

was applied to them. It became, to a very pleasing extent, successful in cases which had previously been utterly intractable; yet the iodine seemed to exert a somewhat capricious power. It would have influence to a certain extent, and then, all at once, it would appear to be perfectly inert; and in more cases than one, instead of reducing the morbid growth on account of which it was administered, it would, as in the human being, waste the general condition and strength of the patient. It was an admirable improvement when the *hydriodate of potash* was substituted for the mineral. It will be found to succeed where the other seemed to be destitute altogether of power; it will not deceive the hope which it has once encouraged; and, so far as we have had opportunity of testing its agency, there is (common care being taken) no evil mingling with the good which it effects.—*Veterinarian*, Nov.

RESOURCES OF NATURE.—A paper of M. Gasparin in the *Rec. de Méd. Vet.* for June, containing a case of necrosis, in which the os pedis (commonly called the coffin bone) was removed in a mule, establishes the fact, otherwise almost incredible, that a labouring quadruped may continue to be useful to a very considerable extent, after the bone of the foot has been completely destroyed by disease, and that nature is able to supply even a second or supposititious os pedis. The mule went to coach work, and was serviceable for two years. The reporter was not able, by dissection, to prove what new production or stump had grown from the smaller pastern.

#### DR. ASHWELL'S REPLY TO DR. BLUNDELL'S SECOND LETTER.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

Sir,—In my reply to Doctor Blundell's first letter, I made certain statements. These my predecessor has unequivocally contradicted, and fourteen times has he repeated, "that they are not true." My silence under such imputations might be mistaken for a consciousness, perhaps for an admission, of guilt. I must therefore verify my own assertions, and this verification shall rest on the best of all testimony; that of the Doctor's own letters. In addition, I shall only claim the attention of the medical public, and space in your journal, for two or three comments on the "fourteen heads" of my predecessor.

My *first* statement was, "that in 1829-30, I was requested by Doctor Blundell to give clinical instructions to his pupils." This is admitted, if it were not, my name on the printed papers of his charity would establish the fact. I did not say, that I gave clinical lectures, but I expressly used the term "clinical instructions" to characterize my precise employment. I will not stop to show how much I did and how long I acted in this capacity: the Doctor has attempted to prove how little I accomplished, and with such efforts I am quite satisfied. In connexion with this fact, it is said, "that I was disqualified for the important duty assigned to my friend Mr. Doubleday, because I was engaged in giving assistance to the rival class of Messrs. Grainger and Pilcher in Webb Street."

How true, or, rather "how untrue" is this statement of the former obstetric lecturer at Guy's, the subjoined letter will best show:—

"Saturday Morning,

"Nov. 1st, Union-street, Borough, 1834.

"My dear Ashwell,—I perfectly well recollect the conversation I had with you relative to the midwifery chair at Webb-street, when the late Doctor Hopkins was incapacitated to continue his duties; and that in consequence of your connexion with Guy's Hospital, you declined to enter into any arrangements with us. I can also positively state, that you never did assist, nor had an opportunity of assisting, the obstetric class of our school.

"I am, my dear Sir, yours truly,

"GEORGE PILCHER."

My *second* statement was, "that when the extension and improvement in the obstetric department at Guy's occurred, my predecessor wrote to me, and requested me to officiate as his obstetric assistant." In his second letter, this is denied. The proofs I now subjoin:—

"1, Great George-street, Westminster,

"Wednesday Morning, Aug. 31st, 1831.

"My dear Sir,—Will you inform me, per bearer, whether you can give me a call this morning at one p.m., as I *wish* to communicate with you on a subject in which you take an interest.

"I am, my dear Sir, yours faithfully,

"JAMES BLUNDELL."

The interview took place, and the result I furnish to my readers, in the "fac simile" of a paper now in my predecessor's possession; the terms of which were dictated by himself:—

"Lime-Street Square,

"August 31st, 1831.

"My dear Sir,—The impression on my mind from our conversation this morning,

relative to Guy's Hospital, leads to the following conclusions ;—

"1st. 'That my being admitted to perform certain of the duties attached to the clinical obstetric instruction gives me no claim to the midwifery chair, so long as you choose to occupy it.'

"2ndly. 'That I am to be recognised as your assistant in the above department, you of course taking the lead.'

"These matters, my dear Sir, are the formal basis of the arrangement, and allow me to assure you, that not only in the letter, but in the spirit, of them I fully concur. I am, my dear Sir, yours faithfully,

"SAMUEL ASHWELL.

"To Dr. Blundell."

Any one may now understand how true, or rather, how "untrue," is my predecessor's assertion, that *he* did not request, but merely *acquiesced* in my becoming his obstetric assistant. Such acquiescence, to say the least, was not passive, but discriminating and vigilant, and proves how sensitive he was to his own interests.

My *third* statement was, "that it was not till 1831, after the conclusion of the above arrangement, that I had the pleasure of being personally known to the treasurer." This gentleman's first conversation with me had reference to this very arrangement, he being naturally desirous to know the individual on whom, in Dr. Blundell's absence or illness, the important duties connected with the hospital were to devolve.

My *fourth* statement was, "that I gave the clinical lectures for two or three seasons." This is denied. Here is the proof;—My first clinical lecture was delivered in the medical theatre of the hospital, at the latter end of the session 1832-33. I continued to lecture clinically in the same theatre during the summer of 1833, the winter session of 1833, 34, and during the present summer. Since 1831, when the clinical obstetric teaching commenced, my predecessor may have given *eight* or *ten* such lectures, I have delivered at least *seventy*. In April, 1833, his health, as will be seen hereafter, failed, and the charge of the obstetric ward devolved entirely on myself. The clinical lecturing was involved in the duties of the ward, and I therefore performed it. Perhaps, however, my predecessor will remember, that late in the summer of 1833, his nephew, engaged I believe in the law, called on me at my residence, and by his uncle's desire, who was still in weak health, *requested* that I would not only continue in charge of the ward, but that

I would also continue to lecture clinically.

This exposition of facts will suffice to neutralize the Doctor's unguarded and incorrect condemnation of my fourth assertion, "that it is not true."

My *fifth* statement was, "that I saw and treated *nearly* all the cases in the female ward, that I had the entire charge of the Hospital Lying-in Charity, and of the obstetric out-patients. Dr. Blundell himself, notwithstanding his denial, shall furnish the proofs of the first part of this proposition, the only part he really attempts to contradict.

The *obstetric* ward opened about September 1831. My predecessor commenced his attendance in November, and continued it till May 1832, a period of *six* months. I then received from him the following note :—

"Dear Sir,—As I am going to the continent for four or five weeks, I beg to commit to your care during my absence, clinical patients in Mary's ward; and I am, dear Sir, yours faithfully,

"JAMES BLUNDELL.

"1, Great George-street,  
May 31st, 1832."

In November or December 1832, my predecessor again took charge of the ward, and resigned it to me in April 1833, having continued to perform its duties for another period of six months. On this occasion, he forwarded to me the subjoined communication :—

"Great George-street,  
April 13th, 1833.

"Dear Sir,—As I am at present confined to the house by indisposition, I will thank you to take under your care the obstetric patients in the clinical ward, till further notice. I am, dear Sir, your obedient servant,

"JAMES BLUNDELL."

Since the 13th April, 1833 up to the present time, Dr. Blundell has not once entered the ward; so that during the thirty-eight months it has been open for the reception of patients, my predecessor has been in attendance twelve, and I twenty-six, months.

What now must be thought of his "startling assertion," that "with a few occasional interruptions, these wards were regularly attended by himself, and not at his solicitation by Dr. Ashwell." Surely I may say, and *most unwillingly* do I adopt my predecessor's uncourteous phraseology, that these declarations are "utterly untrue."

Such were the assertions which Dr. Blundell, by an excess of ingenuity, has

contrived fourteen times "untruly" to gainsay and deny. After the proofs I have adduced, I am quite willing to abide the verdict of the professional public, as to their veracity.

I shall now proceed to make two or three comments on some other parts of this lengthy epistle, feeling that it would be unjust to myself, and uncourteous to the former obstetric lecturer, if I passed them by entirely unnoticed.

Dr. Blundell attempts to establish a distinction between the *clinical* and *midwifery* chairs. The former he allows to be *hospital* property, the latter, he says, is *private* property—a proposition utterly untenable,—the hospital, through its treasurer, having as decided a control over the one as over the other chair; *and such was formerly Dr. Blundell's own opinion*. In the draft of a paper of those "inchoate arrangements," which occurred in 1825, furnished to me by his own solicitor, there occurs the following passage: "It is hereby declared and agreed, that the introduction of the said Samuel Ashwell into the chair of the said lectureship, and the acceptance of him as such associate, assistant, or successor, by the *treasurer* of the said hospital, is intended to be, and shall be taken as a condition precedent to all others," &c. &c. &c. If this arrangement could not be effected without the permission of the treasurer (who might have been hostile), what becomes of any question as to "private property" in such a chair or lectureship?

Dr. Blundell has throughout this controversy assumed an elevation of tone and station to which, as yet, he has not established a satisfactory claim. That it is right to aim high, all will allow, but when my predecessor voluntarily steps forth, as the disinterested and suffering advocate of the class to which he belongs, he ought to be nearly if not quite certain, that he has not overrated his qualifications for such high duties. I am not sure, but I desire to express my opinion with diffidence, that the former obstetric lecturer of Guy's Hospital has mistaken his love of money for the love of a high-spirited independence.

As I am quite certain, and the facts are well known, that for a pecuniary consideration asked for him by his friend, he would, nay, he must, had it been given, have sacrificed the magnanimous sentiments contained in these two epistles. *Hinc illæ lachrymæ*. Dr. Blundell has amused himself at my supposed mistake in the Latin line, an error arising from the misquotation of his own letter, the sense, more than the measure of the verse, occupying my mind. I may, perhaps, be al-

lowed to say, that, unlike my predecessor, I dislike quotations of this kind; there is something like pedantry about them, and the fulness and power of our own tongue, when well understood, disdain such illustrations. It is no small satisfaction to me to know, that notwithstanding the high language of my predecessor, the reputation of the Guy's obstetric school has in no way diminished; on the contrary, the numbers and close attention of the class equal, if they do not exceed, those of former years. These letters are not calculated to augment, scarcely to sustain, Dr. Blundell's former reputation. I have, therefore, answered them with regret and great reluctance, and I trust that my predecessor's friends will not advise him again to engage in so unprofitable a controversy.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

SAMUEL ASHWELL.

13, Devonshire Square, Bishopsgate Street, Nov. 4th, 1834.

## HOTEL DIEU.

CANCEROUS TUMOUR OF THE SUPERIOR MAXILLARY SINUS — AMPUTATION OF THE SUPERIOR MAXILLARY BONE IN TOTALITY—EMPLOYMENT OF THE NEW ROWEL-SAW.

(Reported by our Paris Correspondent.)

ON Wednesday, the 22nd of October, M. ROBERT performed amputation of the superior maxillary bone, at the above Hospital, in the service of M. Breschet.

The patient, a man 51 years of age, of general good health, and rather robust appearance, is a sawyer of wood by trade, and therefore exposed to the air, subject to accidents, &c.; he says he has frequently received blows from pieces of wood about the head and face, but he does not remember having been injured immediately previous to the development of his present disease. About four months ago he was affected with general pains in the joints and extremities, resembling rheumatism, for which he was treated and soon cured. About two months ago he was first seized with a dull pain, which gradually became acute, in the side of the head and under the orbit; this soon extended to the forehead, side of the nose, and root of the jaw; it assumed the character of chronic neuralgia, and the pain was particularly seated in the course of the divisions of the fifth nerve. There was no appearance of inflammation, no heat of the parts, redness over the seat of the pain, or swelling of the cheek.