Private

6

[*Printed for the convenience of the College Committee, and of the other Patrons of the University.*]

Copy of a LETTER to GEORGE AITCHISON, *Esq. College Bailie, containing some Remarks on a Communication from the Senatus Academicus to the Patrons of the University of Edinburgh.*

SIR, 80, GEORGE STREET, 29*th October* 1831.

I BEG leave to acknowledge the receipt of a copy of a Communication from the Senatus Academicus, to the Right Honourable the Lord Provost, Magistrates, and Town-Council of Edinburgh, relative to the late institution by the Crown of Professorships of General Pathology and of Surgery in the University; accompanied with a request, on the part of the College Committee, that I would, for their information, transmit any remarks which the perusal of it might suggest to me, with regard to the Professorship of Pathology in particular. I hope the Gentlemen composing the College Committee will do me the justice to believe, that I feel every inclination to comply with their request; but after the repeated perusal and most careful consideration of that Communication, I must confess that I find myself quite incompetent to give any opinion respecting several of the topics which it embraces. Whether the Government acted properly or improperly in issuing the late Commissions without consulting the Senatus Academicus, and without throwing the new Medical Chairs open for

competition; whether or not the proceedings of Government in these respects are very generally condemned by the Medical Profession; whether the Crown has exceeded its powers in adding the two new Professorships to the Faculty of Medicine; and whether the Town-Council has acted with suitable deference to the Senatus, in its late communication to Government respecting these Professorships,—are questions on which I do not feel called upon to offer any opinion, though the Senatus, in their Communication, have assumed to themselves the right to judge of and determine them, in terms which it is impossible for me to regard as altogether becoming in the Body from which they have proceeded, or as respectful towards those to whom they have been addressed.

But when the Senatus Academicus assert, that "the Honourable Patrons, in exercising their patronage in the University, have invariably allowed a sufficient interval to elapse between the foundation of a new Chair or a vacancy in an existing one, and the election of a Professor to fill it," they seem to have forgotten the circumstances under which several of the members composing the Medical Faculty received either their present or former commissions in the University. These appointments, and others which might easily be adduced, are sufficient to prove, that, however proper the motives may have been, which have at different periods influenced the Honourable Patrons in the selection of Professors, they have not been guided by any invariable principle of the nature of that ascribed to them by the Senatus Academicus.

I think it due, likewise, to the two Administrations from which I have had the honour to receive Commissions as a Professor in the University, to state, that, in creating these professorships without consulting the Town-Council or the Senatus, they have not deviated from the practice pursued on similar occasions by other Administrations. I was informed by the late Professor DALZEL, in 1806, that no reference to the Town-Council or the Senatus was made by Lord LOUGHBOROUGH, when he procured for Dr HUGH BLAIR a commission to be Regius Professor of Rhetoric, nor by the late Lord MELVILLE, when Dr ROBERT BLAIR received a commission to be Regius Professor of Astronomy; and the records of the University will shew, whether any remonstrances similar to those of which I have unhappily been twice the subject, were made by the Senatus Academicus upon these occasions. It would be easy, were it necessary, to adduce, from the history of other Universities in Scotland, additional examples of the creation of Professorships by the Crown, without any previous reference being made to the existing professors.

There are other points in the Communication of the Senatus upon which I do not feel myself called on to express any opinion; as, whether the Senatus is degraded by any regulations respecting the Course of study required of Candidates for Medical Degrees proceeding from without its own walls; whether the disagreement between the Town Council and the Senatus, which led to the late long and expensive litigation between these two Bodies, was, as the Senatus assert, only on "a point of comparatively little im-

portance; or whether the effect of the decision of the Court" of Session resulting out of that litigation be fully and properly expressed in saying, that it declared the Honourable Patrons "to be a constituent part of the University." The frequent reference of the Senatus, however, to the late decision of the Court of Session, makes it necessary for me to remark, what the Senatus seem entirely to have overlooked, that that decision related wholly to the respective rights of the Town-Council and the Senatus, and in no degree touched on the respective powers of the Crown and the Town-Council. The object of the Senatus in that litiga tion, was to shew that there is something so sacred in-the character of the Medical Faculty that no foot must enter that sanctuary unless by their express authority and permission; something so delicate in the construction of the Medical Curriculum, that no ruder hands than their own must attempt to repair or improve it. The decision of the Court found, "That the Town-Council have right of making regulations or statutes for the College of King James, and *that* in respect to the studies to be pursued in the College, and course of study for obtaining degrees, as well as in other respects; and that the Principal and Professors of the said College have not right to make regulations, statutes, or laws, for the College, in contradiction to the Town-Council, or which may not be rescinded or altered by the Town-Council."

Before leaving this subject, I may be allowed also to remark, that the attempt on the part of the Senatus to excite a jealousy in the minds of the Town-Council, with re-

gard to the interference of the Crown in the affairs of the University, and thus to involve the Honourable Patrons in a frivolous and vexatious dispute with the Crown, and their zeal, on the present occasion, to maintain the rights of the Town-Council against supposed encroachments on the part of the Crown, form a striking contrast with the application made by the Senatus to Government in 1824, when a dispute arose between them and their Patrons, in which they prayed that his Majesty would be graciously pleased to exercise his Majesty's prerogative of Royal Visitation, "for ascertaining and declaring the rights, powers, and privileges and immunities of the Senatus Academicus, in whatever relates to the interior discipline of the College, and more especially in the regulation of the scientific and literary studies of candidates for those academical honours and degrees which the Senatus Academicus are solely authorized by the constitution of the University to dispense and confer;"—as well as with the anxiety the Senatus evinced in their litigation with their Honourable Patrons, to exalt the authority of the Crown, in all matters relative to the University, over that of the Town-Council. At that time, certainly, the Senatus cannot have considered it to be so doubtful a point as they seem at present to regard it, whether, "after a University has been constituted by Act of Parliament, and received all the powers and privileges of a free College, the Crown has the power of subsequently interfering in its internal management in the summary way practised on the present occasion."

I feel extremely reluctant to enter upon a controversial

discussion with my colleagues, as to the comparative merits of the mode of teaching General Pathology hitherto pursued in this and in other Universities; because, being well assured that, in virtue of my commission, I must be called on to co-operate with them in conducting the education and examination of candidates for medical degrees, I am unwilling to contribute in any degree to kindle feelings of personal animosity, which it may be easy to excite, but difficult to subdue. I cannot, however, admit the correctness of the assertion contained in the Communication of the Senatus, that the institution of a distinct chair of Pathology in this University is "inexpedient and unnecessary," because "that subject is already fully and effectually taught," so far as this assertion is applied to the branch of medical science committed to my charge, viz. General Pathology, or the general doctrines applicable to the structural and functional derangements of the human body. The only class in which General Pathology is professed to be taught systematically in the University, is that of the Theory or Institutions of Medicine. Besides Pathology, this course comprehends Physiology and Therapeutics; and I confidently affirm, that these three branches of medical science are each of them of so great extent and importance, as to render it utterly impossible for any Professor, however high his talents, or however great his industry, to give a sufficient view of them all, or, indeed, I believe I may say, of more than one of them, in an academical course of the ordinary duration. Nor can I admit that the deficiencies which must necessarily exist in the view of General Pathology given in the course of the Institutions of Medicine,—in consequence of the

small portion of time that can be devoted to it by the Professor of that branch,—can possibly be compensated for, by any exertions on the part of the other Professors of Medicine. There can be no doubt that these professors, in lecturing on medical subjects, must necessarily have occasion to make frequent allusions to the doctrines of General Pathology; but, from the extent of the branches of medical science confided to each of them, it is obvious that they must rather allude to these doctrines in a cursory way, as matters already known to their students, than treat of them in an elementary, full and systematic manner. These endeavours on the part of each Professor to supply, as far as lies within his power, a deficiency in the system of medical education pursued in this University, however meritorious they may be in themselves, afford, it is conceived, rather a proof of the expediency of General Pathology being fully taught by a separate Professor, than an argument against the institution of a Chair for that purpose. Such, I think, is the view which any of my colleagues would be disposed to take, were it proposed to abolish his Class, or to exclude it from the Medical Curriculum, on the ground that the subjects which it is his peculiar business to teach, are incidentally touched upon by several of his brethren in the course of their prelections.

For example, if the Professor of Medical Jurisprudence, —a branch of medical education of the greatest importance, but a distinct professorship for teaching which, I am persuaded, from reasons which it would be easy to assign, were

it required, would never have been introduced into the University without the exercise of the Royal Prerogative,—if that gentleman in stating to the Royal Commissioners the claims of his professorship to be put on a level, in regard to privileges, with the other medical professorships in the University, had had occasion to reply to the objection, that 'the chief topics taught by the Professor of Medical Jurisprudence are appropriated by him through a species of encroachment on the property of his colleagues," may it not be supposed that he would have replied to that objection in terms somewhat similar to the following:—" It has been alleged, that the present Faculty Professors may teach Medical Jurisprudence by each taking to himself any portion that can be construed as bearing a reference to the subject of his professorship. That this is possible in one sense, I admit; the science may be partitioned: there is hardly a single subject of lecture in the present faculty, which might not be partitioned and taught in like manner. But whether it is possible, in another sense, the Right Honourable Commissioners will easily judge when I inform them, that by the common consent of every dispassionate man in the profession, the Professorships of the " Practice of Physic, Surgery, Chemistry and Materia Medica," (he might, had he chosen it, have added that of the Theory of Medicine also) " are already overloaded with matter far beyond the compass of the University Course." In conclusion he might have said, that many of the topics comprehended under Medical Jurisprudence and Medical Police " are really quite peculiar, and the greater number of the

rest common to the Professors of the Faculty of Medicine, only in name, and not in substance."

If there be any foundation for observations such as those which I have supposed might have been made by the Professor of Medical Jurisprudence so lately as 1826, it must be obvious to the College Committee, that these observations are, in every respect, applicable to the chair of General Pathology, and that the establishment of a new professorship for teaching this branch, which shall lighten the members of the Medical Faculty of a portion of the burden by which they are oppressed, must prove of material advantage to them, by enabling each of them individually to confine his attention to, and to complete his view of, that department of medical science which it is more peculiarly his province to teach.

But that the justness of the views I have taken respecting the extent and importance of Physiology, Pathology and Therapeutics, as distinct branches of medical education, may not rest on my opinion alone, I think it right to state, for the information of the College Committee, that the late Dr Cullen, who taught this department of medicine in the University during a period of eight years, was aware, so far back as the year 1772, of the impossibility of giving a sufficient view of all these branches in a course of six months' duration. "I have," he says in a MS. lecture written in that year, "been long persuaded that the time allotted for the Course of the Institutions is by a great deal too short, and I have never been able to finish a course

without extending the time of it beyond the usual limits; and even then I omitted some things I wished to have mentioned, and abridged others that I willingly would have enlarged." "The late celebrated Dr BOERHAAVE," he adds, "bestowed six months upon the Physiology, and hardly two upon the Pathology and Therapeutics; but for my part I am persuaded, that in Institutions that are a proper introduction to practice, the Pathology and Therapeutics should have a considerable share of our time. I must say this plan is not easily executed, the Physiology being a very extensive subject."

The boundaries of each of the departments of medical science included under the head of the Institutions have been progressively extended since the time of Dr CULLEN, by a great number of new and interesting discoveries relative to the functions of the animal economy, the derangements of these functions, and the means by which these derangements may be best remedied; and the difficulty of teaching all of them in one course of lectures must necessarily have increased in proportion. In many Universities, accordingly, as in those of Paris, Vienna, Bologna, Pavia, Rome, &c. there is now a separate professor appointed to teach Physiology; whilst in others, as in those of Berlin, Heidelberg, &c., the Professor of Anatomy gives a full and separate course of Physiology during the summer *semestre* or half-year. I may mention also, that Physiology has been taught in Edinburgh as a separate branch of study in courses of six months' duration, by two private lecturers,

Mr John Allen, now Master of Dulwich College, and the late Dr John Gordon; and each of these courses, it is well known, was productive of great advantage to the students, and contributed in no small degree to maintain and extend the reputation of the Medical School of Edinburgh.

In many foreign Universities, separate professorships also of General Pathology, or of General Pathology and General Therapeutics, have been established; whilst in others, the Professor of the Practice of Physic, or Special Pathology, as this branch of medical education is termed in some of the Continental Universities, and Special Therapeutics in others,—delivers a separate course of lectures upon General Pathology.

The Senatus have in their Communication "particularly desired to turn the attention of the Honourable Patrons, to the *groundlessness* of the chief reason assigned for founding a distinct Chair of Pathology, viz. that it exists in the foreign Universities, more particularly in those of France." The Senatus do not state by whom this has been assigned as the chief reason for founding a distinct chair of General Pathology in the University of Edinburgh, whether by the Government in the preambulary clause of my commission, where I have not been able to find it, or by an irresponsible writer in a newspaper. Nor do the Senatus state the considerations which lead them to pronounce this reason, by whomsoever it may have been assigned, to be groundless, unless we are to regard as such what it scarcely required

one to have "studied in France," to be aware of, that the terms *Pathologie Interne* and *Pathologie Externe*, in the Medical Schools of France, are synonymous with those of Practice of Physic and Practice of Surgery as used in this country; or that the Professorship of General Pathology in the School of Medicine of Paris, is of very recent creation. I shall have little difficulty, however, I believe, in satisfying the College Committee, that if not in the Medical Schools of France, in those of Germany and Italy at least, ample provision has been made for having General Pathology taught in an elementary, full, and systematic manner.

I happen to have in my possession the printed announcements of the courses of lectures delivered at Berlin, during the winter half-year of 1828–29, and at Berlin, Jena, Göttingen, and Heidelberg, during the summer half-year of 1831. In examining these, I find that at Berlin, Professor Bartels lectured on General Pathology four times a-week during the winter session, and that during the summer session, Professor Hufeland lectured on one of the branches of General Pathology named Semeiotics, thrice a-week; Professor Wagner on General Pathology and Therapeutics thrice a-week; Professor Eck on General Pathology and Semeiotics four times a-week; and a private lecturer attached to the University, Dr Becker, lectured on General Pathology four times a-week; that at Jena, Professor Kieser lectured on General Pathology and Therapeutics four times a-week, and a private lecturer, Dr Brehme, on General Semeiotics; that at Göttingen, Professor Conradi lectured on General Pathology and General Therapeutics

four times a-week and Professor MARX on the same subjects five times a-week; and lastly, that at Heidelberg, Professor SEBASTIAN lectured on General Pathology and Therapeutics six times a-week, and on General Pathological Semeiotics thrice a-week; and that besides his two courses, a private lecturer attached to the University, delivered five times a-week a course on General Pathology and Therapeutics.

With regard to the Medical Schools of Italy, again, I find from a short notice of some of these schools written a few years ago in the German language by Dr OPPENHEIM of Hamburg, that at Rome there are separate Professors of Anatomy, of Physiology, and of Pathology and Hygiene, besides two Professors of the Practice of Physic, and a distinct Professor of Clinical Medicine; that at Bologna, Anatomy, Physiology, and Pathology with Hygiene, have each a separate Professor, besides a Professor for Practical and Clinical Medicine; that at Pavia and Padua, a separate course of General Pathology and Therapeutics must be attended by the graduates during the first half of their third year of medical study, Physiology having been attended by them during the *whole* of the preceding year; that at Turin, there are separate Professors of Anatomy, of Physiology, and of the Institutions of Medicine, besides two for the Theory and Practice of Physic; and that at Pisa, there is one Professor for Anatomy and Physiology, another for Pathology and Semeiotics, a third for the Institutions of Medicine and Surgery, and a fourth for Practical and Clinical Medicine.

These, though they be only scattered examples, will serve, it is hoped, as data on which the College Committee may judge of the mode of teaching Physiology and General Pathology pursued in Foreign Universities, and of the great attention given to Pathology in particular in these institutions.

I am not sufficiently well acquainted with the history of the recent institution of a Professorship of General Pathology in the Parisian School of Medicine,—which the Senatus term a most *singular coincidence*, but which I should be disposed to regard as a very natural consequence of Pathology having been, as they justly state, " an object of greater pursuit and higher consideration in that than in any other school in the world,"—to be able to say how far a knowledge of that history might have assisted the English Government, or may still assist the Town-Council of Edinburgh, in judging of the importance of General Pathology as a branch of medical education. But I know that the recommendation to institute that professorship in the Medical School of Paris, proceeded from a Commission appointed by the Minister of Public Instruction, of which no less distinguished a person than Baron CUVIER was President, and a majority of the Members of which were themselves Medical Professors in that School. The Senatus have not mentioned whether " the remonstrances of the Medical Faculty there, and the very general disapprobation of many of the best informed members of the medical profession in Paris," to which they state this appointment has given rise, have proceeded from a disapproval of the parti-

cular individual appointed to that chair, M. Broussais, a gentleman, be it remarked, who, great as his talents and professional experience undoubtedly are, is well known to be the present head of a particular Medical Sect, and to entertain a profound contempt for all medical opinions except his own; or, whether it has arisen from his having been appointed without a *Concours*, or competition by public examination and disputation, the practice now established for the disposal of medical chairs in the Parisian school; or whether they have arisen from its being conceived that this addition to the establishment of Medical Professors already existing in that school, is inexpedient, unnecessary, and burdensome to students. I am disposed, however, to attribute the disapprobation alluded to by the Senatus to one or other, or to both, of the two first of these reasons, rather than to the last; *first*, because, as I have already stated, the majority of the Commission who recommended the institution of the professorship of General Pathology were themselves Medical Professors; and *secondly*, because, in a protest which appears to have been taken by a number of medical gentlemen, against the neglect of the *Concours* on this occasion, I do not find any insinuation against the expediency of establishing such a Professorship in the University of Paris.

Nor am I able to inform the College Committee what considerations induced the Royal Commissioners for visiting the Universities of Scotland, after having stated in their Provisional Report that it was "proposed to recommend the

institution of a Professorship of Pathology distinct from the class of the Theory of Medicine," to withdraw this proposal in the Report ultimately transmitted to Government,—one of the few points, it is believed, in the proceedings of the Royal Commissioners, for whose appointment they so earnestly solicited the Crown, which have had the good fortune to obtain the approbation of the Senatus Academicus. The Senatus seem to believe that the opinion of the Royal Commissioners on this subject was altered by the arguments adduced in the Observations of the Medical and Surgical Professors on the Provisional Report of the Commissioners, in which they stated, that " the proposal to institute a Professorship of Pathology separately from the class of the Theory of Medicine, the Professors cannot but suppose to have originated in misapprehension of the nature of a great part of the medical instruction given in the University, or misunderstanding of the nature of the instruction which would necessarily be given in separate Lectures on Pathology, were such delivered. The changes which are effected by diseases on the different organs of the body, their causes and effects, are demonstrated and explained in the class of *Anatomy;* and the doctrines of Pathology, besides being delivered in a general way in the class of *Theory of Medicine*, form, in fact, the basis of the Lectures in the classes of the *Practice of Medicine* and of *Surgery*, and in many of those in the class of *Midwifery;* and are, besides, continually explained and illustrated in the *Clinical Lectures* on *Medicine* and *Surgery*, and in the dissections at the *Hospital.* The addition of this course appears to the Professors,

therefore, to be both an unnecessary and inexpedient increase of the burdens of the students intending to graduate; and they are confirmed in this opinion, by observing that in the schools of medicine in France, which have been lately re-modelled, and where the subjects of Medical Lectures are, in various instances, more minutely subdivided than in this country, there is no separate class of Pathology, the *Pathologie Interne* corresponding exactly to the class of Practice of Physic, and the *Pathologie Externe*, to the Practice of Surgery."

On the objections to the institution of a separate Professorship of General Pathology, stated in the above extract from the Observations of the Medical Professors on the Provisional Report of the Royal Commissioners, I may be allowed to make two remarks; the *first*, That they shew, even in a stronger light than the present communication to the Town Council, how little title that can have to be regarded as a full view of any science, the materials of which the student is obliged to glean from so wide a surface as the Medical Professors state the teaching of General Pathology to be at present extended over; and the *second*, That it certainly must be acknowledged to be *a most singular coincidence*, that whilst the Medical Professors of the University of Edinburgh were deriving an argument from the practice of the Parisian School against the institution of a separate professorship of General Pathology, the members of that school were engaged in recommending to their government the establishment of such a Professorship; for,

till some better evidence to the contrary is afforded me, than the vague statement in the communication of the Senatus, I must continue to believe that the sentiments of the Medical Faculty of Paris had a due degree of influence on those members of their own Body who represented them in the Commission appointed by the Minister of Public Instruction.

The supposition suggested by the Senatus, relative to the change in the opinion of the Royal Commissioners, I might have adopted more readily, had I not happened to be aware that precisely the same arguments against the institution of a separate Chair of Pathology in the University of Edinburgh, had been submitted to the consideration of these Commissioners, in name and on behalf of the Medical Faculty, in the oral evidence which was received and printed by them before their Provisional Report was prepared.

Nor do I find a more satisfactory explanation of the change in the opinion of the Royal Commissioners, in regard to the importance of Pathology as an extensive and separate branch of medical education, in supposing, with the Senatus, that it proceeded from "a comparison of the arguments contained in the Report of the Medical Professors, with the *sentiments* of many medical men of eminence unconnected with the University;" because, I have reason to believe that the only evidence on this subject received by the Royal Commissioners from individuals not connected with the University, was in favour of the separation of Pathology from

Physiology in the course of medical instruction. In particular, I have the satisfaction to know that Dr DAVIDSON, the present President of the Royal College of Physicians,—whose capacity to form a sound judgment on such a subject will be acknowledged by all who know him,—stated, in the evidence he gave before the Commission, that the task of the Professorship of the Theory of Medicine should be confined to Physiology, as this branch of medical science, from the number and importance of the subjects it comprehends, would give sufficient employment to the undivided attention of one teacher during five or six months, even supposing it to be stationary; and that Pathology would fully occupy a separate course of lectures, in which the teacher should devote as much attention to Morbid Anatomy as may be requisite for the due illustration of the subject.

I have great pleasure, also, in knowing that one at least of the Medical and Surgical Professors, Mr RUSSELL—to whose well known zeal in promoting the study of Clinical Surgery the medical public are indebted for the institution of a professorship for teaching that most useful branch in the University, and for all the benefits which have resulted from it, and whose talents, acquirements, and practical experience as a teacher, entitle his opinions, on all points connected with the improvement of Medical and Surgical education, to the greatest deference,—had occasion to state it to the Royal Commissioners as his opinion, that, so far as he could foresee the influence which the institution of a class of Pathology would have upon the class of Clinical

Surgery, it would be beneficial, since several subjects would in that class be discussed in a scientific manner, most useful for a student to know before he enters the class of Clinical Surgery, and which, if at all taught at present in the University, are there taught in several classes, and only in detached portions.

Had the Senatus mentioned the names of those medical gentlemen of eminence, unconnected with the University, who may have stated it as their opinion to the Royal Commissioners, that Physiology, Pathology, and Therapeutics are branches of Medicine of such an extent only as that they can all be taught in an elementary, full, and proper manner, in one academical course of lectures of the ordinary duration, the College Committee would have been better able to judge, than without this information they can be supposed to be, to what degree of weight or authority the sentiments of these gentlemen were entitled.

In regard to the averment on the part of the Senatus, that the terms of the Commissions of the two new *Regius* Professors do not necessarily imply that the Senatus shall compel attendance on their classes by candidates for medical degrees,—and which, I need not remark, it seems to be the main object of their Communication to the Patrons to prevent,—I beg leave to direct the attention of the College Committee to the following extracts from the "Summons of Declarator, The Right Honourable the Lord Provost, Magistrates and Council of the City of Edinburgh,

against the PRINCIPAL and PROFESSORS of the College of Edinburgh, 28th December 1825."

"That, on the 21st January 1824, the said JAMES HAMILTON *junior*, Professor of Midwifery, presented a petition to the pursuers' predecessors, stating," "That he understood the Commission as a Professor which he had received, dated the 9th of April 1800, and which contained powers to profess the said art, with the same privileges and immunities which the other Professors in the said College do enjoy, or that are known to appertain to a Professor of Midwifery in any other well regulated city or college, conferred also upon him the right and title to belong to the Medical Faculty; *but upon the verbal objection that the Professor of Midwifery is not a Professor of Medicine*, he had been refused admittance as a member of said faculty;" "he therefore prayed the pursuers' predecessors, in order to obviate the said objection, to reconsider the terms of his appointment, as Professor of Midwifery in the College of Edinburgh; and, in the view of entitling him to the undoubted right of being a member of the Medical Faculty, in so far to alter the same as to introduce the words 'OF MEDICINE AND,' so as to make it run 'Professor of Medicine and of Midwifery in this City's College,' and also to grant authority and power to him to examine Candidates, and to do every other thing requisite to the education of Doctors of Medicine, as the same is practised by the other Professors of Medicine in the College of Edinburgh." Pp. 32, 33.

At page 35. of the said Summons, it is farther stated, "That in a minute of Council, dated 7th July 1824, the pursuers' predecessors approved of a Report of their Committee, which" "recommended granting the prayer of Dr HAMILTON's petition under certain conditions, in the same manner as was done in the case of Dr ALEXANDER MONRO *senior*, and his son, when the Professors of Anatomy received new Commissions as Professors of Medicine, in virtue of which alone the Professor of Anatomy is one of the Medical Faculty, as being regularly appointed by competent authority a Professor of Medicine."

Again, the Summons of Declarator, after stating that the Town-Council granted to Dr Hamilton a commission expressed in the terms above stated, goes on to say, p. 37, —"That on the 2d August 1824, this commission was presented by Bailie W. Allan at a meeting of the Senatus Academicus, and Dr Hamilton was received in the ordinary way by the Senatus Academicus, as Professor of Medicine, Midwifery, and the Diseases of Women and Children: That Dr James Hamilton being thus inducted as a professor, under his new commission, had thereby the same rights, privileges, status, and authority as any other Professor of Medicine in the said University; and the class taught by him, in virtue thereof, must be taken and held to be one of the classes of medicine in the said College, and must form part of the regular course of study to be required from those obtaining degrees from the said College, seeing that it is only in virtue of similar appointments and commissions that

any of the Professors of Medicine have any authority to examine candidates in the graduation of doctors of medicine, or that any of the other classes taught by the Professors of Medicine can be required as a part of the course of study to be observed by medical students."

These extracts will, I conceive, sufficiently prove to the College Committee that the terms in which the Commissions of the Professors of General Pathology and of Surgery are expressed, whatever may have been the case "before any compulsory attendance on classes was required for graduation," have, since that change was introduced, been universally considered as implying that the Classes of those Professors who hold such commissions should be added to the Medical Curriculum; and I have reason to know that it was in this belief that these terms were employed by Government in granting the late Commissions.

The Senatus Academicus express great apprehension that the addition of the two new courses to the Medical Curriculum will impose an unnecessary and vexatious additional burden on candidates for medical degrees. I shall readily admit, that, were the candidates to receive no additional information in return for their increased University expenses, they would have some title to complain of such an addition being made to these expenses, as indeed they actually did complain in 1809, first to the Senatus, and afterwards, on the failure of that application, to the Honourable Patrons, when an attempt was made by the Senatus to raise

the graduation Fee; but I cannot allow that they would be entitled to complain, nor, from what I know, from long experience, of the character of medical students, do I think they will be disposed to complain, of additional expense arising out of an extension in the course of Medical Study required of them, if, by such an extension, they shall be in any degree better prepared, at the termination of their academic labours, for the proper performance of the very responsible duties of their profession. To assist the College Committee, however, in judging whether the burdens imposed on candidates for medical degrees in the University of Edinburgh are already so heavy as to render it inexpedient to impose more, I have taken the liberty to annex to these remarks, a Comparative Statement of the Education required of Candidates for the Degree of Doctor of Medicine by the University of Edinburgh, and for the Diploma of Surgeon by the Royal College of Surgeons, as they are to be found in the last printed regulations of these two Bodies.

From that statement, the Committee will perceive that the education required of candidates for the diploma of surgeon by the Royal College of Surgeons, is more extensive than that required of candidates for the degree of doctor of medicine by the University. The period of study required by these two Bodies must be considered as nearly equal, or, if there be any difference, a longer period is required by the College of Surgeons than by the University; as in all cases the candidate for their diploma must have prosecuted his medical studies at a medical school for four

winter sessions, which amounts to twenty-four months, or for three winter and three summer sessions, which amounts to twenty-seven months; whereas, in certain circumstances, the candidate for the degree of Doctor of Medicine is only required to attend lectures during three *anni medici*, which may be accomplished in three winter sessions, or eighteen months.

The Curriculum of Medical studies for the University degree requires attendance on lectures on Ten different subjects, and on Ten courses of lectures, while that for the Surgeon's diploma requires attendance on lectures on Twelve subjects, and on Fourteen courses; so that the latter embraces two more subjects, and includes four more courses of lectures than that for the degree of Doctor of Medicine; and besides, the candidate for the Surgical diploma is obliged to attend an hospital for eighteen months, whereas the candidate for a Medical degree is required to attend an hospital only twelve months.

The Preliminary or Literary qualifications required of the candidate for the Medical Degree are comprised in a knowledge of the Latin language; while, in addition to this, the candidate for the Surgical Diploma must have received instruction in the elements of Mathematics, and have attended a course of lectures upon Mechanical Philosophy. To this statement I shall only add, that the uniform experience of the College of Surgeons has sufficiently shown, that so far from the sucessive extensions of its course of

study, which have taken place during the last thirty years, having occasioned a diminution in the numbers of those applying for diplomas, they have gone on steadily and progressively increasing: and it appears, from what may be considered as a demi-official statement on the part of the Medical Faculty of the University,—viz. some observation subjoined to a List (inserted into the Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal) of the Graduates for the year 1830, the first year after the New Regulations of the University, promulgated in 1825, had come into operation,—that the experience of the University in this matter is not opposed to that of the College of Surgeons; for it is there stated, that "It appears now demonstrated that the changes in the Regulations *have not been carried too far.* The number of graduates of this year, as was expected, is somewhat less than the average of the last five years; but it is *precisely the same* as the average for the five years ending with 1825, and is *fifteen more* than the average of the five years ending with 1820; so that the University has attained the object it had in view, viz. to raise the qualifications of its medical graduates, without diminishing their number."

The Senatus state, indeed, that the course of study prescribed to candidates for a medical degree has always been so framed, as purposely to leave time and opportunity for the acquisition of much information from lectures, hospitals, &c., unconnected with the University. The Honourable Patrons cannot fail to be highly pleased with this liberality on the part of the Senatus towards the Private

Teachers without their walls, a liberality, however, of which, I am afraid, that respectable class of individuals are not altogether aware of the extent to which they have experienced the advantage, and of which I suspect they, consequently, scarcely entertain a due sense. The private lecturers were indeed disposed to acknowledge, in 1825, that a liberal feeling towards them had found its way into the Senatus Academicus, from its being rumoured abroad that a committee appointed to suggest such alterations on the *Statuta* as might appear expedient, had actually recommended to the Senatus, that, in extending the course of medical study to four winter sessions, they should admit attendance on the lectures of private teachers, who were members of the Colleges of Physic and Surgery, during one of these sessions, as equivalent to attendance at an University. But this happy prospect was soon closed upon them; for, when the *Statuta* appeared before the public in an official form, it was found that that part of the committee's proposals which related to private lecturers had been withdrawn.

I cannot but regret, however, that the intention on the part of the Senatus, of leaving time for Students to attend the lectures of Private Teachers, should not be distinctly expressed in the *Statuta* themselves, so that Students might be duly warned of the wishes of the Senatus in this respect. To prescribe a certain number of University classes to be attended by candidates for Degrees, and to leave them to divine that the Senatus expect them to attend other classes

and courses of lectures in or out of the University, is perhaps too much like saying to them, that the industrious may attend as many additional classes as they please, but the idle need not trouble themselves with any more than have been prescribed. I may observe, however, that the College of Surgeons do not seem to conceive, that even their more extended course of education should preclude candidates for their diploma from attending other classes; for, in their Regulations, it is stated, that, "besides the courses of lectures on the different branches of Medicine required by the College, they strongly recommend to students to avail themselves of the opportunities they may possess of attending lectures on Botany, Natural History, Comparative Anatomy, and Pathological Anatomy."

The Senatus have stated, that "a *great* majority of the members of the Senatus have thought it their duty to protest against the appointments of Dr THOMSON and Mr TURNER conveying any privilege different from those formerly granted by the Crown, and especially against their being held to regulate in any manner the course of study of candidates for the doctorship." At the time of the induction of Mr TURNER and myself, the Senatus Academicus consisted of twenty-seven members, eleven of whom only have as yet joined in that protest.

With regard to the suggestion of allowing the Chair of General Pathology to *feel its way*, as the Senatus Academicus express it, for some time with the Students and the

Public, before being included in the curriculum of compulsory study, my knowledge of some of the circumstances connected with the history of the introduction of the Midwifery class into the course of medical study required of graduates, gives me, I confess, a peculiar disrelish for this proposal, novel and ingenious as it must be admitted to be. The Chair of Midwifery was established in the University in 1756, and after it had felt its way for sixty years, the present Professor, who had then held it for fifteen years, applied to the Senatus Academicus to introduce it into the Faculty of Medicine. The Senatus, however, did not grant the prayer of his petition; and it was not till this Chair had felt its way for eight or nine years longer, nor till the Honourable Patrons had intimated to the Senatus their approval of the proposal of the Professor of Midwifery, that the Senatus were induced to express their intention of carrying that proposal into execution. The dispute between the Town-Council and the Senatus, which terminated in the Action of Declarator, arose, as is well known, from the Senatus insisting that this unfortunate Chair should *feel its way* for three years longer, while the Patrons desired that it should immediately be placed in what all then acknowledged to be its appropriate situation.

In order to enable the College Committee to understand fully the grounds upon which I applied to his Majesty's Government for the commission I have now the honour to hold, I beg leave to subjoin a copy of the Memorial, which I addressed to the Right Honourable Lord MELBOURNE,

Secretary of State for the Home Department;—on a deliberate consideration of which his Lordship was pleased to recommend to his Majesty to *institute* a Professorship of General Pathology in the University of Edinburgh, and to honour me with a Commission to teach it.

For the opposition that has been offered on the part of the Senatus Academicus to the two new professorships of General Pathology and of Surgery, I was by no means unprepared. The late Professor STEWART has observed, that "the Academical Establishments in some parts of Europe are not without their use to the historian of the human mind. Immovably moored to the same station by the strength of their cables and the weight of their anchors, they enable him to measure the rapidity of the current by which the rest of the world are borne along." I have had too frequent occasion in the course of a life, a considerable portion of which has been devoted to the business of teaching Medicine, to notice the unfortunate tendency in our Academical Institutions to remain stationary, which has been so happily described by Mr STEWART, to feel any great degree of disappointment or mortification at a resistance being made to my humble endeavours to promote the improvement of Medical education at this University. Indeed, in a short pamphlet which I took the liberty to submit to the consideration of the Patrons and Professors of the University in 1826, for the purpose of drawing their attention to the advantages which might result to the Medical School from the institution of separate professorships of

Surgery and of Clinical Medicine, I ventured to make the following prediction:

"That a proposal for adding two new Professors to the Senatus Academicus, will be approved of by all those who have already obtained admission into that Body, it would be too much to expect. The resistance which has been already so frequently made to the introduction of Teachers of the different branches of Surgery into the University, even when these attempts proceeded from, or were seconded by, the College of Surgeons; the long continued, though ultimately unsuccessful, opposition to the establishment of a Professorship of Conveyancing, notwithstanding the strong support which this measure received from the Society of Writers to the Signet; the success with which the estatablishment of Chairs for teaching Political Economy, and Comparative Anatomy and Veterinary Medicine has hitherto been resisted, notwithstanding the liberal offer of a body of private individuals in the one case, and of the Highland Society in the other, to endow these Chairs, and the difficulty which was so lately experienced in convincing the Senatus Academicus of the propriety of adding the Midwifery Class to the Medical Curriculum,—fully evince how difficult it is, even for what must be considered as a body of the best educated men in the country, to witness, without jealousy, the extension of the same privileges to others, of which they themselves are already possessed."

I shall only further add, that the opinions which I en-

tertain as to the expediency of the power of regulating the course of study for Medical Degrees being vested in the Patrons rather than in the Professors of the University, have been long known to my friends; and they were so distinctly expressed by one of them, to whom my opinions on such subjects are familiarly known, in a letter which appeared in one of the public prints at the commencement of the late litigation between the Senatus and the Town-Council, that I shall take the liberty to quote the passage, premising only, that I have had great satisfaction in finding, that sentiments very similar were expressed at the conclusion of that litigation by three of the learned Judges of the Court of Session, in delivering their judicial opinions at advising the late Action of Declarator.

"It is in order to insure some degree of attention being paid to the interests of the public, that it is of importance that public Bodies, whose proceedings affect the commonweal, should be subjected to a considerable degree of control exercised from without. And whether it shall ultimately be decided by the competent legal authorities, that the Town-Council possess or do not possess the powers which they claim, I think an impartial and discerning public will do them the justice to acknowledge, that they have manifested throughout the whole of these transactions an anxious desire to promote the best interests of the community.

"For my own part I earnestly hope that the authority of

the Patrons, in regulating the course of Medical Education, will be fully established by the decisions of the Courts of Law, before which it is to be brought; and that the public will still be indebted to them for the introduction of a much more efficient system, both of Preparatory and of Professional education, than is to be found in the Statuta Solennia promulgated in 1825 by the Senatus Academicus."

In bringing these remarks to a close, I have to apologise for the length to which they have extended,—a fault mainly attributable perhaps to the small portion of time which I have been able to bestow on their preparation. Hurriedly as they have been put together, I cannot but regret the consumption, in idle controversy, of time which might have been more advantageously employed by me in the composition, and by my colleagues in the improvement, of our lectures; for I presume it can be no offence to them to believe that they participate with me in the following sentiment expressed by Dr Cullen in an introductory address to his chemical students delivered several years after his appointment to be Professor of Chemistry in Edinburgh. "After teaching for so many years," said that distinguished ornament of our University, "it might be supposed that my plan was exactly fixed and sufficiently known; but truly I am yet far from being satisfied with the perfection of my plan, and very certain that it is neither so complete, nor so exactly suited to your purpose, as I could wish. It will, therefore, be a long time yet, I hope at least it will be long,

for it will only be when the languor and debility of age shall restrain me, that I shall cease to make some corrections of my plan, or some additions to my course."

I have the honour to be,

SIR,

With much respect,

Your obedient humble Servant,

JOHN THOMSON, M. D.

Professor of Medicine and General Pathology in the University of Edinburgh.

APPENDIX.

No. I.

MEMORIAL to the Right Honourable Lord MELBOURNE, *His* MAJESTY'S *Secretary of State for the Home Department.*

YOUR Memorialist begs leave to represent, that the Course of the Institutions or Theory of Medicine, as at present taught in the University of Edinburgh, comprehends Three Branches of Medical Science,—Physiology, Pathology, and Therapeutics.

That from the progress which has been made, and is daily making, in Physiology and Pathology, each of these branches has become so extensive, as to render it impossible in one Course of Lectures of the ordinary Academic duration, to give a sufficiently full and comprehensive view of the various important subjects which they respectively embrace; and, accordingly, it is well known that distinct Courses of Lectures on Physiology and Pathology have been established in many of the more celebrated Medical Schools of Italy, France, and Germany.

That though Physiology and Pathology, or the general doctrines of Health and of Disease, are in many respects connected with one another, yet the particular subjects of investigation in each of these

branches, and the proper modes of prosecuting them, are so different, as to render it desirable for the promotion of medical knowledge, that they should be separately studied, and taught by separate Professors.

Your Memorialist begs leave farther to represent, that he has been for a long series of years diligently engaged in the study of Pathology, as relates both to the Structural and Functional derangements of the Human Body, and in particular, that he has procured from hospitals abroad and at home, with considerable pains and difficulty, and with much expense to himself, a large collection of Coloured Delineations of the Morbid Alterations of Structure, which occur in the different Textures and Organs of the Human Body.

That this mode of teaching Pathology, which he believes he has been the first to employ on an extensive and systematic plan, in lecturing on the Practice of Physic, would, if applied to a distinct Course of Lectures on Pathology in the University of Edinburgh, and with a reference to the specimens of diseased structure that are preserved in the Museums of the University and of the Royal College of Surgeons, convey to Students of Medicine much more correct notions of many diseases, and of the morbid appearances to which they give rise, than can possibly be done by verbal descriptions alone.

That your Memorialist is persuaded that a distinct Course of Lectures on Pathology, conducted on the plan he has suggested, would facilitate greatly the Study of Diseases, and render the Course of Medical Education in the University of Edinburgh more

complete than it has hitherto been, without interfering with the proper duties or pecuniary interests of any of its Medical Professors.

In the event of your Lordship approving of the Institution of a Professorship of Pathology in the University of Edinburgh, your Memorialist humbly begs leave to offer himself as a Candidate for that Professorship, the duties of which, were he honoured with the appointment, it would be his highest ambition to execute, to the utmost of his power, for the promotion of Medical Science, and the advantage of the University.

Your Memorialist, &c.

JOHN THOMSON, M. D.

No. II.

COMMISSION to JOHN THOMSON, *M. D. as Professor of Medicine and General Pathology in the University of Edinburgh.*

WILLIAM the FOURTH, &c. &c. &c. WHEREAS We, considering that the branch of Medical Science termed Pathology, which teaches the General Doctrines relative to the Structural and Functional derangements of the Human Body, has, by the progress of medical knowledge, become one of great extent, and that its accurate study is of the utmost importance in a well regulated medical education, and considering also that the instituting a Professorship for that purpose in Our University of Edinburgh will be of great utility; Therefore We, being desirous of giving all suitable encouragement to the same, have agreed to erect a Professorship in Our foresaid University of Edinburgh, under the name of "The Professorship of Medicine and General Pathology;" and being also well informed of the ability and good endowments of JOHN THOMSON, Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh, for the discharge of the duties of the foresaid office, We have nominated, presented and appointed, like as We by these presents nominate, present and appoint, the foresaid JOHN THOMSON to be Professor of Medicine and General Pathology in the University of Edinburgh, during all the days of his life, granting full power to him to deliver Lectures thereon within the said University, to examine Candidates, and do every thing that may be required and necessary to the Graduation of Doctors of Medicine, as amply and fully, and with all the solemnities that the same

is practised in that or any College or University whatever; and requiring hereby the Magistrates and Town-Council of Edinburgh, and the Principal and other Professors of the University, to admit and receive him to the peaceable exercise and profession of the said office, in the usual form.

Given at Our Court at St James's, the 14th day of September 1831, in the second year of Our reign.

By His Majesty's command,

(Signed) MELBOURNE.

No. III.—*COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF*

OF MEDICINE at the UNIVERSITY,—and for the Diploma

FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF MEDICINE.

I. PERIOD OF STUDY.

Attendance on Medical Classes during four *Anni Medici* *, unless the Candidate shall have attended the Medical or Surgical Practice of any General Hospital which has eighty beds, for six months of a different year from any of the *Anni Medici;* or shall belong to the Medical Department of the Army, Navy, or East India Company's Service; or shall have obtained a Literary Degree from an University, after four years of Literary Study there; in all which cases three *Anni Medici* are sufficient.

II. MEDICAL CLASSES.	Duration of Courses.	Number of Courses.
	Months.	
1. Anatomy and Surgery,	6	1
2. Chemistry,	6	1
3. Materia Medica,	6	1
4. Theory of Medicine,	6	1
5. Practice of Medicine,	6	1
6. Midwifery and Diseases of Women and Children,	6	1
7. Clinical Medicine,	6	1
8. Botany,	3	1
9. 10. And two of the following Classes optionally, viz. Practical Anatomy, Natural History, Legal Medicine, Clinical Surgery, or Military Surgery,		2
		10

III. ATTENDANCE on an HOSPITAL during Six Months, at least, of two different years.

IV. LITERARY AND PHILOSOPHICAL EDUCATION.

A knowledge of Latin—ascertained by Examination.

* "To constitute an Annus Medicus, with a view to Graduation, a Student must attend at least two of the above mentioned courses of Six months' duration, or else he must attend between 1st November and 1st August one of these, and two of the Three months' courses above specified."

EDUCATION required of Candidates for the Degree of Doctor of the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh.

FOR THE SURGICAL DIPLOMA.

I. Period of Study.

Attendance on Medical Classes during Four Winter Sessions, or Three Winter and Three Summer Sessions.

II. Medical Classes.	Duration of Courses.	Number of Courses.
	Months.	
1. Anatomy,	6	2
2. Chemistry,	6	1
3. Materia Medica and Pharmacy,	6	1
4. Institutions of Medicine, or Physiology,	6	1
5. Practice of Medicine,	6	1
6. Midwifery,	3	1
7. Clinical Medicine,	6	1
8. Surgery two courses, or one of Surgery and one of Military Surgery,	6	2
9. Clinical Surgery,	6	1
10. Practical Anatomy,	6	1
11. Practical Chemistry,	3	1
12. Medical Jurisprudence,	3	1
		14

III. Hospital Attendance, Eighteen Months.

IV. Literary and Philosophical Education.

1. Knowledge of Latin—ascertained by Examination.
2. Regular instruction in the Elements of Mathematics
3. Attendance on course of Mechanical Philosophy, of at least Three Months' duration.

REGULATION required of Candidates for the Degree of Doctor of the Royal College of Surgeons of Ireland.

FOR THE SURGICAL DIPLOMA.

I. Period of Study.

Attendance on Medical Classes during Four Winter Sessions, or Three Winter and Three Summer Sessions.

II. Medical Classes.

	Duration of Courses.	Number of Courses.
	Months.	
1. Anatomy,	6	2
2. Chemistry,	6	1
3. Materia Medica and Therapeutics,	6	1
4. Institutes of Medicine, or Physiology,	6	1
5. Practice of Medicine,	6	1
6. Midwifery,	3	1
7. Clinical Medicine,	6	1
8. Surgery two courses, or one of Surgery and one of Military Surgery,	6	2
9. Clinical Surgery,	6	1
10. Practical Anatomy,	6	1
11. Practical Chemistry,	3	1
12. Medical Jurisprudence,	3	1
		14

III. Hospital Attendance, Eighteen Months.

IV. Literary and Philosophical Education.

1. Knowledge of Latin—ascertained by Examination.
2. Regular instruction in the Elements of Mathematics.
3. Attendance on courses of Medical Philosophy, of at least Three Months' duration.