

Smith's first letter, and confuted every one of his arguments from his own original works, and from many other works of authority. Instead of extricating himself from the dilemma in which I have placed him, he publishes two letters, one proclaiming that his acquaintance and mine had ceased at his desire, the other about the emended memorial. He has forgotten however to state, that he had written to me after the publication of his first letter, to which communication he received no answer, contrary to the punctuality which I always had observed towards him, and one would think he ought to have discovered that our acquaintance had ceased; yet several days afterwards he called on me, and renewed his large professions of friendship as usual, notwithstanding his letter in *THE LANCET*, "which upon his honour was intended for my journal, and sent elsewhere contrary to his wish and consent." I coolly informed him, that I had endeavoured to refute his statements in my next Number, chiefly from his own works. The journal appears, and then he writes the note dated 1st instant, informing me that our acquaintance had ceased, though I had considered it at an end on declining to answer his letter received several days previously; and as this event is of such great public importance, he has recorded it in your pages.

In the last Number of the *Medical and Surgical Journal*, Dr. Smith is refuted by himself; and there I have defied him, and I now repeat the challenge, to cite one author out of ten thousand on forensic medicine, who supports the doctrines he defends in his first letter; and I repeat the question I asked him at parting, "Does he seriously believe there is one eminent physician or surgeon in this empire who agrees with him in opinion?" Like all defeated disputants, he has the usual recourse to the *argumentum ad hominem*, and not *ad rem*; but this kind of logic is long since exploded. I now call upon him to confute my arguments against his heterodox doctrines, either in my journal or in yours.

M. RYAN, M.D.

Member of the Royal College of Physicians in London.

Hatton Garden, Oct. 11th, 1830.

---

#### WESTMINSTER HOSPITAL.

*To the Editor of THE LANCET.*

SIR,—In your Number of this evening (October 9th), I read a notice relative to the Westminster Hospital special general meeting of the 6th instant, in which you apply the term "jobbers" to one of the parties, and threaten or rather promise to

publish two or three documents that will, you expect, upset all their supposed machinations. Now "jobbers" is, whether justly or not applied, a very offensive term, and if not justly applied, is further calumnious and unwarrantable; I cannot, therefore, avoid entering my protest against the use of such injurious language in the pages of your powerful periodical, as I believe you have ignorantly applied it to gentlemen who constitute the majority, as the event will prove to you, "of the intelligent and independent governors;" gentlemen who, as you humanely hope, "will not fail to perform their duty to the subscribers and afflicted poor." Standing on a very high eminence in the field of medical politics, and having your attention divided amongst multifarious avocations, it is not probable that you can inform yourself accurately on a great variety of circumstances and transactions, which would naturally furnish matter for the critical pen of the editor of *THE LANCET*; and it is quite impossible that your information in numerous instances on interesting questions, can be derived from personal observation or inquiry; and I am not more fully satisfied of the truth of the general position just stated, than I am of that of the particular fact—that with regard to the views and proceedings of the influential party of the trustees of the Westminster Hospital, you have been grossly misinformed. It is with this conviction that I call on you, as in one sense a trustee of the interests of "the subscribers and of the afflicted poor," to suspend your judgment, or at any rate to hold your columns open with "equal and indifferent justice to all parties." It is my intention, with your permission, again to address the public on this subject, after I shall have read the documents of which you promise me the perusal in your next Number. Meanwhile I respectfully request that you will insert this in your next Number, and that you will believe me to be a sincere friend to publicity, and a friend, as well as subscriber, to *THE LANCET*.

C. R. M. S.

October 9th, 1830.

---

#### DERBYSHIRE INFIRMARY.

CASE OF ELLEN COPE.

*To the Editor of THE LANCET.*

SIR,—In offering a few observations on a case, the report of which is contained in your last Number under the head of "Derby Infirmary," I beg to state that I had an opportunity of seeing the patient daily, from the time of her admission to her death; and

as the minutes of the case, and *post-mortem* appearances, were recorded without any view to their being rendered thus public, I transcribe them from my case-book as they there stand; in order that they may not be regarded as "cooked up for *THE LANCET*," or biased in their details by a partiality which might lessen their claims to fidelity.

#### Case.

Ellen Cope, ætat. 45, admitted Sept. 14, 1830, has a large and defined tumour in the abdomen, the upper and right side of which is hard and irregular; single woman; has menstruated regularly; general health does not appear much affected; says that she first perceived the swelling about two years ago, which has now attained an enormous size, giving to the abdomen the appearance of that of a woman far advanced in pregnancy: has a large bronchocele, which has been forming for the last four years.

*Hab. pil. hydrarg. c. rhæo*, ij, o. n.

Common diet.

17. Ordered to rub in the unguentum hydriodatis potassæ every night over the abdomen.

21. Has slight headach, apparently from indigestion.

22. Headach better; pergat.

24. Was attacked this morning with an epileptic fit, which recurred whilst I was in the hospital; this attack was preceded by acute pain in the back, and sickness; pulse slow and feeble; tongue clean, but the breath is offensive; never had any-thing of the kind before. Discontinue the ointment.

25. Had a fit this morning; symptoms as yesterday.

26. After another epileptic attack she died rather suddenly.

#### Autopsy, twelve hours after death.

*Head.*—There is a slight effusion of transparent fluid between the arachnoid and pia mater; about half an ounce of similar fluid, contained in the cavity of the arachnoid, collected towards the base of the skull; no thickening of the arachnoid tunic, or deposit upon its surface; on lowering the head, a small quantity of serous liquid escaped from the spinal canal; about a tea-spoonful was found in the ventricles.

*Thorax.*—The lungs were generally of a dark-colour, and excessively gorged with blood; on cutting into their substance a quantity of frothy fluid escaped, with which the bronchi appeared filled, and which flowed copiously from the mouth. The left lung appeared in some parts impervious to air from excessive congestion; the heart and large arteries were healthy; the venous side of the circulation was generally loaded with dark-coloured blood, of which a considerable quantity was contained in all the cavities of the heart.

*Abdomen.*—The stomach appeared, externally, healthy, but, on opening it, the mucous coat was found very red, especially towards the cardiac extremity, and the villi generally minutely injected. The other viscera were apparently healthy. Attached to the uterus was an enormous tumour about two feet in circumference, rising into the abdomen, and occupying the situation of the womb during the latter months of gestation; two other tumours similar in texture, but not larger than a walnut, projected into the uterine cavity, covered only by its lining membrane. These tumours were formed in the substance of the walls of the uterus, which were expanded over the larger one for some distance unaltered in texture, but became gradually attenuated, so as not to be distinguished from the peritoneum, which likewise invested it. In structure these tumours very nearly resembled cow's udder, having all the characters of the mammary sarcoma of Abernethy. The ovaries were healthy, but the two layers of peritoneum forming their broad ligaments were separated by a small quantity of clear fluid.

Such, Sir, is the case, and such the *post-mortem* appearances, which seemed to demand that the treatment adopted should be submitted to a coroner's jury as one in which the patient had been labouring under intense inflammation of the mucous membrane of the stomach, without its having been detected by her medical attendant; but I would just hint, that had Philanthropist known a little more about the appearances frequently presented by that organ, it would have saved him and some other *literati* of Derby much uneasiness, to which their *anxious care for the welfare of the patients in the Derby Infirmary* has, no doubt, given rise.

To remove therefore the impression, that wherever a "crimson stomach" is found, acute inflammation of that viscus has necessarily been the cause of death, even where a succession of epileptic fits had occurred prior to the decease of the patient, I will briefly refer to one or two authors from whom it may be learned that this is not the first case in which the stomach has been found of a crimson tint, without such a state being indicated during life; but, first, I will say a few words upon the luminous report which has called for these remarks. As a specimen of the candour of this *gentleman*, it is only necessary to point out that the fits, the immediate cause of the woman's death, are not mentioned! In proof of his veracity, I would remark that the statement that the woman "was extremely sick for a day or two before her death, in short, that nothing would stay upon her

stomach," is false. She stated to me as the cause of her fits (and certainly with much probability) that she had eaten some barm-dumplings, which "lay very heavy upon her stomach," nor did she ever complain of the slightest pain or tendency on pressure being applied over the abdomen.

I now proceed to the questions propounded by this reporter for elucidation:—What caused the inflammation, and why were no remedies used to subdue it? The inflammation, or rather the suspicion of inflammation, arose in the ignorance of Philanthropist, and means were not used to combat it, because it had no other existence. In conclusion, for the benefit of Philanthropist in particular, and of the governors of our Infirmary in general, I will refer to authors from whom some remarks on this important subject may be extracted. In Boyer's *Traité d'Anatomie*, we find the following salutary caution:—"Le grand nombre de vaisseaux qui se distribuent dans cette tunique (la veloutée) lui donne souvent une couleur pourpré obscur; c'est à quoi il faut faire la plus grande attention lorsqu'on est chargé de faire l'examen des corps de personnes que l'on soupçonne mortes de poison."

In the "Medico-Chirurgical Transactions," vol. iv, we find recorded twenty successive *post-obit* examinations of patients dying in the London Hospital between the 1st of April, 1813, and the 27th of May in the same year, in which the mucous membranes of the stomachs were found in all states of vascularity, from the rosy tint (given by Bichat and Cloquet as the most natural appearance) to shades of scarlet and even crimson, without such a state being at all indicated by symptoms during life; in this valuable paper, written by Dr. Yelloly, the result of that gentleman's observations is stated as follows:—"In the villous coat of the stomach, appearances of vascular fulness, whether florid or dark-coloured, in distinct vessels, or in extravasation of various sizes, are not to be regarded as unequivocal marks of disease; they occur in every variety of degree and character, under every circumstance of previous indisposition, and in situations where the most healthy aspect of the organ might be fairly expected. It would be useless to multiply authorities. I refer to the book last quoted for full information on the point under consideration, and merely hint that the "crimson stomach" is not "put under the sod" as Philanthropist asserts, but still remains a monument of his ignorance, better worthy of being concealed by silence, than of standing emblazoned on the pages of your extensively circulated Journal.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

T. R. JONES.

Derby, Oct. 5, 1830.

MR. WALFORD AND THE PUPILS OF THE  
LONDON HOSPITAL.

"There's never any of these demure boys come to any proof: for thin drink, and making many fish meals, doth so cool their blood, that they fall into a kind of male green-sickness; and then, when they marry, they get wenches: they are generally fools and cowards."—SHAKESPEARE.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—I was advised to forbear acknowledging the favour of the Whitechapel manifesto, on the grounds of the insignificance of the declarants, and the helplessness of their idol. "What must the priests be where the god is a monkey?" was the traveller's reply to a question after the tytle legion of a Pagan people. I should certainly adopt the advice, were it not for some peculiarities in a letter from the innocents of Whitechapel.

In the letter which provoked the wrath of the "harmless little men," I made honourable mention of Sir W. Blizard; him did I blaspheme, as well as vituperate Mr. Headington: why, therefore, did they not defend the knight as well as the squire? I can solve the problem. Of the *eight-and-thirty*, who have so handsomely done Mr. Headington's business, and set him up with a character, a few will present themselves for examination during the presidency of the object of their lick-spittle adulation; and, should some trembling idiot break down, does he not hope that the remembrance of his servility will stand him in good stead? Of course he does.

I perfectly agree with the *thirty-and-eight*, that no man has a right to defame the character of another, because he differs in opinion; and I ask these discerning youths, if there is no difference between the record of a fact and a defamatory falsehood? They feel a pride in being under such a master; of course they do, and doubtless the master is proud of such pupils; the pleasure is reciprocal, and the pupils are worthy of their preceptor. They say they flatter themselves that Mr. Headington's differing in opinion from me is the sole cause of my hostility to him. In this they do *flatter* themselves, and that is all. I pronounced Mr. Headington's degradation, not because his opinions were opposed to mine, but that his principles are. Mr. Headington has long been a member of a body whose acts have ever been opposed to the best interests of the profession and humanity; whose laws are the dictates of a sordid love of gain; and whose gains are the fruits of the most unprincipled rapacity.

The *thirty-eight* weep over my hostility to Sir William Blizard, and content them-