the principles of chemical and physiological science and for the student this is especially needful when in his last years of study he applies his science to disease. I understand that in Sweden the opinion is now freely expressed that the bedside study of disease should come first and the scientific training later in the curriculum; that the empirical study of disease should excite the student to unravel by science both the cause and the cure. There is much to be said for this view.

The vastness of the London area from which medical students come precludes the possibility of one central institute from considerations of time and space. University College and King's College show every sign of intending to remain institutes for the teaching of the preliminary medical subjects, and there is much to be said for the retention of both these and those other schools which have shown by their energy and progress that they are efficient. These schools are conveniently placed north, south, east, and west, and have slowly been evolved to meet the needs of London. Let us improve and not destroy their evolution. If the friends of the medical schools and the University could raise between them enough to contribute £2000 a year to each efficient school to complete its maintenance the whole question would be solved and at a far less expense than the building and endowing of a new central institute.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

LEONARD HILL, M.B. Lond., F.R.S.,

Lecturer on Physiology, London Hospital Medical College;
Examiner to the University of Oxford, Royal College of
Surgeons, &c.

The London Hospital Medical College, Feb. 27th, 1905.

SCHOOL GREEK IN SOME OF ITS NATIONAL ASPECTS AND THE *VIA MEDIA*.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—Lay opinion is not competent to judge of the technical merits of the question now submitted to its vote at Cambridge or of the details of the school reform which seems to be unavoidable; but it can perceive sufficient proof in the uncompromising division between the experts in school and university education that this cause in which national interests are involved is not ripe for sentence but is ripe for adequate investigation. Not less significant is the unanimity with which the experts agree: (1) that the value of Greek for the highest culture is unsurpassed; (2) that the effect of the proposals now made under the names of science, which is not excluded but most welcomed at Cambridge, and of the University, the trustee of our highest ideals and the custodian of lights never to be extinguished, must be to uproot it finally out of our school teaching, to the detriment and spoliation of not the least distinguished section of our intellectual *élite*; and (3) that the excuse offered to the nation for these extremities is the failure of our present methods to cope with this difficult language without an unwarrantable waste of time. The normal inferences which arise from these admissions must speak for themselves.

Hitherto the only profession practically familiar with the workings of the mind and its mechanisms has had no voice in matters of education. If only its experience were to be utilised, could we not command sufficient ingenuity and practical sense, even without looking to the other side of the Atlantic, for a redistribution of school subjects and for a simplification of the study of classics and also of the modern languages, avoiding any gratuitous waste in teaching the latter on the least practical plan, and securing easier and better Greek? The cause of school Greek is linked with that of the reasoned study of languages which must soon take its place among the indispensables for an English university education and to which our race stands specially committed as to a first duty of empire. Philology, the most ancient and also the most modern of the sciences, is itself a higher branch of physiology. It is the soul of our present Renaissance in modern languages and literature and of that *universalism* which is the prominent feature of our age though we are served by the indispensable machinery of *specialism*. Philology now leans upon Greek quite as much as it did at the first Renaissance and the nation and science itself are therefore pledged to place the tuition of Greek as well as of the modern languages upon truly practical lines.

National interests of a different order are served by the popular demand and by the growing facilities for rapid

methods of fluency in modern languages, a tardy repentance for the ruinous policy of preferring always the easiest task under the motto "This is a free country." The revival of that policy *ad usum scholarum* would be an anachronism. The safeguarding of the highest educational standards is also claimed in behalf of the great profession of medicine, the interests of which are not indifferent to the State. Hitherto the least favoured, but not the least needed, it is the only profession which, drawing no subventions, contributes a large revenue in the value of the lives which it saves year by year. Its usefulness to the nation must grow in proportion to its influence and the measure of its influence must always be the degree of its culture. As its work is the highest, so should its culture be; and Greek happens to be inseparable from the highest medical education, for in medicine Greek is not a "dead" but a living language. *E pur si muove*. It lives and continues unceasingly its additions to the vocabulary of Hippocrates. Throughout the world its old words and the new are the current language of the profession, though too often their origin is hardly suspected by those who utter them or is recognised with less appreciation than a little more knowledge might inspire. This is a sufficient reason why the "high-standard" medical degree of the ancient universities should, in the interests of the State as well as of the profession, ever continue to require an undiminished literary and philological training. As to science, some *via media* should be discoverable to satisfy the aspirations of our "moderns" for Cambridge opportunities and degrees without entailing upon the *alma mater* any lapse of dignity or of trust.

In conclusion, our national advantage lies in the expansion of higher culture no less than of science. To science itself better Greek and more philology would be a positive gain. The popular cry for modern languages is the strongest argument in proof of the increasing importance of philology and therefore of Greek in the range of our higher education and is an indirect demand for their cultivation. We seem to have strayed and to have lost our compass but there are landmarks as bold as the Pyramids to help us to find safety in some middle course and to guide us towards a policy of reconstruction rather than of destruction.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

WILLIAM EWART, M.D. Cantab.

The Athenæum, Feb. 21st, 1905.

THE SALE OF PATENT MEDICINES ON THE CONTINENT.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—I shall feel extremely grateful if any of your readers can give me any information with regard to the regulations that are made in continental countries respecting the sale of patent or proprietary medicines. I may add that as far as regards Italy, France, and Germany I have in my possession official information. It is with regard to Russia, Norway and Sweden, and Belgium that I desire some information.

I am, Sirs, yours faithfully,

T. GARRETT HORDER.

32, Windsor-place, Cardiff, Feb. 23rd, 1905.

MEDICAL TEACHING IN THE METROPOLIS.

To the Editors of THE LANCET.

SIRS,—My reasons for saying that clinical medicine is ill-taught at the London medical schools are: first, my own observation; secondly, the testimony of others, and among them one who is in a unique position to give a just and disinterested opinion on the matter; and, thirdly, the fact that students from some of the schools are wont to seek elsewhere the teaching they cannot find at their *alma mater*.

I need hardly say that my letter had reference to the London schools generally, not to any school in particular. It would be a piece of impertinence on my part to institute comparisons between individual schools, but in view of Dr. Frederick Taylor's letter, and in justice to the medical school of which he is so distinguished a member, I feel I ought to say that if clinical medicine were as well taught in all the other schools as it is at Guy's (and at least one other) my letter would not have been written. It is just because at Guy's "no assistant physician during the last 40