no other notice of Dr. Collins's observations respecting that hospital, than to point out a most deliberate misrepresentation respecting my account of that institution, on which he has been pleased to found an impeachment of my veracity." Is this the manner, I ask, in which the Professor is to satisfy his professional brethren of the utility of his *innovations* and *deviations*, as practised in the Edinburgh hospital for nearly "half a century"? I could scarcely believe my eyes when I saw the monstrous proposal; and I now tell Dr. Hamilton, that no form of abstract whatever, furnished by *any other individual* than *himself*, will be looked upon otherwise than as a *disgrace* to him. What has Dr. John Moir (for whom I have much respect) to do with Dr. Hamilton's imaginary views? How is he to prove from the "ponderous ledgers" of the hospital, that he is the identical Professor, who has been disseminating his "may-be" doctrines since the year 1800, and from which the poisonous sting has been extracted, and it is well known the reception the bee meets with in the hive where this occurs. I *demand* from Dr. Hamilton, and I have no hesitation in declaring my belief, that the entire medical profession unite with me in *loudly calling* for a

minute detail of the cases under his care in the Edinburgh hospital; taken during the progress of the patient's illness, *marking the cause of interference* in those cases, where a *deviation* from the *ordinary* mode of treatment was had recourse to; and at the same time, *making us acquainted* with the *result* in *all* cases to both *mother* and *child*. How can the Professor hold up his head, so long as he withholds this all important information from the medical profession. Is this the way the learned Professor is to establish the "*validity* of his *doctrines*," after excluding the many eminent practitioners of Edinburgh from the charge of the hospital for *fifty years*, and occupying the midwifery chair of the University to their *exclusion* for that almost unexampled period? If so, the public confidence is sadly requited in return for their kindness in retaining him so long in these highly responsible and honorable offices. And is the *benefit* to be conferred on the Professor's professional brethren from those *ages* of experience, and possession of the hospital to their *incalculable disadvantage*, solely to consist in *mere assertions* (without the production of even the *shadow* of a *fact* or *proof* from the hospital *records*) of "*innovations* and *deviations*," of "*new doctrines* and *new opinions*," *one* and *all* of which Dr. Hamilton defines "*to be possible*?" Surely the "*untoward circumstances*" enumerated are not the "*necessary effects*" of the Professor's occupying these truly important offices for half a century; it *must* be his *own mistake*! Is it necessary to declare, that a thousand probabilities will not make one *truth*; or that when facts not generally known are stated, they should be authenticated by proper references. How different are the vague and fanciful assertions of Dr. Hamilton. He states,* "*I have added (Practical Observations, Part First, page 196) that by the adoption of this rule, I can confidently assert, that no patient under my charge, for the last thirty-five years, has been above twenty-four hours in labour, and, ex-*

* See vol. xiii. Dublin Journal, p. 203.

cepting in cases of disproportion, none so long." "Against this practice Dr. Collins has objected in very strong language. He says, page 40 of your Journal: I have, however, studied every page with the closest attention, nor can I find *fact* or *argument* to induce me to alter my decided opinion, that *such* measures, [alluding to the means suggested for limiting the first stage to twelve or fourteen hours,] thus warmly urged, are not only uncalled for, as far as regards the *safety* of the patient, but if *generally* acted upon, likely to be followed by *serious results* both to the *mother* and *child*. This anathema is very inconsistent with Dr. Collins's usual candour, and is certainly not a little startling. I have stated strongly the fact; if Dr. Collins deny *this assertion*, *I shall refer him at once to the testimony of public opinion in this city*!! I confess this is a liberal offer, and as I knew no better way to set about the task, I directed searches to be made of the public records, and *here* indeed, I am told the Professor's "deviations" from the opinions of his professional brethren are clearly proved by public record. As this amounted to a demonstration of the Professor's *title*, it was only "necessary" to search the shops of the several booksellers for any judgments which *may* be outstanding before his deeds were engrossed. I furnish a note*

* "The only charge which now remains for me to refute, is that of 'calumny,' which has been brought against me by Messrs. Moir and Hamilton. This arises from the following statement, made at page 303 of my Treatise respecting Dr. Hamilton, that 'he possesses, *too*, a power of ingenuity which I never saw surpassed, of *selecting passages* to cast ridicule upon the very authors themselves, *who dare to disagree with him in opinion*.' Now this I mean boldly to repeat; it is too *notorious a fact* to be denied; and I confidently appeal to *all* who have attended Dr. Hamilton's lectures, and whose memories are not convenient to a fault, in *proof* of this; and I can as confidently appeal to the general practitioners with whom Dr. Hamilton has frequent intercourse, as to the total want of ceremony with which he treats the professional characters of many of those who move in the same line of practice with himself. It was my intention to have driven Dr. Hamilton *severely* on this point, but I shall for the present be silent, and content myself with proving the *fact* from expressions used in Dr. Hamilton's Valedictory Lecture, as

of what was found, and as it is totally impossible that Dr. Hamilton can *remove* the *difficulty*, he is left in the *enjoyment* of his "innovations and deviations" for the remainder of his life. As to the charge of deliberate misrepresentation noticed, I throw it back upon the Professor with genuine contempt; as neither in this instance, nor any other, did I ever alter a letter of what he has printed; he tells us, to be sure, that he sometimes prints mistakes! The Professor had stated in his third letter, *London Medical Gazette*, that by a report made to the managers of the Edinburgh hospital, it appeared that 15,936 women had been delivered previous to the 1st of Oct., 1836. I have declared that this statement was calculated to make the unsuspecting reader believe that the total 15,936 women were delivered in the Edinburgh hospital; whereas the *fact* is far otherwise, as, from the year 1793 up to 1834 *only* 5,198 had been delivered in the hospital; which showed the annual average to be reduced to the very small number of about 126.* I again tell Dr. Hamilton, that it was a most uncandid statement, and that no individual who was not blessed with his *in-*

exhibited in an extract he himself has given. That Dr. Hamilton does make use of intemperate expressions respecting the opinions of others is quite evident, otherwise where would be the necessity for the apology which he brings forward thrice a-year in the following terms? 'And if, *unfortunately*, my zeal for the improvement of the profession *lead* me at any time into *intemperance* of expression, I hope it will be attributed to the *feelings* of the moment.' This would be a very proper apology for intemperance of expression on *one* occasion, or in the heat of an extemporaneous speech, but when my readers are told, that the same apology comes, coolly and deliberately, *three times a-year* from Dr. Hamilton, and that it has come for *many, many years*, they will think with me, *that it is a piece of humbug*.

"JOHN MACKINTOSH, M. D.,

"Lecturer on the practice of Physic, Edinburgh, 1823."

"As for poor Professor Hamilton, he must now be accustomed to seeing *facts* *versus* his *dogmatic assertions*; but he has run *a-muck* at *every body* so often that he is looked only *all* as an *Accoucheur-Quixotte*."—*London Medico-Chirurgical Review*, October, 1838, page 632.

* See Dublin Medical Journal, vol. xiii. p. 419.

genuity would venture to deny it. Let any man read the passage, and see his *smothered* efforts to *compare* the number of deliveries in the Edinburgh hospital, with that of Dublin; he begins, "It will no doubt, surprise Dr. Collins and the gentlemen connected with the great establishment in Dublin," &c.

How is it, the reader "may" ask, that Dr. Hamilton has attempted to deny Dr. Collins's charge. I blush to tell it, as it is by equally great want of candour, and another attempt at concealment.

My rebuke was called forth by the tricky paragraph alluded to, and which was published in the Doctor's *third* letter of the London Medical Gazette, 19th August, 1837, page 758, and to which I critically referred;—read the artful reply: "in page 387 of the London Medical Gazette, for July 1837, [*mark* this was the Professor's *second* letter,] I have stated, that, "it is well known also, since the establishment of the Edinburgh General Lying-in Hospital in 1793, I have had the chief charge of the institution; and although it is upon a scale quite inconsistent with the extent of our population, yet 15,936 patients were delivered by the medical attendants of the hospital, previous to the 1st of October, 1836;" *mark*, I pray you, the shift;—his *third* letter stated, "it appears, that 15,936 women had been delivered previous to the 1st of October, 1836; and he *attempts* to envelope this notable letter by his *second*, (to which no reference was made,) *because* he there had stated 15,936 patients were delivered *by the medical attendants*! I would ask the Professor to be *frank* in his letters, only I do not wish to be under any compliment to him. The Professor adds, "Dr. Collins has had the hardihood to declare his disbelief in this statement, and triumphantly brings forward a quotation from the annual address to the public, in favour of the hospital, printed in 1834, to prove that only 5,189 patients were delivered within the walls of the hospital. The printed sentence in the address, from which he has taken half a sen-

tence, is in the following words: 5198 patients have been delivered in the hospital, and 9126 out patients have been attended at their own houses."

The reader will please again to *mark*, that *no* such frank deciphering appeared in the *simple* statement in the *third* letter, wherein the Professor wished to "surprise the gentlemen connected with the great establishment in Dublin." Is it not plain, that if I had not luckily stumbled upon the interesting Report of 1834, so as to make known the *outs* and *ins* of the Professor, the Dublin gentlemen must have been seriously, not surprised, but frightened; but now that they are aware that 9,126 of the 15,936 patients, were not only *not* delivered in the Edinburgh hospital, but some of them "may-be" as near to Leith as Edinburgh, the Dublin gentlemen need not be alarmed.

I ask my professional brethren, was I not markedly called upon to expose the want of candour and concealment which I discovered in the Professor's dexterous paragraph. I regret that I have been forced to say so much upon so truly disagreeable a subject; but Dr. Hamilton's vain attempt to escape the imputation rendered this demonstration imperative.* Had I left similar pitfalls in my statement of the deliveries in the Dublin hospital, Professor Hamilton himself would well know how to apply the epithet, which conduct such as this so well merits. Such artful devices as the Professor unblushingly creates, to shelter himself from the "necessary effects" of his *visionary doctrines*, furnish when detected, their own condemnation; and cannot fail to place the inventor in a most unenviable situation. Another of these meretricious efforts, even more worthy than that just noticed, is displayed at page 187, but here—

"Amazement seizes all; the general cry
Proclaims Laocoon justly doom'd to die."

* "On perusing this statement, the reader will perceive the dilemma in which Dr. James Hamilton is placed, and will perhaps say in his own mind, that there is no hole through which he can escape; but alas, he does not know the ingenious Doctor, he will always escape, but always in a manner peculiar to himself."—See Mackintosh's Practice of Physic, p. 280.

Proof. The Professor records, that Dr. Collins, "not contented with asserting that I hold all the possible effects of the protraction of labour to be the necessary and inevitable ones; he has selected for illustration only two of these effects, viz. retention of the placenta and uterine hæmorrhage after delivery; and because these occurrences were *rare* (*not that they did not happen*) in the Dublin Lying-in Hospital; he has triumphantly appealed to this *fortunate coincidence*, as completely proving the error of my opinions."

Is it not almost *incredible*, that a professor of "reputed respectability" would venture to defend himself by so groundless a statement as that which I have quoted, viz., "*because these occurrences were rare!!*" "*not that they did not happen!!*" "he has triumphantly appealed to this. *fortunate coincidence!!*" I need only again *proclaim* the *astounding fact*; that Professor Hamilton absolutely *culled* and published the *only single case* which occurred in support of his visionary doctrines, out of *sixteen thousand four hundred and fourteen deliveries*; as the recorded support of the *validity* of his *new* doctrines and *new* practice?! This was *staring* Professor Hamilton in the face in my last communication to this Journal, where I was compelled to *expose* the utter groundlessness of his doctrines; and yet he persists in wallowing in the *mire*. This *happy* selection of Dr. Hamilton was in *proof!* of the *second* of his doctrines; and his choice in *proof!* of the *third* was alike *substantial*. Both have been so fully developed* as to render additional perspicuity needless. It would be well for Professor Hamilton if his mind were imbued with the following sound and truly practical doctrine, which, on a very recent occasion, was inculcated with the happiest effect, viz., "It will, I think, be conceded, that in any department of natural knowledge, a doctrine which is worthy of the least respect, must have some foundation in nature. A mere speculation, however

* Dublin Medical Journal, vol. xiii. page 413.

ingenious, if it be not only *unsupported* by facts, *but in direct opposition to them*, cannot be received as a doctrine, and any inferences which may be drawn from such a speculation, *must be as false as the foundation on which they rest.*"* Such sentiments deserve all praise; at the same time do honour to the eminent individual who gave utterance to them, and are only in unison with that sound knowledge which has ever signalized him as one of the ablest practitioners, and brightest ornaments of our profession, either in this or any other country.

I had written so far of this paper, when the last number of the Dublin Medical Journal appeared, containing "An Examination of Dr. Hamilton's Letters in Defence of his Opinions;" by Edward W. Murphy, A.M. M.D., late Assistant Physician to the Dublin Lying-in Hospital.

This communication of Dr. Murphy's is full of interest to every member of the profession, and does infinite credit to the author. There are few subjects, a sound knowledge of which is more important, especially to the *junior* practitioner, than the one discussed; and Dr. Murphy has treated it in the clearest and most masterly manner; in every instance adducing unquestionable proofs in support of what he has advanced.

In the conclusion of Professor Hamilton's reply to my last communication, he states that "I have even accused him of concealment in respect to the affairs of the Edinburgh hospital." My charge was more serious, as I have exposed at page 88, in overstating the deliveries in the hospital. With regard to "the very items of expenditure," and "the pupils attending the hospital at an expense of £1 3s. for six months;" it would require more dexterity than even Dr. Hamilton is possessed of, to show that I hinted at such "affairs." When the Doctor was so *candid*, however, I wish he had informed us how much the

* See an Outline of the History of Medicine from the earliest historic Period to the present Time, published in the preceding number of this Journal; by Philip Crampton, F.R.S., Surgeon General to the Forces in Ireland, and Surgeon in Ordinary to the Queen.

said £1 3s. was per head, for every patient *each* pupil attended in the hospital during the six months. Although I would not presume to charge Professor Hamilton with concealment in the like "affairs" noticed by him, I boldly and fearlessly charge and accuse him of concealing the practice of the Edinburgh General Lying-in Hospital for the last *fifty years*, to the incalculable disadvantage of his medical brethren; which is not only a great abuse of the confidence placed in him by the subscribers, but a glaring injury, in depriving the profession of that information which would enable them to practise with credit to themselves and advantage to the public; and to which they are in every sense as fully entitled as Dr. Hamilton. I again repeat, Professor Hamilton's lectures should supply a full outline of the most important occurrences in the hospital; and, therefore, notwithstanding "some" of the public records were "abstracted," this affords no shelter whatever. Dr. Hamilton can "confidently assert" certain occurrences for the last thirty-five years; and can refer to "the public opinion of the city of Edinburgh" for proof of said assertions, for that very long period. He can also tell us what occurred in the first twenty years of his practice; and likewise what occurred in his private practice since the year 1800. He can also state the total number of cases of rupture of the uterus in the Edinburgh hospital since its foundation; although "some" of the records were "abstracted;" but—after all these wonderful efforts to enlighten the profession, he leaves us completely in the dark as to the *total mortality* to the *mother* and *child*. I still hope Dr. Hamilton will reconsider the subject, and give the result of such records as were not "abstracted," filling up the defective part with as many of the important particulars as he can collect from his lectures, or other sources. By acting upon this suggestion, Professor Hamilton will prove he is anxious to do his best; and thus avoid the slur, which the abandonment of so essential a public duty must attach to him, both now and hereafter.

I have very briefly to notice the conclusion of Professor Hamilton's discreditable letter ; it ends thus : " Having pointed out, that by means of interpolations and substitution of words, and by garbled quotations of sentences and paragraphs, Dr. Collins has contrived to render plausible his various misstatements and misrepresentations of my opinions and practice,* I have only to add, that it is impossible for me ever to have any future communication with that individual."

I do not think my professional brethren will credit the Professor's rignarole story of misrepresentations. Dr. Hamilton " may" make such statements, but Dr. Johnson could not define such " to be possible." I allege the " untoward circumstances" in which the Professor is placed, to be the "*necessary effects*" of his " deviations;" and I have most particularly declared such to be my opinion ; thus the word " necessary" has not been inserted " by mistake!!" therefore I hope Dr. Hamilton will not " protest most solemnly" against my using it in the present instance.

As to Dr. Hamilton's declining any future communication with me, the loss of so kind, generous, and valued a correspondent " may be" great ; but " I allege not the necessary effects." I forewarned Dr. Hamilton, in my last communication, that the unworthy language he made use of was in every respect calculated to prohibit friendly intercourse ; and I rather think, from what has been shown of his conduct since, he is not the man, as is said in Ireland, " we would borrow money to spend in his company ;" therefore, " I shall believe after trial, and judge before friendship;" always thinking content the true philosopher's stone, and that a false friend is worse than an open enemy.

* Dr. Murphy justly states, "such has been the ambiguity in Dr. Hamilton's language, and so often has his meaning been misunderstood, so loud has been his protest against misinterpretations, misrepresentations, and mistakes, that though the words seem plain, and the sense apparently clear, *I almost doubt whether the work itself* may not be a misrepresentation of his opinions on the subject of labour, at least in the sense in which it would be most usually understood."

I shall not, however, follow Dr. Hamilton's *harsh* example, and abandon him altogether, and he may rest assured whenever he advances doctrines *similarly fraught with danger*, I shall ever feel it my duty to correct their evil tendency as far as in my power.

ART. III.—*Observations on the Exhibition of Remedies, in the Form of Vapour, in Pulmonary Diseases ; with Description of a Diffuser of the Administration of Iodine, Chlorine, &c.* By D. J. CORRIGAN, M.D., Lecturer on the Theory and Practice of Medicine in the Dublin School of Anatomy, Surgery, and Medicine, Physician to Jervis-street Hospital, and to the Cork-street Fever Hospital, &c.

[Read at the Evening Meeting of the College of Physicians in the College Hall, on the 18th of February, 1839.]

A GREAT obstacle to the successful treatment of pulmonary diseases has always existed in the difficulty of applying remedies, which should exercise a *topical action* in those diseases. The superiority of remedies applied in a topical form, over those acting through the medium of absorption, or constitutional sympathy, is manifest in a host of diseases: ulceration in the eye, the mouth, the throat, or the rectum, diseased secretion from the skin or mucous surfaces, which can be reached by topical applications, are generally speedily arrested and cured; while diseased actions or secretions of no greater intensity, but which, from their situation, may be beyond the reach of local applications, are too often, either of tedious cure, or run their progress unchecked.

In no class of diseases is the difficulty of applying topical remedies more to be deplored than in diseases of the lungs; for, from this difficulty, diseased actions, which in other parts are under our ready control, are in the lungs often incurable.

The impossibility of applying topical applications, in their ordinary forms, to diseased structure in the lungs, has naturally

DUBLIN MEDICAL JOURNAL

*DOCTOR CORRIGAN'S Diffuser for the administration of
Iodine, Chlorine &c in the form of vapour.*

Published by Hodges & Smyth, College Green, Dublin.