cardiac sounds may have undergone no change, or only a slight loss of distinctness in the first sound.

The examination of the urine at this stage gives varying results. For the most part, there is no discoverable change from health, or only the presence of a faint and doubtful opalescence, after boiling and the addition of nitric acid. Even this change may be absent altogether till later on in the disease; or, before it becomes constantly present, we may find albumen only in the urine passed after food. The presence of albumen may also alternate with the deposit of urates or uric acid. Albumen is often altogether absent when these deposits are present; but the relations of albumen to the deposits of uric acid and urates of soda and ammonia are by no means constant. These deposits and the albumen may occur together in the earlier stages of fibrosis of the kidney. It is by no means uncommon for even careful observers to overlook or lightly estimate the early indications which the urine thus affords of commencing fibroid cachexia.

Although the renal change is probably but part and parcel of a general state of morbid changes, the clinical value of the evidence afforded by the urine in the early stages in many cases is most important. It is desirable to examine the urine passed at different times of the day. The early morning urine may be normal in colour and weight (specific gravity, 1018-1022). That passed at noon may be still without deposits on cooling (1022-1024), with or without a faint opalescence after heat and nitric acid. That passed at 6 P.M. (assuming the dinner to be a late one) may be nearly the same as that at noon. That passed on going to bed may deposit urates, sometimes with, sometimes without, faint change from albumen by heat and nitric acid (specific gravity, 1024-1026). It is at this early stage that the symptoms are vaguely referred to disorder of the liver or stomach.

Those physicians whose minds are made up as to the cause of the cardiac hypertrophy in chronic "Bright's disease," may insist that even already there may be such a defective excretion from the kidneys as so far to interfere with the physiological relations of the blood to the tissues, that it cannot pass through the systemic capillaries without an increased impulse from the heart, and that the hypertrophy is so caused. But the assumption of such an altered state of the blood as a true cause of the hypertrophy is entirely unsupported by any observations on the blood itself, and is not supported by evidence on the side of the urine itself. The specific gravity, as stated above, may be normal; the quantity and colour may be normal; the cold urine treated with nitric acid may become as usual nearly solid with nitrate of urea; and the only change, and this but occasional, may be a faint opalescence, under heat and nitric acid, due to the presence of albumen. No doubt in a more advanced stage the uric acid and the urates may cease altogether to be deposited as the urine cools. The urine loses colour and specific gravity, and is considerably increased in quantity, though still in general free from all deposits of desquamated epithelium; as the albumen increases, it contains very transparent fibrinous casts, which are complementary of the albumen of the liquor sanguinis, and equally due with it to mere passive transudation. When these changes in the urine have become more marked, and the general cachexia is advanced, the renal affection is set down naturally, if the case is seen at this stage for the first time, as a primary cause of all the attendant changes, cardiac and capillary. But such a view seems to my colleague and myself to be an erroneous one, and to have arisen from a deficiency in our early clinical knowledge of such cases. Nor can this deficiency be easily supplied from hospital practice.

Poor men who are dependent upon bodily labour for their livelihood do not so often present themselves at hospitals in the early stages of disease. It is in private practice that we have to make good our wants in these particulars, and even here the scientific cultivation of medicine suffers by the readiness to explain away the causes of ailments down to the comprehension of the uninformed. It is, besides, to be noticed, that even when our hospitals afford evidence it is indistinct. In an early stage of fibroid cachexia, persons are apt to die of acute disease in the brain or lungs before the amount of renal change is enough to give it any recognised clinical significance. These early deaths take away from us the opportunity of observing the further course in such cases of the renal degeneration which, apart from such accidents, might soon have become a prominent clinical feature, though it escapes attention when less marked; and the subject is dismissed, with only this recognition, that the kidneys are coarse. I do not see how we could easily have escaped from the trammels of a narrow pathology, and, if I may be permitted to say so in respect of the matter under discussion, from its vicious influence on practice, if our observations had continued to be limited to the more prominent lesions of advanced "Bright's disease," as they present themselves at the bedside, and even on the *post mortem* table.

[To be continued.]

HIPPOCRATES: HIS LIFE AND WRITINGS.

An Inaugural Address delivered before the Royal Medical Society of Edinburgh on the 8th of November, 1872.

By J. WARBURTON BEGBIE, M.D., F.R.C.P.ED.

MR. PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN,—I am going to ask your attention at this time to the life and labours of one of the greatest men connected with our profession in any age or clime. And, although his name is the very earliest name of distinction in Medicine, a careful consideration of his character and work, as these are unfolded to us in his writings, will satisfy all candid minds that we owe a great debt of gratitude to the "Father of Medicine," and that much in the way of instruction and encouragement is to be gathered by us from a diligent perusal of these writings.

In the four hundred and sixtieth year before the birth of Christ, according to very general belief, Hippocrates was born. Whether the date now given was the exact year of his birth or not, is not a matter of much importance. We know, on the authority of Aulus Gellius (who flourished in the second century), in the twenty-first chapter of the seventeenth book of the *Noctes Atticæ* (so called because the work was composed by Aulus Gellius in a country house near Athens during the long winter nights), that Hippocrates and the illustrious Socrates (although born later) were contemporaries. "Itaque inter hæc tempora nobiles celebresque erant Sophocles ac deinde Euripides tragici poete, et Hippocrates Medicus, et Democritus philosophus: quibus Socrates Atheniensis natu quidem posterior fuit; sed quibusdam temporibus iisdem vixerunt." That Hippocrates attained a very considerable age appears sufficiently ascertained, but in regard to the exact time of his decease there has arisen a difference of opinion. The years of his life have been fixed at 85 by some; at 90, 99, 104, and even as many as 108 by others. Which of these statements is correct, we have no proper grounds for determining. We know, however, that the period of the greatest activity of Hippocrates, when his reputation reached its greatest height, was the earlier part of the fourth century before the birth of Christ. Flourishing, therefore, in the time of Pericles, besides the greatest of Athenian statesmen, Hippocrates had for his contemporaries Socrates, Democritus, Herodotus, Thucydides, also Plato and Xenophon, the distinguished disciples of Socrates. Among poets too he had his birth; Æschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, and Pindar flourished at the same time. Phidias, moreover, the "Sculptor of the Gods," the architect, at least superintendent of works, of the Parthenon, the sculptor of the Olympian Jove, was his contemporary. Hippocrates thus came into the world under circumstances which must have co-operated with his own remarkable genius in raising him to the extraordinary eminence which during his lifetime he attained, and which his name has in all subsequent ages retained. In the words of Celsus, as true now as when penned by him in the first century, that is, four hundred years after the death of Hippocrates, in alluding to his separation of the study of philosophy from medicine, "Hippocrates Cous, primus quidem ex omnibus memoriâ dignis, ab studio sapientiæ disciplinam hanc separavit, vir et arte et facundiâ insignis."

You have all heard of Æsculapius (*Ἀσκληπιός*, in Greek)—the god of the medical art, or of Medicine. Homer makes no mention of the origin of Æsculapius; but you will remember his sons Machaon and Podalirius, who were medical men as well as commanders of troops in the Greek army during the Trojan War. Although Homer does not refer to Æsculapius as a divinity, but merely as a physician—styling him "*ἰατὴρ ἀμύμων*" "the blameless physician"—he was worshipped as a god over the length and breadth of Greece. His temples (*Ἀσκληπεία*) were, however, not only places where the god was worshipped, but were resorted to by numbers of sick people, who received treatment in them, and were therefore to be compared to hospitals in modern times. Hippocrates has generally been regarded as the lineal descendant of Æsculapius. Putting aside the fabulous, there can be no question that he belonged to the family of the Asclepiade, the name given to the supposed descendants of the god. The genealogy of Hippocrates is given as follows by Tzetzes, the learned but self-conceited Greek grammarian of Constantinople in the twelfth century, after the manner of an infinitely more exalted genealogy which we have in a still more ancient book. "Æsculapius, who was the father of Podalirius (him of Troy), who was the father of Hippolochus, who was the father of Sostratus, who was the father of Dardanus,

who was the father of Crisamis, who was the father of Cleomyttades, who was the father of Theodorus, who was the father of Nebrus, who was the father of Gnosidicus, who was the father of Hippocrates the first, who was the father of Heraclides, who was the father of Hippocrates the second, commonly styled the Great Hippocrates." Thus, the Father of Medicine was fifteenth in descent from the Greek God of Medicine. The belief in the lineal descent of Hippocrates from Æsculapius was one generally entertained by his countrymen, and also that which ascribed his origin on the female side to Hercules.

The island of Cos, now commonly styled Stanchio, was the place of his birth. On this island, then remarkable for its salubrity and for the delicious nature of its climate, there was erected one of the most distinguished of the temples of Æsculapius. I may mention, in passing, that the original and most renowned of the Æsculapian temples was founded at Epidaurus in Greece, from which temple the worship of Æsculapius was introduced into Rome at the command of the Delphic Oracle or of the Sibylline books, 293 B.C. The principal seats of the Asclepiadæ in the time of Hippocrates were at Cos, Cnidus, and Epidaurus. On the former (an island) was erected, as I have just said, a famous Æsculapian temple, in which, inheriting as he no doubt did from Heraclides his father, and from his grandfather Hippocrates the first, a distinguished position, we can readily understand that in assisting his father in the management of the sick, and in the access he had to the stores of observation, such as they were, collected and treasured in the temple during several centuries, Hippocrates enjoyed the greatest available advantages in the acquirement of professional knowledge. Having, it may be supposed, acquired the usual information which the ordinary observation of diseases and their treatment in the temples afforded, Hippocrates—against the advice, it may reasonably be imagined in defiance of the entreaties, of the Coan Æsculapian priests—determining to judge for himself as to the merits of the very different and rival system of the Gymnasia, entered as a pupil to Herodicus of Selymbria, in Thrace, and from him received instructions in the application more especially of gymnastic exercises in the maintenance of health and for the cure of diseases, as well as of those means which were ordinarily employed in the Gymnasia. Lastly, Hippocrates studied philosophy under the sophist Gorgias of Leontini in Sicily, and he also received instruction in the polite literature and philosophy of the age from Democritus, who, in addition to his philosophic attainments, had devoted much attention to the study of medicine, comparative anatomy, and physiology, such as these sciences then were. From Democritus he no doubt acquired a knowledge of the peculiar views entertained by the early philosophers in regard to medicine. Having received all the instruction in the principles of medicine, and concerning its practice, which the education of the Æsculapian temple, the Gymnasia, and the schools of the philosophers were capable of extending, Hippocrates, there is little doubt, commenced the practice of his art in the Asclepion of Cos, as his father and grandfather, if not other forefathers, had done. Why he afterwards left the place of his birth and early education, visiting many different places, cannot now, and never has been, satisfactorily determined. Probably that conjecture is nearest the truth which supposes him, dissatisfied with the domestic instructions of Cos, to have sought for a more complete and careful medical education. Certain it is that he travelled in Asia Minor, Thrace, Macedonia, Thessaly, and many other countries. Indeed, from his writings we gather that Hippocrates visited the principal cities of Europe and Asia, entering into discussion with philosophers, examining critically the Gymnasia, and extending professional assistance to those who sought his aid; collecting, moreover, assiduously many observations on the different diseases which he encountered, on the epidemic constitution of maladies, on climate, regimen, and the manners and customs of foreign nations. The cause of Hippocrates leaving Cos was ascribed by Soranus (not the biographer of Hippocrates—there seem to have been several distinguished men bearing this name) to a dream, in which he had been commanded by the god to go into Thessaly and there to remain. Another, and in the highest degree improbable, reason for his departure has been assigned by Andreas; namely, his having set fire to the library at Cnidus—in the famous Æsculapian temple—in order that he might enjoy a monopoly of the knowledge which he had previously extracted from its records: a base calumny, which, in the words of the late Dr. Adams of Banchory, not the least distinguished of the modern biographers of Hippocrates, "is more than sufficiently refuted by the veneration in which his memory has been held by all subsequent generations." Numerous are the traditions of what Hippocrates effected on his travels or accomplished at different periods during his long life. What amount of credence is to be attached to the various stories which have been handed down to us, has been at different times keenly argued, and cannot now be at all satisfactorily determined. The account furnished by Soranus of the

cure which Hippocrates wrought in the case of Perdiccas, son of Alexander, King of Macedonia, is copied, without any exception being taken, by Le Clerc, the French, and by Sprengel, the German, historians of medicine; and, although the eminent Dr. Greenhill, writing in Dr. Smith's *Classical Dictionary*, has shown that an absurd absence of correctness in dates throws extreme improbability on the narrative, it was given in Daremberg's first edition of the Hippocratic works, but removed from the second, and is to be found in the *History of Medicine*, by the late Dr. Dunglison of Philadelphia, edited by his son, and very recently published. Having made this reference to the story, which in itself is an interesting one, although incorrect in so far as Hippocrates' connexion with it is concerned, I may give it to you. One day, among others, he was summoned to visit the royal patient—i. e., Perdiccas, conjointly with Eurypnon, another physician, but who had attained a much greater age. Perdiccas was supposed to suffer from a slow fever. Hippocrates soon perceived that the mind of the youthful patient was more at fault than his body; and, in attentively observing all the actions of the invalid, having remarked him to change colour in looking at Phila, then in attendance upon him, he decided that Perdiccas was in love, and found means to cure him by informing the lady that she had been the unwitting cause of his malady.

The name of Hippocrates has been associated with the great plague which visited Athens; and its contagious inroads he is stated to have arrested there, as in other places, by kindling fires. This circumstance, so very generally credited, is thus referred to by Galen: "Pestilentiam ab Athenis, abegit Hippocrates per totam urbem varias pyras ex materiâ aromaticâ extruens." The commentators on Hippocrates have experienced considerable difficulty in determining whether the great physician really was at Athens during the occurrence of the plague; and, presuming him to have been there while such prevailed, what was the particular epidemic during which his useful counsels were given, and his advice found so signally successful that, according to one authority, he was honoured, by a solemn decree of the people, with a crown of gold, and initiated into the solemn mysteries of Ceres and Proserpine. The circumstance of the illustrious Athenian historian Thucydides, who in striking characters has depicted the plague at Athens, not having mentioned Hippocrates and his services in his account, while he states decidedly that the skill of the physicians could do nothing to mitigate the severity of the malady, is, for certain reasons which are well expressed by Dr. Adams in his edition of the Hippocratic works, no valid objection to the truth of the story; while the only serious doubt which can be brought against it is the want of contemporaneous evidence in its support. Supposing Hippocrates to have been actually called upon to administer professional assistance, it must have been during one of the attacks which occurred some years subsequently to the great plague chronicled by Thucydides. Although the name of Hippocrates may not have been heard at the commencement of the fatal visitation, and thus his services have passed unnoticed by the Athenian historian, it is not at all unlikely that, after he had risen to the head of his profession in Greece, as we know he subsequently did, he should have been publicly consulted regarding the treatment of by far the most formidable disease then prevalent. What adds an appearance of truth to this opinion is, that several of the genuine works of Hippocrates, which were probably published during his lifetime, relate to the causes and treatment of epidemic and endemic diseases. Upon a careful investigation of this portion of the life of Hippocrates, we can have no hesitation in agreeing with the learned commentator already mentioned, that, although his visit to Athens, and the fact of his having been consulted by the magistracy of the city, is not determined by any contemporaneous evidence, it is by no means devoid of probability; while the objections to it, which have been started by modern authorities, have not so much weight as is generally supposed.

One other circumstance in the life of Hippocrates is mentioned by Soranus—namely, his refusal to go to the court of Artaxerxes (surnamed Longimanus) when invited to pay a professional visit. This story, as it has reached us, is as follows. Persia happened to be ravaged with the plague. The governors of Asia Minor wrote to Artaxerxes to inform him of the high reputation of the Coan physician. The king, in replying, desired the governors to make the most liberal offer, in order to induce Hippocrates to visit his vast dominions. The governors forwarded the letter of the king, and, in doing so, promised in his name every reward and honour which he could wish for or at all desire. The physician, however, refused, and returned answer in these striking words which, to use the language of a modern French writer, ought to be engraved on the memory of all those of his successors who can think and who can feel. "I have in my own country the food, the clothing, and the habitation I require. As Greek, it would be unworthy of me to aspire to the riches and grandeur of the Persians, and to serve the foes of my country and of liberty." This haughty and memor-

able answer nearly plunged Hippocrates into trouble; but, when demanded by Artaxerxes to deliver him up, in order that punishment for his insolence might overtake him, the inhabitants of Cos dared the great king, and refused to deliver up a fellow-citizen of whom they had so much reason to be proud, and to whom they owed so much. The firmness of the attitude which these patriots assumed, and the unity by which at that time the different Grecian states asserted their common independence, averted in all probability a Persian invasion, which at first appeared to be all but imminent. Now, in regard to this story, just as respects the one already mentioned of the Greek plague, Dr. Ackermann, in his account of Hippocrates in Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Græca*, Dr. Henderson, and other modern scholars, affect to treat it with disbelief; why or wherefore they do not very clearly state. As opposed to this view, we have the opinions of the accomplished Cabanis and of Dr. Adams, who, while readily admitting that the letters in the Hippocratic collection which relate to this story (these are from the first to the tenth inclusive) can scarcely be received as genuine, find no proof that the event upon which they are made to turn is also devoid of truth. It is evident, indeed, that the ingenious and shrewd French author to whom I have alluded, attached very considerable credit to the anecdote, for he has quoted it in both of his well-known works, offering the following apology for the repetition: "I have already cited it in my essay, *Sur la Certitude de la Médecine*, but may perhaps be allowed to repeat the quotation at a time when certain writers seem to be using their utmost efforts to stifle all free and generous sentiments."

Such, gentlemen, are the stories connected with the life of Hippocrates most worthy of our regard, on account of the probability of their dependence upon truth. Others there are, but these so manifestly inaccurate or false as to be altogether unentitled to consideration. Already during his lifetime Hippocrates had much honour—indeed, unequalled renown, in his profession. The habit of calling medicine the art of Æsculapius was gradually lost, and learned men as well as the people generally spoke of it as the science of Hippocrates. I have briefly alluded to all the particulars of importance in his biography which have reached us. After a long life, which must have been essentially a happy one, because spent unreservedly in the service of his fellow-men, "pallida mors", from whose fell grasp for a time he had been instrumental, under Providence, in rescuing very many, "æquo pede" reached him, and at Larissa in Thessaly he died. He was buried between that city and Gytona. His tomb, according to local tradition, was for a long time covered by swarms of bees, whose honey persons came from great distances to gather, on account of the peculiar efficacy it was found to possess in the aphthous disorders of childhood. "He has left", writes Dr. Adams, "monuments of his genius more durable than the marble statues of Phidias his contemporary, and as enduring as the tragedies of Sophocles, and the Olympic odes of Pindar."

I have now to offer you some observations on the writings of Hippocrates; and the first remark I have to make is one with the truth of which many among you are probably already familiar—that only a portion of the works which pass under the name of Hippocrates, and which are contained in the Hippocratic collection, were written by Hippocrates. There can be little doubt that some of the immediate descendants of the Father of Medicine, and more especially his sons, Thessalus and Draco, and his son-in-law, Polybus, as well as others not so closely related to him, continued to publish their own observations and writings under his name, in order to secure honour for that name, and, therefore, increased respect for his memory; or, and no doubt this feeling often prevailed, to obtain more weight for their own opinions and precepts. Further, the practice which they followed was one which had long existed among the families of the medical priesthood. The causes now enumerated rendered it very difficult, at no long time after the death of Hippocrates, to distinguish his works from those of his sons and disciples. A difficulty, thus originated, has continued to increase, as the texts became impaired through the ignorance or inexactness of copyists, and, still more, owing to the bad faith of book-mongers.

Hippocrates lived at a time when paper or papyrus was very scarce among the Greeks. It is true that after the reign of Amasis, King of Egypt—one hundred years or thereby before Hippocrates—who, having married a Grecian wife, had permitted the formation of Grecian colonies on the banks of the Nile, the art of preparing the papyrus had been known to the Greeks, but the use of it was but little diffused throughout their country before the time of Alexander the Great—that is, a hundred years after the birth of Hippocrates. The papyrus or papyrus, the paper reed, is referred to by Pliny: "Papyrus ante Alexandri tempora fuit cognita." And again: "Papyrus ergo nascitur in palustribus Ægypti aut quiescentibus Nili aquis."

The Father of Medicine, however, recorded his observations in a very concise style upon tablets (δελτοί, in Greek) coated with wax, or

upon skins of animals (διφθεράι)—[a Greek root, with which the world in general has of late years, unhappily, become only too familiar, since Bretonneau, the distinguished physician of Tours, about forty-five years since, applied it to indicate the peculiar appearance of the throat, as if coated by a skin—hence diphtherite and diphtheria]. According to Galen, it would appear that not a few of the writings of Hippocrates were never intended for publication, but solely for the author's own use. That many of the works, according to the practice of the great writers of antiquity, were published separately during his lifetime, is in the highest degree probable. Horace, Martial, and Cicero, acted in this way, so also did Plato and Aristotle, in an age not far removed from that of Hippocrates; and, in addition to the proof which these facts bring with them, there is this still more decided ground to go upon—that Galen makes observations and draws inferences clearly implying the publication of certain of the works *before*, and of others *after*, the death of Hippocrates. There exist now no proper data for determining the order in which the different works of Hippocrates appeared. The book of "Aphorisms", however, being made up in great measure of conclusions and observations recorded in other of his works, we have every reason to infer, says Dr. Adams, that this important work was among the latest of his literary labours.

The following works have been uniformly regarded as undoubtedly composed by Hippocrates, and from the first have received the sanction of his name. 1. The Prognostics; 2. The Epidemics (first and third books); 3. The Aphorisms; 4. On Wounds of the Head; 5. On Regimen in Acute Diseases; 6. On Air, Water, and Places. Nothing, writes Dr. Adams, but the most lawless spirit of criticism can lead any one to doubt the genuineness of the works now enumerated. This list does not comprise the fourth part of the entire Hippocratic collection. Thus reduced, however, the portions known to have been written by Hippocrates still suffice, when we consider the age in which they were composed, to justify the enthusiasm of his contemporaries and the admiration of posterity. During many ages, authors confined themselves very much to acting as commentators on the Hippocratic writings. In his *Cours sur l'Histoire de la Littérature des Sciences Médicales*, the very learned French author, M. Daremberg—whose recent death, at the comparatively early age of 53, all who are interested in the study of medical history must keenly deplore—gives a list of commentators on the Hippocratic writings extending to fifty, forty of whom flourished antecedent to Galen—that is, before the second century. Allow me in the little time which is available for the purpose to direct your attention to the undoubtedly genuine writings of Hippocrates; and, first of all, to the Book of Aphorisms, the authorship of which has, from antiquity, been invariably regarded as authentic.

The title of "Aphorisms", "Aphorismi", "Ἀφορισμοί" in Greek, literally *definitions*, "short pithy sentences" or precepts, clearly expresses the nature of its contents. Than this book of "Aphorisms" no medical work of antiquity has had a more gigantic reputation. Physicians and philosophers have continually vied with one another in paying to it the admiration and awarding to its author the veneration which a careful study of its contents has never failed to excite. Of it Suidas, very eminent as a lexicographer in the seventh century, says that "it is a performance surpassing the genius of man". "These Aphorisms", writes Renouard, a distinguished French historian of medicine, "were long regarded as the crowning glory of the medical scientific edifice, as the most sublime effort of medical genius. Only a few years back, the Faculty of Medicine in Paris required of the aspirants to the doctorate to insert a certain number of the Aphorisms in their theses; and perhaps nothing less than the political revolution in France was sufficient to overthrow this old relic of superannuated adoration."

I am inclined to think that the neglect which within a comparatively recent period has been shown for ancient medical literature, and the manner in which medical authority of a like age has been discarded, have in no particular been more unjust and injurious than in overlooking the sterling worth and proof of the author's amazing power of observation which the Aphorisms contain. Were I asked to give advice as to the time when a study of the Hippocratic writings generally, but more especially of the book of Aphorisms, would prove most serviceable to the student of medicine, I should say that, to the young practitioner familiar with the writings and observations of modern physicians and surgeons, whose judgment is becoming gradually ripened by experience, the study of the Aphorisms is invaluable; but, unlike Renouard, I can conceive no time and no period of the education of a physician when the hours spent in the attentive perusal of the Hippocratic writings can with any propriety be considered as lost, or otherwise than most profitably employed.

The language used by Hippocrates is generally concise; sometimes on this account it may be considered a little obscure. Dr. Black has well described his language as "close and compressed, and his diction

as adorned with great majesty". In watching the progress of diseases, we have in the Aphorisms a proof of how vigilant he was, and how indefatigable; no less remarkable was he for the profundity and the singular correctness of his judgment. Not only does a perusal of the Aphorisms lead the reader to the conclusion of his having to deal with the most observant of physicians, but the conviction of their author having been a profound philosopher is also forced upon him. You all know, gentlemen, how apt we are to judge of the excellency of any work by the manner in which its opening occurs. I will venture to say that no medical work of any age begins in a more majestic manner than the book of Aphorisms. Take it in the original Greek, in Latin, or in our own language, the effect it produces on the mind is eminently grand.

"Ο βίος βραχύς, ἡ τέχνη μακρὴ, ὁ καιρὸς ὀξύς, ἡ πείρα σφαλὲρῇ, ἡ κρίσις χαλεπῇ, δεῖ οὐ μόνον ἐκωτῶν παρέχειν τὰ δέοντα ποιεῖντα ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν νοσέοντα, καὶ τοὺς παρόντας, καὶ τὰ ἐξωθεν."

"Vita brevis, ars longa, tempus præceps, experimentum periculosum, judicium difficile; oportet autem non solum se ipsum exhibere quæ decent facientem, sed etiam ægrotum et præsentem et quæ externa sunt."

"Life is short and the art long, the occasion fleeting, the experiment dangerous, and judgment difficult. The physician must not only be prepared to do what is right himself, but also to make the patient, the attendants, and externals co-operate."

"The exordium of this work", says Dr. Adams, "bespeaks at once the reflective philosopher and the practical physician. It commences by contrasting the shortness of human life with the extent of the medical art, the facts of which, as Theophilus the commentator remarks, are diversified, and some of them require long and tedious investigation. 'The occasion is fleeting'—that is to say, the season during which remedies may be successfully applied is soon past; as the poet says, 'Fugit irreparabile tempus.' The last part of the aphorism evinces how well he had apprehended the difficulties which beset the practitioner of medicine, who must be not only acquainted with the part which he himself has to act, but also possess the talent of making the patient, the assistants, and all around co-operate with him in the performance thereof."

There are expressions in this first Aphorism which have made it almost universally known. "Ars longa", "tempus præceps"—these are in every person's mouth: and do we not recognise the *very* sentiment of the old Greek physician in the beautiful lines of America's foremost living poet?

"Art is long, and Time is fleeting,
And our hearts, though stout and brave,
Still, like muffled drums, are beating
Funeral marches to the grave."

And may we not say of Hippocrates, in the words of the same poet—

"Lives of great men all remind us
We may make our lives sublime,
And, departing, leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of Time."

[To be continued.]

THERAPEUTIC MEMORANDA.

ANODYNE COLLOID.

I BEG to send herewith a bottle of a new colloid, which I have prescribed for some time as a topical anodyne application. It has given me very satisfactory results in neuralgia, sciatica, lumbago, all muscular pains, etc. It relieves local pain for the time, and procures a good night's rest, while, of course, the internal treatment appropriate to each case is carried on. I should wish to see its usefulness more extended. It contains—Hydride of amyl, ʒij; aconitia, gr. j; veratria, gr. vj; and ethereal collodion to ʒij. The amyl, by its rapid volatilisation, often produces, almost instantaneously, the desired result; but, should the pain continue, the alkaloids can be brought into activity by applying a piece of moist spongio-piline over the collodion film. The amyl hydride is the only new ingredient; but I think the colloid is a clean and elegant preparation.

M. H. LACKERSTEEN, M.D.

29, Queen Anne Street, W.

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE BRITISH MEDICAL ASSOCIATION IN 1873.—The Arrangement Committee of the metropolitan members have considered that the fine building of King's College would, by its site and structure, afford the most convenient place of meeting. Their application for its use has been promptly and kindly acceded to by the Council of the College.

AN ADDRESS

ON

THE SCIENTIFIC AND SOCIAL VALUE OF THE BRITISH MEDICAL ASSOCIATION.*

By RICHARD C. SHETTLE, M.D.,

Physician to the Royal Berkshire Hospital; President of the Reading Branch.

GENTLEMEN,—From the very able address delivered at our last annual meeting by our President, Mr. G. May, you were made intimately acquainted with the working of the British Medical Association during the period of its past existence. It will be my endeavour, to-day, to sketch out a few of the benefits that ought to accrue to the medical profession generally from such an Association, provided the principles upon which it is supported be sustained upon a broad and right basis. Nor does it appear to me to be necessary that I should make any apology for bringing the affairs of the Association so soon again before you; for there are, I believe, but few amongst us who give much attention to the general working of this or similar institutions. And, indeed, such apparent (though not real) indifference to these matters cannot cause much surprise; for surely the energy and mental strain of the daily routine of ordinary practice are quite sufficient to occupy the attention of men upon whom the grave responsibility rests of ministering to the relief of the bodily and mental infirmities of their fellow-men, and whose time is seldom at their own disposal for other matters. Under such circumstances, I take it, these annual meetings ought to tend to very much good, inasmuch as it is on occasions like the present that members can quietly consider and discuss any subjects which may have presented themselves to them as individual members during the previous year, and which may then, if considered advisable by the Council of the Branch, be brought prominently before the Parent Society.

It must be premised that the chief benefit derived from such institutions consists, as the name implies, in associating members of the profession together, not only for the purpose of framing laws and making rules for the guidance of the members generally, but also for the far more agreeable and pleasurable occupation of spending some few hours—and it may be days—once a year in the recreation of the mind, in the society of many of the most enlightened, intelligent, and necessarily liberal-minded, of the medical profession. But, in whatever aspect we regard the Association, we cannot lose sight of one great fact—that the chief aim and object is to consolidate the members of the profession into one great body, so that each member may act in concert with others, and it might, and should also, be added, that no member may suffer without the whole body being affected. We are well aware that the whole Association is built up upon a tolerably strong and right basis; and although there may be some defects in the general management, which some members might wish to see placed upon a more substantial and better footing, I would venture to point out that the purity of principle upon which the body is working is not materially affected injuriously (at any rate, to any great extent) by those defects, which will undoubtedly either be remedied or removed ere long. Moreover, we are quite certain that we have an executive guiding us, under whose watchful care and influence we shall be directed aright, and that, as circumstances and events occur, experience of the past will give us that prescience of the future which will undoubtedly, if we are true to ourselves, tend to solidify and perfect the British Medical Association.

It is not, however, to be supposed that this or any other society can be worked to the satisfaction of all its members; but, as a rule, I believe that, if we value the Association in a proper spirit, we ought either to seek to investigate and bring before the Council of the Parent Society those matters upon which we are not satisfied; or, if they be of a minor nature, to believe that they will right themselves. Under any circumstances, I would strongly urge upon members not to leave the Society for any grievance, unless the individual points of such grievance have been previously thoroughly investigated in all their aspects by the cool judgment of the Council of the Branch. We know full well that union is strength, and that it is by the united efforts of individual members that good can be effected which, as units only, they would be perfectly powerless to accomplish; and it is quite certain that, if we, as a pro-

* President's Address delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Reading Branch.