

the following terms:—"Shall the general practitioner be contented to receive *his hire* as heretofore, in the shape of an undue, an uncertain, and an unequal profit on the comparatively worthless substances which are compounded together in his prescriptions, thus submitting, *at the least*, to the imputation of being a very *dear trader*, instead of pursuing the more open, candid, and manly course of telling his patients that the real value of his services arises from the stores of professional knowledge and experience which are treasured in his mind; from his power of discriminating disease and deciding upon the appropriate remedies for its relief; that their true character is not *pharmaceutical* but *intellectual*; and that whatever reward may be bestowed upon him for such services must hereafter be given and received, without *equivocation* or *disguise*, on account of its proper equivalence?" When the profession shall have given, as I trust they soon will do, a unanimous and emphatic *negative* to this important question, it will then be proper to inquire how far the course pursued by our association is the right one for rescuing them from the present uncandid and humiliating system. I cannot but hope that professional gentlemen in various parts of the country will take early opportunities of making known their feelings and opinions on the subject. It is probable that a general determination to act upon this better principle would make no material difference in the amount of professional emolument. In some cases, perhaps, it might be more, in others less, in many very nearly what it now is; but in every case it would be a strict proportion to the extent of services actually rendered. I remain, Sir,

Your very obedient servant,
T. M. GREENHOW.

Newcastle, March 16, 1831.

DR. MORRISON'S "MEDICINE NO MYSTERY."

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—IN THE LANCET of the 15th of January there appears a critique on a work of mine, "Medicine no Mystery, &c." which is chiefly characterized by the personal abuse there bestowed on me. I shall offer no comment on the critique in *this* respect; you, no doubt, have consulted the taste of your readers in inserting it. But, Sir, I have to accuse the writer of the above article of an offence of a much graver character, viz. that of having *falsified* my text in the quotations he professes to give from my work, either by supplying a word not to

be found therein, and which alters the signification of the passage, or by omitting a subsequent sentence, which modifies materially that of the doctrine I have laid down; thus in quoting my observation respecting the *terminations of inflammation*, the word *only* is added, which does not occur in the text; and in the subsequent quotation, where I have stated, "that the purulent matter is always contained in a bag," the sentence immediately following is omitted, which runs thus, "*which is formed by a natural process, when the structure of the part does not oppose an insurmountable obstacle to that operation.*"

I am most unjustly accused, Sir, in the above critique, of having designed to attack that respectable class of professional men, the *general practitioners*; nothing could have been further from my intention; the whole tenor of my treatise leads to an inference *directly the reverse*. I have declared myself an enemy "to all self-created and invidious distinctions." My remarks only apply to those who, without *any* previous study or knowledge of the medical profession, presume to practise it,—to the apothecary who, instructed only in the mechanical composition of drugs, abandons his trade to intrude on the profession of his superiors, and to the quack who, educated neither in profession nor trade, criminally exercises *both* to the destruction of his victims. One might have supposed, that with such objects in view, I could have reckoned on the support of every well-wisher of science and of mankind.

The writer of the critique observes, "That no one after perusing Dr. Morrison's treatise, would have his knowledge of the medical art increased." I have, however, anticipated this remark, by stating in my introduction, "that it was rather my design to inspire a taste for the study of medical science, than to convey much actual information in so short a work."

Now, Sir, you will do me but justice in inserting this letter in an early number of your paper. To fair criticism, my little work is of course open, but I deny that any critic possesses the right to falsify my text, or to put sentiments into my mouth which I disclaim.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

JOHN MORRISON, M.D. and A.B.
Trinity College, Dublin.

10, Upper Gloucester Street, Dublin,
February 18, 1831.

[After all, the "false quotations" amount, it seems, to the accidental addition of the word "only."—ED. L.]