short, as bad a case as I have seen ; and out of which I have seen almost none recover. Towards the conclusion of the injecting her pulse returned ; eyes lost the glazed appearance ; areolæ less marked, and her whole countenance brightened up ; her tongue became warmer, and she moved her jaws ; the surface of her body became warmer, as also did her feet, aided by hot sand-bags. She continued in this state for nearly three hours, when the effects began to wear off, and into the same opening I injected other fʒv of the solution. In a very short time after this second injection she became, I may say, convalescent all at once, and with little variation has continued so ever since. During these fourteen days she has had occasional vomitings and purgings. She has had slight comatose symptoms, which were relieved by means of a blister. She had great pain in her chest, and thick, queer, purulent sputa, but all these untoward symptoms have left. I may mention, that in her left eye, which was much inflamed, there is now a small ulceration on the cornea, a little below, not opposite to the pupil. She is now in the convalescent ward, but desired to keep in bed, although she can walk well enough. She eats and drinks well ; has natural stools without medicine ; passes her urine freely ; and sleeps soundly during the night, and is cheerful during the day.

I have as yet not mentioned one very important occurrence, viz., that she was injected on Thursday morning, 21st June ; and that on the following Saturday, at three p.m. I delivered her safely and easily of a dead girl (6th month). The membranes and placenta came away at the same moment ; the placenta appeared very dry, and contained dark venous blood ; the child was very livid,—this, of course, was not in favour of the new remedy ; but, notwithstanding, she has done well. She says she was well aware that the child died within, soon after she was attacked.

As we have made it a rule to remove no moribund patients into our hospital but such only as there is some hope of life in, however distant, we refused to admit the subjects of the above case. Indeed the medical gentlemen who visited them first, refused to grant a line of admission, considering them both too far gone ; but their landlord insisted they should rather die on the way to the hospital than on his property, and accordingly we were obliged to take them in, as we are often compelled to do. I have repeated this remedy since, but not with like success.

I remain, with much respect and esteem,

DAVID C. CARRUTHERS, M. D.

Dundee, 4th July, 1832,
Cholera Hospital.

BARON HEURTELOUP'S OPERATIONS FOR THE DESTRUCTION OF CALCULI IN THE BLADDER BY PERCUSSION.

CORRESPONDENCE RELATIVE TO THE LETTERS OF MR. COSTELLO, INSERTED AT PAGES 362 AND 430.

From Mr. EDWARDS to the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—In justification of a postscript which I appended to a memoir on the evacuating catheter, lately published in THE LANCET by Baron Heurteloup, I beg to enclose for insertion the copy of a letter written to Baron Dupuytren by Dr. Hume and Mr. Brodie, and in which you will find my statements authenticated. I should not have troubled you with this communication, were it not for the publication lately of an extraordinary letter, in which are repeated the calumnies to which the author formerly gave birth. I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

D. O. EDWARDS.

Dr. HUME and Mr. BRODIE to Baron HEURTELOUP.

“Sir Baron,—Dr. Heurteloup having acquainted us that an unfaithful account of the operation which he performed in our presence on Colonel Rankin has been transmitted to the Institute of France ; and that you are appointed especially to inquire into the progress made in England in the treatment of calculous patients, we take the liberty, at his request, of addressing to you a few observations upon the history of this case.

“We certify that no attempt was ever made or contemplated, to extract from the patient's bladder a broken instrument, but that simply the branches of the *instrument à percussion*, which the Baron had then recently begun to employ, remained three lines and a half apart, a circumstance which determined the operator to make an incision into the urethra, in order that the branches should be passed out through the aperture, and forcibly closed and withdrawn, without dilating the urethra excessively. In fact, the branches were brought together, and the instrument was taken out, without exciting the slightest inconvenience. If the lateral section was performed immediately after the disengagement of the instrument, it was not because it was thought *urgent* to do so, but solely because it was considered most advantageous to the patient.

“We add furthermore, that if lithotomy was resorted to on this occasion, it was purely at the suggestion of Baron Heurte-

loop; and that if this operation had an unfortunate termination, it ought to be attributed in a great measure to the advanced age of the patient, for he survived the operation more than two months, the wound very nearly healed, the urine passed freely and entirely through the urethra, and there was no other cause of death than extreme debility.

"We affirm, finally, that although Baron Heurteloup occupied no more than *one* or *two* minutes in attacking the large stone which the bladder contained, this stone, notwithstanding its toughness, was broken into many fragments when we proceeded to its extraction *

"We believe we are doing but an act of justice to Baron Heurteloup, in saying that he conducted himself throughout this affair in the most honourable manner, frequently visiting Colonel Rankin in his long illness, and being always well received by him.

"We have the honour to be, Sir Baron,

"Your very humble servants,

(Signed) "J. R. HUME, M.D.

"B. C. BRODIE.

"To M. le Baron Dupuytren, D.M. P.,
Chirurgien en Chef de l'Hôtel Dieu,
Membre de l'Institut de France, &c. &c."

From Mr. GOODWIN to the Editor of
THE LANCET.

Sir,—On the 22nd of June I received the following letter from the Baron Heurteloup, and I rely on your justice in inserting it, as well as my reply to the statements of Mr. Costello.

To GEORGE GOODWIN, Esq.

"My dear Mr. Goodwin,—Might you not have been mistaken in the particulars which you gave me respecting your case? You told me that the surgeon to whom you addressed yourself previously to your consulting me had introduced, *three times*, an instrument into your bladder, and that each time he was occupied from a quarter to half an hour in searching for your stone, which he did not succeed in seizing. Although I mentioned no names in drawing up your case, Mr. Costello, who announces himself as the surgeon to whom you first addressed yourself, has just published in THE LANCET of Saturday, June the 23rd,

page 363, a series of statements relating to you, which contradict the information given me by yourself and Mr. Hodges your medical attendant. I have not the least doubt, that if the facts, such as you related them to me, were incorrect, you would give them in their right light, and that if, on the contrary, what you stated was correct, you would, as a matter of duty, oppose a contradiction to what so nearly concerns yourself. I hope your health continues good. Believe me, Sir, ever yours truly,

"BARON HEURTELOUP.

"1, Vere Street, Cavendish Square."

As soon as I had read this, I immediately procured THE LANCET alluded to, and found in a letter, addressed by Mr. Costello to the Academy of Sciences of Paris, the following passage:—

"The second patient who left me for M. Heurteloup had paralysis of the bladder, and a stone which held a fixed situation in that organ. This patient had been cut by Mr. Brodie three years before. I made an attempt with Civiale's instrument; I experienced no difficulty in seizing the stone between two of the branches of the forceps, and detaching from it considerable portions which my confrère must have seen, but I was not able to dislodge the stone from its fixed situation beneath the neck of the bladder, and which appeared to me to be that of the old cicatrix. The attempt was renewed with a similar result; each attempt occupied about *five minutes*. I explained the difficulty to the patient, and proposed to dislodge it by means of Hunter's two-branch forceps, he was however intimidated by officious observations, and he placed himself under the care of M. Heurteloup, whom I had previously proposed to call in consultation. The indication of dislodging the stone, whose fixity in this case formed the sole obstacle to its comminution, was fulfilled by the means which I had previously proposed. The impediment once removed, of course the cure became easy. This patient was restored to health, at which I sincerely rejoice; and far from thinking that I had failed, he came afterwards to thank me for my attentions to him. It was admitted that my confrère and myself were of the same opinion as to the difficulty of the case, and the means of obviating it. So much for the imperfection of the means employed by me."

This case is mine, and as Mr. Costello has made statements not founded in fact, I consider myself bound in justice to the Baron Heurteloup, as well as by my regard for truth, to offer you a positive contradiction of them. I was cut for the stone by Mr. Brodie in May 1829, and in June 1831 I had a return of the same complaint.

* At that time the instrument of Baron Heurteloup had not assumed its present form. On this account the branches yielded a little to the constriction. In fact the instrument employed upon Colonel Rankin was nearly a first essay, and therefore little more than a model. Since that time a series of 62 have been made, each more complete and perfect than its predecessor; and the weight of the hammer being determined, and the probable resistance of the stone calculated, the whole strength of a man be applied in striking, without any fear of the break giving way.—D. O. E.

I consulted Mr. Brodie, but having heard that there was a safer mode of cure than the use of the knife, practised by two gentlemen in the profession, both strangers to me, I inquired about it, and was recommended by a friend to Mr. Costello. Upon this circumstance being known to Mr. Brodie and Mr. Morrat, my medical attendants, they both, for reasons best known to themselves, withdrew, and I was left alone, waiting the return of Mr. Costello to town. When he arrived, I thought it right to have the assistance of another professional friend at these operations so important to me, and I called in Mr. Hodges of No. 6, Upper North Place, Gray's Inn Road, who attended at all of them, *three* in number, and not *two* as Mr. Costello says, and who can attest to the truth of my statement, as he kindly visited me every day.

In the first place it is difficult to imagine (as Mr. Costello affirms) that my stone held a fixed situation in the bladder, for the Baron Heurteloup, before several medical gentlemen, immediately and with the greatest ease seized and comminuted it; and I have it now in pieces and powder in a box.

In the second place, each of the *three* sittings did not, as Mr. Costello also gives us to understand, in contradiction of what the Baron had said, occupy *five* minutes, but lasted from a *quarter* to *half* an hour, as Mr. Hodges, who was present, can certify as well as myself, who, from the anguish and torture I was enduring, should be inclined to estimate the duration of the sittings at a much higher rate.

In the third place, it is impossible that the Baron should have *seen the considerable portions* of stone which Mr. Costello says his operations caused me to evacuate, for he never, to the knowledge of Mr. Hodges or myself, extracted any from the bladder by his instrument. I never voided any thing like broken pieces of stone after the sittings; and, finally, in point of fact, Mr. Costello never, even with the sound, succeeded in feeling the stone, nor did he ever seize it, as he affirms, between the branches of his instrument; at least we saw no proofs of it, and the manner in which he manoeuvred and raked about in my bladder, tends to make us believe that all his attempts to *seize*, not to say *feel*, the stone, were unsuccessful.

In the fourth place, Mr. Costello never proposed, as his letter would lead any one to believe, to call the Baron Heurteloup in consultation; but, on the contrary, he said he did not consider himself justified in making any further attempt without the assistance of M. Civiale, and strongly urged me to let him send to Paris for that gentleman, to which I would not consent.

In the fifth place, I did not go to thank

Mr. Costello for his attentions to me, as he asserts, nor have I ever seen him since. I sent Mr. Hayward, a respectable friend of mine living in North Place, to remunerate him for his attentions to me, and I declined receiving any further visits from him. This step Mr. Hodges fully concurred in. What passed between Mr. Costello and Mr. Hayward, I understood at the time to amount to an acknowledgment on the part of Mr. Costello, of a complete failure.

In the sixth place, Mr. Costello, between the second and third sittings, did propose to dislodge the stone from beneath the neck of the bladder, where he assured me it was situated, with Hunter's forceps, but he came to operate for the third time without that instrument, and the sitting was considerably prolonged. I was then induced to address the Baron Heurteloup, which I did through Mr. Brodie, who was kind enough to introduce him, and not from the *official observations* of any other person, as Mr. Costello takes the liberty of affirming. I had, indeed, heard from high authority of the Baron's talent and skill, and which I have good reason to know were not exaggerated. He made use of his *new curved instrument and hammer*, and immediately seized, not from *beneath the neck of the bladder*, but from the lateral portion on my right, the stone, which he as soon comminuted, without giving me any pain worth mentioning. I am now perfectly well, and free from anything like a painful sensation.

Such is a true and accurate statement of what I underwent, and such as my medical attendant Mr. Hodges, residing at No 6, Upper North Place, Gray's Inn Road, will, I am sure, feel pleasure in certifying.

I am sorry that Mr. Costello, by deviating so widely from the truth in what concerned me, should have placed me in the painful necessity of bringing to light such gross inaccuracies, and publishing the facts correctly. I considered myself bound in justice to write this letter, and I beg, Sir, that you will give it a speedy insertion.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient humble servant,

GEORGE GOODWIN.

Chapel Street, Grosvenor Place,

June 25, 1832.

P.S. Since writing the above, I have submitted it to the perusal of Mr. Hodges and Mr. Hayward, and they have given me leave to say, that they both fully agree in the above statement of facts. G. G.

Twelve o'clock.

From Mr. BRIGGS to the Editor of
THE LANCET.

SIR,—The letter inserted by Mr. Costello in last week's LANCET being evidently not

written in a scientific point of view, it would be quite unnecessary to answer it, did it not contain a numerous collection of incorrect statements, and misrepresented facts. As Baron Heurteloup's pupil, which great advantage has enabled me to become well acquainted with all that relates to his operations, I should justly expose myself to censure if I allowed to pass unnoticed, inaccurate publications tending to depreciate a mode of operating, the advantages of which are becoming daily more and more evident by the success accompanying its application. Allow me, therefore, to offer a few observations in reply to Mr. Costello's letter. I consider it my duty to take this upon myself, although it is not the Baron Heurteloup's wish that any notice should be taken of it.

The cases of several patients to which Mr. Costello alludes in his letter, are as inaccurately, as they are incompletely, related. That of Colonel Rankin was so very incorrectly given, that Mr. Brodie and Dr. Hume, the two gentlemen who were present during the whole of the operation, were kind enough to write a letter to the Academy of Sciences, in which they contradicted the fallacies of Mr. Costello, and by giving to the gentlemen of the Institute accurate information, showed in a true light the motives which induced Mr. Costello thus to speak of an unfortunate, but simple and instructive, surgical case. Mr. Costello's letter, however, although forwarded to the Institute, was not, as he most likely had anticipated, even perused; for the secretary being accustomed and commissioned to read such papers only as are useful to science, soon perceived the tenor of this letter, and it was laid aside. It is due to Mr. Costello here to remark, that he has himself, in a note, rectified, in some degree, the inaccuracy of his assertions touching this case, but not having also transmitted this information to the Academy of Paris, as he should have considered it his duty to do, are we not justified in concluding, that *he knows that the statement is incorrect?*

With respect to Captain W——'s case, to which Mr. Costello alludes, he is equally inexact in his statements, and it would certainly have been more just and more worthy of men of science to have obtained correct information before publishing a case in which the name of another professional gentleman was concerned. Mr. Costello should have gleaned his particulars from Mr. Money and Mr. Green, whom he knew visited, conjointly with the Baron, Captain W——, whilst he was labouring under a disease unconnected with the stone, and which, if not entirely, at least in a great measure, caused his death. The Baron

Heurteloup considered it his duty to direct the attention of Mr. Money and Mr. Green to the manner in which Mr. Costello had represented this case, and these gentlemen will, perhaps, think it right to induce Mr. Costello to retract what he has said, and present the case in its true colours.

There is little to say on Mr. Goodwin's case, the second which Mr. Costello mentions; it is one in which the Baron Heurteloup said, that the *perce-pierre* had not been and could not be successfully employed, and also the case in which Mr. Costello introduced three different times the straight instrument above mentioned into the bladder, without being able to seize the stone, although each of the three attempts was of very long duration. The Baron was furnished with these particulars by Mr. Goodwin, the patient, and they were corroborated by the testimony of Mr. Hodges, his medical attendant, who saw all that was done.

With respect to Mr. Stockbridge's case, I need make no comments on it; it speaks for itself. A straight instrument could not be introduced into the patient's bladder without violence, which in this operation, above all others should be avoided. The Baron Heurteloup, who, from talents, long experience, and delicate tact, must certainly be as competent as any one to introduce into the bladder either straight or curved instruments, advised the patient not to allow any further attempts to be made with a straight instrument, but to wait until he had constructed a curved one, which at that time engaged his attention. Mr. Stockbridge, however, by some means or other, was deterred from following this wholesome and reasonable advice; in his excusable impatience to be relieved, he was persuaded to consult Mr. Costello, who unhesitatingly proceeded to introduce the *perce-pierre*, a straight instrument, which he employs in all cases. He succeeded in passing it into the bladder, I should think by *force*; for the Baron Heurteloup's acknowledged skill and talent could not have failed in the *usual* application of this instrument. Mr. Costello says, that the instrument went into the bladder easily. It may be so, for it is always *possible*, with a metal instrument, to overcome obstacles presented by soft and yielding organs. But was it prudent to do so on this occasion? It appears not, for death ensued, as Mr. Costello candidly confesses. This case furnishes undeniable proof of the utility of a curved instrument, which, however, Mr. Costello does not seem at all disposed to admit.

With respect to any other cases in which the Baron Heurteloup accuses the *perce-pierre* of being of insufficient and unsuccessful application, Mr. Costello is not the

operator alluded to, although I don't know why he attributes to himself all the cases mentioned; but he must certainly be aware, that he is by no means the only surgeon who attempts to operate with the *perce-pierre*.

Allow me, Sir, further to add to these observations:—

1st. It is impossible to admit that Mr. Costello has treated successfully with the *perce-pierre*, since his arrival in England, the number of patients he names; for it is natural to suppose that had he effected these cures, he would have published them in detail, since that alone can justly establish the reputation of a surgeon.

2ndly. Mr. Costello never having seen the curved instrument employed, never having even *seen it* as constructed by the Baron, and, finally, never having received any correct information respecting the manner of making use of it, cannot in justice pass any remarks on it, nor can his opinion respecting it be considered of any more weight than that of any person who should panegyrisse or detract from the labours of Mr. Costello, with which few or none happen to be acquainted.

3rdly. It is difficult to conceive how Mr. Costello, in no way distinguished by scientific labours, and comparatively young as to experience, should, in so positive and unrestrained a manner, give his opinion on this operation, and on the means of performing it, whilst other gentlemen, whose talents and long experience have placed them at the head of their profession, continue silent, having too much justice and good sense to condemn or criticise the new system, until they have studied its advantages and defects.

4thly. I would, in conclusion, remark, that a letter, written by a surgeon to any learned body for the sole purpose of preventing a professional brother from receiving the reward of long and arduous labours, supposing every word of the letter to be of the most scrupulous exactness, would be deemed a rather indelicate action, and certainly unworthy of a professional gentleman; but when the facts related in the letter are untrue, such conduct requires an appellation which, out of respect for you, Sir, and your readers, I refrain from applying. The following is a

*Statement of Captain W.'s Case,
written by himself.*

“ Fifty-nine years of age. Good health through life, till June 1828, when, after horse exercise, passed bloody urine, which disappeared till October, when horse exercise again produced slight hemorrhage, with pain in the glans penis, making small quantities of urine seven or eight times during

the day, and four or five times during the night. Horse exercise discontinued till Oct., 1829, when it again produced profuse hemorrhage for nineteen days and nights. Horse exercise discontinued; great irritation and pain in making water, which at times suddenly stopped. Was sounded the 29th of May, 1830, when calculus was discovered in the bladder. Less irritation, discharging urine four or five times during the day, and generally three during the night, and from *four to eight* ounces at a time, *healthy and clear*.

“ June 25. Mr. Costello passed through my place of residence (Wrexham), when I was strongly recommended to submit to an operation by him, which was granted. Was sounded, and the bladder pronounced free from the slightest organic disease, and in every way prepared. A sitting took place* on the 26th June. The stone seized five times; escaped every time; the *perforator* touched it. The stone was declared to be ten lines. This attempt produced slight hemorrhage for three days, when it was succeeded by fetid and purulent urine, which is now subsiding, but is not even now voided in greater quantities than two ounces, and at times much less; attended with great pain, by which the head is greatly affected. I must remark, that the above attempts produced violent fever for some time, with declining health, *previous to which it was unimpaired*.

“ From the period of its being ascertained that Capt. W. had stone, he had fully determined to proceed to London, and apply for relief to Baron Heurteloup; but a friend addressed Capt. W. to say that Mr. Costello was soon to arrive at Liverpool, and at the same time recommended Mr. C. as a careful operator. From these favourable accounts Capt. W. considered it would be a great advantage to him to have the operation performed at his own house, and yielded to so *apparently* favourable an opportunity. Mr. Costello arrived at Wrexham on the 25th of June, and sounded Capt. W. that evening, and declared to him that he never had a patient better prepared, and in other respects more favourable for immediate operation. Judge then of our surprise, when, on the 3rd of July, in answer to a letter from Captain W.'s medical attendant, Mr. Costello states the operation had failed for want of due preparation. Mr. Costello having intimated his intention to return by Wrexham, Captain W. addressed him, expressing his and all his friends' surprise at the contents of his letter, and requesting him not to do so on his (Captain W.'s) account. Captain W. has not therefore heard more from Mr. Costello.

* Not an exploration.—T. B.

"Capt. W. considered it necessary to make this statement known to Baron Heurteloup as the professional gentleman chosen by Capt. W., from whom, by God's assistance, and the Baron's unremitting care, he yet hopes to experience a cure from so dreadful a complaint.

"THOMAS WATSON.

"London, August 24th, 1830."

Such is the letter which I have in Capt. W.'s own handwriting, and which I feel it my duty to publish, as Mr. Costello has not thought fit to show this case in its right light, especially as far as he himself was concerned. Allow me also to answer the following passage in Mr. Costello's letter relating to Capt. W.

"The first of these I visited in the country, on my way to Edinburgh. After having made an *exploration*, it was settled that he should go to London in order to have lithotripsy performed on him. On his arrival in town I had not yet returned. The patient placed himself under the care of my confrère, who operated upon him, and he died."

This passage being evidently written to induce such as read it to believe that the Baron Heurteloup's operation caused the death of the patient, I think it right to combat an insinuation which has so deplorable a motive by a testimony of unexceptionable validity. It is a letter addressed to Mr. Money, in which Mr. J. H. Green explains why he was called by Baron Heurteloup to visit Captain W.

"46, Lincoln's Inn Fields,
July 9, 1832.

"Dear Sir,—In answer to your inquiries respecting the state of the late Capt. W., previous to your attendance, I beg to say that I saw him with Baron Heurteloup after the first and only operation of lithotripsy, and that he was at that time labouring under a complaint which had no connexion with the stone or the state of the bladder. I would add that the bladder was then in a favourable condition, and did not appear to have suffered in any degree from the operation. I am, dear Sir, respectfully yours,

"JOSEPH HENRY GREEN."

"— Money, Esq."

From this letter, then, we may conclude that Capt. W.'s death was not caused by the operation of lithotripsy. A few remarks, however, on what Capt. W. underwent, will further prove this.

This patient, after having undergone an operation of lithotripsy at his own house at Wrexham, which was unsuccessful, came to London to consult Baron Heurteloup. His health was greatly impaired by the attempt of Mr. Costello, who thinks proper

to denominate long and painful operations simple *explorations*. The Baron seeing Capt. W. in so unfavourable a condition, at first refused to operate upon him. For nearly four months the patient entreated the Baron in the strongest manner to undertake the treatment of his case, and it was only after Capt. W. had called three different times into consultation Messrs. Brodie, Money, Green, or White, that it was decided that on account of the anxious wish of the patient, the Baron could not do otherwise than subject him to his mode of treatment.

The patient was operated upon once with the *trois-branches à virgule*; two calculi were seized and excavated by the *virgule* with rapidity and facility, and in presence of Dr. Granville. No unfavourable symptoms appeared after this operation, but the Baron having ascertained that there existed in the bladder two oval stones of large dimensions, resolved not to proceed with the same instrument, as the patient could not have borne the number of operations which the means he then possessed to break down such calculi rendered necessary.

The Baron was at that time constructing his *percuteur courbe à marteau*, and he told Capt. W. that he would not continue the operation until that instrument was completed, for the size of the stones in his bladder required rapid and efficacious means. The patient waited therefore, and was in as favourable a state as could be wished for; he made water at long intervals, the urine was clear, and the Baron was on the point of proceeding in the comminution of the stones with the *percuteur*, when Capt. W. was seized with an acute pleuritic affection which caused his death. Shortly after the pleuritic symptoms declared themselves, Mr. Green was called in consultation, who found the patient in the state described in his letter. He died three months after M. Heurteloup's operation.

I should have preferred making no use of a paper which I have in my hands, but Mr. Costello, careless of sacrificing truth to the accomplishment of his object, compels me to commit it to print. This paper, which was written and signed by Capt. W. himself, and given to the Baron Heurteloup, contains an account of all that he underwent before he consulted the Baron. This letter will give proofs, too evident, that Mr. Costello did something more than merely explore the bladder of the patient.

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

T. BIGGS.

Vere Street, Cavendish Square, July.