

MAN-MIDWIFERY,

AND

THE RESULTS;

WITH

A LETTER ADDRESSED BY THE LATE SIR ANTHONY CARLISLE
TO THE LATE SIR ROBERT PEEL, THROUGH THE
LEADING JOURNAL OF ENGLAND,

AND

NUMEROUS OPINIONS, AND VALUABLE SUGGESTIONS IN
MIDWIFERY, BY EMINENT PRACTITIONERS.

WITH THE NAMES AND ADDRESSES OF

FORTY-FIVE LONDON MIDWIVES.

BY W. TALLEY, SOLICITOR.

NEW EDITION.

"Midwifery is no branch of the Medical Art."—*Vide* DAVIDSON'S New Medical Act, 1858.

"That the profession is silent on these abuses is, in my opinion, to be deplored. Such silence may arise from the fear that the denunciation of them would tend to lower it in the estimation of the public more than the continuance of the abuses themselves. Yielding to none in the desire to uphold the dignity of my order, I must say that I share in no such apprehensions. The public, in return for the confidence they repose in us, have a right to such protection, and if they find that it has been withheld, that in a mistaken solicitude for our own interests we have neglected theirs, they will bind us all up in one common with together, and the diploma, though it may still indicate the man of science, will cease to insure us the position of gentlemen."—*The Speculum: its Moral Tendencies*, by a Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons. Bosworth and Harrison.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR, BY

TAYLOR AND GREENING, GRAYSTOKE-PLACE,

FETTER LANE, E.C.

PREFACE TO THIS EDITION.

"Nemo mortalium omnibus horis sapit."

NOTWITHSTANDING the howl and scowl of interested individuals, and the futile arguments advanced by the effeminate practice of "Ladies' Doctors," the rapidity of the demand for my first edition affords me infinite pleasure in contributing another impression of my collection of evidence on the subject of the laws of human nature. Many quotations will be found, printed in red ink, in order to distinguish a certain class of the medical profession. I have no hesitation in stating my humble opinion that the cruel practice, suggested by the authors, of interrupting the course of natural labour, is a criminal offence, according to the existing laws of mankind, and that in the event of such heinous conduct being brought home to them, it would be beyond the eloquence of the most distinguished advocate to relieve them from the dire penalties of the bar.

That educated men should attempt to impose on the credulity of an undefended woman in her hour of travail, may appear to the unwary as incredulous, but when the "famous doctors" proclaim their numerous editions, it behoves the Government of boasted Britain to regulate the "professional" practice assumed by their proffered advice, which tends to tear away by force, with feelings most revolting, the innocent babe (whose birth

would have been easy in their absence) and destroy its unsuspecting mother.

In anticipation of the happy day when modest, unassuming, and deeply scientific women may attain honourable distinction as physicians, for the suppression of barbarity, I have ventured to add my feeble efforts in aid of a Medical Establishment for Gentlewomen, which may produce comfort in affliction, and be a protection against insult, and enable the Medical Profession to sustain their dignity and reputation.

Little Hall Barn, Beaconsfield,

1st August, 1864.

P R E F A C E.

“ He beheld the City and wept over it.”—Luke xix. 41.

FOR the protection of the brightest ornament of society, and the uninterrupted happiness of my fellow-countrymen, the following pages are respectfully submitted to the public, in the hope of suppressing the most dangerous and pernicious practice of *man-midwifery*.

The fearful prevalence of the great Social Evil—not only in our large towns, but throughout the rural districts of this highly-favoured land—is clearly attributable to this degrading practice, which, (for the amelioration of all classes of society,) it is expedient to expose. Any custom tending to foster that evil is deserving the utmost serious attention. It is the duty of every lover of his country and race to enter a solemn protest against acts that lead to unlimited power in any family, and hence temptations to crime. When those acts grow into a practice, and are encouraged by the *fashionable* classes of society, and supported by all the influence of a certain branch of the medical profession, it may take some years to wrest it from their unhallowed hands. According to the valuable opinions of physicians in the highest practice, and many eminent surgeons, the odious practice of man-midwifery stifles the operation, and materially retards delivery; and in the opinion of highly educated practitioners masculine aid, or even the presence of a man in such cases is a positive *affront to nature*. Although of recent origin, it has grown rapidly, and spread villany over the land.

That practitioners will meet with just retribution is certain, and a dispassionate view of the facts herein recorded will at least convince the impartial reader of the

necessity of a sifting enquiry. Acts of Parliament and repressive policy measures will be of little avail in putting down pollution, while some of its great resources are left untouched. You may teach that poor but beautiful orphan girl morality, but she needs bread, and her needle does not make enough to sustain her, though she plies it almost day and night. The labour market, in which she has to compete with others, is overstocked, and the introduction of machinery is gradually diminishing her gains. The poor mothers of our native land, with their daughters, are thus compelled to seek the miserable pittance obtained by menial occupations. All this because woman is shut out from much of the work for which her tact and talent, her sympathy and position, would fit her. Society has no mercy upon her. In the natural vocation of a midwife, she can supply, at least to her sex, more than the learned physician; but, unhappily for our country, *strong men* have supplanted her, and scarcely a choice is left to her in the sphere of honest, independent labour but menial occupation. Wonder not that she often scorns the opinion of the world, and takes her revenge. The procurer fattens upon her horrible trade, because we allow delicate sensitive woman to be elbowed out of her legitimate office by "*female medical men*," who would be better employed with her distaffs and spindles. "Lead us not into temptation" clergymen pray, and admonish others to pray; yet at the same time they thrust their wives and daughters, their medical attendants, and, so far as their example goes, the whole medical profession, and the superstitious portion of the community, right into temptation. From such flagrant inconsistency between preaching and practice, we should with all solemnity pray, "Good Lord, deliver us."

W. TALLEY.

1st June, 1863. www.history-of-obgyn.com Lincoln's-Inn-Fields.

THE OR MAN MIDWIFERY AND THE RESULTS :

Or Medical Men in the Criminal Courts.

ETC. ETC.

That Man-Midwifery leads to adultery and prostitution, is abundantly proved by the distressing cases which have recently been published in the *Times* Newspaper and other leading journals, which will be found in the following pages.

By Davidson's new Medical Act of 1858, it is quite clear, that midwifery is *no branch of the medical art*, and that the several colleges were opposed to such an effeminate practice by their members.

The following letter on the subject by the late Sir Anthony Carlisle is conclusive, and of the highest importance to the human race, inasmuch as he was *president* of the College of Surgeons, and was considered the best authority.

B

LETTER OF SIR A. CARLISLE,

Late President of the College of Surgeons,

TO THE LATE SIR ROBERT PEEL.

(FROM THE "TIMES" NEWSPAPER.)

SIR,—The high ministerial station which you deservedly occupy must often expose you to the various kinds of applications respecting the condition and management of our national institutions, and also to personal or partial interference about their several real or pretended interests. In all such instances you must perceive the fairness and the ultimate advantage of preferring direct information from the respective constituted authorities, of requiring advice from rival institutions upon doubtful measures, and of regarding with jealousy the private communications of interested individuals. It is, however, reported that you are, at this time, beset upon the subject of introducing an ordeal for licensing man-midwives, by certain members of the London College of Surgeons, and that you are urged by popular men (whose wisdom and disinterestedness may be questioned) to favour their scheme with your powerful influence.

As the prevalent vice of avarice may have some share in this professional movement, it is fit that you and the public should be acquainted with the probably concealed effects of granting the solicited privileges; and for the reasons already given, I am induced to address you through the press.

Man-midwifery has only been practised in England during the last hundred years, and it was introduced as a French fashion. From the beginning it has been strongly opposed on the score of its indecency, by many distinguished and scientific medical men,

and also, because the birth of mankind appears to them to be a purely natural process, so wisely ordered, that it very rarely demands any other aid than experienced mothers can safely give. Even so late as the illustrious mother of his present Majesty, that exemplary Queen was personally attended by good Mrs Draper, without difficulties or misadventures; whereas, the contrary result, under male management, in the fatal affair of the Princess Charlotte and her infant, will be long remembered.

If it should be asked why so many professional men addict themselves to a degrading vocation, it may be answered, that the practice of man-midwifery leads to *unlimited power* in every family, and thence to lucrative ends. Women, naturally timid, and ignorant of their own structure, are peculiarly exposed, during the most important office of their existence, to the persuasions or menaces of more knowing persons, and they are thence easily made to believe that the natural and wholesome delays and pains of child-bed are within the control of medical or surgical art,—an assumption which is too generally acted upon, and with unvarying evil consequences; because it is a *violation* of the *ways of nature*. Man-midwives have continually alleged that ignorant women practitioners commit many fatal mistakes, and now they present similar objections against unlicensed men. If, as I believe, the safeguards of child-bed are amply provided for by nature, and that not one instance in a thousand calls for any other help beyond what any moderately experienced woman can safely give, why are we to license adventurers, who may seek notoriety by desperate acts, often involving manslaughter—operative acts, the moral propriety of which is very doubtful, and the time and the methods for performing them, still subjects for rancorous disputes? But the present affair is not respecting the utility of man-midwives, but the impropriety of empowering any special corporate medical body to coerce the rest; to further impede female midwives in a becoming duty, and to deprive delicate women of that great resource of self-respect. Already the prevalence of man-midwifery has driven country surgeons and apothecaries to adopt this humiliating office, and the number of women practitioners has been thence so reduced, that paupers are in many places delivered by apprentice boys under 16 years of age. The Royal College of Physicians in London, who rank the highest for learning and for decorum, have lately *rescinded their admission of licentiates in midwifery*, whether for considering the practice as derogatory to a physician, or as an *overweening privilege* towards females and children, is not avowed; but it seems that no London physician educated at Oxford or Cambridge, has yet condescended to be a man-midwife. The Royal Colleges of Surgeons in London, in Dublin, and in Edinburgh, have likewise hitherto renounced every connection with man-midwifery.

The teachers of midwifery are indiscriminately doctors and surgeons, but at this moment the majority of lecturers and superintendents of lying-in charities are physicians, while a multitude of legally appointed sub-physicians (styled apothecaries) are

equally entitled, with the other classes of the faculty, to establish tribunals for examining and licensing candidates for man-midwifery, if they should deem it expedient. Finally, it may be noted, that the different classes of man-midwives have never yet agreed among themselves to adopt a common ordeal for certifying the qualifications of their calling; and you may be assured, Sir, that many worldly interests will rage against the establishment of any monopoly of this kind in any single institution, because *man-midwifery* is the covert way to *medical fortunes*. If, however, the greediness of a few individuals should expose this subject to free discussion, and the judgment of married men and modest women should be copiously awakened, perhaps the general custom of employing women may be again resorted to, *and their competent instruction publicly enforced*.

It is said that our changeable neighbours at Paris are already tired of their fashionable freak, and when our countrywomen reflect that not one in ten thousand of their sex throughout the globe allow of the presence of a man during the rites of child-bed, they may acquire courage, and unite their efforts to re-place the routine of midwifery among themselves. I will not offend you and the public by any observations upon the outrageous stories collected on this occasion to *prove the violent and fatal injuries committed by unlicensed man-midwives*, because I think the privilege sought for would increase those evils.

With the greatest respect, I have the honour to be,

Your very obedient servant,

ANTHONY CARLISLE,

Langham-place, Feb. 19.

The following circular containing the opinions of eminent medical men, and others, have also been published at the expense of the advertiser, being of the utmost importance to all classes of society.

HINTS TO HUSBANDS;

AND

GOOD NEWS FOR THE WOMEN.

“ Sit you down,
And let me wring your heart, for so I shall,
If it be made of penetrable stuff;
If damned custom have not brazed it so,
That it be proof and bulwark against sense.”

Dr. McNair, a physician of forty years' practice, says—“ All that is proper to be done in a case of natural labour, (that is, a labour which terminates in twenty-four hours after it has set in, *without artificial assistance*), from its commencement to its termination, will suggest itself to any person of common understanding, and I have long laboured under the conviction that the office of attending women in their confinement should be entrusted to prudent females. There is not, according to my experience, and the reports of many of the most eminent surgeons, more than one case in three thousand that requires uncommon assistance. I am aware, however, that there are crafty physicians who attempt, and often succeed, in making the distressed female believe that it would be altogether impossible to get over her troubles without his assistance.”

“ It is my firm opinion,” says the late Sir Anthony Carlisle,

"that the practice of man-midwifery compromises the character and morality of our country. It is *demoralising* to society, an *insult* to virtuous women, and a *foolscap* to men. If not checked and abolished, the pretensions to female modesty, and a respect for the decorums of society, will eventually be altogether excluded from the female character."—SIR ANTHONY CARLISLE, *late President of the Royal College of Surgeons.*

"What can be more inconsistent with the tender nature of women, or more terrible to them, than to see men come armed against themselves and their tender infants with knives, hooks, iron-forceps, &c.? For my part I am positive that, let who will use instruments, they kill more infants than they save, and ruin many more women than they deliver fairly. I know some practitioners who are too well acquainted with instruments to lay them aside. No, they do not think themselves in their duty or proper office, if they have not their cruel accoutrements at hand; and, what is most unaccountable, and unbecoming a Christian, is, that when they have perhaps wounded the mother, killed the infant, and with violent torture drawn it out piece-meal, they think no reward sufficient for such a piece of manglework."—D. MAUBRAY.

"I view the present practice of calling on men, in ordinary births, as a source of serious evils to child-bearing, as an imposition upon the credulity of women, and upon the fears of their husbands, as a means of *sacrificing delicacy*, and consequently *virtue*."—THOMAS EWELL, M.D.

"No man should ever be *permitted* to enter the chamber of a woman in labour, except in consultations and on extraordinary occasions. The practice is unnecessary, unnatural, and wrong; it has an immoral tendency."—W. BEACH, M.D. New York.

"In the submission of women to the unnecessary examination of physicians, exposing the secrets of nature, it is forgotten that every indecency of this kind is a violent attack against chastity; that every situation which produces an internal blush is a real prostitution."—COUNT BUFFON, *the celebrated writer on Natural History.*

"As matters stand at present, it is easier to cheat a woman out of her life than out of a shilling, and almost impossible to detect or punish the offender. Notwithstanding this, people still shut their eyes, and take everything upon trust that is done by any pretender to midwifery, without daring to ask him a reason for any part of his conduct."—DR. BUCHAN.

"Wild beasts are caged; but worse than these, the accoucheur, meddlesome and violent, has been let loose upon society."—DR. CURTIS'S "OBSTETRICS."

"I have ever believed that there would be a time when this sinful practice should be exposed and extirpated from the earth; and now, blessed be God, light begins to dawn upon the subject. Success to the enterprise."—REV. WM. MILTIMORE, New Hampshire.

"Medicine and Midwifery are both domestic arts; woman is all but born a doctor. Ladies of England, think of this! Hitherto you have left the field of 'labour' to men, who would be better employed with your distaffs and spindles. Mothers of England, you have a mission—fulfil it; proclaim to your daughters that the birth of a child is not a surgical operation, but a natural process, and that there is no case of parturition so difficult that it may not be better managed by a well-instructed woman than by a man, whose very presence in the sick chamber disturbs the uterine action, and causes the greater number of difficulties that occur in such cases. Whatever objections the apothecaries throughout the country may now find it their interest to adduce against the practice, this fact is at least certain, that all throughout the West, during the days of the Cæsars, and for many centuries after, women were the only attendants of parturient women. Then, as far as regards the East, who, let me ask, looked on at the birth of the Twelve Apostles? An oriental mother, even at the present time, would sooner die than seek the assistance of a man in her hour of travail."—DR. DICKSON.

"Men of England, are you not ashamed of yourself? You permit males to assist your women on occasions when the *very sight of a man actually adds to the difficulty of their position*. The labour pains, in most cases, cease at the approach of the doctor. What right has a man in that room? The birth of a child is not a surgical operation, it is a natural process, too often made a death-scene by the *meddlesome man-midwife*. There is not, in any labour case, a conceivable difficulty which a competently instructed female might not meet with as good a result as the doctor."—IBID.

"I hesitate not to say that hundreds of women perish in childbed from the employment of males, all of whom would have been saved if females had officiated. I would say to women everywhere that they owe it to the modesty of their sex, to the principle of good morals, to their own lives, to the lives of their children, and the good of mankind, to set their faces against the present destructive, disgraceful, and unrighteous practice of employing in ordinary cases, males instead of females as midwives. No virtuous man—jealous of the honour and dignity of his wife, as an affectionate, virtuous husband, no man or woman of chaste moral principle, will think our language too strong, who are aware that women are more susceptible to temptation during

pregnancy than at any other time—and who will examine the plates and remarks made under the head of “Touching,” in the large work on Obstetrics, and who will observe the shameless positions in which men are presented in contact with women! Oh, loathsome abomination! If such plates are necessary, why not introduce *women* instead of *men*!—*Vide Beach’s “Midwifery,”* page 17.

REPORT of the Royal Maternity Charity for 1856:—

Births (attended by Midwives,)—3297

Women died 2

Medical works by eminent practitioners on the above subject (proving the deceit and brutality of the “crafty physician,” or “unlicensed man-midwife”), may be had on receipt of eighteen postage stamps.

WILLIAM TALLEY, Solicitor,

Lincoln’s Inn Fields, London.

N.B.—“Midwifery is no branch of the medical art.” Any *woman* may practise it, but *men* require a licence. They will be expected to wear a night-cap, *cut off* their *whiskers*, and be capable of washing a baby, if required. *Moustachios* are not recognised.—*Vide New Medical Act, 1858.*

[Except a man be a licentiate in midwifery, and registered as such, he cannot legally recover any fee for the attendance.—W. T.]

EXTRACT

FROM A PRIVATE LETTER RECEIVED FROM A CLERGYMAN.

November, 1856.

“My Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge, with many thanks, your kind present of Dr. Stevens’s work. My mind is more made up than ever, as to the shameful impropriety of employing men-midwives (when so many excellent and competent females are to be had), since the birth of my first child in July, when my wife was so skilfully brought through her labour by Mrs. Denman, one of the Royal Maternity midwives.

“It would amuse you, could I tell you all the artifices employed by the Medical profession in the neighbourhood (near London) where she was confined, to intimidate me; and failing in this, other members of my family, stating that I was all but guilty of manslaughter should I carry out my intention of entrusting my wife’s life to an “ignorant midwife.”

“How far they were right the sequel proved,” &c.

It really appears astonishing that such a delusive and degrading practice should have been tolerated for

nearly a century. The excellent work on Man-midwifery by the late Dr. Stevens (the author of "Medical Reform"), affords most conclusive evidence of the danger and iniquity of the practice. The following address is copied from this valuable work, viz. :—

"To the President, Benevolent Ladies, and Reverend Gentlemen of the Society for the Suppression of Vice.

"From time to time I have seen in the public prints, accounts of your laudable intentions and endeavours to suppress dens of iniquity, bad houses, and snares for the seduction of young and unprotected females.

"Judging of the nature of your institution by these endeavours on the side of virtue, I conceive it to be particularly agreeable to you that a work such as this has been issued from the press, exposing, with the view of suppressing, a deep, silent, secret source of adultery and cruelty—a silent, secret piece of well-dressed vice, fawning to the heart's best affections, like the reptile in the garden of Eden—a thing which entwines around and fascinates, the more surely to drive home the sting of dishonour, and *destroy its unsuspecting victim*—a work, seconding your good efforts, is appropriately addressed to you, by

"Your humble and obedient servant,

"J. STEVENS, M.D."

The following cases will give some idea of the class of men who practise midwifery:

STONE v. STONE AND APPLETON.

Court of Probate and Divorce.

(Before SIR C. CRESSWELL and a Special Jury.)

March 25.

This was a petition by the husband for a dissolution of marriage on the ground of the wife's adultery with the co-respondent. The respondent denied the adultery, and the co-respondent did not appear.

The Queen's Advocate (Sir R. Phillimore) and Mr Lopes were counsel for the petitioner; and Mr Karslake, Q.C., Dr. Spinks, and Mr Searle for the respondent.

The petitioner is Captain Thomas Howard Elphinstone Stone, formerly of the Indian service, now quartermaster of the Devon Militia, and residing at Exeter. The co-respondent is Mr Robert Appleton, a surgeon, lately residing at Budleigh Salterton, in Devonshire. It appeared that Captain Stone was married to the respondent, whose maiden name was Clack, at Morton Hampstead, Devonshire, on the 22nd of March, 1854. Shortly afterwards the petitioner, in company with his wife, joined his regiment in India, where they remained during the mutiny. In 1858 he obtained leave to visit England on account of his ill-health, and he and his wife on their return first resided at Morton, but shortly afterwards went to Budleigh Salterton. In August, 1859, Captain Stone returned to India, leaving his wife at Budleigh, where her friends resided. At this time they had three children, but a fourth child was born in the following November. Captain Stone again returned to England in May,

1861. During his absence Mrs Stone, having been in ill-health, was attended by the co-respondent, and it was alleged that he had abused his professional opportunities by seducing her. In November or December, 1861, Captain Stone charged his wife with unfaithfulness to him, and about Christmas she was removed to lodgings at Exeter, where, on the 2nd of January, 1862, she gave birth to a child. There was a claim of £5,000 for damages.

The evidence of Susan Harris, taken by a commission at Brighton, was read. She said she was in the respondent's service after September, 1860, and that Mr Appleton was often locked up with her mistress alone. She was on very familiar terms with the servants, and used to come into the kitchen, take up her clothes, and dance and sing before them. Witness observed suspicious appearances about the respondent's bed before the petitioner's return. She also asked then what would produce abortion, for she was afraid that Mr Appleton had put her into a swoon, and taken advantage of her. Witness at first would not tell her, but subsequently mentioned a drug, which Mrs Stone afterwards regularly took.

On cross-examination the witness said that she had been in a reformatory, and with good reason. At the time her evidence was taken she was in daily expectation of being confined of an illegitimate child.

The Rev W. Courter Clack, curate of Morton, of which his father was rector, had solemnised the marriage between the parties. The respondent was his sister, and he had also married the petitioner's sister. On the return of the parties from India they first resided at Morton; but after a little time they went to Budleigh Salterton, which was about twelve miles from Exeter. At that time they had three children. Captain Stone went back to India in the month of August, 1859, and a fourth child was born in the following November. In December, 1861, witness went to Budleigh Salterton, and saw Mrs Stone. Said to her, "Dear Matty, are you aware that Howard has been up to me and made a charge against you of being in the family-way by Mr Appleton?" She said it was a cruel and wicked accusation. Told her that he would go and see Mr Appleton; and she said "Do." Went to Mr Appleton, and asked him if he knew of the serious charge which Captain Stone had made against him? He said that he had not been aware of it till the Saturday night previous, when he received a letter from Captain Stone, which he read to witness. [It was put in.] Mr Appleton said he solemnly denied the charge, and that he would make Captain Stone prove his words. Told him that it was a serious charge, and hoped he would clear himself. Communicated what had

passed to Mrs Stone. She said, "I knew that, William. I knew that he would deny it solemnly, for it is a cruel thing, as I told you before." About Christmas Mrs Stone was removed to lodgings at Exeter, where she was confined on the 2nd of January.

Cross-examined: Very shortly before the conversation which witness had had with the respondent she had been staying with one of the children at the rectory. The case for the petitioner had not concluded when the Court rose.

(March 26.)

This case, which is a petition by the husband for a dissolution of marriage, on the ground of the wife's adultery with the co-respondent, was resumed to-day.

The Queen's Advocate (Sir Robert Phillimore) and Mr. Lopes appeared for the petitioner; and Mr. Karlake, Q.C., Dr. Spinks, and Mr. Searle for the respondent.

Christopher Northcote was the first witness examined this morning. He said that he lets lodgings at Exeter, but that he had studied medicine and surgery two years in an infirmary ten years ago. Mrs. Stone, when she left her residence at Budleigh Salterton, in December, 1861, came to lodge at his house, where she gave birth to a child on the 2nd of January, 1862. No doctor was present at the time; but Mr. Webb, a surgeon of Exeter, was called in on the following day. He (witness) from his experience in the infirmary, said he considered the child was a full-grown one at its birth.

In cross-examination, he said that he had seen six cases of midwifery in his experience. He considered nine months the average period of gestation; but it was so long since he had studied the subject he could not speak with any confidence about it.

John Casey said he was a cabinetmaker at Budleigh, and remembered Appleton leaving there in April, 1861. [This witness was called to produce the account-books of Appleton; but, after argument, they were held to be not admissible as evidence against the respondent.]

Wightwick Roberts, a magistrate of the county of Cornwall, said that he was an old friend of Stone's family, and was also acquainted with the family of Mrs Stone. He was present at Mr Bishop's, the solicitor to Mrs Stone, at an interview with her brothers-in-law, Mr Bragg and Mr Stevenson, when it was arranged that Mrs Stone should go into lodgings at Exeter. He (representing Captain Stone) advised the father and aunt of Stone to allow Sarah Harris, who is now confined with an illegitimate child, and whose evidence was read yesterday, 5s per week, on con-

dition she should live with her mother. This was the last witness for the petitioner.

Mr Karlake, Q.C., then opened the respondent's case in a speech of four hours' length. He urged upon the jury that the fact of the non-appearance of Appleton, the co-respondent, ought not to have been pressed by the counsel for the petitioner against the respondent. It could only excite prejudice against Mrs Stone. If it could have been shown that she was a party to the absconding of Appleton the case would have been different; but the fact was she entirely disapproved of it. The petitioner's own witnesses have proved that when she first heard of his having gone away clandestinely, she exclaimed, "What a bad man he must be to leave his wife and children;" and that she herself was frightened to think how much she had been in his power. He called the jury's attention to the position of Appleton with respect to this trial. It had been said that Appleton, by his non-appearance, admitted his guilt; but this admission was only technical. It was possible that Appleton did not even know of the petition. Advertisements had been put into the papers, but they might not have been seen by him, as he was no doubt abroad. The learned counsel trusted the jury would bear this in mind, to get rid of the prejudice that had been imported into the case. He then commented upon the evidence of the petitioner's witnesses, and gave an outline of the respondent's case, which will of course be best seen by the evidence to be adduced in support of it.

Mr Lopes then called

Susan Marks, who on examination said she entered the service of Captain and Mrs Stone on the 25th October, 1859, as nurse maid. Mrs Stone had three children at that time, but was confined of a fourth in November, when Mr Appleton attended her. During February, 1861, Mrs Stone was very ill, and Mr Appleton attended her again for a few days constantly. He attended her occasionally till she went away to Taunton, on the 9th of April, from which place she returned about the 19th or 20th. Witness attended upon her while she was ill in bed. She had a swelling in her leg, and it had to be bandaged by the doctor, and witness was in and out of the room when it was being done. Mrs Stone was never well even at the best of times. She was frequently sick, and threw up blood. Mr Appleton's visits to Mrs Stone were about ten minutes or a quarter of an hour long. Witness was constantly in the habit of attending upon Mrs Stone. (The remainder of the witness's evidence was in contradiction of the examination of Sarah Harris.) She never saw Mrs Stone come into the kitchen, pull up her clothes and dance and sing. Mrs Stone never said in her

(witness's) presence that ladies in India took something to get rid of their children, nor that Mr Appleton had put her into a swoon. She remembered Mrs Stone feeling faint one morning after taking her medicine, which was too strong, and Mr Appleton came about eleven o'clock, and ordered her brandy-and-water. He remained about a quarter of an hour. Witness said she never, with Harris, marked the time by the clock of Mr Appleton's visits. His usual time of coming was eleven o'clock. He ordered Mrs Stone to Taunton in April for change of air. In May or June she went to her father's, at Morton Hampstead. Witness said she left in October because Captain Stone wanted to put more work on her. He wanted her to do all the housework. When Captain Stone came back from London in June, he said Mrs Stone was getting stout.

In cross-examination, she said she did not time Mr Appleton's visits. She considered them about ten minutes or a quarter of an hour long. She did not remember his coming in January. She went out with the children in the morning and afternoon, and when she made the beds they were either with her or down stairs with Mrs Stone. Mr Appleton might have called in her absence. Mr Stevenson came to her twice, and Mr Bishop, the solicitor, spoke to her about the case in Mr Stevenson's presence, about the second week of January, 1862, at Mrs Stones's lodgings. Nobody said anything about Mr Appleton. She remembered Mr Baker coming to her at Sidmouth but did not tell him that her mistress was in a faint in her bed-room when Mr Appleton was there, and that he had ordered brandy and water. She did tell Mr Baker that her mistress's medicine was nauseous, and had a smell of chloroform; but she did not tell him that Mrs Stone had been in a swoon. She told him she would do all she could for her.

At the conclusion of the evidence of the witnesses the case was again adjourned.

March 27th.

This case was resumed to day. The Queen's Advocate (Sir R. Phillimore) and Mr Lopes appeared for the petitioner; and Mr Karslake, Q.C., Dr Spinks, and Mr Searle for the respondent.

Mary Somers, a laundress at Budleigh, said she washed for Mrs Stone till the third week in June, 1861. On Mrs Stone's return from Taunton at the end of April she fetched the linen to the wash, and it was not in an unusual condition.

Ann Frost, of Denbury, said that on the 20th of December, 1861, she went to Mrs Stones's, at Budleigh, as nurse, and accompanied her to Exeter, where she stayed with her till the 14th of February, 1862. She remembered the birth of the

child, and that Mrs Stone was up the day before. No preparation was made for it, and Mrs Stone was only ill half an hour before it took place. Mr Webb, the surgeon, came shortly after.

In cross-examination she said that Mrs Stone had a quick time, but the child was not a fine one. She did not say to Mr Northcote that the child was not a seven months' child, nor anything to that effect. She told Mrs Stone half an hour after the birth that it was a seven months' child, because it was so small. She asked Mr Webb to see the baby, but he did not agree with her about its being a seven months' child.

Sir R. Phillimore: How do you know that Mr Webb did not agree with you?—Witness: By his manner of speaking. He said it was a small child. He could not give any further evidence about it. (Laughter.) Mrs Stone never said to witness that Mr Webb was to attend upon her. She (witness) sent for him, as he had been named to her by Mrs Stevenson if a medical man were wanted.

John Newcombe Stevenson, of Berridge, near Exeter, said that he heard of Captain Stone's return in 1861, but did not see him till the 12th of December, 1861, when he (witness) was staying at Morton Hampstead, standing at the breakfast-parlour window with Mr Clack. He saw some one ride round to the back, kissing his hand, and he ran round and saw Captain Stone, who said, "How do you do? How are you?" Witness answered "Very well." The captain said, "I wanted to see you very particularly." He (witness) replied, "Very well, but you cannot come in here." Captain Stone then said, "I suppose you know all about it?" Witness said, "How should I know? What do you mean?" The captain said, "Matty's gone to the bad?" Witness answered "That must be purely imaginary on your part. You had better go to your sister's house, and I shall be happy to hear anything you have to say in the evening." He went to Budleigh the following day, and arrived there at seven o'clock in the evening. Captain Stone tapped him on the shoulder, and he (witness) said, "Oh, that's you. I'll go up with you at once." They went together on the way to Victoria-place. Witness remarked that the captain kept looking behind him, and as they were going up the hill the captain said, "Wait a little; I want to go in here." He returned, and they proceeded again, when after going a few yards, a third person stepped up on the other side, and the captain said, "Allow me to introduce the Rev. Mr Wayett to you." They all three then went on. Just before they came to the door Stone said, "Now Wayett, you will hear what she

has to say." Witness said, "Gentlemen, I don't understand the meaning of this, and, turning to the captain, "I have come as the representative of your wife's parents, simply to have a private conversation with her." His reply was, "You shall not say a single word, unless in my presence and that of a witness." Witness said, "This is too bad; it is conduct not becoming a gentleman and a Christian." This interview lasted three-quarters of an hour, and Mr Wayett was present nearly the whole time, except when witness went upstairs with Mrs Stone, followed by the captain. Mrs Stone was ill, and vomited blood. Captain Stone, Mr Wayett, and witness left together. He said that angry words passed between the captain and him, but he got no explanation whatever of the grounds of the charge against Mrs Stone. He did not hear Mr Wayett say in that interview to Mrs Stone, "What staggers me is that you should complain of Appleton taking advantage of you, and yet still continue to employ him." He did not hear her say, "I do not know where else to go, as he understands my child's case." On the following Sunday he and Mr Bragg went to Mrs Stone, and soon after saw Captain Stone and Mr Baker come into the room together. Mr Bragg said, "We have come down about this charge. It is a cowardly mode of proceeding in bringing it in so extraordinary a manner." Witness said "Your wife was friends with everybody when she left Budleigh, and when she returned from Morton found everyone against her." Mrs Stone was in the room most of the time, and he (witness) said to the captain, "Have you not made a charge against your wife of being flighty or loose in India?" He said, "No, I did not. I merely said she was fond of society." Witness said, "I will have no prevarication; give me a direct answer." Mrs Stone then stood up and said, "Oh! Howard, have you said such a thing of me?" and then threw herself into his arms. He then said to her, "No, my dear, I never said a word against you; do not let them hurt me." Witness then said to Mrs Stone, "Who are your friends here?" She said "Harriet Baker was my friend;" and (to Mr Baker), "You, dear—do you know anything against me?" and Baker said, "No; I always thought you an excellent wife." At the end of the interview he (witness), Mr Bragg, and Mrs Stone went to Appleton's house, but could not find him. Mr Bragg said, "This is a paltry excuse for getting some money out of the family;" but nothing was said about £3,000. Mr Bragg did charge the captain with cowardice. He (witness) denied that Mr Bragg said to Stone, "Appleton has taken advantage of her under

the influence of chloroform ; see how ill she looks, cannot you you forgive her?" nor anything to that effect. He denied having said to Captain Stone, "Why did you not horsewhip Appleton," or that the captain said he would not break the laws of the country. He denied having said, "Then I will send Appleton to horsewhip you." He denied having said to Baker that, as he was a magistrate, his word would be taken before Baker's. In cross-examination he said he had been a magistrate for 15 years. Soon after the interview he assaulted Captain Stone in the middle of the day, in the principal street in Exeter. Three weeks after he was summoned before the magistrates, and was convicted for breaking the municipal law of the city by calling the captain a liar in the street, but the summons for the assault was dismissed, on his giving his word of honour that he would not annoy the captain again. The reason he refused Captain Stone into old Mr Clack's house was because he knew that both Mr Clack and his wife, who are over 80 years of age, had a great dislike to the captain. Old Mr Clack did not drink the health of the captain every evening. (He denied this so emphatically that the judge desired him to be moderate.) In the interview he asked Captain Stone and Mr Wayett if they charged Mrs Stone with infidelity. They both said "No," and Mr Wayett added they did not go upon that, and made a proposition that Mrs Stone should be removed to her friends. He (witness) heard first of the charge from Mr W. Clack, who told him that there had been some impropriety between Appleton and Mrs Stone. That was before the interview between himself, Captain Stone, Mr Wayett, and Mrs Stone. He said he believed that Appleton's name was mentioned at the interview, and that he said to her, "You know what they charge you with." He knew Mr Bishop, a medical man, and went to his house in February, 1862. He could not recollect that Mr Bishop asked him if the child was full-grown at its birth. He did not recollect saying to Bishop that one day, when the servant went into Mrs Stone's bed-room, she saw her lying on the bed, breathing heavily, with her hands stretched out, and that Appleton, who was at the foot of the bed, told the servant to go downstairs and mind her own business. He did not recollect Bishop saying that that must have been the time when the intercourse took place. Bishop had said that he had been told that Mrs Stone had confessed an intercourse with Appleton, which took place while she was in an unconscious state under the influence of chloroform. He (witness) called upon Bishop for the purpose of getting a denial of the report. He might have said there was a mystery in the matter, because it had

been said the child was not Captain Stone's, as it came before its time.

The case had not concluded when the court rose.

MARCH 28.

This case was resumed to-day. It was a petition by a husband for a dissolution of marriage on the ground of the wife's adultery with the co-respondent.

The Queen's Advocate (Sir R. Phillimore) and Mr Lopes appeared for the petitioner; and Mr Karlake, Q.C., Dr. Spinks, and Mr Searle for the respondent. No one appeared for the co-respondent.

Mr Bragg, a solicitor, of Shankford, thirty-two miles from Budleigh, corroborated generally Mr Stevenson's account of the interview, and further said he did not call upon Mrs Stone in Exeter, and was not concerned in getting up this case. He, however, took the deposition of Frost at Moreton Hampstead. He knew Mr Bishop, the surgeon, who dined with him one Sunday in December, but without invitation. He denied having said anything to Bishop about chloroform, or anything about this matter.

Wm. Prater said he was a surgeon at Fairplace in Okehamp-ton, and formerly house-surgeon at the London Hospital. Mrs Stone placed herself under his care in August, 1862. She was suffering from biliousness, vomited blood, and had large varicose veins from the ankle up to the groin, and was hysterical. Bandages were required for the varicose veins, which seemed to him of long standing. As a medical man he could say that when a woman had once had a premature birth she would be likely to have a repetition of it. He said that a medical man could not from the appearance of a child altogether say whether it had been prematurely born.

In cross-examination he said it was a vulgar error to suppose that an eight months' child was rare. A medical man could not of a certainty say on inspection whether a child was a seven or a nine months' child. There were no indicia by which he could speak positively, but in the majority of cases he would be right. He himself should judge from the proportions more than the size. The nails of a seven months' child would be thinner than a nine months' one, but he did not think the hair was any criterion. The head was first the most developed, and as the child grew older the disproportion between the upper and lower extremities ceased. He thought he should be right in nine cases out of twelve in judging by that disproportion whether a child was a seven or a nine months' child.

The Judge: Is it more probable that a man would mistake a seven months' for a nine months' child than a nine months' for a seven?

The witness not answering at once,

The learned judge said he had better not answer if he had not considered that question.

Wm. Tyler Smith, a fellow of the College of Physicians, and examiner of midwifery in the University of London, said there was no certainty in judging of the maturity of a child by the size. Babies varied in weight from 5 to 15 lbs. He had known a seven and a half months' child to be larger than a nine months' one. He did not consider the hair any sign of maturity, as he had known an immature child to have more abundant hair than a mature one. Weakness of body and distress of mind were common every-day causes of premature labour.

In cross-examination he said he did not agree with Dr Taylor, who, in his work on medical jurisprudence, said it was impossible for a medical man of experience to mistake a seven months' child. He considered the size, the pupil of the eye, the hair, and skin indicia of maturity. With tolerable certainty one might judge whether a child was a seven or nine months' one.

By the Judge: By "tolerable certainty" he meant on an average; but there was no absolute certainty in judging any individual case.

Dr Samuel Richards, 36, Bedford-square, said that he believed, with a moderately developed child one could speak with certainty on its maturity. Any period from thirty-five to forty weeks he should consider maturity; but a child of less than thirty-five weeks he should consider immature. He was clearly of opinion that no medical man could on inspection of a seven months' child positively say whether it was a seven or a nine months' one.

John Casely, recalled by Mr Karelake, said that he and two other gentlemen had been engaged in realising Appleton's estate under an assignment for the benefit of his creditors, who had been paid 10s in the pound.

The Queen's Advocate, to rebut some of the evidence brought on behalf of the respondent, recalled Mr Dean Baker, who said that Susan Marks had told him that her mistress had been in a faint about eight or ten days after her brother's funeral, which was on the 4th of March, 1861.

Christopher Northcote (recalled) said that Ann Frost had told him she did not believe the child to be a seven months' one.

Mr Karlake, Q.C., and the Queen's Advocate ably and eloquently addressed the jury on behalf of their respective clients.

The learned judge, in addressing the jury, said, that this case had occupied a great deal of their time, but he was sure they would not grudge a little more while he went through the conflicting evidence that had been submitted to them. Nothing on the one hand, could be of greater importance to a wife than that she should be rescued from the imputation of adultery; for a more grievous injury could not be inflicted on her if it were without foundation. And on the other hand, the husband ought to be relieved from his connection with an adulterous wife and the maintenance of spurious offspring. Before he proceeded to the evidence, he must tell the jury that the party who takes upon him the affirmative has the burden of proving his case. Whatever suspicion respecting Mrs Stone's conduct the captain might have excited in their minds, if they were left in such doubt that they could not positively affirm her guilt, they must pronounce her not guilty. The captain and his wife returned from India at the close of the mutiny, and in Aug. 1859, he again went out to India, leaving his wife behind, who in the following November gave birth to another child. Before he left England, he had desired that a Mr Walker should attend his wife, and Appleton the children; but it appeared that Mr Walker took offence at this arrangement and declined to attend at all, unless the whole family were placed under his charge. Thus it was that Appleton attended Mrs Stone in her confinement in November, 1859. In March, 1861, a letter was written to Mrs Stone by the captain, announcing his departure for home invalided. It was alleged that the adultery was committed about that time. There was no evidence of any intercourse between Appleton and Mrs Stone in 1860, and no person had appeared as a witness of any familiarity between them. In February and March, 1861, Appleton was alleged to have been in very frequent attendance on Mrs Stone, but the proof of this rested entirely on the deposition of Sarah Harris, who in early life had been a prostitute, and afterwards was in a reformatory, whence some ladies had procured her a place at Mrs Stone's. Since she had left the Stones she had again deviated from the path of virtue, and was now unable to be present as a witness, in consequence of her having recently given birth to an illegitimate child. There was no doubt a dulness of conscience in such a girl, which would lead the jury carefully to weigh her evidence. She had declared in her deposition that Appleton was in the habit of staying with her mistress an hour or an hour and a half at a time. In that statement she had been flatly contradicted by her fellow-servant, Susan Marks,

who had said that Appleton was not in the habit of staying more than ten or fifteen minutes. She, however, went out with the children in the morning and afternoon, and therefore Appleton might have been there in her absence. If the jury believed that a man paid such visits, of an hour and a half long, they no doubt would consider it a suspicious circumstance; but if it had been so, did they not think that such visits would be talked about in a small town like Budleigh Salterton? Again, Sarah Harris has said that her mistress asked if women who were pregnant did not sometimes take things to "put aside" children. The jury were to consider this. Would Mrs Stone be more likely to consult her paramour, who was a surgeon, or Sarah Harris, who had been a woman of the town? Sarah Harris had also said that her mistress was in the habit of taking a "cipitate" powder. Now all the doctors say that the supposed effects of a precipitate is a vulgar error. Sarah Harris might have recommended "cipitate," or she, having been a prostitute, might have known of such a powder, and, thinking it effectual, might have said she recommended it. She also had asserted that she and Susan Marks used to time Appleton's visits by the clock; but here again she had been flatly contradicted by Susan Marks. It was for the jury to weigh this evidence. It appeared that on the 7th of April, 1861, Mrs Stone went to Taunton and returned to Budleigh on the 20th. In that time she received the letter announcing her husband's speedy return. Appleton a few days after left Budleigh; but the jury were cautiously to avoid inferring anything against Mrs Stone on account of that. The captain returned to England in May, and from the 18th of May cohabited with his wife without any observation till the 10th December. The jury were left in the dark as to what excited his observation. They could not know how the suspicion of his wife's infidelity to him first came into his mind, for neither the husband nor the wife could by the law appear before them as witnesses. His Lordship then read the evidence of Mr and Mrs Dean Baker, and Miss Jesse, and the other witnesses, commenting upon it as he proceeded. He drew the attention of the jury to the remarkable fact that Mrs Stone expected an early confinement. Miss Jesse said, and she was corroborated by others, that at the end of October or early in November Mrs Stone said, "Only think how unfortunate I am that I cannot have my old nurse, as she is engaged in November, December, and January, and I shall want her in December or January." The important question for the jury was, why did she expect it? It was for them to decide. It was extraordinary that she should tell the witnesses who had deposed to the fact that she wanted a nurse so early, as she must have been calculating

forty weeks, thereby necessarily causing them to infer that some one not her husband must have been the father of the then unborn child. Medical evidence had been adduced for the respondent, to show that it was almost impossible to judge whether a newly-born child was a seven or a nine months' child. This was brought to contradict the evidence of Mr Webb, a surgeon, of 30 years' experience, now deceased, but who had attended her in her confinement, which took place on the 2nd of January, 1862, and had expressed his opinion that the child was maturely born. The scientific men brought here had said that it was impossible to speak with absolute certainty upon that point; but it is only in the exact sciences they could have absolute certainty. They must judge from probabilities in this case as in every other not subject to mathematical demonstration. His lordship having gone over the whole of the evidence, which we have previously fully reported, and to which we refer our readers, concluded his summing up by saying that if the evidence had left no reasonable doubts on the minds of the jury that this woman had committed adultery, they must say so; but if they were not so satisfied they must pronounce her not guilty. If they found for the petitioner they would have also to say what amount of damages should be awarded to him; and upon that head he would only say that nothing could be worse than a medical man taking advantage of his opportunities in the absence of a husband to seduce the wife.

The jury retired at half-past five, and, after an absence of an hour and a half, returned with a verdict for the petitioner, and damages against the co-respondent £2,000.

(April 28.)

This case was a petition by the husband, a captain in the army, for a dissolution of marriage on the ground of his wife's adultery with the co-respondent, who had been her medical attendant.

It will be remembered that the jury found a verdict for the petitioner, and awarded £2,000 damages against the co-respondent.

Mr Karlake, Q.C., (Mr Searle with him,) now moved, on behalf of Mrs Stone, for a rule to show cause why a new trial should not be had, on the ground that the verdict was against evidence, and also on the ground of mis-reception of evidence by his lordship.

At the conclusion of the learned counsel's argument,

The learned Judge said that he had no doubt that the evidence complained of was properly admitted, and therefore no rule would be granted on that point; but, on the other ground,

he would reserve his judgment until he had again read over his notes of the evidence.

STONE V. STONE AND APPLETON.

In this case his lordship refused a rule for a new trial.

“The most natural proof that, in the first ages of the world, the *man-midwife* (accoucheur) was unknown, is, that there is no word whatsoever in the mother or original tongues to signify this profession in a man, whereas that which signifies a midwife (accoucheuse) is found in all languages.”—*Hecquet de l'Indecence aux hommes d'accoucher les femmes*,” p. 1.

Let any man who disputes this position peruse the case of D— against D—, in Robertson's Reports of Cases in the Ecclesiastical Courts, a terrible picture of conjugal contention and wretchedness in high life, all attributable to the accoucheur, who insisted upon the husband leaving the lying-in-chamber, and influenced the wife, fatally for her husband's peace and her own, to concur in his exclusion. *A more flagrant instance of medical presumption and insolence could not readily be found.**

“Here then,” says Sir Herbert Jenner Fust, in his judgment, “is the clue to everything that subsequently took place—an end of all that happiness and comfort which might have been expected to attend the union between these parties.”

The archives of the law would afford the inquirer many a fearful example of similar evils consequent on the unnatural and sinful practice of man-midwifery.

Hints to Husbands, p. 152.

By GEO. MORANT, Esq. J.P.

BROMWICH v. WATERS.

EXTRAORDINARY CHARGE OF SEDUCTION.
NORTH WALES CIRCUIT.

(Before MR. BARON BRAMWELL. Chester, April 3.)

This was an action brought by Caroline Isabella Bromwich against the defendant, Edward Waters, for the seduction of her servant, Mary Whalley, whereby plaintiff lost her services.

Mr Serjeant Shee (specially retained), Mr Vaughan Williams, and the Hon. R. Bourke, were counsel for the plaintiff; Mr Welsby, Mr M'Intyre, and Mr Giffard appeared for the defendant, and Mr Horatio Lloyd and another learned gentleman watched the case on behalf of the other parties interested.

Serjeant Shee, in addressing the jury, said: Gentlemen of the Jury—The plaintiff in this case is Caroline Isabella Bromwich, who is a lady of independent fortune, residing with her sister at Boughton, near this city, and she brings this action, availing herself of a strictly legal right, namely, to obtain compensation in damages for the loss of services she sustained through the misconduct of the defendant to the young woman, sufficiently to vindicate the character of the young woman in her employment—sufficiently to vindicate the character of the young woman in her virtue and respectability—in whom she entertains the utmost confidence, and who, in evidence which is to be submitted before you, she believes to be grievously and cruelly wronged. The defendant, Dr Waters, is a gentleman in the enjoyment, and has been so for many years, of a lucrative business as a physician in Chester and its neighbourhood. He is a little more than fifty years of age, the father of grown-up children, and a man who has secured for a great number of years the esteem and respect of his fellow-citizens. I have totally misunderstood the instructions which the plaintiff has given me if I don't say sincerely and reverently, God forbid that so much honour, so much opportunity of usefulness as Dr Waters is now in possession of, should be lost to him in the autumn of his life, except upon evidence clearly established in this court. I do know that Dr Waters knows perfectly

well that until the 26th of July, 1862, the plaintiff in this case and her sister entertained no feelings for him but those of friendship, respect, and gratitude. The service of a medical man, even though unsuccessful, was great; and until four years ago the plaintiff and her sister were indebted to Dr Waters for the attention bestowed by him upon a dear brother whom they lost in this town, a gentleman, an officer in one of Her Majesty's regiments. Let Dr Waters have the full benefit of this, although previously to the month of July, 1862, there was no gentleman in this world whom the plaintiff would have been able to believe capable of that which she feels it her duty to bring before you. She was indebted to Mary Whalley, who has been now for fifteen years in her employment, and watched over the sick brother whom the plaintiff has lost. She, during those fifteen years, has placed her employers under those obligations which are the result of long and effective services. In the month of February, 1860, Mary Whalley, then being about 26 years of age, had for some time seemed suffering a pain, the origin of which it was not easy to trace, and the plaintiff thought she could do no better than avail herself of the skill of Dr Waters, and she directed Mary Whalley to consult him. He pronounced her to be suffering under a bilious derangement, and treated her at the same time as for bilious sickness, giving her ordinary prescriptions, which did not much improve her. Finally, in the month of March, 1860, the plaintiff thought it might be as well to give Mary Whalley the benefit of a change of air, and determined to take her to Llandudno, a watering place in Wales; afterwards it was found that the air did not agree with her. In the month of March, 1860, the plaintiff, accompanied by Mary Whalley, went to Llandudno, and, having stayed there a short time she went to the Isle of Man, returning the first week in July to her residence in Boughton. The excursion had produced but little beneficial effects upon Mary, and soon after her return to Chester she again consulted Dr Waters, and complained of a pain in her chest and stomach. The defendant examined her in bed at the house of her mistress, and promised her, encouraging her to come and see him as often as she could, that he would charge her nothing for advice, and told her that her druggist's bill would be as much as she could afford. She accordingly visited him at his house until the second Saturday—I give her words exactly—on the second Saturday in the month of December, and on that day he desired her to remove her stays so that he might examine her stomach; and he did examine her stomach, and the lower part of her stomach, and, without telling her what he was about, suddenly put his hand up her clothes, which caused her to be somewhat alarmed, and she said "I don't

like to come here again." He answered, "I am not going to hurt you, I am not going to do anything to you : I have children of my own ;" and told her that she was suffering from ulcers in the womb, and there were only two things to be done—he must either apply caustic or she must get a husband. He made use of the speculum to apply caustic, and said "Promise me not to tell anyone I have used caustic, as it is a surgeon's business." Now, gentlemen, I am told that the practice of a surgeon and the practice of the physician are separate from each other ; but I am given to understand that there is no such broad distinction between them as to render it at all beyond the practice of a gentleman like Dr Waters. About Christmas next following, 1860, Mary Whalley was lying on the sofa for the purpose of examination by the use of the speculum, and while Dr Waters was applying the caustic some one rapped at the door, when Mary Whalley hastily drew her handkerchief, which she had been accustomed to cover her face with while subjected to this operation, and she observed, when he suddenly rose from the sofa, his dress disarranged. He turned his back as soon as he rose from the sofa, and after a few seconds went to open the door. That was of a nature to excite some alarm in the mind of the pure and virtuous young woman. She repeated her visits until the month of April, 1861, and during that time the speculum was frequently used. This treatment continued a length of time, at intervals of a week or a fortnight. In the month of April the plaintiff and Mary Whalley took another excursion to the Isle of Man. They consulted Dr Waters before they left, and he strongly pressed upon them not to consult any other medical man. Of course he expected that their absence would not be very long, for they returned on the 24th of May. Before they went, I believe, but certainly during their absence the complaint of Mary Whalley had assumed a different and much more serious aspect. She had up to that time never been subject to any description of a fit ; while she was in the Isle of Man she was frequently attacked by fits of a most serious description—they were of the worst character of hysteria, sometimes amounting to catalepsy ; and in that kind of hysteria a person, although prostrate and unable to move, except convulsively, does not entirely lose the senses. I am told by the most learned professional men, that the use of the speculum to a person of delicate body would be very likely to cause these fits. On the day of the return of the plaintiff, Mary Whalley had a most serious attack on board the steamer ; she was carried insensible to the hotel, and did not recover her consciousness for some time, and after recovering she was removed to Boughton. Between the 24th of May and the month of June Miss Emily Bromwich being unwell, and Dr Waters

having occasion to go frequently to the plaintiff's house, Mary Whalley consulted the defendant at his own house. He saw her very frequently at her mistress's house, and during that time he said not a word about ulcerated womb, nor attempted or proposed to use the speculum, or apply caustic. In the month of August Mary Whalley resumed her visits at the house of the defendant. He said to her on one occasion, when he was applying the caustic, "You want a husband now: how should I do for your husband?" She replied, "I am too ill for a husband." On another occasion he said, after he had been operating upon her, "You have a beautiful colour. If you could only see yourself in the glass, you would think yourself fit to be a bride." These visits were unfortunately continued during the months of October and November. On the 9th of November she had taken nothing but a small piece of bread, soaked in her tea, until three o'clock in the afternoon. She on that day called on Dr Waters, and was handed into a room in which he had been accustomed to see her; he very soon joined her, and a conversation passed between them, when she remarked that she felt very faint, and he said "I will get you something to refresh you." He left the room and returned with a glass of wine, which he requested her to drink, which she did in two or three sips, and immediately fell insensible. She remembered only that the upper part of her dress was open, and she recollected nothing more until about 5 o'clock, when she awoke and found herself lying on the rug of another room. She must at that time have had a very serious and much longer fit than usual. She being so ill, defendant ordered a cab to take her home. On the 2nd of April, 1862, the plaintiff took her to Malvern, when it was observed that her person was visibly enlarged. Dr Waters was consulted by letter, and he pronounced it to be simply an enlargement of the liver. On the 26th July, 1862, the patient having been under hydropathic treatment at Malvern, was delivered of a full-grown male child. She solemnly declares that never to her knowledge had she been known by man, but she had no knowledge of what took place on the 9th November, 1861.

Mary Whalley was called and distinctly swore that, to her knowledge, no man had ever taken indecent liberties with her, but deposed to one equivocal act on the part of the doctor when he was attending her, and some expressions of an improper character, all of which the doctor swore were untrue.

Dr Lee, the eminent physician of London, Dr Ramsbotham, of Edinburgh, and Dr Taylor, were called to prove that where there were symptoms of hysteria the use of the speculum, without which caustic cannot be applied, under the circumstances above alluded to, was improper.

The defendant was called, who swore positively that the act imputed to him was false. He explained his treatment of her case, and admitted she might have called in November, but that he did not remember on what day, although he thought it was the day on which he sold a pony, which afterwards became most important, because Mary Whalley admitted that she was insensible but once in the doctor's house, and that it was only on that occasion she left the house in a cab, and she fixed that day as the 9th of November. Assuming that what she said must have taken place on that day to be true, the child, which was born on the 26th July following, was born just three weeks short of the ordinary time of gestation, which was admitted, by the doctors on both sides to be quite possible; but the servants perfectly remembered Mary Whalley coming in November to see the doctor, that he was engaged, and that, although he might have seen her a few minutes, he soon afterwards went out; that they saw Mary Whalley, who was very ill, but that she never was insensible; that they got a glass of wine from Mrs Waters, after which she was very sick, and that they got a cab for her, in which she went away; and that she was gone before the doctor returned. The nurserymaid remembered going on that day with the doctor and his children to the paddock where the pony was kept, so that they might have a ride upon it before it was sold. The lady who bought the pony, and entered the amount in her account-book, proved that the day in question was the 29th of November, which was further corroborated by other curious evidence; therefore, assuming that the day when Mary Whalley was sick and left in a cab was the 29th of November, and that although she was mistaken about the day, though not as to what occurred, the child ought not, if it had gone the full period of gestation, to have been born before September. Evidence was called to impugn the general character of Mary Whalley; it was sought to be shown that she had been on familiar terms with one Joe Smith, and a boy named Bill Boddy, of the age of 14, and they in turn were called to swear it was untrue.

Mr James Young Simpson, F.R.C.S., and Professor of Midwifery, Edinburgh, said that the treatment of the case by Dr Waters was quite right and proper and such as he would have resorted to in similar circumstances.

Dr Keiller and Dr Fyfe gave evidence to the same effect.

Mr Welsby addressed the jury on behalf of the defendant, and Serjeant Shee on behalf of the plaintiff.

His Lordship, in summing up, dwelt upon the probability and the improbability of the case at great length. He said no one could over-estimate the importance to the parties of the issue to be decided. To the defendant it was almost life or

death. It was of the gravest importance to Mary Whalley also. As far as Miss Bromwich was concerned, nothing would have induced her to expend such a vast sum in litigation had she not been convinced of the truth and chastity of the girl whom she had treated more as a friend than a servant, and believed that she had been grievously wronged. After commenting on all the facts, he said that the case for the plaintiffs entirely depended upon the oath of Mary Whalley, corroborated, no doubt, by one curious feature, which was, that throughout the whole time of her pregnancy, she had always allowed herself to be examined, and had acted as if she thought such a thing was impossible.

The jury retired at half-past six, and did not agree upon their verdict until twelve o'clock.

One of the jury would not agree, and asked his Lordship if they had any doubt as to the evidence of the plaintiff, ought they to give a verdict for the defendant.

His Lordship remarked that they ought to give the defendant the benefit of it. They therefore returned a verdict for the defendant.

The verdict was received with cheers. [Ironical, we assume.—Ed.]

PERJURY BY A PHYSICIAN.

MARCH 28.

(Before Mr Baron Martin.)

NORTHERN CIRCUIT, LIVERPOOL.

EVAN THOMAS surrendered to take his trial upon an indictment charging him with having committed perjury at Manchester, on the 6th January, during an inquest held before the city coroner on the body of Mrs. Mary Ann Bell, a widow, from Bassenthwaite, near Keswick, who died suddenly at the Cathedral Hotel, Manchester, on the 6th of January.

The facts of the case, as narrated by counsel for the prosecution, were as follows: On the 5th of January last a widow of the name of Mary Ann Bell visited Manchester by appointment with the prisoner, for the alleged purpose of consulting him. Mrs. Bell, on her arrival in Manchester, was met by Thomas and accompanied him to the Cathedral Hotel, at which establishment he had procured apartments. The next morning the lady was very unwell, which created surprise in the minds of those who attended her at the hotel, as she appeared to be in such good health on the previous evening. About half-past nine o'clock on the 6th of January, the morning after Mrs. Bell's arrival, Mr. Thomas paid her a visit. He went into her room and locked the door, which excited the curiosity of the chambermaid, who listened outside. Mr. Thomas remained in the room about twenty minutes or half an hour, during which time the servant heard what she described as something like "a heavy pair of scissors" coming in contact with a table. In a short time after this noise, the prisoner came out of the room, and called for Mr. Batley, the landlord, to whom he stated that the lady had died suddenly of epilepsy. After a brief conversation they left the room, the landlord locking the door and giving the key to the doctor, who went to consult Mr. Herford, the coroner, respecting an inquest. The inquest was appointed to be held at three o'clock that day, and in the meantime the doctor, assisted by another medical man, made a post-mortem exami-

nation. Before the coroner Thomas stated, *inter alia*, that there was a tumour in the womb; that there was intense congestion of the brain and membranes, which was a symptom of epilepsy; and that he had never seen the deceased before. Mr. Thomas sent a telegram to Cockermouth addressed to Dr. Steel, but there being no such gentleman in that town it was delivered to Dr. Bell, a medical practitioner there. The telegram announced Mrs. Bell's death, and on receiving it Dr. Bell, informed Mr Waugh (a solicitor) of the fact, and as that gentleman had been the legal adviser of Mrs. Bell's husband he sent Mr. Musgrave, his managing clerk, to inquire into the circumstances connected with the death of the lady. On his arrival, Mr. Musgrave called upon the prisoner at his house, and had a conversation with him, in the course of which he repeated the substance of his deposition before the coroner. Mr. Musgrave afterwards saw the coroner, and from what was stated to him the latter was induced to hold a second inquiry, in which Mr. Thomas admitted that he had seen Mrs. Bell, the deceased, a year ago, and also about a month before her last visit. These statements were directly contradictory of those made in the first deposition. On examining Mrs Bell's private drawers at her own house at Keswick, there were found three letters, which a competent witness proved were in the handwriting of the prisoner. The police-officer who arrested Thomas took possession of several memoranda-books, in which there were three entries of money received from "Mrs. Bell, Keswick."

It appeared from the evidence that Mr. Heath, of the Manchester Royal Infirmary, conducted another postmortem examination, when he found a fœtus of about four months' growth, a small tumour in one of the ovaries, and slight congestion of the brain; but he found nothing inconsistent with the supposition that epilepsy was the cause of death. It appeared, however, that in his post-mortem examination, Mr Thomas had not examined the brain at all.

At the conclusion of the evidence, his Lordship summed up, and the jury, after an absence of two hours, returned a verdict of guilty, but with a strong recommendation to mercy.

His Lordship, in passing sentence, severely reprimanded the prisoner for bringing a disgrace upon a learned and honourable profession, and plainly intimated his belief, formed from one of the prisoner's letters, that Thomas had been carrying on an illicit amour with the deceased, and was the father of the child of which she was pregnant.

The prisoner was sentenced to three months' imprisonment.

POLICE NEWS.

A PROFESSIONAL BLOW, PROFESSIONALLY DESCRIBED;

OR THE

RESULT OF MAN-MIDWIFERY AND UNNATURAL TREATMENT.

The following cases are of recent occurrence:—

“After abruptly ordering the Husband and Protector out of his wife’s chamber (a piece of medical presumption and insolence), in the presence of a competent midwife (whom he recommended) and another woman, he assumed a right to perform her office.* To her honour, be it said, she complained to her husband of his conduct, and refused his attendance; hence the assault by the patient’s husband, which was minutely described in the following “surgical language” :—

The Plaintiff said—“I am a surgeon, residing in Dunster. When he came opposite, he jumped upon the door step, and dashed his *right fist* on to my *left cheek bone*, saying at the same moment, ‘*I have an account to settle with you, you blackguard.*’ The first blow was immediately followed by a second from his left hand, but which did not reach me. I put myself on my defence, and several blows were exchanged, and finally I *slipped* down in the *mud*, when the defendant knelt upon me.

Mr. Densham addressed the Bench on behalf of the defendant. He believed there were circumstances to be pleaded in extenuation of the case.

The Bench: Whatever had taken place, the defendant was not justified in the conduct he had pursued.

Mr. Densham continued: The truth was that the plaintiff had recently attended the defendant’s wife in her confinement, and *circumstances then occurred* which had since led the defendant to act in an excited state, and he thought, considering that the defendant was thus led to do what he had done, the fine should not be so heavy as if there had been no reason for the assault; and, after all, he did not think it very good grace on the part of the

* “The man-midwife usually intimates his wish to make the examination *per vaginam* through the medium of the nurse of his own recommendation, and should the patient, struck with the daring impropriety of his request, desire to inform her husband of the infamous proposal, the nurse dissuades her by saying that “husbands are not supposed to understand these things,” and that she will probably destroy both her own life, and that of her child, by refusing to submit to it! After this the accoucheur soon triumphs, the examination is effected without further remonstrance, and the victim is irretrievably entangled in his insidious toils.”—*Hints to Husbands.*

medical man to fight with the defendant as long as he was able, and then, when in the gutter, to cry out for help, and now bring a summons against his opponent, as it was also clear that the doctor fought as well as the defendant, although the assault was really committed by the latter.

The defendant was fined £5, including costs, which he freely paid."—*Somerset County Gazette*.

"A young married lady in the neighbourhood of Dunster,* of a highly respectable family, is injured for life, having been ruptured by an unlicensed man-widwife, who has recently become notorious."† He had the damnable impudence to threaten an action against any one who may damage his reputation, in consequence of *his own act and deed*."

It is to be regretted that medical men don't report cases of villany to the council of their college, who have the power to erase the names of such scoundrels from the register; however, a partnership may be destroyed by such a course, hence the unnatural sufferings of the principal objects of our lives.

The following observations on the subject of male-midwifery and infantile mismanagement are selected from a very excellent and scientific work, by an eminent London physician, who thus ridicules the present practice:—

"One very great obstacle to improvement in medicine has been the very general preference given by Englishwomen to male over female practitioners of midwifery;‡ for by means of that introduction numbers of badly educated persons not only contrive to worm themselves into the confidence of families, but by the vile arts to which they stoop, and the collusions and conspiracies into which they enter with nurses and each other, they have in a great measure managed to monopolise the entire practice of physic in this country. To check the career of these people, Sir Anthony Carlisle wrote his famous letter to the *Times* newspaper,§ wherein

* A little contaminated town in West Somerset, crippled by drunkenness and vice, and the immorality of those hoary-headed old monsters, whom their poorer neighbours are conjured to respect and treat with veneration.

† There is a maxim prevalent with accoucheurs, and the hellish aphorism is treated as a jest among them, that a woman will usually desire to patronise upon all subsequent occasions the man-midwife who has once introduced his finger *per vaginam*.—"Hints to Husbands," by George Morant, Esq. Published by Simpkin and Marshall.

‡ "A proof that 'Court-fools' are as common as ever.—*Fallacies of the Faculty*."

§ P. 7, *ante*.

he declared that '*the birth of a child is a natural process, and not a surgical operation.*' Notwithstanding the howl and the scowl with which that letter was received by the apothecaries, it is pleasing to see that the public are now beginning to be aware of the fact that more children perish by the meddlesome interference of these persons, than have ever been saved by the aid of their instruments.* How many perish by unnecessary medicine common-sense may form some notion—for the fashion of the day is to commence with Physic the moment the child leaves the womb—to dose every new born babe with castor oil before it has learnt to apply its lips to the nipple! Who but an apothecary could have suggested such a custom? Who but a creature with the mind of a mechanic, and the habits of a butcher would think of applying a cupping instrument behind an infant's ear to stop wind and convulsions? The nurses and midwives of the last age knew better. Their custom in such cases was to place a *laurel-leaf* upon the tongue of the child. The routinists laughed at what they called a mere old woman's remedy, and declared that it could have no effect whatever; they little knew that its strong odour and bitter taste depended upon the prussic acid it contained. Gentlemen, you may get many an excellent hint from every description of old woman, but the old women of the profession—the pedantic doctors, who first laugh at the laurel leaf as *inert*, and yet start at the very medicine upon which its virtues depend, when given with the most perfect precision in the measured form of prussic acid! Men, who in the same mad spirit of inconsistency, affect to be horrified at the mention of opium or arsenic, while they dose you to death with purgative physic, or pour out the blood of your life as if it were so much ditch-water."†

* The "*Men-Midwives*," the light-fingered gentry, are the "*pests*" of society, and, notwithstanding, we find such degraded fellows often at a "wedding breakfast, and creeping into high quarters; how long their presence will be tolerated on such occasions remains to be proved.

† *Fallacies of the Faculty*, p. 184. By Samuel Dickson, M.D. Pub. by Tinsley, Brothers.

SEWELL v. TOPHAM.—SEDUCTION.

From the *Standard*, July 14th, 1862.

[Before Mr. Justice WIGHTMAN and a Common Jury.]

This was an action for seduction. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

Mr. Serjeant Parry and Mr. Lumley Smith were counsel for the plaintiff. Mr. G. Denman, Q.C., was counsel for the defendant.

The plaintiff is the widow of an army accoutrement-maker, and the defendant is a medical man, practising at Derby and the action was for compensation for the loss of her daughter's service, a young girl of nineteen years of age, through her seduction by the defendant. The defendant had known the plaintiff's son, and first became acquainted with her daughter at his house. Before that he apparently was paying his addresses to Juliana, the plaintiff's eldest daughter, but nothing came of it. He paid the daughter Marian, the girl seduced, marked attention at her brother's house, and afterwards seduced her at the Surrey Gardens.

Marian Sewell deposed—Previous to June, 1860, I was living with my mother, who is a widow in Albany-road, Old Kent-road. My father died two years ago last January. He was an army accoutrement-maker. I first made the defendant's acquaintance in July, 1860. I was nineteen last November; I was leaving my brother's house in Brunswick-street, when he took me for my sister Juliana. The latter end of November, 1860, I met him at my brother's house. My mother, a younger sister, two brothers, and two gentlemen were there. He sat by me and talked to me a great deal that evening, and he expressed sorrow at my sister's absence. They used to walk out together frequently. I left my brother's house about twelve o'clock to go home. He wanted to kiss me for my sister, and asked would I return it for her. He kissed me in the passage, and when we got to the doorstep. On Monday, May 6th, 1861, I went to the Surrey Gardens with Mrs.

Simpson, a lady friend, lodging in my mother's house, and there met my younger sister, who had gone earlier. I met the defendant there about half-past seven in the ball-room, I had a short conversation with him, and he said he would meet me again when the dancing commenced. At nine o'clock he came to the dancing platform in company with a friend, Mr. Walker, who had been with him at my brother's house. At the defendant's request I walked with them about the gardens for about three-quarters of an hour. We then sat down and Mr Walker left. Defendant told him he did not want him, and told him to go back with his friends. After he had been gone some time he came back again, and the defendant offered him brandy-and-water to leave. He went away, and I continued sitting on one of the seats with the defendant in a secluded part of the garden. After Walker had left defendant commenced taking liberties with me, and afterwards had intercourse with me. He said I should not leave the gardens until I had yielded to him. He said nothing particular, but I knew what he meant. He said if I got into trouble *he would get me out of it*, and if I was a good girl he would make me his wife. It was about a quarter to twelve o'clock when I returned to Mrs. Simpson in the ball-room. The defendant would not allow me to leave him earlier. Mrs. Simpson was very angry at my having left her. On the 3rd of February, 1862, I was confined of a child. I wrote to the defendant three times and informed him of my condition. (In the first letter she requested him not to say anything to her sister "Jully," and that she received an answer appointing to meet her in the evening at seven o'clock, at the top of Brunswick-street. Before receiving that letter she wrote stating that she was in the family-way. He did not keep his appointment.) This was the first time I ever had been to the Surrey or any other gardens. I only had one intercourse with him.

Cross-examined.—My sister Fanny saw him kiss me, and told my mother of it. I told him to be quiet, but he kissed me a second time. I did not tell my mother of it. I did not call out when he kissed me (laughter). I have not been to a theatre for four years. I do not visit dancing places. We sat on the grass on a slope underneath a tree, and afterwards we went under a tent for shelter, and it was there the connection took place. The gardens were very crowded.

Other witnesses were called in support of the plaintiff's case.

Mr. Denman said that the defence was that the defendant never had connection with the plaintiff's daughter. It was more a case of affiliation than seduction, but there was wanting the necessary corroborative evidence required in both cases. There was no pretence for saying that the defendant ever paid

his addresses to the sister, and all the acquaintance he had with Juliana was of the same free-and-easy character with regard to kissing that appeared to exist between him and the plaintiff's daughter Marian. The meeting between them at the gardens was accidental, and although the defendant went to the gardens for an immoral purpose he did not carry it out with the plaintiff's daughter. The defendant was about 21 years of age at that time.

The defendant was called.—He said—I am a medical student at Guy's Hospital. My first acquaintance with Marian arose in this way. I was walking with a friend down Brunswick-street, in the Borough, when a man opened the door of one of the houses and invited us in. We went in and found several females going there, and there was singing and music and conviviality going on. The plaintiff and her daughter were there. I saw her in the passage when leaving, and I kissed her there and on the door-step.*

Mr. Denman.—Did she resist at all?

Defendant.—Oh, dear no (laughter).

Mr. Denman.—Not more than was convenient to you.

Defendant.—She made no resistance at all. I never spoke to her again till I met her by accident in the gardens. She spoke to me first in the gardens, and she or her lady friend first touched me on the shoulder. I did not take liberties with her that night. I kissed her once or twice (laughter).

Mr Denman.—Don't you call that a liberty? (laughter.)

Defendant.—The gardens were very crowded, and there was no opportunity for my having intercourse with her. I intended to have done so. I did not ask her in direct terms to submit, but I said something to that effect. I have not the least idea what part of the gardens it was. It was my intention if I had had an opportunity, but the gardens were too much crowded.

Cross-examined.—I never spoke to the brother before or since he invited us into his house in Brunswick-street and Trinity-square, Southwark. I never took her to the Surrey Gardens.

The learned Counsel having addressed the jury for their respective clients,

The learned judge summed up, and

The Jury returned a verdict for the plaintiff—Damages, £20.

* Medical men should keep clear of door-steps! (P. 33 ante.)

SPEDDING v. SPEDDING AND LANDER.

DAMAGES £1000.

From the Daily Telegraph, July 25th, 1862.

[Before Sir C. Cresswell and a Common Jury.]

This was a suit for dissolution of marriage, brought by the husband, a clergyman in the Church of England, against his wife, on the ground of adultery. The respondent and co-respondent both appeared, but did not plead. Damages were laid at £2,000.

Dr. Spinks was counsel for the petitioner; Dr. Wambey and Mr. Day appeared on behalf of the respondent and co-respondent.

The enquiry elicited circumstances of a very painful and peculiar character. The petitioner, the Rev. Francis Spedding, married his wife, then Miss Isabella Mansfield, a lady of great personal attractions, on the 22nd of June, 1846, at Flymby in Cumberland, where he was at that time curate. They lived together at various places in Northumberland, Yorkshire, and other parts of England, where the husband was engaged in his professional capacity as a clergyman. For the last fifteen years they had resided at Chipnell, in Shropshire, apparently on the most affectionate terms. There were four children of the marriage, the youngest at the time of the offence alleged in the petition being not quite a year old. It appeared that, at the time of the confinement of the respondent with her last child the co-respondent, a medical man in the same town, was called in to attend her. The lady was in some danger, and the services of the co-respondent were rendered necessary for some time afterwards, during which period the unfortunate attachment which formed the subject of the suit had its origin. The co-respondent, a married man, revealed to the vicar of the parish the relationship which subsisted between himself and the respondent; and, further, as he loved the lady they intended to elope, and then proceed to Melbourne, Australia, where, having sold his practice at Chipnell, he purposed to establish himself. The vicar, the Rev. Henry Cunliffe, remonstrated with him on the impropriety of his conduct, reminded him of the misery he would

cause not only to the family of the petitioner, but to his own, and endeavoured to impress upon him the obligations he owed to every law, human and divine; but to no purpose. He soon after eloped with the respondent, and procured for her a lodging at Rhyll; but at this period he seems to have contemplated the abandonment of the scheme, for he made a proposal, whether meant, or not, to place the lady under the protection of her mother. Ultimately, however, on the 4th May, 1861, the co-respondent, having sold his business, accompanied the lady to London. The husband immediately communicated with the detective police employed at the Euston-square station, when the parties were traced to the Exeter Hall Hotel, Strand. The petitioner came up to town the next morning, and found his wife and the co-respondent together; but they at once took a cab and rode off. They are at present residing at Melbourne.

A lady, Mrs Skelton, and the petitioner's sister, proved the solemnisation of the marriage, and the terms on which the petitioner and his wife lived during the period of their co-habitation.

The Rev. Henry Cunliffe said that the petitioner had been curate at Chipnell during ten years of his incumbency, and for about five years before; that he had always appeared to be kind and affectionate towards his wife, and that he was quite prostrated by mental anguish when he had heard of her infidelity. The co-respondent said they both meant to get a divorce, and then they could be married.

Sarah Moore, chambermaid at the Exeter Hall Hotel, identified the night dresses which the respondent and co-respondent left behind, which were marked with their respective names.

A voluminous correspondence was read. In one letter the respondent implored to have her children, as she feared they should be placed under a stepmother.

Dr Spinks having summed up the evidence; Dr. Wambey addressed the jury. It was the first time, he contended, that a clergyman of the Church of England had come into that court and did not blush to ask for damages as compensation for his wife's misconduct. There was nothing to show that the respondent had not seduced the co-respondent, rather than that he should have seduced her.

Sir C. Cresswell left the evidence as to the adultery to the jury. Upon the question of damages the learned doctor had said it was the first time that a clergyman had come into that court to ask for damages. He could not help looking at Dr. Wambey to see whether he blushed when he made that statement. No doubt if ever the court should be used by married

women to get divorced from their husbands in order to marry their paramours a monstrous injury would be inflicted upon society, and the evil would be largely mixed with the good that might be expected to result from its existence. As to the assertion that the respondent had seduced the co-respondent, it was of a piece with his other misconduct that he should seek to vilify the woman he had debauched. Under the constitution of the court the disposition of damages rested with the discretion of the judge. In this case there were four children of the marriage, who were left without maternal guardianship and tenderness. The jury would no doubt look at all the circumstances, and assess what damages they thought fair and reasonable.

The jury, after a few minutes' deliberation, returned a verdict that the co-respondent had committed adultery with the respondent, and she with him, and assessed the damages at £1,000.

Sir C. Cresswell granted a decree nisi, with costs against the co-respondent.

FIENDISH PROPENSITIES OF "THE CRAFT."

"A lady, according to fashionable custom, engaged a doctor, apparently a very nice elderly man. The lady was very young, pretty, and innocent—great temptations, no doubt—but M.D. should have been his shield; it was not so. His words and actions were by the lady herself reported to her husband, who swore that if a proper midwife could be found, his wife should never be so insulted again. He kept his word. She has had a large family and has always been attended by a female, both in England and on the Continent. Now, policy—says our informant—with her, would have been to have had a doctor, for she was the daughter of a Surgeon, the grand-daughter of one, and had two or three brothers at that time in practice as such."

"In another case instruments were used when certainly not necessary. A midwife was called to a patient by another, who had been in attendance upon her for twelve hours and was fatigued. A doctor was present, and from what could be ascertained the labour was tedious, and the friends anxious; the doctor pronounced it a case of 'deformed pelvis,' and said the patient could not be delivered without lessening the head, although she has had a large family. A pupil was sent for, and the woman *shamefully exposed*, the cranium lessened, and delivery effected, *all the necessary instruction* being given to the pupil both during and after the operation. When the doctor left, he gave the husband strict charge that should the patient ever be pregnant again, to let him know in the seventh month, when he would save the mother and child too. She had another child at the full time in less than twelve months after, *was attended by a female*, the child was born alive, and the mother did well."

The case of *Russell v. Adams* has not escaped the burlesque of our inimitable friend "*Punch*." The acutest censor of the age, in a recent number, May 16th, 1863, thus evokes public sympathy on behalf of the young lady and her mamma.

"A BITER BIT.

"It is very seldom indeed that a Bankruptcy report can afford any satisfaction to the benevolent reader, but the following one must highly gratify every well constituted mind that remembers the base and ungrateful attempt at extortion which, under the name of a lawsuit, is mentioned therein:—'In re Annie Russell.—An adjudication of Bankruptcy was this day made against Annie Russell, recently an unsuccessful plaintiff in the breach of promise case "*Russell v. Adams*." The bankrupt petitions *in forma pauperis* as a professor of Music, of 24, Cottage Grove, Peckham, and it would appear was arrested on the 29th ultimo, for £350 costs incurred by Mr. Adams.'"

He continues, "The action above referred to was brought by a young lady against an eminent Surgeon, her medical attendant and a married man. It was met with a flat denial of the alleged promise, and a charge of conspiracy against the plaintiff and her mamma. The verdict of the defendant was received with cheers. A numerous meeting of *Mr. Adams's* professional brethren was held to celebrate his escape from the ladies in question, and to express indignation at the attempt which had been made upon him. The retributive bankruptcy of the unsuccessful plaintiff in such a case as that of *Russell v. Adams* excites mild emotions, of the same nature as those which are aroused by the poetical justice of a tragedy whose catastrophe takes place in front of Newgate."

In the *Daily Telegraph* of May 13th 1863, the following advertisement appeared:—"To Ladies only:—Mr. Scott attends and corresponds in Midwifery, Pregnancy, Obstructions, *Disappointments in Marriage*, and all cases peculiar. He has had 30 years of London practice.—Address 17, Adam-street, Strand, London. 'The Ladies' Medical Confidant,' post free 14 stamps."

It is to be hoped that Mr. *Punch*, in remembrance of his glorification of 30 years' London practice, will introduce him into female society, where he may obtain all the female complaints publicly courted by female medical men!

Let the public beware of a *peculiar* class of advertisements in the cheap publications "For Female Disorders," and regard them as most venomous, and emanating from the "spy tube" department.

The Times of May 14th, 1863, contains a full report highly interesting to ladies, of the meeting of the members of the University of London, for the admission of candidates for degrees, which was presided over by Earl Granville, K.G., the Chancellor of the University. "The noble Chancellor then rose, and said that he felt it to be his duty, and also a high honour, and in every sense of the word a very great pleasure to preside on that occasion." After referring at length to the business and prosperity of the University, he thus gracefully concludes in reference to the admission of gentlewomen to the degrees of that University. "There was one question to which he would for a moment refer, that was not of inferior importance to any that had engaged the attention of the senate; he alluded to the question whether women as well as men should be admitted to the degrees of that University. In any remarks he might make he felt perfectly convinced that his friend on his right (Mr. Grote, vice-chancellor,) would readily protect the ladies and affirm that they were equally

competent to obtain honours in any pursuit they might feel disposed to attempt. The argument, which was chiefly enforced by those who wished for the admission of women to degrees, was based on the liberal character of the University. It was also stated that the great object of such an University was to promote knowledge, and that persons estimated knowledge very much in proportion to the value they found attached to it. It was then argued that that value would be greatly appreciated by a certificate emanating from a body like that of the London University, which would be recognised by the world at large. Eminent examples of gifted women were quoted in support of the argument; and among those whose names were mentioned was the name of that modest, unassuming, and deeply scientific woman Mrs. Somerville. And it was said that a certificate of that kind, bearing testimony to the acquirements of women, would greatly assist them in obtaining employment by persons who would not readily take their own word. On both sides it was admitted that there was no question as to conducting the education of men and women together; and that the only question was whether women should be examined or not. Now, it was held by those who did not agree to this proposition, that there were great and serious objections to the system proposed. It was felt that men and women were different in quality of talent and in intellect, and that to teach them and educate them exactly in the same manner, would do injury to each and both in combination. It was also felt that the field of exertion for the talents of men and of women lay in different directions, and that what might even be a merit in the one sex might be a fault in the other. Besides this, it was doubted whether it was desirable to expose women—members of the gentler sex—to that spirit of competition, and—which the very character of the thing itself implied—to that struggling and striving, as it were, for domination and power to which their admission to academical degrees

ould lead. These were some of the reasons which influenced their chancellor (a laugh) to commit what he certainly felt to be a most ungallant act—that of giving his casting vote against the proposition. From conversation with men and with women on the subject, he believed there was not one woman in 100 who was not for the exclusion of women from University examinations.”

The following interesting article on “Infancy and Nursery Management,” is selected from the highly interesting columns of *The Queen*, the lady’s weekly journal, which only tends to show the necessity of establishing a Ladies’ Medical College.

“A great deal of valuable space in the columns of this journal has been devoted to the treatment, care, and preservation of almost every animal whose outward form and pleasing instincts have secured for its possessor the enviable position of domestic pet. Doves, canaries, sparrows, cats, dogs, and even a spider, have been objects of tender solicitude to the fairest of the land. And it is a matter of congratulation that these helpless creatures should have found eloquent sympathisers in their condition, for the home is brightest where the favourite bird warbles from his golden cage, and the hearth is warmest where sleek “puss” dozes on the rug. But there is another domestic pet, whose existence in these pages has hitherto been overlooked. It is to the little bundle of flannel in the downy cot, and the bright-eyed cherub in its mother’s arms, that I allude—the Baby, in fact—the little helpless stranger amongst us, who has not yet learned to smile his gratitude, or lisp his thanks. In anticipation of his arrival, cambrics of the finest texture, flannels of exquisite softness, lace of fairy-like fabric, and the lightest down have been selected for his service. Every stage of the happy infant’s growth has been foreseen, every contrivance that can tend to his comfort, has been procured. The bassinet, with linings of delicate hue, and the basket furnished with the toilet requisites of a luxurious age, have been in readiness long

before the joyous moment of his appearance. Love and wealth combined have done their utmost to secure the infant's outward happiness, but the future welfare of the child rests upon less appreciable means.

“ Little, save its organic structure, do we know of the tiny infant when first he appears amongst us. Although the common lot of humanity has alike attended the birth of prince and peasant, neither state chroniclers nor humble poets have recorded the impressions produced upon the infant when first he breathes the air or gazes upon the light. To judge from the dozing unconscious manner with which he meets the inquiring look of tender parents, the dawn of life is a peaceful slumber. *Nature, perfect in all her works*, is marvelously so when from her hands she issues her masterpiece—the infant-man. All the mechanism of life is there ; every bodily sense, and every faculty of the mind are present in the slumbering form, awaiting the period of development to impel for action the noble frame, or to secure salvation for the immortal soul. A blank page in the book of life is the first day's existence of the cherished babe. With a care almost amounting to fearfulness should its earliest requirements at our hands be supplied. Upon the first few hours and days of its life may depend the health and happiness of years. It is sad to think that the knowledge of the laws by which Nature regulates her works are so little heeded, so little understood ! If any proof were required in support of this remark, a reference to the Registrar General's report would confirm the fact :—‘ *Of the deaths in England in 1859, no less than 184,264—two in every five deaths of the year—were of children under five years of age, and above half of them, 105,629, had scarcely seen the light, and never saw one return of their birthday.*’ It has been more recently stated that from 43 to 45 infant deaths take place in every 100 births. What do these startling figures reveal ? Why should infants wither, droop, and die, at the very portals of life ? Why should they

be prematurely cut off, and pass from the cradle to the grave? *Must there not be something wrong in the habits of society?* Is the science of life as advanced, and is the spirit of the age as morally correct, as we like to think? Whilst these stern facts are recorded, we cannot refuse the belief that a *deeply-rooted evil is undermining our strength.**

“There is perhaps no subject which engrosses greater interest at the present time, than the sacrifice of human life. Nations jealously watch each other with a view to its suppression. Peace congresses raise their voices against the unnatural conflict of man with fellow-man.

“Almost every invention of the age has for its object the economy of life. From the army, that, by unskilful manoeuvres, is sacrificed in the field, to the humble miner who is stifled by fire-damp in the pit—wherever life is sacrificed—investigations, courts-martial, and inquests are held. Yet as an able writer has lately remarked, ‘*an annual slaughter of innocents* take place in this gifted land of ours, surpassing in number those of adults, who are, in the same space of time, swept down in battle, killed on railways, or by any other mechanical ‘accident’ so called.’

“To remove this stain upon our national records should be the endeavour of English mothers. With them mainly rests the task. Let them grapple with disease and death, and win a victory as proud as ever conqueror gained upon the battle-field. For this great object they need not leave their homes. The scene of conflict lies at their own fire-side. The means of warfare surround their bed and wait upon their board. Hand-in-hand with their little ones, they may go forth and meet their enemy. With no other weapon save Nature for their guide, and God for their trust, they will have power to fell him low.

“Throughout the ranks of civilised society there exists

* Hemorrhage and inflammation may be ascribed to the fashionable practice—so repugnant to the laws of human nature.

not a more honourable position than that which the British matron holds within the precincts of her home. It is there that domestic virtues shine as a beacon-light to all the world. England's Queen herself has stooped from the majesty of her throne to ennoble those virtues. The time is passed when, to illustrate a commendable mode of rearing a family, the example of the labouring man was cited. Reference is now made to the highest family in the land. Osborne and Balmoral furnish the instance of a model home *par excellence*. And every wife may be a queen if she will condescend to study and practise the means by which our august and gracious sovereign—not unmindful of her high estate—has made herself pre-eminently a woman. This great distinction, however, is not to be attained by any means short of following in the same footsteps. It is not by listlessly taking the opinion of chance advisers that good counsel is imparted. Special ministers must be consulted. Diet, ventilation, out-door exercise, and morality are their names. The laws which they interpret are arbitrary and inviolable. As surely as happiness, ease, and enjoyment of life result from obedience to their dictates, so surely does infringement of their laws incur a corresponding penalty. No complicated acts, deeds, and settlements, are necessary to bestow on the poorest subject in the land, the benefits and privileges which these ministers of health bestow. A vigorous frame, joyous spirits, and the inestimable boon of undisturbed sleep, are amongst the blessings in their gift. Let young mothers, then, take counsel of these advisers; and having ascertained the principles on which the laws of nature are based, let them banish every vain and frivolous excuse that may impede the course of their noble destiny.

“Referring once more to Royal example, one guiding principle is evident in all the movements of our beloved Queen. It is the principle of punctuality, a principle

which, if not ranked among the cardinal virtues, assuredly deserves so to be. Punctuality has been termed the "politeness of Kings." It is more. It is the obligation under which all lie, whatever may be their rank in the social scale. The meaning of the word in its restricted sense, is confined to "keeping time." In its broader signification, it implies a scrupulous and exact discharge of all the duties of the hour. It is in the latter sense that our Queen unerringly illustrates the noble principle. Whether as Queen, wife, or mother, she faithfully discharges the duties of her station. Punctuality induces obedience, obedience is taught in the palace as the most dignified virtue of kings and princes.

"In every nursery there should be a clock, the plainest and the best the means of the purchaser can afford. The hours of rising, food, recreation, and repose, should be regulated solely by that sign. Ill humour arising from capricious treatment; derangements of health caused by ill-timed food; fretfulness occasioned by irregularity of sleep; and all the evils attendant on a badly-managed nursery, will, by this means, be abolished. Instinctively the little ones will be trained to habits of obedience and regularity. They will look upon the index of their nursery clock, as evidence from which there is no appeal."—UNA.

The following letter has been addressed to the editor of the *Times* :—

Lincoln's Inn Fields, London,
10th February, 1863.

SIR,—As the important movement in aid of a College for the Medical instruction of Females is engaging much attention, I venture to address you on the subject, it being of the highest importance to the human race.

Although we have many excellent institutions supported by benevolent Ladies, Reverend Gentlemen, and many others, ever anxious to assist in any good work for the suppression of vice, bad houses, and snares for the seduction of young and unprotected females, yet I submit to you, Sir, that unless the "New Medical Act" is more rigidly enforced, whereby the ravages of the "crafty physician" may be annihilated, that such laudable intentions will, to a great extent, be frustrated, inasmuch as they will fail to reach the root of the evil.

As long as the malpractice of the junior members of the medical profession is tolerated, either through the introduction of their senior partners into the lying-in chamber, or otherwise, so long may we expect to find them mingled with the greatest criminals of the day, of which there have been too many sad instances of late, duly chronicled in your impartial Journal.*

How can we recognize such a class of professional

* In female cases, it is not too much to assume that whilst medical men retain their natural feelings, they acquire impure desires, and when nature's powers become exhausted (either through profligacy during their training, or the excitements usually occasioned by their effeminate practice), they become fiendish in their propensities, and hence foul and brutish practitioners.—W. T.

hypocrites? or how can we find language to address them?

“ Oh Man! thou feeble tenant of an hour
 Debased by slavery, or corrupt by power ;
 Who knows thee well, must quit thee with disgust,
 Degraded mass of animated dust!
 Thy love is lust, thy friendship all a cheat,
 Thy smiles hypocrisy, thy words deceit.”

Let me express the hope, Sir, that you may be enabled to view this subject with that interest which I am assured must be felt by the ‘*young blood*’ of England. Believe me, Sir, a few words from you will go so far, and have such weight, that I am assured we should have comparatively an easy task in establishing, (for such desirable objects,) a College, which I hold to be clearly expedient, *for the interests of society, and the sake of humanity*, as you will hereafter discover by some melancholy occurrences which have recently come under my notice, through the dangerous consequences of employing unlicensed Men-midwives. If He-, or Man-midwifery was publicly exposed, we should not hear of women dying under the hands of men, or ruined for life through the damnable art of the crafty Physician, which can only be characterized as a vile attempt to supersede nature. Let the medical profession endeavour to uphold the dignity of their order!

The practice of Man-midwifery owes its origin to France, and has now unhappily disgraced the profession for nearly a century, and the ravages of the junior members of the profession are of such frequent occurrence, that I humbly submit to you, Sir, it is the duty of every christian to expel such maltreatment and unmanly practice. The cases within my own knowledge are truly heartrending, and would make your blood run cold. It is gratifying to know that there are many eminent members of the profession doing their utmost for the suppression of the evil, by endeavouring to replace the Midwife in her legitimate office. On the occasion

of the birth of George the 4th, in 1762, the Queen, his mother refused the assistance of a doctor. "Delicacy had, in those days, so far the ascendancy, that the obstetrical art was chiefly practised by females; and, on this occasion, the Queen was assisted by Mrs. Stevens, Dr. Hunter being in attendance in an adjoining room, in case of professional aid being required.—'Memoirs of George the Fourth.'" Thus were all the children of George the Third brought into the world by the aid of Mrs. Stevens. The mother of our present Queen was assisted by a woman, and England rejoices in the happy result. Let the country contrast the happy, yet natural results, with the lamentable and melancholy fate of England's former hope—the Princess Charlotte of Wales and her babe. Alas! that ingenious and Royal female in anticipation of becoming a mother, pleased herself with the fond idea of suckling her infant; "and," says Mr. Huish, "it was the cause of most poignant grief when it was announced to her, that, in conformity with etiquette, she would not be allowed the enjoyment of one of the sweetest occupations of a mother," so little was a fatal termination of the interesting accouchement anticipated. She, too, with the same delicacy of feeling which influenced her august grandmother, expressed a wish to be attended by a woman, but Dr. Bailey (no doubt to secure Royal recognition of the male-practice in furtherance of the interests of the faculty) introduced Dr. Croft. What he was paid for this, deponent suggests not; however Dr. Croft, (who certainly was considered the first practitioner of the day,) after the fatal event, and after a similar fatal event, committed suicide! Dr. Bailey's deathbed confession makes it evident that he wished his time had been otherwise employed; frequently did he exclaim, "*I wish I could be sure that I have not killed more than I have cured.*" If the grave could speak, how fearful would be its revelations on this topic! how monstrous the guilt of those who revel in innocent blood! Dr. McNair, a

Physician of 40 years' practice, says, "All that is proper to be done in a case of natural labour, (that is, a labour which terminates in 24 hours after it has set in, *without artificial assistance*,) from its commencement to its termination, will suggest itself to any person of common understanding, and I have long laboured under the conviction that the office of attending women in their confinement, should be entrusted to prudent females. There is not, according to my experience, and the *reports of many of the most eminent surgeons*, more than *one* case in 3000 that requires uncommon assistance.* I am aware however, that there are *crafty* Physicians who attempt, and often succeed in making the distressed and alarmed female believe it would be altogether impossible to get over her troubles without his assistance."

"An Act

That blurs the grace and blush of modesty ;
 _____takes off the rose
 From the fair forehead of an innocent love,
 And sets a blister there."

Sir Anthony Carlisle, late President of the Royal College of Surgeons, says, "Childbirth, like parturition in the lower animals, is purely a natural process, the safety of which Divine Providence has most wisely secured, and consequently it is always mischievous to tamper with pregnant women, under the pretence of hastening, easing, or retarding their delivery." He also says, "the safeguards of child-bed are amply provided for by nature, and not one instance in a thousand calls for any other help beyond what any moderately experienced woman can safely give." I shall only add the following distressing case which was recorded in the *West Sussex Gazette*, and quoted in the *Liverpool Mercury*.—"A young woman aged 22, was attended by a Surgeon in her confinement. Her sufferings were protracted and fearful in the extreme. The Surgeon was

* "Let 'em alone and they 'll come home,
 . And bring their tails behind 'em."

repeatedly urged to call in additional assistance regardless of expense. He made light of the case. The husband made repeated enquiries how matters were proceeding. He was as repeatedly informed all was doing as well as could be. The wife became delirious with agony. The Surgeon descends the stairs to the anxious partner. "*I have bad news to tell you! SHE IS GONE!*" "Good God! you have delayed it too long." "My dear fellow, all has been done that could be done." Oh! Sir, who can read or write such things with calmness? It would make devils weep. The Surgeon was sent to Winchester Gaol.*

Dr. Ewell, a learned Physician of 30 years' practice, whose authority is at this moment in great estimation, in the introduction to his "*Letters to Ladies,*" says, "The serious object of my present solicitude, is to wrest the practice of Midwifery from the hands of men, and transfer it to women, as it was in the beginning, and ever should be; I have seldom felt a more ardent desire to succeed in any undertaking, because I view the present practice of calling on men in ordinary births, as a source of serious evils in child-bearing, as an imposition upon the credulity of women, and upon the fears of their husbands, as a means of sacrificing delicacy, and consequently virtue, and as a robbery of many good women of their proper employment and support." He also says, "But the opposition, the detestation of this practice cannot be so great in any husband as among some women. The idea of it has driven some to convulsions and derangement, and every one of the least delicacy feels deeply humiliated at the exposure. Many of them while in labour have been so shocked at the entrance of a man into their chamber, as to have all their pains banish, (sometimes for several days.)"

* The foul murder of poor Cook by Palmer, his medical attendant and sporting companion, will long be remembered, and how many murders by medical men occur annually, God only knows.

Every *man*-midwife has witnessed a temporary cessation of labour, caused by his entrance. The knock at the door, the ring of the bell, is sufficient to produce this result; ordinarily, it provokes a little jocularly, but is too frequently followed by serious consequences.*

To be instrumental in relieving one of this truly interesting class, will be a heavenly consolation, to all who can be alive to the pleasures of serving the virtuous, amidst the wreck of our *natural* laws, and the dissolution of social order.

Believe me, Sir,

Faithfully yours,

WILLIAM TALLEY.

To the Editor of *The Times*.

* One flagrant disobedience to the law of Nature, which is the law of God, is the employing of man in the hour of travail. God's curse is upon it. *Sorrows are multiplied*. Keep men away; let women, and women only, be employed, and God's blessing will follow; *sorrow and suffering* will soon pass away. The presence of the "*dirty doctor*" shames and frightens nature out of the room!

MALE OR FEMALE MIDWIVES.

“Until within about two centuries, male accoucheurs were wholly unknown. Women alone presided at births. And the alleged origin of this modern custom reflects no special credit upon it. Its propriety is questionable, because it is directly in the teeth of that native female modesty so innate, as well as necessary to woman. Let those who know, testify to the extreme reluctance with which young mothers submit, in their first confinement, to be handled by doctors. It is perfectly revolting to their finer sensibilities. This is not the result of prudery, but of natural MODESTY. And that modesty—the great safeguard of human virtue—it does much to annul. It breaks the ice, and paves the way for familiarity with other men than their own husbands; and that not a few doctors take advantage of it, and the confidence required by this custom to excite improper feelings in women, and to gratify unhallowed passions in themselves, is more common than husbands for a moment suppose. These husbands, before and at accouchement, persuade, and scold, and almost force their wives to allow the doctor to make his observations—of which there is no sort of need in one case in hundreds—and the bars of virtue thus torn down, both the doctors and others find subsequent access too often allowed, whereas but for her having been thus “broken in,” nothing on earth could have induced her to have tolerated the least familiarity.

And, what is worse, women must lay all their female complaints before the doctor, and talk much about these private matters, of which physicians can take advantage to excite impure desires. Husbands, look well to this matter.

Besides, till every feeling of instinctive modesty is worn away, the presence of strange men around the lying-in bed has a *dampening, repressing influence on the mother's mind, which materially retards delivery*. She tries to suppress her spasmodic efforts, and this stifles the operation. Yet the presence of husbands is admissible, and even desirable, as it sustains the mother; but this *turning out husbands*, because their presence is improper, yet admitting doctors, is *strange*.

And why are not women quite as well qualified as men, to officiate on such occasions? They have smaller and softer hands, more tact, more of the child-loving instinct, which is an important pre-requisite, and especially more tenderness and quickness of perception, together with PERSONAL EXPERIENCE—the most important preparation of all. How infinitely better

does this experience fit mothers to preside, than all the learning of the schools does men? This book-learning UNFITS men for accoucheurs, for it induces them often to resort to instruments where nature, left to herself, would do the work far better, and save mother and child.*

“The world is naturally averse
To all the truth it sees, and hears,
But swallows nonsense, and a lie
With greediness and gluttony.”

The Greeks had female physicians.† The mother of Socrates was a midwife, and such was the chasteness of the times that lithotomy on the female subject was performed by one of her own sex. At Athens the positive enactments of the land were inefficient to overcome their scrupulous modesty. It is said that the Athenian doctors procured a legal enactment transferring the practice of midwifery to themselves; but at the very attempt the women rose *en masse*, and declared they would die, rather than submit to such outrage upon common decency. Where, then, in view of this noble expression of natural sentiment, is the superiority of English women, in naturalness, in virtue, in purity? Even in France, in Paris, the practice of Man Midwifery is becoming an exception instead of the rule—more honoured by its breach than the observance—and to the inhabitants of the provinces is still, as ever, most revolting.‡

By the inhabitants of the greater part of the world a man is not permitted to approach where labour is going on; and so it would be with us; *and would be*

* “Maternity or the Bearing and Nursing of Children,” by O. S. Fowler, New York.

† “Ubi non est mulier, ibi ingemiscit æger.”

Where woman is not, there the sick man groans.

‡ “Such a system (the employment of females) would be more congenial to the refined sensibilities of womankind, which revolts, and naturally, from the idea of employing masculine aid in cases of so delicate a nature.”—*Court Circular*, Feb. 27, 1858.

did our women consider what is due to themselves, to their husbands, their children and to society. There is no need that men should be employed.* The need that they should be sent to a less effeminating employ is urgent. † “Who shall go to the war?” Their own sense of honour would lead them to yield the field to those whose right it is, were it not that the influence and wealth to which the degrading practice leads extinguishes every spark of honour in their breasts.—From the *Journal of Health*.

“Men, are you men—who lead such hybrid lives,
 Who, being surgeons, sink into midwives?
 If, with the sex, you seriously would vie,
 Why not the distaff and the spindle try?
 Throughout the Orient, Arab, Turk, and Jew,
 On such occasions, never send for you;
 Not even the Nubian by the harem door,
 Dare show his face until the birth is o'er.
 Talk of the sanctity of married life—
 Nation of fools! who thus degrade the wife!
 At such a moment, when the feminine mind
 Shrinks from the succour of her nearest kind,
 Could you do worse, were she a courtesan,
 Than to her chamber introduce a man?
 When the Third George's Queen was “in the straw”
 What male on Majesty dared place a paw?
 Or, where the English matron would endure
 The outlandish monster termed an “Accoucheur!”
 How sad the change of manners, year by year,
 Since bearded midwives first came over here!
 Morality is now a senseless word,
 And modesty the same—a thing absurd.

* Sir Anthony Carlisle styled the boasted “art” a “pretence,” and accoucheurs “mere nurses.”

† “The employment of medical practitioners in cases of accouchement, has long been a matter of grave objection amongst the middle and upper classes of society, in every part of the United Kingdom. Undoubtedly the idea is naturally revolting to the refined mind, and naturally suggests the propriety of employing females to attend on their sex in cases of so delicate a nature.”—*Commercial Daily List*, Feb. 9, 1858.

What need has modesty for veil or shawl
 Where sex is scarcely recognised at all?
 'Tis not My Lord who leaves My Lady's room,
 But Dr. SLOP—who treats her for the womb.
 Why smiles the maid? why grins the chamber-groom?
 Alas for Physic too!—a Science once—
 The chosen refuge now of rogue and dunce,
 Who, while degrading woman, still contrive
 To starve out honest Art and basely thrive!
 These soft-lipped "Neutrals," now, usurp the place
 Of Esculapians foremost in the race,
 Brave men and true—who wear the soldier's cross,
 For noblest deeds in trench, and field, and fosse.
 SLOP—Dr. SLOP may now "SIR SLOP" enact,
 In a Queen's chamber for—his "feminine tact,"
 Precede the gallant Galens of our wars,
 And elbow SANDWICH—who defended Kars!
 No longer left to women's hands and heads,
 Travail is now what every woman dreads;
 A natural process, for the nonce, becomes
 An operation costing goodly sums;
 While rogues in grain, with much parade and fuss,
 Do things, ye gods! not pleasant to discuss!
 Alas! how little England knows the pranks
 Whereby Imposture thins her female ranks!
 Once in the sick room, with an eye to fees,
 Tales they get up of uterine disease;
 Disease, the realms of Physic never knew,
 Till 'speculating Simpson' gave the cue;
 And, working thus on woman's weaker nerves,
 They raise whatever ghost their purpose serves!
 Then, not the young alone, but graver dames,
 Fooled by mere phantoms with un-English names,
 Endure 'examinations'—Ladies, speak!
 Do these not shock the soul and blanch the cheek?
 Surprise comes first—next horror, ill disguised;
 But soon to worse some get familiarised!
 For what will trusting woman not believe
 And bear, when 'scientific men' deceive?
 With no suspicion of the game these play,
 Their tales of terror haunt her night and day.
 Now she dreads 'tumour,' now dreads 'cancer,' now
 'Version' she talks of, with a 'why' and 'how.'
 Reasons, of course, and numberless occasions,
 Have these quick rogues for their 'manipulations,'
 But who—immortal truth!—can justify

The frightful means they locally apply?
 Caustics, that keep their patients always ill,
 Yet ever ready to indorse their skill;
 While abscess, ulcer, hæmorrhage itself,
 Attest what men may CAUSE for love of self.
 Note the result—whatever the pretext,
 In soul, at least, the woman is unsexed;
 Words that of yore would make her forehead flush,
 She now blurts out to men without a blush!
 Heavens! how can husbands, fathers, brothers lend
 Their countenance to such an odious end!
 In all the *animal* kingdom, where or when
 Were such things needed—tell us, Englishmen!
 Of 'base chirurgery' let the world take heed,
 For this is base chirurgery indeed!"

Physic and its Phases.

But our country is not wholly given up to this vile custom—a filthy fashion.* In many country districts, where there is not a doctor for miles, a female neighbour performs without difficulty that which is her natural duty. Difficulty is almost unknown where women only are employed, but if once the doctor is introduced in a neighbourhood "*difficult cases*" are not wanting.† The first case, if it suit him, becomes a difficult one; he gives it out as such, and says it was well he was called in time. It is told abroad, if doubt is expressed by any they are assured that "the doctor says so." The patient herself believes it more readily, because the circumstance excites more sympathy on her behalf.‡

But not among the poor alone is the midwife in request. A gentlewoman practising amongst the wealthy inhabitants at the Court end of London

* "Child-birth is simply the performance of a natural function, like eating, drinking, evacuation of the bowels, &c."—*Dr Johnson.*

† "Good tales swell the professor's fees."

‡ Medical men are prone to tattle about the "difficulties" occasioned by the "size" of the child, but they forget that our little hens lay very fine eggs, without *artificial assistance.*

receives a fee of ten guineas, and when summoned to the aristocracy, as she is very frequently, receives thirty guineas for her attendance. "I am pleased," says the author of *The Accoucheur*, "to be able to state that there are females in the higher classes among the nobility, who not only 'would rather have a midwife than a doctor,' but who will, *on no account*, permit a *man-midwife near them at the time of childbirth*.* The celebrated female midwife, Madame Boivin, is a Doctor of Medicine of the University of Paris. She has written a book on midwifery, which will compare with any that has yet been written on the subject by the most learned men in that profession. Many women who are now toiling as daily governesses might make handsome incomes as midwives. Their right has long been occupied by people who should be otherwise employed.†

"A thousand times you dwell upon the miseries of one sufferer, without thinking of the millions who happily and healthily pass the period of parturition.‡ Away with your forebodings! Believe the truth, when pregnant, that, in all probability, you will do perfectly well, and the most ordinary woman can render you every needful assistance, without the interference of *men-midwives*; *their hurry, their spirit for acting*, have done the sex more harm than all the injudicious man-

* He, or Man-Midwifery, is beastly brutality, and those villains who practise it should be punished as rogues and vagabonds—thus much for medical instruction in the present century—setting nature at defiance, and spreading prostitution over a happy land.

† Dr. S. Dickson.

‡ "Child-birth, like parturition in the lower animals, is purely a natural process, the safety of which Divine Providence has most wisely secured; and consequently it is always mischievous *to tamper with pregnant women*, under the pretence of hastening, easing, or retarding their delivery."—*Sir Anthony Carlisle*.

agement of midwives, of which they are so fond of tattling."*

A lady, still in practice, Mrs Elizabeth Mate, of Islington, has practised since 1827, first in the City-road hospital, where she delivered 101. Her certificate was signed by Drs. Conquest and Liddersdale. She left there, being appointed to the Islington Lying-in Institution, early in 1828, where she continued until 1843, having delivered during that time 2012. Mrs Mate was attending, the whole of that period, cases for the parish of Islington, delivering for the midwife, who was unable for some years from bad health, to attend the duties of her office. She was also, at the same time, midwife to the Ladies' Philanthropic Society, as well as to the Finsbury Dispensary. Her private cases would surprise every one. She frequently attends foreign ladies, especially those from the West Indies, &c. In 1846 she was appointed midwife to the Parish of Islington, and has twice (without assistance) delivered two full-grown children *joined together*, in one instance joined by the sides, and in the other by the front part of their bodies. Her cases are two, three, and sometimes four per day and night.

SUMMARY OF CASES ATTENDED BY MRS MATE.

Private	3,587
City-road Hospital	101
Islington Lying-in Institution	2,012
Parish of Islington	3,278
Ladies' Compassionate Society	242
Philanthropic Society	51

9,271

Where is the *man*-midwife who can compete with the above?

The excellent publications of Hamilton Fitzwilliams, Esq. (published by Mr Caudwell) give sound advice on the highly important subject of midwifery, and the

* Dr. Ewell.

destruction of human life and happiness by the employment of male agency. He says, "While condemning the usurpation of the practice of midwifery by the *he*-professors of the 'art,' one of the authors mentioned in the title page of this work recommends them to claim the whole business and routine of the lying-in room to themselves—to monopolize the offices of nurse and waiting maid, as well as that of midwife, and then they would have things all their own way*. There would be no 'tell-tales of their freaks and gambols.' They could clout the child, dress and undress the lady, tie her garters, put on her shift, &c. &c., 'and all this,' he says, 'would be as consistent and becoming' as the 'touching' and 'pawing,' the 'fingering' and 'feeling,' the 'peeping and prying,' &c. and fashion would soon reconcile female scruples to the innovation, obtain the consent to it of kind husbands, and silence public opinion." Really, this suggestion is so encouraging, I am thinking of qualifying for the "fun," and that we, the associated firm in co-partnership of He-midwife, He-nurse, He-waiting-maid, & Co., would thus have the whole business in our hands; the increased gratitude and affection of our patients, the delicates and modests, the augmented praises and recommendations of the touting and trumpeting delicates and modests, and the infinitely augmented thanks and confidence of the said delicates' and modests' husbands; and get well paid, too, into the bargain. This is, certainly, no bad hint; it is worth the notice of the *he*-midwifery tribe. Increased gratitude, increased affection, increased praise and recommendation, in-

* According to the most eminent members of the medical profession the womb naturally expels her contents like the bowels, and assistance is as absurd in the former case, as it would be in the latter, and if they always operated at the same time (and they do frequently) "strong men" may for the future, assist the nurses, instead of the patients, as they are so ambitious for acting in our private apartments.

creased thanks and confidence, increased pay, and, what is as much as all the rest (considering that we, the tentatives and speculatists, the peepists and pryists, are not exactly Munchausens—men who would contend about being foremost in the forlorn hope at the entry of “the deadly imminent breach,” or love to be “first and foremost amidst the battle’s roar,”) increased improbability of having our touching and feeling freaks and pranks discovered, as we should have the matter all our own way, snug, sly, and cozy. Really, Messieurs He-midwives, and ye, the other touching and tailing medicals, this is a splendid idea; you ought to “come down something for it,” and reward your benefactor. The least you can do—indeed, it is the cheapest and the easiest reward you can bestow—is to allow the suggester of the brilliant and sublime idea to range through your respective seraglios and preserves of delicates and modests, and select among your admiring and affectionate kiddies, a kiddy or two for his own proper use and recreation. “And surely this would be no great stretch of generosity on your part, considering how easily and readily you replenish your stock and replace your capital, or, to adopt sportsmanlike phraseology, ‘restock your preserves.’ Should you be disposed to be niggardly in this respect, believe me, the old codger, who is a connoisseur in nun’s flesh, like yourselves, will not feel disposed to serve you again, and pother his pate in devising plans for your sakes and recreation.”

The author of “Death-blow to He or Man-midwifery” gives the following valuable information, as being all that is required to be known on this delicate subject, and writes thus:—“But without treating the matter lightly, let us see what is the precise amount of the prodigious anatomical knowledge to which the most ‘eminent’ and the most ‘skilful’ of those worthies, the he or man-midwives, who so busily and cozily occupy

F

themselves in paying their manual and visual respects to delicate and modest married women, instead of employing themselves at the tail of the plough, or some other useful and honourable manual avocation, for which nature, in her wise and provident dispensations, has better fitted them, can pretend.*

All the anatomy requisite for a practitioner (whether male or female, he or she, mongrel or genuine, natural or unnatural,) is a knowledge of the bones of the pelvis in its perfect state, so as to be able to judge whether it is deformed, and to what degree. In connection with the lumbar vertebræ, its situation and axis should also be known. The knowledge of its form and diameter is comprehended in the knowledge of the different bones of which it is composed, namely, the share-bone before, technically called the *pubes*, the rump-bone, and the lower part of the back, or hinder bone, called *coccyx* and *sacrum*, and the hip and flank bones laterally, called *ischium* and *ilium*; the two pubes-bones—namely, the hip and flank, are united by cartilage or gristle, and this inarticulate junction is called *symphysis pubis*. A knowledge of the contents of the pelvis is also necessary. Thus the female pelvis contains the bladder before, and also the urethra, or water passage, which lies exactly within the symphysis pubis; the uterus or womb in the middle, and the rectum, or fæcal excretory, behind. The shape of the womb resembles a large pear a little flattened, but becomes more globular as the fœtus grows. The upper and largest part of it is called the *fundus*, the lower and small the *neck* or *cervix uteri*, and the mouth of it *os uteri*. The womb's mouth is placed at the end, resembling the mouth of a puppy or a tench, thence called *os tinæ*. This forms a slight inversion over the vaginal passage, but in the

* In future, when nurses find men intruding themselves within their legitimate province, it is suggested to them that they may "crown" such "mock modests" with the "Royal George" with impunity.

act of parturition the womb and the vagina form one continuous passage.

The obstetrical practitioner should also understand the increase and elevation of the gravid uterus during the various periods of gestation, which amount of obstetrical knowledge, I have no hesitation in saying, every woman who has been a mother knows much better than any he-midwife or demi-masculine and demi-feminine mongrel that ever cursed the face of the earth with his presence and mischievous propensity. She should also know the natural situation of the child in utero, and of the placenta. Respecting the child while in utero, and during the mother's parturition, the chief distinction is to ascertain the opening of the two principal bones of the head. The larger opening on the top of the head is called the *anterior fontanelle*, the smaller one, towards the back of the head, is called the *posterior fontanelle*. These are distinguished by the anterior being the larger, and surrounded by the two frontal and the two parietal bones; the smaller has only three angles, formed by the posterior angle of the parietals, and the corresponding point of the occipital bone. The seam which runs from the one fontanelle to the other, dividing the skull on the top of the head, is called the *sagittal suture*. The placenta, or after burden, adheres, when right, to the fundus uteri; one end of the navel string, or cord, technically termed *funis umbilicalis*, is inserted into the *placenta*, the other into the child's navel. The fluid in which the child swims while in the womb, is technically termed the *liquor amnii*, *amnios*, or *chorion*, popularly *the waters*.

Such, reader, is the amazing amount of knowledge of anatomy which those profound anatomists, the he or men-midwives, "the dear, darling doctors" of "light-headed women," are constantly accusing their more efficient and successful competitors in the reciprocity or free-trade principle of promoting the population of the world—the "fumbling old she-midwives"—with

being ignorant of. Amazing as it is, however, "I guess," as the Yankees say, whether nine-tenths of the "touching and tailing, the prying and peeping gentry" fully understand. But their objection to "the fumbling old women" on the ground of their ignorance of anatomy is about as sound and as valid as that of their claim to their monopoly of the use and abuse of their murderous iron instruments. If the use of instruments be necessary, (Vide ante p. 7) I should like to hear the he-midwifery logic to prove what prevents females becoming expert in the application of them. In their use (recollect, he-midwives, I am not speaking at random, but advisedly and deliberately) it is not bodily strength, but tact and dexterity, that are requisite, and I believe no man that is possessed of the least gallantry but will allow that the delicate and tender hand of woman is capable of using them with equal tact and dexterity as the heavy and clumsy paw of any he-midwife alive.

"If a child should be still-born in a case in which a midwife has been employed," observes one of the authors of the admirable works mentioned in the title-page of "The Death-blow to He or Man-midwifery," an inquest is held on the body, and the village or neighbouring surgeon's evidence (whose interest it is to defame an opponent by whom his income is affected, and his false and spurious importance in the neighbourhood gives his opinion the desired effect) insinuates that the child had died through neglect, and the incompetency of the midwife. The midwife is consequently dreaded by every pregnant woman in the neighbourhood, and the same surgeon-accoucheur, notwithstanding in his own practice he may have been present at the birth of dozens still-born, and done incalculable mischief to mothers, is employed with confidence for the future."

In the *Times* newspaper, of April 10th, 1845, will be found the report of a trial before Baron Parke, at Nor-

wich, on the 8th of the same month, of a man-midwife, a regular diplomatised surgeon, for cutting away the womb and a considerable part of the large intestines, in consequence of which monstrous and cruel operation the poor woman died. But hear it, ye lovers of fashion and legal practice! he was acquitted upon the testimony of medical men—members of the craft—because he had a licence to kill, *and they were ready to swear that "even skilful and experienced practitioners were liable to such misfortunes."* Then, oh! never employ them, for

"Murder most foul and unnatural"

may be the consequence, by brutes thus made irresponsible to humanity."

Mrs Ruth Stebbins, a nurse, said that the young doctors of Sheffield, when speaking of attending the young wives on the first occasion, called it "halter breaking them," and rejoicing in their occupation. "There," they would say to each other, as they looked out into the street,

"There goes one that I halter broke a few weeks ago, and there, yonder, comes another that I will break in soon."

Break her altar vow! break her fidelity! to his boastful lust.*

About a century ago male accoucheurs, or men in the nursery, were wholly unknown. Women alone presided at births. Let us glance at the origin of this unnatural and revolting practice, which was imported from France. The Rev. James Caughey tells an anecdote of a sea-captain asking where the Americans had their

* "Scarcely a member of the profession whom you meet but has a tale to tell of practices, which, if made public, would bring the mighty from their seats: but there is too much indecency involved in the disclosure to allow of publicity That they are silent on these abuses is in my opinion to be deplored. Such silence may arise from the fear that the denunciation would tend to lower it (the profession) in the estimation of the public more than the continuance of the abuses themselves. Yielding to none in the desire to uphold the dignity of my order, I must say that I share in no such apprehensions."—*A Member of the Royal College of Surgeons.*

fashions from. It was replied "from England." And where does England get them from?—"from France. And where does France get them from?—"From the devil." Would you believe it? Will the ladies of England believe that they are following in the slimy wake of an harlot? So it is. The first man-midwifery patient was a kept woman—a courtesan—a favourite mistress of Louis the XIV., but even she did not submit without some degree of shame, as the ladies of England now do. "She desired it might be kept a profound secret. She sent for one Julien Clement,* a surgeon of some reputation, and he was conducted with the greatest *secrecy* into a house where the lady was, *with her head covered.*" The event took place in December, 1665. The practice spread but slowly, and *at the risk of life* by the profession, to other countries. Dr Viles, of Hamburg, disguised himself in woman's attire, and succeeded in being present at a birth, for which he was *publicly branded*, and another writer says he was *condemned to the flames.*

The Rev. W. Miltimore, of Litchfield, N. H. states, that "a physician in his parish having attended a pretty-faced woman in her confinement, presumed upon his intimacy, and jumped into bed with her, but by her screams she brought in friends to her relief. The public papers of June, 1847, state that Dr S. S. Perry, of Gainesville, Ala., representative of the Legislature, attended as family physician in the family of Col. J. A. Winston, State senator. Dr. P., as is not surprising, became a paramour, then an adulterer. Winston shot him through, in the Post Office, and exclaimed, "Thank God, I have killed the seducer of my wife, and the destroyer of my own peace!"

Dr Ewell speaks of "the melancholy tale of the se-

* J. Clement, alias M. Chison—the fortunate attendant upon this case—was soon after appointed midwife to the Princess of France.—Dr. DAVIS.

duction of the wife of a member of Congress, from Carolina, by her accoucheur."

The papers of November, 1847, state that Alderman James Noe, of Lafayette, La., shot Dr Easton. Cause,—improper intimacy between Dr. E. and Noe's wife. The alderman was tried and acquitted.*

Dr. G., of Lowell, was tried for infanticide. To show his general character, several ladies testified in court that he had, on sundry professional visits, endeavoured to seduce them. To one woman, whose husband was absent, he prescribed *adultery as indispensable* to her complaint.† In the excellent work, by John Browne, Esq., known as "The Accoucheur," in which he addresses the Rev. Mr Tattershall, of Liverpool, on the evils of man-midwifery, occasioned by some remarks made during the debate in the case of Dr Nevins, at the meeting of the West Derby Board of Guardians, (reported in the *Liverpool Mercury*, of September 11th, 1857, when the Rev. gentleman strangely remarked that "*he should not like to see a midwife attending his wife, although he knew many poor people would have a midwife as soon as a doctor,*") he observes, "The evil which you, no doubt, unwittingly countenance and encourage by those sentences is sapping its foundation; happy homes are by it made desolate; it threatens in all classes, and, alas! destroys, in too many instances, their peace, purity, and

* Medical men "play the devil" in families.

† On the subject of prostitution, "the miserable overflow in our streets," there has been of late, week after week, a leader in the *Lancet* blaming the squeamishness, fastidiousness, &c., of ministers of the gospel and others for not encountering the growing evil. While I would not attempt to exonerate these individuals, I think I may be excused calling upon the *Lancet* to "look at home." How many of the 80,000 ruined bodies and curse-pursuing souls that prowl the streets of London may be laid to the charge of the writer or writers of those leaders? —"Accoucheur."

virtue, filling them with mourning, lamentation, and woe. To me, Sir, it is ever a matter of astonishment that intelligent guardians of public morals, instructors of the people, and ministers of the gospel, should give the weight of their influence, by precept and example, to support such a system of pampered iniquity, such a curse to the sanctity of home, *such a hot-bed of vice and of prostitution as in man-midwifery*. But, thank God, there are some who have their eyes open to its terrible consequences. A brother clergyman of yours, in a note to a friend writes "my mind is more made up than ever as to the shameful impropriety of employing *men-midwives*."*

Dr Blundell relates a case wherein a surgeon called at his house whilst he had a case of labour under his care, about which he was very anxious. He said "*the mouth of the womb is beginning to open, and I can feel the child*, but the patient is somewhat weak, and labour makes but little progress." On my enquiry how long delivery had been protracted, 'a few hours,' was the reply, and he added that there was every pressing symptom. '*A meddling midwifery is bad*,' I rejoined, 'therefore it is better to wait, and not unwisely and rashly disturb; the best accoucheur is *nature*, the mother of us all.' A day or two passed away, after which he called on me again, observing that his patient, still undelivered, was getting weaker and weaker, and that he wished me to give her a visit. On entering the apartment, I saw the woman lying in state, with nurses, accoucheur, and all the formalities attending a delivery. One small point only was wanting to complete the labour, which was *that she should become pregnant*. A few hours after the patient died, and, on examining the abdomen, we found the peritoneum full

* Once permit "*the charms*" of old England to be blighted, you can never recover her native possessions—

'Once put out the light.

And then, put out the light!"

of water, but the womb clearly unimpregnated, was no bigger than a pear." Let us hear no more of "ignorant old women" after this. Did ever a "fumbling old midwife" make such a mistake as this?

The late Dr. Smellie can only be remembered as a beast in such cases, with his male pupils who attended his experiments together, evidenced by his own words, thus,—“Her breach being moved towards the bed-side, some of the ‘gentlemen’ kept her in that position. I had her put in the same position, and applied the forceps in the same manner as in the afore-mentioned case. I then pulled very gently every pain, and the woman being *exposed to show* the operation, I was surprised to see what I imagined the occiput come along with the pubes,” &c. Would husbands suffer this if they were present?* Imagine a number of gay young fellows, full of midnight spree, surrounding the patient with morbid curiosity. After such a course of instruction, it is no wonder that medical students are eaten up by disease, and *destroyed in their youth*, with the finger of heaven pointing at them as they walk the streets, seeking cases for the gratification of their filthy passions.†

For the benefit of husbands, the much-respected author of “Man-midwifery Dissected” thus expresses

* If such inhuman treatment be consistent for the poor, why not treat gentlewomen in the same way? Where’s the man who would not bayonet the villain who dared introduce an apprentice, or his filthy partner, to protect him in such a case?

† My private acquaintance with medical men is very limited, but their courtesy entitles them to my sympathy as “*injured men*”—enemies to themselves. Two of the elder ones were separated from their wives; the third was deprived of his *testicles* through disease; another is obliged to carry a catheter in his hat; and No. 5, a *very respectable man*, kept his mistress at the post office of his “*little town*,” forsook his bed, until, at length, his poor wife (who brought him a fortune) dropped into his arms a lifeless corpse, with a deep and fatal incision in the side of her neck.

his opinion. "No proper transaction can take place between a married woman and a man who is not her husband which requires the husband's absence; and if any woman who pretends to modesty should prefer the sympathy, 'the kind and gentle words' of the doctor to those of her husband (who is the person best adapted and qualified to console and encourage her in the anguish of her labour), especially when the doctor's hands and eyes are so curiously and temptingly engaged, I have but little doubt she has a very good motive for so doing—a motive which the doctor will not be slow or backward in appreciating and reducing into practical use and operation.

"No man can object to a husband's presence in the bed-room of his suffering wife," says the author of "The Danger and Immorality of Employing Men-midwives," unless he has some foul design in view in the employment of either his hands or his eyes.*

"Can that woman be deemed virtuous," is the emphatic and memorable question of the author of "Man-midwifery Exposed,"† who suffers another man to take liberties with her person, especially in those parts which ought to be sacred only to her husband, behind her husband's back, which she would object to and feel offended at before his face.

"Conversing with a gentleman," says the author of "The Impropriety of Men being Employed in Midwifery," who has considerable practice in midwifery, I introduced the subject of the general character of women. His opinion may be collected from some of the observations made. They were these.—"I think six or seven out of every ten married women are im-

* No man of honour will do behind a husband's back what he is ashamed to do before his face, and it would be a blessing if husbands on ever being requested to leave their wife's chamber by the medical man were to kick such a scoundrel out of their house.

† Dr Stevens.

morally disposed, and in^d these cases the medical attendant has the best chance of success, as he is the readiest and most safe to trust." We have an almost unlimited power, observes another of my acquaintance. There is no necessity for us to plot; we come to "close quarters" at once. In fact, we have the opportunity of receiving the favours of the fair with the greatest facility, and on the most extensive scale. We buy our gratifications at a cheap rate; we obtain profit and pleasure at the same time—a pretty girl, the thanks and gratitude both of herself and her *cara sposa*, and what is more are paid, too, in the bargain."

"On such a theme 'tis impious to be calm;
Passion is reason, transport temper here."

A few months since "Punch," who always defends the "dear women" from leechery, received the following suggestion for "female medical men," that inasmuch as the 'frenchified' title of 'accoucheur' is un-english, and not generally understood, that they would be much better known to all classes of society by prefixing 'NURSE' to their names, *i. e.* "Nurse Smith, Nurse Perkins, Nurse McKinzey—can wash a baby, tie garters, fasten bandages, or adjust a chemizette—in fact, anything belonging to the long robe department."

In concluding this highly important subject with "Death-blow" on my desk, let me draw the reader's attention to the following sensible observations of a man of honour and a gentleman by birth and education, who speaks to you as a father, having your interests at heart, and evidently desiring to deter you, amidst the enjoyment of your sacred happiness, from the intolerable interruption which invariably arises from an odious practice, which it is our fervent desire to put down. "Ye pusillanimous, shallow-pated, half-witted, antlered animals! Ye 'creature husbands!' Ye slaves to popular absurdity and immorality, who are overborne by custom, and cannot muster up spirit and resolution

enough to protect your wives' persons from insult and pollution, and maintain your own honour and dignity, but patiently and approvingly submit to the greatest possible indignity and dishonour that can be offered to manhood, that you may avoid the reproach of not acting like other husbands, but at the bidding of any ignorant and crafty, and, for aught that you know to the contrary, licentious and lecherous he-midwife, sneak out of your wife's bedroom, and leave the scoundrel (who may possibly clap a pair of antlers on your sconces) lord paramount of your own bedroom, your snuggery, and all that is dear to you, to amuse himself in his tentative and speculative, his pawing and peeping proceedings with your wife, at his will and pleasure; I tell you that, if you are not entitled to a pair of cuckold's horns, you are richly worthy of being adorned with a brace of asses' ears.* Is not your conduct about as prudent as mine would be, should I commit my purse to a stranger (more especially should that stranger be a light-fingered gent) that he may count my money for me, and while that light-fingered gent is counting it for me, to turn my back to him? Messieurs Sagacity! ye far-sighted, clear-seeing folks! ye bright and flaming samples of John Bull's superior intelligence! let me tell you that the he-midwife's requisition of your absence is a very wise and prudent measure—equally wise and prudent with that of the rampantly salacious priest, mentioned in the "Decameron" of Boccaccio, who sentenced the husband to penance in a dark room at the bottom of his own house, while he entertained him-

* An old friend remarked to me whilst on this conversation that on his wife's first confinement, the medical man (or for brevity the "m—m." which belongs equally to other words applicable to this violated profession,) told him to leave his wife's room, and on subsequently requesting to be informed the reason, by a medical friend, he was unhesitatingly told "that he may amuse himself with your wife to be sure." "Ah, I thought so," said he.

self with the wife in an upper apartment!† Ye supine, credulous, and hoodwinked dupes—ye “creature husbands,” with your “foolscaps” and “antlered pates,” is there not a great inconsistency—a perfect fatuity in your conduct! If I, or any other man—if we, I say, are a little conspicuous in our gallantries and attentions to your faithful ribs, your much better halves, are you not all fire and tow—perfectly plucky—and, with sword and pistol in hand, or, if you be not so inclined to pursue us to the very knife, but feel a hankering to strip us in Her Majesty’s Courts, law and ecclesiastical, of all right and interest in our muck and dross of this worldly interest—and all this, too, for some little innocent gaieties and flirtations with your *cara sposa*? But how different your conduct with the “dear,” “darling,” “sweet,” “charming” pals and coves of your delicate and modest “married wives,” who regale and entertain themselves in their tentative and speculative recreations with the said delicate and modest wives, aye, and that, too, with your sanction and authority!

You see, Mesdames Delicates and Modests, and Messrs Peepists and Pryists, I am no stranger to the fun—the pranks and gambols of he or man-midwifery. I must own that I have seen a little service in the vocation. Having made this acknowledgment, I will endeavour to atone for my misdeeds by tendering a bit of advice. I hope the touters and trumpeters, Mesdames the Delicates and Modests, will take this hint, and abstain from their pernicious practices of be-praising and recommending their feeling and pawing, their peeping and prying pals and coves, the he-midwives. For the information and meditation of their thoughtless dupes, I make the following extract from one of the inestimable works mentioned in my title page (*Death-blow*):—

†*Le toucher indiscret*, as the French term this hateful indecency.

“Women know not how much they weaken their husbands’ affections and lessen their esteem—how much they estrange their love and respect—by their submission to the filthy and abominable practices of man-midwifery. Besides its pernicious and demoralising tendency, it has occasioned the diminution of the respect and value of the female character in the estimation of men—of that devoted and delicate consideration in which it was held before the introduction of the bestial and unnatural custom. Many men are also deterred from marriage from its prevalence.—*Man-midwifery Exposed*.

The same author (Dr Stevens) says—“The facts are abundant to show that such intrusion is unhallowed and abhorrent to all creatures, and not less so to the purity and delicacy of woman, and the suspension of labour, *the shrinking back of the fœtus*, like the sensitive plant, at the approach of the rude hand of man are consequences which will begin to account for the appalling fact that man-midwifery has made its own horrid work, and torn away by force, with the feelings all revolting at their presence, the babe whose birth would have been easy in their absence: while an unnatural canker has corroded the heart-strings of the husband for a long time after, and the constitution of the wife has sustained an irreparable injury for life.”

Such is Dr Dewees’s testimony as to the consequences of this “sacrifice of feeling.” “Nature is shocked, is paralyzed—by the intrusion of men on these occasions. We are told that the Indian women of the forests go away alone, refusing the attendance even of their own sex. Farmers very well know that, when their domestic animals are about to bring forth their young, they go away to a place of retirement; and if they are confined so as to make escape impossible, and spectators are about, they manifest great impatience, uneasiness, and distress, till the intruders are away, *which affords immediate relief*. And are women in civilized life less

annoyed and injured by the presence of men. Where is the advocate of man-midwifery who will pay them such a compliment? But there is a native feeling in woman, in whatever rank of society, which is and must be violated by the present practice.

If the "light-fingered" and "painstaking" gentry require evidence of their odious practice, let the scribes bear witness to the writings of their professional brethren in the following pages. They are, no doubt, familiar to many, and may, perchance, have engaged the curiosity of the innocent young wife, who may yet be competent to reprove her unsuspecting monitors who have thus boldly proclaimed their office of matron.*

That men of education should violate the laws of life, and inflict pain and misery on our nearest and dearest objects, is surprising, and naturally provokes contempt and indignation, as well as the rebuke of their less ardent brother practitioners.

Extract from a book entitled "*Hints to Mothers*," by Thomas Bull, M.D., Member† of the R.C.P., formerly Physician-Accoucheur to the Finsbury Midwifery Institution, and Lecturer on Midwifery, and on the diseases of Women and Children, author of "*Maternal Management of Children in Health and Disease*." 13th edition. — Lond.: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1861.

Page 181.—*Examination by Medical Attendant*.—
"Soon after the arrival of the practitioner, if labour has commenced, he requests, through the intervention of the friend of the patient, or the nurse,‡ to make an examination—'to take a pain,' as it is termed. This

* "These tentatives are the work of a shameless charlatanism, which solicits them, and which tampers with chastity and decency, to establish its empire upon the ruins of a virtue, to which the sex owes its most solid foundation."—*M. Roussel, a French physician*.

† By the by-laws of the college, any member practising midwifery is subjected to the pain of expulsion.—*W. T.*

‡ The nurse is the mere puppet of the doctor, and frequently gets a good rating for not calling him in time. I hope I have destroyed that mutual understanding by my "royal" suggestion.

" is frequently objected to ; and, from a false delicacy,
 " the patient does not consent to his wish until obliged,
 " by the severity of her pains, in a more advanced stage
 " of the labour. *Now, it is highly important that in*
 " *the earliest stage of the process this examination*
 " *should be made ;* for the medical attendant obtains
 " necessary and valuable information, which regulates
 " his conduct. Thus he ascertains whether labour has
 " actually commenced, or if the pains are spurious, or
 " false pains only, requiring a plan of treatment for
 " their relief, which he at once prescribes. He is enabled
 " to determine by it whether his assistance is neces-
 " sary ; whereas, if it is deferred, he might be the means
 " of occasioning mischief by being an idle spectator
 " when he ought to be acting.* And, moreover, it
 " enables him to encourage his patient, not only by
 " informing her how far she is advanced in labour, but
 " what is of much more importance, whether the position
 " of the child is natural.

" The medical man having intimated his wish to
 " make this examination, withdraws from the bedroom
 " to afford the patient an opportunity of placing herself
 " upon the bed for the purpose proposed. Unfor-
 " tunately, she frequently takes a wrong position,
 " and it becomes necessary to rectify it—a circumstance
 " at all times painful to the mind of a delicate woman,
 " and equally annoying and vexatious to the practitioner
 " himself. The right mode is as follows :—The patient
 " should place herself upon her left side at the foot of the
 " bed in such a manner as will enable her to fix her feet
 " firmly against the bed-posts ; her hips within ten or
 " twelve inches of the edge of the bed, her knees drawn up,
 " and her body bent forward. This position will bring
 " the head and shoulders near the centre of the bed, and
 " pillows must be placed to raise them to a comfortable
 " height. The nurse should then throw a covering (a
 " blanket or otherwise, according to the season of the

* "Oh! shame, where is thy blush?"

“ year) over her mistress, the curtains should be drawn, the rooms slightly *darkened*, and a chair placed by the side of the bed for the medical man.* By adopting the foregoing plan the medical attendant is not even seen by his patient; her feelings of delicacy are in no degree wounded, and, as the inquiry yields such important information, and gives no pain, all rational ground of objection is obviated.”

“ *Advice to a Wife,*” Published by Churchill and Sons.

With an involuntary laugh, let me instruct the young wife, and see

What Pye Chev—ass lays down,
Or what she gets for half-a-crown.

After addressing “ Dear ” Sir Charles Locock, and commenting on “ the *ignorance* of a young wife,” and “ the *diffidence* of a young wife,” and her *bashfulness* and *modesty*, he says :—

P. 110, No. 513.—“ No! the *occasional* taking of a pain is absolutely necessary, to enable the medical man to note the state of the parts, and the state of the labour, but the *frequent* taking of a pain is very objectionable and reprehensible.”

P. 116, No. 545.—“ During the latter stage of labour the patient should always *keep her eyelids closed*,” &c. †

P. 117, No. 554.—“ The bowels ” very indelicate
555.—“ The next thing to be attended to is the way in which the patient should be *dressed for the occasion*.”

556.—“ I would recommend her to put on a short bed-gown, reaching to the hips; to have on a flannel petticoat to meet it; and then to put on a dressing-gown over all.”

567.—“ One female friend, besides the doctor and the monthly nurse, is all that is needed.” No husband wanted.

576.—“ He, too, will be able to administer comfort to her when he has ‘ tried a pain,’ or ‘ taken a pain.’”

* As this appears to be a *dark subject*, it is suggested that the husband should hold the candle!

† Keep your eyes on the Doctor, ye gentle lambs!

“as it is called, and when he can assure her that “it is all right and straight”—that is to say—that the child is presenting in the most favourable position, and that everything is progressing satisfactorily. Moreover, he will be able to inform her the *probable* duration of the labour.”*

612. “Of course the medical man will make her comfortable by removing the soiled napkins, and applying clean ones in their place.”

At the urgent request of the printers many quotations from the doctors' books are omitted altogether, inasmuch as they are entirely unfit for this publication.

It is only due to Sir Charles to state that he repudiates the assumed acquaintanceship of his dedicator, leaving him to his infancy management, evidenced by his courteous communications on the subject, which are entitled to the utmost publicity, in order to correct any misapprehension on a subject of the highest importance to the human race, hence the following correspondence:—

Bletchley, Bucks, 13th August, 1863.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that my attention has been recently called to a new work, entitled “Advice to a Wife,” by Pye Henry Chavasse, which he has dedicated to you, and therefore I venture to ask you to take the trouble to inform me if this work was submitted to you for your approval, in the first instance; and if you are aware of the practice which it affects to denounce, and in reality recommends?

Being about to publish the opinions of the highest members of the medical profession, I should be glad to know whether you consider the “*taking of pains*,” so

* “And if any blame them for this their rataconniculation and reiterated lechery upon their pregnancy and big-belliedness, seeing beasts, in the like exigent of their fulness, will never suffer the male-masculant to encroach them, their answer will be, that those are beasts, but they are women, very well skilled in the pretty vales and small fees of the pleasant trade and mysteries of superfetation.”—*Rabelais Works*, lib. 1, p. 108.

earnestly encouraged by Mr. Chavasse (page 110, No. 513, &c. &c.) in natural cases of labour, beneficial in its results, or such a *positive affront to nature*, as to endanger the life of the patient?

With the greatest respect,

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

WILLIAM TALLEY.

To Sir Charles Locock, Bart.,

&c. &c. &c.

Broadstairs, August 16, 1863.

Sir,—Your letter of August 13 has been forwarded to me here.

I am aware that Mr. Pye Chavasse dedicated the last edition of his "Advice to a Wife" to me, but I have never read the book, except a slight glance at the table of contents, so am not in the least answerable for his doctrines. I cannot, therefore answer your question, as I do not know to what extent, or *in what manner*, the "taking of pains" you name is advised. If the phrase applies only to the ordinary *watching* of the progress of the labour, I cannot understand how it could possibly "endanger the life of any patient."

My acquaintance with Mr. Pye Chavasse is as follows:—About two years ago I wished to send out to St. Petersburg, to my daughter-in-law, a short guide how to manage an infant, and applied to Churchill, the publisher, for the latest popular work on the subject, and he sent me Mr. Pye Chavasse's little book on the management of children's illnesses and health. Before I sent it, I thought it wise to read it, and I found what seemed to me *various deficiencies*, and I sent the book out with manuscript remarks, and alterations for my daughter's use. I then took the liberty of writing to Mr. Pye Chavasse, a *perfect stranger*, telling him how and where I thought his work may be improved. He

expressed himself obliged to me for my remarks : said he was at that time preparing a new edition, and asked my permission to embody my remarks in it, which I readily allowed. He then said he should like to dedicate the new edition to me, and also one, then in the press, of his other works, which he forwarded to me, but which *I did not take the trouble to read, because I never have heard that any man is held answerable for the doctrines or parts of a book, merely because it is dedicated to him.*

Your obedient servant,

C. LOCOCK.

To William Talley, Esq.

Bletchley, 19th August, 1863.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge your polite reply to my letter, and to thank you for your courtesy.

I was impressed with the belief, on reference to Mr. Chavasse's work, "Advice to a Wife," that you would never acknowledge such a book, or have allowed the *familiar dedication*, without disclaiming all approval, if your attention had been called to the odious advice which it contains ; hence I took the liberty of writing to you on the subject. However, I believe nine out of ten would assume that the practice suggested is the recognised practice of the highest members of the profession, if permitted tacitly to appear, and remain without contradiction.

I find Dr. Bull has been writing in a similar style in his "Hints to Mothers."

Their method of "*taking pains*," or "a pain or two," is unmistakeable, *and is not in the sense which you mention*, and, no doubt, would have desired. If ever such authors should be directed to employ their hands in a *menial capacity* for the commission of such an outrage and cruelty towards females, I don't believe the public would ever wait patiently for the infliction of the punishment which may be awarded them.

Unless the Council of the Colleges publicly denounce such works, and regulate the professional conduct of any member attempting to interrupt the course of natural labour, I am convinced that the medical profession will suffer more public odium than the worst classes of our poorer neighbours, because the former must have had the benefit of an education beyond the reach of the latter, and the public are not disposed to accept voluntary evidence that the laws of human nature are to be rendered subservient to any artifice emanating from the members of such a respectable authority as the Royal College of Surgeons.

I will only add that experience, long since, taught farmers the dangers of interruption or molestation, and hence the poor peasant, although uneducated, would make some of his superiors by birth and education ashamed of their practice.

Trusting you will not allow the public to be misled by such "dedications,"

I have the honour to remain,

With the greatest respect,

Your humble servant,

WILLIAM TALLEY.

To Sir Charles Locock, Bart., &c. &c. &c.

Broadstairs, Kent.

The above work has been withdrawn, and a *subsequent* edition issued—thanks to all *interested* parties.

In cases of concealment of birth, the unfortunate young women get over their difficulties with comparative ease, and frequently don't alarm any of the inmates of the house.

The poet, in treating of one of the most solemn subjects that ever engaged the thoughts of man, tells us that

" 'Tis vain to seek in men for more than man."

If it be so (and reason and experience confirm the

truth of the maxim), surely he must be more than man, or less than man, who can explore the secret recesses of Venus, and rove luxuriantly over all the hidden charms of beauty and loveliness, and say that he has not had his misgivings of being able to refrain from the violation of "all but one" of the prohibitions of his Church Catechism. All men love lovely women, and Nature ordained that they should, for wise and obvious purposes; and experience proves that the passion is so strongly implanted in nature, that even the wisest and the best of men have, when a critical opportunity was afforded, occasionally violated and outraged the greatest rule and law of social duty—the doctrines and legislation of the marriage bond—and have

"Void of fear or shame,
Ascended their best friend's couch as rank adulterers."

Unhappily for the interests of morality, and the welfare and happiness of society, no men possibly can have more opportunities, calculated for ingratiating themselves with women, than *he*-midwives; and we all know that flattery has its usual effect on them. If licentious freedoms* do not take place in such cases, it must be either owing to an extraordinary insensibility in the man, or to the woman not suiting his taste. To suppose otherwise implies a perfect ignorance of human nature.† The "dear," "darling," "delightful," "charming" *he*-midwife, in his tentative and speculative proceedings—his pawings and peepings, with "his kind and sweet words," has already thrown down the barriers of modesty; and

* Believe me, unsophisticated young reader, if you could play the dishonourable office of an accoucheur or see its performance, without rousing the "British Lion," you must be regarded as one of the miserable wretches who hath sustained the irreparable loss of youthful vigour and courage.

† A gentleman, well acquainted with hospital practice, states that the debilitated practitioners apply the birch "to work up nature," and hence the filthy practice at brothels of seeking young prostitutes to whip them and be flogged.—*Vide Lloyd's Newspaper*, 12th July, 1863.

to adopt a military phraseology of illustration, when the outposts have been assailed, and the barriers forced, or the outworks carried, the camp or the citadel is at the mercy of the foe, and the ark of the covenant in his possession.*

Before husbands have really felt the pangs of humiliation, or heart-burn, it is sometimes difficult to deter them from being ensnared, especially when a relative has to be "*intro-doo-ced*." During a conversation with a notorious "young medical" the following horrible confession was rendered with a sort of gusto which gave me a faithful impression of him. With an unconcerned air he remarked in cases of labour, "You know sometimes women become delirious with agony, and call us all sorts of names, *but* (with his peculiar shake of the head) *we never take the slightest notice of them*." Poor women! The same fellow called in a young professional friend for his wife in a natural case of labour, with a midwife in attendance, but whether this piece of buffoonery was done to deceive the public is within his own breast.

The danger of entrusting a nurse, when she has been recommended by a medical man-midwife, is particularly noticed by many writers on this subject. Mr. Morant, in his excellent work, entitled "*Hints to Husbands, a Revelation of the Man-Midwife's Mysteries*," thus speaks of them—"These nurses are very much in the power of the accoucheurs, for it is principally through the latter's recommendation that they obtain employment, at least among the upper classes, and the evils which arise from this state of things are fatal to the interests of morality. *The nurse is afraid to act without the man-midwife*, not because she is incompetent, but because it essentially concerns the *man-midwife* to play the principal part, in order that the belief in the necessity for his presence

* But teach men to to doubt, and you have put a weapon in their hands, which they will handle, not as you please, but as they please. This is a telling, because a true accusation, and a home thrust.

and *assistance* should not, by any act of hers, be shaken ; such is their jealousy on this head, that we have known the man-midwife, on arriving too late to be present at the birth, roundly rate the nurse of his own appointment for not having sent for him sooner, although the case was of the most ordinary description, and great additional ease of mind and general comfort were *experienced by the patient through the absence of the doctor*.^{*} The nurses, in their six months' training at the hospital, learn much, however, that is useful to them in their own after practice ; for many of them are employed by the humbler classes from motives of economy, and we should fain believe of delicacy also. Through one of these nurses we have learnt the frightful indignities to which the poor hospital patients are sometimes subjected. A difficult case of labour, as it is termed, occurs ; the wretched victim is stripped naked, candles are placed around the bed, and the students assemble in crowds, perched on ladders and benches, to watch the progress of the labour and the manipulations of the operator. O God ! that in a Christian land, in our boasted Britain, priding herself on her civilisation and proprieties, such orgies, which would raise a blush amidst the rites of devils, should disgrace the name of science.

“ Such devils would pull angels out of heaven,
 Provided they could reach them—'tis their pride ;
 And that's the odds 'twixt soul and body plagued !
 The veriest slave that drops in Cairo's street,
 Cries, 'stand off from me !' to the passengers ;
 While these blotched souls are eager to infect,
 And blow their bad breath in a sister's face,
 As if they got some ease by it.”

Having written and collected thus much in condem-

* Heretofore, physicians used to taste their patients' excretions, the better to judge of their state and condition—a laudable custom of the ancients, but not much practised by the moderns ! There is as much a fashion in physic as in anything, and its mode is as changeable almost as that of dress.—*Vide Rabelais' Works*, vol. ii., p. 56.

nation of the most degrading practice of man-midwifery there only remains one other villanous invention for the ruin and destruction of the pride of old England—the nearest and dearest objects of our lives—to which it is my intention to refer. The abuse of the “Speculum,” or “spy tube,”* has been so much exposed, and its utility has been so much questioned by all practitioners of good repute, that it is quite clear that such an instrument, if ever employed in female complaints, should be only entrusted to the hands of a woman, and in *male complaints* such a practice is next to bestiality.†

Let any one visit the London anatomical museums, where waxen images of the villanous hands of men are not only shown in indecent contact with women, but the brutality of the fiendish members of the contaminated profession of surgery is there portrayed for the vision of such morbid creatures as may think proper to expend a shilling for the maintenance of the disgusting exhibitions of the metropolis. That good sometimes comes from evil may be, in this instance, fully exemplified, inasmuch as such exhibitions are calculated to suppress both the odious “trade” of man-midwifery, and the speculum trade,‡ and tend to lower, in the estimation of the public, the practitioners who are addicted to either.§

* That Satan finds some mischief still
For idle hands to do.

† Since the Female Men have thought proper to “look into the future — *ad cap'andum vulgus*—it is clearly expedient that respectable females should be warned of the villains who hand about their obscene advertisements in the streets, or court their attention through the penny papers.

‡ “Light-fingered gentry,” *alias* the “*spying and peeping coves*.” Let parents seeking a *medical* marriage consult the “spy tube” previously, and thus prevent the “*disappointments*” so much dwelt upon by these “professionals,” and ease the business of the divorce courts!

§ The opinions of the press, generally, on medical works, which have been extensively advertised in the papers from which such opinions emanate, cannot be relied on. A work by Pyc Henry

The Royal College of Physicians, so lately as the year 1827, designated the practice of *man-midwifery* as "an art foreign to the habits of gentlemen of enlarged academical education, and one which might safely be entrusted to discreet matrons."

Let the "young blood of England" be well informed on such highly important subjects, and with the odious thoughts, "that the young bride, radiant with joyous innocence and glowing fantasies, 'beautiful exceedingly,' and pure as fair, must, in a few short months, in blind obedience to a spurious custom, yield herself to the pollution of a stranger's *touch*, and banish for ever from her husband's soul that dear delicious dream—entirety of possession!" There will be no difficulty in repelling this most cruel and degrading practice assumed by a certain class of low fellows, of mean and spurious origin, unworthy the appellation of Englishmen!

"I left no calling for this idle trade."

Your attention is earnestly requested to the following remarks, taken by permission of the author, from the preface to the *original* edition of "*Horæ Subsecivæ*."* (First Series.) The talented and kind-hearted author (Dr. John Brown,) thus presents the subject to his readers:—

"There is one subject which may seem an odd one for a miscellaneous book like this, but in which I have

Chavasse, entitled "*Advice to a Wife*" (who does not appear in the register as a licentiate in midwifery), suggests the "*taking of a pain or two if it be allowed*." I view the practice as I do the book, *i. e.*, *dangerous*. In short, it recommends the commission of the very outrage which it pretends to denounce.

* It is much to be regretted that in the last edition of this valuable work the publishers have reduced the value of the book by the omission of the original preface.

long felt a *deep and deepening concern*. To be brief and plain, I refer to *man-midwifery*, in all its relations, professional, social, statistical, and moral. I have no space now to go into these fully. I may, if some one better able does not speak out, on some future occasion, try to make it plain from reason and experience, that the management by *accoucheurs*, as they are called, of natural labour, and the separation of this department of the human economy from the general profession *has been a greater evil than a good*; and that we have little to thank the Grand Monarque for, in this as in many other things, when to conceal the shame of the Gentle La Vallière,* he sent for M. Chison.†

* A favourite mistress of Louis XIV.

† This surgeon was most probably a person named Chison, of whom Count Bussi Rabutin relates the following anecdote:—“Meanwhile Madame de Crequi went to seek Madame on the day which she had appointed for their party to St Cloud. She there met Chison, who had come to see one of Madame’s girls, who was ill; he is La Vallière’s medical man, and is facetious and witty; after he had learned the complaint of the young lady, Cheer up, said he to her, I have remedies for all, even for lovers’ hearts. Ho! G—! G—! replied Madame, teach me them directly, for ten or a dozen that I have, whom I should like to cure, provided it costs me only a few garden herbs. Ha, Madame, replied he, it costs me much less than herbs, it costs me nothing but words. In fine. Chison, who sacrificed everything for the entertainment of Madame, related to her how the king had sent him to inquire, and that he had demanded, with extreme emotion, whether Mademoiselle de la Vallière could really survive, and if her leanness was not a bad symptom. And what was your answer? replied Madame. What, said he, can your highness be in doubt? I assure you that I promised him, with as much boldness, the prolongation of her years, as if I had a letter from Heaven. I spoke as a philosopher of life, and death, and destinies; it needed nothing (when I saw the joy of the king) but to have promised him an immortality for the girl. True, G—, cried Madame; what secret charms has the creature to inspire so great a passion? I assure you, replied Chison, that it is not her body which supplies them.”—*Hist Am. des Gaules. Amours de la Vallière*, page 430.

The “witty and facetious” Chison spoke with certainty

“ Any husband or wife, any father or mother who will look at the matter plainly, may see what an inlet there is here to possible mischief, to certain unseemliness, and worse.—Nature tells us with her own voice what is fitting in these cases,—and nothing but the omnipotence of custom, or the urgent cry of peril, and terror, and agony, what Luther calls *miserrima miseria*, would make her ask for the *presence of a man* on such an occasion, when she hides herself and is in travail. And, as in all such cases, the *evil reacts* on the *men* as a *special class*, and on the *profession itself*. It is not of grave moral delinquencies that I speak, and the higher crimes in this region ; it is of *affront to Nature*, and of the *revenge* which *she always takes* on both parties who actively or passively disobey her. Some of my best and most valued friends are honoured members of this branch ; but I believe all the real good they can do, and the real evils they can prevent in these cases, would be attained if, instead of attending, to their own ludicrous loss of time, health, sleep, and temper, some 200 cases of delivery every year—the *immense majority of which are natural*, and require no interference, but have nevertheless wasted not a little of their life, their patience, and their understanding—they had, as I would always have them do, and as any well educated, resolute doctor of medicine ought to be able to do, confined themselves to giving their advice and assistance to the *sage femme* when she needed it. I know much that may be said against this—ignorance of midwives, dreadful effects of this, &c. ; but to all this I answer, take pains to educate carefully, and to *pay well*, and

which experience alone could give ; he had doubtless attended La Vallière in her “confinement.” Do such conversations ever occur now ? There is nothing new under the sun ; what has been will be, and the laureate, not without reason, sings in Maud :—

“ Yonder a vile physician blabbing
The case of his patient.”

treat well these women, and you may safely regulate ulterior means by the ordinary general laws of surgical and medical therapeutics. Why should not "Peg Tamson, Jean Simson, and Alison Jaup" (*vide* Sir Walter Scott's "Surgeon's Daughter,") be sufficiently educated and paid to enable them to conduct victoriously the normal obstetrical business of "Middlemas" and its region, leaving to Gideon Gray the abnormal, with time to cultivate his mind, and his garden, or even a bit of farm, and to live and *trot less hard* than he is at present obliged to do? Thus, instead of a man in general practice, and a man, it may be within an area of forty miles for his beat, sitting for hours at the bedside of a healthy woman, his other patients meanwhile doing the best or the worst they can, and it may be, as not unfrequently happens, two labours going on at once; and instead of a timid, ignorant, trusting woman—to whom her Maker has given enough of "sorrow"—being, in this hour of her agony and apprehension, subjected to the artificial misery of fearing the doctor may be too late, she might have the absolute security, and womanly hand and heart of one of her own sex.

"This subject might be argued upon statistical grounds and others; but I peril it chiefly on the whole system being *unnatural*. Therefore, for the sake of those who have borne and carried us, and whom we bind ourselves to love and cherish, to comfort and *honour*, and who suffer so much that is inevitable from the primal curse, and for its own sake, let the profession look into this entire subject in all its bearings, *honestly*, fearlessly, and at once. Child-bearing is a process of health, the exceptions are few indeed, and would, I believe, *be fewer* if we doctors would *let well alone*."—JOHN BROWN, M. D., *Fellow and Librarian of the Royal College of Physicians, Edinburgh.*

THE END.

MIDWIVES IN LONDON.

- Allen, Mrs., 114, Wardour-street, Soho.
 Ayers, Mrs., 16, Mount-street, London Hospital.
 Barrett, Mrs., 12, Webb's County-terrace, New Kent-road.
 Bennett, Mrs., 15, Bryan-place, Caledonian-road.
 Billup, Mrs., 83, Evelyn-street, Deptford.
 Birch, Mrs., 4, Corbet-court, Brown's-lane, Spitalfields.
 Cameron, Mrs., 37, Lower Whitecross-street.
 *Chegnay, Mrs., 41, Paradise-street, Lambeth.
 Clark, Mrs., Church-street, Kentish-town.
 Copestake, Mrs., 1, Baltic-street, Golden-lane.
 Croker, Mrs., 48, Bacon-street, Brick-lane, Spitalfields.
 Dawe, Mrs., 49, Noble-street, Goswell-street.
 *Donaldson, Mrs., 3, Gate-street, Lincoln's-inn-fields.
 Doran, Mrs., 77, Marborow-square, Chelsea.
 Douglas, Mrs., 68, Great College-street, Camden Town.
 Downing, Mrs., 22, New Quebec-street, Portinan-square.
 Fountain, Mrs., 5½, Boundary-row, Blackfriars-road.
 Gardiner, Mrs., Squire's-terrace, Bow Common-lane.
 George, Mrs., 3, Buckingham-place, Old Kent-road.
 Gray, Mrs., 9, Warren-street, Tottenham-court-road.
 Greenaway, Mrs., 9, Red Lion-street, Clerkenwell.
 *Greenbury, Mrs., 8, Lower-terrace, Islington.
 Harding, Mrs., 22, Pott-street, Bethnal-green-road.
 Harper, Mrs., 12, Leonard-street, Curtain-road.
 Jackson, Mrs., 14, Troman's-row, Brompton.
 Jenneson, Mrs., 101, High-street, Hoxton Old Town.
 Jones, Mrs., 16, Leicester-street, Leicester-square.
 Laux, Mrs., 9, Church-row, Stepney.
 Manning, Mrs., 37, Chicksand-street, Mile-end New Town.
 Marshall, Mrs., 71, Church-street, Bethnal-green.
 Martin, Mrs., 33, Dean-street, Soho.
 Moyes, Mrs., 6, Wood-street, Spitalfields.
 Muirhead, Mrs., 40, King-street, Borough.
 Nicholls, Mrs., [Limehouse.
 Painting, Mrs., Bartlett's-buildings, Holborn.
 Rogers, Mrs., 11, Brunswick-sq., Brunswick-st., Hackney-rd.
 Sivell, Mrs., 17, Ebury-square, Pimlico.
 Smith, Mrs., 15, Wynford-terrace, Lower-road, Rotherhithe.
 Smith, Mrs., 177, Evelyn-street, Deptford.
 Tunstall, Mrs., 14, Harcourt-street, New-road.
 Viner, Mrs. M. H., 40, Somerford-st., North-st., Whitechapel-rd.
 Walters, Mrs., 24, Leman-street, Whitechapel.
 Walters, Mrs., 153, Marylebone-road.
 Watta, Mrs., 9, Wardrobe-place, Doctors'-commons.
 Young, Mrs., 5, Caroline-street, Hackney-road.

N.B.—Applications should be made to the Secretary of the Female Medical Society, 1, Norfolk-street, Strand, W.C.

* Highly recommended.

95

THE ROYAL BABY.*

Words by C. H. Witt, Esq. Arranged by T. Westrop.

Air.—"KING OF THE CANNIBAL ISLANDS."

Published at the "Musical Bouquet" Office, Holborn.

* It is well known by members of the Court that the beautiful Princess refused the assistance of the "royal doctors," and that Her Royal Highness experienced great comfort by their absence, and "*the maternal knowledge of the Countess of Macclesfield.*"

MEN IN FEMALE-ATTIRE.

Price One Shilling.

CONTAINING THE OPINION OF
EMINENT UNIVERSITY MEN
AND
SCIENTIFIC WOMEN
ON
DELICATE SUBJECTS.

Revised by a Physician, and enlarged.

"Ingenuas didicisse fideliter artes,
Emollit mores, nec sinit esse feros."

ALL BOOKSELLERS; OR OF THE AUTHOR OF THIS BOOK ON
RECEIPT OF TWELVE POSTAGE STAMPS.

Beaconsfield, Buckinghamshire,
Midsummer, 1864.

Man-Midwifery Exposed; or, the Danger and Immorality of Employing Men in Midwifery Proved, and the Remedy for the Evil Found. Addressed to the Society for the Suppression of Vice. By JOHN STEVENS, M.D. 2nd edition, enlarged, 1s. Cloth, 1s. 6d.

The Accoucheur; a Letter to the Rev. W. Tattershall, of Liverpool, on the Evils of Man-Midwifery. By a Student. Price 1s. Cloth, 1s. 6d.

Man-Midwifery, and the Results. With a Letter addressed by the late Sir Anthony Carlisle to the late Sir Robert Peel, through the leading Journal of England, and Numerous Opinions and Valuable Suggestions in Midwifery by eminent Practitioners; with the Names and Addresses of Forty London Midwives. By WM. TALLEY, Solicitor. Second edition, revised and enlarged. Price 1s. Cloth, 1s. 6d. Roan, 2s.

Hints to Husbands, a Revelation of the Man-Midwives' Mysteries. By GEORGE MORANT, Esq., late of the Grenadier Guards. 3rd edition, revised and enlarged, price 3s.

Death-blow to He or Man-Midwifery; addressed to Husbands, Fathers, and Brothers, on—1. Its Unnecessary and Unnatural, its Disgusting and Obscene Practices, and 2. Its Sinful and Demoralising Consequences. 2nd edit.

Fallacies of the Faculty, in a Series of Letters. By SAMUEL DICKSON, M.D. Price 5s.

Physic and its Phases; or the Rule of Right and the Reign of Wrong. By ALCIPHON, the "Modern Athenian." Price 2s. 6d.

London Medical Practice, its Sins and Shortcomings. By a Physician. Price 2s. 6d.

Ladies' Manual of Practical Hydropathy, for Female Diseases; also Directions to Mothers how to carry out Hydropathy for their Children. By Mrs. SMEDLEY, Matlock Bank Hydropathic Establishment, Derbyshire. Tenth Thousand, gilt edges, price 1s. 6d.

Practical Hydropathy, including Plans of Baths and Remarks on Diet, Clothing, and Habits of Life, with 160 engravings of Baths and Anatomical Illustrations. By JOHN SMEDLEY, Lea Mills, Derby. Price 2s. 6d. Post-free for 36 stamps.

Sanitary Work, and Where are the Laborers? Or, the Responsibility of Influence: Fact and Fiction. By Mrs. FISON.

Junonesia: or, Women Rescued. Published by WILLIAM KIDD, Tavistock-street, Covent Garden.