

Postscript to Dr. Hamilton's letter of September 27th 1824, to the members of the Senatus Academicus of the University of Edinburgh / [James Hamilton].

Contributors

Hamilton, James, 1767-1839.
MacLagan, David, 1785-1865.
University of Edinburgh. Faculty of Medicine.

Publication/Creation

[Edinburgh] : [Murray & Mitchell, Printers], [1824.]

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/uwe57myp>

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>

POSTSCRIPT

TO

Dr HAMILTON'S Letter of September 27th 1824,

TO THE

MEMBERS of the SENATUS ACADEMICUS of the
UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH.

GENTLEMEN,

BEFORE the Meeting of the Senatus Academicus for which the preceding pages were chiefly intended, I received some information from Cambridge, which I considered it my duty to transmit, through our Reverend Principal, for your information, and which I now beg leave to repeat, as I find that several Members of the Senatus were absent from the Meeting (October 14th) at which this information was given.

In the first of the preceding pages, it is stated, that during the last ten years, the number of Medical Graduates at the University of Cambridge had been seventeen, while it had amounted to one thousand and ten at this University. But by information which I subsequently received, I find, that at the University of Cambridge there is this difference between Medical Graduates and Doctors of Medicine,—that those who obtain the degree of Bachelor of Medicine are, by courtesy, called Doctor out of the University, though, in point of fact, they cannot receive the degree of Doctor of Medicine till four years after the previous degree of Bachelor. So cautious are the English Universities in sanctioning Physicians, that they have established an intermediate degree between the Bachelor and the Doctor, called Licentiate.

Thus,

Thus, in Cambridge, (and I believe it is the same in Oxford), it requires six years attendance before a Candidate can be made Bachelor of Medicine, at the end of two years more he may be made Licentiate, and he does not acquire the degree of Doctor till he have been ten years Member of the University.

This information enabled me to correct an error into which I had fallen, in comparing the number of Medical Graduates of Cambridge with those of Edinburgh during the last ten years. I had stated the former at seventeen, and the latter at one thousand and ten. The fact is, that while seventeen degrees of Doctor of Medicine were taken during that period at Cambridge, there were also thirty-two degrees of Bachelor of Medicine conferred.

But this, I apprehend, does not invalidate the argument, that a very large proportion of our Graduates settle as Surgeons and Apothecaries, while the Medical Graduates of the English Universities act exclusively as Physicians; and I request the particular attention of the Senatus to this most important fact, because it seems to have been much overlooked. Many of our Members, unacquainted with the Profession, have reasoned upon the acquirements of Physicians, as if all our Medical Graduates were to settle as such. Even the Medical Faculty, in their statement now before us, admit that a great many of them become Surgeons. Dr Alison tells us, that "of 203 Graduates of this University in the last two years, forty-eight have Diplomas from the College of Surgeons here, and a great many others from those of London and Dublin."

From the discussions which have occurred lately, I certainly had resolved to take no share in the debates respecting the new Curriculum, and it is therefore very probable that I should not have troubled the Senatus with this Postscript. But it was pointed out to me this evening, that in Dr Christison's letter, which I had received,
but

but had not had leisure to read, some direct allusions, not quite respectful, were made to my Class. With surprise and regret I have found that this information is correct, and I feel myself therefore called upon to offer for your consideration my sentiments on the subject of that letter.

When the expediency of a Professorship of Medical Jurisprudence was originally under discussion in this University, one of our Colleagues, whose opinions have deservedly great weight with us, objected to the appointment, upon the ground, that each Professor of the individual branches of Medical Study must explain the several Medico-legal questions which arise before Courts of Law, with much more advantage to the Students, and probably also to the elucidation of the question, than any Professor appointed to give Lectures on such multifarious subjects can do.

His reasoning, according to my recollection, was to the following effect. The Professor of Anatomy, after showing the structure of the brain, the lungs, and the heart, and explaining the nature of their functions, could point out the evidences of suffocation by drowning, or hanging, or strangulation, in a manner infinitely better calculated to leave a lasting impression on the mind of the Students who had just been taught the healthy natural state of the parts by preparations and demonstrations, than a Professor who has to take all this previous knowledge for granted, and who gives merely abstract details.

The Professor of Chemistry, after describing the various preparations of Metals, many of which are highly deleterious, such as Arsenic, &c. is, from the nature of the subject, led to show the means by which the presence of such metals, however disguised, may be detected, though mixed with the contents of the stomach or bowels. In the same way, the Professor of Materia Medica must, in the exercise of his duty,

duty, point out the vegetable productions which are poisonous, and the symptoms which they occasion when acting as such.

It is part of the duty of the Professor of Surgery to state the evidences by which it can be determined, in cases of homicide, whether the acts of violence had been the immediate cause of death ; and both he and the Professor of the Practice of Physic must, in the progress of their instructions, describe the changes which take place after death, from natural and from violent causes.

Finally. As to all the questions respecting pregnancy, concealed or simulated,—the appearances of the Infant at the different periods of its existence, from conception to the full time,—the duration of pregnancy,—the evidences of infanticide, &c., such subjects can be best elucidated by the Professor of Midwifery.

These observations of our Colleague made a great impression upon my mind, but I did not accede to his conclusion, that a Professorship of Medical Jurisprudence must be *quite unnecessary*. I held, that when a Regius Professorship is offered, it should always be thankfully received, and that it might be of great importance, that those Students who could bestow much time (without regard to expense) upon their education, might have all those subjects brought to their recollection in one general view.

While I cordially assisted my old friend Dr Duncan senior in his endeavours to establish this Professorship, I was at the same time fully aware, that questions upon Medical Jurisprudence and Medical Police occur infinitely more rarely in this free Country, than in the Continental States of Europe, where little regard is paid to personal freedom, and where the morals and the manners of the inhabitants are very different from those of our intelligent countrymen.

Notwithstanding

Notwithstanding some opposition, a Regius Professorship was instituted, and we have now the experience of above twenty years, by which we can estimate its utility. This may be done upon the principle either of ascertaining the benefit which has occurred to the public from the appointment, or the success of the individuals who have held the Chair. I should have felt great delicacy in bringing the latter under your consideration, had not Dr Christison himself furnished the data, and even with those data, I shall pass over this part of the illustration as briefly as possible.

Let us first consider the subjects of the Lectures of the Professor of Medical Jurisprudence, and we may take Dr Christison's own words. "The object of Medical Jurisprudence is, to prepare the Physician and Surgeon for determining all questions in Law which are determined by Medical Evidence. Such questions occur in Criminal Law upon most trials for homicide, whether by wounds, by strangling, or by poisoning, and on all trials for rape, criminal abortion, exposure of Infants, concealment of pregnancy, and infanticide. In Civil Law, they occur in cases of disputed pregnancy, in some suits for divorce, nullity of marriage, and reduction of testaments, and in all questions of disqualifications, whether of body or of mind, such as for serving in the army, or on juries, or as witnesses,—for making insurance on lives, for exercising various public functions, or for managing one's private affairs."—As the Lectures thus relate both to Criminal and to Civil Law, we may consider each branch separately, and we begin with Criminal Cases.

When the Catalogue enumerated by Dr Christison is considered, it can scarcely be doubted, that the only persons in this Empire competent to direct a Judge and a Jury in cases of homicide by wounds, strangling, or poisoning, must be men engaged in the practice of Surgery; and that in cases of violation of females, criminal abortion, concealment

cealment of pregnancy, and infanticide, no other than those extensively engaged in the practice of Midwifery can give adequate information from their own proper knowledge and experience. How much startled would the Lord Justice-Clerk be, if in a case of criminal abortion, for example, the Senatus Academicus should send his Lordship word, that their Professor of Medical Jurisprudence could explain the subject better than the Professor of Midwifery.

In Civil Law, it is admitted, that "Cases of disputed pregnancy, and some suits for divorce, and nullity of marriage," are the subjects of Medico-legal discussion. But when our Professor has had a little more *practice* in his calling, he will see that he must extend this catalogue. Cases of filiation—of alleged superfetation—of sterility—with several collateral questions, every now and then occur before Courts of Law. According to our present habits, they are, as a matter of course, referred by Judges to the opinion of those who have had experience upon such subjects; but, according to Dr Christison's argument, they ought to be decided by those who can best *speculate* upon them.

As the investigation of truth is the paramount duty and object of the Judge, he naturally endeavours to discover it from the most authentic source.—With every respect for the abilities of the Professors of Medical Jurisprudence hitherto appointed in this University, I must be permitted to say, that there is a natural impediment to their acquiring the *practical* knowledge necessary for determining many of those questions, and that is *the want of opportunity of observation in actual practice*. This has been most candidly conceded by Dr Christison himself. He says, "The subject of the Chair is confessedly the most difficult to teach of all the Medical Sciences,—it requires a most extensive and minute acquaintance with almost all the others."—In other words, a man must be an experienced Surgeon, Physician, and Accoucheur, as well as an excellent Botanist, Chemist, and Anatomist, to do justice to the duties of such a Chair.

If

If indeed it were the custom in this Empire, as in many States on the Continent, for the Agents of the Law, in every case of personal violence, of suspected suicide, and, in short, of every supposed or real criminal act, tending to injure, morally or physically, any of his Majesty's lieges, to be directed in all their proceedings by a Professor of Medical Jurisprudence, then it would follow, that his Lectures ought to be attended, not only by every Graduate, but also by every Student of Law. No Member of the *Senatus Academicus* can, I hope, ever wish to see such a state of society in this favoured country ;—and yet, unless a revolution to that extent take place, Medical Jurisprudence, from the nature of our social institutions, can never attain that high station in this part of the world, which it at present enjoys upon the Continent.

Some of the Gentlemen, whose opinions upon this subject differ from my own, may perhaps urge, that a most important part of the duty of a Professor of Medical Jurisprudence relates to MEDICAL POLICE. But in Britain the interference of the Police in Medical matters is very limited. On this subject I have the satisfaction to be able to refer the *Senatus* to an authority which is unquestionable. It is that of Dr Paris and Mr Fonblanque. They say, page 138. vol. I.—“ With the exception of the Quarantine Laws, and some incidental, rather than direct aids which the subject receives from the Law of Nuisances, &c. there is but little of that regulation in England which can be strictly denominated Medical Police. We have already expressed our opinion upon the apparent inattention of our Government to this branch of Legislation, and have considered it as the necessary consequence of the cleanliness and good order by which this nation is so pre-eminently distinguished.”

Hitherto I have endeavoured to shew, on general principles, that the Professorship of Medical Jurisprudence is not essentially necessary to

to the welfare of our University and of our Fellow Citizens. I must now be permitted to make some animadversions on certain statements in Dr Christison's Letter, which convey a very strong censure upon the whole School of Physic in our University.

When in the Memorial urging my Claim, I stated, that no *practical* information is given by the Professors of Medicine on the diseases of Women and Children, although all that I meant was, that those Professors, not being engaged particularly in attending cases of such diseases, could not give the minute information which one who has dedicated his whole attention to the subject is enabled to do, you all know how much offence was taken.

Now mark, I pray you, what Dr Christison has said:—"No one can allege that Legal Medicine is taught, directly or indirectly, in the course at present enjoined on the Graduates of our University." Again, "In the Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal, which has long held the first place among such Works, the papers strictly belonging to Medical Jurisprudence and Police which have appeared during the last ten years, form between a fourth and a fifth part of the whole. Owing to the peculiar arrangements followed by the London Journalists, the proportion in their Works cannot be ascertained without great labour; but from what I have been able to make out, it is about a seventh or eighth of the whole. Now, if even the latter proportion be compared with the respective shares held by the other Medical Sciences, it will be found that not one of them, except the Practice of Physic, equals it; and that many of them, particularly Midwifery, (which alone the Faculty propose to add to the Curriculum), are vastly beneath it."

On the former of those sentences it is unnecessary for me to offer any remarks. It is not my duty to defend the Medical Faculty, and as we are assured that *three of the six* Members of that Faculty have
approved

approved of Dr Christison's claim, we are called upon to admire their forbearance under such a heavy imputation; a forbearance which, considering all that has lately happened, is beyond measure praiseworthy. And yet it will require something more than mere assertion to convince me, that Dr Hope does not explain the tests by which chemical poisons may be detected,—that Dr Duncan junior does not enumerate the phenomena of vegetable poisons,—that Dr Monro does not explain the effects and marks of suffocation,—and that Dr Home does not point out the means of distinguishing death from asphyxy, and the changes which follow death, whether from natural or violent means. In my humble apprehension, these are the great data upon which the chief questions upon Medical Jurisprudence in criminal cases, not connected with Midwifery, must be decided.

Without affectation, I declare that I feel very reluctant at saying any thing in defence of my own department; but considering what I owe to our Honourable Patrons, to the Medical Profession, and to the Public at large, I might be accused of acting inconsistently, were I to pass unnoticed such an attack.

By his own showing, Dr Christison admits, that a large proportion of the Medico-legal questions which are agitated before Courts of Law, both in criminal and in civil cases, relate to subjects connected with the female sex. These naturally fall under my department; and although hitherto, from the short duration of my Course, I have been obliged to treat very briefly of the different subjects relating to Sterility—Signs of Pregnancy—Duration of Pregnancy—Criminal Abortion—Marks of immaturity of the Fœtus—Infanticide, &c. I have not treated of them either *hypothetically* or *superficially*. I have been enabled, from *practical observations*, to correct many of the errors of the Continental Medico-legal writers. This very day, November 22. I had occasion to show in Lecturing, that a particular doctrine, by which the

character and fortune of individuals may be highly injured, is utterly inconsistent with reason and with fact, although supported by many eminent foreigners, and even sanctioned by Paris and Fonblanque, the latest respectable writers on this subject in Britain, Vol. I. page 260. *et seq.* In the same manner, in a few days I am to show the appearances of the embryo at the different periods of pregnancy at which it is thrown off, and, in doing so, must correct several errors of Continental Medico-legal Professors. Now, it must be evident, that if our Professor of Medical Jurisprudence had a collection of Specimens, (which is so necessary to elucidate this subject), he could make little use of them, for he could not, from his own proper experience, decide upon the precise period at which those several embryos had been cast off. Again, on the important questions respecting infanticide, I am enabled to prove, that some of the most eminent foreign Medico-legal Professors, and I specially name Foderè, Mahon, Chaussier, and Lesieux, have fallen into some important errors, not from want of great talents, and great assiduity in investigating the matter, (for Chaussier and Lesieux have dissected 900 infants, either still-born, or which died soon after birth,) but from not having had the opportunity of ascertaining the phenomena by observation in real practice.

These considerations induced me, when in obedience to the directions of our Honourable Patrons I made preparations for extending my Course of Lectures from three to six months, to draw out at full length precise instructions in regard to all the Medico-legal questions upon the various subjects comprehended in my department, whether criminal or civil, which can occur before Courts of Law, and I have every reason to expect, that upon those points I am enabled to give information that may be relied on. Accordingly, in my Lecture of November 10th, in detailing the new plan of the Course, I read to the Students the following words.—“ 3dly, I shall consider at very great length the various Medico-legal questions relative to the peculiar state of

of the female sex,—to sterility,—to the appearance of the embryo at different ages, up to the full time,—to infanticide, and many collateral subjects,—questions which hitherto I have been under the necessity of treating in a very summary manner. I have indeed always been aware of the importance of such discussions, but when I had so much matter to go through within the space of three months, I was compelled to make a selection.”

If the Professor of Medical Jurisprudence, in the progress of his studies, acquires accurate notions on all the subjects above alluded to, he must owe them entirely to the researches of practitioners of Midwifery, and upon that point at least, he will no doubt admit, that Midwifery is not *vastly beneath* Medical Jurisprudence.

To those who are not in the habit of reading modern Medical writings, it will appear rather wonderful, that Dr Christison, notwithstanding his positive assertion, that “*no one can allege that Legal Medicine is taught, directly or indirectly, in the course at present enjoined on the Graduates of our University,*” has actually, towards the conclusion of his Letter, fully refuted his own asseveration.—These are his words.

“While it possesses many topics peculiar to itself, it contains others also, by which it is connected with all the other Medical Sciences. These common topics are necessarily treated by the other Professors very cursorily. It cannot be expected, that the Professor of the Practice of Physic shall enter fully into the vast subject of contagion—of marsh-miasma—of insanity—in their Medico-legal relations;—that the Professor of Chemistry, or of Materia Medica, shall detail, with exact minuteness, the tests for the poisons, and the symptoms produced by them;—that the Professor of Midwifery shall exhaust the numerous Medico-legal topics connected with his branch; or the Professor of Physiology and Pathology, those minute physiological and pathological inquiries

inquiries which have frequently to be discussed in Courts of Law. Each of the Professors of these branches knows that his Science is quite overloaded with matter. One of them has assured me, that the introduction of a course of Medical Jurisprudence into the Curriculum would, on that account, be a great relief to him ; and I hope no one among them will now be found so attached to old notions, and averse to all improvements, as to call that relief an encroachment."

Had Dr Christison been acquainted with some of our proceedings during last spring, he could never have alleged, that each of the Medical Professors knows that his individual branch of Science "is quite overloaded with matter."

We had a tabular view from the Medical Faculty, sanctioned by the Senatus Academicus, and transmitted to the Honourable the Patrons, shewing, that besides all the other important subjects contained in their Lectures, the Professor of the Theory of Medicine, the Professor of the Practice of Medicine, and also the Professor of Anatomy, find leisure to give *many* Lectures on the diseases of Women and Children.

By that tabular view, our Patrons have been told, that out of between 130 and 140 Lectures annually given by our present eminent Professor of the Practice of Medicine, *ninety* at least relate to the diseases of Women and Children. Now, as our Honourable Patrons have thought fit, according to their undoubted powers, to transfer that duty to me, our Professor must be highly gratified by the offer of being relieved by Dr Christison from "*the vast subjects of contagion, of marsh-miasma, and of insanity.*" If he accept of the offer, he will enjoy the rare privilege now-a-days of a sinecure office.

As to myself, I regret much that I cannot avail myself of Dr Christison's obliging offer, for the two reasons already specified,—My conviction

viction that, from observation and experience, I can give information on the questions of pregnancy, infanticide, &c. which must tend to correct the errors of foreign and *speculative* Professors of Medical Jurisprudence, and my having already pledged myself to the Students to do so.

Having thus submitted such reasons as should, in my humble opinion, lead the Senatus to understand, that from the morals, and the habits, and the manners of the inhabitants of this country, it is little probable that either Judges or Lawyers will ever act under the direction of Professors of Medical Jurisprudence, and that the most important and difficult Medico-legal questions which are commonly agitated before Courts of Law, can be best decided by the testimony of experienced practitioners in the different departments of Medicine and Surgery, the irresistible conclusion must be, that the *practical* duties of the Professor of Medical Jurisprudence must be extremely limited. Let us now consider what encouragement there is for Students to attend the Lectures of this Professor.

On looking into the records of the Court of Justiciary, from the 1st January 1819, (nine months before Dr Christison graduated,) up to the 1st November 1824, it appears that there were about ninety trials for crimes during that period, on which Medical testimony *might* have been required, making *fifteen* trials annually. Of these, there were about sixty cases of homicide and murder, and thirty cases of assaults or violation of women,—concealment of pregnancy—criminal abortion,—and child murder. In one third, therefore, of the criminal cases tried in Scotland, the testimony of practitioners of Midwifery would be alone regarded by the Judge and the Jury. There remain for the pupils of Medical Jurisprudence *ten* cases annually of homicide and murder; and it is a most extraordinary fact, that, as far as I have been able to discover, (and I have taken some pains upon the

the subject, in the six years preceding this date, there has been only one trial for *poisoning*, and that occurred in November 1821. Supposing that in all those annual ten cases, no criminal ever pleads guilty, and that the crimes are perpetrated with such singular precautions as to elude ordinary testimony, and to require scientific researches, such as are no doubt communicated by the Professor of Medical Jurisprudence, there would, even on that supposition, be a very limited field of practice for the pupils of his Class. But every man conversant in the practice of Criminal Law, knows that cases where the opinions of Medical men are required to direct the Judge or the Jury, very seldom occur, and when they do happen, that the testimony of the practical men, whether Apothecaries, Surgeons, or Physicians, called to give evidence upon the case, far outweigh, in the minds of the Judge and the Jury, the *speculative* opinions of ingenious scientific men.

Much has been insinuated in Dr Christison's paper on the ignorance and blunders of Medical Practitioners upon some criminal trials. One fact will convince the Senatus Academicus, both of the exaggeration and of the inconclusiveness of this argument. In the celebrated case of Captain Donellan, tried for the murder of his brother-in-law, Sir Theodosius Boughton, on the 30th March 1781, they will find, that the most eminent Surgeon and Anatomist of that day, and, we may say, of the last century, to whom the improvement of Surgery is more indebted than to any other individual in ancient or modern times, John Hunter, gave, *upon speculative principles*, an opinion which was quite disregarded by the Judge and the Jury; and every Physician and every Lawyer of respectability, who has ever studied the account of that trial, has borne willing testimony to the justice of the verdict.

These considerations should lead the Senatus Academicus to pause before they add to the Curriculum another Class, which may be fairly
 termed

termed *speculative* rather than *practical*. It must be surely unnecessary to remind the Senatus, that there are many branches of knowledge which can be learned by study and reflection, that is, by a diligent investigation of what has been already published upon the subject, such are the dead Languages, Arithmetic, Geometry, and other branches of Mathematics; while there are others, such as all the practical departments of Medicine and of Surgery, which can only be acquired by actual observation at the bed-side of the sick.

Since the Medical Faculty have been pleased to admit that some extension of the Curriculum is required, the question now under discussion by the Senatus is, Whether that addition should be calculated to give PRACTICAL information to our Graduates, so as to render them useful general practitioners, or to add to the *speculative* branches of study, with which they are already burdened.—If the Classes necessary for Degrees were to be now determined upon by the Senatus, without regard to the vested rights of the present incumbents, it may be affirmed, I trust without offence, that one of the Classes at least, viz. Botany, would be excluded.

Should any of our Members still entertain the slightest doubt on this subject, I entreat that Dr Christison's own account of the success of the Professors who have held the Chair of Medical Jurisprudence should be carefully examined. He tells us, "that Medical Jurisprudence has been hitherto taught by the youngest and least experienced of the Professors;"—"that it has twice happened, that just as the Professor was beginning to lay the foundation of a well attended Class, all the fruits of his labour have been lost by his translation to another office;" and, "that the Chair has been again and again thrown into the hands of a young man, unknown to the Students, and to the Medical public."

I beg leave again explicitly to state, that I have never considered, nor alleged, that a Professorship of Medical Jurisprudence is not useful. On this point I have always differed from several of my friends and colleagues, whose opinions I hold in much respect. But I have no hesitation in declaring, that in the present state of Medical practice in Great Britain, attendance on Lectures on Medical Jurisprudence cannot be necessary for any Medical man who gets a regular education, and that, therefore, they ought not "*to be enjoined on our Graduates.*"

If we are to add to the Curriculum attendance on branches of study not elucidated by Medical practice, we should select Logic, Mathematics, and Natural Philosophy ; and if we wish Medical Graduates to acquire information having a closer affinity with the subjects of their future pursuits, we ought at once to adopt Natural History, provided the Professor give a six months Course.

Probably the Senatus are not aware of the language which was held out by some individuals when the Professorship of Medical Jurisprudence was first instituted. On the fall of the short-lived administration under whose auspices it was established, it was openly declared, as if from authority, that whenever the then incumbent should be otherwise provided for, that Professorship, like other useless offices, should be done away. When the opportunity occurred, and was not embraced, the apology given out was, that the Crown Counsel had represented, that it would be of great importance to have a Physician of talent encouraged to attend to the subject of Medical Jurisprudence, in order that he might assist them with his opinion in criminal cases. The reason seemed plausible, for it was not then known how very seldom any *speculative* or theoretical opinion of Medical men is required by a Court of Law.

Your

✂ Your patience, I am afraid, must be exhausted by the length of this Letter, and therefore I shall compress as much as possible the very few remaining observations which I have to offer. On this account I avoid troubling you with the reflections, which must occur to every Medical Practitioner, on the three editions of the projected Curriculum laid before us by the Medical Faculty. Considering the long time that Faculty have consumed in deliberating upon the subject, the style of those three editions is most wonderful, though some may allege that the Statement of Dr Alison, lately put into our hands, is still more extraordinary.

While the Medical Faculty, in that document, proceed on the assumption, that Medical Jurisprudence is to be added to the Curriculum, (for of the three Classes they hold out for the choice of the Senatus, they object to one, viz. Natural History,) they take no notice whatever of the important claims of Clinical Surgery. On this omission, however, Professor Russell has presented us with his sentiments, and as they are sanctioned by the concurrence of the whole *practical* part of the Medical Profession, it is to be hoped that they will receive due attention from the Senatus Academicus.

In respect to Medical Graduation, the plan which I had the honour to submit for your consideration has been treated with dignified silence by the Medical Faculty, and yet they have admitted, in a more ample manner than I was willing to urge, the difficulties and the disadvantages of the old System, both to the Examinators and to the Candidates. I have occasion to know, that my proposed plan has been for some time followed by the Regius Professor of Medicine in Cambridge, and that it has received the full approbation of a number of very competent judges. The more I think upon the subject, the more I am convinced of the utility which would result, both to this University and to the Public, from some such plan; and I have no doubt, when the
present

present feelings and prejudices have passed away, that, with trifling modifications perhaps, it will be adopted, though the probability is, that in this, and other improvements, it is our fate to be anticipated by other British Universities besides that of Cambridge. I must confess, that I did not entertain very sanguine expectations of the favourable attention of the Medical Faculty to any proposal emanating from me, and therefore I feel the more regret for being obliged to object to the whole tenor of the three editions of their projected Curriculum, and to the reasonings contained in their Statement presented through Dr Alison.

I have the honour to be,

GENTLEMEN,

With due respect,

Your obedient humble Servant,

JAS HAMILTON, Jun.

Edinburgh, 23. St Andrew's Square,

November 22. 1824.

Murray & Mitchell, Printers.

1
✓
Dr. MacLagan

George Street