

A final reply to the numerous slanders, circulated by Nathaniel Chapman, M.D., professor of the institutes and practice of medicine in the University of Pennsylvania / by Granville Sharp Pattison.

Contributors

Pattison, Granville Sharp, 1791-1851.
National Library of Medicine (U.S.)

Publication/Creation

Baltimore : Printed by J. Robinson, 1821.

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/xrfyvz8f>

License and attribution

This material has been provided by This material has been provided by the National Library of Medicine (U.S.), through the Medical Heritage Library. The original may be consulted at the National Library of Medicine (U.S.) where the originals may be consulted.

This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.

**wellcome
collection**

Wellcome Collection
183 Euston Road
London NW1 2BE UK
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722
E library@wellcomecollection.org
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

Pattison (G. S.)

A

FINAL REPLY


TO THE

NUMEROUS SLANDERS,

CIRCULATED BY

NATHANIEL CHAPMAN, M. D.

PROFESSOR OF THE INSTITUTES AND PRACTICE OF MEDICINE IN THE UNIVERSITY
OF PENNSYLVANIA.



BY GRANVILLE SHARP PATTISON.

30203


Boy

*"An hypocrite with his mouth destroyeth his neighbour ; but through
" knowledge shall the just be delivered."——Prov.—Chap. xi. v. 9.*

BALTIMORE :

Printed by J. Robinson, corner of Market and Belvidere-streets.

1821.



A REPLY, &c.

As I stated in the conclusion of my "REPUTATION OF CERTAIN CALUMNIES," &c. that I should never notice any thing Dr. Chapman might print on the subject of Mrs. Ure's divorce; my again coming before the public in answer to his two new publications, may seem, when first considered, to convict me of vacillation and indecision of character. But when the object of these pamphlets is exhibited; when it is shewn that a period of nearly ten months has been allowed to elapse since the publication of the "*Refutation, &c.*" and the appearance of these pamphlets which are avowedly answers to it, and more especially, when, if the voice of the publick of Philadelphia is to be believed, during this period an emissary has been sent to Europe for the avowed purpose of raking together and collecting information against my character, and when it is proven that numerous agents have been applied to in Scotland with the same intention, and that Dr. Chapman and his friends have been unceasing in their endeavours to obtain from gentlemen who have lately been in my native country, stories which might tend to criminate me; when all this is remembered by the publick, and when, from this, it is demonstrated that these pamphlets contain every item and iota of accusation which has ever, as a shadow, been thrown upon my reputation, since the hour of my birth, until the present day, it cannot appear wonderful, possessing as I do ample evidence to refute these, that I should be most desirous to come before the members of the country of my adoption, and vindicate to them the honor and integrity of my character, which places it high above the pitiful shafts that have been directed against it by my fallen and degraded enemy.

In this second "*Refutation,*" I shall, in the first place, give a short history of the divorce. 2dly, An examination of the evidence adduced by the pursuer, and a refutation of it, so far as it seems to criminate me. 3dly, A proof that there was collusion betwixt the pursuer and defender. 4th, A few remarks on the notes added to Dr. Chapman's former pamphlet, and, lastly, a few concluding observations.

Dr. Ure, the pursuer in the action of divorce, is a man of about 40 years of age, and of considerable scientific acquirements, but of degraded moral character. Mrs. Ure, the defender, was a woman about 34 years of age. The parties had lived together as man and wife, from the year 1807 until a few months before the passage of the bill of divorcement. I was acquainted with them for some years before this time, but, became more particularly associated with Dr. Ure during the winter of 1817—18, from the circumstance of my then becoming a professor in the same institution with him, and from the necessity there was for our being frequently together with the view of making arrangements for the erection of the new buildings contemplated by the Managers of the Andersonian University. On the 5th of April, 1818, I left Glasgow for the purpose of paying a six months visit to the French Metropolis; at that time, I would wish it to be particularly observed, *that Dr. Ure entertained no suspicion of his wife's infidelity, that the parties were living together in all the intimacies of husband and wife, and that they continued to do so until the month of August, nearly five months after my departure from Glasgow.* (See Dr. Ure's petition, p. 2.)

As it appears in evidence (see examination of Agnes Blair, p. 25) Mrs. Ure is conveyed by her husband to the house of Agnes Blair in Falkirk, on the 12th of August, and "he then took lodgings for her." It may be remarked that Falkirk is a small country town, on the direct post road betwixt Glasgow and Edinburgh, one through which several hundreds of persons pass daily in their journey betwixt the two towns, and consequently a place, of all others, the most unfavourable as a place of concealment.

In the month of October, 1818, I arrived in Edinburgh, where I spent several days, in my way home from Paris. Mrs. Ure had written to an acquaint-

tance, to request me, to call upon her on my return to Glasgow. This I agreed to do, as Falkirk was in my direct rout home, and as there was a detention of the passengers from half past 11 o'clock, the hour of their arrival, until 1 o'clock, the hour when they started for Glasgow. This visit was made openly, and not under any concealment. The evidence proves that *I walked in a garden overlooked by the surrounding houses, with Mrs. Ure, (see evidence p. 30.)* which no man would have done if conscious that Mrs. Ure had separated from her husband on account of adultery, alleged to have been committed by him. On my return to Glasgow, Dr. Ure met me and continued to hold intercourse with me, as he had been wont to do previously to my visit to Paris. There was no enmity nor hostility expressed, and up to the very day on which the decree of divorce passed, his conduct was such as to make me suppose that he was on the very best terms with me.

On the 5th day of February, 1819, the very day on which the bill of divorcement was granted, I, for the first time, heard that I was suspected of a criminal intercourse with Mrs. Ure, and was told that an application had been made to the commissaries for a divorce, for adultery, alleged to have been committed by me. I immediately called on Dr. Ure for the purpose of ascertaining whether there was any foundation in this report, but he being from home, I wrote to a writer to the signet in Edinburgh,* and requested him to call at the Consistorial Court and ascertain whether such an action had been entered. The moment I became satisfied of the fact, I left Glasgow for Edinburgh for the purpose of taking the advice of counsel. I saw Messrs. Jeffery and Cockburn, and was informed by them that I could not move in the affair, that I was no party in the case, and that the supposed parolour only became so in the second action, which usually followed in a case of this kind—the action for damages. That unless an action for damages is brought forward by Dr. Ure, and of this there was no chance in the present instance, it was impossible for me to appear in court. I was advised to see Mrs. Ure, and ascertain her object in supporting her husband in this infamous transaction, and by showing her the ruin in which it would involve herself, to endeavour to get her to send into court a *reclaiming petition*. Fearful that my seeing her myself might lead to a suspicion of an undue influence, having been employed, I directed my agent to wait upon her at her lodgings. Mrs. Ure, on my agent's visiting her, made a full confession of the collusion; stated that she had been induced to go into it, from promises made to her by her husband, and that as *he* had deceived her, and his promises had not, nor were likely to be fulfilled, she most readily consented to send into court a reclaiming petition. This, she herself, employed an agent to prepare, and gave up, for the purpose of supporting it, several documents, among which, THE LETTER mentioned as *a forgery*, by Dr. Chapman, but which I shall sufficiently prove in the sequel, to have been a genuine letter, and which of itself, is sufficient to prove that Dr. Ure and his wife were so debased as to be capable, of the most infamous of actions.

The letter here mentioned, is one of so infamous a character, and contains expressions so grossly indelicate, that it is not fit that it should be brought before the public. Dr. Chapman, *himself*, seems willing to admit, that if I can only prove Dr. Ure to be the author of this letter, that I am acquitted of every charge. "*Either*" (he observes) "*Dr. Ure or Mr. Pattison is the most consummate of villains in existence: the one or other wrote the letter in question: the latter is found in possession of it, and let him show how he got it.*" This I shall do in the sequel of this history, and in proof of it, I shall bring forward a mass of testimony so strong, so satisfactory, and so conclusive, that it will force, even upon my enemies, an irresistible conviction of the groundless nature of the charges brought against my character.

That I was most anxious that the reclaiming petition should have been sent in and supported by Mrs. Ure, I have no hesitation to confess. It was in this

* The writers to his Majesty's Signet are composed of the first class of Lawyers in Edinburgh: Mr. Burn, my agent, stands pre-eminent as a gentleman and a man of honor.

way, and in this way alone, that my character could be cleared by a court of justice, of the charge brought against it. If I had really been guilty of a criminal connexion with Mrs. Ure, I would ask, what object could I have in getting the case again brought into court. Or if Dr. Ure was not conscious that he had obtained the divorce by the collusion of his wife, what objection could he have had, to permit the case again to be brought under the consideration of the commissaries. That Dr. Ure was most unwilling that the case should not be permitted again to be brought into court, is evident, from his petition presented to the commissaries, the 5th of March, 1818; and from the fact that he had his wife removed from Edinburgh by one of his agents, to the house of Mrs. Cameron, in Port Glasgow, where he kept up a correspondence with her, and induced her, by settling more money upon her than would have been awarded by the commissaries, allowing they had, as they most certainly would, had the petition been supported, have removed the decree of divorce.

From the following letter, written by a respectable Medical Student of Glasgow, and the facts of which are substantiated by an affidavit, it is proved, that Dr. Ure, in two several instances, when he ordered the porter at the institution to state to his class that he was confined to bed from sickness, visited Greenock, situated two miles from Port Glasgow,* the residence of his wife, and that during his first visit he had written her, wishing her to agree to something, to which she had refused her consent.—During the second visit, it is to be presumed that he did not satisfy himself with writing, but that he had an interview, as immediately afterwards his wife became moulded to his purposes, and gave up that prosecution which was to restore to her character, and some measure of respectability.

GLASGOW, 10TH MARCH, 1819.

MR. GRANVILLE PATTISON,

SIR,—In answer to your request, I am now going to give you a short detail of what happened on my visit to Mrs. Cameron's at Port Glasgow. I have been this season, a pupil of Dr. Andrew Ure; Thursday, 16th February, I went up to his class, as usual, but I found there was no lecture; I then asked the porter what was the reason, when he told me that the Dr. was confined with a sore throat; I went up the next day, and as there was no class, the same enquiry was made and answer given. I had occasion to go down to Port Glasgow the following day, and happened to call upon Mrs. Cameron, and after seeing her, I asked if Dr. Ure was in the house, she said no; I then asked her when he had been there, she answered me, he had not, but that she believed that he was in Greenock, for that he had sent up a letter from Greenock to Mrs. Ure, wanting her to agree to something, to which his wife refused to consent; but as it was none of her business, she did not enquire particularly regarding it.

I had occasion to go down another time (24th February) to Greenock and Helensburgh; I accordingly went in the Dumbarton Castle steam boat, and some time after having sailed from the quay, Dr. Ure came up to me while walking on the deck—he seemed to be in great confusion when he saw me—he asked me where I was going? I told him I was going to Greenock and Helensburgh, and that I was going to put some goods on board the Fanny, for New York. He then asked me if I was going to stop in Greenock all night? I said I was not. He then told me that he was going to Greenock to get the Town Hall fitted up with seats, in which he was going to give a course of lectures; he then begged I would not repeat our conversation, and immediately upon making this request, he said he was going to give a very interesting course of lectures in Glasgow, and that he would give me a ticket to attend them, gratis. I came from Helensburgh to Greenock on the following morning (viz. Tuesday) and while on the quay, I saw Dr. Ure. I came up to Glasgow on the same day. I went up to his class on Wednesday, and on asking one of the students if there had been a class on Tuesday, he told me there was not. I asked what excuse the porter gave? He said the excuse was that the Dr. had a severe head-ach.

I am, Sir, Your most obedient, humble servant,

ALEXANDER STEPHEN.

* Port Glasgow is situated on the river Clyde, 22 miles below Glasgow.

So soon as I learnt that Mrs. Ure had withdrawn her reclaiming petition, the hope which I had indulged, that my character would have been vindicated by a court of justice, was destroyed, and the only line of conduct which was left me to adopt, was to come before the public with a STATEMENT OF FACTS. I accordingly inserted the following advertisement in the Glasgow newspapers of the 6th of March, 1819 :—

IN THE PRESS AND SPEEDILY TO BE PUBLISHED,

A STATEMENT OF FACTS,

ILLUSTRATED WITH

FAC-SIMILES OF DR. URE'S LETTERS,

By GRANVILLE SHARP PATTISON, Esq. SURGEON.

*“ Even handed justice
Returns the ingredients of the poison'd chalice
To your own lips.”*

On the morning of the 26th of March, the day before the one on which the statement of facts was to have been published, I received a letter from my agent in Edinburgh, which stated that a bill of suspension or interdict had been applied for at the Chancery Court, against the publication of the documents referred to in my advertisement, on the plea, that as *Dr. Ure*, and not Mr. Pattison, was the author of these documents, the latter had not the right of authorship, and consequently was not entitled to publish them. Immediately on obtaining this information, I went to my printer, and having procured twenty copies of my pamphlet, I distributed them amongst respectable gentlemen of Glasgow, with *Fac-simile* copies of Dr. Ure's most infamous letter, with the view of giving a limited circulation to my statement, before the bill of interdict to prevent me, was served. At 12 o'clock, noon, the interdict was executed, but as this *only prevented my publishing Dr. Ure's documents*, I read my statement in the evening, with the exception of the part which related to them, to my class. The effect produced, was most triumphant; the audience, consisting of above 500 of the most respectable citizens, continued for above a quarter of an hour afterwards, to express by reiterated plaudits, their conviction of my innocence, and at a meeting of my class, convened a few days afterwards, it was unanimously resolved, that a diamond ring should be presented to me in testimony of the high sense they entertain of my character, as a man of honor and a gentleman. A handsome ring was accordingly presented, accompanied with the following letter.

GLASGOW, APRIL 6TH, 1819.

MR. GRANVILLE PATTISON,

SIR,

The gentlemen attending your Course of Lectures on Anatomy and Surgery, beg leave at this time, when the present session is drawing to a close, to present you with a diamond ring, as a small testimony of their high opinion of your talents; of their gratitude for your exertions; of their sense of your obliging, liberal, and gentlemanly conduct on all occasions, and of their heartfelt wishes for your future happiness and prosperity.

WILLIAM Mc KAY	} Committee appointed by the class.
JOHN CONNOLLY	
JAMES BROWN	
WILLIAM DRURY	
JOHN GARDINER.	

I trust I shall be excused, making here a short digression in the history, that I may call my reader's attention to a statement made by Dr. Chapman in his preface to the case of divorce, p. VI. which proves that that abject individual is so lost to every correct and honorable principle, that he asserts his falsehoods in opposition to the most direct and positive evidence. Having made the absurd statement, that the court issued *sua sponte* the injunction to prevent the publication of my pamphlet, he goes on to add, that when I attempted to read it to my audience, they became so disgusted that an interruption, "which ended in the dispersal of the company, before one third of my defence was read," took place. He informs us that he had this statement "from several gentlemen," but, *as usual*, mentions no names; and, to confirm the statement of these several gentlemen, he has the effrontery to quote a passage from Mr. Walker's letter, published in my former refutation, the sequel of which letter, most positively contradicts the *fact assumed* from it viz.—That my audience were so disgusted that they would not permit me to proceed in my defence. After a piece of conduct like this, so base and so disengenuous, what, I would ask, can we expect from the Professor of the Practice of Medicine in the University of Pennsylvania.

I again publish Mr. Walker's letter, that my Reader may himself judge what confidence is to be placed in Dr. Chapman's *facts*.

GLASGOW, MARCH 30, 1819.

TO JOHN PATTISON, ESQ.

DEAR SIR,

Through your kind letter, which reached me in London, I have had the pleasure of becoming acquainted with your respectable mother and her family. I was, therefore, in common with their other friends, much mortified at the injurious report respecting your brother, Mr. G. S. P., which got into circulation about a month after my arrival; the more so, as it appeared to be *justified* by the sentence of a court. It was some relief, however, to be assured that it was false; and would, in a little time, be proved so. I waited, therefore, with some impatience, for your brother's "Statement of Facts, &c." Being prevented by some legal restraint, on the part of his adversaries, from publishing it, I attended and heard it read (as far as was permitted) to his class, a few evenings since; and I have now no hesitation in saying, that the whole evidence taken together, and in connexion with other circumstances, *which could not be known to the court*, did not justify the sentence; and on the contrary, I think your brother has been grossly abused, and become the dupe of a *foul conspiracy* between Dr. U. and others; for I cannot otherwise account for many circumstances that I have become acquainted with. Indeed, the conduct of that man stamps him the *most depraved of human beings*. With regard to the sentence of the court, it is only to be accounted for by recollecting, that as far as regards your brother, the evidence was *ex parte*. It is unfortunate, too, that he appears to have no legal remedy—*immediately* available.

I hope to have the pleasure of seeing you in the fall; mean time, remember me respectfully to Mrs. P., not forgetting our poor friend Simpson, to whom I wrote some time since.

Believe me very sincerely, yours,

DAVID WALKER.

P. S. I might add that, judging by the loud and repeated plaudits of his audience, consisting of 500 people, the effect of your brother's expose was common to all.

But, to proceed with the history. The day after I had vindicated my innocence to the public, with the view of forcing Dr. Ure to bring before them, evidence of the charge which he had brought against my character, I inserted the following advertisement in all the Glasgow newspapers.

STATEMENT OF FACTS, &c. &c.

- - - - - "Even handed justice
 "Returns the ingredients of the poison'd chalice
 "To your own lips."

"Some weeks ago, I inserted the above advertisement in the Glasgow newspapers; and have since been busily employed in correcting the press, and preparing for publication "The Statement."—Yesterday, at twelve o'clock, noon, I had served upon me, a bill of suspension, and interdict against the publication of the documents referred to in the said advertisement. This has both astonished and gratified me—I have felt struck that I should, after my character has been injured, be prevented from publishing any thing which might be necessary for my justification—I have felt pleased that this interdict should absolve me from the necessity of publishing, what was of a very unfit character for general circulation.—My only wish throughout the whole of this publication, has been to have a full and a clear exposure of facts—I therefore now challenge Dr. Ure and his wife—to lay before any committee, formed of the most respectable of our citizens; all the documents which they may have against me; and further to lay before them the whole of the correspondence, which passed between them after Mrs. Ure's separation—allowing me at the same time to produce that part of it, which I have been interdicted from publishing."

GRANVILLE SHARP PATTISON.

George Square, 24th March, 1819.

It must be palpable to every man who has the capacity to think, that if Dr. Ure had really possessed evidence to convict me, that he would at once have accepted my challenge, and laid before a committee, composed of respectable gentlemen, his proof. The *fac simile* of his letter—a letter which stamped both his own and his wife's reputation, with unheard of depravity, had been circulated by me, before the interdict had been executed. A refusal on his part, to come forward, was a silent, but damning confession of all the charges I had advanced both against him and Mrs. Ure; and a triumphant refutation of the implied charge which the sentence of the Court had seemed to throw upon my reputation. The parties, however, were conscious of their guilt; and dared not come forward as accusers in an assembly where I was permitted to be a defender. I remained in Scotland for nearly two months after the publication of the advertisement, and when I left it, I did so, loaded with the most satisfactory testimonials of the high estimation in which my character was held, as a man of science and a gentleman. (See appendix to former Refutation, all of which were written some months afterwards, letters class II and text p. 35.)

That Dr. Ure had the disposition had he possessed the ability to injure me, is rendered evident by the conduct he pursued a few months after my departure for America. So long as I remained in the country he did not even whisper a doubt as to the genuineness of his letter, of which I had circulated *fac-simile* copies, but after I had sailed he began first by hints, and some months afterwards, by bold assertions to state that it was a forgery, and having by bribes and threats induced his wife to grant him a declaration to that effect, he prepared a large octavo volume for the press, to prove that I had really been guilty of a criminal connexion with his wife. The whole argument of which rested upon the assumption that I had forged the letter, of which the *fac-simile* had been published. He printed in the Glasgow newspapers of date the 27th August, the following advertisement.

In the Press, and speedily will be published,

IN ONE VOLUME 8vo.

SEDUCTION, DIVORCE, CALUMNY. NO NOVEL.

*Printed from attested documents in vindication of one Husband,
and for the instruction of all.*

FELICES TER ET AMPLIUS,
QUOS IRRUPTA TENET COPULA.

In this work will be developed, the progressive corruption by a religious devotee, of a respectable wife and mother. The new system of dishonoring a husband, with legal impunity, by making a writer to the signet the go-between: and the new art of calumny, or the fabrication of the forged letter, lately printed by Granville Sharp Pattison, in a flagitious pamphlet, and circulated by him and his friends, for ruining the gentleman's character, whose family peace he had destroyed.

This publication was long suspended from motives of delicacy towards the deluded lady, and is now most reluctantly brought forward, solely to defeat a vile plot of moral assassination.

The present advertisement has been delayed, only till the chain of evidence could be rendered complete. The document forming the last link arrived but two days ago, though the succession of dates will testify that the utmost diligence has been used for several months, in seeking evidence to expose the conspiracy.

This work is such, as virtuous women may read with pleasure, and vicious ones with profit.

Glasgow, 27th August, 1819.

I think it hardly necessary to remark, that this advertisement is characteristic of a base and degraded mind. Independently of its coarseness and vulgarity the author from it, is evidently desirous to convert that which to every man of feeling would have been a subject of shame and mortification, into one of profit.

On the morning of the 9th of October, the day on which the packet letters leave Philadelphia, I received the above advertisement, and by the post of that day I forwarded the following address to the publick of Glasgow, which was received and printed there the beginning of November following:

A short letter addressed to the public, by Granville Sharp Pattison, Esq. on his seeing an advertisement inserted by Dr. Ure, in the Glasgow Herald, on the 27th August last.—Glasgow: Printed by Young, Gallie & Co. 1819.

TO THE PUBLIC.

I have this morning received, by the Ship Albion, the Glasgow Herald of the 27th August, and, were it possible for me to be astonished at any thing which proceeds from Dr. URE, I should have felt wonder-struck at the advertisement which he has thought fit to publish. But I, and not only I, but the Glasgow public, know the individual referred to sufficiently well to believe him eminently qualified for a line of conduct which is marked by *Effrontery, Falsehood and Cowardice*. The impudence of the man is indeed unique, in supposing that he will make a sensible public believe to be a forgery the most infamous of all written productions; one which he got me interdicted from publishing; one which I begged him, both publicly in my Class, and by advertisement, to allow a respectable Committee to examine; one which proves itself to be in his hand-writing, and bears in its matter and style the marks of

truth, so forcibly that no unprejudiced person acquainted with his hand-writing, can look upon it without conviction; one, which he through a female friend and his agent, made every effort to get out of Mrs. Ure's hands, while she resided in Edinburgh, weeks before I was aware either of its existence, or that of the divorce; one which he did not even deny until he found that his apology of its having been written in raillery would not go down with his acquaintances, and that on account of it he was shunned like a being under a moral putrefaction; one which I declare, by all that is sacred, I never saw, until the moment, when before two most respectable advocates, it was produced by the gentleman to whom Mrs. Ure had delivered it within an hour previously; and one, on account of which, although I continued in Glasgow for months after I had given it out to be a letter of Dr. Ure's to his wife, he took no legal measures for redress: a forbearance which, to every person of common sense, must demonstrate what were the responses of his own conscience on the subject—yet, incredible, and monstrous as this piece of impudence is, Dr. Ure's history and character can justify it. He who knows Dr. Ure's former actions, can realise such a specimen of our species. It was also necessary to know Dr. Ure, to know the coward, who, so long as a single male member of my family remained in Glasgow, durst not give vent to the heart-burnings of his disappointed malice. I doubt not but that in the proposed publication the most unheard of impudence and falsehood will be advanced. There is, however, a mightiness in truth which at once overwhelms falsehood, and compels it to shrink from its searching and exposing glance.

Dr. Ure may flatter himself of three things by this publication.

1st, To restore some shade of character to himself.

2d, To injure me in America.

3d, That a voyage of 4000 miles will prevent my calling him to an account.

These anticipations I have to assure him, are vain.

1st, As Dr. Ure's present desperate attempt to shake himself free of his letter of 12th October, 1818, must be founded on some piece of machination, only worthy the author of that most foul and damning document, such an attempt can only increase his infamy.

2d, My character here is too well known to be injured by any thing which can proceed from so contemptible a creature.

3d, I have to promise him, that so soon as my Lectures are finished, which will be by the end of February next, I shall visit Glasgow, and make him answerable for every falsehood which he may, in my absence, have dared to print.*

As to the Divorce, Dr. Ure, his wife, and her friends, know that had she persisted in her opposition it could never have been obtained, and as she was bribed by Dr. Ure to withdraw her opposition, by the settlement of an annuity, the divorce was collusive and illegal.

GRANVILLE SHARP PATTISON.

Philadelphia, 9th October, 1819.

P. S. Dr. Ure gives me a very pretty specimen of the consistency of his proposed work, in the advertisement. "The work has been solely delayed from motives of delicacy towards the deluded lady;" and adds in the next sentence, "that it has only been delayed until the chain of evidence was complete." A contradiction which it is surprising the Doctor could not detect.

A few days before the one fixed on for the publication of Dr. Ure's BOOK, and after he had gone to the expense of some Hundreds of pounds Sterling for paper, printing, &c. &c. the edition, consisting of two thousand copies, was suppressed. My reader, will no doubt, be anxious to be informed of the cause of this:—Dr. Ure having "through threats and promises," induced his wife to

* As the book advertised by Dr. Ure was never published, it was not necessary for me to visit Scotland.

perjure herself, by granting him a false affidavit, which went to state, that the letter of which I had circulated *fac-simile* copies, was a forgery, prepared for the press, the work above mentioned. The foundation on which the whole of it rested was this affidavit. Having however had the baseness, with the usual inconsistency of an unprincipled man, to refuse to pay the promised reward to his wife, she came forward, and by the following letter addressed to my agent, the facts of which were afterwards confirmed by an oath, made a confession of the infamous part she had acted in the transaction.

GREENOCK, 23d AUGUST, 1819.

SIR,

You are perhaps already aware that Dr. Pattison published, what he called his Statement of Facts, containing a fac-simile of the letter which I gave to you to be shewn to counsel. The letter is of such a nature, that much odium has been attached to Dr. Ure's character as the author of it. His character and situation were in fact likely to be completely forfeited, unless the effects of the letter were counteracted in some shape or other: accordingly, finding that nothing short of his having written any such letter as is copied into Dr. Pattison's pamphlet would have that effect; and that even his own denial or assertion on this head might be *inefficacious*, the Dr. was forced to have recourse to me, and through the medium of a friend for whom I had always entertained the highest respect, and through *threats* and *promises* held out, regarding my future prospects in life, and also that of my dear children, I was prevailed on to give a writing under my hand, containing, that the letter as it appeared in Pattison's pamphlet was not a genuine copy, but a fabrication, or something to that effect: this step I have ever since regretted, for a three fold reason:—1st, because what I stated was not consistent with truth—2d, *because the provisions made to me have not been made good, nor are they likely to be realized*; and 3dly, because I find that more serious consequences than I apprehended are in all probability to result from it, I am told that my declaration is to be made the ground of a criminal action against myself, as well as against those who were in any way connected with the publication of the pamphlet, and against you in particular, as it has been said, that Dr. Ure has traced out, that it was you who gave the letter to the engraver; under these circumstances, the preservation of the original letter has become a matter of the greatest moment, and it will at once occur to yourself, that it is absolutely necessary to the vindication of your own character and honour, that the letter be exhibited as publicly as possible, to satisfy the public by a fair comparison of it with the Doctor's other letters, that it is truly a genuine letter, and not a fabrication or forgery as is now alleged, and that the copy in the pamphlet is a true copy. Such an exposure will surely have the effect of deterring the Dr. from persisting in using the evidence I have so improperly afforded him, in support of any prosecution he may be induced to raise. Notwithstanding of my having by letter retracted the statement, on the ground that it had been extorted by *false threats* and *promises*, it has been laid before the Managers of Anderson's Institution, and all my relations, and some of my best friends are likely to turn their backs upon me, unless they are satisfied by a comparison of the hand-writing of the Dr. that the letter in your custody is really and truly one penned by Dr. Ure. I therefore beg of you to deliver up the letter to Messrs. Smith & Craig, that they may forward it to me, and I will instruct them to pass from the proceedings against you in the interdict question; or if you do not wish to part with it, but for a short time, give it these gentlemen, and they will pass their word of honour, or grant an obligation, to return it to you in the course of eight days.

I am, Sir,

Your most Ob't Serv't,

(SIGNED)

CATHARINE MONTEATH.

Addressed,

JAMES BURN, Esq. W.S.
Edinburgh.

This letter places the characters of both the pursuer and defender in the divorce, in sufficient relief. Dr. Ure, that he might free himself from the odium and disgrace which had been attached to his character as the author of the infamous letter of which I had published *fac-simile* copies, did not hesitate, for the accomplishment of this purpose, to adopt means the most infamous; and to second him in a plot which placed the lives of several innocent persons in danger, it was only necessary to bribe his wife. She no doubt afterwards confessed this; but she did so, not from any feeling of remorse, but out of revenge, because the provisions promised to her had not been made good, nor were they likely to be realized. Her *confession* necessarily put a complete stop to Dr. Ure's publication; for the argument on which the whole of it rested was by it destroyed, and had he now attempted to circulate a single copy, he would have made himself liable to a criminal prosecution. That I could have no agency in inducing Mrs. Ure to come forward with her *confession*, will be admitted, when it is recollected, that I was at the time it occurred in the United States; and to prove that it was spontaneous, and written without any application on the part of my friends, it is only necessary to compare its date, (23d August,) with the date of Dr. Ure's advertisement, (27th August,) as by doing so, it will be observed that my agent was in possession of the *confession* before he could have had any knowledge of Dr. Ure's intention to publish his book.

Immediately after Mr. Burn had received Mrs. Ure's letter, he addressed the following communication to the trustees of the Andersonian University; which it will be observed, confirms and corroborates all the facts of the preceding history.

EDINBURGH, 28TH AUGUST, 1819.

GENTLEMEN,

In the absence of Mr. Granville Sharp Pattison, Dr. Ure has attempted to vindicate his character at the expense of truth and the characters of others. So long as his assertions were merely verbal, I determined to take no notice of him or them; but now that he has, by the medium of a newspaper, called upon the attention of the public, I conceive that my farther silence might be improperly interpreted.

In the Glasgow Herald of yesterday, an advertisement appeared bearing the title of "Seduction, Divorce, Calumny," in which the letter printed by Dr. Pattison in his pamphlet, is expressly stated to be forged. The friends of Mr. Pattison have no wish to prevent the publication of Dr. Ure's work—Mr. P. has ever courted publicity; and in order to satisfy you and the public of the authenticity of the letter, and that every opportunity was afforded Dr. Ure of proving its fabrication if he had dared to stand the test. I beg leave to call your attention to the following statement:—

In the Glasgow Chronicle of the 5th March last, the following advertisement was inserted by Mr. Pattison:—(Already inserted, see page 6.)

Dr. Ure, dreading the consequences of this publication, had sufficient influence with Mrs. Ure to induce her to apply to the Court of Sessions in her own name, for an interdict against the publication of his letter to her of 23d of October, 1818, which was granted against Dr. Pattison, myself, Maurice Ogle, bookseller, and Young & Gallie, printers, in Glasgow.

Several copies of Mr. Pattison's pamphlet, so far as finished, including a copy of Dr. Ure's letter, 23d of October, and *fac-simile* engravings were circulated previous to the information of the interdict; but after it was intimated, Mr. Pattison, in deference to the Supreme Court, refrained from farther circulation, and inserted the following advertisement in the Glasgow Courier:—(Already inserted, see page 8.)

To this challenge Dr. Ure returned no answer, and sought no opportunity of bringing the matter to a public test; from the first he did not even attempt to deny the authenticity of the letter, and endeavoured to get clear of the odium by raillery. His Agent here even called on me, and did not deny its genuineness, but maintained that it was mere *badinage*, and could be explained as written in a spirited manner to raise Mrs. Ure's spirits.

Dr. Ure finding however, that his raillery and his Agent's *badinage* were not well received, began gradually, first to express doubts of part of the letter, then of the whole; and no sooner had Mr. Pattison left Glasgow for America, in pursuit of an honourable and lucrative situation there, than Dr. Ure loudly, but still verbally asserted that the letter was a forgery.

Last month he was in Edinburgh, endeavouring to impose on others. He consulted Mr. Wm. Patrick, W. S. to whom he maintained the letter was a forgery, upon the legal steps he ought to adopt to vindicate his character, and punish the fabricators of the letter. Mr. Patrick waited separately upon Mr. Francis Jeffery, advocate, and myself, and both Mr. Jeffery and I explained to him the whole matters connected with the letter; and I offered to produce it to Mr. Patrick for his inspection; and at his request agreed that Mr. Gemmell, Dr. Ure's Agent, should be present: accordingly, on Saturday, the 24th ult. by which time Dr. Ure had returned to Glasgow, I, in company with Mr. Pattison's Agent in Glasgow, who happened to be here, waited on Mr. Patrick at his house, where Mr. Gemmell joined us, and compared the letter with others of Dr. Ure. At the meeting I engaged on the part of Mr. Pattison, that the letter would be produced before you, and as *Mr. Gemmell hesitated to stand that test*, that it would be produced before any number of respectable gentlemen whom Dr. Ure might name: both Mr. Gemmell and Mr. Patrick agreed that the offer was a fair one; the former promised to communicate the offer to Dr. Ure, and the latter declared that he would have no farther concern in the business. Since that period more than a month has elapsed, and Dr. Ure has taken no notice of the affair.

It appears however, that Dr. Ure has not been idle, but that he has been making every attempt, however dishonourable, to extricate his name from the infamy to which it is consigned. Mrs. Ure's letter to me of the 23d inst. will explain one of the means used by him to impose on you and the public, a copy of which letter, and my answer of the 26th, addressed to Mr. Craig, W. S. I now enclose. In conclusion I beg leave to state, that on the part of Dr. Pattison and his friends, I am willing to produce before you, or the public, the original letter of Dr. Ure to Mrs. Ure, of 23d October, 1818, which is alleged to be a forgery; and Dr. Ure and any of his friends may be present at the examination of it.

I trust you will not conceive any apology requisite for thus intruding on your attention: I consider this statement necessary not only in vindication of Dr. Pattison, myself and others, but also in deference to you in consequence of the imposition which Dr. Ure has used towards you. I have confined myself to a mere statement of facts, without comment, and to shorten the statement I have even omitted additional evidence of the genuineness of Dr. Ure's letter.

I am, gentlemen,

Your most Ob't Serv't,

(SIGNED)

JAMES BURN,

Writer to the Signet.

To the Trustees and Managers of the Andersonian Institution.

(Copy of a Letter from Mr. Burn to Mr. Craig, referred to and enclosed in the above letter.)

EDINBURGH, 26TH AUGUST, 1819.

DEAR SIR,

In addition to, and explanation of, the conversation betwixt us to day, I beg leave to state, that in the letter from Mrs. Ure, dated Greenock, 23d inst. delivered to-day by you to me, which you mentioned came under cover to you, and which I read to you, she writes, in relation to Dr. Ure's infamous letter, "It is necessary that the letter be exhibited as publicly as possible, to satisfy the public, by a fair comparison of it with the Doctor's other letters, that it is truly a genuine letter, and not a fabrication or forgery as is now alleged, and that the copy in the pamphlet is a true copy."

If these are Mrs. Ure's sentiments there is no farther occasion for the interdict, and whenever she chuses to consent to its being withdrawn, I engage that the letter will be exhibited to any number of respectable persons whom she may name, proper caution being taken that the letter be not destroyed. Whilst writing, I may here repeat what I mentioned to you to day, that on the 24th ult. the original was exhibited to Mr. Patriek and Mr. Gemmell, and that the latter person compared it with other letters of Dr. Ure's. That on the part of Dr. Pattison and his friends, I engaged that the original letter would be produced, either before the trustees of the Andersonian Institution, or any number of gentlemen in Glasgow, whose respectability was previously ascertained, whom Dr. Ure might name; providing always, Mrs. Ure's consent was obtained; and that no notice has since been taken of the offer, either by Dr. Ure or his agents.

The contents of Mrs. Ure's letter do not surprise me, they are what I would have expected of Dr. Ure.—I am,

Dear Sir, Your's truly,

(SIGNED)

JAMES BURN.

Addressed, WM. CRAIG, Esq. W. S.

A few days after writing this letter, Mr. Burn went on to Glasgow, and laid the original letter of Dr. Ure before the managers of the Andersonian Institution; who were fully satisfied of his being its author.

In conclusion, Mr. Burn got another Agent on the 7th November, to institute an action against Dr. Ure for nominal damages, *on the charge that he had falsely accused me of forgery*; merely that he might have an opportunity of calling into court, evidence to prove that the divorce had been obtained through a conspiracy, formed betwixt Dr. Ure and his wife; and his object in employing another agent was that he himself might be subpoenaed as a witness, his evidence being of a character which would clearly go to the support of the action. This action was, however, resisted by Dr. Ure, on the plea of its being an action of *feeling*; and that no mandate from an absent party was sufficient to support it, the more especially as the person granting it had threatened personal chastisement rather than a prosecution. This objection was entertained in the Inferior Court, and as the Supreme Court would probably have required me to appear personally in support of my prosecution, and the more especially as the only object I had in view, a vindication of my character, had been accomplished by the steps already taken, my friends have not considered it necessary to push the affair further.

All of these facts are proved by a long letter written to me by Mr. Burn, from Edinburgh, of date the 11th November, 1819; the genuineness of which letter is certified by the gentlemen before whom the documents have been placed.

The greater part of the facts stated in the preceding history, do not rest upon my simple dictum, but are established and proved by unquestionable and authenticated documents. But as there are some statements given, which rest upon my assertion, and as these may at first seem rather incredible, I shall, before I proceed to the second division of the subject, make a few remarks upon some of these particulars. And 1st. It may seem incredible to those who are not acquainted with the character of the Consistorial Court, that the action for divorce should have been entered on the 2d December, 1818, and that I should have remained ignorant of it until the 5th of February, 1819. If I shall, however, be able to prove, as I shall most satisfactorily hereafter, that Mrs. Ure assisted her husband in obtaining the divorce, it will be evident that there was no reason why I should come to a knowledge of the action before the public generally. That the public were not aware of the existence of the action, until after the 5th of February, 1819, two months after it had been in court, Dr. Chapman's own pamphlet inadvertantly proves. From the extract of a letter printed there, addressed to Dr. Mason of N. York, from

Dr. Chalmers of Glasgow, it is proved that had Dr. Chalmers even heard a hint of this divorce, that he would not have granted me the recommendatory letter which he had previously addressed in my favour to Dr. Mason. Now if the date of this letter (5th January, 1819) be appealed to, it will be seen that it was written more than a month after the divorce had been entered in court; and from the correspondence which passed betwixt myself and Dr. Chalmers, hereafter to be published, it will be demonstrated, that the fact of a bill of divorce having been applied for, did not become public until after the 5th of February. But, that I did not come to a knowledge of the divorce until it was obtained, it is unnecessary for me to employ arguments to prove. Dr. Ure himself, in his answer to Mrs. Ure's reclaiming petition, corroborates and proves the truth of my statement. He there observes, the fact was, that *no sooner* was the divorce passed and the fact *known in Glasgow*, than Mr. Pattison came to Edinburgh for the purpose of inducing Mrs. Ure to send in the reclaiming petition. (See proceedings, p. 35.)

2dly. It is somewhat difficult to reconcile to reason the fact that although my name had been used by the pursuer in obtaining the bill of divorce, that no remedy was open to me; that I was not permitted to come into court to vindicate my character. But when the subject is fully considered this difficulty disappears. In a note in my "Refutation," which is here again published, I observed that the consistory court of Scotland is an ecclesiastical court in which all prosecutions connected with marriage, &c. &c. are settled. If A is desirous to obtain a divorce from his wife B, all that A is required to do, is merely to go into court, and file a bill, alleging that B had an adulterous intercourse with C. It is obvious that there are only two persons connected with this action; A the person prosecuting, and B the person prosecuted. C, the individual who is the *reputed paramour* may be an ideal personage; he, it is evident is no party in the cause, and consequently, as *parties* only are qualified to lead proofs in court, allowing that he was aware of the suit, and could prove that he has only the day before returned home, after an absence of 20 years in India, and that the alleged crime, as said to have been committed by him must be groundless: still it is impossible for him to appear in court to prove this, and as judges are only entitled to judge from the facts delivered in court, although the fact of his absence be notorious, no notice could be taken of it by the court; and if the wife did not resist the action, and this she will most certainly not do, if she colluded with her husband, as a matter of course the bill of divorce would be granted.

In all cases where a husband A obtains a divorce from his wife B, from her having really been guilty of an improper intercourse with C, a second action immediately follows. A now prosecutes C for damages; and in this second action, C having become a party, he can appear in court, and endeavor to put aside the charge made against him by A. of guilt with B. But it will at once occur to my reader, that if A. has obtained his divorce by a collusion with B, he will not proceed to an action for damages, seeing it gives C. a power which, in the former action, he did not possess, viz. to appear in court, and prove the nullity of the charge brought against his character. Dr. Ure, although in very needy circumstances, aware had such an action been instituted, that I would bring forward incontrovertible evidence of the conspiracy, *wisely* declined entering on it.

From this statement it is obvious that I had nothing to do with the action of divorce. Mrs. Ure alone was the defender, and she only was intitled to appear as such in the court. But it may be supposed, that after the sentence of divorce had passed, that I might then have brought an action against Dr. Ure for defamation of character. But this idea will at once be set aside by recollecting that the court, deceived by the collusion of the parties, had sanctioned the defamation, and against a *court* no action could have been entertained; moreover, it must be borne in mind that my name is introduced only incidentally and collaterally, and in such a way as not to entitle me to an action against Dr. Ure any more than against the court or the witnesses; and, of this opinion were Messrs. Jeffery and Cockburn, the very distinguished counsel whom I con-

sulted. The charge of adultery was made against Mrs. Ure; no charge whatever, was made directly against me. But although, it was not in my power to bring an action against Dr. Ure, he was clearly intitled to bring one against me, and had the evidence by which he obtained the divorce, not been collusive, had it not been made up of a tissue of falsehoods and inconsistencies, which would have been exposed in all its villany by an *actual* defender, is it to be believed that Dr. Ure, would not have availed himself of the action for damages, which invariably in these cases follows the action for divorce. The courts of Britain, it is well known, are particularly severe in their sentences on these occasions, and as Dr. Ure must have spent a very considerable sum of money in prosecuting the suit, and as this would have been ordered to have been paid along with a large sum as damages, had he satisfied a jury that I was really guilty. Nothing it is evident, but a consciousness that I was innocent of the imputed charge, and a conviction that were I only permitted to appear in a court, that I should prove this to the satisfaction of the public, could have deterred him from bringing this action.

I placed this matter in my former pamphlet in its true light. That this statement is consistent with truth, I will with confidence appeal to every intelligent lawyer who is conversant with the courts of Scotland. Yet Dr. Chapman asserts that I am guilty of falsehood, that "I represent the tribunal as clerical in its nature." I should have expected, as he was the avowed author of the "*FORENSIC SPEECHES*," it would not have been necessary for me to tell him that an ecclesiastical court is not necessarily one composed of *clergymen*; the Orphans' Courts of this country being such, although all their members are of the laity. To this I may add, that its decisions and practical proceedings are regulated by the *CANON* law, and not the *COMMON* or general law of the land. The quotation which he gives from Ferguson's History of the Courts of Scotland, does not militate in one particular against my account of that court. It is no doubt mentioned that if the decisions of the Consistorial Court "be alleged to be wrongously pronounced," an appeal may be made to the Supreme Court. But this appeal it is evident can only be made by a *party*.

From the history of the divorce which has been given, and the truth of which has been proved by unquestionable and authentic documents; it is demonstrated, that both the pursuer and defender in the action, were persons of the most abandoned character. Dr. Ure's most infamous letter, of which I published in Glasgow a *fac-simile* copy, has been proved beyond a question, to have been a genuine letter; and this of itself is sufficient to acquit me, with every person who reads it, of the crime with which I have been charged. But as this letter, from the reasons already mentioned, is of a character which forbids its general publication, it may perhaps be expected that I should make a few observations on the evidence which was adduced in support of the prosecution. These will, however, be very short, because the documents already published vindicate my reputation, and because it would be necessary in entering into an extended argument on the evidence to use indelicacies of expression, which I should be very unwilling to employ.

Before I enter on an examination and refutation of the testimony advanced in support of the divorce, I shall indulge myself with a few observations on the hardship of the situation in which Dr. Chapman's most shameful and unheard of attack has placed me. The testimony advanced in all divorce cases, whether false or true, is of a character ill suited for circulation amongst the members of a virtuous community. Dr. Chapman, however, regardless of the public morals; intent only upon injuring me, and through me the University of Maryland, has allowed no feeling of decency to restrain him, but has thrown on the table of almost every family in the country, his gross and impure accusation. He knew well that I possessed ample evidence to refute the charge, for he had himself seen my documents, and had repeatedly declared that they were such as must satisfy the most sceptical as to my innocence. But as I had had sufficient magnanimity, when he attacked me in presence of his wife, to refrain, on hearing her screams, from beating his coward soul from his body, and although possessed, on the publication of my Refutation, of authenticated anec-

dotes of his history, of a much darker shade than the accusation he had falsely brought against me; yet as I had in pity to his wife spared him, and in respect to myself had not condescended to recriminate, he flattered himself that rather than violate decency, by the publication of those documents which he from general recollection, may have considered necessary for my justification, I would have allowed my character to suffer. He was correct in his opinion, that rather than give publicity to documents which could have the effect of injuring the feelings of the chaste and virtuous, that I would have remained silent, but he has most fortunately been mistaken in his belief, that I could not justify my character to the public without publishing those documents.

Another ungentleman-like unfairness, which Dr. Chapman has been guilty of in the publication of his last pamphlets is, that he has allowed ten months to elapse between the publication of my Refutation of his first attack, and the publication of the present pamphlets, which are avowedly answers to it. This lapse of time is apt to make his new publications convey very unfavourable and incorrect impressions. It is not to be expected that the public will take more than a very general and partial interest in personal controversy. The publications of the opposing parties may be read, but the impression they produce is necessarily ephemeral, and the facts they contain are soon dismissed from the memory. Never I believe was any reply more triumphant than my "REFUTATION OF CERTAIN CALUMNIES, &c." It convicted Dr. Chapman of the most gross and wilful falsehoods, and set aside by irresistible proof, the aspersions which he attempted to fix on my reputation. It threw him from the rank he had before possessed in society, and made every man of honour and feeling view him as a degraded and base calumniator. Yet although this was universally admitted, when the facts of my Refutation were fresh on the public mind, now that these are in a great measure forgotten, his new pamphlets, although they consist of merely the old charge dressed out in a new garb, are by many considered as containing a new accusation. I never denied in my Refutation, that Dr. Ure had obtained a divorce from his wife, on account of adultery alleged to have been committed with me. On the contrary, I admitted the fact in the most unequivocal manner. I then stated that the divorce had been obtained through collusion, and having placed my documents before four of as respectable gentlemen as any in this country, they gave me their certificate, by which they testified to the public, "*that the charge of an adulterous intercourse betwixt Mr. Pattison and Mrs. Ure, was wholly destitute of foundation.*" I would ask, if any other charge is contained in these pamphlets, than the one from which their certificate acquitted me? There is none. I allowed before that this divorce had, from an *ex parte* statement, been sanctioned by the sentence of the court, and surely in doing this, I was not desirous to mislead and deceive the community with which I had become associated.

No charge can be brought against the reputation of a man, of a character so difficult to put aside, as the one advanced against me. If an abandoned female asserts, that she has been engaged in a criminal connexion, with the most virtuous and honourable member of society, even although, he has never seen her, it is impossible for him to bring forward a positive testimony to prove that he is not guilty. And in general in such a case all that is left for a virtuous man, is merely to place his assertion against that of his accuser. Mine is not the first instance where a divorce has been obtained on the plea of a criminal intercourse, which had never existed; but mine, I most sincerely believe, is the first, where the injured individual has been enabled to bring forward an overwhelming mass of testimony to enforce a conviction of his innocence. It is ungenerous and unmanly to bring a charge of so peculiar a character, so difficult of refutation, even against a man, who, residing in his native city, has his reputation established with the public, and who is supported by the influence of his numerous friends and connexions; but, to publish such a scandal against a stranger who stands alone single, and unsupported, who is far removed from his friends, and from those sources from which evidence alone can be obtained to vindicate his character, is ten thousand fold more so. This shameful calumny was proclaimed by Dr. Chapman, when I

first entered Baltimore, a stranger, unknown and unsupported. I repelled the charge, and have since held that rank in society which I feel conscious I am justly entitled to occupy. I would again repeat, that this is no new charge; every item of it was contained in Dr. Chapman's first publication, and every tittle of it was disproved by my "*Refutation*." All that is here new is the testimony furnished on the trial; and surely this must, by every considerate and candid mind, be viewed as wholly exculpatory. But I would even caution my readers to receive Dr. Chapman's edition of the trial *cum grana salis*. For it will be recollected that I have convicted him already of a most audacious attempt to mislead his reader. I would refer to this "Reply," p. 7, where my reader will see Dr. Chapman's quotation from Mr. Walker's letter, and the letter itself. He will there find the following extract:—"I attended and heard it read *as far as was permitted*;" by which extract Dr. Chapman assures his reader, that Mr. Walker evidently alluded to an interruption which Mr. Pattison experienced from the disgust felt by his audience, and which terminated in the "dispersal of the company before one third of the defence was read." *Now the sole object of Mr. Walker's letter was, to state in the clearest and strongest manner, the satisfaction evinced by my audience at my triumphant vindication.* After Dr. Chapman has been convicted of such an unheard of piece of audacity, it is certainly no act of injustice to believe him capable of any misrepresentation. But as the "decree of divorce" contains really nothing which can be considered as criminating me; I believe that Dr. Chapman has been afraid to make any very glaring change in the official document. There are, however, occasional typographical errors which tend to confuse the subject, which I have no doubt were intentional. In the analysis too, anxious to prove that there was a very particular intimacy betwixt Mrs. Ure and my sister, he misquotes the terms of the cards which passed betwixt them. In "THE DOCUMENT," Mrs. Ure in her card addressed to Miss Pattison, addresses her in the common way—Dear Miss Pattison—and Miss Pattison in her reply in like manner begins, "Dear Mrs. U." Dr. Chapman commenting on this as illustrative of the "*great intimacy*," misquotes and adds *my*, which materially alters the sense.

I owe to Dr. Chapman's exertions, and his *liberality in sparing no expense to obtain a copy of the examinations of the witnesses*, the first sight I have been able to procure of their depositions. Dr. Ure himself, aware of the weakness of the proof, and satisfied if examined by me, that its contradictions and absurdities would enable me to expose the conspiracy and collusion, wisely gave orders to his agent, two days after the bill of divorcement had been obtained, to prevent the evidence being examined either by me or by my friends. This may appear strange to those who do not bear in recollection the fact, that I was no party in the action. If this is only kept in recollection, it will be at once admitted that I had no power to claim the right of examining the evidence. That I could not obtain a sight of the examinations of the witnesses will be proved, by my calling on Dr. Ure, in my second advertisement, to lay before a committee all the evidence he possessed of my asserted guilt; (See this Reply, p. 8.) and by the following observations which I made upon his preventing my seeing it, which I now quote from the "*Statement of Facts*," published by me in Glasgow; observations which I durst not have made *there*, unless they had been strictly consistent with truth.

"I am sorry that in giving their evidence, I cannot be so full and explicit as I could wish. One would suppose that although it was possible to conjure up some shadow of an apology for their concealment of the process of divorce from me, until it was decided, that this being accomplished, every semblance of reason for further privacy, for longer mystery, was removed. But with them it is different, when they have by their *ex parte* evidence, got the sentence of a court in their favour, still are they unwilling to show to the criminated individual, the evidence of his crimination. Surely if truth was the standard of their evidence, they would glory in its unfurlment. Surely if baseness and villainy had not congregated their evidence, they would not refuse it to the public. Surely, if they were not conscious in their own minds of its weakness, if they were not persuaded that it would dissolve into nothingness in the hands of him

whom they have attempted to criminate, they would not refuse him a copy of it. Yet true it is, that most sedulously have they prevented me from seeing it, and their agent in Edinburgh has declared, that he has their positive orders not to allow it, on any account, to come into my possession.

"Fortunately they have not been able to keep me in perfect ignorance of their evidence. Having written to my agent in Edinburgh, when the rumour first began to be circulated in Glasgow, he called at the Commissary Court the day on which the sentence of divorce was passed, (5th February,) and was allowed by the clerk to read it hurriedly over, before they had given instructions for its being kept private. At this time he took notes with a pencil, of every thing which he conceived could possibly throw a shadow of suspicion upon my character. His notes are as follows:—

'The witnesses examined are Agnes Sydeserf and Jean Lindsay, servants at the time in Dr. Ure's family; Mrs. Mary Park; James Gemmell, Writer in Edinburgh; James Monteath, Writer in Glasgow; Agnes Blair, Spouse of Wm. Mitchell, Weaver in Falkirk, with whom Mrs. Ure resided; Christian Stirling, Wife of James Baird, residing at Falkirk, who lived in the flat above Mrs. Ure; and Ann Simpson, servant with Mrs. Mitchell. The citation was executed the 2d December, 1818, against Mrs. Ure personally. The examination of witnesses began the 19th January, 1819. Mrs. Ure appeared to be identified by witnesses. The sentence is passed in her absence. The writings produced are—1. Mr. Pattison's address in Paris, *written in pencil*. 2. A card from Mrs. Ure to Miss Pattison, requesting her to send said address. 3. The draft of a letter dated Falkirk, holograph of Mrs. Ure, but unsigned and unaddressed. 4. A holograph prescription of Mr. Pattison's.'

'The substance of the servants' evidence is as follows:—That Mr. Pattison had called frequently at the house, and had occasionally remained in the Dining-room alone with Mrs. Ure—That once on entering the room, one of them had seen Mr. Pattison standing at the fire beside Mrs. Ure, and she thought he had his hand touching her shoulder.—That one forenoon Mr. Pattison called for the keys of the Institution, that he got a key from Mrs. Ure, but that she shortly afterwards left the house, saying, that she had given Mr. Pattison a wrong key, and that she would require to carry him the right one—That on one occasion, one of them returning home from a message, had the door opened by Mrs. Ure, whose dress seemed a little deranged—That without asking any questions, her mistress had told her that Mr. Pattison was with her; but that she neither saw him nor heard him go out. Lastly, that they had never, at any time, when Mr. Pattison was alone with Mrs. Ure, heard any noise nor observed the slightest derangement of the furniture. One of the servants says she was suspicious of Mr. Pattison, from seeing him standing at the fire with her mistress, and from his calling frequently at the house.'

'Mrs. Park swears that on a visit to Mrs. Ure in Edinburgh, Mrs. Ure told her that Mr. Pattison was the father of her child.'

'Messrs. Gemmell and Monteath merely swear that they had been consulted by Dr. Ure as to the divorce.'

'Dr. Geo. Monteath and Mrs. Park identify the hand-writing of Mrs. Ure.'

'Agnes Blair *alias* Mitchell, Ann Simpson and Christian Stirling *alias* Baird, swear, that Mr. Pattison had called *once* upon Mrs. Ure at Falkirk, and had walked with her in a garden behind the house.'

'The copy of the letter which was said to be returned from Falkirk to Glasgow in an *empty box*, and identified to be in Mrs. Ure's hand-writing, states that she is with child to the person for whom it was intended. It is neither signed nor addressed, but the exclamation, *O Granville!* is occasionally employed in it.'

'The letter from Mrs. Ure to Miss Pattison merely requests her Brother's address in Paris, for the information of a gentleman of her acquaintance. The address is simply Mr. Pattison in Paris, *written in pencil*.' "

The above abstract of the testimony, furnished me by my agent, was the only one I could ever, until the present, obtain of the evidence advanced in the trial. It was from this that I prepared my "STATEMENT OF FACTS," several documents from which are published in this "REPLY."

Since I have obtained the copy of Dr. Chapman's pamphlets, I have studied with considerable attention and care the depositions of the witnesses; and I feel satisfied, that were I permitted with this single document, to plead my cause before any assembly of gentlemen, that with it alone I would compel them to grant me a verdict, acquitting me even of the slightest indecorum. There are some parts of it, the meaning of which I cannot even guess at. We are told for instance, in the petition of the pursuer, that particular acts of adultery were committed "at the pursuer's sea-bathing quarters, at Fairlie near Largs, in June and July," 1818. This is not stated merely *pro forma*, for the pursuer having stated some months in the beginning of the year, makes an omission of the month of May, and then makes the assertion, that acts of adultery were committed during the months of June and July. And condescends particularly on the situation where these were committed. I was in France from April until nearly the end of October, and I therefore assuredly could not be the guilty person stated to have committed these acts of adultery. Again, acts of adultery are said to have been committed at Edinburgh, in the house of Douglas, Taylor in Carnegie-street; and with the view of proving this, the names of Douglas, his wife and their servant, are all entered on the list of witnesses. Their names would certainly not have been mentioned, had they not possessed the power to prove the fact of an *adultery* with Mrs. Ure and *some* person; and that I was not that person, will I think be admitted, when it is observed that their evidence is not called for in the proof, which is led with the view of obtaining the divorce for acts of adultery, asserted to have been committed by me. I merely call my reader's attention to these facts at present, hereafter I shall perhaps take occasion to reason upon them.

The evidence may with propriety be divided into two parts:—1st, The facts testified to by the witnesses, who had no interest in the result of the trial; and secondly, The proof furnished either directly or indirectly by the defender herself.

The only witnesses who furnish the first class of evidence are the two servants, Agnes Sydeserf and Jean Lindsay, who were living at the time the criminal intercourse is asserted to have been carried on, in the house with Dr. and Mrs. Ure. To their examinations I would particularly call the attention of my reader, and I think he will, after a careful and attentive examination of them, admit that they, if divested of the presumptive colouring and support which is given to them by the second division of the evidence which was furnished, either directly or indirectly by Mrs. Ure, that they in fact do not contain one tittle of evidence which might not be brought against the character the most upright and honourable member of society; who, without any suspicion of a conspiracy against his reputation, was in the habit of visiting intimately and familiarly in a family.

In every case of *crim. con.* which has ever been tried, where the parties were really guilty, it has been almost invariably by the testimony of the servants residing in the family, that the paramour has been found guilty. They, from their situation, must necessarily, if such a connexion existed, bring forward damning proof as to the fact; but here the servants' evidence, if properly understood, is altogether exculpatory. When interrogated, as to whether they ever observed any derangement in the furniture of the room after my visits, or whether during them, they ever heard any noise, they answered in the negative.

Another important fact to be carried in recollection is, that these examinations were wholly *ex parte*—that the person who interrogated them was Mr. Prentice, the agent for the pursuer, and that of consequence he would be desirous so to lead the questions, as to support the action of his client, and that there was no counsel employed by Mrs. Ure to destroy or counteract this. That he did so, and gave them a bearing inconsistent with the truth, I trust I shall be able satisfactorily to prove.

Great weight is evidently given in the evidence of the servants, to a story about my having called for the key of the institution, &c. &c. (See page 11.) and the inference directly drawn from this is, that this story furnished unquestionable proof of a criminal understanding betwixt Mrs. Ure and myself.

That my calling for the key of the institution was a mere *excuse*—that my true object was to concert a meeting with Mrs. Ure in the institution buildings—that she, having given me a wrong key, might by telling the servants that she had done so, leave home without suspicion, by simply stating that she was going to carry me the right one. Now from the following letter, it will be proven that when I went for the key, I was accompanied by Mr. Scott the architect, that he remained at the door of Dr. Ure's house, until I went in and obtained the key—that I did not remain longer than was required to go and return—that the key was discovered to be a wrong one, and that Mrs. Ure came shortly afterwards to the institution with the right *one*. Had Mrs. Ure mentioned to me, in giving me the wrong key, that her object was to have a meeting with me in the institution, which she most certainly would have done had any guilty connexion existed between us, my informing her of the fact that Mr. Scott was with me, and waiting for me at the door, would assuredly have put a stop to such an intention.

GLASGOW, 20TH MARCH, 1819.

MR. GRANVILLE PATTISON,

SIR,

I recollect particularly of you calling on me, about the end of March or beginning of April last, (previous to my making sketches of plans for the intended Andersonian College,) to go with you to examine the present building, to see the elevation and width of the seats, &c. &c. that you called at Dr. Ure's house for the key; that I waited your coming down, which was not longer than to have gone and returned; that the key intended for the entry-door was not the right one; after repeatedly trying all the keys we had, to open the door, we requested James Gillan, Mr. Gordon's shop-man, to look at the keys and see if he could open the door; it was concluded there was some mistake; you immediately went across the street intending to proceed to Dr. Ure's house; that Mrs. Ure met you before you turned the corner of John-street Church, carrying another key in her hand, which after trying, was found to be the right one; that on seeing the door opened, Mrs. Ure immediately went away without entering the premises; that we staid some time in the place, and that we came away together without your returning to Dr. Ure's house at that time.

I am, Sir, Your's, &c.

JOHN SCOTT.

That my visit for the key, was an innocent one, will I think now be admitted, and this being granted, it is worthy of remark, how the most innocent act may be so distorted by the misconceptions of a witness, and by a lawyer, leading the questions, as to put on the semblance and character of a guilty one. The servant depones that when Mrs. Ure told her she was going to the institution with the key for Mr. Pattison, that she was very much agitated, "*she looked flurried and not as usual,*" and again she depones "we the servants knew that Dr. Pattison had a key of the institution, as one of the surgeons who lectured there." Now two facts are here sworn to which are inconsistent with truth, Mrs. Ure could not be flurried when she went out with the key, as I have proved that there could be no intention of a meeting, and at this time I had no key of the institution. I had only been elected a professor in it about a month before, and did not lecture in the buildings of the institution, until the following session. The fact that I had no key at this time need not rest on my own testimony—Mr. Scott's letter, written to me in answer to certain queries, proves it beyond question, for if I had had a key, what object could I have had in taking that gentleman to Dr. Ure's house to ask for one. From these observations it will, I trust be admitted, that had the evidence of the servants even gone to state very suspicious circumstances, which it does not, that still nothing short of their swearing to the *fact* ought to have the effect of injuring my reputation. The witnesses from Falkirk swear, that I called *once* on Mrs. Ure when residing there.

This is certainly a fact, from which no criminating inference can be drawn. It will be borne in mind, as I have already explained, how Mrs. Ure contrived to have an interview with me as I passed through Falkirk in my way to Glasgow, and as this was my direct way home, and as I was necessarily detained there for an hour and an half, the Edinburgh stage arriving at $\frac{1}{2}$ past 11 o'clock, and the Canal boat not leaving Falkirk until 1 o'clock, and having no suspicions it is not to be supposed I would have refused to make this visit. In fact my making the call tends to prove my innocence, for as I must have known, if guilty, the object of Mrs. Ure's removal from Glasgow; it is not to be believed that I would, with this knowledge, have called in open day on Mrs. Ure and "walked in a garden with" her.

The only part of the evidence therefore, which appears to criminate me, is the second class,—that furnished either directly or indirectly by Mrs. Ure. The monstrous absurdity, if she had actually been guilty of adultery with me, that she would herself have come forward and furnished her husband with the *only evidence* which could tend to support the divorce, must startle and confound every candid man who looks at the evidence. I am certainly entitled to the privilege possessed by the lowest member of society, to be considered innocent until I shall have been proved to have been guilty. Throw aside Mrs. Ure's most unnatural testimony, and my character is cleared from all suspicion. Her testimony, if I had ever been guilty of adultery with her, she most certainly never would have furnished. But, had Mrs. Ure been differently situated, had she been simply in the relation of a witness, and not the defender in the action, still, I would insist that her evidence was not entitled to the weight of a feather, when it went to criminate a respectable character. The most infamous letter addressed to her by her husband, of which I published a *fac-simile* copy, proves her to have been a woman destitute of all principle and qualified for the perpetration of any act of abandonment; when she finds herself deceived by her husband as to certain promises made to her, she sends in her reclaiming petition, where she herself states under the sanction of a most awful oath, that she was innocent of the adultery with which she was charged, &c. &c. (See page 32.)—when again under the control and direction of her husband, she withdraws this petition, which if supported must have removed the sentence of divorce, and some months afterwards she is induced by Dr. Ure's *bribes* and *threats* to give a writing under her hand, which was neither more nor less than an affidavit that the letter I had published was a forgery, an affidavit which placed my life in jeopardy;—and finally, she comes forward and makes to my agent a *spontaneous confession*, that she had been guilty of this perjury. Was it remorse it may be enquired, which induced her to make this *confession*? Not at all, she comes forward spontaneously with her *confession*, because, as she herself states in it, the bribes made have not been paid, nor are they likely to be realised. If the evidence of a woman whose character is thus proved to have been the most infamous, alone and unsupported, is to be received, however strong, against character, the most virtuous and honorable member of society is not safe. That my character remained unblemished, and that it had never been charged with the slightest indecorum, is abundantly proved by the fact, that Dr. Chapman, with all his agencies and exertions, has been unable to rake up a single peccadillo against it, and that such a character should be allowed to be injured by so infamous a couple as Dr. Ure and his wife, or their very suitable representative in this country, Dr. Chapman, is contrary to every principle of justice. But I shall not content myself with resting my acquittal on the fact, that there is no evidence adduced in the proof which tends even to throw suspicion upon my character, except what is furnished either directly or indirectly by Mrs. Ure, but I shall demonstrate it from the contradictions and absurdities, which that evidence itself involves. Mrs. Mary Park, a woman of colour, swears that Mrs. Ure told her when she paid a visit to her in Edinburgh, that I was the father of her child; this proves nothing more than that Mrs. Ure said so, and the absurdity of this confession will at once be admitted, when it is remarked to have only been made the 2nd December, 1818, (See proceedings p. 17.) and when turning to the letter adduced in proof and said to have been

written by Mrs. Ure to the said Mrs. Mary Park, and bearing date the 23rd October, 1818, (See p. 20.) it is clearly proved that Mrs. Park was all along privy to the asserted cause of separation betwixt Dr. and Mrs. Ure. Another absurdity which every sensible man must perceive this confession involves, is Mrs. Ure's assuming to herself the knowledge that I was the father of her child. It is admitted that at the period of the conception of this child, Dr. and Mrs. Ure were living together in all the intimacies of the married state, had she therefore at the same time been carrying on an intrigue with another man, still she could not have pretended to say that her child was his offspring, more than that it was the offspring of her husband.

All the remaining testimony is furnished directly by Mrs. Ure herself, the *nominal* defender in the action. It consists of a copy of a letter which she sent to her husband from Falkirk, and a letter which she wrote Mrs. Mary Park from Edinburgh, and my address in Paris written by Miss Pattison *with a pencil*.

We shall consider these documents in order, and first the *copy* of the letter which is asserted to have been the copy of one sent to me. It is sworn to be in Mrs. Ure's hand writing, and is dated the 14th August, 1818. This letter has evidently been written *ad captandum*; but a more awkward and clumsy piece of evidence has never been introduced into a court of justice. I would ask, can the absurd supposition be for a moment entertained, that this letter was truly and honestly written with the intention of being sent to me?—is it to be credited that a woman situated as Mrs. Ure is represented to have been "*hiding herself from her friends*," as she expresses herself in the letter, and "*concealing the situation she was in*," that she would have made a copy of a letter which contained a confession of her shame and infamy; or if she had been so illiterate, which is contradicted by the style of the letter, as to require to make a copy, that she would not have immediately here destroyed it? But there is another gross absurdity involved in this letter: we are told, first, in evidence, (*see Dr. Ure's petition, p. 2.*) "That Mrs. Ure herself," prior to the 1st of August, 1818, "*confessing her guilt*," and stating that she was with child from an adulterous intercourse, *she was dismissed the society of the pursuer and his family, and had since been maintained and supported under false names and obscure lodgings in an adulterous manner at Falkirk,*" &c. &c. and again, at p. 7 we are told, "that the defender, being in an unhappy state of mind, made a confession of her guilt by said letter, (dated 14th August,) and that she sent the pursuer a copy of said letter. It must strike every reader that this statement cannot be consistent with truth, for we are first informed that Mrs. Ure, having before the 1st of August, made a confession of her guilt, was dismissed the society and family of the pursuer; and again it is stated, that this confession was made by Mrs. Ure, sending the pursuer the copy of a letter falsely asserted to have been sent to me; and which, as it bears date the 14th of August, could not consequently have been received until sometime after the defender had "*been dismissed the family of the pursuer.*" I shall be excused calling my reader's attention more particularly to the absurdities which this statement involves.

Supposing for a moment, that an improper connexion had existed betwixt me and the defender, Dr. Ure, to come to a knowledge of it, must have had some evidence of it. It appears on evidence, that I left Glasgow for Paris the 5th of April, 1818; and that Dr. Ure entertained no suspicion of me up to the day of my departure, is rendered evident from my visits being continued up to that date; and from Dr. Ure's living with his wife at that time, and for *four months* afterwards, in all the *intimacies of the married state*. When I had left Glasgow, the only possible way in which the pursuer could come to the knowledge of my guilt, still going on the supposition that I was guilty, was, through the medium of a correspondence, or by a confession. That there was no correspondence, is proved by the fact, that this is neither produced nor referred to. It may be said, that his finding my address at Paris in an old trunk of the defender, was what first made Dr. Ure suspicious; but this idea is immediately contradicted; for, in referring to the evidence, (see p. 19,) it will be seen that this address was not discovered until after the action had been commenced. Prentice for the pursuer stated on the 26th January, 1819, "*that since last diet*

of court, the pursuer had discovered in an old trunk of the defender's in his house, a note holograph of the defender's," enquiring my address in Paris, &c. &c. It is hardly necessary to reason on the absurdity of Mrs. Ure's making a confession. Is it to be for a moment believed, that she, living and cohabiting with her husband, who could not in relation to me entertain any suspicion of her, would come spontaneously forward and make confession of her guilt? Mrs. Ure was not at a period of life, she was 34 years of age, the mother of several children, and married for 12 years, that it would have been possible for her to have been led from the path of virtue, by the seductions of a villain. If she had been guilty, her's must have been a deliberate act of abandonment, and consequently it is not to be believed that when no ground of suspicion existed, she would have made a spontaneous confession of her guilt to her husband. But even allowing what is most positively contradicted by the letter of Dr. Ure, of which I published a *fac-simile* copy, that her feelings were naturally pure and chaste, and that from an horror and repugnance of the crime she had committed, she was led to make a confession of her guilt to her husband, why would she, after having done so, write the copy of the letter which was asserted to have been intended for me? The truth is, this copy of the letter is a mere link in the chain of the conspiracy. The letter in all probability was written by Dr. Ure himself, and afterwards copied by his wife, and was never intended either to have been sent to me or any other person. But the single object of its composition and preservation was, that it might be introduced as evidence into court. But as it was necessary to support *the idea* that the original of the copy was sent to me, Mrs. Ure goes to the Post-office with a letter, and that she may have a witness, she takes *the servant of the lodgings with her, she shows her a letter, tells her it is for France*, and not content with this, she quarrels with the Post-Master about the price, tells him she did not pay so much in Glasgow, which must have been false, as the inland postage is the same on all foreign letters sent from Scotland; and lastly, to give her husband sufficient proof that a letter for France was put in the Post-office, she no sooner returns home than she tells her landlady that she had been at the office with a letter for France: and although this is supposed to have been the letter, of which the copy is introduced in evidence, and which begins, "*With a mind overwhelmed with grief, and a breaking heart,*" yet the landlady informs us, that having returned from the sorrowful duty of putting this melancholy epistle in the Post-office, that this lady with the *broken heart* sat down and began to joke and laugh with the servant about the Post-office adventure. "*They, (Mrs. Ure and servant,) were laughing and talking about the defender's quarrel with the Post-Master,*" &c. (See p. 28.)

One of the strongest presumptive evidences furnished in support of my supposed guilt, is the fact which both the pursuer and defender are most desirous to assume, viz:—That after Mrs. Ure was dismissed the family of the pursuer, that she was maintained and supported by me. When a person reads without attention the testimony, they are apt, from both parties making this assertion, to suppose that the fact was proved. But of this it will be found there is not a tittle of evidence; on the contrary, there is the most positive proof that it was not so. If I had supported and maintained Mrs. Ure at Falkirk and Edinburgh, as Dr. Ure assumes in his petition, (see p. 2) I must have supplied her with money; now I could only do this in one of two ways, either by enclosing it in a letter, or by sending it by my agent. Had it been sent in the former way, as it is evident Mrs. Ure was willing to furnish Dr. Ure with proof, from her giving up to him the copy of letter, &c. &c. my letter enclosing the money would most certainly have been delivered to him, and exhibited in evidence. Or if my agent had called on Mrs. Ure with money, she knowing who he was, he would have been subpoenaed on the trial as a witness. It may, however, be said, that there was evidence furnished in proof, as to Mrs. Ure's having been supported by me—that my agent provided the lodgings for her in Edinburgh. But I would enquire how is this proved? Exactly as every thing else in the trial, *by the assertion of Mrs. Ure*. In her letter to Mrs. Mary Park, she states that a Mr. B. had provided lodgings for her in Edinburgh—"that he was most attentive," and that "he brought her supplies of books," and that he was a

most "*gentlemanly lad*." Now if Mr. Burn, my agent, is intended by this Mr. B. as it is wished to be believed, it is very remarkable that he should be called a "*gentlemanly lad*;" a Scoticism which conveys the idea of a youth not yet entered the age of manhood. Mr. Burn, my agent, is a most respectable gentleman, betwixt 30 and 40 years of age, and could not therefore be designated as a "*gentlemanly lad*." But let this stand as it will, whoever was intended by the "*gentlemanly lad*," who took the lodgings and brought books to them, must have been known to the landlady; and if she could have proved, as she certainly could have done, who the person was who took the lodgings and brought books to them, her evidence would no doubt have been called for in court, provided it would have gone to establish the fact, that this was my friend. It will be observed, that Mr. Burn and Mrs. Ure's landlady in Edinburgh, are both entered in the list of witnesses affixed to the summons served on the defender, and as the pursuer had the power to *subpœna* both of these persons to furnish evidence, it is certain that he would not have neglected to have done so, had he not been persuaded, that they stating the truth, their evidence would have gone against the action for the divorce. That my friend and agent was anxious to come forward as a witness, is proved by his letter, referred to in this reply, and we have from this the most satisfactory proof, that what he had to say must have been exculpatory.

Another evidence, that there was an intention by this letter to enforce the belief, that Mrs. Ure was living under my protection in Edinburgh, is the request that she makes Mrs. Park, to enclose her letters to Mr. B. She, however, very inadvertently proves, that those letters which were *really* intended to be written to her, would require her real address, for she in another sentence of her letter says, "*Address to me at Mr. James Brown's, Wright, No. 2, Arthur-street.*" This very particular address would certainly not have been required, had the letters been addressed under cover to a person who was seeing her daily. But it is unnecessary to go on reasoning on this subject. Dr. Ure himself furnishes us with evidence, that his wife at Falkirk at least, was maintained and supported under false names by himself. AGNES BLAIR, (see p. 25.) *depones*, "That Mrs. Ure came to deponent's house in Falkirk, on the 12th of August, 1818, accompanied by Dr. Ure, the pursuer; and that HE then took lodgings for her under the name of Mrs. CAMPBELL." This fact, therefore, contradicts most positively the assertion which Dr. Ure makes in his petition—that his wife, having made a confession of her guilt was dismissed his society, and supported at Falkirk by me; and as there is not one tittle of proof adduced, that I supported her in Edinburgh, it is but reasonable to infer that she was there likewise, supported by her husband. Mrs. Ure thus addresses Mrs. Park in the letter we are now considering:—"I know not how I am to write to my husband." That this could not be the genuine sentiment of Mrs. Ure will be proved, when it is recollected that it was her husband who himself took her to Falkirk; and more positively, when the infamous letter of Dr. Ure to his wife, of date the 12th of October, 1818, is read, which proves beyond all question, that the understanding betwixt Dr. Ure and his wife, after their separation was perfect; and that they still continued to correspond on the most *familiar terms*.

I feel that I should be fatiguing my reader, were I to dwell longer on the absurdities and inconsistencies which the evidence adduced in support of the prosecution presents. I feel persuaded that no man who has the capacity to reason or think, will be able to go over it without coming to the conclusion, that in no single particular can it be supposed to criminate me.

It will be allowed, that all that species of evidence which invariably is adduced in support of a criminal connexion, is in this case wanting. The servants proved nothing; and although we have had sufficient evidence that Mrs. Ure kept carefully every scrap of paper which could tend in the slightest degree to criminate me, and delivered them to her husband, not a single *Billet-doux*, nor letter of mine have been introduced into the proof. Is it not customary when a man seduces a woman, for him to commit himself in this way by writing letters, making appointments, &c. &c. Yet in this proof, although Mrs. Ure did all in her power to support her husband, not one single scrap of paper, with my hand writing upon it is introduced. Is it to be believed, that had I

actually been engaged in a connexion of that kind with Mrs. Ure, that I would not before setting off for Paris, have made arrangements for carrying on a correspondence during my absence? Is it to be credited that I should not have furnished *myself* my mistress with my address in Paris? Such gross absurdities cannot be got rid of, and force the conviction that I was, to use the language employed by Mr. Walker, in his letter written from Glasgow, at the time when all the facts of the affair were fresh before the public, made "*the dupe of a foul conspiracy.*"

As what has been already said proves that this divorce was obtained through a conspiracy, and by the collusion of Dr. and Mrs. Ure, it will be unnecessary for me to dwell long on this division of my subject, I shall indeed only give an analysis of the proof which was adduced in support of the prosecution, being persuaded that this will be quite sufficient to enforce the demonstration with every intelligent reader.

ANALYSIS.

Mr. Pattison in the habit of visiting with Dr. and Mrs. Ure leaves Glasgow on the 5th April 1818, *at which time no suspicion existed with Dr. Ure that he had been engaged in an intrigue with Mrs. Ure*; both the pursuer and defender in the action of divorce *living at that time and continuing for four months afterwards, in all the intimacies of the married state.* In the beginning of the month of August Mrs. Ure, it is said, when there *could have existed no suspicion* of her having been engaged in a criminal connexion with Mr. Pattison, *came forward and made a confession of her guilt to her husband who very politely took her himself to Falkirk, a small town on the direct road betwixt Glasgow and Edinburgh where he provided lodgings for her under the name of Mrs. Campbell, that after she had remained two days there, not satisfied with the confession she had made her husband, which if sincere and honest, must have determined her never again to think of her paramour she wrote a letter or rather the copy of letter which contained a confession of her guilt to her paramour, beseeching him to prevent her shame from being discovered, &c. &c. and sends to her husband the copy of this letter avowedly written for the purpose of adopting some plan to conceal her shame.* Mrs. Ure aware that Mr. Pattison must pass through Edinburgh, on his way home from Paris, requests an acquaintance to beg him to call on her as he passed through Falkirk, the place of her concealment, which had been most conveniently and judiciously fixed in a small town on the direct road betwixt Edinburgh and Glasgow; and one through which Mr. Pattison would pass on his way home to the latter place. Mr. Pattison having called, Mrs. Ure requested him to take a walk in a garden with her, in order that her land-lady, and some of her neighbours might have an opportunity of identifying his person. Mrs. Ure having accomplished this, leaves Falkirk immediately afterwards, goes to Edinburgh, where she addresses a letter to Mrs. Mary Park, a woman of colour, with confessions of her shame—and not content with this written confession, she has the woman of colour conveyed to Edinburgh, where she tells her, most pointedly that Mr. Pattison is the father of her child.

The action of divorce is commenced the 2nd December, 1818, no resistance is made by the defender, on the contrary she does all she can to assist the pursuer. *She comes obligingly when requested into court and exhibits herself to the witnesses to save them trouble in identifying her person, &c. &c.*

Dr. Ure meets Mr. Pattison on his return from Paris as he had been wont to do, before his departure from Glasgow; *all politeness, attends frequently at Mr. Pattison's lectures, and up till the day when the sentence of divorce was passed exhibits in his demeanor to Mr. Pattison, a line of conduct which no man could show to a person whom he considered the destroyer of his peace.* Finally Mr. Pattison is kept most sedulously both by the pursuer and defender, in ignorance of the proceedings of the divorce, until after the action is finished. Such is the evidence, and all the criminating evidence, as was before stated, has been furnished either directly or indirectly, by the nominal defender in the ac-

tion. It will be admitted that nothing is said by the servants, but what might be said against any gentleman who was in the habit of visiting frequently and familiarly in a family, and consequently their evidence is wholly exculpatory, for the belief cannot for a moment be entertained, that if Mr. Pattison had been engaged in a criminal connexion with Mrs. Ure, they would not have been able to furnish unequivocal and certain proof of it. The fact which is therefore, abundantly proved that the only evidence furnished on the trial, was furnished by the defender herself, is proof positive of the collusion. For where is the woman to be found, who, if she did not collude with her husband for particular reasons and purposes, would when no suspicion existed against her reputation, come *spontaneously* forwards, to proclaim her own shame, disgrace, and infamy.

The question *cui bono*, is naturally suggested: What could have induced Mrs. Ure to collude with her husband, when by her collusion her own character was to suffer? It is not to be expected that I can pretend to divine or explain the reasons which induced Mrs. Ure to act as she has done in this affair. All that can be expected from me, is to vindicate my own character; and this I am persuaded I have most satisfactorily done. But I may state that a rational theory, at least, may be offered as explanatory of Mrs. Ure's conduct, the data of which are supplied by the evidence. Mrs. Ure is accused of having committed particular acts of adultery during the months of June and July, at Fairlie, near Largs—which acts of adultery must have been committed by some other person than Mr. Pattison, as he was at that time living in Paris. Now we may suppose that Dr. Ure, did at that time, discover that his wife was engaged in a criminal connexion with some servant, or some inferior persons; and thus possessing evidence, which would have convicted her of an act of adultery with said person, he had induced her to agree to go into a plan which might place Mr. Pattison, who had visited familiarly in the family, in such suspicious circumstances as would enable him to obtain the divorce in his name, as this would not be so disgraceful, and damages might possibly be obtained. At the same time he guarded against a failure, by stating the acts of adultery, regarding which he possessed proof; and which if the Commissaries had refused the divorce for the alleged adultery, said to have been committed by Mr. Pattison, he could not have failed to obtain the divorce in the name of the actual paramour.

These observations are merely offered as a probable explanation of Mrs. Ure's conduct. The publick are as well qualified as I am, to judge of their correctness. It will by all, be admitted that it is not more difficult to explain the reasons which could have induced Mrs. Ure to collude with her husband, than to give a rational explanation of the causes, which could induce a woman, possessing a respectable character, to come spontaneously forward, and when neither her husband nor the world, entertained any suspicion of her conduct, to proclaim, her shame and infamy.

As all the allegations which Dr. Chapman made in the 1st edition of his "CORRESPONDENCE," were most satisfactorily and triumphantly refuted in my "REFUTATION;" which was published in answer to it, it will be unnecessary for me now to enter again on an exposition of the falsity of the calumnies, which are contained in that publication. I shall confine myself to a very few observations on the notes, which he has added to the 2nd edition of his "CORRESPONDENCE," and first, Dr. Chapman affirms, in several of his notes, that I made assertions in my Refutation, which are not to be found there. One example will be sufficient to prove the truth of this, in a note to page 33rd, of "Correspondence," he states, "it cannot have escaped the recollection of the reader of Mr. Pattison's pamphlet, how artfully he attempts to fix upon me, the character of a *professed duellist*, and of a *turbulent and sanguinary character*." Now this is really too bad, to accuse me of an attempt to exhibit DR. NATHANIEL CHAPMAN, AS A PROFESSED DUELLIST, and AS A SANGUINARY CHARACTER. I declare seriously upon my honour, I never entertained such an opinion in relation to Dr. Chapman, and how he can possibly think, that I was desirous in my "REFUTATION" to picture him to the public as such, is beyond the power of my comprehension to divine. But let the reader judge for himself. If my pamphlet be turned to, it will be observed that I published in it the *Post*,

which I put up in Philadelphia, when he refused to render me the satisfaction I had demanded, and if the terms of this Post be examined, it will be seen that I proclaimed NATHANIEL CHAPMAN, M. D. as a "LIAR," a "SCOUNDREL," and a "COWARD," and surely this is not an artful attempt to fix on him, the imputation of a "PROFESSED DUELLIST," and "SANGUINARY CHARACTER." I have no hesitation in admitting, that Dr Chapman is the very last man living, who ought to have such imputations fixed on his character. I consider him, so far as relates to *fighting*, to be perfectly *harmless*, and that the public may be satisfied that I am not *too liberal* in my admission on this subject, I would beg leave to state, that this opinion of his character, has not been formed singly from the manner in which he conducted himself in relation to me, but that it has been strengthened and confirmed by the *meekness* and *humility*, with which he two months ago, submitted to severe chastisement bestowed upon him, for his falsehoods and insolence, by Dr. Hall of Philadelphia. Although the Professor of the Practice of Physick, *seems* very much alarmed at the idea, that I shall misrepresent his true character, and endeavour to make the public believe that he is a man of courage; still he appears exceedingly jealous of my reputation on the score of fighting, and seems determined to destroy it. If, he demands in a note, Mr. Pattison was really so fond of fighting, why did he not meet Drs. Horner or Gibson. He knew well that a man of my consequence could not *condescend* to meet him, but either of my friends would have done him that favour, if he had asked them. I shall myself answer these queries. Dr. Chapman mistakes my character very much if he supposes I am emulous to be considered a "man of war," I am not at all fond of fighting, and most certainly shall never engage in a duel unless I am compelled to it. With Dr. Horner, I had no quarrel, I knew that individual indeed, only as a well behaved inoffensive young man. I heard it is true, after I had posted Dr. Chapman, and when I was arrested by his brother-in-law, on account of the challenge, and taken to the court-house, that he came in and told Mr. Webster, that if I had wished to fight, he would have fought me. Mr. Webster's reply that he could not expect me to fight him, as I knew very little about him, and had never spoken of him either in terms of praise or censure, was the only answer I conceived such a boyish remark required. It would have really been an unheard of piece of condescension, if I had gone out to the field with every young man, the professor could persuade to agree to fight me. As to Dr. Gibson, my controversy with him was purely scientific, our weapons were pens, and I believe the Professor of Surgery will confess, that I have fought him to his heart's content.* One word more on the subject and I have done. Dr. Chapman appears, now that he has been posted, and consequently deprived of all title to expect to be called on to fight, to insult without hesitation--for I conceive that both Drs. Gibson and Horner must consider themselves very much insulted, in being told by him, as they are, that although Mr. Pattison is a very unworthy character, and one whom no *gentleman* can fight, still he is quite good enough for either of them to be engaged in an affair of honour with.

That Dr. Chapman is regardless of all evidence, and repeats his false calumnies in opposition to the most positive and direct proof, is abundantly proved by his publishing in the second edition of his correspondence, all the statements which had been disproved by my Refutation. I shall however quote a few passages from the notes, to convince my reader that he is a man so shameless, as to publish his "*facts*" in despite of all testimony. In the first edition of his correspondence, he asserts, that to "*resist the clamour raised against*" me, I was banished from my native city, and that I went to London, where "*I lingered a few weeks,*" in the hope of being able to do something with the view of gaining a livelihood, but finding that I could not succeed, "*after lingering a few weeks,*" I embarked for America. Now if my Refutation be turned to, it will be observed, that by Dr. Barclay's letter, dated Edinburgh the 19th, 1819, it is proved that I did not leave Glasgow until the day before, more than three months after the publication of the divorce, and that I did so on account of the letter of invitation written me by Dr. Dewees, which assured me "*that*

* See Postscript to my second edition of my "ANSWER."

were I on the spot my election would be certain" to the Anatomical chair in Philadelphia, and that I was not banished from Scotland, Dr. Barclay's letter most unequivocally proves, for it alludes particularly to the divorce in the following passage, "even he too has had his enemies and opponents, who have been active and indefatigable, and who not being able to depreciate his professional talents and acquirements, have tried to censure the correctness of his conduct in point of morals, and to convict him of some gallantries. The impression, however, they have made is confined to their own party. And he has openly repelled the charge, and in such a manner that the blow they intended for him, is now recoiling on their own heads, by which means it has neither diminished the number of his former friends, nor darkened his future prospects were he to return." (Refutation p. 39.) In my refutation, I further proved that I only arrived in London on the 24th of May, and as I sailed from Liverpool in the Packet Courier on the 1st of June, it was necessary for me to leave London on the evening of the 28th May, so that so far from "*lingering there for a few weeks*," as Dr. Chapman asserted, it is evident that I only remained there for five days. "During the short period of my stay there," as I observed in my refutation, "the attentions I received were of a most gratifying character. I was visited by Sir James M'Gregor, Sir Wm. Adams, Messrs. Astley Cooper, Wadrop, Travers, Lawrence, &c. &c. and received from all of them warm letters of introduction to distinguished characters in the United States; and meeting accidentally in the city, Mr. Stirling of Glasgow, a man of the first honour and respectability, and a gentleman who is connected in Philadelphia, I received from him letters to Doctors Hare and Chapman, which he read to me. They were couched in the strongest language, and begged of Dr. Hare and the other individual to receive me with attention and kindness, and to introduce me to *all their friends*. Having been honoured by being made a Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons, and a member of the Medico-Chirurgical Society of London, I left that city on the 28th, and early on the morning of the 30th May arrived at Liverpool, from which place I embarked on the following day, in the packet ship Courier, bound for New-York." The letters given me by the gentlemen above mentioned, which speak of me in the handsomest terms, were published in the refutation. They, with Dr. Barclay's letter, which was likewise published, afforded incontrovertible evidence that I left my own country *with honour*, and that *my stay in London did not exceed five days*, yet Dr. Chapman has had the audacity still to persist in his assertion, and adds in a note in the new edition of his correspondence, the following observation. "This is now put beyond the possibility of a doubt" (alluding to his assertion that I had *been driven with dishonour from Scotland, and that I lingered for a few weeks in London attempting to gain a livelihood*.) "I have lately been assured by Dr. Dewees, that he has seen a letter to Mr. John Pattison, from a *very near* relation, about the date of the receipt of his brother's recommendations, stating that in consequence of *his amour with Mrs. Ure*, he had determined to quit Glasgow, and seek a settlement in London. He does so accordingly, but not meeting with encouragement, he set sail for this country, in the spirit of an adventurer, to try anew his fortune—and such is the true history of his emigration." As the documents published in my "*Refutation*," to establish the fact of my leaving home honoured and respected, and that my stay in Loudon did not exceed five days, were of such a character that it was impossible to put aside the evidence they furnished of these facts, it is unnecessary for me to show the weakness of the testimony, on which Dr. Chapman has the effrontery to assert, that his first calumny "*is now put beyond the possibility of a doubt*." I shall merely ask the question, can it be supposed that if Mr. John Pattison did receive a letter, such as Dr. Chapman on Dr. Dewees' authority asserts he did, that he would have been so regardless of his own, and his brother's reputation, as to go and publish his brother's disgrace, by showing this letter to a man, with whom he had but a very general acquaintance, and one who was on very intimate terms with those men, who wished it to be believed, that they had great power in influencing the minds of the gentlemen who had the gift in their hands, which Mr. Granville Sharp Pattison was at the time anxious to obtain.

Again, the extracts of the letters written me by my brother from Philadelphia, on the subject of the professorship, and which were published in my "REFUTATION," were all written in such a style as to prove satisfactorily, that he was averse to my removal to America. He consequently could not feel very desirous that I should succeed in my application. Yet Dr. Chapman in despite of the evidence which this and several other facts mentioned in my "REFUTATION," furnished on this subject, gets *his ever ready and convenient friend, Dr. Dewees*, to assert that my brother was distressed beyond measure at the little encouragement my claim received from Dr. Chapman, and "*conjured him to endeavour to enlist Dr. Chapman in my interest !!*"

Dr. Chapman affirms that I have been guilty of making certain false statements in my "REFUTATION;" and solemnly denies the truth of them. I shall quote an example to prove that what I did state, was literally true, and that Dr. Chapman, in denying it, is guilty of a deliberate falsehood. I had asserted in my Refutation that when Dr. Chapman challenged Dr. Dewees he had a family: Dr. Chapman accuses me of stating what I knew to be false, and observes, "Concerning the affair (challenge) with Dr. Dewees, I shall only observe, that it happened fifteen or sixteen years ago, and that at the time he was without children." Yet in despite of this positive contradiction, Dr. Chapman must have known that my statement was consistent with truth. It is notorious in Philadelphia, that this challenge was given on account of some quarrel which had occurred in regard to the canvas, in which both parties were engaged for the chair of midwifery, to which Dr. James was appointed. The election took place in the year 1811, at least 7 years after Dr. Dewees had been married to his second wife, and when he *had either two or three children.*

The fact of Dr. Chalmers having recalled the letter he wrote in my favour to Dr. Mason, *immediately* on the publication of the divorce, although I satisfactorily explained in my "REFUTATION" the circumstances attending it, is again brought forward and enlarged upon. All I have now to repeat on that subject is, that this second letter of Dr. Chalmers to Dr. Mason, was written before I came before the public with my defence. So soon as I did so, I have most unequivocally proved, that all who heard it were convinced of my innocence. Dr. Chalmers had refused to suspend his judgment, and as I had, by a note written immediately on my coming to a knowledge of the charge which had been brought against my character, requested him to do so, I felt hurt by his conduct, and very indifferent about his opinion, and most certainly never would have received from him any other letter of recommendation. What may have been his opinion on the subject, on my leaving Glasgow, I have no knowledge, and will not therefore pretend to say. All I shall state is, that I have never yet shewn my documents to any gentlemen who did not, whatever may have been their previous sentiments, become instantly convinced of my innocence in relation to the charge inferred from the divorce. That there may even at this moment, be persons in Scotland, who, having never heard any statement from me, may believe that I was guilty of a criminal intercourse with Mrs. Ure, is very possible, but it is certain that I left home honored and respected by the great mass of society, and if Dr. Chalmers, or any other individual, should be doubtful of my innocence, the reading of this pamphlet will, I trust, dispel from their minds all doubt on the subject.

Dr. Chapman is very desirous to exhibit Dr. Ure as a very good man, and one who is universally respected in Glasgow. I stated in my "Refutation" in opposition to this opinion, the fact, that he had only with difficulty been saved from Botany Bay, on account of his having destroyed his father's *will* with the view of defrauding his brothers and sisters of their patrimony. This, Dr. Chapman, of course will not give credit to, and to convince his reader that it is not so, and that all the charges I have brought against that man are false and unfounded, he quotes a passage from a dedication letter addressed to Lord Glasgow, appended to a work of Dr. Ure's. That the fact in regard to the *will* is correct, does not now rest upon my authority, as respectable a clergyman as any in this country, now residing in Baltimore, who was educated in the University of Glasgow, was there when the affair about the *will* occurred, and

is familiar with the fact. And that Dr. Ure was the author of the most infamous letter addressed to Mrs. Ure of date the 12th October, 1818, is now proved beyond all question, and consequently, even according to Dr. Chapman, he is proved to be "*the most consummate villain in existence!*" That many books are dedicated to gentlemen who despise the characters of their authors is certain. Dr. Chapman has himself, it is known, after having been guilty to one gentleman of the most shameful deception, dedicated to him, not, it is true, a work of his own, but a London translation of a French work which he edited, and having as it is stated, purloined the subject of his thesis from the work of a most distinguished medical character, he has had the audacity to dedicate to him, a work of which he was merely the editor. Now, as these facts are not to be controverted, and as there seems to be a twin resemblance between Dr. Ure and Dr. Chapman, Dr. Ure's having dedicated his work to the Earl of Glasgow, cannot certainly be considered as any proof that he is a man of "great consideration and standing."

There is a strong disposition in the author of these pamphlets to convince his reader that my family were on very intimate terms with Dr. Ure's. Of this, however, there is no evidence—it was not so. I was the only member of my family who was in the habit of visiting familiarly at his house, and when it is recollected that I had just been appointed a professor in the same institution with him, it was most natural that I should be anxious to restore by every means in my power, respectability to his character.

As Dr. Chapman's pamphlets contain a kind of *omnium gatherum* of slander and defamation, he is not content with attacking my moral character, but makes a thrust at my professional reputation. He even goes the length of observing in relation to the controversy in which I was engaged with Dr. Gibson that, "Totally unable to sustain himself, *he is silent, &c.*" Now, the medical public from Maine to Georgia, are in possession of the *last* publication, which appeared in that controversy, my "*ANSWER,*" &c. &c. and I believe that it is universally admitted that the *unfortunate "Aristides," alias Dr. Gibson,* is prostrate, and "*hors de combat.*" As to review to which Dr. Chapman refers, I would only observe, that when engaged in the controversy, I mentioned to Dr. Elberle that I thought it very probable that Dr. Gibson would send a review to his old preceptor, Mr. Charles Bell, for insertion in some of the British Journals; whether the one referred to was manufactured in Philadelphia, as I have no evidence I would not pretend to say. I will only remark that it comes directly from the office of Mr. Charles Bell, having been avowedly written by his dissector, Mr. Shaw. Dr. Gibson or Mr. Shaw being unwilling to give me credit for my observations on Lithotomy, is no proof that they are of no value. Another British Journal which has been lately put into my hands (The Medical Intelligencer) speaks in terms of high commendation of my essay, and so satisfied were they that the Surgeons of Europe were not acquainted with the Anatomy and Pathology of the Prostate Fascia, that they have gone to the very unusual expense of having engravings of my plates entered in their periodical publication for more clearly illustrating the subject.

As to the other professional charge (*viz.*) that I stated to Dr. Physick that I was at once admitted a member of Societé Medicale D'Emulation, without undergoing the usual routine, and that this statement is proved to be false, I will answer, that it is a pity for Dr. Chapman to expose his ignorance of the learned Societies of Europe by his observations. All I stated was strictly true. When I was introduced by my friends Baron Larrey and Dr. Magendie, and about to begin to read to the Society an essay on wounds of the abdomen, the President begged me to waive the ceremony, and come and take my seat on his right hand, which I accordingly did. All the papers read in the course of the year, either by gentlemen who are members of the Society, or others, are delivered to committees to be reported upon, and the reports on those essays which are considered as containing *new and valuable information,* are published in an annual volume entitled the "*BULLETINS OF THE SOCIETY,*" and it is always considered as the highest compliment for an essay

to be introduced into this volume. It is so long since I read the observations of the committee upon my paper, that I cannot now speak decidedly as to its contents. I recollect, however, perfectly, that upon my arrival in Philadelphia, my brother mentioned to me that both Drs. Dewees and Chapman had been much delighted with the notice which had been taken of me in the Bulletins of the Society. I was the first in Europe who recommended the opening of the belly for the removal of tumours from that cavity, and it is true that it was stated in the "Bulletin" that what "I had done was in opposition to the established principles and authority of Surgery." But the object of my essay was to overturn some of these, and to prove by the recital of a case, where life was certainly saved by the operation, that the axiom delivered to us from Hippocrates, "that wounds of the belly were fatal," was one supported not by truth, but by prejudice. My proposal for removing diseased ovaria which was chiefly objected to, has, by the experience of an eminent Surgeon of Kentucky, Dr. McDowell, who has several times with success, performed the operation, been demonstrated to have been most just and scientific.

The last observation I shall make on the correspondence, is that all its allegations are unsupported. I say unsupported, for Drs. Gibson and Dewees, are almost the only names advanced in confirmation of Dr. Chapman's statements. As the former individual stands at this time, charged before a court in Philadelphia, of having circulated through part of Maryland, the most gross and false calumnies against the reputation of one of the most respectable and enlightened physicians in the country, he must not consider that I do him an injustice in refusing to receive his testimony, until he has been acquitted of this very high charge, by a verdict of his countrymen; and as to poor Dr. Dewees, I would only refer my reader to an account of the manner he has acted in this business, (*see Refutation, p. 33*) and allow him to let his testimony have *then* all the weight he may consider it worthy.

I am fearful my reader will think that I have been guilty of making a false assertion in this "Reply," for I have again and again, stated that Dr. Chapman's new publications, did not contain any new charge against my reputation. I confess my error, and as I shall now fully state the **NEW CHARGE**, I trust to the indulgence of my reader. The **NEW ACCUSATION** is, that I, a **PROFESSOR OF ANATOMY** in Glasgow, was once accused of having in my dissecting rooms, the dead body of a female that was stolen from the grave. I confess that this is a charge of a *grave* character, and what is more, I honestly allow that it is consistent with truth. The charge however, is not according to the Philadelphia Professor, confined to the simple act of taking a body from the grave, but it is as much aggravated. 1st. The body taken was the body of a "*lady of distinction*," and 2ndly, it was taken with the view of improving the Science of Medicine, the person having "died of a disease that excited" my "curiosity." As I was, however, acquitted by the verdict of a jury of this charge, had it therefore been one of a more serious nature, my character in relation to it was exonerated. That the Professor of the Practice and Institutes of Medicine, in the University of Pennsylvania, should feel a horror at dissection, I can easily understand. He is himself most grossly ignorant of Anatomy, the ground-work on which all Physiological reasoning must rest; he advances in his lectures *when they are original*, the most absurd hypotheses, and attempts to support them by anatomical data which do not exist, he has even had the hardihood in an essay on the nourishment of the Fœtus lately published,* to attempt to support the hypothesis he defended, by the assumption that the epigastric artery, was the one which supplied the uterus with blood, an anatomical blunder so gross, that the greatest tyro in anatomy, could have corrected it, and one so shameful as to be enough to destroy forever, the reputation of the University from which it emanated. That a man, so ignorant, should have dared in the enlightened 19th century, to assert that a professor of anatomy, who was acquitted from a charge of this kind, one to which every teacher of Anatomy must be exposed, is on a par in guilt with him who steals his father's will, and is nothing better than an "*acquitted felon*," hardly aston-

* See Medical Recorder, Vol. IV, Page 169.

ishes me; and I should not wonder if his *zeal* to prevent the possibility of Dr. Physick's being placed in the situation of an "*acquitted felon*," should induce him to banish dissections from the University of Pennsylvania, and have anatomy hereafter taught by the exhibition of the *very beautiful wax-figures* which I have been informed in Baltimore were prepared for the Professor of Surgery, by that ingenious Italian artist, Signior Chiapi.

Having, I trust to the satisfaction of my reader, put aside all the charges which Dr. Chapman has thought fit to bring against my character, I come now in conclusion, to offer a few observations on the motives which have induced him to act a part, unparalleled in the history of controversy. Even Dr. Chapman seems conscious of the baseness of his conduct, and is desirous to persuade his readers that the task which he had undertaken was a painful one. He observes, "circumstanced as I am, it may be conceived how painfully I have engaged in a controversy of this nature, so inconsistent with my principles, and the tenor of my conduct.—That I have not been actuated by any vindictive motives, my heart assures me. The controversy was of his own seeking, and most reluctantly did I approach this huge mass of moral putrefaction, being fully aware that it could not be stirred without contamination, &c." The professor must have a very contemptuous opinion indeed, of the minds of his readers, if he can flatter himself that they are to be blinded and deceived by such observations as the above. *His heart assures him, that he has not been actuated by any vindictive motives!!!* What then it may be asked, has induced him thus to calumniate and abuse the reputation of a man, whom he himself, was most instrumental in seducing from his native country? Is the tenor of Dr. Chapman's life so pure and virtuous as to entitle him to act as the censor of public morals? I cannot condescend to recriminate, if I would, I have ample field to do so; all I shall say is, that no man who knows him will ever suppose that he is qualified to sit as President of a Society for the suppression of vice. Had it, however, been otherwise—had Dr. Chapman's own character been irreproachable, and had he held so high and pre-eminent a rank for his virtue in Society as to qualify him to become the guardian of morality, still the manner in which he has prosecuted these calumnies, must convince every man, that a spirit of malignity and personal hatred, and not the public good, has alone actuated him. I have proved already that he has disregarded truth, and has shut his eyes against evidence of my innocence, which was not to be controverted. That he knew I was innocent, the public will believe, when informed, that all the evidence now laid before them, and other documents still more demonstrative of it, had been placed before Dr. Chapman. Yet, although perfectly persuaded that the charge of an adulterous intercourse between Mrs. Ure and myself was wholly destitute of foundation, Dr. Chapman has for the last ten months, been most active and indefatigable in endeavouring to procure false statements against my reputation. He has written to agents in Liverpool and Glasgow, assuring them that money will be readily paid if evidence be furnished him of any charge against my reputation, or the respectability of my family. He has even written a *friendly* letter to Dr. Ure, begging his assistance in this work of moral assassination—and if the voice of public report is to be credited, an agent has been sent by him to Europe, that he might be enabled to obtain information to blast my prospects and reputation in a country where I am as yet, a stranger.

Having been informed that he had made an attempt to persuade a very respectable gentleman who had lately arrived in this country from Glasgow, to furnish him with a false statement on the subject of my character, I wrote Mr. Hanna of Philadelphia to obtain for me the facts, which I now publish from his letter.

DEAR SIR,

After the receipt, yesterday, of your letter of Monday, I had an interview with Mr. Manson, and while with me, I wrote down, what you have below; on reading it over, Mr. Manson asserted that it was all correct, according to his recollection of circumstances; if Mr. Orr gave Manson the whole of the details contained in the certificate he was required to sign, he, Manson, has forgotten

them, though he is very positive as to the general character of the paper submitted for Mr. Orr's signature, because it embraced two points, the first, the fact of your guilt in the affair of Mrs. Ure; the other, the fact that no individual in Glasgow had any reason to believe that you came to this country for a Professorship, because invited for that purpose. *Mr. Orr said, that all Glasgow knew you came here according to invitation, to accept a Professorship in the University of Pennsylvania.*

Mr. Orr left here for Europe, I think, in the month of April, after having remained here near twelve months. Within the ten days preceding his departure, Orr called at Chapman's house, because Chapman had called once or twice without meeting him, at Orr's house. Chapman handed Orr a long paper for Orr to subscribe, giving, as Chapman said, the details of certain facts which he, Chapman, asserted that Orr had mentioned to him in relation to Mr. Pattison and Mrs. Ure; I mean as to the fact of Mr. Pattison's guilt. The certificate, Mr. Manson says, he perfectly well recollects that Mr. Orr told him, stated that he, Orr, had never heard mentioned in Scotland, that Mr. Pattison was gone to America for a professorship. Mr. Orr remarked to Chapman on this point, that it was not so, that the contrary was the fact, that all Glasgow knew Mr. Pattison had come to this country for a professorship, and refused to sign the certificate. Chapman then proposed that he, Orr, should take home the paper and correct and alter it to please himself. This he also refused and stated positively, that he would sign nothing on the subject of Mr. Pattison's conduct, *because he knew no facts that would militate against the character of that gentleman, and denied to Professor Chapman, that he had ever in any conversation said a word against Mr. Pattison.* Mr. Manson is authorised by Mr. Orr, to forward him to Scotland, any publication coming from Dr. Chapman, in which Orr is mentioned as authority for any fact against Mr. Pattison, and that Mr. Orr would publicly contradict and refute any statement coming from Chapman, in which his name may be mentioned. Mr. Manson says, when Mr. Orr and himself had the conversation, Mr. Orr's anger against Chapman had not yet ceased for *wishing to get him to subscribe his name to what he unhesitatingly pronounced a falsehood.*

I am, Dear Sir,

Your's Very Respectfully,

DAVID HANNA.

That neither honour nor principle have guided Dr. Chapman in his attempt to calumniate my character, the above letter sufficiently demonstrates; and that an enemy so debased, and one who has stooped at every meanness to gain information against my honour and respectability, has been unable to bring forward a single charge against it, which I have not been enabled to disprove, is I conceive, the strongest and most triumphant testimony which can be offered to the public, of the estimation in which my character is held in my native country.

The veil which Dr. Chapman has attempted to throw over the real object of his hate and persecution, is too flimsy to conceal his true intention. Personal hatred to one who first exposed in all its vileness his true character, is one and a strong motive, which has actuated him; but another has been equally influential. The high reputation which the University of Maryland has gained, has filled him with fear and disquietude, he has trembled, not for the reputation of that school, which formerly supported by the talents of a Khun, a Woodhouse, a Barton, a Rush, and a Wistar, stood unrivalled, and forbade all rivalry and opposition; but for the emolument which that reputation bestowed on him, an unworthy member of it. He has found that *quizzing* students out of their money, and *quizzing* them into their diploma's,* although it has filled his pockets with cash, has destroyed all the reputation which the University of Pennsylvania possessed; and that it being now understood in the country that whoever pays Dr. Chapman \$100 as a fee for becoming a

* See American Medical Recorder, vol. III. p. 500.

pupil of a *quizzing* class, conducted by him and two of his brother professors, will be sure of his diploma, that testimonial of medical qualification has lost the consideration which it formerly possessed, and is now viewed as little better than waste paper. He has himself been chiefly instrumental in destroying the reputation of the University with which he is connected, and aware that others must now take the lead, he has hoped to postpone the evil day to a more distant period, by endeavouring to persuade gentlemen at a distance that the University of Maryland is a school where they must not trust their sons, because *Mr. Pattison holds a Professorship in it*. The impotent effort to injure the University of Maryland by the circulation of slanders against its Professor of Anatomy, has not been confined to Dr. Chapman. One of his colleagues has been equally active, as the following facts will demonstrate. I was consulted, the beginning of last summer by a young gentleman from Virginia on account of a tumour of the face. He had consulted an eminent surgeon of Philadelphia some years before, who, having been mistaken as to the true nature of the disease, performed at the interval of two years, two operations, which had only the effect of aggravating the complaint. When I saw the patient, I had no difficulty in discovering that the affection was an aneurism by an anastomosis of the internal maxillary artery, and one which no operation but ligature of the carotid artery could possibly benefit. This operation was accordingly performed with success, and the patient restored to health.

Dr. Gibson, immediately after the return home of my patient, visited the town where he resided; whether he had or had not other business there, I shall not pretend to say, but this I can prove, that he stated over the whole country which he traversed, that I had performed an operation for a disease which had never existed. I will demand of *this Professor of Surgery*, if any man, at all conversant with his profession will pretend to say that, after an artery passing to an aneurism has been tied, it is possible to ascertain whether an aneurism had or had not previously existed. He had only seen my patient after the operation, and he consequently was not entitled to give an opinion on the nature of a disease which had been removed by it. It has been widely circulated in Philadelphia and elsewhere, that this patient has died from my blunder; and some of Dr. Gibson's and Chapman's pupils have been active in giving currency to this falsehood. As it must *gratify* their preceptors to learn that this report is groundless, I shall publish the following letter lately received from my patient:

MY DEAR SIR,

I have just now received your letter—I can assure you that neither myself nor father have felt or expressed the slightest dissatisfaction at the operation, on the contrary we have been deeply impressed with the utility of it, and are continually confirmed in this belief by my progressive improvement.

I hope you received no further trouble from the Philadelphia faculty. Their representations can have no weight with any who saw me before the late operation, and have since had an opportunity of observing the change in my appearance. I require no other evidence of what I owe you than the immense alteration I feel.

I never enjoyed better health than I do at this time, and my friends all congratulate me on the very great change that has taken place in my appearance. Having undertood as coming from Dr. G. that some of the physicians of this town, corroborate his opinion of the impropriety of the operation: I would state that no physicians here have examined my case excepting the —

With the highest esteem,
Your Obed't. Serv't.

*I have been unwilling to introduce names unnecessarily.

Dr. Gibson will not pretend to deny, that he in this journey stated publicly, that very few of the patients I had operated on, recovered, and *triumphantly* assured the gentleman, he happened to meet, that his friend, Dr. Chapman, was about to publish a pamphlet, which would assuredly damn and blast my prospects for ever. Dr. Gibson has had his triumph, and I hope he now feels pleased and contented.

The Professors of Surgery and of the Practice of Medicine in the University of Pennsylvania, if they flatter themselves that by a line of conduct so base and so dishonorable, they will be enabled to injure either my reputation, or the standing of the University of Maryland have, miserably mistaken the feelings of their countrymen. Both the University of Maryland and my character are open to the free and critical examination of a discerning public. If undeserving of public support, it will speedily be withdrawn from us, but if it is otherwise—if we can substantiate our claim to the patronage of our countrymen, neither back-biting, nor slander, nor the circulation of falsehood will have the effect of removing it from us.

have now for ever done with these men— To engage in controversy with such, I have proved is useless; for by them truth and honour is disregarded. Ten months they have been engaged in the filling of their "*green bag*," which has been opened and its contents circulated over the whole face of the country—I have now refuted these, and should they ever hatch up any other calumny, I shall treat it with the silent contempt it merits.

FINIS.

POSTSCRIPT.

Dr. Chapman appears to have been exceedingly hurt at the idea, that any gentleman would have thought of giving an opinion on what he calls my *ex parte* statement. He observes: "That Mr. Chauncy, such is my confidence in the *integrity* and *profound* respect, for the judgment of that *eminent lawyer*, should give an opinion on a *statement purely ex parte*, seems to me so improbable, that I suspect here, too, Mr. Pattison is guilty of a falsehood;" and again in the preface, to the case of Divorce, he remarks: "To the gentleman of Baltimore, who rather incautiously on a *statement entirely ex parte*, vindicated by a certificate, the innocence of Mr. Pattison, I now address myself, and call on them, by all those high obligations, of which I will not permit myself to doubt, they entertain a proper sense, to review the case, to *mark the perfidy practised on them, by the suppression of every tittle of criminatory evidence; and to counteract, by some efficient measure, the great and flagrant injustice which has been done, by the weight of their authority.*" But although Dr. Chapman, from the above extracts seems to think that no "*profound lawyer*," nor man of "*integrity*," would judge from an *ex parte* statement, he with his usual inconsistency, in another passage of the preface, informs his readers, that the "*DECREET OF DIVORCE*" which every man must allow to be a *statement purely ex parte*, had been by him submitted to three "*eminent lawyers*, who after a careful examination, have pronounced the chain of evidence to be without a flaw, and is deemed by them in every respect sound, complete, and satisfactory." I trust that these "*three eminent lawyers*," unless they be as I rather suspect, mere "*ideal creations*," "*will review the case, and counteract by some efficient measure, the great and flagrant injustice they have done.*"

As it is probable that this "*REPLY*" may come into the hands of some gentleman, who have never seen my "*REFUTATION*," in which the certificate is published: and as this document is frequently mentioned both in Dr. Chapman's pamphlet, and in this Reply. I make no apology for again publishing it.

CERTIFICATE.

Being requested by Granville Sharp Pattison, Esq. Professor of Surgery in the University of Maryland, to examine a series of Letters and Documents, relative to the causes of his coming to the United States, with the view of becoming Professor of Anatomy in the University of Pennsylvania; and also in relation to a charge made against him by Dr. Andrew Ure, of Glasgow. The undersigned examined said letters and documents and, are satisfied, 1st, That said letters and documents are genuine, and were written and made at the *time and manner* they respectively profess to be; and 2dly; That the charge of adulterous intercourse between Mr. Pattison and Mrs. Ure, is wholly destitute of foundation.

R. SMITH.
JOHN M. DUNCAN.
W. H. WINDER.
A. NISBET.

I have considered it unnecessary to republish the list of authenticated documents which was added to the certificate.

The reader will bear in mind, that when the above certificate was given, it was after a laborious and minute investigation of the charge brought against me and of the numerous documents which I possessed to rebut it;—that it was not, as Doctor Chapman has pleased to represent it, a certificate founded on an *ex parte* inquiry, but on the contrary that an accurate and faithful summary of the evidence given on the trial for divorce, was submitted to these gentlemen, together with numerous documents too voluminous, and many of them of a character unfit to be published, but which conclusively established the collusion between Doctor Ure and his wife, and my complete innocence.

I have now to inform my reader, that soon after the appearance of Doctor Chapman's last pamphlets, I sent them to those gentlemen, and requested their diligent perusal of them. I have since called on them, and they authorize me to say in the strongest language, that they do not find in the document and pamphlet published by Doctor Chapman, any cause to change the opinion expressed in their certificate; and are entirely persuaded of the genuineness of all the evidences and documents submitted by me to their examination,—the record published by Doctor Chapman, being little else but a formal exposition of what had been already submitted to them.

It must be manifest, therefore, to my reader, that the Doctor's assertion that my statement to those gentlemen was *ex parte*, is wholly gratuitous, and his appeal to them on this point consequently inoperative. I have deemed it important to notice this, principally to show, how bold this *Professor of public morals*,—this *ensor morum*,—can sometimes be, though without ground to sustain him; for nothing is more obvious in the late edition of his pamphlet, than his tenacious and unwarrantable adherence to points that had been formerly conclusively disproved.

GRANVILLE SHARP PATTISON.

