

**An analysis of the section of the symphysis of the ossa pubis : as recommended in cases of difficult labour and deformed pelvis, by Doctor Alphonse le Roy, professor of midwifery at Paris / by James Rymer.**

**Contributors**

Remey, James.  
Royal College of Surgeons of England

**Publication/Creation**

London : Printed for T. Evans, 1783.

**Persistent URL**

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/xw772mrj>

**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**

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

ANAL

SEC

OF  
SYMPHYSIS OF

AL REC  
IN CASES OF DIFF  
DEFORM

BY DOCTOR AL

FIRSTHOE OF MI

By JAMES RY

C L O

PRINTED

PATER-

NO

AN <sup>Le</sup>  
ANALYSIS  
OF THE  
SECTION  
OF THE  
SYMPHYSIS OF THE OSSA PUBIS,

AS RECOMMENDED  
IN CASES OF DIFFICULT LABOUR AND  
DEFORMED PELVIS,  
BY DOCTOR ALPHONSE LE ROY,  
PROFESSOR OF MIDWIFERY AT PARIS,

By JAMES RYMER, SURGEON, &c.

<sup>C</sup> LONDON;  
PRINTED FOR T. EVANS,  
FATER-NOSTER ROW.  
MDCCLXXXIII.

A N A L Y S I S

S E C T I O N

SYMPHYSE OF THE OSSA PUBIS

AS RECOMMENDED

IN CASES OF DIFFICULT LABOUR AND  
DEFORMED BILVAE

BY DOCTOR ALPHONSE LE ROY,

OF THE FACULTY OF MEDICINE AT PARIS.

BY JAMES KUMMER, Surgeon, &c.

LONDON:

Printed for T. Agnew,

TATLER-STREET, &c.

1841.

T O

HER MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY,  
C H A R L O T T E,  
QUEEN OF GREAT BRITAIN,  
FRANCE AND IRELAND, &c.

May it please your Majesty,

**A**LPHONSE LE ROY, M. D. and  
professor of midwifery in the city of  
Paris, actuated, no doubt, by motives of uni-  
versal good to mankind, has communicated  
to the world the discovery of an operation,  
which, he thinks, gives a kind of perfec-  
tion to this important branch of Medicine.  
I have very seriously perused and consider-  
ed his history of the nature and success of  
this operation. Upon the first view of it,  
it seemed in some degree plausible; but,

having since candidly reconsidered it, in a relative and comprehensive manner, upon the dead subject, I am, thence, led, according to the degree of my own understanding, to condemn, and give it my most cordial negative. Bold and dextrous dissectors may be votaries for its establishment; but able anatomists and physiologists, it is humbly presumed, will, at one view, see the train of dreadful consequences which, in all probability, must attend its adoption and practice. It would seem that, in all the cases mentioned, the operation had been performed unnecessarily.

Your Majesty's resplendent virtues, and goodness, and kindness of heart, so eminently disposed to promote the happiness and welfare of all descriptions of mankind, will naturally be inclined to take under your Royal patronage any thing which may have a real tendency to secure the prosperity and health of these Kingdoms; and, in an especial manner, the happy  
pre-

preservation of all women in labour: It is with this view, may it please your Majesty, that I have taken the liberty to dedicate the following pages to your Majesty's Royal and most gracious protection.

And, zealously praying to the Almighty God, the merciful Author of our common nature, that your Majesty may very long enjoy all possible earthly blessings,

I continue to be,

May it please your Majesty,

with every humble

and becoming duty,

Your Majesty's

devoted servant,

JAMES RYMER.

ANALYSIS





# A N A L Y S I S

OF THE

## SECTION OF THE SYMPHYSIS PUBES.

**I**F the section of the symphysis of the pubes were an operation of simplicity, of safety; and, above all, of efficiency, in the happy preservation of the mother and child, we should be happy and proud to give it our hearty concurrence and support: but, as far as we can judge, being assured on the contrary, from natural facts and anatomical demonstration, of its inefficacy, of its dangerous consequences; and, viewed comprehensively, of its terrible and butcherly nature, we wish never to think of it without horror.

The worthy translator says, he “perceived,” &c.—Our senses and mind are so imperfect in the present mortal state, that we ought not to build upon mere perception. We should, with great circumspection, be very deliberate in drawing conclusions: For, upon fair and repeated trial, it often happens, they turn out injurious to the public, and disgraceful to

ourselves, instead of having a boasted tendency to universal good. The more generally this dreadful operation shall become known to the world, (to the sensible, judicious, well-informed and cool-headed world,) it is modestly presumed, that it will meet with proportional reprobation.

It is the duty of society to cast a jealous eye upon every innovation which decides upon life and death. We are told that this operation was no sooner performed at *Paris*, upon Mrs. *Souchot*, than its fame was every where spread, at home and abroad; upon which were formed various opinions for and against it. The doctor is displeas'd with every one who differs from his ideas. "Behaviour of this kind," says he, "has been common in every age." Some went so far, it seems, as to rob him of the honourable part he had in the discovery: but, he tells us, he was proof against their calumny.

We are very seldom able to complete our wishes by a *little* exertion; and we venture to doubt whether any of the doctor's experiments can prove either the utility or practicability of the operation.

While

While we disclaim against severity, and indecent terms, our duty to our fellow creatures, and our love of truth, authorize and call upon us, to give our sentiments with all the freedom of language, upon a subject which has for its object the health and happiness of women, and the preservation of infants.

For the diligence of Mr. *Alphonse Le Roy*, and his intention to do good, the faculty of Paris, it seems, appointed gentlemen to inspect the case of the section of the *pubes*. The doctor says they made a just report. He was honoured with a medal, which had his name engraven upon it; but still, he says, he has not gained his due reward of fame and reputation; he being certain, in his own mind, that he has made discoveries useful and highly interesting to mankind. He consoles himself, however, by saying, that the uninterrupted pleasure of doing good yields greater gratification.

Accoucheurs are every where to be found, who recur to means destructive both to mother and child; and, as far as our small portion of knowledge extends, we will take our *Bible oath*, that if Doctor Le Roy's operation of the sec-

tion of the symphysis of the *pubes* were to be adopted by every accoucheur, many a poor dear soul would perish under the hands of surgical butchers.

We trust the laws will ordain, that if any accoucheur shall voluntarily presume to be so savage as to cleave asunder, in difficult labours, the *pelvis* of whatsoever woman, *of his own accord*, and without the advice and consent of a Doctor William Hunter, he shall be devoted to Tyburn without benefit of clergy.

Doctor *Le Roy* goes on to methodize his subject; and, having recourse to ontology, he proposes, first, metaphysically to “consider how the mind of man, so slow in its advances, at length arrived at a discovery of this operation.” Wonderful indeed! we shall presently see what hand he makes of this abstract enquiry.

Doctor *Le Roy* thinks, comparing *his* with the Cæsarian operation, that he has perfected the act of delivery. We have no hesitation to declare, that we hold both operations in equal detestation and abhorrence. Provident Nature, infinitely kind and merciful, never intended  
such

such violence to the loveliest and fairest of all her wonderful works. Our arrogance, our impatience, our indiscrimination, our want of genius, and of *dear sensibility*, often times push us on to the most reprehensible and tragical actions. How many hundreds of lovely forms have been injured by the rash and unnecessary application of instruments in the hands of inadequate, ignorant, and abominable fellows, who dare to call themselves accoucheurs!

We shall plead in favour of unerring Nature, so far as to suppose, that she never yet formed a *pelvis* of proportion and symmetry, by her own scale, whose transverse and lateral diameters were not amply sufficient to allow of the descent of the child's head, where judicious management and assistance were given, due time granted, and where the patient was, in other senses, in health and strength. If a *pelvis* be preternaturally formed, be distorted, and the diameter only two inches; where, indeed, the lumbar vertebræ are bent down into the basin, or the *pubes* and *sacrum* almost in contact, we admit that no *fœtus* could possibly descend. The section of the *pubes* here, if a Doctor Hunter advised it, might be undertaken to save the mother; otherwise,  
can

can extraction only be effected by opening the abdominal parietes and uterus, with a view to save the child?—Horrid operation! may every distorted pelvis be secured in the single state by the laws of its country! May its uterus forever remain unimpregnated; and may its owner be blest and happy in celibacy! If unfortunately these ladies should conceive, may God, of his infinite mercy, grant them a speedy abortion.—It were better eternally to be an old maid, than to run the hazard of a split pelvis.

The substance, cartilage, ligament, (call it which you please,) the connecting medium of the bones in question, appears not to be intended by nature to enlarge the pelvis during pregnancy. Its greatest expansion, if it swell at all, in gestation, would be so inconsiderable, in the general sweep or periphery of the pelvis, that any radius, or diameter of it, would not be sensibly lengthened. We have much reverence for *Hippocrates*; but the bones of the pelvis do not divide and separate one from the other in the first labour; neither do they open to the right and left, like a pair of calipers, at the completion of gestation. If *Avicenna* supposed, on the point of exclusion, that

that the joints of the pelvis separated, all I remark is, he might have been a tolerable physician; but, assuredly, a lame anatomist, and no accoucheur.

We admire the question of Vesalius. People must be complete lunatics indeed, who cleave their virgin daughters to facilitate their labours.

*Jacques D'Amboise* might have met with a subject where the symphysis separated a few lines: whether he did or not is unworthy of contention. Mr. Pineau, from the specimen given, was but a sorry physician. To cleave the pubes with a wedge, is a dreadful idea! We give *Pineau*, however, vast credit for shuddering at the thought of separating by incision; but must immediately rob him of every merit in allowing the child, *in utero*, to be more noble than the bones which compose the *pelvis*. *Galen*, in this instance also, speaks like a fool.

Mr. *Duverney* having shewn one pelvis whose *pubes* had been separated by labour, is no general authority for cutting asunder the *pubes* of any poor dear soul of a woman.

Mr.

Mr. *Sigault* proposes the section of the symphysis of the *pubes*, in cases where the *Cæsarian* operation is performed, by reason of the disproportion of the pelvis to the child's head. Judicious and rational men wish in all cases to avoid that operation. It is possible by it to save the child: and in twenty thousand instances, perhaps, one mother may recover.

It is apprehended by one of the most learned and honest men now living in the world, in these sciences, that a well-formed pelvis is rarely so small as not to allow of the descent of the child's head. He thinks, with judicious management, that every well-formed woman, where nothing preternaturally occurs, may be safely delivered without violence to her body. He is an enemy to all cutting and flaying; and abominates every indelicate practice. His judgment is built upon solid logic; and his virtues are celestial. His vast and comprehensive mind, stored with universal knowledge, founded upon *facts*, is yet so greatly humble, that, in adoration of the Supreme Essence of all possible existence, it confesses with sincere and becoming humility, in proportion to acquired intelligence, the more he is convinced of his own weakness, his own presumption,  
and



and comparative ignorance in attempting to unfold the very simplest processes and operations of the infinite Majesty of creation. From this grand soul we are presented with no flourishes of self dignity—no ill-tim'd theatrical enchantment—no blandishments of swaggering vanity—no despicable imbecillity of disgusting pedantry—no magisterial, jesuitical, hypocritical phiz, pompously displaying its insignificant consequence in the ebullitions of frothy nonsense; nor sly, dark, insidious, and dogmatical glances upon characters; nothing, in short, but a great assemblage of pleasing affability, venerable endearment, and a noble *altogetherness* of adorable qualities constituting his individuality; all founded upon the broad basis of common sense, and springing from a pure conviction of the criminal pride of human life, and the necessary misery of a finite perishing mortal.

Behold a man at this day complete in his profession, (having an eye to the progress, gradation, and present state of science,) happy in the persevering study of doing good to his fellow creatures, blessed with such angelic sensibility of heart and godlike sympathy, that he would not torture any of Nature's most apparently insignificant creatures for all the gifts

of christendom ! This truly great man never was disposed to gain knowledge at the expence of animal life ; there being an ample field for its acquirement in a more consistent and praise-worthy manner.

It was not by the cruel sufferings, by the murder and bloody sacrifice of poor passive and endearing animals, that this good man discovered and explained the system of absorbent vessels in the human species, directly leading to the nature, prevention, and cure of diseases ;—of more real utility to mankind than all the grand discoveries of the immortal Newton !

Here I must relate a dream.—I thought I was called to a family of three people, spectres, so worn out and emaciated, that there was nothing apparently left but skin upon their bones. I put one, naked, into a bath of warm new milk ; the second into a bath of warm mutton broth ; and the third, I thought, I rubbed all over with the epiploon of a hog for half an hour. I put them to bed in flannel shirts, it being frost : and, when I called the next day, found them all fat and lusty. It struck me also, that I cured cancers and scrophula by the doctrine of absorption. But to proceed—

Mr.

Mr. *Le Roy's* operation has led a parcel of dull, stupid, savage, insensible hearted animals of the human figure, to mangle, in agonizing tortures, faithful dogs, gentle sheep, and hundreds of poor inoffensive brutes, sacrifices to the horrid operation of cleaving asunder the bony pelvis of the pregnant uterus!

Mr. *Sigault* says, as a reason for the operation, that an inch is gained by it. Now, if he means an inch of circumference, then all that can be gained in diameter will be (we shall grant him a good allowance) four tenths and a quarter. If he means that he gains an inch in diameter, then the pubes must have receded, and sprung outwards very near four inches. In such a case, they must have jerked with such violence, as to tear asunder the ligaments and cartilaginous connections between *sacrum* and *ilium* on each side. What a dreadful shock to the delicacy of female nature! Who could thence be surprized if lumbar abscess, and a melancholy train of evils succeeded?

He says the section was done upon a *sow*, and the parts reunited in fifteen days. We should be mightily sorry to apply reason-

ing drawn from a *sow*, to the fairest and dearest work of Almighty God. It is well known we may cut into cavities and joints of quadrupeds, with perfect safety to the poor animals, while the same thing, done in the human species, is followed by alarming mischief and sad catastrophe.

The swelling and softening of the cartilage during pregnancy, so much dwelt upon in the treatise before us, is no kind of reason why the *pubes* should be cleft asunder in any case whatsoever. Besides, admitting, for once, it might be judged proper, who is to perform so nice an operation? Can we suppose every worthy country practitioner of midwifery equal to the task? No one should be suffered to do such an operation, who is not in the constant habit of dextrous dissection, and particularly skilled in the anatomy of the parts. Let us have in view the importance of the contiguous organs, which in nine cases out of ten would be assuredly slashed and mangled; not to mention the direful consequences of extravasation into cavities.

Mr. *Le Roy* is convinced “ that during pregnancy, there is brought about, particularly  
towards

towards the pelvis, *a solution of the earthy matter in the mother, which is converted to the use of the fœtus.*" We do not admit of such an extravagant idea, even hypothetically. What! would Nature decompose the ossa innominata of the mother, to build up the skeleton of her infant?

Softness of bone is a disease totally abstracted from pregnancy. Absorption of their earthy matter might certainly have occurred in Mrs. *Soupiot*, but not with a view to make bones for a new subject—Nature had no such design; it arose merely from the peculiar cause of softness or decomposition of bone—a matter clearly illustrated by the great Doctor William Hunter, my most venerable master.

Mr. *Le Roy* says, he divided the pubes of Mrs. *Brasseur*, who died in consequence of the injurious treatment of a woman who endeavoured to deliver her; that the pubes parted so as to admit his four knuckles, an extent equal to two French inches and a half.

An eminent lecturer upon anatomy, it seems, in London, has outdone Doctor *Le Roy* in distance. He performed the section of the pubes,

pubes, I am told, when the bones separated four inches. Now, even here, if we credit the report, as the bones must recede upon the principle of a pair of calipers, it will be found, that a radius drawn from the center of motion to the extremity of either pubis, will measure nearly the same as before the operation; unless, indeed, we suppose the bony substance of the pubes to be elastic; and, like a bent bow, constantly endeavouring to bring itself into a strait line;—in which case the child's head has nothing to fear, provided it keeps clear of the angles and ragged edges of the divided bones. If, then, we explain this affair upon the principle of a bow, we must look upon the posterior external ligaments between *sacrum* and *ilium*, as the string of that bow constantly acting upon the stretch—the resistance to their relaxation being the connecting medium of pubes. We find the power exerted is capable to separate them four inches, as is said, upon the cutting of the symphysis. We wonder, in labour, when the said cartilage is in a manner dissolved and soft, and approaching to pulp, according to Dr. *Le Roy*, that the bones are not naturally pulled asunder with vast jerk and loud snap, lacerating all the anterior internal connections of *sacrum* and *ilium*. If, again, the  
sepa-

separation, upon cutting, takes place merely in consequence of the spring of the lateral bones, without affecting the joints of *sacrum*, what a power must be exerted, by the connecting medium of pubes, to keep them together! This affair may be aptly enough illustrated by a pair of mechanic's calipers. If we open this instrument, the distance between the extremities of its legs will be of course in proportion to their separation. If that distance is four inches, pray, are the extremities of the legs farther from the center of motion? In like manner, comparing the ilium and sacrum, on each side, to the legs of the calipers, whose center of motion must be an imaginary point behind sacrum; if we cut the symphysis pubes, and the bones recede four inches, what will be the consequence? will the extremities of pubes be farther from the center of motion? and, separating like a pair of calipers, is it possible that the anterior internal connections from sacrum to ilium shall not be injured, and a world of alarming mischief produced? Again, if the separation is effected merely by muscular force, and elasticity of bone, (waving all considerations of sections of crura clitoridis, slit bladders, wounded uterus, extravated blood, and diffusions of urine, &c.) will it

be

be an easy matter to bring and keep such elastic bones in an apt contact for speedy re-union ?

After all, nevertheless, we will acknowledge that a separation of four inches must necessarily receive a segment of the child's head, and thence facilitate its descent; but what becomes of the poor soul the mother? what happens to her body? Lord defend us! Christ be with us in the hour of death, and day of judgment!

Doctor *Le Roy* has adopted a very good maxim. He says, he is always communicative in things relative to science, convinced that the loss of the honour of some discoveries is not to be put in competition with the enjoyment of the conversation of others, and the consequent improvement of the mind. We beg, and trust, the Doctor may allow us the same indulgence; and have to pray, that he might not accuse us of arrogance, petulance, vanity, or of any other understrapping behaviour. We have no manner of quarrel with Doctor *Le Roy*; on the contrary, we desire to respect him; and honestly wish him an abundant share of the little good there is allowed in this  
best



best of all possible worlds. Our business is entirely confined to the operation of the section of the *symphysis pubes*, which, as far as we can judge, ought to be laid aside, and banished these kingdoms and dominions, without any manner of provisional clause, excepting the aid of the judgment of the most eminent anatomists, surgeons, physicians, and accoucheurs, to which we bow with all due reverence.

Doctor *Le Roy* is obliged to Mr. *Chandon* for defending his favourite proposition, viz. “that in labour a woman never should lose her life, when under the care of an able operator.” What a happiness to the sex, and how great a man would the Doctor be, if he could but mathematically found, and render infallible, this grand proposition!

Mr. *Chandon*, it seems, in his thesis dedicated to the marine minister, Mr. *Sartine*, says, “By this operation, none of the viscera essential to life are endangered.” What become of the *crura clitoridis*? is the urinary bladder of no consequence to life? is there no danger to be apprehended from the tearing, riving, cracking, and laceration of the connecting ligaments? Can we be assured that no abscesses nor

caries shall take place in and about these parts? and, lastly, what effect will be produced by the action of muscles originating from, and inserted in, these bones?

We beg leave here heartily to acquiesce with the Doctor. He says, "It is a characteristic of real merit, to seek truth merely for its own sake:" wherefore we have the pleasure to add, that having very candidly submitted the operation recommended by the Doctor to the test of fair experience, we find it advisable to refute, condemn, and reject it.

Mr. *Sigault*, in his thesis, (he must have been a bold, a daring, and a dextrous surgeon, and an adroit dissector,) directs the operation thus:—"Take a bistory with a blunt point, cut and divide the integuments above the *pubes*, go through the pyramidal muscles from top to bottom"—these are often wanting, sometimes they extend three or four inches upwards, so that, in the latter case, a gash would be made with a vengeance! He says, "the symphisis of the *pubes* being now exposed, convey your fingers to the cellular membrane behind the *pubes*, and cut boldly this intermediate cartilage: immediately the *pubes* will separate  
above

above an inch, and the *fœtus*, by the force of nature, will come safely into the world." *Sigault* gives this description, with as much perfect ease, indifference, and indiscretion, as if the subject of operation were a Cheshire cheese, or a huge peck loaf. He says, "When the power which tends to separate the extremities of the pelvis no longer exists, the *pubes* will reunite." This is a mere piece of theory; as are all his subsequent remarks, delivered with incautious levity, and physiological imprudence. He looks upon wounds of the bladder as mere trifles. He exultingly demands, "And why should not the cartilages reunite?" for this plain reason—because, not being vascular for red blood, they do not go through the animal process of healing, like fleshy parts of ordinary vascularity. How can a man speak who is not furnished with the apparatus of articulation? He is peculiarly happy in reconciling and accounting for every thing which does not coincide with his own favourite ideas.

The learned *Gaubius* did well, in determining the government of Holland not to give up a female convict to the butchery of *Mr. Camper's* proposed experiment; *Gaubius* did honour to human nature! *Mrs. Souchot*, the famous

example and authority for the practice of this section of the symphysis pubis, was a woman, we are told, of three feet eight inches high; having, we suppose, an incurvated spine, and a deformed pelvis. She had been delivered of several children by the means of extracting instruments.

The desire of having this operation performed with a view to universal good; or, simply, perhaps, (as sorry scribblers and vain writers, and prating coxcombs like myself, are constantly in the habit of buffeting, reviling, and oblique accusation of one another, from *little hearted* principles of vulgar self-puffing, of labouring under the plaguy malady of *cacoethes scribendi*) as an author, to hear the judgment of the world upon it, led Doctor *Le Roy* to call in several of the faculty at the fourth labour of this poor creature. He says, it was unanimously agreed, that she could never be delivered of a living child, except by the *Cæsarian* operation; so that, it seems, for the sake of having a living child, they would yield up this poor woman to providence. Horrid! why did they not conclude to deliver her as in the former labours? Common sense tells us, (that best of monitors!) that the preservation of the mother is more desirable, and of more

more consequence to society, than that of the fœtus in utero. Be that as it may, Mr. *Souchot*, we are told, requested the advice and assistance of Doctor *Le Roy* in behalf of his poor wife. We afterwards find, by the declaration of Mrs. *Souchot*, previous to this operation, that she “had had four painful labours.” Why, thence, for God’s sake, would any man determine, for the plea of having a living child, to cleave asunder the bones of this unfortunate body, at the natural risk of her existence? Because, quoth Doctor *Le Roy*, the diameter from the anterior to the posterior part of the pelvis did not exceed two inches and a half; and the child’s head, in utero, measured at least three inches and a quarter. We should be glad to know how the Doctor managed to apply his rule from pubis to sacrum, in a pelvis containing the gravid uterus. He makes no mention how much the diameter of a fœtus’s head shall be diminished by the bones of the cranium slipping and sliding and lapping over one another. In short, it appears Doctor *Le Roy* was determined the operation should be done. He says, “the moment the separation was completed, the *pubes* parted as if the string of a bow had been divided “—*Kerrish!*—” and receded to each side under the integuments.” What a ripping, swashing,

swathing, crashing, gashing, bloody gap it must have been ! The extent of the separation, he says, was such, that he laid his four knuckles in the space, which, he adds, gave him great pleasure ! He says, “ the patient was delivered, to her great joy, of a living son.” How far these matters are founded we leave to the curious. The party concerned confesses, that this poor woman had great sufferings ; she had fever ; she had disease in the joints of the sacrum and ilium ; the left crus of the clitoris and meatus urinarius had been divided ; and, we will presume, a slit bladder. We are told, that, on the sixtieth day from the operation, she walked down stairs to go in a coach to the college of physicians. This may be all possible ; but, we beg leave to assure Doctor *Le Roy*, and, with all humility and deference, the whole world, that we shall never perform such an operation in these kingdoms of our own accord ; holding it in abominable horror, by reason, as far as we can judge, of our rational ideas of its dangerous tendency to womankind ; and its blackguard consequences to our own character ; to which, with Doctor *Le Roy*'s kind leave, we wish upon every occasion to bestow some small attention.

The great Author of our nature has thought fit so to construct and frame us, that, for infinitely wise purposes, concurring with the general laws of created things, we are liable to a sufficient number of natural evils; let us not unnecessarily and wickedly multiply them by our own restless and ambitious invention.

After the operation, Doctor *Le Roy* asks a very curious question respecting the forceps. He says, “ If after the operation we leave delivery entirely to nature, it would probably occasion pains in the posterior articulations, and irritate and inflame the surrounding parts. Hence we ought not to leave the expulsion of the child to nature.” He acknowledges the necessity of using the forceps, and, in the same breath, asks, “ Why should we then have recourse to a method which endangers the child’s life, when the section” (the cleaving of the mother) “ has been undertaken merely to preserve it ?”

Doctor *Le Roy*’s way of explaining the swelling and softness of the cartilages is mighty silly. He thinks cartilage may swell like a wedge of porous wood driven forcibly into the cleft of a rock, so as to break off huge pieces  
of

of it. Here the Doctor should have adverted to capillary attraction, for which the structure of cartilage is not calculated. The intervertebral cartilages expand from elasticity; by no means from the "afflux" or absorption and accumulation of inelastic fluids. Water, although its compressibility may in some sense be proved, yet it possesses that quality in so inert a manner, that we apprehend it to be unfit to be used as a spring in animal bodies. Neither can we admit that the cartilages of the articulations of the pelvis are endued with vegetative powers during pregnancy. Who would say that gristle, in gestation, underwent changes upon the same principle as that of the pregnant uterus and growth of plants?—mighty ridiculous! We are informed experiments are going on upon poor passive beasts, to ascertain and give us information of the practicability of cleaving asunder mothers in a series of succeeding labours; so that if a stout young married woman has the luck of difficult labours, she may stand the chance of being cleft open ten or a dozen times. May God of his infinite mercy deliver them all from such complete misery!

Upon the whole:—There is the *high* way; the *low* way; the *new* way; the *old* way; the *lateral*



*lateral* way, of cutting for the stone ;—but, if I recollect well, we have not yet heard of the *middle* way. Now, if one could be sure, that upon cutting the *symphysis* of the *ossa pubis*, the bones would separate, in all cases, three or four inches, with perfect safety to the patient ; that there would be no cracking, jerking and riving asunder of the posterior ligamentary connections ; that the divided parts, hard and soft, sensible and insensible, would kindly reunite, and obligingly heal up in fifteen days, (as happened in the experiment of the *sow*,) it would certainly be right to recommend the *middle* operation for the stone in preference to all others. But, as prophecy implies a knowledge of futurity, of events not yet existing, we, despairing of its success, and protesting against all oracular affairs, candidly beg leave to submit the fate of the *middle* operation for the stone to the more refined genius and improved judgment of future ages.

T H E E N D.

12

...of cutting for the horse...but  
I recollect well, we have not yet heard of the  
middle way. Now, if one could be sure, that  
upon cutting the Ligament of the Os pubis,  
the bones would separate, in all cases, three or  
four inches, with perfect safety to the patient,  
that there would be no cracking, jerking and  
riving slender of the posterior ligamentary con-  
nections; that the divided parts, hard and  
sensible and insensible, would kindly reunite,  
and obligingly heal up in fifteen days, (as hap-  
pened in the experiment of the *Novus*), it would  
certainly be right to recommend the middle  
operation for the horse in preference to all  
others. But, as prophecy implies a knowledge  
of futurity, of events not yet existing, we de-  
parting of its success, and protesting against  
all oracular affairs, candidly beg leave to sub-  
mit the case of the middle operation for the horse  
to the more refined genius and improved judg-  
ment of future ages.

THE END