Freedom in teaching / by G. A. Gibson.

Contributors

Gibson, George Alexander, 1854-1913.
Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh

Publication/Creation

Glasgow : Macdougall, 1901.

Persistent URL

https://wellcomecollection.org/works/h2y6ms59

Provider

Royal College of Physicians Edinburgh

License and attribution

This material has been provided by This material has been provided by the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh. The original may be consulted at the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh. where the originals may be consulted.
Conditions of use: it is possible this item is protected by copyright and/or related rights. You are free to use this item in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s).

wellcome collection

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

Gibson, George Alexa
Royal College of Phys
[2]61 b21976[2]

FRE

G. A

Reprinted

FREEDOM IN TEACHING.

BY

G. A. GIBSON, M.D., D.Sc., F.R.C.P.Ed.,

PHYSICIAN TO THE ROYAL INFIRMARY AND LECTURER ON MEDICINE IN THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

Reprinted from the "Glasgow Medical Journal" for November, 1901.

GLASGOW:
PRINTED BY ALEX. MACDOUGALL, 68 MITCHELL STREET.
1901.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016

https://archive.org/details/b21902306

FREEDOM IN TEACHING.[1]

—o—

To say that your request to open the first session of the new century at Anderson's College Medical School conveyed a flattering compliment would be but a feeble expression of my feelings on receiving your invitation. There could be but little hesitation in acceding, if possible, to your wish, albeit two weighty considerations rendered my response to your summons a matter of anxious debate. It seemed doubtful if, in this age of public discussion, any subject could be found sufficiently fresh to deserve being put before you; it further appeared open to question whether any effort of mine might be worthy of the occasion. Well knowing how sympathetic an audience of medical students is to anyone who endeavours, no matter in how humble a fashion, to be of use to them in whatever sphere, such doubts have been swept aside.

It is, in truth, despite these misgivings, a pleasure to meet the undergraduates of this College. One and thirty years ago it was my privilege as a freshman to stand within the walls of the Western University when she, for the first time, occupied her new abode on the adjacent hill. My memory of the day on which her new portals first stood open, marked by a red stone though it be, is like a confused kaleidoscope of gorgeous academic tints, but my ear still rings, and ever will ring, with the insistent shouts of the junior medical world for that genial man who afterwards became a kind friend—Allen Thomson. Of another event there is in my mind a somewhat more distinct image—and this many of you will readily appreciate—of the great torchlight procession by which we, the younger members of the University, formally ratified in our own way the transference of her home from its old seat in the High Street to its present throne on Gilmorehill.

It seems to me that no matter could more usefully occupy

[1] The Inaugural Address delivered at the opening of the winter session at Anderson's College Medical School on 18th October, 1901.

our attention for a few minutes on this occasian than the consideration of freedom of teaching. It is my wish to speak upon this subject, which is, indeed, a matter of serious, nay, of vital importance to the wellbeing of our northern medical schools. In doing so it will be necessary for me to crave your leave to glance at some past events. You need not, however, fear any tedious investigations in the erudite, or, perhaps, even pedantic, manner of Dryasdust. A few eddies in the stream of time will alone claim our attention.

The subject chosen for these remarks naturally presents two aspects for our inspection—how it has been won for us, and how it is to be used. From these two different points of view let me invite you to regard it.

In early times, when anyone had attained to an extent of knowledge satisfactory to his teachers he received the stamp of their approbation, and, *ipso facto*, became also himself a teacher. In virtue of this sanction—by whatsoever name it was called—learned men went out over the surface of the known world, from the Columns of Hercules to the Golden Chersonese, burning with enthusiasm to impart their knowledge to all who might listen. The story told by Bulœus[1] of the beginnings of university education in France is, in this connection, of vivid interest. Two wandering Scots appeared one day in a French town, during the reign of Charlemagne, and, standing in the market-place, offered to sell wisdom to those who were willing to buy of them. The monarch—a worthy grandson of Charles the Hammer, in his desire to improve the condition of his people, no less than to extend their bounds—having been told of this, summoned them to his presence, and, learning that their purpose was a real desire to teach, vouchsafed to them his countenance and support. In this way, according to the historian of the University of Paris, did academic institutions have their origin in France, and these two learned wayfarers from our shores may justly be regarded as the precursors of Abelard and Sorbonne. In this age when university extension is not merely in the air, but is in many seats of learning an accomplished fact, our warm admiration goes back across the gulf that separates us from them to those early forerunners of modern progress.

It will readily be understood from these remarks that it is not possible to agree with the distinguished man who so long led a powerful party in the arena of politics, in his views regarding the nature of universities. "It is, I believe,

[1] Bulœus, *Historia Universitatis Parisiensis*, Tomus I, p. 101.

a fact," said Gladstone, in his rectorial address to the University of Edinburgh,[1] "and if so, it is a fact highly instructive and suggestive, that the university, as such, is a Christian institution." To hold this opinion is assuredly to narrow our conception of education. Are we not to regard the great schools of Egypt and of Greece as in a very real sense universities? Certainly we must, or the name itself becomes a misnomer; the belief, therefore, of Kirkpatrick[2] commends itself to my judgment, that the Academy at Athens and the Museum at Alexandria were true prototypes of the modern university.

Confining our attention to the study of medicine, with the sciences ancillary thereto, and restricting our purview to the schools of Edinburgh and Glasgow, we shall find that this spirit, *i.e.*, of freedom in teaching, has led either to the foundation or to the development of medical education in these renowned seats of learning. In the city of St. Kentigern, it is true, medical education had no place in the earliest days of the University. It must not be forgotten that my first "Alma Mater" goes back into the times of the Renaissance. She owes her origin to Nicholas V, a man to whom is very largely due the revival of learning in Europe, and of whom Gibbon,[3] no partial critic, says, "the fame of Nicholas the Fifth has not been adequate to his merits." At first the University comprised little beyond the Faculties of Arts and of Divinity—Medicine had no place within her palaces, if, indeed, we may thus think of the interesting old buildings near the Molendinar Burn. In the fulness of time, nevertheless, Glasgow was to have a medical school, and a great one too. This was, however, the creation of a later age.

But for "the nominal tribute paid to medicine," as Duncan[4] gracefully puts it, by the existence of the Chair held for nine years by Robert Mayne, and which lapsed on his death in 1646, there was no attempt even to recognise in the most shadowy fashion the claims of the healing art. In 1714 the Chair of Medicine was re-established, and John Johnstoun was elected to it, yet the recently published and deeply interesting volume dealing with the history of the

[1] Gladstone, *Rectorial Addresses delivered before the University of Edinburgh*, edited by A. Stodart Walker, p. 5.

[2] Kirkpatrick, *Historically Received Conception of the University*, pp. 116, 123.

[3] Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, vol. xii, p. 134.

[4] Duncan, *Memorials of the Faculty of Physicians and Surgeons of Glasgow*, p. 125.

University[1] correctly puts the matter:—"Although the real foundation of the Faculty of Medicine may, therefore, be dated from the re-establishment of the Chair of Medicine in 1714, no systematic instruction in Physic appears to have been given within the University till 1746, when Dr. Cullen, with the sanction of the Professor, delivered a course of lectures, while he also taught Materia Medica, Botany, and Chemistry."

This at once leads to the heart of the matter. William Cullen, one of the greatest names on the medical roll of fame —notwithstanding the much more lowly estimate of him by my friend, Professor Clifford Allbutt[2]—began his distinguished career by teaching as a free-lance outside those walls within which he was destined afterwards to shine as one of the brighest ornaments. Did he not, before his professorial honours were attained, impart the fire of his enthusiasm to Joseph Black? Was not Thomas Thomson, the author of chemical symbols, a teacher in Glasgow before he adorned the University Senate? These, and many other instances of what may be termed the scientific lineage of Glasgow's famous men, for much of my knowledge of which my warm thanks are due to the interesting researches of my friend, Dr. James Finlayson,[3] show what benefits have arisen and may occur from the spirit of freedom in teaching.

There are some whom we ought, on this occasion more especially, to remember with reverence. The institution in which we meet to-day was founded one hundred and five years ago by the bequest of John Anderson. This remarkable man may well be likened to our fellow-countryman, the "admirable Crichton," for, master alike of ancient and modern languages, conversant with the natural as well as the physical sciences, learned in the lore now included under the term anthropology, a critic of the science and art of war, and skilled in numerous technical details of many handicrafts, he may well be held, like the sixteenth century prodigy, to have been armed with an intellectual panoply. It will redound to the credit of John Anderson that he, long in advance of his age, saw how necessary it was for technical skill to be founded on accurate scientific knowledge, and that he generously gave his time, energy, and means for the furtherance of technical education.

[1] *University of Glasgow—Old and New*, p. 107.
[2] Clifford Allbutt, *British Medical Journal*, 5th January, 1901.
[3] Finlayson, *Members of the Medical Profession in Glasgow of Wide Celebrity*, p. 4.

The Medical School of Anderson's College has just completed its first hundred years of existence. Taking its origin in 1800, when the distinguished John Burns began to teach anatomy, assisted by his eminent brother Allan, it has been adorned by many famous men, amongst whom it is, perhaps, not invidious to mention, as one of the brightest stars in its firmament, Thomas Graham. It has provided numerous occupants of distinguished posts in different universities, and it is not without interest to recall how, within forty years of its inception, it furnished in Thomas Garnett the first professor of the Royal Institution, and in Thomas Graham the Master of the Mint. Its pupils have gone out into every part of the world, and some have, like David Livingstone, rendered the whole human race their debtors. If time permitted us to trace out fully the history of these famous men, we should see how they in their day bore themselves like men—

"Et quasi cursores vitai lampada tradunt." [1]

If you will permit me to bring before you a few facts regarding that medical school which now claims my allegiance, it will be easy further to illustrate my meaning. Nearly a century before the establishment of the Town's College—now the University of Edinburgh—some earnest men, amongst whom must be mentioned Gilbert Primrose, ancestor of "the lonely ploughman," as it is at present the fashion to term Lord Rosebery, induced the City Fathers to grant them, in 1505, a "seal of cause" calling into existence the "Incorporation of Barber Surgeons." This deed, ratified in due course by James IV, undoubtedly created a living school of medicine, and in its terms, indeed, explicitly enjoined teaching. Here, for more than two hundred years, the only real medical teaching in Edinburgh was carried on, for not until 1722 did the University seriously begin the task of medical education. It is of interest to observe how this duty was undertaken. In that year the Town Council appointed "the first Monro," then Professor in the Incorporation of Surgeons, as Professor of Anatomy in the University. In this transaction we have, as it were, an epitome of the progress of teaching in Edinburgh. Occasionally the Town Council, usually far-sighted, were led astray. It so happened that a worthy ancestor of mine was one of the pioneers in surgical teaching in the city. The surgical corporation in 1776 and 1777, after he had for about ten years been engaged in teaching surgery, attempted to

[1] Lucretius, *De verum natura*, ii, 78.

obtain the creation of a Chair of Surgery in the University, but the great influence of "the second Monro" prevented this movement from being carried out. Monro induced the Town Council to appoint him professor of anatomy and surgery; gave a few perfunctory lectures on the latter subject to ease his conscience; thus the Chair of Surgery was not instituted till 1831—two generations later! In this way did the glamour of a great personality retard the progress of learning, and, to use a common figure of speech, put a spoke in the wheels of time. This was, fortunately, an uncommon occurrence. The more usual course of events has been that some man, full of enthusiasm for a subject, undertook to teach it, proved its usefulness as a factor in medical education, and by his success led the University authorities to found a chair or a lectureship for the subject. In a word, the University has been educated and guided to a great extent by the teachers outside her walls.

Now, it has to be remembered that for many years the teaching carried on outside the walls of the University, both in Edinburgh and Glasgow, was absolutely unrecognised by the Universities of these cities. In the days of "the third Monro," anyone who desired to learn anatomy found it necessary to study the subject beyond the walls, yet he must, forsooth, attend the prelections of the professor—or rather, if all tales are true, of the professor's grandfather—and pay fees twice over. The same appears to have been the sad fate of the Glasgow undergraduate, for it is obvious that, during the second quarter of last century, the Andersonian School had a larger number of anatomical students than the University, and assuredly the lectures given there were not qualifying for the degrees of the University. So absurd did this unjust restriction become, that in Edinburgh a strong agitation began and culminated successfully in the decision of the Town Council, then patrons of the University, to issue statutes in 1840 allowing undergraduates to take a proportion of their classes outside. These statutes were strongly opposed by the professorial oligarchy, and an appeal to Cæsar was only settled in favour of freedom by the House of Lords in 1847. This protracted litigation, tedious as it may seem, was "but as yesterday when it is past" as compared with the "thirty years' war," if you will let me call it so, between the University and the Faculty of Physicians and Surgeons in this city, arising out of the rights to practise of their graduates and licentiates. This, however, by way of parenthesis.

Fortunately, we live in happier times. The decision of the House of Lords was followed by the Universities Act of 1858, by which undergraduates were allowed to take four of their classes in the extra-mural school, and this has been wisely extended by the Ordinances of the Universities Commission to half of the entire curriculum. The university authorities, the medical corporations, and the body of teachers realise that, for the furtherance of scientific progress, as well as for the advance of professional education, united efforts are essential. Jealous animosity has given place to generous emulation, and the teachers of to-day, whether within or without the walls of the universities, vie with each other in friendly rivalry.

For years it seemed to some of us in the East that it would tend to the advance of medical education if the different teachers in the extra-mural school were in some way organised. Various proposals with this end in view were carefully discussed, and at last, six years ago, we adopted an easily working scheme. This arrangement, while preserving perfect internal autonomy, vested the external management of the school in a Governing Board on which each of the Royal Colleges and the body of lecturers are equally represented. Would it be considered an unwarrantable piece of intrusion on my part to express the hope that, for the advancement of medical education, the different elements of the extra-mural school in this great city of the West will follow our example? We have already reaped a rich harvest from the seed which we have sown, in many ways, and only the other day we found the utility of our organisation when we were in some anxiety as to the benefits offered by Mr. Carnegie's munificent gift.

Of the advantages arising from a generous rivalry there can be no question. Every successful teacher has his own special gifts—these will naturally appeal to particular types of pupils, and herein, it seems to me, lies one valuable result. But, further, in the existence of free competition, there is the possibility of training teachers. It may be true, as some would tell us, that the teacher, like the poet, is born, not made. Even granting this, he must yet be discovered and proved; it is accordingly well that he should go through a period of practical education in the art of teaching before he is called to occupy such a prominent and important post as a chair in any university. On the principle of the survival of the fittest, the useless teacher is soon eliminated.

Having in some measure given a sketch of the origin of those opportunities which we now enjoy, our attention must

be given to the manner in which we may show ourselves worthy of the labours of those who have gone before us, by making the best use of the freedom which we owe to their exertions. In considering this branch of the subject, we shall find it presents several phases. Many-sided though it be, however, its main aspects are twofold—it may be regarded from the point of view of the teacher and also from that of the student.

On us who have the honour of holding responsible positions in medical education, it is incumbent to define the limits by which our teaching is to be bounded. The general scope of each branch of study is, as you well know, laid down with tolerable exactness in the regulations and statutes of the General Council, the Universities, and the Corporations. But, besides the limits prescribed by the enactments of the authorities charged with the duty of watching over the education and examination of medical aspirants, we have to consider the nature and extent of those subjects which we teach. In dealing with the natural sciences—and much of the training of medical students falls under this head—we must ever bear in mind that a portion of current belief, larger or smaller according to circumstances, is really matter of opinion. In no previous age, perhaps, has this been more true than in our own. Enormous strides have been made in almost every department of natural science, many of them led up to by induction or even intuition. On all sides we hear of the "fairyland of knowledge," the "poetry of science," and other high sounding phrases, whatever they may import. Now, my meaning is simply this—How far are we justified in our teaching in introducing such matters of opinion?

About a quarter of a century ago my old master, Virchow, shook the learned world by his famous speech on the "Freedom of Science." The keynote of that address was the necessity of restraint in what is taught by those accredited to give instruction. The thesis was illustrated by examples culled from many fields of scientific activity, and perhaps, if you will allow me a short quotation, the sum of the matter is to be found in the following paragraph:—[1]

"From the repeated experience of the past we ought to take a signal warning, lest we should unnecessarily impose on ourselves the obligation, or succumb to the temptation, to draw conclusions at a time when we are not justified in so doing. Believe me, gentlemen, herein lies the great difficulty

[1] Virchow, *The Freedom of Science in the Modern State*, p. 63.

for every student of nature who addresses the world at large. Whoever speaks or writes for the public is bound, in my opinion, to examine with twofold exactness how much of that which he knows and says is objectively true. He is bound to take the greatest possible care that all the merely inductive generalizations which he makes, all his extended conclusions according to the laws of analogy—however obvious they may seem—be printed in smaller type under the text, and that in the text itself he put nothing but what is really objective truth."

"Gentlemen, I think we should be abusing our power, we should be imperilling our power, unless in our teaching we restrict ourselves to this perfectly legitimate, this perfectly safe and unassailable domain. From this domain we may make incursions into the field of problems, and I am sure that every venture of that kind will then find all needful security and support."

This must not be taken to mean that the realm of the imagination is to be altogether suppressed—far from it. It is the bounden duty of each and all of us to exercise those gifts of imagination with which we have been endowed, and in our country, where Celtic fire is tempered by Saxon purpose, it is not likely that any wild flights of fancy will lead us far astray. Even Virchow in his pleading allows a place for the imagination. Speaking of the tendency towards the objective in modern science, he remarks:—[1]

"Probably, too, the subjective current will still exist beside it. Then also, probably many an individual will be dreaming his fair dreams. The province of objective facts in Medicine, large as it has become, has still left so many borderlands unoccupied, that abundant opportunities are daily offered for anyone who pleases to speculate."

It is, indeed, very unsafe, even in such an objective age as our own, to interfere with perfect freedom in matters of opinion. There can be no doubt that the belief of to-day often becomes the laughing-stock of to-morrow, but he would truly be unwise who acted habitually upon such a principle. Quite lately we have found the danger of belittling even the traditions and legends of ancient times. How few of us would have pictured in our wildest dreams the slightest foundation for the tale of Minos and the Cretan Labyrinth, yet the dawn of this twentieth century has seen, as the result of recent excavations, a real basis for that story, glowing with the

[1] Virchow, *The Freedom of Science in the Modern State*, p. 48.

poetic fancy of the Greek mind, which we all learned in our boyhood.

But when we would in every way encourage the play of the imagination, we must bear in mind the wise caution of Virchow, and only teach as fact what has been proved. We can, no doubt, extend the interest of our subject by the exercise of some imagination, and even stimulate inquiry by bringing forward matters of speculation. It must, nevertheless, be our primary duty as teachers chiefly to employ shafts from the quiver of truth, *i.e.*, of assured fact; in other words, to exercise a wise restraint in our utterance. Speaking for myself, there has always been much help in those lines of the greatest of the poets of Germany, himself no mean scientist:—[1]

"So ist's mit aller Bildung auch beschaffen:
Vergebens werden ungebundne Geister
Nach der Vollendung reiner Höhe streben.

"Wer Grosses will, muss sich zusammen raffen:
In der Beschränkung zeigt sich erst der Meister,
Und das Gesetz nur kann uns Freiheit geben."

It is, indeed, all important for us in all our efforts to bring those for whom we are responsible face to face with truth itself. Sometimes truth is self-evident, and we may then say with an ancient writer[2]—"Felix, quem veritas per se ipsam docet, non per figuras et voces transeuntes, sed sicuti se habet." This, in the nature of things, cannot always be so, and we have, in the words of a still older author,[3] to "prove all things." In the realm of natural science—and much of our medical education, as we have seen, comes within this domain—absolute certainty does not reign with such uniformity of law as in the region of physical science. My late friend and teacher, Professor Tait, whom we have recently lost and shall always mourn, used to point out to me that it was doubtful whether the study of living beings could ever really merit the term "science;" he used to contend that from such studies no Kepler had as yet arisen, and probably never could arise; and he fearlessly asserted that, in the very nature of things, a Newton in connection with vital phenomena was out of the question. None of us will probably care to join issue with such a contention.

[1] Goethe, *Gedichte-Natur und Kunst.*
[2] *De Imitatione Christi*, lib. i, cap. 3.
[3] 1 Thessalonians, v, 21.

It was one of the great lessons which we learned from Lord Lister, first in Glasgow and later in Edinburgh, to face every problem honestly, and if a wrong decision had been reached to confess it candidly. His example has been to me throughout my teaching existence one of the most powerful incentives to rational scepticism in scientific inquiry and frank avowal of error when faulty conclusions are arrived at. While attempting, therefore, in every way only to teach what is ascertained fact, it is part of our duty to encourage you in the individual quest after truth. As Jowett says, in his contribution to that work which created such a sensation in theological circles in the middle of last century, "Doubt comes in at the window when Inquiry is denied at the door."[1]

In approaching the other aspect of this portion of our subject—the last part of this address—let me ask you to regard my remarks as suggestions coming from an elder brother. You may, indeed, reply that advice from anyone standing in that relation is apt to be treated with but scant respect. But if any of you who have listened to me thus far should be inclined to resent brotherly admonition, let me entreat him to believe that there will be no attempt to "improve the occasion," as it is termed by certain religious circles.

Those of you who have already passed within the gateway of scientific study need no words of mine lauding hard, honest work. But to those who are only as yet on the threshold, it may be allowed me to sing its praises. There is a happiness in exertion of any kind, even when taken only for its own sake. This is as true of the intellectual as of the physical side of our nature; it applies with equal force to the cultivation of mental powers as of bodily activities. But the pleasure becomes much exalted when we know that the process of education has some definite end in view, when by thought, and word, and deed we are striving to fit ourselves for some part in life. We must remember where this *rôle* is to be played—a thought which arises very naturally on this St. Luke's Day. The stage is that of mankind; the issues of the drama are life and death. On the walls of your wonderful Exhibition hangs a classical canvas by a great modern painter, illustrating one of those legends which reveal the soul of a people—the struggle of Herakles with Death for the life of Alcestis. It requires no great effort of imagination to realise the agony of Admetus while the event of the contest hung in the balance,

[1] Jowett, *Essays and Reviews*, p. 373.

the gratitude of him and his wife when restored to each other, or their veneration for the large-hearted hero of the story. In our fight with the grim enemy we are, in the same way, watched with the eye of anxious solicitude, and the results of our struggle when successful are received with thankful hearts. It seems to me that we of the healing art are somewhat too diffident in this respect; we do not fully realise the affection by which we are surrounded. The great point to be kept ever in view is simply this, that to be able to take our place in the work of the world with success we must take pains to train ourselves. "The surest way," says Cicero,[1] "of seeming what we are is to be what we wish to be thought."

Work and wait—in these simple words lies a world of meaning. Some years ago, my friend, the late learned professor of medicine in your University, delivered an eloquent address[2] upon the text—"Tout vient à point à qui sait attendre." This address may confidently be recommended to you as containing most excellent advice in finished language—advice not to sit with folded hands waiting, like the immortal Macawber, for something to turn up, but to utilise every moment of waiting in self-education. This leads me to observe that the value of high ideals to all of us cannot be overestimated. As we grow older, our illusions tend to drop away one by one, but our ideals cannot thus be torn from us. Let us, therefore, keep before us the ambition of worth rather than fame, of integrity rather than success. It may be, it must be, that we shall all fall short of our ideal, but it is still there guiding us like a beacon through the shifting seas of life.

But while you strive with your whole strength to seize every opportunity for acquiring the knowledge which is your first object, it has not to be overlooked that there are other aims to be borne in mind. The bow cannot always be kept stretched, it must be unstrung at times; you will be in the right if you remind me of the outcome of "all work and no play." You must have hours of relaxation. Some of these every day we hope you will spend in physical exertion. Without exercise the body must suffer, and when the body is impaired the mind must be affected. If our northern climate in winter is not propitious for out of doors exertion, its place may be taken by efficient substitutes. By all means seek opportunity for exercise in the gymnasium.

But there will be some time left over after routine work

[1] *Cicero de Officiis*, translated by G. B. Gardiner, p. 100.
[2] Gairdner, *Lancet*, 1897, vol. ii, p. 299.

and necessary exercise. How are you to use it? Whatever you do, see that you do not loaf. For all of us, alas, the sands of time run but too swiftly in the glass. We cannot afford to lose any golden hours. Take up some hobby. Make some special study. Remember that the truest mental recreation lies in change of occupation. Read the poets—of the better sort. From Chaucer to Kipling you will find thoughts that are good and true. Read the novelist—also of the highest class. In their pages you will find refreshment for your minds. Study the histories of great races and the lives of great men—you will there find pictures of stirring deeds, portraits of noble men, and remember—

"We needs must love the highest when we see it."[1]

You will perceive that my purpose is to beg you with such strength as is in me to develop all the powers with which you have been endowed, so as to become complete men, as recommended by Plato in the *Republic*.[2] There are times, moreover, when you will find the truest solace in looking on the face of nature. Apart from the scientific interest derived from the study of natural objects, this beautiful world pours balm upon wearied spirits. Earth and sea and sky have a healing influence upon the jaded mind. There is not one of us who is not at times worn with the fight against the ills of life to which we have devoted ourselves, and heartily inclined to endorse the feeling depicted by the late Laureate—

"I found Him in the shining of the stars,
I mark'd Him in the flowering of His fields,
But in His ways with men I find Him not."[3]

And, now, to bring these somewhat rambling remarks to a conclusion, you will allow me to wish this College in the new century a continuation and an extension of the usefulness, and therefore success, which have followed her career during the hundred years of her existence. No better wish could be expressed, and you will believe me that it is as sincere as it is hearty. Inasmuch as the College is intimately bound up with the ancient University on the one hand, and with the venerable Faculty of Physicians and Surgeons on the other, it follows that their utility and prosperity must go hand in hand. The

[1] Tennyson, "Guinevere."
[2] *The Dialogues of Plato*, translated by B. Jowett, vol. ii, book 3.
[3] Tennyson, "The Passing of Arthur."

old fable of the family likened unto a faggot is here singularly applicable, and the well-wishers of the Glasgow Medical School, amongst whom you may count me as one of the most warm, cherish the fond hope that each branch of that great body may enjoy more and more the sunshine of prosperity as the reward of endeavour, may produce greater and greater results for the welfare of mankind, and may in still larger degree attract earnest students from every quarter, so that she may be able to say[1]:—"Bring my sons from far, and my daughters from the ends of the earth."

[1] Isaiah, xliii, 6.

GLASGOW: PRINTED BY ALEX. MACDOUGALL.