

Observations on premature delivery / by Odinoivoithos.

Contributors

Merriman, Samuel, 1771-1852.
Royal College of Surgeons of England

Publication/Creation

[London] : [publisher not identified], [between 1810 and 1819]

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/n9r5ddwh>

Provider

Royal College of Surgeons

License and attribution

This material has been provided by This material has been provided by The Royal College of Surgeons of England. The original may be consulted at The Royal College of Surgeons of England. 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
183 Euston Road
London NW1 2BE UK
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722
E library@wellcomecollection.org
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

place early in the morning, at the moment when she felt the pain in the abdomen.

Mrs. Hill was twenty-six years of age, had been pregnant twice before. I attended her in one of her labours; but nothing unusual then occurred.

IV.

Observations on Premature Delivery. By $\Omega\delta\iota\nu\sigma\beta\omicron\eta\theta\omicron\varsigma$.
J.M.

IN the *Medical Repository*, (Vol. iii. p. 283,) some "*Observations on the Cæsarean Section and premature Delivery*" were inserted, signed $\Omega\delta\iota\nu\sigma\beta\omicron\eta\theta\omicron\varsigma$; one chief object of which was to shew the absolute necessity of having the principles, upon which the practice of inducing premature labour was adopted, clearly defined and understood; because it was probable, that a legal investigation of this practice would, at some time, take place, and practitioners of midwifery might be put into an extremely awkward predicament on such an occasion, by the malice of the designing or the prejudices of the ignorant, unless they could very satisfactorily explain their motives and conduct.

I am afraid that I went a *round-about* way to prove my position, otherwise I cannot account for the severe, and as I presume, *undeserved* strictures on my paper, in a subsequent number, by a SURGEON, who evidently mistook the drift of my arguments.

This gentleman is highly indignant that I should have made the slightest allusion to the *lex scripta* upon this subject, or should even have hinted, that any thing like *criminality* could attach to any member of the honorable profession, to which we both belong, and in which he believes that neither *knaves* nor *fools* exist. I envy him that happy condition of mind which can lead to such a belief, and will not attempt to shake his credulity; the intention of the present paper is solely to state, that what I ventured to prognosticate has really occurred, a case of this nature having been investigated before a Coroner on the 30th of October last*.

The physician who had attended the case, gave a most satisfactory account of his conduct, and his character remained unimpeached; the verdict of the Jury freeing him from all imputation of blame.

What would have been the event had the necessity of the operation *not* been proved? What, if the operator had been either *knave* or *fool* enough to undertake an operation, the principles and justification of which he did not understand?

* See the *British Press*, Newspaper, October 31.

