Three Unpublished Letters of Sylvester O’Halloran

CLAIRE E. LYONS

Three letters, written by the celebrated Limerick surgeon and antiquarian Sylvester O’Halloran, are published for the first time. The context in which they were written is discussed and analysed and they are set into the already published body of his correspondence, to provide a more nuanced understanding of O’Halloran’s medically activated, but politically directed, activities.

Very little of the known correspondence, private or public, of the celebrated Limerick surgeon and antiquarian Sylvester O’Halloran (1728-1807) survives, notwithstanding the body of correspondence published by J.B. Lyons in the 1960s,1 or the additional letter published in 2007 by the present author.2 This article introduces into the public domain three of his previously unpublished letters. This correspondence is preserved in manuscript form in the Bodleian library, Oxford. The earliest letter dated 1779,3 is to an unidentified correspondent. The second two letters, dated June 1781 and February 1782 respectively,4 are to Lord Macartney (1737-1806), who at that time was Governor of Madras, a position he held from 1781 to 1786.

The first detailed account of O’Halloran’s medical career was published in 1848 by Sir William Wilde, a fellow surgeon.5 More recently, J.B. Lyons6 of the Royal College of Surgeons has further added to our understanding of the unique position O’Halloran occupied in the medical world of eighteenth-century Ireland and England. O’Halloran’s individual and innovatory involvement in medical science, as revealed by both Wilde and Lyons, serve to establish O’Halloran as an original thinker, an individual who acted and thought ‘outside the box’ and consequently, places him as an individual of superior intellectual capacity, towering over most of his eighteenth-century contemporaries in the field of medical science.7

O’Halloran received his surgical training at London, Paris and Leiden.8 In 1749 he returned to Limerick and began his successful career as a surgeon. His regular publications, on diverse subjects, maintained his profile in the medical world throughout his long life. He published two major works on the cataract: A new Treatise on the

---

3 Catalogue No. G.A. Ire 4019.
4 Eng lett b.23.
Glaucoma, or Cataract in 1750 and five years later A Critical Analysis of the new Operation for a Cataract. In 1765 he published A Complete Treatise on Gangrene and Sphacelus, with a New Method of Amputation (hereafter New Method of Amputation) a work which features prominently in the unpublished 1779 letter and which provides the link between these three letters. In 1791, in volume four of the Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy, O'Halloran published An Attempt to Determine with Precision such Injuries of the Head as Necessarily Require the Operation of the Trephine. This work was followed by A New Treatise on the Different Disorders Arising from External Injuries of the Head: Illustrated by Eighty-Five (selected from above 1500) Practical Cases in 1793. This latter work is significant, not only as an interesting composition on head injuries, but also for the insights it provides into the social pastime of faction fighting, which has, O'Halloran informs us, allowed him ‘to convert the follies of my country-men into wholesome information, for the good of mankind!’

O'Halloran’s antiquarian works are outside the largely medical ambit of this present article, though he would not have made this distinction. O'Halloran was forever mindful of the ‘esteem’ of Ireland and availed of every opportunity to emphasis her ancient civilized culture. In the preface to his work on amputation he states:

In the most early periods of our history, it appears, that the health of the subject, was a particular object of attention in the state; and where no other monuments of our antiquity left, yet would this alone, in every civilized nation, secure us the character of a polished people.

Moreover, in his Introductory Discourse to his A new Treatise on the different Disorders arising from External injuries of the Head, cognizant that his own proclaimed expertise in the field, based on a liberal supply of patients, might be used as evidence of Irish barbarity, he observes:

But as no opportunity has been lost by the enemies to the reputation of this most ancient country -and too many of these are domestic ones - It will no doubt be remarked that if under the present mild and equitable laws, such violences [sic] and outrages are perpetrated and continued, what must have been the state of barbarity of the country when governed by the native rodes; ... Will the generous foreigner forgive me, if, for a moment, the PHLEGMS off the philosopher is absorbed in the fire of the patriot; and that I descend to render that justice to my poor country-men, which they have for a long period seldom experienced!

9 Published in Limerick by Andrew Welsh, it was reprinted the same year by Vaillant in London. O'Halloran dedicated this work to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Francis Seymour Conway (1718-1794), Earl of Hertford.

10 O'Halloran, (1793), Introductory Discourse p. 5.

11 Sylvester O'Halloran, Insula Sacra or The General Utilities arising from some permanent Foundation, for the Preservation of our Ancient Antvms Demonstrated and the Means Pointed Out (Limerick, 1770); An Introduction to the Study of the History and Antiquities of Ireland (London & Dublin, 1772); Irene Defended; or, A Candid Refutation of such passages in the Rev. Dr. LeFland', and the Rev. Dr. Whittaker's Works, as seem to affect the Authenticity and Validity of Antient Irish History (Dublin, 1774); A General History of Ireland, 2 Vols (London & Dublin, 1778); ‘An introductory Discourse to the poem of Conloch’ in Charlotte Brooke, Reliques of Irish Poetry (1789), pp 3-8; ‘On the Ancient Arms of Ireland’, Anthologia Hibernia, vol. 1 (1793), pp 245-54.

12 O'Halloran, New Method of Amputation, p. xii.

13 O'Halloran, Disorders Arising from External Injuries of the Head, pp 6-7.
O’Halloran clearly appreciates the manner in which his work might be construed in the existing political climate to further denigrate the Irish race and he digresses to forestall his work being used in a manner contrary to his intent.

Aside from the more intellectual pursuit of his publications, O’Halloran was a humanitarian and committed to improving medical facilities in Limerick. He was founder of the first Limerick County Infirmary and, moreover, supported the erection of a Lying-in-Hospital in 1773 giving his services "gratis." The foundation stone from the old Limerick Infirmary was incorporated in a new medical building at the Mid-Western Regional hospital in Dooradoyle in 1989 which was named the Sylvester O’Halloran Post-Graduate Centre. He has also been commemorated by the Limerick Civic Trust which named a foot bridge, erected over the Abbey River, in his honour in 1987.

**Background to the previously unpublished 1779 letter**

As Lyons has pointed out there is evidence that O’Halloran was garnering support to petition for a civil list pension. He bases this on a comment in a letter in 1783 from O’Halloran to Edmund Burke:

> tho’ my Claim in the cause of my Profession may perhaps not appear to you, so Eligible; yet now as a man of Letters; as one who has warmly & Successfully interested himself in Exploring, Vindicating, & Establishing his Native History, some public Countenances is due.\(^1\)

This letter has previously stood in isolation. However the content of the 1779 previously unpublished letter reveals the background to and the organized strategy which underpinned O’Halloran’s campaign. It also shows that his initial campaign was centred on his *New Method of Amputation* (1765). Moreover, this correspondence facilitates the contextualization of O’Halloran’s persistent struggle in a series of letters, public and private, spanning a period of eleven years and provides valuable insights into the influential social and political circle in Britain that was open to O’Halloran.

Working backwards then, and in consequence of this new insight afforded us by the 1779 letter, it is possible to contextualize O’Halloran’s letters to the Freeman’s Journal in 1772 and again in 1778 as the first public appearance of an enduring campaign on his part to achieve recognition for his contribution to medical science. O’Halloran’s first mention of the term ‘reward’ in relation to his *New Method of Amputation* is in a letter published in the Freeman’s Journal in 1772,\(^2\) six years after the initial publication of the work. This letter also records O’Halloran’s first public expression of disappointment at the reception of this work in Ireland – a work which he feels, would have earned him a national reward in any other country in Europe, but in Ireland, he submits, the climate is such that his ‘Irishness’ is operating against him:

> Indeed, so sensible was I of the Importance of this new practice, and the extensive Inductions to be drawn from it *Principals* I had Reason to think myself intitled [sic] to national Reward, for my unwearied Diligence in this Affair: sure I

---

\(^1\) Lyons, ‘Sylvester O’Halloran’ (May, 1963), pp 228-30.

\(^2\) Reprinted in Lyons ‘Letters of Sylvester O’Halloran, pt.ii’, pp 41-2. Lyons has incorrectly dated this letter to 1793: it was written in 1783, ref. Sheffield Archives WWM/BK P/1/1836.

\(^1\) Ibid., pp 32-4.
am, that in any other country of Europe, the Author of so useful a Discovery would not be unnoticed! [...] Why will you not to adopt it? Sure you will not think the worst of it by being the Discovery of your Countryman?  

The tone of the letter is strong and argumentative in places and indicates that O'Halloran felt that a more encouraging reception of his work in Ireland would activate further support for his cause. This is supported by a letter in the Freeman's Journal six years later in 1778, when he again complains about the unwillingness of Irish surgeons to adopt his new method of amputation. To add weight to his argument, he contrasts the reluctant Irish response with the positive reception his work has received in England—a work O'Halloran assures us that has the full backing of Robert Adair, and has been availed by the surgeons in both St. George's and St Thomas's Hospital in London. 

In 1778, however, Irish surgeons continued to ignore what O'Halloran considered was, in general, a major advancement in medical science and of particular utility to the military. Irish parochialism O'Halloran suggests is responsible for its rejection. In his address to the 'very respectable Body of [Irish] Surgeons', O'Halloran is implicitly critical of their behaviour in a contrast drawn with the actions of his friend William Bromfield (1712-1792) surgeon at St. George's Hospital, London:

he [Bromfield] condescended to adopt a mode of practice, the invention of a person greatly his inferior in every point of chirurgical merit, merely because he was satisfied of the justness and utility of it; and by so doing has greatly raised its reputation and consequence.

I am persuaded, Gentlemen, [...] you would readily adopt any practice that tended to public utility, even though a native of the kingdom was the author of it.

A meanness of spirit then, O'Halloran feels, rather than an overriding concern for the good of humanity, is the driving motivational force responsible for the reluctance of the 'very respectable Body of Surgeons' to support his new method of amputation. Interestingly, this was not the first time that an Irish medical audience had failed to appreciate O'Halloran's work. Wilde informs us that when O'Halloran presented his initial treatise on the cataract to Edward Barry, President of the College of Physicians in Ireland, in 1749, that the College, notwithstanding, that this work had been previously

17 Ibid., p. 33.
18 Ibid., pp 34-5.
19 Robert Adair was surgeon-general to George III. When the Royal College of Surgeons received its charter O'Halloran and Adair were simultaneously appointed honorary members. Reprinted in Lyons, 'Letters of Sylvester O'Halloran, pt. ii', p. 44.
20 Ibid., p. 35. Though the surgical application of this work, which O'Halloran held in such high esteem, is little regarded today, nevertheless this work retains a profile due to the small appendix, The Proposals for the Advancement of Surgery in Ireland, which is sequestered at the conclusion of the work; and from which, it is generally agreed, the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland evolved. Wilde, 'Illustrious Physicians' p. 228; Lyons, 'Sylvester O'Halloran, 1728-1807' (1989), p. 71.
21 William Bromfield was a surgeon at St. George's Hospital. In common with O'Halloran he was a humanitarian and had founded, with Martin Madan, the Lock Hospital to which he was appointed surgeon. Bromfield was appointed surgeon to George III in 1761 after his marriage to the Princess Charlotte of Mecklenburg.
recommended for publication by Richard Meade (1673-1754) in London, had neither the ‘time nor curiosity’ to appreciate its contents.

O’Halloran’s letter to an unknown correspondent, 1779

This letter is a carefully orchestrated, well-planned piece of self-promotional marketing, designed to sell the O’Halloran product to the authorities as a suitable candidate for a civil list pension. In the light of which, it is not an improbable conjecture, that this letter may only be an example of one of many such letters, dispatched to influential individuals to gather support for his campaign.

Based on the content of this 1779 letter it appears that, for some time prior to this, O’Halloran had garnered the support of an influential group, what in present-day terms could possibly be considered a marketing support team, who had been working behind the scenes to promote his claim for a ‘public reward’ based on the utility of his New Method of Amputation. And in light of the military dynamic of England’s colonial expansionist policy, it is not surprising that the military utility of O’Halloran’s method, which boasted a quicker recovery time than other methods then available, would appeal and find support with the English establishment. The endeavours of his friends on his behalf, it seems, had now resulted in a favourable response from the secretary of the Treasury, Sir Grey Cooper (1726-1801). In light of which, and clearly on the advice of his friends, which he refers to in the anonymous plural as ‘they’, he once more put pen to paper.

Among those O’Halloran mentions is first and foremost his friend and fellow surgeon and Irish man, Robert Adair (1710-1790) who had advised him to petition the current Prime Minister Lord North (1732-1792), John St. John (1746-1793) elected member of Eye at this period had petitioned Lord North on O’Halloran’s behalf. This reference to St. John facilitates the contextualization of what hitherto may have appeared to be an insignificant inquiry to a ‘memorial’ recorded elsewhere in a letter to Burke dated 1778:

I shall be much obliged to you, to Enquire of Mr St. John, how the Memorial I gave was disposed of. I cannot help thinking that the laws of Common Humanity,

24 O’Halloran and Dr. Richard Mead had common interests. Mead had studied classical literature and antiquities at the University of Utrecht before he entered Leiden as a student of medicine. He was elected into the council of the Royal Society 1705, physician to St. Thomas’s Hospital in 1703, and was censor of the College of Physicians in 1717, 1719, and 1724. In 1727 he was appointed physician to George II.

25 Grey Cooper was called to the bar in 1751. He entered politics in 1765 and was appointed secretary to the Treasury. He remained joint secretary to the Treasury for sixteen years under successive governments until the downfall of the North administration in 1782.

26 Adair was appointed as Chief Surgeon to the Hospitallers and Inspector-General of the Regimental Infirmary, on 3 March 1756. He married Lady Caroline Keppel in 1759. He was a ‘personal favourite’ of George III and of his brothers, one of whom, William Henry Duke of Gloucester (1743-1805) he is said to have saved from death on two occasions. Archibald Maule, ‘Robin and John Adair’, Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine, xiii, second series (October, 1937) pp 576-96; Anonymous, Memoir of the Life of Robert Adair, Esq. (1790). O’Halloran was presented at the home of the Duke, Gloucester House sometime during 1777, see The Nation, 2 Dec., 1843, p. 12.

27 Frederick North, second earl of Guilford, Lord North, a member of the Tory party, served as prime minister of Britain from 1770 to 1782. In 1780 he had legislation enacted that allowed Ireland to export woollen goods, and to trade freely both ways with British colonies. He was in favour of the union of Britain and Ireland and during the debates on Pitt’s Irish trade proposals spoke in favour of union.

28 John St. John (1746-1793) was a member of the Whig party and friend of Edmund Burke. He represented Eye during the years 1775-84. Though in this letter he refers to a Col. St. John, I take it that this may be in error as in the 1778 letter to Edmund Burke he specifically mentions Mr St. John.

29 Eye was a market town and municipal borough in the Eye parliamentary division of Suffolk, England.
are Interested in that affair, especially at the very dawn of a Bloody War,\textsuperscript{30} and that a good Minister and a good Man, will not overlook it.\textsuperscript{31}

As the letter, from which the above comment is taken, is dated 1 August 1778 St. John’s contact with Lord North, on O’Halloran’s behalf, may have taken place sometime earlier that same year.

Another influential political figure mentioned in this correspondence is Lord Beauchamp\textsuperscript{32} who at this juncture held the position of lord of the treasury in Lord North’s government and had advised O’Halloran on procedure Sir Grey Cooper, previously mentioned, had similarly responded. Although the recipient of the 1779 letter remains unknown, internal evidence regarding the content and direction of the material, seems to suggest that he had a high political profile and was, at the least, an acquaintance, if not a friend, of Edmund Burke and was most probably a member of the Lord North government then in power.

It is clear therefore from this 1779 letter that O’Halloran’s plans to secure some form of official remuneration were well advanced at this stage and what he now required was for some ‘friend’ to petition Parliament on his behalf. Which immediately raises the question as to why Burke, who already has in his possession, O’Halloran tells us, ‘the heads of the Intended Petition’, has not already done so? Evidently, O’Halloran feels that Burke is being somewhat reluctant in this matter and seeks intervention on his behalf:

I write by this post, to my friend Mr. Burke to Engage him to make the Required Application, and presentation from me to Parliament, which I hope he will comply with; [...] Will you, My Dear Sir, be so kind as to see and speak to Mr. Burke on this Matter, and to favor me, with a letter, as soon as Convenient.

Unfortunately, there now exists a four-year gap between this letter and the next extant correspondence between O’Halloran and Edmund Burke dated 1783\textsuperscript{33} so what may or may not have occurred in the interim is at present unknown.

O’Halloran’s letters to Lord Macartney, June 1781 & February 1782
These two previously unpublished letters from Sylvester O’Halloran to the diplomat and colonial governor Lord Macartney\textsuperscript{34} are clearly an outgrowth of O’Halloran’s civil

---

\textsuperscript{30} O’Halloran may here be referring to the war in the American colonies. In Feb. 1778 France and the United States had signed a ‘Treaty of Alliance’ obligating Spain to assist against the English. On 21 June 1779 Carlos III of Spain officially declared war against the English.


\textsuperscript{32} Francis Ingram Seymour, (1743-1822) was the eldest son of Francis Seymour Conway, Earl of Hertford who had held the post of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland in 1765. His son Francis Ingram served as chief secretary to his father, during his time in office. Francis Ingram sat in both the Irish and English parliaments. He represented Lisburn during the period 1761-8, Lostwithiel from 1766-8 and Oxford 1768-94. He was lord of the treasury in Lord North’s government 1774-80. Beauchamp was a proponent of religious toleration and spoke in favour of relief for Catholics in 1778. He spoke against Pitt’s trade proposals and while he advocated an independent parliament for Ireland, he believed that the political ties between England and Ireland were essential.

\textsuperscript{33} Lyons, ‘Sylvester O’Halloran’ (1963), pp 41-2.

\textsuperscript{34} George Macartney (1737-1806) diplomat and colonial governor was born in either Antrim or Dublin and educated at Trinity College, Dublin. He enjoyed a long political and diplomatic career. In 1764 he was appointed British envoy to Russia. He was MP for Armagh 1768-76. In 1769 he was chief secretary to Lord Townsend, the Irish viceroy and part of his duties was the management of the Irish House of Commons, a position he held until 1772. His appointment as governor of Madras in February 1781 was for a period of five years where his mission was to counter in India the French and the Franco-Dutch alliance support for American Independence. Macartney’s next posting was in Peking, again for the East India Company and in 1796 he became governor of the Cape.
pension campaign. For, in addition to pleading the general and military utility of his *New Method of Amputation*, O'Halloran’s claim for public remuneration was based on a promised, more complete, second edition of this work. An edition, he informs us in the 1779 letter, is already at an advanced stage of preparation.

What the exact nature of O'Halloran’s relationship with Lord Macartney was is impossible to say, based solely on the evidence of this meagre correspondence. However, that previous correspondence had taken place may be gleaned from the initial sentence of the 1781 letter transcribed below. It is most likely, however, in the present context, that O’Halloran has approached Macartney to stand for him with a London bookseller, in much the same manner as he had approached Henry Jerome de Salis in 1777 concerning the printing of his *A General History of Ireland* (1778). He may also have enclosed in his letter to Macartney, as he did with his letter to de Salis, some further documents relating to a general overview of the proposed work and a list of printing proposals.

Be that as it may, O'Halloran’s request to Lord Macartney indicates that he was now far enough advanced with his proposed second edition that his thoughts had turned to the practicalities of printing and finding a sponsor and possible subscriber that would not only appreciate the military utility of his work, but would be sufficiently stimulated to stand sponsor for him with a suitable bookseller. O’Halloran’s reply to Lord Macartney, dated 2 February 1782, confirms that his request was met with a positive response; ‘Gratitude for the unlimited order, on your Book-seller, in London’. This support from the highly political and military influential Macartney would have greatly enhanced O’Halloran’s campaign. However there is no evidence that a second edition of O’Halloran’s *New Method of Amputation* ever came to press. The last extant mention of this work is in a letter to Burke dated 1783, where he assures Burke that although the death of his wife had delayed matters somewhat he intends to ‘immediately resume’ work on the second edition.

More importantly this letter also confirms that Burke did not support O'Halloran’s petition to Parliament in 1779. It appears that Burke’s reluctance was due to the fact that he felt that O’Halloran’s claim, based solely on his contribution to medical science, was insufficient grounds to warrant a civil list pension. However, O’Halloran is nothing if not persistent in this matter and once more appeals to Burke for support and, furthermore, broadens his argument to include his antiquarian works. In addition, he urges Burke to remedy the neglect of Irish ‘genius’ by agitation for the extension of royal favour to Ireland:

The fact is, our Irish men of consequence seldom extend a thought, beyond themselves & their immediate dependents; so that Genius may flourish or Expire for any Attention paid by them to it. I cannot help thinking, but a proper representation thro’ you, would be a means of Extending Royal Munificence to this side of the Channel.39

Despite the persistent and enduring nature of O’Halloran’s campaign it was to prove unsuccessful. It was a subject, however, that remained close to his heart and in a letter to

36 Ibid., pp 50-1.
38 Ibid.
39 Ibid.
the Irish artist James Barry (1741-1806) in 1791 he again referred to the lack of interest shown by the British government in encouraging Irish talent in the form of a pension:

Our country wants not for men of genius in every department of science as well as in the fine arts; but we have not Maecenases, and an English government seems not very forward to call forth the exertions of genius amongst us, since, in the long swell of our pension list, not a single instance can be produced, of the smallest favor bestowed on men of genius and abilities. See, then, the necessity of our encouraging the fire of genius in each other.

With the benefit of hindsight, we can see that this was not the most auspicious time for O'Halloran, more particularly a politically marginalized Irishman, to attempt an entry onto the civil list. The American War of Independence and the spectre of the imminent loss of the colonies had brought to prominence the general abuse of the civil list patronage system. Edmund Burke was especially committed to reform and when returned to power he was responsible for the introduction, in 1782, of legislation that would initiate a more widespread reform of the system in general. An attempt by Charles Vallancey (1721-1812) to obtain a government pension for O'Halloran's fellow antiquarian Charles O'Connor (1710-1791) in 1788, had likewise failed.

Situating this new material within the body of previously published correspondence reveals the protracted and enduring nature of O'Halloran's campaign to achieve public recognition for his work. In addition, to providing invaluable information regarding the influential circle of friends that O'Halloran felt free to draw on for support, the letters, in particular that of 1779, provide a valuable insight into the complex political process and the 'behind the scenes networking' involved in mounting a campaign to achieve a civil list pension in eighteenth-century Ireland and Britain. These letters have been transcribed retaining the form, punctuation and spelling of the originals.

Appendix
O'Halloran's letter to an unknown correspondent 1779

Dear Sir.

As I know you to be, a Gent. of great politeness and good Nature as well, as well as of taste and Erudition, they Encourage me to Request your friendly support - It is now about fourteen years since I published a Treatise on Amputation Gangrene, in which a New Method of Amputation was described. many [sic] Attempts, for Centuries had been made to abridge the Cure after Amputation, and to Remedy many Inconveniences Complained of, as Subsequent to it; and it may be with Confidence affirmed, that these

40 Published in The Nation, 2 Dec. 1843, p. 12.
42 Ibid., p. 25.
44 Repeated word in text.
Useful discoveries were Reserved for me. I may be permitted to say so, since it has since been Acknowledged, by the Royal Reader[y] of Surgery, at Paris, by the Medical Society of London, as may be seen in the fourth Volume of their works. By Mr. Bromfield, in the first Volume of his Surgery etc. Yet so it has happened, that Interesting as this Object is, to the public, particularly, to the Military, and so long and Eagerly sought for, notwithstanding the Recited testimonies in its favor, it has made very little advances, Except under my own hands. Convinced of its great Utility, Mr. Adair, when I was last in London, Recommended me to Memorial Lord North, Claiming a Public Reward for so Useful a discovery. Which was delivered by Col. St. John. Lord North, wrote to Mr. Adair, to know if I was Intitled [sic], to such Reward; and he gave it, as his opinion, and quoted Authorities for that opinion that I was. Lord Beauchamp wrote me word, that his opinion was, that the Application should be made thro' Parliament; and I was yesterday Honored with a letter from Sir Grey Cooper, pointing out, that to Apply properly and to Succeed, some friend should Apply to the Chancellor of the Exchequer for his Majesty’s permission, to move the House on that head, which must be done, by a petition referred to that House. That [sic] Rewards, for useful discoveries in Medicine, have been allotted, the voice of antiquity, as well as of modern times, sufficiently proclaim - the Regency [of] Louis the 14th is Replete with proofs of this kind, as well as that of his Successor; even the Use of Agaric to stop Hemorrhagies [sic] or bleedings, was Royally Rewarded, by this last - In England also, such Rewards have been granted - By adopting my Mode of Practice, the cure of Amputation, is abridged by one half in the thigh, where its defects are most Sensibly felt, by it, the Cure is Completed, in one third of the time, it now takes up. But besides, the Expedition in healing, the bones are so firmly Covered, with solid flesh, that the patient is totally Exempt, from all these effects, complained of in all other methods, and are by a wo[ol]den leg, make nearly the same use with the stump, as if no such loss, had been Sustained - All these facts have been sufficiently proved, not only in private practice, but by 14 different Cases, in the Public Hospital of this City. When I first published that work, I had proved it, but in three Cases; yet so eager was I, that the public should benefit by so Useful Practice, that I immediately laid it before them. I have for about twelve months prepared a second Edition, Replete with many new Cases and further Improvements, but I have waited the Issue of my Memorial; as it is but too Evident, that without some Eminent mark of Public Approbation, this second Edition, will no more Engage the Attention of the Faculty, then the former - In Consequence of Sir Grey Cooper’s letter, I Write by this post, to my friend Mr. Burke to Engage him to make the Required Application, and presentation from me to Parliament, which I hope he will Comply with; and I am sure it will not want your Countenance and Support. Will you, My Dear Sir, be so kind as to see and speak to Mr. Burke on this Matter, and to favor me, with a letter, as soon as Convenient. I think it is Evident, that by Engaging in this Matter, you Essentially serve the public. I shall, if Necessary, attend on the spot, and submit the facts, to the severest Scrutiny[sic]. I hope Mr. Burke will not decline the task, as I could not presume to Request you to do it. He has the heads of the Intended Petition, which I wish you would see – I shall be Solicitous for a speedy Answer; and I have the Honor to Subscribe my-self, with great Respect and Esteem - Dear Sir

Your most Humble

and obednt servnt

Limeric Dec. 2nd - 1779 -

Sil: O Halloran

45 Chirurgical Cases and Observations, 2 vols. (1773).
O’Halloran’s letter to Lord Macartney 1781

My Lord.

The very kind Letter, which your Excellency did me the Honor of writing to me, of the 19th of February, I did not Receive till the 24th; two days after the departure of the Swallow; and with pleasure and gratitude, I sit down, to Return your Excellency my unfeigned thanks, for this mark of Esteem, and for your Letter to Mr Walter.

It is true my Lord, that I have hitherto to, made no other use of it, but to show to my friends, that proof of your Excellency’s generous attention to what Regards the Honor of your Country; and when I do send it to London, I shall be Carefull [sic] not to abuse your Lordships Liberality. My friend Mr. Browne, the present prime Sergent, has lately favored me, with some interesting particulars Relative to the [sic] depriving Irish Lords of their Judicature, from a very scarce work of the late Lord Egmont’s. Indeed my Lord, this Attempt of mine, Seems every day, more and more Important; and when I Consider the vast fund of Information still to be sought for, and the little Countenance and Attention paid to the Subject by the public, I am often intimidated from proceeding into, at least with that Alacrity, I otherwise should.

I am truely [sic] Sorry my Lord, at the very Unfavorable Accounts from India; but I hope that to your Excellency will be Reserved, the glorious task of Repelling foreign Invaders, and Restoring internal peace to that Quarter of the Globe. It would afford me particular pleasure could I be so happy, as to preserve a place in your Excellency’s Memory, and to be sometimes Honored with a few lines, when affairs of greater import, did not Interfere—

With the most profound Respect and the warmest wishes for your Excellencies Success in India, and for your safe and happy Return to your Country, and to your friends,

I have the Honor to Subscribe my-self
My Lord, Your Excellencies much Obliged,
and most Obednt.
and most Humble Servt _
Sil: O Halloran

O’Halloran’s letter to Lord Macartney 1782

My Lord.

Gratitude for the unlimited order, on your Book-seller, in London, and I am high sense[ible] of the Honor of your Excellencies kind letter accompanying it, just before your quitting Tarbot, stimulated me, to return you my thanks; which I did by the Trial

---

46 O’Halloran’s interest in Indian affairs has a personal dimension as his son, Joseph O’Halloran, was appointed midshipman on board the East India Company’s slop of war, Swallow on 22 February 1781. In 1782 he was made ensign in the Bengal army in India. Moreover, as Lord Macartney sailed for India on the 21 February, 1781, there is the possibility that the Swallow may have comprised part of the escort.


48 The word ‘regard’ was written initially but then crossed out and the word ‘attention’ written over the crossed out word.

49 John Perceval (1711-70), 2nd Earl of Egmont was a British politician, pamphleteer, and genealogist.

50 Macartney’s initiatives to collect revenue to support the war effort against the Franco-Dutch alliance was not immediately supported by the governor general in Calcutta, Warren Hastings, who a month later, in July, made Sir Eyre Coote ‘military supremo’ in Madras. This may be the part of the troubles that O’Halloran is referring to above. For a more detailed account of Macartney’s time in India see Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (2004) p. 27.
Packet last June. The same Vessel being now ready to sail from the Shannon, I again take the liberty, to Request [if] your Excellency, will accept of my grateful Acknowledgment and permit me the wishes, to preserve a place in your Memory.

The Letter I Enclosed to [Mr.] Walter, last August; but hitherto have made no further use of it, than that of proclaiming your Excellencies generous Intentions - the truth of it is, My Lord, tho' I am far advanced in that work, and have Laid it out, on a broad and a generous Scale, yet so Little Curiosity do I see, in my Country-men, that I apprehend it would scarce quite caste, much Sub (?) reward a man, for his Labor and Trouble. As for the Ancient History; my love for my Country, my Ardor to Rescue it, from the many Calamities, which ignorance and Malice had thrown on it; and administer our great Ancestors, with some degree of dignity, due to their virtues, were [sic] superior to Every other Consideration. In the present incidence I do not feel my-self quite so much interested; and for what I can see, the Public bestow Little thought on the Matter. I am never the less persuaded, that if it was to goe [sic]on with Alacrity, it would not be the Case. Now I sure of your Excellencies Countenance and Protection I would certainly persevere in work, which I flatter my-self, would ultimately tend, to the Credit and Honor of Ireland.

With the warmest wishes for your Excellencies Success in India, and for Every thing that can add to your happiness, I have the Honor to Subscribe my-self - My Lord - Your Excellencies much Obliged, and most obednt. Humble Servnt.

Sil: Ó Halloran

Limeric Feb.y 2d. 1782 -