

Dialogues between a pupil of the late John Hunter, and Jessé Foot, including passages in Darwin's Zoonomia / [Jesse Foot].

Contributors

Foot, Jesse, 1744-1826.

Publication/Creation

London : T. Becket, 1795.

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/m447uv6w>

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>

1.

DIALOGUES

BETWEEN

A PUPIL

OF THE LATE

JOHN HUNTER,

AND

JESSÉ FOOT,

INCLUDING PASSAGES IN

DARWIN'S ZOOLOGIA.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR T. BECKETT, PALL-MALL.

M.DCC.XCV.

DIALOGUES

BETWEEN

ALPHEUS

AND THE LARK

BY JOHN RUSKIN

AND

THESE NOTES

95400

INCLOSURE

DARWIN'S ZOOLOGICAL



LONDON

PRINTED FOR T. BUCHANAN, BATH-MAN

M.DCCC.LV.

S A C R E D

TO THE MEMORY OF THE LATE

ADAIR CRAWFORD,

M D. F R S.

PHYSICIAN TO ST. THOMAS'S HOSPITAL,

AND AUTHOR OF THE

ESSAY ON ANIMAL HEAT.

SI NOBIS ANIMUM BONI VIRI LICERET INSPICERE, O QUAM
PULCHRAM FACIEM, QUAM SANCTAM, QUAM EX MAG-
NIFICO PLACIDOQUE FULGENTEM VIDEREMUS! NEMO
ILLUM AMABILEM, QUI NON SIMUL VENERABILEM,
DICERET.

SENECA.

S A C R E D

TO THE MEMORY OF THE LATE

ADAIR CRAWFORD,

M.D. F.R.S.

PHYSICIAN TO S. THOMAS'S HOSPITAL,

AND AUTHOR OF THE

ESSAY ON ANIMAL HEAT.

ET NOBIS ANIMAM HONORARI LICET. IN VITIS
TELEGRAPHICIS PACIFICI. QUAM HANNOVER. QUAM EX MAN
NITIO PLACIDUSQUE TULLIUS. IN ANTHEMIO. LINGUA
ILLUM AMABILIS. QUI NOS TULIT. AMABILIS
DECEBAT.

P R E F A C E.

IT is difficult to say at what period of life a certain knowledge has been obtained, when once the time which actually was employed in it, has escaped all recollection.

For my part, I know not when the method of dialogue was first impressed upon my judgement: and I am not a little pleased by having first finished, from a general idea of the nature of dialogue, what I now offer to the reader, before I looked out for a critical comparison, in order to decide whether what I have done, be in any manner comparable with the mode adopted, either by antient or modern dialogists.

The common practice among authors is, to form the preface after they have

finished the body of the work, and after they have allowed themselves the indulgence of searching at their leisure, for what might have been said by former authors.

It would be presumption to suppose that this preface can be extended to any length, but from ignorance alone. For who can be bold enough to offer to the publick a preface upon dialogue, unless he has so far condescended to rely upon his own abstracted talent, as not to recur to authors who have already registered the result of their learned enquiries?

He indeed who hath not read the preface by Dr. Hurd (the present Bishop of Worcester) might presume, that he had something to say upon the question; but he who has, will feel how vain the attempt would be, to insinuate a single critical thought that might possibly have
 escaped

escaped the observation of this modern philosopher. How am I to declare my sentiments to the world? how am I to express my admiration of that preface, which I conceive to be one of the most classic, the most perfect, and consequently the most entertaining pieces of criticism that has been produced, since the days of Longinus?

Dr. Hurd did not undertake this production without being competent to the task: it was not arduous to him: it was the natural effect of a well-grounded education, fostering taste and reflection: it was the pleasurable result of a real philosopher's employing his mind for the benefit of the world; whilst it might be fancied that he was indulging an useless, an unprofitable, and a solitary indolence under the shade of academic bowers.

To the clergy of England we must look for the promotion and preservation
2 of

of literature. And when we envy them their incomes, we ought to reflect, that literature and morality are principally supported by them. That their time is occupied not only in the pulpit, but that the training of youth,—that permanent fountain of all that elevates the mind, and dignifies the conception,—is almost totally confined to them. The man of fortune may or may not appropriate his time to the production of useful essays; but the temptations which offer through life will make his pursuits precarious and unsteady, and turn aside his first formed resolution. The physician will obey the calls of practice. And the lawyer will be hurried away from his study by the clamorous appeals of constant suitors.

Besides,—the clergy of England are the only conservators of literature. In their libraries, antient and modern productions

ductions are deposited. To these every growing generation can freely resort, and feast on the accumulated labours of past ages. If these valuable archives were not preserved, and if they were not thus open, where could students at all times apply? If books, like pictures, were collected only by the opulent, to decorate their private museums, they would swell their grandeur indeed in proportion to the rarity, and exhibit the specimens only of the relicks of literature, of literature fallen into a state of decay, by having been dependent on the caprice of taste. We should then find fragments of literature, like fragments of antient architecture in ruinous cities and falling palladiums. The doors of the great might be shut, where there was no liberty to enter. The capricious austerity of the proprietor might baulk the zeal of the student. The hall might
be

be too nice for the feet, and the books too neat for the hands of the vulgar visitor; and the forbidding looks of sturdy janizaries might scowl him from the door.

Then on whom besides must we build our hope for the preservation of literature, but on those who condescend to dwell at the recluse seats of learning favourable to study; than on those who furnish us with such means of reflection, as ourselves more generally engaged, would solicit without being able to obtain, and would be deprived of without finding them, but through their meritorious industry, obedient to our search?

I am persuaded that no one ever approached a clergyman with a becoming veneration, without being certain of receiving the desired information from him, accompanied with a dignified and a gracious complacency. It is the clergyman that inculcates the *vita bil-*
riter

riter ducenda; for what stronger hold have we for solid happiness through life, than from the improvement of our reason, and the establishment of a standard of morality? I mean to be understood in saying, that the inhabitants of this island never would have arrived to that exalted height of honour, humanity, and arts, but for the well-grounded instructions taught in our two universities.

I first thought of conveying my sentiments in this form of dialogue from reflecting that the subject of those dialogues now offered by me, had given cause to so many productions, in so many ways. That it had been discussed in essays, in criticisms, in miscellaneous journals, and in every other shape, but in this which I have now adopted.

And I first thought of dialogue, because it comes so near to cataphismal examination. It is a form of argument,

more likely to keep those who cannot argue at all, and who consequently wish to shew off without argument, as well as those who wish to avoid argument for fear of the consequences, more closely to the point. The ignorant will find their advantage, by having the question placed fairly before them, and without its being so frittered away as to illude their capacity ; and the designing will not have it in their power so easily to escape from that of which they cannot bear to be convicted, because by their theory it has been contradicted.

Besides the novelty of dialogue will recall the attention, when upon the very same subject it has been tired down with essays. And it should be always remembered, that it is the duty of every author not to be fastidious in his choice of that method which is most likely to engage the interest of the reader.

reader. There is a certain decorum belonging to a writer, as there is to any other profession in life, and that is, to render himself as agreeable as possible to those who pay him a respect. Every author should go before the public with the strongest recommendation he can bring.

I have now the opportunity of comparing my dialogues with those of my predecessors, and of examining them by that standard of criticism which has been erected in the preface by Dr. Hurd.

I know not whether I am to congratulate myself, or not, for not having minutely searched for a precedent in order to ascertain the true spirit of dialogue, before I compleated my own, or after I had compleated it. But if I were permitted to express my own satisfaction, I should certainly say, that I am better pleased that I did not adopt a

c 2

model,

model, and that I have not to plead in any instance, wherever I may be found defective, that I was cramped in giving a latitude to my opinion, from any rule laid down, and any decorum of dialogue observed by former authors.

Dr. Hurd has given the palm to the style of Cicero, although as he candidly confesses, he could not himself keep up to it. It appears to me that the reason why he could not confine himself to that decorous mode adopted by Cicero, is self-evident. The dialogues of Cicero were founded upon abstracted philosophical questions—such as that, on Old Age; and consequently the passions of mankind, their follies, their falsehoods, their hypocrisy, and their sophisms had not that concern in his debates, which is to be found in the subjects of Plato, of Socrates, of Lucian, and of all our modern dialogists.

I do

I do not conceive that it is possible for any man, to support an argument abstracted from some degree of passion : and I do not know, that irony and humour are not the most eligible instruments which reason has to work withal, when truth is to make its way against vulgar conviction.

What were the passions with which man is endowed designed for, if they were not to be exercised, under the controul of his reason ? if they were not to aid his justification upon any point in which he had a right, and which he could not obtain without the exertion of them ? Let those then who think otherwise, convince me by good authority, that there is one single example of dialogue without a passion in which the affairs of men are concerned ; and that such a dialogue is calculated to correct, either the absurdities, or
 2 fophisms

sophisms of those, to whom it is opposed.

There is no one part of the human character, which ought to be more faithfully watched, than the sophist's. It is perhaps the most groveling of all ideas, to suppose that truth cannot be fixed. No one opinion can be more fatal to reason, than that which presumes, that there is no such thing, as a permanent truth.

Having made these few observations, I submit my first efforts in this form, to the public, craving the indulgence of the candid part of them; and more especially, as I know that I am surrounded by a gang of bigots, who would rather sacrifice error to truth, than surrender a single opinion of him, who was their preceptor, and against whose opinions, I have, and I trust not ingloriously, been long contending.

If

If I have been found sometimes too severe, let it not be forgotten, that when one aims to fix the standard of truth, in opposition to vanity, ignorance and interest, one must not stand too nicely upon the delicacy of terms, lest the arrow which is too faintly shot, should drop before it has reached the mark intended.

The intelligent reader will see from whom I have adopted the manner of my dedication; and I know that I have not dishonoured the idea, by the change of name.

Of the late Doctor Adair Crawford I trust there never can be, but one opinion.

I have to regret, that he was not a practical physician, highest in fame, only because his superior accomplishments were not more thoroughly understood.

His

His genius and his virtue, his meekness and humility, were the pride and the praise of his friends, but I fear that these cardinal qualities rather stood in his way with the public, when it is considered what the requisites must be for constituting eminence, in the practice of physic, in this most extensive and busy metropolis.

J. F.

Dean Street, Soho,

October 6, 1795.

ERRATA.

- Preface—p. xix. 1. 1. for “two,” read “too.”
 11. 5. for “infallible,” read “fallible.”
 16. 7. for “newpapers,” read “newspapers.”
 32. 4. for “pupose,” read “purpose.”
 99. 13. for “relicts,” read “relics.”

I was a pupil of the late John Hunter,
 and as I admire candour too much to imagine, that I shall be the worse received by you, I shall not hesitate in announcing, that the doctrines which I imbibed from my late preceptor, I have ever held sacredly inviolable upon my mind, although I trust, they have not warped my judgement.

That is what every man would hope to say; but human nature is a very competent to surmount to irresistible an hold upon the inclination. That which is imbibed from the first impression cannot but remain more firm than you are aware. Few men think for themselves; and fewer still are able to shake off early-contracted habits of thinking.

DIALOGUE THE FIRST.

PUPIL.

YOU will pardon the freedom which I have taken of interrupting your attention, but my zeal for enquiry after truth has led me to solicit a conversation with you.

FOOT.

May I beg to know to whom I am indebted for the honour of this visit?

B

PUPIL.

PUPIL.

I was a pupil of the late John Hunter, and as I admire candour too much to imagine, that I shall be the worse received by you, I shall not hesitate in announcing, that the doctrines which I imbibed from my late preceptor, have been strongly impressed upon my mind, although I trust, they have not warped my judgement.

FOOT.

That is what every man would hope to say; but human nature is scarcely competent to surmount so irresistible an hold upon the inclination. That which is imbibed from the first impression cannot but remain more firm than you are aware. Few men think for themselves; and fewer still are able to shake off early-contracted habits of thinking, which they have implicitly received from those in whose talents they have confided. And besides that preference which is given to a preceptor, by whom the first rudiments of science are imparted, there is a necessity for the mind, in order to be free, first to disengage itself of an habit acquired from a wrong education, before it can commence a
new

new series of reflection. Now this is an undertaking so very formidable in its nature, that the generality of men hope to avoid it.

PUPIL.

But as I flatter myself so far, that I can attend to your arguments, and that I am open to receive any correction, my judgement being perhaps somewhat perverted, I trust you will not disappoint me.

FOOT.

I certainly shall not baulk your confidence in yourself, by hesitating to answer any thing you require from me.

PUPIL.

I thank you, and the unlimited freedom you have given me, I conceive as a mark of your liberality.

FOOT.

Then I cannot see that there is any obstacle to your proceeding, as I rely equally upon your indulgence, that when you have interrogated me upon any point you wish, you will permit me, in my turn, to interrogate you also.

PUPIL.

With all my heart, sir, I have no other interest but to inform my understanding, as long as I can obtain the means of information. Sir, the world at large are puzzled to decide from what extraordinary motive it is, that you, who have taken no other part in criticism but against John Hunter, should have been so diligent and watchful in your criticisms upon his productions. The world acknowledge your talent for criticism, but cannot be persuaded that you are actuated by a pure motive and desire for encreasing the general stock of physiological knowledge, whilst you adhere to the productions of my preceptor alone, passing over a critical examination into those of any other.

FOOT.

That, as far as I know, may be the opinion of the world, that is, the opinion of those, who had an opinion of John Hunter, that is, the opinion of those, who, without consulting their own understanding, if they had any, implicitly relied upon him. But the obvious answer to your question is, that I never did wish to extend a reputation upon criticism; that

that as long as criticism is exercised as a pleasure, it conveys in a very agreeable manner both enlightened entertainment, and necessary information; and that an author never can feel himself conscious or happy, when his criticism is directed to personal motives, and not to the value of general improvement. In my various readings on professional subjects, I have discovered absurdities which startled me, conceptions which no rational man would have formed, practice which no sensible man would have adopted, cases which no man of honour would have given, and yet I was silent; but I will tell you why I was so; it was, because I should have given a significance to any one of those acts, if I had made my remark upon it. My conviction, my argument, and my language, must have attracted attention; and attention, thus attracted, must have encouraged those very projects I meant to decry. It would have divided men's opinions by the appeal being made to incompetent judges; and my opposition would most probably have promoted that very interest I aimed to defeat; being fully persuaded, that whatever is not rightly understood, is equally liable to be condemned, whether it be true or false.

PUPIL.

And are these the only reasons you have to offer for your criticisms on John Hunter?

FOOT.

These are reasons why I confined my criticisms to John Hunter alone. John Hunter was not to be written into reputation by any criticism formed upon his works. His reputation consisted in an uncontradicted and submissive obedience to what he said, and to what his pupils propagated as his sayings. And I must be plain with you in avowing, that as long as I permitted others to think for me, so long was I under the same influence of John Hunter's opinions with others; I was just as much chained down by them as the enchanted is by the enchanter, or the bigot by the priest; and so I should have remained, if he had not published; for as I had not attended his lectures, I took the whole for granted that I had heard, extraordinary as it was, broached as his doctrine, without permitting my own understanding to go at all into the insolence of doubting; but after he had published, and after I had the

the opportunity of comparing and applying talent against talent, and integrity against integrity, I thought I saw a great deal of room and cause, for asserting the right to a justification of points, which I deemed to be palpable truths in science.

PUPIL.

So then you mean to avow, that you never had any personal quarrel or antipathy to John Hunter; that I am to understand from you, that you were induced to publish your criticisms upon his opinions, in no sense whatever, from any other motive, than purely because you judged them to be open to criticism, from that motive only, without annexing to it any thing else relating to the conduct or character of my preceptor?

FOOT.

I was not induced to oppose John Hunter from any cause, previous to his publication on the Venereal Disease; or from any other cause but that which this publication provoked. I will go farther. I do not know that I should even have opposed his opinions after they had been published, although I knew they became more dangerous in society,

just in proportion to the reputation of him who was their author; yet I do verily believe, that I should have let them alone, and left them where I found them, if I could have persuaded myself that they were the opinions purely of a mistaken undefining character.

PUPIL.

Oh then! I understand you. You mean to say, that my preceptor did not write what he thought, but what he pleased, and what was grateful to his thirst after singularity.

FOOT.

You have almost anticipated my explanation, but not exactly. John Hunter was not induced to publish his leading opinions merely as loose singularities produced by the sportive effusions of a careless mind, or silly misconceptions of a weak judgement; for from the glaring absurdity of some of them, and from the physical impossibility of others, I am led to believe, that as the chief part of his opinions, when carried into practice, would be injurious, he cared less for being thought a moral than a singular man. And this sentiment, however delicate the subject of it may be, I mean to maintain.

PUPIL.

PUPIL.

Sir, you astonish me; and yet I feel so much interested by the serious manner with which you avow your sentiment, and the firmness with which you seem determined to support it, that I beg your explanation.

FOOT.

I am afraid you are, without design, leading me into too wide a field; besides, I observe that you come to me, as if you were not wholly prepared to defend your preceptor. I cannot be presumed to take any advantage of you; but I ought to suppose, that you would not have thus interested yourself in this conversation, if you had not studied the subject; and that you cannot be said to have studied it, without your having, in some degree, made yourself a master of it. Pray permit me to ask you, have you read your preceptor's book on the Venereal Disease, and also my observations upon it with any attention?

PUPIL.

I have.

C

FOOT.

FOOT.

And do you know that seven years are passed since I compleated them, that is, six years before the death of your preceptor?

PUPIL,

I admit it.

FOOT.

Then I am satisfied ; because I have not, from what I shall say, to inform your understanding, so much as to help your recollection. You may perceive then, that during your preceptor's life-time, there were six compleat years for doing those facts away which I had advanced against him, if that had been possible ; and that he, and his admirers, were content all that time with evasive answers to serious charges, not silently despising, but incorrigibly growling. Some have advanced, that I had had a personal quarrel with him, that I wrote as a rival, that I was of an envious disposition, that I was jealous of his fame. Others were content to say, that I wrote to bring myself into notice, that the undertaking was presumptuous and not worthy a reply, and that I aimed

aimed more at severe wit, than plain matter of fact. Now these are the only materials which have been brought in reply against my observations, as if there had been nothing infallible in his opinions, or as if there had been they were too intricate for me to develop, too deep for me to fathom, that is, your preceptor's opinions were above my comprehension, and my observations upon them were below his and his admirers notice. Pray sir, have you read other answers to my observations of a better description, if you have, in whatever publication you have found them, be so obliging as to point them out?

PUPIL.

I must candidly confess, that I have heard you reprobated, but not answered; that in conversations and in publications I have both heard and seen many observations or sketches rather upon your attack of my preceptor's opinions.

FOOT.

Yes, and they have been more like the cursory invectives from an incensed passenger bawling in the streets, than a deliberate investigation

vestigation from a studied advocate; more like words common to mankind in a state of provocation, than proper to literature issuing forth from the study of a physiologist.

PUPIL.

Your observation has, I assure you, struck me for its truth; and I am free to confess, that had you been replied to manfully, perhaps I should not now have been so much at a loss for decision, or for the defence of my preceptor's opinions.

FOOT.

You know I said, that, from some of his opinions, I could collect that he cared less about being thought a moral than a singular character; and I shall add, that as long as this subject is exposed to every reader in your preceptor's book, or until the pages be cancelled and the errors of them be confessed, I will not cease to counteract their baneful effect. There was vanity or venality in almost all his suggestions; and that obstinacy which he acquired from the approbation of his admirers, would not permit him to conceal from the public what was the more indecent

decent by being untrue. His chapter on impotence would not have been endured if it had come from the pen of any other author; but I see the blush mantling upon your cheek, and I will spare your state of confusion. I am defending myself before you, and in that defence I am not unfolding a practice which shame always conceals, but which the consequent desolation of the constitution so easily betrays; I am not with a busy prying eye detecting that which has not been avowed; no, I am answering a bold opinion, a challenge for investigation into former opinions proclaimed by your preceptor, and in a public print circulated throughout Europe, or rather the known world.

PUPIL.

I am anxious, sir, for your passing on to another subject.

FOOT.

Do you not think when your preceptor said in page 12, “ I could even allow a man
 “ who has a Gonorrhœa to have connection
 “ with a sound woman, if he took care to
 “ clear

“ clear all the parts of any matter, by first
 “ syringing the Urethra, making water, and
 “ washing the glans,” that this was a singularity founded upon an immoral indifference to the welfare of society, or a weak opinion from him who gave it, and injurious to him who followed it?

PUPIL.

I am sure it was.

FOOT.

What do you think of the truth of the following singularity? Your preceptor has said, that the specific extent of Venereal virus is only an inch and a half up the Urethra, and that the pain, inflammation, and discharge which extend eight inches farther up along the same Urethra, are sympathetic affections of virus acting an inch and a half only; Is this singularity to be accounted for by any rule which common sense and general observation can possibly direct?

PUPIL.

The inflammation being extended all along the Urethra, and that part of eight inches
 which

which exceeds the supposed specific distance of an inch and a half being of the same anatomical nature, being a continuation of the same canal, I must candidly confess, until I hear a better motive, that this opinion appears to me to be a singularity founded upon the most ridiculous vanity. There is not, and there cannot be a good reason assigned in justification of the affected novelty.

FOOT.

Do you not think, that from out of the most vulgar book that ever was written, as rational a method of the cure of Gonorrhœa is to be taken as that which is found in the work of your preceptor? Is there any thing direct in his complicated system of cure? Do you or does any one of his admirers imitate the precepts of their preceptor in this instance? If they do, I know that they must be constantly shifting their remedies; and if they seek for reasons for it, he has told them that they will find them all included in the word “perhaps.”

PUPIL.

I cannot without exposing myself to uncertainty follow my preceptor's system of curing
Gonorrhœa;

Gonorrhœa; I confess it; there is nothing direct in it; the whole of what he says seems to be dependent upon “ perhaps’s.”

FOOT.

Then had such an author a right to insult other practitioners by announcing of himself in the public newspapers, that his acquired knowledge of the cure of Gonorrhœa was to throw all former authors at an humble distance? And pray give me leave to ask you, if you can point out those valuable opinions which he complains were stolen from him and in which he was anticipated? for with this grievous charge you find he has begun his book.

PUPIL.

My preceptor read many courses of lectures from time to time, in every one of which the subject of the Venereal Disease formed a part. This was constantly practised by him until he published; I therefore do not think that he had a right to complain if the pupils who paid him for his instructions had applied his opinions to the purposes of practice; for what other purpose would they

they have attended him, but for practical instruction, and for which they paid him? therefore I confess there appears to me to be something uncommonly selfish in his complaints.

FOOT.

I find you have declined answering the last question I put to you, and I shall not force it. Notwithstanding your preceptor has thus given his complex method of cure, and notwithstanding he has consumed more than an hundred pages in quarto in treating upon the supposed consequences of Gonorrhœa, yet he is found to assert that “Gonorrhœa cures itself.” How will you explain this paradox? Is it to be thus explained, that your preceptor finding that he had not a perfect knowledge of cure, therefore presumed that the issue of Gonorrhœa would have been the same without any attempt in him to cure it as with it? in my opinion he should either have abandoned his assertion that “Gonorrhœa cures itself” and that “every Gonorrhœa would cease without any medical help,” or abandoned his incongruous system of curing Gonorrhœa and of the sup-

D

posed

posed consequences of Gonorrhœa; there was no occasion for him to talk of curing that which cured itself.

PUPIL.

My preceptor, I own it, ought to have adhered to the one or the other opinion, and not have embraced both, as they are so contradictory to each other. When he said that “Gonorrhœa cures itself,” he should not have proposed a system for curing it, and a system for curing the supposed consequences; there appears a contradiction which I am incapable of explaining; and I fear that singularity or venality, or call it what you please, had some share in the paradox. He ought not to have laboured ineffectually in search after a cure, and yet denied the necessity for it, nor given such a train of consequent diseases, if he believed that “Gonorrhœa cures itself.”

FOOT.

Then the sequel will prove to you more than was necessary. Your preceptor was induced to apply the most desperate and the most dangerous remedies that ever were suggested

gested for the cure of the supposed consequences of Gonorrhœa; and your preceptor has adopted those remedies which the caution of former surgeons had banished out of practice. Those remedies, sir, your preceptor has revived, to cure what? the consequences of that which cures itself; and he has revived them, without even acknowledging that they had ever been in use by other surgeons, or that they had from their dangerous action been banished out of practice.

PUPIL.

I presume you refer to his method of cure of obstructions in the Urethra by caustic, and to the instrument which he introduced for the conveyance of it.

FOOT.

I do sir, and I mean to say, that he stole a practice which had deservedly remained in oblivion for forty years. I call it stolen, because he did not confess that it had been a practice, and a banished practice; and I mean also to repeat his own words, that “this method may be employed both in cases where
“a bougie will pass and where it will not.”

Now when I asserted in a former publication that your preceptor had thus advised the application of caustic indiscriminately, the Monthly Reviewer in his observations upon my Treatise on the Venereal Disease, took upon him to assert, that John Hunter had not advised the indiscriminate use of the caustic for the cure of obstructions; in answer to him I shall only say, that I never would belie another, even to defend myself.

PUPIL.

I am not sorry for your own justification, that you have quoted those last words of my preceptor, as I have heard it more than once denied that he had ever given any such direction.

FOOT.

It is not to be supposed that he really was so presumptuous as to carry into practice what he has thus recommended. I can pardon all his admirers for not believing half that he has said, even if I proved it; because the practice of it could not have been conducted without ruin to patients, and without disgrace to any one besides your preceptor who ventured upon it.

PUPIL.

PUPIL.

I cannot any more than you see the necessity for the application of caustic where a bougie can be passed. This assumption of my preceptor appears to be bordering somewhat upon empyricism; and my little experience has convinced me, that there is not a stronger objection to an empyric than the application of his nostrum to diseases for which it cannot do good. It is that universality which the empyric aims at embracing, that brings perhaps a discovery eminent for particular purposes into general disrepute.

FOOT.

Not being a stranger to your preceptor's opinions, you I am persuaded will believe me, when I quote his having said, that since his practice at Bellisle in the year 1761 to the time of his publishing on the Venereal Disease in the year 1786, he had, by a method of treatment which he fully describes, dissolved every bubo, excepting three, and thereby prevented them from coming to abscess.

PUPIL.

Sir, I have attended to this assertion, and to your former observations upon it; and
although

although I have searched for a reply to them yet I have not found it.

FOOT.

Well then, have you yourself examined it in theory, and are you, for that is most important, capable of pronouncing either from your own knowledge or from what you have collected from your friends on this fact advanced by your preceptor? that is, whether he could do, or whether any one else could or can do that which he there asserts he did?

PUPIL.

I admit your objection and I trust you will not urge me to a more explicit declaration.

FOOT.

Certainly not. I understand you as well as if you had gone into the most elaborate apology; and I will be content to wait until any one less ingenuous and consequently more hardened will dare to support this dishonourable avowal. It is not I agree with you worth our time to debate the question; but yet it must not escape our attention, if it be purely for clenching the enquiry, that your
preceptor

preceptor has given many more cafes of patients than three, where buboes under his own care have come to abcefs; and there is one cafe in particular where hemlock had been adminiftered to a patient fuffering under a long continued phagedenic bubo, until by the very influence of the medicine, he dropped from his chair and expired.

PUPIL.

It is to be prefumed, that this patient muft have died of the remedy and not of the difeafe; for I cannot agree even with you, if that were your opinion, that the worfe ftate of a phagedenic bubo and for the cure of which no medicine had been adminiftered, would produce fuch a fudden death.

FOOT.

Undoubtedly not. He died of the remedy. Your preceptor in this inftance has deceived you; when you thought he funk, he foared; Apollo was both the god of phyfic and the fender of difeafes; you will find according to the remote tradition of heathen mythology, that it was one trade formerly, and thus your preceptor meant it fhould continue ftill.

DIALOGUE

DIALOGUE THE SECOND.

FOOT.

SIR, I do not mean to reproach but to commend you for thus seeing you so early returned to renew our conversation; it is the fairest promise of your being interested in it, and it flatters my pride and prompts me to candour.

PUPIL.

Social conversation, mutually solicited and liberally indulged, always tends to establish the genuine design of human investigation, and the true knowledge of individual character; the latter is frequently misconceived for want of intercourse, and is represented through a misreported medium.

FOOT.

FOOT.

Be that as it may, it has never as yet altered my principles of truth, or swayed my resolution in the avowal of them; but yet I am assured that your sentiment has its just weight. I think sir, when we parted from our last conversation, the subject of it was your preceptor's infallible method of treating bubo.

PUPIL.

It was; and with your permission the sooner we proceed to another the better. Sir, I am inquisitive to hear what you have now to say on the subject of the blood being contaminated by the Venereal poison, when the constitution is evidently contaminated also; as you know my preceptor was of opinion that the blood in this state is not contaminated at all.

FOOT.

In my opinion, your preceptor was induced from no better motive to avow this doctrine, than he was on what he said on bubo. There is but this difference betwixt the criminality of either, that he can be

E

more

more readily detected in a false assertion when he says that he could and had dissolved every bubo but three, as that is a practical question common to every medical man; every practitioner can follow his instructions and can afterwards answer for his assertions being false; whereas it might not be possible, upon the doctrine we are at present debating, to convict your preceptor by so strong an evidence; but if he be convicted by the strongest that is possible, I trust that you will admit it.

PUPIL.

Surely sir, I do not demand impossibilities, nor would I shelter myself or my friend under the subterfuge of evasion. But it must not be omitted to be told, that my preceptor has found on his side an advocate for the opinion of the blood in that state not being contaminated, which I doubt if it be not too formidable for me to dream of attacking, and which would perhaps even shake your resolution were I but to avow the name.

FOOT.

If you please, that I might not be governed by the influence of a name rather than by
 7 the

the essence of truth, you will stop. I do not wish you to go directly into a consideration of any other authorship's doctrines but that of your preceptor's, lest we confound when we mean to explain.

PUPIL.

I only intend to apprize you of this opinion having taken root in the minds of those who had not been in the way of studying the nature of action of the Venereal Disease, and that it had been produced in corroboration of the law of action of poisons by analogy.

FOOT.

Now I understand you, and I will reply to it as soon as I have dispatched the principal; that is, when I have done with what your preceptor has advanced upon the subject. He has said that although the constitution is infected with the Venereal Disease, yet the blood is not contaminated, and that the blood cannot convey the contamination; that secondary symptoms, that is, Venereal ulcers produced on the surface of the constitution infected, and on any part thereof, cannot convey the contamination either. I

suppose you will admit that it cannot be known that the constitution is infected at all, unless there be outward and visible symptoms on some part of it of its being infected.

PUPIL.

Certainly not. It might under certain circumstances be suspected, but it cannot be known. I remember very well, that my preceptor's doctrine stands just as you have stated it. I think it a very important question under every consideration. It is not a question confined to medical men alone, not as a mere whim or caprice of opinion as insignificant as the cut of a coat, or the form of a wig, or as a new reading in an old lecture-room, but it is a question which it is most material to society that it should be rightly decided; for it refers to whether the disease be hereafter ignorantly or designedly propagated from one to another or not. I presume sir, you will agree with me, that all our contests about opinions, if they do not tend to preserve mankind from the effect of disease, are not worthy the attention of honest well-meaning practitioners; nor would that class be at the pains of engaging in disputation,

tion, unless it were to learn the truth of the question, or from any other motive risk the censure of calumny and ignorance.

FOOT.

You talk well, but your diffidence now-a-days will only stand in your way. He who now lives under the awe of censure, upon medical questions, though he possesses the rarest genius, will die like a dunce. Conviction can only advance under the protection of perseverance: a miser might conceal his gold, he alone has an interest in it: but when diseases of beings of our own nature are the objects of enquiry, we join ourselves with them, we make the interest one and common, and diffidence from any motive would only depress and impoverish human talent, would wrongly concede that conscious superiority from him who deserved it to him who arrogated it, do not fear for me sir.

PUPIL.

I see you want no support which I can give you, but my attention you can always command; and I shall most correctly weigh in the scale of my judgement that difference
in

in opinion which you are about to oppose to what I have found advanced by my preceptor; as, to be plain with you, my poor capacity has pointed out to me more especially that Venereal ulcers must have the power of contaminating.

FOOT.

I not only say they have, as a mere matter of opinion, but I assert it as a fact of which every case of a patient in that state may be produced as an example; not only the discharge from the ulcers themselves will convey infection, but all the secretions of a patient thus conditioned are possessed of the power of conveying infection also. Nothing tends more to bare down truth than theory which is not the result of practice. As cases prove my assertion, how dangerous and baneful must the consequences be of a denial of them, seeing that there is but one only remedy for the cure of the Venereal Disease! If the possibility of infection be denied whereby Venereal symptoms are contracted, there must be an impossibility for a subject ever to be cured by the same practitioners who do deny it; unless they really professed what I
seriously

seriously am persuaded they would, namely, one opinion in their theory, and an opposite one in their cure. Your preceptor would go about curing with mercury cases as Venereal, which his theory denied to be possibly Venereal; and if you called his opinion and his remedy into question, and pressed him close upon the argument, then he would with an hardened effrontery tell you, that “if mercury cured the complaint, it was no matter whether it was Venereal or not.” Your preceptor would thus try to cure as Venereal cases, all those dreadful symptoms brought on by transplanting Venereally-infected teeth, by a child sucking an infected nurse, by a nurse sucking an infected child, by a sound subject having a Venereal intercourse with one whose constitution was infected, and by Venereal ulcers coming into contact with parts of a sound subject and thereby producing Venereal symptoms. All these possible modes of infection I assert from the strongest conviction of the truth; and your preceptor denies them. I cure them with mercury, because I know them to be Venereal; and your preceptor cures them with mercury, because he says he knows them to be not Venereal,

but

but as mercury is their cure, he tells us that
 “ it is not material, whether they be Vene-
 “ real or not ;” that is, he raises a storm of
 confusion on purpose to assuage it.

PUPIL.

I beg your—

FOOT.

Stop if you please sir, I have not quite
 finished ;—and what is more, your preceptor
 denies those modes of infection not as con-
 firming general opinions both formerly and
 at present maintained, not as confirming
 what passes every day within the scope of
 observation among every rational and com-
 mon practitioner even, nor as what have
 been advanced by the most reputable authors
 and established by the most able practitioners
 from the first history of the disease to the
 present time, as facts indisputable and with-
 out the enlightened knowledge of which the
 disease would have been most ignorantly
 mistaken, and must have ever most fatally
 terminated. Your preceptor thus has for
 the sake of singularity confounded the Vene-
 real law of action, and exchanged established
 truth

truth for improbable opinion, regular practice for indecisive empiricism.

PUPIL.

I beg your pardon for just reminding you, that my preceptor has given a train of experiments in order to ascertain the progress of the disease.

FOOT.

He has said as much; and in his experiments consists the vanity of your preceptor. He forced his experiments to bend to his theory. Whatever absurdity he advanced he confirmed it by experiments. But these could never establish the true nature of the Venereal Disease in any wise equal to its natural action; as when he applied his experiments wrongly, these could not correctly confirm the true nature and extent of action of the disease. The fact is, that the natural action of the disease, as it is seen in all the varieties of cases which offer, is the only true and solid experiment which practical knowledge can confide in; this is to be depended upon, and by this is to be ascertained in the most perfect manner possible the

F

power

power and extent of action of the Venereal poison. Whoever is inquisitive about the nature of action of the Venereal poison, let him correct this one error, let him substitute experience for experiment. What signifies his proving by experiment that the blood is not contaminated, (as he calls it,) if cases prove that it is; that ulcers, and that a transplanted tooth do not impart the infection, and that a sucking child is not infected by the nurse, nor the nurse by the child, if cases prove the very contrary; and if these are every day seen, felt, and understood?

PUPIL.

But it must not be forgotten, that my preceptor has given the history of an experiment on one person which lasted for three years in order to ascertain the progress of the disease.

FOOT.

Yes, he has told us so, and you may persuade yourself that he did it, or that if he did it he had a right to do it, or that by doing it, he did that which afforded an insight into the nature of the disease without which we were still in the dark; for my part
I do

I do not believe that your preceptor ever made that experiment, that he ever could have committed so brutal an act; but even when he states it either from reality or fiction, I am persuaded that the result of that experiment has circumscribed rather than extended our knowledge of the true nature of the disease.

PUPIL.

But you see sir, for I know you read, that my preceptor's experiment which he made at St. George's hospital with ulcerous matter is quoted by Dr. Darwin as a fact upon which he proceeds to establish or corroborate rather, a similar fact.

FOOT.

I beg your pardon, it was not a similar fact. It does not follow, if Dr. Darwin's experiment were true, that your preceptor's must be. If you take the converse of the question, and try the action of the Venereal poison by variolous poison, you will find that no one can have the small pox the second time even by matter imparted from another.

F 2

other. Is that the case with respect to the Venereal Disease?

PUPIL.

I admit that it is not at all improbable to suppose, that the blood of a person under the influence of one poison may impart that poison to another person, when the blood of a person under the influence of another poison may not.

FOOT.

That is very fair; but you will presently find yourself undeceived, for that is not the state of the present case either. Dr. Darwin has quoted your preceptor as a very great authority, but the quotation was not applicable. You will always find how ready I am to subscribe to every fact, and I will defy the whole world to prove, that I ever by evasion shrunk from or perverted any question by which my sincerity in argument may be doubted. Dr. Darwin possesses a fine fanciful genius, and has afforded a wonderful display of it to the delight and edification of all his readers. Dr. Darwin will pardon me, I hope, when I say that practical and anatomical

tomical observations are not the creations of fancy, but the labours of truth and judgement, and the result of solid proofs. Dr. Darwin doubted nothing advanced by your preceptor, because he was not equal to him in the practice of the Venereal Disease. Dr. Darwin believed your preceptor, and therefore gave him the same credit for any assertion, as if he had obtained it from his own knowledge. It is a general custom among men of character and science to take each other's data for granted, and that custom is not to be condemned, because now and then a deception is played off, and because now and then a black sheep is discovered. We must all be content to learn from authors one part or another of the present state of human knowledge, no one of himself can embrace the whole; and where shall we look for confidence, if it be not found among those who investigate subjects ultimately tending to preserve and maintain the human race.

PUPIL.

Your observations appear to me to be perfectly correct and just. From the pains you seem determined to impose upon yourself, I
promise

promise that I shall readily discriminate those investigations which you are proceeding to offer on ulcerous Venereal matter, and which you are inclined to believe does convey the Venereal poison.

FOOT.

If there be one fact more obvious than another, this is it; but as your preceptor has stated it, you will find him to be correctly right, for he only removed the ulcerous matter from one part of the same person to another part, and he found that it would not reinfect, and so far he was strictly within the pale of propriety. But he made this experiment wrong through ignorance, and from that cause he confirmed in some measure a fact, but not that fact which he sought after. He established the fact that the ulcerous matter of one Venereal ulcer cannot when inserted on a sound part of the same person, produce another Venereal ulcer; but that does not prove that if the ulcerous matter of one person had been inserted on a part of another person, that it cannot produce another ulcer. Now your preceptor, and from that he reasoned generally instead of particularly,

larly, only inserted it on the same person and found that it did not produce another ulcer, and Dr. Darwin knowing no better than your preceptor has implicitly given into the same opinion. The strongest reflection upon the solid intuitive powers of those physiologists consists in pointing out to the admirers of both, that my discovery in this instance stared them full in the face without their seeing it. Pray which do you think is most likely to deceive us, symptoms of the disease or their assertions, when they are found contradictory to each other?

PUPIL.

It is very clearly understood by me, that you distinguish between the action of the Venereal poison of a person upon the same person, and the action of the poison of one person upon another; and that if it be true, that discovery belongs to you, and if false, you have fallen in for your share of having made a delusive vain assertion.

FOOT.

I am free to admit, that any appellation however thraſonic would be too mild for
me,

me, if what I have asserted upon the relative action of the Venereal poison be not true. You are welcome to bestow upon me exactly the same epithets which your preceptor has provoked by asserting that ulcerous Venereal matter will not infect, that the blood of one infected will not infect, and that infected nurses giving suck to children will not infect them, nor infected children nurses. Your preceptor is no more, he has descended into that valley where we all must follow, and therefore any address from me to him would be somewhat similar to him who calls after another when he is out of hearing; but he has left his theory behind him, and Dr. Darwin is become in this instance his representative; and I shall be a little bold in the confidence of my own understanding by telling him, that he is perfectly ignorant of what he has advanced upon this question.

PUPIL.

It appears to me I must own, to be a needless enquiry to endeavour to establish or make your discovery more obvious by farther illustration; or to explain by more instances the fallacy of the opinion that the blood is not contaminated

contaminated. The blood is to be considered as the principle of life, and of every secretion. Suppose a testicle enlarged and indurated by the Venereal poison; I will ask then, by what other medium was the infection imparted to this testicle, but blood? let those who deny that the blood is not contaminated tell me what connection there is between the body and the testicle, besides blood and nerve? if blood did not convey the infection to the testicle, why then it must be conveyed by nerve, and which is still more ridiculous.

FOOT.

If this had been a new question and first contended by us, if common cases from every period of the history of the disease had not convinced every observing practitioner of the fact, I should have barely given in my argument to the public and left with them the question at issue. But I say there is no doubt about the fact; every man that knows any thing of the matter, every man that admires truth, and values the benefit of it, and every man to whom it is necessary that it should be known already is assured of it.

PUPIL.

I really subscribe to your opinion, for I see no reason why I should so far yield it up as to submit that cases should give way to theory; that would be too bad. If matters of belief were like matters of fact, then heresy might be brought into the question.

FOOT.

Surely, a little heresy is all these two physiologists were seeking for. Give their opinions but a general hearing, altercate them, keep up their cork and feather only a little while for the sake of their public fame, and then, when their game is over, any one else may take the battledores out of their hands. Dr. Darwin stands upon no ceremony with probability; in my opinion he cares not about it. I see another opinion of your preceptor's which he has more egregiously outraged, than I could have thought the fancy of any man would have suggested. But is it not late, and time to adjourn?

PUPIL.

Pray sir, if you can spare the time, proceed now: we are engaged in the very marrow
of

of conversation, therefore if you possibly can indulge me, do not brake off as yet.

FOOT.

Sympathy, sir, has been a stalking horse uncommonly favourable to new opinions; just as if the power of sympathy had been suspended, undefined, or unknown till now; and just as if it had been an useless quality in the animal œconomy, before it was brought forward to aid in explanation the new opinions of your preceptor and Dr. Darwin.

PUPIL.

I am not unacquainted with your sentiments on sympathy. You only generally speaking object to the use of the word as expressing a corresponding condition of one part with another of the same person, and that it was preferably expressed by the more general term of “corresponding irritation;” sympathy implying a mental feeling of one individual for another, and not a corporeal feeling of one material part of an individual for another on the same.

G 2

FOOT.

FOOT.

You are so far right; but there is more yet to be explained. These two physiologists have not only substituted sympathy for corresponding irritation, but have attributed to sympathy the cause of symptoms which neither sympathy nor corresponding irritation will explain. Of this error in your preceptor I have formerly spoken; and now I will shew you a most curious observation upon sympathy by Dr. Darwin.

PUPIL.

As I have not perused Zoonomia with an eye of criticism, I of course cannot guess even at what you are so obligingly about to inform me.

FOOT.

I do not know how you should; for who can guess at that which possibility never united? Dr. Darwin in reasoning upon the power of sympathy supposes that the symptoms of hydrophobia most fatal to a person are in consequence of sympathy with the wounded skin inflicted by the bite of a mad dog; that a person bitten ever so flighty, if

that

that person be infected with hydrophobia, is so infected in consequence of sympathy and not of absorption; that particularly the affection of the throat which is the most important of all the symptoms, as it deprives the person of the power of swallowing any fluid, is produced by sympathy with the original bite on the skin.

PUPIL.

I submit myself to your having studied this subject, to your having collected cases upon it, and to your greater intimacy with the nature of it, than I possibly can be. Pray is not the bite inflicted by the mad dog, when it does infect, generally insignificant?

FOOT.

Yes, generally so.

PUPIL.

Does it not most commonly heal up some time before the symptoms of hydrophobia appear?

FOOT.

Often a long time before, and always some time before.

PUPIL.

PUPIL.

Is not the space of time between the bite and appearance of symptoms seldom less than thirty, and frequently forty, fifty, sixty, seventy, and yet more days? .

FOOT.

You are quite correct.

PUPIL.

Then how is it possible when the wound is healed, which was to cause the sympathy, when the time is indefinite in which the sympathy is to take place, when the whole of the symptoms of hydrophobia approach in gradual order, how is it possible, I ask, to attribute any one of them to sympathy? to attribute them to what? to a sympathy with a wound long ago inflicted and long ago healed? If sympathy has been the cause of those symptoms, every person who undergoes the small pox either by inoculation or breath experiences all the process of symptoms from sympathy. The symptoms of every morbid disease to which the animal œconomy is exposed are produced from a sympathy commencing with the first conveyance

ance of infection into the habit. Is this not giving a wonderful scope to the operation of sympathy, almost amounting to an universality?

FOOT.

It is true. There is nothing now-a-days too absurd to be believed; and I am confident that this opinion will have its advocates, as well as the Doctor's retrograde project, and short passage from the stomach to the bladder. In spite of what the eyes cannot see, and the understanding cannot approve, the amusement of the various lecture-rooms will be thus occupied. But if either had the probability or the promise of any plausible desideratum, one would be zealous in cherishing the investigation from a hope of success, and of the benefit that would result therefrom, upon the same motive that projectors have planned the cutting a navigable passage from the mediterranean into the red sea, or the little canals throughout Great Britain; or that navigators have aimed at exploring a passage of sea dividing the extent of American continent !!!

PUPIL.

Ha, ha, ha, ha, ha! Ha, ha, ha, ha, ha! Ha, ha, ha, ha, ha!

FOOT.

Laugh away, laugh on heartily either at him or me; I find when your preceptor is not the object that you can indulge a little pleafantry; it is the way of the hawk to fly high, to soar above his prey in order to make his discoveries; he never descends until he has made up his mind to pounce upon the quarry.

PUPIL.

Evoë, Evoë, Dr. Darwin! here is a premium offered to you by the London anatomists if you point out the supposed short passage from the stomach to the bladder in a shorter space of time than the Hudson's bay company can theirs!!!

FOOT.

Sir, there is this difference between the Doctor and your preceptor: your preceptor did not believe the absurdities which he advanced, I am assured he did not, many of them;

them; whereas the doctor not only has persuaded himself to believe his own absurdities, but your preceptor's also.

PUPIL.

Has not Dr. Darwin also given a plan to be adopted for getting male or female children at will?

FOOT.

He has, and I recollect many more plans and opinions which I do not think myself competent to decide upon; nor do I think that there is scarcely more than one man in this country who can.

PUPIL.

And pray who is he?

FOOT.

Dr. M****.

PUPIL.

Ha, ha, ha, ha, ha! Ha, ha, ha, ha, ha!
Ha, ha, ha, ha, ha! You make me laugh
from sympathy! You have thrown me into
convulsions, I should have said spasms! I
see sir, you adopt the favourite adage, you
H make

make ridicule the test of truth. Now that I have breathed a little, I am anxious to learn your opinion of the nature of that affection in the throat which deprives a patient of the power of swallowing in consequence of hydrophobia.

FOOT.

Sir, it is much easier to say what a thing is not, than to know what it is. If you read both antient and modern authors, you will find that they widely differ in assigning causes. One of the most prominent features of the human mind is that strong propensity for finding out causes; and as it is most commonly an arduous stretch of the mental power, the very exercise of it must be confessed to be a mark of inquisitive industry in the mind which is voluntarily thus engaged. But from the limited nature of human understanding and from an ignorance in first causes, we are found to be frequently arrogant and disappointed in our attempts on reasoning from cause to effect. The Creator alone has the power over causes; the Creator directs the effect by the cause, and we endeavour to trace the cause through the effect.

Thus

Thus in proportion to the judgement of speculative physiologists, you constantly see variations of opinion, and every one's theory more or less plausible in an exact degree with his strength of mental endowment.

PUPIL.

You have made a very modest apology for the theory you are about to display upon this question; pray proceed, as I promise myself an exquisite repast.

FOOT.

Certainly I ought not to hesitate. If my native modesty had forbid me to impart, and hardly had permitted me to risk opinion of this sort, the example of others would have corrected my first nature. Have you not seen persons in the height of passion whose whole frame has been agitated, whose limbs have trembled, whose eyes have looked furious, large, and glassy, whose faces have been distracted, whose mouths have foamed, whose tones and utterance have been altered, inarticulate, and husky, and whose powers of deglutition have been for a while suspended?

H 2

PUPIL.

PUPIL.

Frequently.

FOOT.

Now when a person is under the influence of a passion excited by any natural cause adequate to produce such effects, these continue as long as the cause which provoked them supports them, and no longer. The passion as it is called being over, the signs of it gradually decline, and in process of time the violent dominion of passion usurped over reason will be at an end. Now sir, I consider the passion of hydrophobia to be directly such a passion as this common passion which I have described. I consider every symptom of hydrophobia to be directly similar to that produced from a natural cause. There is first of all a change in the temper, a desire for solitude, a quarrelsome disposition towards the most intimate and valuable friends, and at length, the whole frame is agitated, the limbs tremble, the eyes look furious, large, and glassy, the face is distracted, the mouth foams, the tones and utterance are altered, inarticulate, and husky, and the power of deglutition is totally suspended.

PUPIL,

PUPIL.

So far you have made out a very strong and a very obvious analogy; and you appear to be hitherto correct in your statement; but there remains much more to be explained before you will obtain converts to your opinion.

FOOT.

Probably you are right; we are all too apt to be blind to our own errors, and we ought to be obliged to those who have the wisdom, the candour, and the courage also, to point them out.

PUPIL.

There is a most material distinction in the catastrophe of a person in a fit of passion and a person in an hydrophobia, and I am afraid your critics will not permit it to escape. Most of those who undergo fits of passion recover from them, all those who are afflicted with hydrophobia die of it. If you explain this objection to my satisfaction, I shall not hesitate to give my assent to your analogy.

FOOT.

FOOT.

This is not so difficult a task as you may imagine; and I am rather surpris'd that you did not discover my intention before, as you know I laid particular stress upon the power of passion excited from any natural cause, that the effect could not support itself beyond a limited duration; whereas, when the hydrophobic passion is excited, it is produced by the absorption of a morbid virus; in this instance the cause is not discontinued, and therefore the symptoms cannot subside, consequently no person thus afflicted can have the least chance or hope of recovery. In the first instance, the passion is roused by some mental provocation; in the second, by the action of a morbid poison insinuated into the habit; the one may and does abate, the other cannot; the one is provoked by an external cause which may cease, the other by an internal cause which never can.

PUPIL.

I suppose you only mean that this should be received as a conceit, as something offered by you as approaching nearer the truth than what we are told by Dr. Darwin; and look-
ing

ing at it as I do in that view, I am irresistibly impelled to acknowledge, that it is more analogous, more compleat, and more ingenious, than any cause I have hitherto heard assigned. Apropos! Is it not asserted that my preceptor was the first who practised the method of excision of the part bitten by a mad dog? but upon recollection I take upon me to avow that it is so asserted, and I think it very strange, as I find that you was induced to publish your Essay on the Bite of a mad Dog purely because of the inadequacy of any other method, and because my preceptor had not adopted excision of the bitten part, but had applied caustic, and depended upon that.

FOOT.

I did not expect this open confession from you, it is a voluntary tribute to justice. I see you refer to what is said by Home in his life of your preceptor. It is very true, that I was induced to publish my essay on the bite of a mad dog, and to collect and bring forward more cases in the plan I afterwards published, than ever were collected and well authenticated by any predecessor. In that
very

very essay I prove by John Hunter's letters to Dr. Johnson that he was perfectly ignorant of this method by excision; that his own words are "we seem to be as much at a loss how to treat it as they were a thousand years ago." Now this letter was written in consequence of his having treated two cases the most favourable for excision, not by excision, but by caustic; both of which cases failed, as both the patients died of hydrophobia.

PUPIL.

I am astonished that Home should have advanced as a matter of belief with him what could be so easily and so openly refuted; but I am more astonished that he would have hazarded a revival of that which only can tend to lessen the reputation of his brother-in-law, his own veracity, and that just confidence which we should be otherwise disposed to give him upon other points which could not possibly be so easily refuted. This appears to me I must own to be a most desperate act.

FOOT.

FOOT.

Not more so than many more. They who grasp at all things hold nothing fast. Why should you be astonished at the combination of those who hope to appear pre-eminent alone, and who without borrowing from others would not be found to possess of themselves one single quality of excellence? It is surely time to adjourn. But I shall not dismiss you without leaving upon your mind a due impression of what we have been debating.

PUPIL.

I shall most readily give you all my attention, and yield to your inclination.

FOOT.

To fix those conceited opinions of your preceptor, those doubtful experiments and those immoral precepts, to bring his admirers into a fair discussion of them, to hold them to it without subterfuge, to hinder them from starting at their approach, from digressing instead of closely arguing, is a difficult task; and can be only attempted by thus publicly challenging them to it. They

I

possibly

possibly may be more ashamed to shrink from a fair defence of their preceptor when the public eye is upon them; and may confine themselves more closely to matter of fact, when they know that they are watched.

PUPIL.

That will be coming at once to the question, and the reputation of my preceptor will be more advanced by his opinions standing the test of investigation, than by their saying that he has a reputation, and avoiding all argument in support of it.

FOOT.

You will be pleased to tell them so.

PUPIL.

I certainly shall, it is but fair, and they are forced to comply with it, or to hold their tongues.

FOOT.

Your preceptor's admirers may be strictly compared to starting horses; they affect to show the greatest spirit when they see an object they dare not face; they start, they prance,

prance, they lay hold of the bit, they endeavour to throw their riders, and all the while when their noses are attempted to be brought back to the frightening object, their hearts palpitate, their reason forsakes them, fear possesses them, they turn their contrary faces about, and start again.

PUPIL.

I am free to admit that where there is power there is ease. These convulsive irregularities denote feebleness. To correct with temper or to despise with ease, to answer direct or to be silent without muttering, will be ever the conduct of those who feel their own superiority, either by natural or cultivated talent.

FOOT.

Well then sir, I shall consider you as their delegate. Your conciliatory manners warrant you to be a proper person for the purpose. When they are assembled at the Lyceum to prove the possibility of their preceptor's opinions, for even that may be difficult, tell them how incumbent it is upon them to answer the following questions. I

may afterwards perhaps send them in some more, but let these suffice for the present, and you will have the goodness to take them with you.

1. Is the discharge in a Gonorrhœa, Pus?

2. Is the specific extent of virus confined to an inch, or an inch and a half, or two inches at most, within the Urethra?

3. Is sympathy the cause of the inflammation throughout the Urethra? of the inflammation on the neck of the bladder? of a swelled testicle? of a bubo? of Phymosis and of Paraphymosis? of chordé?

4. Is his cure of Gonorrhœa that which has improved modern practice? who follows his method? are his bread pills, or is his injection of solution of sublimate the most preferable example of a remedy?

5. Need there be any remedy for that which cures itself?

6. When

6. When Gonorrhœa cures itself, might he not have spared two of his chapters at least, the one which treats on the cure of Gonorrhœa, and the other for the treatment of the constitution in the cure of Gonorrhœa?

7. What do you think of electricity, and of cicuta for the cure of chordé?

8. Is the muscular power of the bladder encreased, that is, mended by its being diseased?

9. Is not the application of caustic to strictures in the Urethra a very good thing? and is not the following passage from the book of your preceptor a very good thing also? “ This method may
“ be employed both in cases where a
“ bougie will pass and where it will
“ not.” does not this shew that it is a very good thing?

10. How many cases of spasm have you seen in the Urethra, independent of positive obstruction?

11. What

11. What think you of his chapter on Impotence? is not the following passage in it a very honest thing? “ This complaint is by many laid to the charge of Onanism at an early age, I think I may affirm that this act in itself does less harm to the constitution in general, than the natural.”

12. Is not the following passage a very honest thing? “ I could even allow a man who has a Gonorrhœa to have connection with a sound woman, if he took care to clear all the parts of any matter, by first syringing the Urethra, making water, and washing the Glans.”

13. Do you say with him, that Phymosis and Paraphymosis never happen in consequence of Gonorrhœa only?

14. Will you presume to cure a Chancre by caustic alone, and will caustic alone reduce a Chancre to the state of a common sore or wound?

15. If

15. If he has dissolved every Bubo but three, which he found within his practice since the year 1761, if he has said so, and if he has shewn you how he did it, cannot you do the same?

16. Has he not admitted in page 14, and subsequent pages, "the poison being the same in Gonorrhœa and Chancre," and yet has he explained to you how it happened that a person might have a Gonorrhœa without its producing on himself a Chancre, and a Chancre without its producing on himself more Chancres or Gonorrhœa?

17. Did not his ignorance of the nature of the Venereal poison being harmless to the person who secretes it, induce him to try those experiments upon the same person which he should have tried upon another? and was he not from this error induced to deny the nature of that infection which cases are constantly proving, namely, that the poison can be imparted from one person to another by ulcerous matter as well as by the fluid from

from Gonorrhœa or Chancre, by a transplanted tooth, by sucking, and by all the secreted fluids of a person infected?

18. Do you believe that he made an experiment which lasted three years : is there one living witness to justify the fact, and what do we derive from it ?

19. Has not Home said in his Life of John Hunter that he believed that he was one of the first who taught that “cutting out the part was the only mode of preventing the Hydrophobia,” and where are the practical instances ?

20. Is it likely that he knew of the certainty of the effect from the bite of a mad dog being prevented by the excision of the bitten part, when he treated two cases which proved fatal by caustic, instead of excision ? when as it is confessed from his own words “every other known “method was tried” in those two cases ? when he confesses that “we appear to “be as ignorant as they were a thousand “years ago ?” and when he has not even

even hinted at one syllable about the mode of excision of the bitten part? Now is it likely or is it not, that my Essay on the Bite of a Mad Dog first brought your preceptor to his reason upon these fatal cases?

DIALOGUE THE THIRD.

PUPIL.

YOU told me fir, that my conversation was acceptable, and you have generously supposed me desirous after knowledge; you will I trust agree with me that knowledge belongs to no particular parties, and that parties are generally formed among men only for the purpose of promoting interested designs, and to which a shew of knowledge is rendered an assisting and a necessary agent.

FOOT.

You open so frankly, that I almost fear to encounter you. Your breathing time has
given

given you confidence, and made your mind more firm. I like it. Hesitation may be a delicate feature in an innocent mind, and it may be a monstrous mark in an hypocritical one also; but frankness will bare examination all around, and will voluntarily expose itself and turn itself about, in order that it might be more closely and more thoroughly examined.

PUPIL.

I have been reading your life of my preceptor, and I have read all the criticisms upon it. I have read his life by Home also.

FOOT.

You might have said Home's life, for it will serve for either.

PUPIL.

That is true. He seems uncommonly shy of you, although he has endeavoured at following your order, and given a different construction to your facts. It appears to me clearly, that he has brought forward and dwelt upon facts which he would not have dreamt of, but in consequence of your having

pointed them out before; and has aimed at giving them another inclination for the purpose of repelling what you have advanced; silently and cunningly conveying the antidote without noticing the poison, exhibiting the remedy without announcing the disease, wishing not to be seen answering you lest a reference should incline the ballance of argument against him, opening one eye of his readers and shutting up the other.

FOOT.

Oh! he is most sincerely welcome; it would be hard to deny a valet-de-chambre the wardrobe of his deceased master; or would it be just to say, that if he wore his master's cloaths; he did not come honestly by them. Home is welcome to appear in any part of his brother-in-law's dress, provided he gave a just account when he did undertake to do it, how the brother-in-law himself came by it. If your preceptor had been the original author of the practice of cutting out the part bitten by a mad dog, I certainly should have had no objection to any reputation which might have been derived from it, descending as an heir-loom in perpetuity to his successors.

PUPIL.

PUPIL.

I believe verily that you would not, if that had been the case. Then suppose we read over your life of my preceptor together; I retain, I flatter myself, enough of the objections which have been offered to it, and enough of the contradictions which have been urged against it, to qualify me for meeting the principal arguments as they come in review before us.

FOOT.

With all my heart; although it might be supposed that one does not very much like to have those damned good-natured fellows, as Sir Fretful Plagiary calls them, too often brought into our company.

PUPIL.

That appears a very indifferent matter to you. The more they attempt to grind you, the sharper you are. In the first place, I like your introduction; it contains the whole property of a biographer.

FOOT.

I thank you sir, proceed.

PUPIL.

PUPIL.

Your description of the contests between the Hunters and the Monroes, between the Hunters and Pott, and between the Hunters and Baron Haller that would have been, if Haller had not consciously felt himself above it, has been variously criticised; by some we are told that the subject was generally known, that it had already occupied too much of the attention, and that it was too remote for revival; as if these were reasons why it should not have been put into the life, as if that which had been a cause of public appeal, and which had excited a contention for years in a public print, the Critical Review, should not have had a corner in the life of one of its most important agents.

FOOT.

You are right; but such is the cold indifference in which pure knowledge is held, that you find, when the contending passions have subsided, and the principal actors have withdrawn from the scene, that the subject of dispute being only their second object, and their own interest being the first, the one may
sleep,

sleep, when the other is answered: besides, one may be canted over with the plausible sentiment of many honourable contentions having terminated by the reconciliation of parties, and that therefore it is invidious in any man to attempt to revive them.

PUPIL.

I feel the force of your observation; and I suppose, that will be the plea which will be given by the Critical Reviewers for having been silent altogether upon your life of John Hunter, for not having even noticed it.

FOOT.

The Critical Reviewers might or might not suppose that I meant an attack upon them, when I said the Hunters hired their Review as a vehicle of their complaints, and retained it's editor by a bribe; but that was no fault of mine, it belongs to the natural history of your preceptor, unless I have advanced a falsehood by referring my readers to the Critical Review, and by their finding nothing in it to prove the question; but if what I said in the life be true, if they have thus embarked in this desperate and mercenary

cenary project, the fault is with those who pretending to be independent, and to impart purely the knowledge of others and their own observations upon it, are detected in venally disseminating dissentions and propagating false opinions, with those who have put themselves in the way of being exposed, when the truth of the case accidentally comes out, and is again accidentally revived to the public eye.

PUPIL.

Besides sir, I presume that the present authors of that Review were not the authors during the contests, those being thirty years ago; and that therefore the present could not consider themselves in any manner principals in transactions too remote for their time; at least it would have been politic in the present, and it would have shewn that they were, what Reviewers ought ever to have been, masters of the passions, if they had not given such strong cause for suspecting that they mingled their feelings with those of their predecessors: surely sir, you cannot suppose that they are at this present time, the same set of people?

FOOT.

FOOT.

Not the individual set, but the same race; not individually the same mind in the same body, the same lodging in the same house, the same coat upon the same back, fate and fashion have rendered that impossible; but they are of the same class with the former, impelled and continued on by the same necessities, they receive the same pay, feed on similar food, lie in similar chambers, are endowed with similar talents, partake of similar educations, trained up to similar practices, possess similar countenances, and unblushingly hold out similar palms of corruption.

PUPIL.

Then you think that they looked out for a bribe from you to defend their own reputation, and not having received one, they suffered it to take its chance.

FOOT.

Mark me sir, I do not think for them, or care about them. The authors of *Tristram Shandy* and of the *Crazy Tales* have exchanged with them a few lessons in their

L

own

own way; they knew very well how to adapt themselves to every condition; they ascertained with much more nicety than I can, the exact depravity of the human heart; I would rather refer you for their characters to them, than take up our present time farther about them; they are just worth our notice, and that is all; in spite of us they will always be incorrigibly the same to the end of time; the lowest among men, drudging on from necessity. Have you not lately seen in your way to Greenwich asses with sand-bags upon their backs?

PUPIL.

I have.

FOOT.

And so did I thirty years ago. Now these which you lately saw probably were not the same individual asses which I then saw, or which might have been then seen by Sterne, or by Hall, or by any other passenger from London to Greenwich, that was their contemporary; but still asses are destined to carry the bags of sand from Greenwich to London.

PUPIL.

PUPIL.

How long do you reckon an afs might live?

FOOT.

Ask that of a Reviewer.

PUPIL.

The series of your life of my preceptor has been said to be a libel upon him, as attacking his education, his candour, his veracity, his honour, his chirurgical talents, and his general deportment.

FOOT.

I never expected to write the life of John Hunter without being stung by hornets; I was prepared for that in my own mind before I began; I did it with open eyes and mental conviction; but the only question is, whether what I have advanced be true or not?

PUPIL.

That they must justify before they can obtain credit for their assertions, or condemn yours. They must alter the effect of your facts and establish their own, before they

can give another colour to his life: this is natural.

FOOT.

And that they never can do; I will go farther, they dare not contend with me for the truth article by article. Whenever I have asked, what advances your preceptor has made in surgery, or in anatomical discoveries, of any value, I have never found one of them capable of fixing and dwelling upon any thing. I now ask you sir, whether you can do better for him? What did the doctrine of absorbents derive from him? I do not mean what he says it derived from him, but what by comparing the advances of others with his, what did it derive?

PUPIL.

I am not of myself prepared to answer that; but if he cannot be defended there, I know not where he can.

FOOT.

I am sorry I put the question to you. We are told by the brother-in-law, in his life of him, that he entered as a gentleman commoner

moner at St. Mary Hall Oxford, and we find him the next year at St. George's Hospital; now it would not have been very difficult to have found out that he had not staid long at an University, if we had not found out where he was the next year.

PUPIL.

That I believe might as well have been left alone; and from what I have heard from him during his lecturing, and from what I have seen under his own hand, I should have been better pleased if that had not been noted, because it naturally raises the curiosity to enquire into the effect of an education which has exalted every man of genius whose good fortune it was to partake of it.

FOOT.

Sir, I suppose at the most he might have made an excursion one summer day to St. Mary Hall, and if he staid long enough there to hang his hat upon a peg, I dare say it was for a time no longer than the hat might have remained without needing to be brushed afresh. Now sir, I call upon you, who were more conversant with him than I, to say

say whether you did not find yourself much more mortified than he was from the embarrassments he constantly experienced through a barren education? Sir, this I mean to assert, that an illiterate man never feels conscious of his own deficiency.

PUPIL.

What signifies our dwelling upon that which no one can enquire into without being convinced? I beg you would put aside that parcel of his manuscripts which I see you are preparing to lay before me, to do what? to convince me of what I confess.

FOOT.

Then let them hold their tongues about education. I will so far comply with you as to keep the manuscripts for another provocation; but whilst the witness is living, you shall have the following anecdote, lest it be contradicted when what he told me cannot be maintained. This will not keep like a manuscript, it being subject to the fleeting breath of life. A physician wrote to your preceptor to appoint a time for consulting
with

with him about a case; your preceptor returned a written answer beginning thus—

PUPIL.

I intreat you sir, to change the subject. Let us proceed with our perusal of his life, at the same time I am free to admit you have been altogether forced upon this.

FOOT.

I yield to your interference.—In the life written by the brother-in-law his excellences in surgery are enumerated; they consist in a daring extirpation of tumours; in the operation of the popliteal aneurism; and in cutting out the part for the prevention of hydrophobia.

PUPIL.

The latter you have answered already to my fullest satisfaction. The merit given him does not belong to him, it belongs to you, and it was defaming his name to attribute that to him which was not his own; it was in a great degree confirming what you have persisted in, that he was so barren of himself as to be constantly cultivating a reputation
by

by what he stole from the stock of others. But you must allow that the tumours he dissected, as stated by the brother-in-law, were great actions, or rather great appropriations of sound judgement and operating power.

FOOT.

The operation was a daring one, and not aided by judgement. It was his contempt of judgement that made him operate; his brother-in-law has not told you the true event of this case. If you read this letter, it will shew it you. You may read it aloud. These men are not to be answered by the bare assertions of any man of honour.

PUPIL.

This letter I see came by the Penny Post.

“ SIR,

‘ In page 31 of Mr. Hunter’s Life by Mr. Home it says “ he dissected out a tumour of
 “ the neck, which one of the best operating
 “ surgeons in this country had declared,
 “ rather too strongly, that no one but a fool
 “ or a madman would attempt, and the patient got *perfectly well*.” The fact is, that
 Mr.

Mr. Pott and many other eminent surgeons in London and on the Continent persuaded Mr. Pocock not to have the tumour removed, because it was strumous and connected with many other glands in the same state of disease; Mr. Hunter gave his decided opinion that it would cure him, on which Mr. Pott exclaimed in the words quoted.'

'The result was that Mr. Pocock died in twelve months after the operation, with an enlarged spleen, diseased lungs, and other encreased lymphatic glands, declaring the operation had hastened his death.'

'W. French.'

'Mr. Jesse Foot,
Surgeon,
Dean Street, Soho.'

This appears to me to be very explicit, and plainly establishes my preceptor's want of judgement; and the brother-in-law producing this as a select instance of his skill in surgery proves how he must have been hard pushed for a precedent. But you certainly

M

must

must approve of his method of treating the Popliteal Aneurism?

FOOT.

Why sir, the knowledge of the operation is an improvement in the practice of modern surgery; yet its preferable success will be ever dependant upon the nature of the case. The operation will be more successful in cases where the aneurism has been produced from an accident, than from a constitutional cause. This distinction will lead to its success. It ought only to be preferred under the direction of judgement. It would be the worst practice to attempt it in some cases, as it would be the best in others. It is upon the whole relatively excellent. I see the brother-in-law has not in his catalogue of excellencies touched upon your preceptor's applying tight bandages to arms inflamed from the operation of bleeding. This was giving the simple idea, for I believe it never would have arrived to the pitch of being a practical one, a decent, a modest, and a silent funeral; and I hope it will rest for ever without a monument!!!

PUPIL,

PUPIL.

The application of tight bandages to inflamed arms was an idea which you did a laudable act to the public in reprobating, and you have my thanks for it, as I assure you I might have been disposed to have followed his theory, had I not read your arguments against the practice.

FOOT.

If you have any more surgical questions to put to me, pray let us hear them, do not be sparing of his excellencies; or otherwise one might be told of some that were omitted hereafter by one or other of his squalid pupils, who guggle forth their jargon, as water comes out of a bottle.

PUPIL.

Pray have you read his Treatise on Gun-Shot Wounds?

FOOT.

I have read it, but am not prepared to speak of it; hereafter will be a time for that. I must have a little conversation with the

surgeons from Germany, whom he did not send out, for those whom he did send out, were complained against. The latest surgeons sent thither will be able to judge practically upon the subject. His cases whence he drew all his inferences, and which offered when he was green in practice at Bellisle and at Portugal, were neither adequate from variety in their proper nature, nor from his practical knowledge, at that period of his life, for giving such a conception of the effect of gun-shot wounds, as one single action of the outer post of guards would furnish in the present continental war. The practical surgeons in the present continental war must have seen enough to realize the truth of the dreams of your preceptor, or rather to be enabled to discern, whether they be dreams or realities. What a pity it is, that the treatise had not been published two years sooner !!!

PUPIL.

I know your reason. The wounded who came from Germany to London to be cured, did not apply to him, because they left his pupils there ignorant, and consequently conceived

ceived that their master must have been so here. But if this treatise had then come forth, they must have been convinced of the contrary; and instead of applying on their return to other surgeons, would for their own interest have applied to him. It appears, I confess, that my preceptor was very much at leisure both at Bellisle and at Portugal; for it was during his stay there, that he was so full of those first conceptions which he afterwards matured, and produced to the world. All his wonders in his book entitled "the Animal OEconomy" had their creation in the year 1762. His note-book is constantly referred to for events of this period. His Paper on the Organ of Hearing in Fishes, his wonderful power in the dispersion of a Bubo, with many more, what you are pleased to call, fabulous discoveries, had their origin at Bellisle, or at Portugal.

FOOT.

Whatever subject had been published upon by another previously to having published on the same, he always antedated, in order to shew that although he was fore-stalled

stalled in the printing, he could not be forestalled in the idea.

PUPIL.

That could only be a successful piece of fraud, as long as he could support the credit of being esteemed a man of honour.

FOOT.

And so long he had my most unbounded credit. Although he did not publish upon a subject until twenty years after his return from Bellisle, yet the note-book was constantly referred to; and even previous to his going to Bellisle, and whilst he was dissecting with his brother, the note-book was found to be filling up apace, upon every discovery brought forward by others, upon every period subsequent to that. His note-book, it would appear, was to him as the Sybils Leaves, although he was not or could be conscious of the similarity.

PUPIL.

Perhaps you suppose he resolved in this note-book to invent the digestion of the stomach after death, and to present the invention twenty years hence.

FOOT.

FOOT.

I hear you call it an invention; I do not know whether you mean it as a farcasm upon me or upon your preceptor; but I will insist upon it, that it can be an invention only; for if it were a discovery, any anatomist may see it when it is once pointed out; whereas as an invention, it might for ever be confined to the Museum of the Hunters. No one else has or can see it, not even the inquisitive eye of Spallanzani can discern it. The invention fairly belongs to the Hunters, and the brother-in-law needs never to take out a patent for it from fear that some one else should dare to take away the right,

PUPIL.

His observations upon the Torpedo were not the first that were made upon that fish?

FOOT.

They were not. Reaumur, Redi, Steno, and Lorenzini, had published theirs; but your preceptor did not mention their names.

PUPIL.

PUPIL.

Pray was the discovery of certain receptacles of air-cells in birds first made by him?

FOOT.

You know it was impossible. The discovery long ago belonged to Professor Camper, who had published upon it, and who came on purpose over to England from Holland to call your preceptor to an account for the piracy. You may see his apology lame as it is, in a note annexed to the paper.

PUPIL.

Was the description of the Gillaroo Trout originally his own?

FOOT.

No, it was not. Watson had published a description long before him, but your preceptor has not mentioned his name.

PUPIL.

Was his description of the Gymnotus originally his own?

FOOT.

FOOT.

In his paper on the *Gymnotus* he has not noticed a single author, although Bancroft and Garden had both of them published their descriptions of it before him.

PUPIL.

His treatise upon teeth, I see in his life has had the fullest criticism from you. You have there enumerated a long list of the most reputed authors who had written upon this subject. I am hurt to find that my preceptor could have published upon a subject so general, without acknowledging the merit of a single author. By his always concealing, in every instance, the names of authors from whom he borrowed ideas, it plainly appears that his design was to take any man's right away from him whenever he wanted it, and wherever he found it.

FOOT.

The names of the authors are so reputable, that because he has not quoted them I will. By fixing your attention upon them, you will learn not to forget them. They are Eustachius, Fallopius, Columbus, André

N

Dulaurens,

Dulaurens, Rolpinkius, Duverney, Bertin, Albinus, besides some professed dentists; those your preceptor had either not known, or chose to forget, I care not which. But there is a point in my criticism on this treatise, which directly attacks your preceptor's veracity, and I want to know if his advocates will seriously venture to vindicate it.

PUPIL.

I think I know what you hint at. Is it not about his injecting a tooth?

FOOT.

Sir, in page 111 he told us in a gossiping style, that he injected a tooth, and flitting it in halves, found that it was well injected; and in page 36, he told us that "we cannot
" by injection prove that the bony part of a
" tooth is vascular." Now I long to know if this injected tooth be in the Museum, if it be there, I call it a wonderful instance of impossible skill; and if it be not there, I call the whole account an idle tale fabricated for the amusement of his credulous pupils.

PUPIL.

PUPIL.

Your inference, independent of your irony, is fair. A tooth so injected must now be found in the Museum; if it hath not a place there,—but I shall say no more. I see you have brought forward a case directly against his opinion, that a pregnant woman having the small-pox seemed not to infect the foetus.

FOOT.

I have. I recommend a perusal of this case to Dr. Darwin, as I know not what other communication there is betwixt the mother and the foetus, but by blood. Besides this case, there are many similar to it confirming the same fact, published before your preceptor's paper upon opinion; and which as they were contradictory to what seemed to be his opinion, he has not noticed at all.

PUPIL.

The account of the Organ of hearing in Fishes would, by what he says, appear to be his own; for if I recollect, this was one of his amusements at Portugal.

N 2

FOOT.

FOOT.

Yes, so he has told us. If you believe him, he made this discovery in the year 1760, and he published it in the year 1782. Now Professor Camper published on the same discovery in the year 1761, and again in the year 1774; and in the year 1778, the researches made by Geoffroy on the organ of hearing in fishes were examined by the Royal Society of Physicians at Paris, and their report upon them was then printed. Sir, I mean to avow on every one of those productions your preceptor has been designedly silent.

PUPIL.

His observations on the Structure and OEconomy of Whales, I believe, were published in the year 1787, and I think you produced in his life the titles and the dates of two papers by Professor Camper prior to those observations of my preceptor.

FOOT.

I did. One bears date in the year 1765, the other in the year 1776, and neither of them have been regarded by your preceptor.

It

It is thus that the silly credulity of his admirers has been played upon; for it was thought that all his productions were original discoveries. The same plagiarism might be detected in his Observations upon Bees, in which he has omitted the names of every author of repute, and in almost every other subject which he has ever treated upon.

PUPIL.

The subjects which you have avowed to be not original, I confess you have fully proved that they were not so, and have convinced me that the thorough intention of my preceptor, by concealing the original authors, was, that they should be deemed proper to him alone. Pray then sir, answer me this question in the plainest and truest manner, Was there any thing of his own in the Animal OEconomy, and which no one else before him had written upon?

FOOT.

I believe there were; and that you may not mistake them, and may see the importance of them, I will point them out. They consist of the Digestion of the Stomach after
Death,

Death, of ascertaining the Cause of the variegated Feathers of a Pheasant, of the account of a Free-Martin, of experiments on Worms to ascertain the Power of Heat in Animals and Vegetables, of remarks on a new marine Animal, of the invention of a Bellows for the Recovery of drowned Persons, and of the procreative Power of an half spayed Sow.

PUPIL.

Apropos,—has it not been said that you have never seen that Museum which you have affected to describe, and is it true that you have not seen it? But before you answer the question, I must observe to you, that in my opinion you have made out a just and candid arrangement of it.

FOOT.

I have never seen it; but if I had, I could not myself have given so good an account of it as that which I offered in my life of your preceptor. It was done for me by a competent man of excellence; and I will give the Critic credit for his sagacity but not for his candour, as when he said that I had not

seen the Museum, and therefore could not describe it, he omitted to acknowledge, that it was fairly described. Now if he had said that the description could not have been mine, because it was so justly and so fairly given, he might have been right.

PUPIL.

I comprehend you; you mean to declare, that the descriptive part of my preceptor's Museum was not done by you; that it was too good, and too honest to be done by you, and that it positively was done by another.

FOOT.

I do. The inferences and remarks which follow are my own. Now sir, what will this foolish Critic say for himself, when I defy him to produce an account of the Museum more in its praise than is there given? and what will he say for himself, when he reflects, that if I have done the Museum more than justice, if I have in some measure sacrificed my opinion, and concealed that which might have injured the interest of the property? what will he say for himself in
having

having urged this explanation by his thus playing the Marplot?

PUPIL.

I am free to admit that any man of discernment might have seen that your comment upon the Museum was softened from a more delicate consideration than a conviction of the propriety of Parliament purchasing it.

FOOT.

You may rely on it, that I spared my opinion from the best of motives: I might have said much: I had the power, but did not use it: I owed the debt to justice, and yet I evaded paying it.

PUPIL.

Since you published the life of my preceptor, have you read a little pamphlet sold by Kearsly upon the subject of Parliament purchasing the Museum?

FOOT.

I have. It might be called an incendiary Letter, at one time servilely supplicating, and at another demanding, just as sturdy
beggars

beggars act before and after they are refused. It is pretty to see how this ingenious advocate can twist and apply contradictory tones to suit his purpose. Now, your preceptor is said to embrace all the emoluments, from pure merit, of all the places that Government had to bestow. Now his practice was more extensive, and his income from it larger, than any other surgeon's, either before or at his time. Now he has bequeathed by will as a patriotic legacy his Museum to the public;—and now it is a valuable acquisition to the English nation;—and Parliament is to have the honour of purchasing it, by which the pupils will be attracted to London!!! Then, mark the consequences from Parliament's refusal.—Then the money would be wanted for its value, as your preceptor died poor, and his family ought to be considered as the children of the state.—Then if Parliament does not purchase it, the Museum shall not remain in London, it shall be sent to Scotland, it shall not remain here without being purchased, but it shall be sent thither if it be not.—Then London by this will be a sufferer, it will lose what was an honour to it, what was collected in it by money gained

in it.—And then the pupils will rebel, and withdraw from the London Hospitals to follow into Scotland the fortune of the Museum. A serious threat of emigration!!!

PUPIL.

I think it was not the most conciliatory method of addressing Parliament, which the author might have taken; and I apprehend it must have been displeasing to any one who has read it.

FOOT.

Besides, I think it will be difficult to prove how this collection can improve the art of surgery. It will be hardly worth while for a student who comes up to London for a twelvemonth to quit the practice of anatomy and surgery, and embarrass his mind about the preservation of diseases, the histories of which are unknown to him, and about morbid dissections neither made nor seen by himself. The engraver's art can multiply every important figure in the collection; and the description of it can be read and studied in any place, and at any time, when the student finds himself at leisure. Whenever the

Museum

Museum be purchased, the cost of it does not end there. The preservation of it might be lengthened by expence and care, yet even with those, its duration cannot be long. There are two ways of disposing of it, if Parliament be so uncharitable as to lend its deaf ear to the application, or not to administer to the will. The threatened resolution of sending the whole of it to Scotland might be taken, or it might be sold in distinct lots to your preceptor's pupils, who will doubtless buy them up greedily, as pilgrims did heretofore the relicts of their saints.

PUPIL.

A truce with your irony, sir; but I cannot help remarking how unhandsomely the Hunters seem to treat the English, their patrons. William Hunter offered his Museum to them only for the fee simple of a piece of ground, and it being refused, he left by will his Museum to Scotland; and thus we have been threatened with the disposal of my preceptor's.

FOOT.

FOOT.

Civil to the last, or rather as long as there is a hope of their turns being served. They do not seem content with large incomes from the public whilst living, but seek a profit after death; or rather would draw one if they could. There might be a desire in every man for perpetuating his own excellencies I admit, but some good must be derived from them, before posterity will ratify the proud idea.

PUPIL.

That cannot be contradicted. Sir, in your series of transactions in the life of my preceptor, every one must have seen, that you have written to men, however partiality might have warped the judgement. It cannot be said that you have not been critically nice in establishing the proofs of your various anecdotes; or that you have not given them with a scrupulous authenticity, well knowing that reasonable beings require to be convinced by reason only, not by authority.

FOOT.

It will now be no difficult matter to prove every thing I have advanced; and it was for
that

that cause I published his life so soon after his death, that any one article which I have given to him if false or perverted, may be now also the better contradicted. I am confident that if the same life had been written fifty years hence, there are many of the facts which I have stated, and which now must be received, that would not then have been credited. “De mortuis nil nisi bonum” has been construed “speak nothing but good of the dead;” it is I know generally so taken, as if the dead were always to be praised. If this were the true construction, the adage thus conceived would be a wicked one; it would place the highest virtue and the lowest vice, the noblest sincerity and the vilest hypocrisy upon the same basement.

PUPIL.

Certainly he that speaks the truth of the dead, speaks good of the dead, that is, justly of the dead.

FOOT.

Therefore sir, pray tell his admirers, that instead of their saying that I have blackened
his

his character, it is their duty first of all to contradict by better proof than I have brought, what I have said in the life of your preceptor, if they cannot,—there is his character.

FINIS.

Therefore sir, pray tell his admirers, that instead of their saying that I have blackened his