very early stage. In the treatment of tuberculous deposits accessible to surgery it was not all-sufficient that operations should be carried out for the removal of the local lesion, for recurrence was very frequent. In conjunction with Professor McWeeney he had had experience of many cases in which threatened recurrence was aborted by the treatment referred to. Mr. M'Ardle asked was it not time to devote some of the wealth which had been filched from Ireland in the past to the protection of the remnant of its once great population? Surely it was not beyond the resources of the predominant partner to provide properly for the care of a community too poor and too long kept in ignorance to be able to protect itself. The establishing of minor centres, such as had been suggested, would be a costly experiment, and could but retard the development of a State institute worthy of the name and worthy of the possibilities of this country. While waiting for such an institute, it was the duty of the Government to make some exceptional effort on behalf of Ireland, owing to the alarming condition of the people, as accentuated in the Registrar-General's Report. A suggestion had been made that a consumption dispensary should be started, say, in Dublin, having a medical director, and associated with him trained assistants, so that any medical man requiring help in dealing with the different stages of tuberculosis would, in the case of the poor, have assistance gratis. This dispensary would provide for the examination of specimens and the distribution of vaccine for suitable cases, and would give such instructions as would be required by general practitioners both in Dublin and in the provinces. Dealing next with the duty of the people, Mr. M'Ardle said that until the most illiterate of the people became aware of the dangers attendant on the harbouring of the germs of consumption no real progress would be made in its prevention. There was a force in Ireland which, once put in motion, would do more than all the powers together to stamp out the chief cause of Ireland's deterioration. This was the power of the ministers of religion, who had free access to the homes of lowly and exalted alike. Should it be necessary to apply for local help for the construction of health stations throughout the country, the law should be so arranged that the county councils would have the determining voice in the expenditure of such moneys as might be necessary in the carrying out of this work.

The Recorder, in moving a vote of thanks, said it was time the public conscience was roused on the subject, if the health and strength of the next generation were to be preserved.

Professor E. J. McWeeney, in seconding the vote, said there were three great causes for the depopulation of Ireland: One was emigration, which was due to economic reasons; another was insanity; the third was tuberculosis. All the deaths and all the sickness—for one must reckon 10 people sick for every 1 who died—owing to tuberculosis could be prevented were the germs killed off or their transference rendered impossible. This was a work in which all citizens, irrespective of creed, politics, or social distinction, ought to lend a willing hand. Had they but a consumption dispensary, with its accessory sanatorium and open-air school, many might be snatched from the very jaws of tuberculosis. Belgium, a country not much larger than Munster, had found so much benefit from such dispensaries that there were now no fewer than nineteen, and no centre of population of any importance was without one. He was glad to be able to congratulate the Corporation on having at last made a move towards establishing a sanatorium for working-class consumptives. When would the National Education Board awake to a sense of its duty and make hygiene a compulsory subject? In conclusion he advocated the systematic medical inspection of primary schools and scholars, and the provision of open-air schools for sickly children.

ROYAL VICTORIA HOSPITAL, BELFAST.

By J. A. CRAIG, F.R.C.S.Eng.,

ASSISTANT OPERATIVE SURGEON TO THE HOSPITAL.

THE opening address was delivered by Mr. Craig, F.R.C.S.Eng., on October 18th, in the Out-patient Department. Professor Lindsay occupied the chair in the absence of Dr. J. W. Browne, the chairman of the staff,

and there were a large number of medical men and students present.

The lecturer first welcomed both old and new students on behalf of himself and the staff. He said he intended to occupy their attention for a few minutes with the ever-present subject of the training of the medical student. He congratulated those who had just returned from the university contests, and had upheld the traditions of the school; their successes showed that the efforts of their teachers were not in vain. To those who had failed, he said that the consistent worker who has lost his examination had, at any rate, lost nothing more. Mr. Craig then dealt with the various subjects of the earlier years, and insisted on the excellent training of the classics, and the necessity of a certain amount of culture; the influence of the profession would be in proportion to the amount it possessed. He pointed out that the homes of culture, the older Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, were now growing as large and important medical schools, and this fact was one proof of the value of a broad education and social fitness. In dealing with the effort to prune the elementary subjects, he said the value of biology, of chemistry, and of natural philosophy in their power of teaching the art of learning, of reasoning, of manipulation, of the clear expression of one's ideas, was indisputable and of great practical advantage. Mr. Craig then dealt with hospital life and hospital teaching, the necessity for hard work, for silence, for sympathy, and for numerous other qualities were all soon borne upon the student. In after-years the graduate was urged still to remain the student, and visit other schools, and keep in touch with advances in his subjects.

Dr. Calwell proposed a hearty vote of thanks to the lecturer, which was seconded by Professor Sinclair, and passed with acclamation.

"A SIDELIGHT ON MEDICAL EDUCATION."

By A. FRANCIS DIXON, M.B., Sc.D.

PROFESSOR OF ANATOMY, TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.

IN January, 1905, the BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL published, under the title "A Sidelight on Medical Education," a series of tables based upon an analysis of the returns submitted to the General Medical Council by the Admiralty, the War Office, and the India Office.

These tables were stated to represent an analysis of the returns sent in of all the examinations for the services since June, 1902. The analysis indicated that the Irish and Scottish candidates were not so successful in securing commissions, or in qualifying at the examinations, as the candidates from the English schools, and from this it was inferred that certain deductions were justified and a side-light thrown upon the educational methods and curricula in force in the different parts of the United Kingdom.

The matter attracted a considerable amount of attention, but the judgement of the Examination Committee of the General Medical Council on the returns submitted to it was that "such changes have lately been made in the conduct of the service examinations that the Committee think no conclusion of practical utility can at present be drawn from the statistics."¹ In view of this pronouncement it is of interest to inquire if at the more recently held examinations the same relative amount of success has attended the various groups of candidates, or if a wider knowledge of the scope of the examinations and of the tests imposed has led to a more equal relative distribution of success.

On three occasions since the JOURNAL has published tables similar to those issued in January, 1905—namely, in June, 1905, in June, 1906, and in September, 1906. Unfortunately the figures of January and June, 1905, and June, 1906, are not mutually exclusive; but by taking the figures published September 22nd, 1906, which are stated to represent an analysis of all the examinations for the services held since June, 1902, and subtracting from them the figures given in the table of January, 1905, we can, if we assume the figures correct, construct a series of tables which, by comparison with those of January, 1905, will answer our inquiry and show whether the same amount of relative success still attends the candidates of the various countries and various licensing bodies, or whether success and failure are

¹ Report dated May 25th, 1905.

TABLE I.

Showing the Extent of the Competition for Each Service.

	Number of Candidates.	Number of Vacancies.	Proportion of Candidates to Vacancies.
Royal Navy Medical Service...	23	9	5 to 1.9
Royal Army Medical Corps ..	165	120	5 to 3.6
Indian Medical Service ..	91	48	5 to 2.6
Total or average ...	279	177	5 to 3.1

TABLE II.

Showing whence the Candidates received their Qualifications.

Licensing Body.	Number of Candidates.	Proportion of Entire Number.
English Colleges and Universities ..	100	35.8 per cent.
Scottish	75	25.8 "
Irish	100	35.8 "
Colonial	1	0.3 "
Mixed... .. .	3	1.0 "
Total or Average... ..	279	—

TABLE III.

Showing the Proportion of Commissions gained by the Candidates of each Country.

Country.	Number of Commissions Won.	Proportion of all Commissions Offered.
England	74	41.8 per cent.
Scotland	46	25.9 "
Ireland	56	31.6 "
Colonies	1	0.5 "
Mixed	0	0.0 "
	177	—

TABLE IV.

Showing the Relative Success of the Candidates of Each Country in Proportion to the Respective Numbers.

Country.	Number of Candidates.	Number who Gained Commissions.	Proportion of Success to Candidates.
England	100	74	74.0 per cent.
Scotland	75	46	61.3 "
Ireland	100	56	56.0 "
Colonies	1	1	100.0 "
Mixed	3	0	0.0 "
Total or average...	279	177	63.4 "

TABLE V.

Showing the Percentage of Candidates who Passed the Qualifying Standard, including those who Gained Commissions.

Country.	Number who Entered.	Number who Passed the Standard.	Proportion to the Total.
English candidates ..	100	95	95.0 per cent.
Scottish	75	78	77.3 "
Irish	100	76 (? 78)*	76.0 (? 78) "
Colonial	1	3 (? 1)†	100.0 "
Mixed	3	2	66.6 "
Total or average ...	279	234	83.9 "

* 76 is the number arrived at by subtracting Table V of January, 1905, from Table V of September, 1905. 78 is probably the correct number, as will be seen by comparing with Table VI here published.

† The number arrived at by subtracting the figures of January, 1905, from those of September, 1906, is 3; this is obviously incorrect.

TABLE VI.

Showing the Proportion of those who Failed Totally among the Candidates of Each Country.

Country	Number of Candidates.	Number Rejected.	Proportion of Total Failures.
English candidates ...	100	5	5.0 per cent.
Scottish	75	17	22.6 "
Irish	100	22	22.0 "
Colonial	1	0	0.0 "
Mixed	3	1	33.3 "
Total or average...	279	45	16.1 per cent.

TABLE VII.

Showing Details of the Performance of each Class of Candidate.

Qualifications.	Number of Candidates.	Commissions Gained.	Qualified but Unsuccessful.	Rejected.	Percentage of Success.
English Conjoint Board alone ..	69	55	13	1	79.7
" " and Oxford degree ..	1	1	—	—	100.0
" " and Cambridge ..	2	—	2	—	0.0
" " and London ..	7	5	1	1	71.4
" " and Durham ..	1	1	—	—	100.0
" " and Manchester ..	1	1	—	—	100.0
" " and Edinburgh ..	2	2	—	—	100.0
" " and L.S.A. ..	—	—	—	—	—
English Apothecaries' Society alone ..	4	3	—	1	75.0
" " and London degree ..	—	—	—	—	—
" " and Scottish diploma ..	2	2	2	0	66.6
London degree alone ..	3	2	1	0	66.6
" " and Manchester degree ..	—	—	—	—	—
Cambridge degree alone ..	—	—	—	—	—
Durham	7	4	1	2	57.3
Birmingham	1	0	1	—	0.0
Manchester	4	2	2	0	50.0
Scottish Conjoint Colleges alone ..	17	6(?)	2	10	29.4
" " and Edinburgh ..	—	—	—	—	—
degree	1	1	—	—	100.0
Aberdeen degree alone... ..	7	7	—	—	100.0
Edinburgh	40	25	9	6	62.5
Glasgow	10	8	1	1	80.0
Irish Conjoint College alone ...	48	19	12	17	39.6
Dublin University alone ..	31	23	5	3	74.2
Royal University of Ireland ...	21	14	5	2	66.6
Colonial Universities	1	1	—	—	100.0
Mixed	(3?)	—	(2?)	(1?)	0.0
Total or average	279	177	57	45	63.4

TABLE VIII.

Percentage Comparison of the Work of Certain Classes of Candidates.

Qualifications.	Number of Candidates.	Gained Commissions.	Qualified but Unsuccessful.	Total Qualified.	Number Rejected.	Percentage of Winners.	Percentage Qualified.	Percentage Rejected.	Order.
English Conjoint diploma alone ...	69	55	13	68	1	79.7	98.5	1.5	1
English Conjoint diploma and English degree ..	12	8	3	11	1	66.6	91.6	8.3	2
Irish degrees alone	52	37	10	47	5	71.1	90.3	9.6	3
Scottish degrees alone	57	40	10	50	7	70.2	87.7	12.2	4
English degrees alone	15	8	5	13	2	53.3	86.6	13.3	5
Other classes together	9	5	2	7	2	55.5	77.7	22.2	6
Irish Conjoint diploma alone	48	19	12	31	17	39.6	64.6	35.4	7
Scottish Conjoint diploma alone ...	17	5	2	7	10	29.4	41.2	58.8	8
Total or average	279	177	57	234	45	63.4	83.9	16.1	—

becoming more equally distributed as the nature of the examinations becomes better known. Only questions of this nature can be answered by a study of such tables; other inferences are hardly justifiable, as no indication is given to show whether the various schools have been represented by candidates above or below their average standard of proficiency; and, further, since the ages of the candidates are not given, we cannot infer whether or not much time has been spent in special preparation for the service examinations.

The accompanying tables have been made by subtracting the figures given by the BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL in January, 1905, from those published by the same JOURNAL in September, 1906. Assuming the figures given in these returns to be correct, the tables should represent an analysis of the returns made to the General Medical Council of all examinations for the services since January, 1905—namely, two for the Indian Medical, one for the Royal Navy, and three for the Royal Army Medical Corps. For convenience of comparison, the tables have been drawn up in a precisely similar form to that adopted by the JOURNAL.

A comparison of the tables here submitted with those published in January, 1905, shows that the average proportion of candidates to the total vacancies is much the same as in the earlier examinations. The most remarkable fact is the relatively large increase of the candidates from Ireland, the number of which is now equal to that from England. The English candidates have diminished in number from 47.3 to 35.8 per cent. of the total number. The Irish have increased from 25.4 to 35.8 per cent., and the Scottish have increased their relative numbers by about 1 per cent. to 26.8.

With regard to the commissions gained (Table III) we find that England has gained 17.3 per cent. less, Scotland 7 per cent. more, and Ireland 12.9 per cent. more of the total commissions offered.

In proportion to the number of candidates, England still leads in capturing most vacancies. The differences between the three countries are, however, by no means so marked as formerly, since England's proportion of success to candidates has diminished from 78.1 to 74, while Scotland's has increased from 48.1 to 61.3, and Ireland's from 45.7 to 56 per cent.

The positions of the three countries as judged by the proportion of their candidates who have passed the qualifying examination (see Table V) is not much changed; the numbers are—England 95, Scotland 77.3, and Ireland 76 (? 78), as against 93.3, 72.6, and 80 per cent. formerly. Ireland has lost 2, England has gained 2, and Scotland 4.5 per cent.

Table VI shows the proportion of candidates who have failed to qualify. Since January, 1905, England has improved its already high position in this respect by diminishing its total failures by 1.5 per cent.; Scotland has diminished its failures by 5 per cent., and Ireland remains practically where it was in January, 1905, and shows a percentage of failures just a fraction below that at present exhibited by Scotland.

Tables VII and VIII are those which have always attracted most interest. Here we have the performances of the candidates from the various licensing bodies exhibited and compared. Unfortunately, in many cases the number of candidates is small, but taking the various licensing bodies, which have sent up 15 or more candidates, we may arrange them according to their percentage of success as follows: English Conjoint Board alone 79.7 per cent., Dublin University 74.2 per cent., Royal University of Ireland 66.6 per cent., Edinburgh University 62.5 per cent., Irish Conjoint Colleges 39.6 per cent., and Scottish Conjoint Colleges 29.4 per cent.¹ Candidates from Aberdeen and Glasgow were very successful, securing 100 and 80 per cent. respectively, but their numbers were not large.

One has only to compare these results with those shown in the tables of January, 1905, to see that great changes have taken place. The success attending the candidates of Dublin University has increased 31, of the Royal University of Ireland 3.3, of Edinburgh University 12.5, of the Irish Conjoint Colleges 5.6 per cent., while that of the Scottish Conjoint Colleges has diminished by 9.5 per cent.¹

¹ I have taken 5 as the number of successful candidates (see Table VII this note); there is undoubtedly an error in Table VII of January, 1905.

The tables certainly appear to indicate that as the requirements of the newer examinations are becoming better known, success is becoming more uniformly distributed. The high position of the English Conjoint Board candidates may well be due to the fact that the examinations are London examinations, and this conclusion agrees well with the fact that those Conjoint Board candidates who also hold University degrees are less successful than those who hold the diploma alone. (See Table VIII of September 22nd.) The former will in greater proportion have been educated outside London.

I have not copies of all the actual returns submitted to the General Medical Council, and have not had time to look them up; I have, however, assumed that the numbers given in the JOURNAL are correct, yet before leaving the matter I desire to draw attention to some errors and misleading figures in the analyses of the returns as published in the JOURNAL. For instance, in Table VII, published January, 1905, the numbers of commissions gained by the Scottish Conjoint Colleges should read 16 instead of 15, and the percentage of success should be 42.1 instead of 39. In Table VIII, published June 2nd, 1906, the total number of candidates is given as 178, but the column of figures added together gives 185. This appears to be due to the fact that "other classes together" are put down as 13, but a comparison with Table VII shows that the correct number is 6. In the analyses published on September 22nd, in Table VIII, 14 has been added to the number of candidates holding English diplomas *plus* English degree, and in the same table the L.S.A. candidates and some others are left out altogether. Further, a comparison of Table V, September, 1906, with the corresponding Table of January, 1905, reveals an error in the number of Colonial candidates who have passed the standard. This error will seriously affect the percentage which is given in the same table.

A close comparison of Tables V and VI also leads one to believe that there is an error of 2 in the number of Irish candidates who have passed the qualifying examination. This is brought out in Table V accompanying this note (compare with Table VI).

Some of the most remarkable figures are, however, to be found in the analyses of June 3rd, 1905. In Table IV the average proportion of success to candidates is given as 33.9; in Table VII the same proportion is given as 54, and in Table VIII as 47.8. As a matter of fact, the correct figure is approximately 50.3. Again, the percentage of candidates who have qualified is given in Table V as 64.8, in Table VIII as 77.4, while the actual number is 81 per cent. Finally, the proportion of total failures is variously given as 35.1 (see Table VI) and 22.6 (see Table VIII), while the correct number is 18.9 per cent.

If the analyses are to be published in future in similar form, it is to be hoped that care will be taken to give correct numbers and percentages.

* * Professor Dixon, it will be observed, takes some of the tables regarding service examinations which have appeared in the JOURNAL, assumes that they are correct, utilizes them to build up a theory of his own, invites us to accept it, and then cuts off the branch on which he stands by suggesting that the tables are wrong.

It is not a method which commends itself, but fortunately the criticisms, formidable as their list appears, in nowise really affect the essential structure of the tables, so that the author's theory to that extent is safe. This being assured, his mathematical comments become mere *obiter dicta*. Conceivably they are well founded, conceivably they are otherwise; but in any case it is scarcely worth while to devote time and space to their consideration.

There have been seven, and not four, series of tables published in these columns, and possibly the author has misinterpreted some of those which he has seen; certainly this is the case in the instance which he regards as the most remarkable. It is worth noting, however, that the candidates who should really be regarded as entitled to the first place on the result of all the examinations held up to the present are not the holders of the English conjoint diploma alone, but the holders of this diploma *plus* an English degree, though their number is small and the margin narrow. To this extent, therefore, there really is

an error in the last series of tables, though the point affected is of no real importance.

Nothing, indeed, in the way of mathematical criticism to which the tables can be subjected can disturb their great outstanding feature, namely, the extreme and quite abnormal difference shown between certain large classes of candidates in the number of men who fail to reach the qualifying standard.

This is the point of real interest in the tables, for though, obviously, all candidates cannot win commissions, at any rate, all might pass the qualifying standard, and in the winning of commissions candidates from the three divisions of the country—England, Scotland, and Ireland—might be expected to show a proportionately equal degree of success. So far, however, from this being the case, there are material differences in the latter respect, while in the former the percentages of total failures or of men who fail to pass the qualifying standard range from about 3 to 43.

As an explanation of the very great difference in the degree of success obtained by different classes of candidates, Professor Dixon suggests that, in the earlier part of the period covered by the returns, the scope of the examinations was not equally widely known in all parts of the kingdom; if this were the case the differences would, of course, tend to disappear, and the author by certain calculations of his own endeavours to show that they are doing so, thus proving the truth of his explanation.

It is, doubtful, however, whether many persons will be convinced by his reasoning on this point, for, though it is true that in the last year or so the number of Irish candidates has augmented and that they have gained proportionately more commissions, Professor Dixon's own tables show that the limits of total failure have widened, not diminished. They stand for the later examinations at 1.5 per cent. only for English Conjoint diplomates at one end of the scale, while at the other end they are as high as 35.4 per cent., and 58.8 per cent. for Irish and Scotch diplomates respectively. Even amongst Irish degree holders the percentage of total failures stands at 9.6 per cent., which, in view of the circumstance that in connexion with Professor Dixon's own college there is a school specially devoted to the preparation of candidates for the services, is scarcely consistent with the supposition that the differences are due to lack of knowledge of the nature of the examinations; for in Dublin, if anywhere, the scope and character of the tests imposed must be exceedingly well known.

Nor does the suggestion seem quite satisfactory as regards the examinations at any date, since the general nature of the examinations must always have been at least as familiar in Ireland and Scotland as in England. This is especially probable, because until just before the commencement of the period which these returns cover, the services, the Army Medical Service in particular, were very far from popular among English students. There is a further hint in the paper which is of a kind similar to one made by a Scottish correspondent a few weeks ago, and is to the effect that the differences shown perhaps may be due to the examinations being held in London and by English examiners. This suggestion, unpleasant in itself, cannot be sustained: for at the competitions for admission to the Indian Medical Service and the Royal Army Medical Corps, at which alone it is common for candidates to be rejected solely on the ground of lack of professional knowledge, the examiners are selected from a very wide area. To make this point clear the names and addresses of the present examiners are here added. For the Indian Medical Service they are: Dr. Hale White (London), Mr. Ernest Lane (London), Professor J. Symington (Belfast), Professor Calder Leith (Birmingham), Dr. Haultain (Edinburgh), and Professor Cash (Aberdeen). Every year two of them retire in rotation and are replaced by others selected in corresponding fashion. For the Army Medical Corps the examiners, who are likewise changed from time to time, are at present, Dr. F. Taylor (London), Professor Clifford Allbutt (Cambridge), Professor W. G. Smith (Dublin), Dr. Byrom Bramwell (Edinburgh), Professor T. Sinclair (Belfast), Professor T. Ogston (Aberdeen), Mr. A. J. Pepper (London), and Professor Rickman Godlee (London).

MEDICAL MAGISTRATE.—Dr. J. Kenrick-Jones, of Llanrhaidr-yn-Mochnant, Oswestry, has been placed on the Commission of the Peace for the County of Denbigh.

WORDS AND THINGS.

At the opening meeting of the Students' Physical Society of Guy's Hospital, Professor Clifford Allbutt delivered an address on "Words and Things." After some introductory remarks he said that by "things" he meant what we supposed to be an external world, after the manner of which we were or ought to be continually remodelling our ideas; by "words," on the other hand, he meant signs, arbitrary and very variable signs, by which we endeavoured to indicate these ideas and converse with them. Speaking of the literary man, whose profession was not with making things but with dressing them, he said it was no bitter cynic who said that "persons who cannot afford the time to experiment write books on the subject." This smart redressing of things in precious words to catch the attention of the readers of magazines, must do harm both to the public and to the journalist in divorcing manner from matter, in regarding "style" not as in the substance of the thing itself, but as an applied decoration; the thing itself being, in two of its aspects, the personal experience and this experience modified by the author's temperament. This last quality it was which was properly Style. When the style became but a frippery, clothing somebody else's stuff, affectations, insincerities, and false notions bred and abounded.

To dwell upon things rather than on words was the method of observation, which in its fullness contained the experimental method, and although it would not be fair to say that the Greeks never attained the use of this method, its practice by Aristotle, by his pupil Theophrastus the botanist, by Archimedes, or Hipparchus, never attained anything like the maturity to govern their conceptions.

Both before and after the Socratic period the pursuit of knowledge was mainly not by this method but by the method of public discussion. If we realized how a word might survive to oppress and mislead us, as other ghosts did when the underlying thing had dissolved, we should be more careful in setting up imposing names, as we physicians were very prone to do, until we were sure that the thing was there; and in no case should we let a name give an absolute value to temporary or developing notions.

Words were fraught for the mind with three qualities at least—with Sense, Meaning, and Significance. By Sense, we indicated the direct intention of the very words themselves, although the sense was often dependent more or less upon the context; moreover, we knew that many words had more than one direct sense. By Meaning, we indicated that which the author wished to convey; a burden unfortunately too very often different from the sense. Thirdly, by Significance, we meant something more diffused and impalpable than either sense or meaning. A great part of his significance the author might not have deliberately foreseen and intended: it was often something intuitive, springing from his sympathy and imagination as well as from his systematic purpose.

Before entering upon the use of words in natural science, Professor Allbutt referred to their use in logic. Locke said of logic that one could not apply the syllogism until the truth was ascertained, and that then one did not want it. The answer might be, nevertheless, that having apprehended a truth we applied the syllogism to discover and formulated the deffest, most economical, and most effectual mode of expressing it. The danger was lest we should not use logic thus clear-sightedly, but should be tempted to suppose its manipulation of words to be a manipulation of things, and lest the constructor of syllogisms should suppose himself a creator of truth.

Undoubtedly in the last hundred years we had been devoting ourselves, and with marvellous success, not of course to get rid of abstractions, but to divest them of substance, to appraise their value as devices of thought, and to determine their functions; we were, notwithstanding, still a prey to formulas and accepted words for things. And we erred in two curiously opposite directions: we attributed substance to names, and then, because by this factitious solidity they imposed upon us, we left them standing while we were no less busily, if unwittingly, engaged in pulling to pieces the concepts to which they were applied. Thus names became fimsier than ever; no longer corresponding even to concepts: they were but the rags of thought.

The name of a disease was not, as it was continually