

objects too multifarious to be accomplished in any satisfactory manner by the labours of an individual, they were therefore wholly abandoned.

It may probably be useless in me to mention, that the well-known Dr. Aikin published, in the year 1780, "Biographical Memoirs of Medicine in Great Britain, from the Revival of Literature to the Time of Harvey;" a work deservedly well received. In the year 1799, a work was published by Mr. Hutchinson, entitled "Biographia Medica, or Historical and Critical Memoirs of the Lives and Writings of the most eminent Medical Characters, that have existed from the earliest Account of Time to the present Period, with a Catalogue of their Literary Productions; in two volumes, octavo." This work has been the vehicle of much and extended information to me, in pursuits of a somewhat similar nature, and in a voluminous inquiry into Medical Biography, in which I am at this moment engaged; my obligations to the author of the last mentioned work will be acknowledged with a proper sense of gratitude and respect. In the mean time, should Dr. Henderson require any further information respecting Dr. Milward, the memoirs in my possession will be very much at his service.

I am, Gentlemen,

Your obedient servant,

EDWARD STORER, M.D.

December, 8th, 1811.

To the Editors of the *Medical and Physical Journal*.

GENTLEMEN,

YOUR insertion of a paper signed Medicus, in your Number for December, induces me to appear again before your readers. I confess I feel much satisfaction at the candid manner in which Medicus states his objection, not particularly to my theory, but to the long exploded doctrine of equivocal generation. I shall, therefore, beg leave to call his attention to the explanation of the antiquated experiments which he has adduced, and particularly recommend an attentive perusal of Buffon's Natural History; where he will find ample proof that the bodies which he saw and describes as *worms*, have no more relation to the particular worms of the human body than to any other class of animals.

I believe Leuwenhoek was among the first who discovered these living bodies, or organic particles, in the male semen, from which he endeavored to prove that they were the

the embryos of so many men and women,—a doctrine not more absurd than to allow these particles the power of becoming human worms. The experiments of the Count de Buffon, Mr. Needham, and many others, sufficiently prove that these living organic particles are universally to be found in decoctions or solutions of all animal and vegetable substances, and that they are the consequence of the dissolution of all animated nature.

As to Medicus's second experiment, on which he seems to rest his complete conviction of equivocal generation, it has been made long since, not only with boiled and purified vinegar, but also with jellies, boiled and prepared in many different ways, with a view to destroy these apparently-living bodies, but in vain, as they again appeared with this difference only, that they seemed more minute. To prevent prolixity, I shall not occupy your valuable pages with long quotations, but refer Medicus, as well as any others who wish to be acquainted with the subject, to the 2d vol. of Buffon's *Natural History*, translated into English by Smellie; where he will find his experiments, with many others, related by that celebrated author. In these experiments, however, he will no where find any proof of these organic particles assuming the form of *worms*, which is the principal mistake into which Medicus has fallen; as he quietly concludes from his experiment, "that worms may be produced in any part of the body by diseased matter being thrown out, and entering into the putrifactive fermentation." The meaning of which I take to be that the dissolution or putrification of any of the animal solids or fluids, is attended by the production of these organic particles; but why allow these particles the power of becoming particular worms; for we generally find human, as well as other, worms, preserve a specific form. Before we can subscribe to such doctrine, it must be proved by experiment, that living organic particles have the power of assuming this peculiar form, without any sexual intercourse of parents. Even the energetic mind of Buffon himself, who fancied he saw all nature spring from these organic bodies, does not mention any experiment in proof of their transition into any particular species; although loosely and without his usual candour, he supposes their union in an irregular and promiscuous manner to be the general cause of human worms. This being a mere supposition, without any experimental proof, it is unnecessary for me to attempt its refutation.

As it does not appear that there is any proof or analogy of any animal, or species of animals, however minute, being produced without parents; I see no reason for abating the

ovate doctrine, by which is meant not merely the egg, but the embryo or foetus, in whatever form the parents produce it.

By inserting the above you will much oblige your friend and correspondent,
 Ipswich, December 5, 1811.

W. HAMILTON,
 Surgeon.

To the Editors of the Medical and Physical Journal.

GENTLEMEN,

THE late decision of the cause, *Fuller versus the Executors of the Duke of Queensbury, deceased*, and the observation of the judge thereupon, that apothecaries have no legal claim to compensation for their trouble in attending patients, other than as they are paid for their medicines; have given rise to the following queries, which fall within the scope of your correspondent Observator's remarks, p. 386.

- 1st. Have apothecaries residing in the country a legal right to make a charge for *visits* or *journeys*, separate from their charge for medicines?
- 2dly. Have apothecaries residing in London a legal right to make a charge of *coach-hire*, for the purpose of visiting their patients?
- 3dly. If so, have they not an equal right to charge coach-hire, when they visit their patients in their own carriages?

Very few apothecaries are aware of the situation in which they *legally* stand with regard to practising medicine; it would therefore be of general utility to this branch of practitioners to understand:

- 1st. Whether apothecaries in general have any legal right to practise medicine; that is to say, to visit patients in diseases, and to prescribe for their complaints.
- 2dly. Whether the charter of the Society of the Apothecaries authorises the members of that society to visit patients and to prescribe for them.
- 3dly. Whether members of the College of Surgeons have a legal right to practise as apothecaries, or to visit in, and to prescribe for, any other diseases than those which are strictly surgical.
- 4thly. Whether members of the College of Surgeons, acting as apothecaries, could substantiate a claim in a court of justice for attendance on patients, where the complaint was not strictly surgical.
- 5thly. Whether the Royal College of Physicians possess the power of suspending from practice, except for mal-practice, any surgeon, or surgeon-apothecary, whether a member of the *Society of Apothecaries* or not.