

**A letter to the President and Fellows of the Royal College of Physicians,
London / by Edwin Lankester.**

Contributors

Lankester, E. Ray Sir, 1847-1929.
Royal College of Physicians of London.

Publication/Creation

London : C. & J. Adlard, 1847.

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/jgthrq65>

License and attribution

This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



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

A LETTER
TO THE
PRESIDENT AND FELLOWS
OF THE
ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS,
LONDON.

BY
EDWIN LANKESTER, M.D., F.R.S. F.L.S.

MEMBER OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS, LONDON; MEMBER OF THE
ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS OF ENGLAND; LICENTIATE OF THE APO-
THECARIES SOCIETY; SENIOR PHYSICIAN TO THE FARRINGTON
DISPENSARY; LECTURER ON MATERIA MEDICA AND THERA-
PEUTICS AT THE ST. GEORGE'S SCHOOL OF MEDICINE;
HONORARY MEMBER OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE
MEDICAL SOCIETY; SOME TIME HOUSE
PHYSICIAN, UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE HOSPITAL.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY C. AND J. ADLARD,
BARTHOLOMEW CLOSE.

1847.

322404



WELLCOME INSTITUTE LIBRARY	
Coll.	weIMOmec
Call	p. vol
No.	WB 6;
	3;
	1-22

INTRODUCTION.

FROM the circumstance of being refused a license to practise in London, after having been granted a license to practice in the country, by the College of Physicians, I felt that justice to myself, as well as the College, demanded that I should not only offer an explanation of my conduct on that occasion, but also that I should remove, if possible, the mark of disgrace which such an occurrence would be likely to attach to me. The same motives which induced me to address the President and Fellows of the College, have prompted me to print that address for the purpose of circulating amongst my friends, so that at least my own justification may extend as far as the College condemnation. In doing this, I do not wish to place myself in a position of antagonism to the College: I am still one of its members, and though belonging to what some may regard as the humbler class of its licentiates, I am not the less anxious that anything I do should be no disgrace to a body which ought to be the embodiment of the moral as well as the intellectual development of one of the noblest professions. I also hope that the publication of the circumstances under which

I have been recently refused a license may not be without its influence upon the councils of those who may have the framing a new charter for the College, and for which the Fellows have memorialised the present government. That any man wishing to practice medicine, or any department of medicine, honorably and free from quackery and pretension, should, after passing four examinations, giving him a title to practise, be required to undergo a fifth, upon which he may be pronounced to be incompetent, I hold to be a great evil, not only to the man who has to submit to it, but to the community in which such a practice has grown up. There is no more effectual way of increasing quackery than by unnecessarily increasing the difficulties in the way of honorable practice, unless it be to legalise the one and prosecute the other. That the medical institutions of this country, with legal power, are more numerous than the welfare of the community demands, has long been admitted. That one body should have the power of refusing a license to practise the same profession which another body had previously granted, has been also regarded as an unreasonable power of oppressing, which ought not to be trusted to rival corporations; but that the same body should have the power of granting a license at one time, and refusing it at another, is an anomaly which I believe was not regarded possible until the College of Physicians afforded an example in myself.

For the sake of those who may be ignorant on the point, I may state that the College of Physicians in

London, by an Act of Parliament passed in 1519, has power to grant two kinds of licenses: one for England and one for the City of London, and seven miles round the same. The former licenses are granted after examination by the Elects of the College, a self-elected body of eight Fellows, who have also the power of electing the President, and who generally consist of the senior members of the College. The latter licenses are granted by the Censors, who are appointed annually to this office by the Fellows, and who generally are younger members practising their profession in London. The licenses which these bodies give to practise have been regarded as entirely independent of each other, and the Censors consider a person as practising illegally in London who has not received from them their license. Although it is evident from the Act of Parliament (Hen. VIII, 14 and 15) that no other physicians than those licensed by the Elects have a right to practise in the country, the Elects, not having any special powers of action in such cases, have not interfered with the few London licentiates who practise in the provinces. It does not however appear, that at any period in the history of the College the Censors have had an opportunity of examining a licentiate who had been previously examined by the Elects, till it occurred in my own case. I certainly gave them an opportunity of demonstrating what I had previously been assured could not be the case, that they deemed the license of the Elects as no license at all.

That the Censors have acted in this matter according to

the letter of their institution I do not doubt, but I feel equally persuaded that they have acted in opposition to the spirit in which they were invested with power. The object of the Act of Henry VIII, to which the College owes its existence, was to prevent "ignorant and illiterate" persons from practising physic, and the examinations were instituted, rather as a barrier to uneducated men, than as a test of the knowledge of the educated physician, as a protection of the public against the quack and the empiric, and not to afford the rival examiners of the College, the opportunity of harassing and injuring their own licentiates.

A LETTER,

&c. &c.

TO THE

PRESIDENT, ELECTS, FELLOWS, AND CENSORS, OF THE
ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS, LONDON.

GENTLEMEN,

Having placed you in what I must believe to be the unpleasant position of not recognizing me as an intra-licentiate of the College of which we are mutually members, I feel it due to myself as well as to you, to offer an explanation of the circumstances under which I presented myself, so little prepared, for the examination to which I submitted. I need not, perhaps, remind you that, in 1841, I was admitted by the Elects a member of the College, and obtained at that time legal permission to practise as a physician in all parts of the United Kingdom; it was then my intention to have practised at Leeds in Yorkshire, but circumstances occurring which rendered it desirable for me to remain, at least for a time, in London, I was reminded by the censors of your College that I was not practising legally, and on inquiry found that, according to the present laws of the College, I could not be recog-

nized as practising in London unless I submitted to a second examination ; to this I felt great objections.

1st. That by my so doing I should be admitting a principle which I regard altogether as unjust, that physicians practising in London ought to be examined by a different standard of qualification from those practising in the country.

2d. On account of the annoyance and inconvenience of preparing for another examination, and that before a body of men who would necessarily be my competitors in practice and position, and contemporaries in study, and who, however anxious to act fairly, had on past occasions, in the history of the College, not shown themselves free from educational prejudices and personal motives in the performance of their public duty,* and the vote of any one of which against me would be sufficient to prevent my appearing before the Board of Fellows for my license.

3d. I knew that there was a strong personal feeling existing between the Elects and Censors, with regard to

* It is not often that rejected candidates for medical licenses are known, but in the history of the College of Physicians the Censors have refused to recommend for the license two most distinguished British physicians, Dr. John Mason Good and Dr. John Armstrong, and in doing so have, I think, laid themselves open to the assumption of the text, and have also demonstrated the incompatibility of the construction of the Censors' board with the spirit of the charter of the College, which was to prevent "ignorant and illiterate" persons alone from practising physic. It appears from returns made to Parliament last year, that the College of Physicians seldom rejects candidates for its license at all. During the three years 1842, 1843, and 1844, for which these returns were made, the Censors of the College did not reject a single candidate, and the Elects but one. If we may infer from these three years the previous conduct of the Censors, it would appear that the list of their rejected candidates is much more distinguished than that of their licentiates.

the examination of the extra-licentiates, and which I had some reason to apprehend might end in the latter body attempting to demonstrate the truth of their allegations against the former body.

These objections weighed so strongly on my mind, that as the question of medical reform had been agitated, I felt assured the anomalous distinction between licentiates *extra urbem* and licentiates *intra urbem*, would be abolished, provided any change was made at all, and the more especially as the same Act of Parliament which confirmed the Charter, giving power to the Censors to examine licentiates for London alone, gave to the Elects the power of examining for the country alone; thus depriving those who had been examined by the Censors of the right to practise in the country. The College had, however, never intimated to its intra-licentiates that they were not legally qualified for practice in the country, and I still hoped that the same courtesy would be shown to their extra-licentiates, and that by some by-law the College would recognize its elect-made physicians in London, as it evidently had done its censor-made physicians in the country. In the meantime my position became one of inconvenience, by the College refusing to recognize me as a member in London, and signifying such refusal by withholding my name from the list of extra-licentiates. With this I found there was little hope of procuring admission to practise in the hospitals and dispensaries of the metropolis, which have most of them through the influence of the intra-licentiates a law, requiring that their physicians shall be of the class of censor-made physicians.

Finding myself in this position, I sought the advice of those members of the College whom I thought were the best exponents of its spirit, and who one and all expressed their opinion, that although the law as it at present stood

required that candidates for the license *intra urbem* must submit to an examination, yet, still, that such an examination must be *formal* in the case of a person already licensed to practice *extra urbem*. With this conviction in my mind I went directly, without any kind of previous preparation from my literary and scientific pursuits, to the examination of the College; and I was no less surprised at the decision of the Censors than they probably were at the different estimate I had made of their examination, compared with other candidates. It may be that the Censors will state, that they were prepared to make some allowance for my previous position, but that my deficiency in those branches of knowledge deemed important by them, was too great to allow them to pass it over. I think, however, if they will reflect on the entire absence in my case of any "getting up" for the occasion, the carelessness with which I regarded an examination which I should not have ventured on, had I not looked upon it as a matter of form, and the nervousness which seized me when I found I was submitted to rigorous questioning; and when for the first time the thought flashed across me, that the Censors might and could, perfectly justifiably to their own consciences in accordance with their custom, refuse to recommend me for a license to practise in London, they could not be surprised at the answers which I gave.

Every generous minded member of our College and profession must feel that no importance ought to be attached to mistakes made under such circumstances, with regard to elementary knowledge, or to the difference of opinion that might be expressed by one accustomed for many years to think for himself: that the technicalities of anatomy, or the details of rare pathological conditions, escape for the moment the mind of every practitioner, is well known, and more especially when, as a teacher and writer, he has been

in the habit of treating such subjects in a systematic manner.

It was under these circumstances that I presented myself at the Censors' board, and now bearing my testimony to what I believe to be their gentlemanly manner and conscientious conclusion on that occasion, I ask if there be no power in the College by which a case like my own may be reconsidered? The College has for the first time in its history rejected one of its own licentiates—has given its diploma—granted its license—and countenanced, by the authority of its President and Elects, an individual to practise on Her Majesty's subjects, in all and every part of the United Kingdom with this exception, that no sooner do these same subjects come within the magic circle of seven miles round London, than they are refused the benefit of his advice, at least with the sanction of the College.

I think it will be admitted by all who take an interest in the welfare of the College that it has placed itself in a false position—a position that no other institution of a similar kind in this or any other country ever attempted to assume; for it must be recollected that this is not a question of degrees of honour, but one of license to practise; the examination of the College is not one to ascertain the relative merit of candidates, but their ability to practise; the standard to be raised is not the highest possible for the honour of the College, but the lowest possible consistent with the welfare of humanity and the public good. Had I presented myself for honour or for honours at the College, I should have felt that I stood in an entirely different position, and should have done as I have always done previously—as my standing in the classes of University College will prove—have prepared myself to take a respectable

position amongst my competitors;* but I went to the College for a license to practise my profession in London, and amongst the same people that the College had previously given me a license to practise amongst out of London.† I did not, I could not, possibly imagine that the College would assume the new position amongst kindred institutions that its conduct to me has placed it in.

It may, however, be urged that the examination for granting the extra-license was trivial at the time I was admitted, compared with what it is now, or with what the examination for the intra-license is at the

* As a proof of this assertion I subjoin the following certificate:

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LONDON. CERTIFICATE OF HONOUR.

It is hereby certified that Mr. Edwin Lankester obtained Honours in the following Classes:

Practice of Medicine	Dr. ELLIOTSON, Professor.
Obstetric Medicine	Dr. DAVIS, "
Pathological Anatomy	Dr. CARSWELL, "
Surgery	Mr. COOPER, "
Anatomy	Mr. QUAIN, "
Chemistry	Dr. TURNER, "
Botany	Dr. LINDLEY, "
Natural Philosophy	Dr. RITCHIE, "
Medical Jurisprudence	Dr. THOMSON, "
Comparative Anatomy	Dr. GRANT, "

CHAS. C. ATKINSON, *Secretary to the Council of the College.*

† The following is a copy of the license of the Elects of the College:

Sciunt omnes nos Henricum Halford Baronett. Medicinæ Doctorem et Præsidentem Collegii Medicorum Londinensis, una cum consensu Gulielimi Lambe, Thomæ Hume, et Clementis Hue, prædicti Collegii Sociorum et Electorum, auctoritate nobis a Domino Rege et Parlamento concessa, examinasse vicesimo nono die mensis Januarii A.D. 1841, probum virum Eduinum Lankester e Comitatu Suffolcensi eumque dignum Judicasse qui admittetur ad praxin Medicinæ Secundum Statua Regni. In cujus rei Testimonium nomina nostra his Literis adscripsimus. Datum Londini in Collegio nostro vicesimo nono die mensis Januarii, annoque Domini millesimo octingentesimo quadragésimo primo.

HENRY HALFORD, Præsides.

GUL. LAMBE, Elect.

THO. HUME, Elect.

C. HUE, Elect.

present day. I should not have suggested this argument, had I not known that this had been urged by some of the intra-licentiates, and by the Censors themselves, as a reason for the re-examination of extra-licentiates for the intra-license: I would submit that, with this, candidates who have passed their examination can have nothing to do. Whatever might have been the examination for the extra-license, I was prepared to submit to it, and whatever might have been the decision of the President and Elects by whom I was examined, I should have borne it in silence. I would, however, recall to the recollection of the fellows, that all their examinations a few years ago were trivial, compared with what they are at the present day; that the examination for the intra-license ten years ago, was of the same nature as the examination for the extra-license at the time I submitted to it; and that on this ground the intra-licentiates fellows and officers of the College might be required to undergo re-examination; and I ask how many members would be left to carry on the business of the College, if they were judged under the circumstances and by the standard by which I have been?

As the inferiority of the examination of extra-licentiates has been made the excuse for requiring re-examination for the intra-license, I would call the attention of the College to the list of extra-licentiates, and would ask whether, as a whole, the individuals are not known to be as capable of practising their profession as the more favoured intra-licentiates? On that list I find men who have contributed largely to the literature of their profession, men holding the most prominent and responsible positions as teachers in medical schools, and physicians to hospitals and dispensaries, and of whose names the profession to which they belong have every reason to be proud. The fact is, that

examinations like those of the College, do not test a man's ability to practise medicine; and the knowledge which would allow him to pass the single examination for the extra-license, is as much proof of his talent as the more imposing five days for the intra-license. That the College has admitted men to practise *intra* or *extra urbem*, and is obliged to retain them on its list, who have little or no knowledge of their profession, who vend patent nostrums, write books for the sake of practice, or pursue the chimeras of homœopathy and hydropathy, arises as much, I apprehend, from its necessarily defective mode of examination, as its want of legislative authority. It is, then, I think, unjust to fasten on one class the stigma of a deficiency which can be as easily proved to exist in the other, and this arising from a common cause. Every one knows that in examinations, where a large range of subjects are examined on, the memory is drawn upon rather than the judgment, and to this class belong the examinations of the College of Physicians, and there are few men who could not go through them with more ease when they first leave a medical school than subsequently. In most instances the medical man exchanges at the bed-side the recollection of verbal technicalities, for the observation of the facts of disease, such facts as can alone make him a useful practitioner, and to a knowledge of which alone should appeal be made, in testing his fitness for the practice of his profession.

But even allowing that the extra-licentiates are an inferior class, on whom does the onus of this fall? Surely not on the extra-licentiates, but on the College; ought not the College to be placed at the bar of the Legislature, and tried for the crime of having misused the power intrusted to it, of having, for the sake of the gain to be got therefrom, sold its license to inferior men? If this allegation

be true, ought not the College to be pronounced guilty? and ought it not to make what restitution it can to myself and others of what they have taken from us? We were most of us, I believe, honorably connected with other medical institutions; men with no professional mark of inferiority, till we joined the College of Physicians. If, then, the College has made this mistake—for such all must allow it to be—the least thing I think it could do, would be to allow those on whom it has unwittingly placed its degrading mark, the opportunity of entering the superior rank, and for ever cease to hold out to the medical practitioner, the lure of its extra-license. In acting thus, I humbly submit, that the College would only be acting up to the spirit of its institution, and in accordance with its own practice in regard to the Fellowship. Every year some of the licentiates are introduced to the Fellowship without further examination, and why should not this principle be acted on with regard to the extra-licentiates who wish to avail themselves either of the honour or advantage of the intra-license.

I am unwilling to intrude myself on the College, but I feel that my professional standing, independent of their corporation and privileges, as little deserves the position they have placed me in as my relation to themselves. Although I would repudiate the wish to justify my claim for their sanction to practise in London, upon the merits of my recent examination for the intra-license, on the grounds I have before stated; I would, however, prefer the claim of an admitted knowledge of my profession by members of their own body, and others, independent of the extra-license.

The first testimony I would offer is that of Dr. C. J. B. Williams, one of your Censors and one of my Examiners,

when I was refused the intra-license. This was given on the occasion of my becoming a candidate for a Dispensary in London.

“Dr. Edwin Lankester is well known to me as an intelligent and well-informed physician, and having had much intercourse with him during the period of five months, when he performed the duties of resident medical officer, at the University College Hospital, I can fully testify to his competency to fill the office of physician to a Dispensary with credit to himself and much advantage to the objects of the Institution.

“C. J. B. WILLIAMS, M.D., F.R.S.

“Prof. of Medicine, and Physician to the Hospital
University College, London.

“Holles Street, July 26th, 1841.”

Every one, I think, must feel that Dr. Williams had much better opportunity of testing my knowledge at the bedside in the constant care of his own patients in the wards of an Hospital for five months, than he could have had in an examination lasting only a few hours.

For several years I have had the honour of holding the position of teacher of *Materia Medica*, and *Therapeutics*, at the School of Medicine, in Grosvenor Place, where my lectures are recognized by the Society of Apothecaries, the College of Surgeons, the University of London, and for aught I ever heard to the contrary, by your own body. I lectured in this school in conjunction with one of the Fellows of your College, and when recently he was too ill to lecture, I was requested by him and his colleagues to deliver the course of Lectures on the Principles and Practice of Medicine

for him, which I did, I have every reason to believe, to his satisfaction, and that of his pupils and my colleagues ; I may also add, that most if not all the pupils of my class are also clinical pupils of one of the gentlemen who sat at the Censors' board, at the time of my examination.

Since my residence in London, it has been my happiness to make many friends amongst those members of your own College, and others who by their writings and labours, are justly esteemed as amongst the most enlightened members of their profession ; I have met them at the bedside of the sick, and in intimate professional intercourse, and whenever I have needed their testimony to my professional skill and information, it has been given me in the most flattering terms. [Copies of some of these Testimonials I inclose.*]

You cannot, I think, accuse me of allowing my feelings to influence my judgment, if I consider these circumstances as affording more abundant evidence of my competency to practise my profession, than the possession of a license from the College. I can conceive, however, that it might be urged that I had been engaged in other pursuits, and had neglected my profession ; this I can entirely deny. It is now eighteen years since I commenced the study of physic, and during the whole of that period I can produce abundant evidence of having been actively engaged either in the study of medical literature and the observation of disease, or in the teaching and practice of medicine. During this period I have written on the subject of medicine, and many of my contributions to medical literature are extant with my name ; I have not, however, written for

* See Appendix.

the sake of drawing attention to myself, and the greater part of my writings exist in a form, the authorship of which I am not at liberty to avow; that I have been engaged in the practice of my profession will be seen by a reference to the testimonial of Dr. Williams, as well as from the fact that I have been attached for the last five years as physician to one of the largest Dispensaries in the metropolis: I believe I may again appeal to several members and fellows of your College, who have been my colleagues, as to the competency with which I have fulfilled its duties. But even had I been less actively employed in the practice of my profession, I have yet to learn that the scientific researches in which I have been engaged have unfitted me for the duties of a physician. I have pursued chemistry, botany, and microscopic anatomy in relation to human physiology and pathology, and believe that both in the training the pursuit of these sciences have given my mind, as well as in the facts they have presented to me, that I am the better able to practise my profession.

I believe then that I could furnish evidence of having read extensively, observed accurately, and practised successfully, in every department of my profession, and yet I am told by the College that I require another year of preparation. If I were a young man who had only had the five years' study which the College requires, I might consistently have been sent back for a year; but what must be thought of the value of the College examination which supposes that the knowledge it requires may be got up in twelve months, but could not be gained by eighteen years of hard study and diligent observation.

At the same time, however, I am not ignorant of the fact, that there are gentlemen in London who, in less than

a year, would engage to prepare me, as they have done hundreds of other members of the College, in such a manner as to ensure my passing their examinations. I have never, however, condescended to the practice of cramming in the four examinations that I had previously submitted to and passed. I conscientiously regard myself at this moment as fitted to practise my profession, and if the College examinations are of a nature rather to test the schoolboy qualifications which may be got up by a cram, than those which have been gained by reading and experience at the bedside, I can only express my regret that public confidence should have been given to examinations which every member of the College must feel are not worthy of it.

Under these circumstances, then, I trust that I may not urge in vain that the position of one class of your members, the extra-licentiates, be taken into consideration, and that should it be thought that the College has fallen into an error in reviving this obsolete class of physicians, that full compensation be made to those have been thus betrayed by offering them the intra-license, or extending to them the courtesy that is extended to the intra-licentiates; or if it be found advisable for the interests of medicine or the public good that there should still be two classes of practitioners, one for the metropolis and another for the cities and towns of England and Wales, I would suggest, that the distinction rest not on a difference of qualification, but on a difference in the price of the diploma, allowing every one to qualify himself for metropolitan practice by paying the difference. Should it be found that the College cannot do this, I must in the meantime trust myself to the discernment of an enlightened public and the generosity of my professional brethren, and hope that the legislature will not be tardy

in redressing the injury which the present laws of the College are calculated to inflict on its own members.

I am, Gentlemen,

Your obedient servant,

EDWIN LANKESTER.

22, Old Burlington Street ;
January, 1847.

APPENDIX.

TESTIMONIALS.

From J. ELLIOTSON, M.D., F.R.S.

Late Professor of Medicine at University College, and Physician to the Hospital.

Conduit Street.

Dr. Elliotson has great pleasure in stating that Dr. Lankester was one of the most industrious and respectable of his pupils some years ago, and is in every respect highly eligible for the office of Physician to the ——— Dispensary.

From C. J. B. WILLIAMS, M.D., F.R.S.

Professor of Medicine, and Physician to the Hospital, University College, London; President of the Pathological Society, London; and one of the Censors of the Royal College of Physicians, London.

Holles Street.

Dr. Edwin Lankester is well known to me as an intelligent and well-informed Physician; and having had much intercourse with him during the period of five months when he performed the duties of Resident Medical Officer at the University College Hospital, I can fully testify to his competency to fill the office of Physician to a Dispensary with credit to himself, and much advantage to the objects of the Institution.

From ANTHONY TODD THOMSON, M.D., F.L.S.

Professor of Materia Medica and Medical Jurisprudence, and Physician to the Hospital, University College, London.

My dear Sir,

University College.

I have much pleasure in bearing my testimony to your general talents, high medical acquirements, and the full possession of that degree of observation and tact, which the practice of medicine requires to make an efficient and distinguished practitioner. I am fully authorized to put forth these opinions from my opportunity of observing your management of the department of Resident Medical Officer to the College Hospital during Dr. Taylor's absence. I have no hesitation in saying that you will be a valuable acquisition to any Medical Charity.

From JOHN TAYLOR, M.D.

Late Professor of Clinical Medicine in University College, London, and Physician to the University College Hospital.

August 4, 1841.

Dr. Edwin Lankester has been well known to me for some years, both as a pupil of University College, and subsequently; and I have much pleasure in stating, that as a student he was much distinguished by his intelligence and application, and by the highly honorable position which he obtained in the public examinations of the College in a very unusual number of classes. Since that time I have had the means of knowing that he has zealously availed himself of every means of obtaining professional information, both theoretical and practical; and recently, in the absence of the Resident Medical Officer of University College Hospital, he was appointed to discharge the duties of that officer during a period of nearly five months. On this occasion he had to take charge of the medical patients in the absence of the physicians, and he performed the duties intrusted to him in a satisfactory manner.

Knowing also that Dr. Lankester is a gentleman of excellent moral character, I cannot hesitate to believe that he is well qualified to undertake the duties of Physician to any public Dispensary.

From W. SHARPEY, M.D., F.R.S.

Professor of Anatomy and Physiology in University College, London, and Examiner in Anatomy at the University of London.

68, Torrington Square.

I have great pleasure in bearing testimony to the merits of Dr. Edwin Lankester, now a candidate for the office of Physician to the ——— Dispensary. I have been acquainted with Dr. Lankester for some years, and I know him to be a man of excellent character and solid professional attainments: he has had the benefit of an extended medical education, and has fully availed himself of every opportunity of acquiring medical and scientific knowledge. I beg to add that his conduct has always been most correct, prudent, and judicious, and that I consider him in all respects highly qualified for the appointment which he now desires.

From R. QUAIN, Esq., F.R.C.S., F.R.S.

Professor of Anatomy, and Surgeon to the Hospital, University College.

Keppell Street.

Dr. Lankester was first known to me as a most respectable and industrious student of University College. Since the close of a very distinguished career as a student he has availed himself of many and most favorable opportunities, both in this country and on the continent, of improving his professional education.

Considering the ability he is possessed of, the extent of his professional attainments, and his industrious habits, I have no hesitation in expressing my confident opinion that Dr. Lankester will perform with eminent efficiency the duties of the office of Physician to a Medical Charitable Institution.

From SAMUEL COOPER, Esq., F.R.C.S., F.R.S.

Senior Surgeon to University College Hospital, and Professor of Surgery in the same College;
late President of the College of Surgeons of England,

London.

Dr. Edwin Lankester being a candidate for the office of Physician to the ——— Dispensary, I have great pleasure in stating, on such an occasion, the favorable opinion entertained by me of his fitness to discharge the duties of the appointment. Dr. Lankester has studied the various branches of science connected with medicine, in University College, with indefatigable zeal and distinguished success; he has already filled situations of great responsibility, and which also afforded him the advantages of experience; and I know of no man who is more trustworthy and correct in his general conduct. Believing him, therefore, to be in every respect a well-qualified candidate, I wish him success in the present canvass.

From DAVID D. DAVIS, M.D.

Late Professor of Obstetric Medicine at the University College, and Obstetric Physician to the Hospital.

My dear Sir,

17, Russell Place, Fitzroy Square.

In favour of your claims to the appointment of Physician to the ——— Dispensary, I have to state that you have, ever since you left your studies at the School of University College, determined your attention with much zeal to the various departments of practical medicine, and that latterly you have filled the office of Resident Medical Officer at the University College Hospital. In the performance of the duties incidental to that appointment the Resident Medical Officer has to prescribe for the in-patients belonging to the Physicians in their absence; and for the out-patients on his own days of attendance.

From the manner in which you acquitted yourself of these duties you must, I am sure, be highly qualified for the office for which you are a candidate.

From ROBERT LISTON, Esq., F.R.C.S., F.R.S.

Professor of Clinical Surgery, and Surgeon to the Hospital, University College.

5, Clifford Street.

Dr. Lankester has for several years pursued, with great diligence and success, his studies at the University College and Hospital. He has filled several offices of trust with great credit, and has distinguished himself in the school. He is thereby qualified to fill the office of Physician to any Dispensary or Hospital.

From EDWARD FORBES, F.R.S., F.L.S. &c.

Professor of Botany, King's College, London.

My dear Sir,

Edinburgh.

With great pleasure I offer my humble testimonial in favour of your professional and scientific acquirements. From your conversation and your writings I have derived much delight and benefit, and feel sure that with your knowledge any Institution with which you may be connected will derive honour and reputation from the connexion.

From ALEX. J. LIZARS, M.D., F.R.C.S.E.

Professor of Anatomy and Physiology in the University of Aberdeen.

I had the pleasure of becoming acquainted with Dr. Edwin Lankester during the summer of 1840, and then formed the highest opinion of his talents. Since then I have had frequent intercourse with him, which has only confirmed the views I first entertained respecting him. I consider him admirably fitted for the office to which he now aspires, and I most sincerely wish him every success.

From JOHN REID, M.D., F.R.C.S.E.

Professor of Anatomy and Physiology in the University of St. Andrews.

I had the pleasure of meeting Dr. Edwin Lankester repeatedly in Scotland during the last summer and was delighted with the extent and accuracy of his scientific attainments. From his very excellent talents, professional zeal, his facility in expressing himself, his experience in examining minute structures with the microscope, and from his affable and obliging disposition, I believe that he possesses the capabilities of becoming a very excellent Professor of Pathological Anatomy.

From SAMUEL LANE, F.R.C.S.E.

Lecturer on Anatomy and Surgery at the Theatre of Anatomy and Medicine adjoining St. George's Hospital; Surgeon to the Lock Hospital.

Grosvenor Place, Nov. 28, 1846.

I have had the pleasure of knowing Dr. Edwin Lankester intimately for some years. In the year 1843, from his well-known talents and capabilities as a lecturer, he was applied to by the teachers of the School of Anatomy and Medicine, adjoining St. George's Hospital, to accept the chair of *Materia Medica*, which post he has filled with great ability, and to the entire satisfaction of his colleagues up to the present period. He has also lectured on botany. During the last session, in consequence of the severe illness of Dr. Goolden, at the solicitation of his co-lecturers, he delivered the greater part of a course of lectures on the Practice of Physic.

As an author, Dr. Lankester is favorably known to the profession since the year 1836, by numerous publications in our periodicals, and by separate works on scientific subjects connected with professional knowledge, embracing Botany, Natural History, *Materia Medica*, Dietetics, &c., in which he has displayed great research and considerable literary talent.

With respect to practical knowledge in his profession, the fact of his being at the present moment Senior Physician to the Farringdon Dispensary, will, I presume, be considered a guarantee that it is extensive and sufficient.

Such being my knowledge of Dr. Lankester's literary, scientific, and professional attainments, it is with pleasure I add my testimony to his high integrity and moral worth.

Under these circumstances I can express my opinion confidently that Dr. Lankester is in every way highly qualified to hold the appointment of Physician to any public institution, and that any professional duties intrusted to his charge will be most efficiently and conscientiously performed.

From T. P. TEALE, Esq., F.R.C.S., F.L.S.

Surgeon to the Leeds General Infirmary.

Leeds.

Being informed that Dr. Lankester is a candidate for the office of Physician to the _____ Dispensary, I have much pleasure in bearing testimony to his zeal in science and to his professional attainments, which eminently qualify him for discharging the duties of the office which he solicits.

From HENRY ANCELL, Esq., F.R.M.C.S.

Lecturer on Medical Jurisprudence, and formerly on *Materia Medica*, at the Medical School adjoining St. George's Hospital; Member of the Council of the National Institute of Medicine and Surgery; Surgeon to the Western General Dispensary.

3, Norfolk Crescent.

I hereby certify that Dr. Lankester was selected by the Committee of Lecturers at the School of Anatomy and Medicine adjoining St. George's Hospital to fill the chair of *Materia Medica*; that he has ample means of illustrating that course of lectures; that he has delivered the first course to the perfect satisfaction of his colleagues, and that in my opinion he is fully qualified as a teacher in that branch of medical science.

From JOHN LINDLEY, Ph.D., F.R.S.

Professor of Botany, University College, London.

My dear Sir,

If any testimony to your fitness as a teacher of botany is of any use to you, you are heartily welcome to it; and indeed may claim it as a pupil of whom I have reason to be proud. I only wish recognized teachers were always half as well acquainted with the subject as you are with botany.

From THOMAS GRAHAM, F.R.S.

Professor of Chemistry in University College, London, and Examiner on Chemistry in the University of London.

My dear Sir,

University College.

I have much pleasure in certifying, from an acquaintance with you of several years, to the extent and accuracy of your knowledge in the branches of Chemistry bearing upon *Materia Medica*. You have published several experimental inquiries, which prove you to have devoted great attention to the subject, and to be familiar with analytic processes. I have no doubt that you fully possess the chemical qualifications of a lecturer on *Materia Medica*.

From JAMES ALLEN, Esq., M.R.C.S.

Lecturer on Midwifery in the York School of Medicine.

It affords me much pleasure to bear my testimony to the scientific attainments and professional abilities of Dr. Lankester; and from his high moral worth am persuaded the poor would have an able and kind friend in him, conceiving Dr. Lankester especially well qualified for filling the office of Physician to a Charitable Institution.

From J. HUTTON BALFOUR, M.D., F.L.S.

Professor of Botany in the University of Edinburgh.

15, Dundas Street, Edinburgh.

I have had the pleasure of being acquainted with Dr. Lankester for a considerable period, and have been led to form a high opinion of his talents and abilities. I am glad to hear that he means to come forward as a candidate for the Chair of Pathology in University College, for I am satisfied, from the distinguished appearance he made in the Class of Pathology, from the great attention he has subsequently devoted to this department of medicine, as well as from the power he possesses of communicating information, and of inspiring others with enthusiasm in the prosecution of science, that he is well qualified for the situation.

From ROBERT CARSWELL, M.D.

Late Professor of Pathology and Physician to the Hospital University College, London;
Physician to his Majesty the King of the Belgians.

Brussels.

I have much pleasure in certifying that Dr. Lankester formerly attended my lectures on Pathological Anatomy delivered in University College, and that in the study of this, as of other branches of his profession, he distinguished himself by his great industry and zeal, and obtained prizes and honours in several of the medical classes.

For these reasons, and especially in consequence of the extensive opportunities he has enjoyed of acquiring a practical knowledge of his profession both at home and abroad, I can conscientiously recommend him as well qualified for the discharge of the duties of the office of Physician to the ——— Dispensary, or any other institution of a similar kind.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LONDON. CERTIFICATE OF HONOUR.

It is hereby certified that Mr. Edwin Lankester obtained Honours in the following
Classes :

Practice of Medicine	Dr. ELLIOTSON, Professor.
Obstetric Medicine	Dr. DAVIS, "
Pathological Anatomy	Dr. CARSWELL, "
Surgery	Mr. COOPER, "
Anatomy	Mr. QUAIN, "
Chemistry	Dr. TURNER, "
Botany	Dr. LINDLEY, "
Natural Philosophy	Dr. RITCHIE, "
Medical Jurisprudence	Dr. THOMSON, "
Comparative Anatomy	Dr. GRANT, "

CHAS. C. ATKINSON, *Secretary to the Council of the College.*

It may be as well to add, that these Testimonials have been obtained at various times for special purposes, and the object was rather to furnish a small amount of competent testimony, than to swell the bulk of such documents. In more than one instance, the Testimonials were not presented, and those printed are selections made with a view to maintaining the opinion I have advanced in the letter.

