and the national abhorrence of intoxication hinders much excess in drinking. His augmented privations and hardships in the field and on board ship, further contributed to render the system less liable to sympathise acutely in local injuries, whilst the common preference to sleep in the open air folded in a capote (national mantle), inured him to the vicissitudes of temperature, and removed the dangerous excitement of crowded tents or ship holds. When wounded, therefore, a Greek was naturally free from the dangers of vigour and plenitude, and from the reduction of flesh and spirits incidental to protracted ailment. His system did not receive a like shock at the moment of the accident, nor suffered so much from the subsequent reaction, as a stout robust European labourer, or as the soldier whose digestive functions have been exposed to frequent surfeits of animal food and ardent liquors; nor was his constitution so relaxed as not readily to reply to the demands of reproduction of parts." The surgeon, instructed by these facts, was contented on the field to see his patient, wrapped in his capote, lying under any accidental shelter; and in ships, covered in the same manner, lying on the deck.* Little medical treatment was ever required in surgical cases, and bleeding was only once necessary after operation. Our local applications were alike simple. The face of the stump was covered with a single fold of calico, and the roller, as sparingly as possible, spread over the limb. If pain in the stump supervened, it was kept constantly moistened by cold water, and leeches largely applied in the vicinity. The treatment of gun-shot wounds not requiring amputation, differed in no manner from that commonly pursued.

LONDON UNIVERSITY.

THE following letters respecting the dismissal of Professor PATTISON, have been addressed to the proprietors by two of the Professors, and extensively distributed amongst the friends of the institution.

TO THE PROPRIETORS OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF LONDON.

My Lords and Gentlemen,

A STATEMENT has lately been circulated by Mr. Pattison among the proprietors, apparently with the view of proving himself to be the victim of a cabal; and he appears

to suspect that not only the late warden, the professors, and students, but even members of Council and the late committee of proprietors, were parties in the plot. In the same pamphlet he states, in regard to myself, that I have been "most active in my endeavours to drive him from the University;" and attempts to show, by extracts from a letter imprudently written by Dr. Alexander Thomson, that I was one of those who conspired against him. These circumstances have induced me to address to you the present letter, explanatory of the part which I have taken in these transactions.

Previous to my connexion with the University of London, I had no acquaintance whatever with Mr. Pattison. When I joined the institution, I was introduced to him as to the other professors, and from that period to the middle of the 2nd session I continued on terms of friendly intercourse with him. True it is that circumstances very soon led me to consider his appointment as an unfortunate one. I did not, however, on that account, act in a hostile manner towards him, but, on the contrary, did all in my power to contribute to his popularity. Of this, Mr. Pattison's own statement adduces ample evidence, since some of the strongest facts by which he supports his present case were procured by my means, and establish both the absence of hostility on my part, and my perfect willingness to serve him.

The letter of the 9th of December, 1829, published in the twelfth page of his statement, deserves particular notice in this point of view. The inquiry there referred to was instituted agreeably to Mr. Pattison's own wish, and for the purpose of defending him against anonymous enemies:—seven or eight students, selected by Dr. Davis, were accordingly examined by Dr. Conolly and myself, and the result reported to the Council. The assurances of Mr. Pattison induced me to believe that persons of influence in the University were plotting his ruin, and it was this feeling in the parties to that letter which gave rise to the tone of indignation with which designing whisperers are there denounced. These circumstances sufficiently prove that, in December of the second session, I was so far from being a party in a cabal against Mr. Pattison, or from giving countenance to any cabal, that I had every disposition to defend him, and acted zealously in his defence.

In the after part of the same session, events occurred which terminated my friendly intercourse with Mr. Pattison. The dissatisfaction which I had endeavoured to remove in the early part of the session, ultimately became more extensive, and assumed a definite form. Mr. Pattison had no longer

* In fact, sailors refused to hang up in cots in the sick bay of the *Hellas*, either in medical or surgical diseases.

to deal with vague rumours and anonymous accusers. The complaining students came forward in their proper persons, and offered to substantiate what they said by evidence. Under these circumstances the difficulties of Mr. Pattison ought to have been at an end. He had only to meet his accusers face to face, to expose the absurdity of their objections, and to prove by the testimony of a majority of his class, that he had performed his duty in a satisfactory manner. This plain and obvious course, which would have at once defeated the object of false accusers, was not adopted. Instead of showing that the facts which the students stated were erroneous, Mr. Pattison, in co-operation with his supporters in the Council, endeavoured to persuade that body that the complaining students ought not to be heard, but should be expelled; and that they were instigated to complain by the intrigues of Mr. Horner. Mr. Pattison associated himself with some other professors who were dissatisfied with Mr. Horner, and a pamphlet appeared, containing the complaints of these gentlemen against the late warden.

The mode in which Mr. Pattison conducted his defence appeared to me in every way improper. I objected to his summary mode of treating the students, for the following reasons:—As the second session advanced, I heard from various quarters, especially from two of my colleagues, Dr. Davis and Dr. Thomson, that very serious dissatisfaction prevailed among Mr. Pattison's pupils; and when the discontented students subsequently complained to the Council, several of them were found to be young men who were far advanced in their studies, and who had distinguished themselves by gaining the highest honours which the University had to bestow; and, lastly, I knew from my own observation that some of the complaints of the students were well founded. Under these circumstances I could not continue a supporter of Mr. Pattison. I felt that, situated as the London University was, without a charter—without privileges—founding its claim to public estimation on the character of its professors, and the excellence of the education which they offered to students,—I felt that the only proper course for the University, as well as for Mr. Pattison, if he was really well qualified for his office, was to institute an immediate inquiry, in order to prove to the mass of our students that their complaints, respecting incompetence at least, were unfounded. To Mr. Pattison's accusations against Mr. Horner still greater objections were applicable. The charges brought against that gentleman I considered then, as I do now, to be frivolous and vexatious—as devoid of any real foundation as are the more recent charges

of the same nature which Mr. Pattison has embodied in his last statement. The treatment which the late warden received on that occasion appeared to several of my colleagues and myself so unjust and unmerited as to call on us to express our disapprobation to the Council.

I have stated the preceding facts in order to show that, so far from being a conspirator against Mr. Pattison, I was for a long time one of his most zealous defenders; and that when I ceased to be so, I had ample reasons for my conduct. With respect to my share in the transactions of last session, I have very little to relate. Having discontinued all intercourse with Mr. Pattison, I carefully avoided making inquiry or receiving information respecting him. I was accordingly quite ignorant that dissatisfaction existed in his class, until I heard of it accidentally a few days before a memorial against Mr. Pattison was presented to the Council by sixty of his students. During the disorders which followed I declined taking any part whatever until about six weeks after their commencement, when some of the students applied to the medical professors, requesting their interference. In consequence of this application, Dr. Grant, Dr. Thomson, and myself, inquired into the nature of their allegations, and informed the Council that the case was such as to demand inquiry. This was the sum of my interference with the pupils. With respect to the Council, I did what the urgency of the case demanded. My first offence was in not continuing to support Mr. Pattison, and in being blind to the numerous perfections to which the American students appear to have been so sensible. My last was, in informing the Council, after the termination of the session, that the unpopularity of Mr. Pattison had reached such a height, that his continuance in the chairs of anatomy and surgery was incompatible with the existence of the medical school. Dr. Thomson, Dr. Grant, and Mr. Pattison's own friend, Dr. Davis, expressed themselves at the same time to the same effect; and the truth of the remark was well known to the Council, as I believe to every one well acquainted with the facts, and with the nature of medical education in London. In the same address we urged the Council to make an amicable arrangement for his retirement, and offered to facilitate the adoption of such a measure by a pecuniary contribution from our own resources.

Such are the explanations which I have felt myself called on to give relative to myself. But the statement of Mr. Pattison conveys such an erroneous impression respecting three parties who are not present to defend themselves, that I cannot and ought not to abstain from claiming for them

that justice to which I know them to be entitled. I allude to the late persecuted warden, Mr. Horner,—to the students,—and to my deceased colleague, Mr. Bennett.

1. Against Mr. Horner an early dislike was taken by one or two of the professors, and no opportunity was lost to excite the same feeling in others. Every act of Mr. Horner was canvassed and misconstrued, he was opposed and annoyed in every possible manner, and in some cases treated with direct insult. That these were the feelings which influenced several of the professors I can testify with certainty, since they were early instilled into myself, and influenced my conduct for a considerable period, until the malice displayed in some charges, and the absurdity of others, made me first doubt and then disbelieve them altogether. With respect to the charges brought by Mr. Pattison against the late warden, the facts have all proceeded from the intercourse which arose out of Mr. Horner's situation, and in every instance followed the events which Mr. Pattison endeavours to prove them to have produced. Were Mr. Horner present to defend himself, the formidable history which Mr. Pattison has described at pages 19 and 20 of his Statement, would dwindle into merited insignificance.

2. I have, in the next place, to defend our students against the reproaches which have been indiscriminately heaped upon them. The disorderly and unruly conduct of these young men, *after* open hostility had commenced between Mr. Pattison and his class, attained that ungovernable height to which large assemblies are prone when violently excited, and which cannot be justified. But it is important for the proprietors and the public to be aware of all the circumstances which led to this extravagance. The conduct of these young men throughout their whole previous career at the University was, in every respect, deserving of the highest praise. They had been diligent in their studies, correct in their conduct, and respectful to the professors. The memorial which they sent to the Council, expressly directed against Mr. Pattison as a teacher, spoke of him in other respects in terms of kindness; and the language throughout was temperate and respectful. But, as soon as this memorial was sent, Mr. Pattison's treatment of his class immediately changed, and he attempted to introduce a novel system of discipline, to which the medical students of London, and, as I apprehend, of every other medical school, are entire strangers, and which was not likely to be patiently endured. The result, which was to be anticipated, occurred; Mr. Pattison demanded the assistance of the Council, and the Council did all they could

to support him. But the students, who might have been ruled by a single word, under judicious management, would not submit to compulsory measures on behalf of a person who had lost all influence amongst them; and from my knowledge of these events, coupled with the disposition and character of the students, I have no hesitation in asserting that the whole of the disorder was occasioned by the indiscretion of the professor himself.

But it has been maintained, that the mere fact of students complaining of professors was a thing not to be tolerated, and should have been punished by immediate expulsion; and that no professor can feel at ease in a situation where he may himself be subject to similar treatment. Instead of arguing this point abstractedly, I shall treat it practically. With respect to the last point, I affirm that of the nine gentlemen who are at present engaged to conduct the medical department of the University, there is not one, or more than one, who feels the slightest uneasiness on the subject. They know perfectly well, that if they qualify themselves duly for their situation, engage heartily in the management of their respective duties, and treat their students with kindness and discretion, their intercourse with their pupils will be attended with unmixed gratification. In regard to the former I will simply state the facts as they have happened. Sixty pupils send a respectful and temperate memorial to the Council, complaining of certain negligences and defects in Mr. Pattison, which, if substantiated (and the pupils offered to substantiate them), would have proved Mr. Pattison to be unfit for his situation. The students who made these statements were not boys, but young men, several of them advanced in their studies, and highly distinguished by their attainments. Into the nature of their complaints I have neither time nor inclination to enter, but I will mention one complaint as an illustration. Mr. Pattison gave a prospectus of his course, engaging to teach certain subjects; a pupil paid his fee on the faith of this prospectus, and ultimately complained that Mr. Pattison did not fulfil his engagement. Whether this was or was not true I know not, and offer no opinion; but I do think that this and similar complaints were of that distinct form and serious nature which called for immediate inquiry. The accused person, one would have thought, should have been the first to demand such a step, and might with justice have complained of those who refused it. But to inquiry Mr. Pattison and his friends were warmly opposed; the memorial was set aside without notice for about six weeks, and the time of the Council was occupied with the usual frivolous charges against Mr. Horner,

and discussions about the discipline of students.

It has been declared that Mr. Pattison's reputation as an anatomist and teacher is of that exalted kind, as to render any doubt of his qualifications ridiculous. Sorry should I be to deprive Mr. Pattison of one iota of his reputation; but, if ill-judging friends make rash assertions to suit special purposes, it becomes necessary to reduce them within their just dimensions. Mr. Pattison has been a teacher of anatomy and physiology for, I believe, about twenty years, and yet I greatly doubt if Mr. Pattison can lay his finger on a single fact, and claim it as his contribution, during that period, to the stock of anatomical and physiological science. If we inquire whether he is the author of any useful compendium for facilitating the acquisition of anatomy, we shall find an equal blank. The qualifications which four years ago appear to have dazzled the Council, and thrown into shade, as is asserted, the substantial claims of Mr. C. Bell and Mr. Mayo, who by-the-by were never candidates for the anatomical chair, were these:—1. That Mr. Pattison produced a certain number of certificates; and, 2. That fifteen years before he had been a promising young lecturer in Glasgow, and had subsequently taught in the United States with much success. Of the certificates, about half are from America, given by persons unknown to me, and which, therefore, may possess a value which I cannot appreciate. Of those given by individuals known in Great Britain, several of the most valuable were dated years before the London University was thought of, and did not profess to recommend Mr. Pattison to the notice of the Council. But mere certificates of opinion are, in general, a very unsafe guide; and, therefore, the only strong part of Mr. Pattison's claim was the fact of his having been successful as a teacher. All these things, however, go by comparison; for every one knows that persons may be eminent at a distance, and really possess considerable attainment, and yet appear very little when they come to the metropolis. If Mr. Pattison had taught successfully in such places as London, Paris, or Berlin, where anatomical science is at its height, and competitors of eminence numerous, his success in the University might have been calculated on with certainty; but it does not follow that he could succeed in London, because he was successful in America.

3. I shall now endeavour, in the last place, to rescue the memory of my deceased colleague, Mr. Bennett, from the odium which Mr. Pattison's statement has thrown around it. In his last, as well as his preceding statement, Mr. Pattison has attached

great importance to the behaviour of Mr. Bennett at the first distribution of prizes. Mr. Pattison thinks this single circumstance was of great injury to his character, and quotes my information to prove that it was talked of in the country. It is quite true, I did hear it talked of. Professional men throughout England were anxious to learn who Mr. Pattison was; and why a professor from America was selected to teach anatomy in London; and asked numerous questions respecting him. But can it be seriously supposed, that the high anatomical knowledge and great powers as a teacher, which Mr. Pattison assures us he possesses, should, during a seven months' course of lectures, have made so feeble an impression on the students, that Mr. Bennett, his inferior in rank, dissipated all by a single symptom of disapprobation? Had Mr. Pattison made a good impression, the occurrence would have been confusion to Mr. Bennett, and honour to himself; the same generous youth, whom, in gratitude for the knowledge derived from Mr. Bennett, we have seen raising a monument to perpetuate their sense of his merit, would have defended Mr. Pattison, had they felt that he deserved it.

It may be supposed that the conduct of Mr. Bennett proceeded from a systematic attempt to injure Mr. Pattison with his pupils. Of such conduct I believe Mr. Bennett to have been incapable. Mr. Bennett, during his short career at the University, was labouring under constitutional disease, attended with extreme irritability. Of Mr. Pattison's attainments he had a very low estimate, and he considered that Mr. Pattison had treated him with disrespect. The unfortunate exposure referred to by Mr. Pattison, was owing to a combination of these circumstances, and was in direct contrast with his general conduct in regard to Mr. Pattison. The influence which Mr. Bennett acquired over the minds of the students was solely derived from his extensive knowledge, and his admirable skill in conveying it. By these he delighted the students, and gained their affection and admiration. The plain truth of the matter is, the Council chose (as they had a full right to do, and most fortunate was it for the institution that they did so choose) to appoint a separate professor of anatomy and a separate demonstrator; but an unfortunate blunder was committed, and the person whom the students discovered to possess the highest qualifications occupied the lowest station.

I here gladly put an end to this letter, and only regret that the mode in which Mr. Pattison has conducted his defence, should have imposed on me the necessity of saying so much. Had Mr. Pattison been content

to draw up a plausible case for himself without molesting the character of others, I would have remained in silence, though I may have dissented from his conclusions.

I have the honour to be,
My Lords and Gentlemen,
Your most obedient servant,

EDWARD TURNER.

Hastings, Aug. 28th, 1831.

*To the Proprietors of the University of
London.*

My Lords and Gentlemen,—The ex-parte "Statement of Facts" of the connexion of Professor Pattison with the University, contains accusations of Dr. Turner and myself, which, if true, would justly hold us up to the reprobation of the proprietors. My excellent colleague has spoken for himself, and has entered into a review of some points in the pamphlet of Mr. Pattison, by which he has shown the real causes of the discontents that have unfortunately prevailed in the University, and has exposed the highly-coloured and exaggerated manner in which many of the subjects discussed in the Statement are presented to the public. It is not my intention to go over the same ground, but merely to do that which is due to my character and reputation, to refute the charges brought forward against me, as well as to expose the insinuations artfully and most illiberally thrown out to induce you and the public to believe, that my son was influenced by me in the part which he unfortunately took in the transactions alluded to. Both the charges and the insinuations are totally devoid of any foundation in truth.

It is evident, from the letter to the Council, dated December the 9th, 1829, signed by four professors, that neither Dr. Turner nor I could be charged with harbouring any enmity against Mr. Pattison prior to that time, as we there endeavour to uphold his reputation when anonymous complaints were brought against it; but it is soon afterwards asserted, that we have since "become most active" in our endeavours to drive him from the University; and that we have attempted to get over the "inconsistency" of our conduct, by asserting that the students who were examined, when the report was drawn up, have since informed "us" that they had altered their "opinions." Now, we have never asserted that the students told us so; and it is equally incorrect that we have endeavoured to excuse our apparent inconsistency upon that plea. When the charges against Mr. Pattison were secretly communicated to the Council, we came forward to express our disapprobation of charges preferred in that manner; and we were willing to support our colleague, when we were satisfied that

the complaints were, in a great degree, exaggerated, and, in some respects, untrue. But, even at that time, I was aware that there existed some ground of discontent in the anatomical class; and I took the liberty of a friend, soon afterwards, to speak to Mr. Pattison on the subject, and to urge him to adopt a different line of conduct. If this advice was neglected, if the information which these students acquired from their demonstrator, enabled them afterwards to perceive the deficiencies of their professor, and such was the case, the charge of inconsistency cannot be justly urged either against them or me. Mr. Pattison, although he promised much, did not endeavour to make himself more popular with his pupils, by a greater degree of attention to their instruction, and by bringing up his own stock of knowledge, so as to place him on a par with other anatomists: on the contrary, the causes of discontent became more and more obvious, not only in the class-room, but in the Dispensary, as the minutes of its managing committee testify (see Appendix); and, as such was the case, is it extraordinary or inconsistent that I should change my opinion respecting the conduct and the attainments of the anatomical Professor? The department of anatomy in which the students complained they were not instructed by the Professor, is that termed *general anatomy*; and that their complaints were not wholly groundless, was tacitly acknowledged by Mr. Pattison, in giving up that part of the subject to Mr. Bennett, when he voluntarily relinquished one half of his professorship to that gentleman.

Notwithstanding my conviction of these facts, I remained a passive spectator of the disturbances which now began to display themselves in the anatomical class: indeed, if I spoke of them at all, it was to lament their existence, and to regret the course which the pupils pursued. Mr. Pattison has no ground for assuming that, in a sentence quoted from what he is pleased to term the confession of Dr. Alexander Thomson, the professors alluded to are "Drs. Thomson and Turner." I never spoke to any of the medallists on the subject, and therefore could not blame their supineness, nor urge them to "make complaints personally to the members of the Council, to cultivate the dissatisfaction of the pupils." (See note in Statement, p. 41.) On the contrary, Mr. Pattison well knows that whatever part my son may have taken in the discontents and disturbances of the students, his conduct on that occasion was far from being approved of by me. It is painful for me to be obliged to state, that the expression of my disapprobation was the cause of a coolness which existed between my son