great meeting within her walls. All Western Europe, the whole civilised world in fact, is bound to honour Italy as the motherland of the Renaissance of the sciences, chief among which medicine owed to her for centuries instruction and resources enlarged by discovery. Torn as she has often been by civil strife and distracted by foreign aggression she has never wanted men vigorous in mind and buoyant with hope to keep always alight the grand beacons of science. And so we come to the modern era which has witnessed Italian unity, the rise of Italy to great power, and, with this, the multiplication of scientific institutions and the reaccession of Italians to the mighty League of Universal Medicine. It was to this grand result of Time that the last Congress did homage in choosing the Eternal City for the seat of its successor. This concourse "proves," continued Dr. VIRCHOW, "that the ancient yearning which drew the Northman to the smiling regions of the South is not extinguished; only, and Italians should know it, they come as friends, as brothers." "Physicians," he said, "are the born vindicators of humanitarian thoughts, habituated as they are to subordinate their own convenience to their neighbour's appeal, and to promote the cause of humanity by unselfish coöperation. They, more than the cultivators of other fields of knowledge, are destined to be the harbingers of peace and of charity. Every new International Congress reinforces the sentiment of solidarity in all the members of the corporation of the healing art, and stimulates the zeal in the search for a profounder harmony of the means which are destined to remove the obstacles impeding the welfare of the social organism. May the present Congress contribute to strengthen knowledge of truth, to enhance the intensity of the moral aspirations, to tighten the bond of fraternity between the colleagues of all countries; may it add another route to the many lines subserving the pacific intercourse of the nations."

The keynote struck by these consummate orators was played up to effectively by the speakers who followed, those of them who used Italian as their medium (and not a few of them did so with skill and effect) naturally eliciting the most marked signs of appreciation. From the inauguration theatre to the nineteen Sections the oratory of the presidents of the latter betrayed no decline either in originality of conception or in felicity of language. In truth, the Eleventh International Congress, if disappointing in some of its details—due, doubtless to the unprecedented proportions it has assumed—will be remembered as having outshone its predecessors in "medical oratory," a pre-eminence it could hardly have helped achieving under the inspiration of its presiding head, Dr. BACCELLI, who, at the second Congress of the series—that held in Florence a quarter of a century ago—drew from its French president the praise of having been the Demosthenes and the Cicero of its discussions.

THE history of medicine has from time to time to be re-written, not only in consideration of new facts disclosed by literary research, but also by reason of the fresher, larger, juster view that a more exalted standpoint enables the modern historian to take. This reflection is irresistibly borne in upon the reader on perusing such occasional surveys of the medical past, recent or remote, as MOLESCHOTT gives in his memoir of DONDERS, or VIRCHOW in his rehabilitation of GLISSON. It is not that new details have been brought to light in these masterly monographs: it is that familiar history has been re-read by a keener, more experienced, better trained eye; and the result is a juster, more scientific appreciation of the subject.

What VIRCHOW did for GLISSON he has once more done for an even greater personage, GIOVANNI BATTISTA MORGAGNI. The theme was well chosen in itself, and equally so was the occasion of treating it. A meeting of the International Medical Congress in Rome was a fitting opportunity of reminding the world of what Italy had contributed to medicine, and of all men to whom the task could have been committed, a German of the standing and scientific record of RUDOLF VIRCHOW was the appropriate one. The outcome of this happy coincidence is a chapter in the annals of medical, chiefly pathological, progress which will remain memorable when much of the proceedings of the Congress is forgotten—an essay not more admirable for its knowledge, its noble impartiality, and its luminous characterisation, than for its masterly brevity of style and the haunting felicity of its phrases. In reproducing it in full in our columns we are aware that the processes of translation have a ruthless effect on the bloom of verbal expression

Medicine reveals to VIRCHOW, in spite of its twenty-five centuries, an unbroken, a manifestly continuous, development. Greek in its origin as a branch of nature study, it remains Greek to this day, as is apparent in its nomenclature, even in the barbarisms of the youthful moderns—barbarisms which labour to conserve at least the gloss of Hellenic origin. The retrospect taken by VIRCHOW is in this way far more reassuring than that of the traditional historian with his "revolutions of medicine," which he is apt to represent as gyrating in a vicious circle. Accretion, development, modification—all are features in the record of the art, bringing it, like every other human interest, within the supreme law of Evolution. The influence of the Eastern intellect on the Greek medicine is an especially instructive passage of VIRCHOW'S exposition. That spiritualistic element—that πνεῦμα,—in which he finds the first dim anticipation of magnetism and hypnotism, was an Oriental contribution of which not a trace is to be found in the purely objective mind of that Greek of Greeks — HIPPOCRATES. Passed through the Arabian alembic, the Greek medicine took a fresh departure, principally at Salerno, where GALEN lived again rehabilitated in Latin translations from the Arabic, but suffered from the contra-scientific influences of the Church. Here, again, VIRCHOW corrects a popular fallacy in the very restricted value he attributes to the mediæval hospitals under ecclesiastical control. These were, as their name implies, little more than "guest houses" where medical relief was but occasionally given, and that of a dubiously professional kind. Those among such institutions which really figure in the history of medicine owe that honourable pre-eminence to their having largely fallen into secular hands. Losing their sacerdotal character, they thus became auxiliaries rather than opponents in that struggle so decisive for the fortunes of medicine—the struggle for the enrolment of the healing art in the study of natural history—the

struggle "whose prize, or more precisely whose prizes, fell to anatomy."

The archæology of this most interesting question, When did human anatomy begin? gives VIRCHOW another opportunity of showing his twofold accomplishment in the scientific and the literary sphere. In the few strokes of a master he states the view of the Church which based itself on the infallibility of GALEN, whose authority no findings of the anatomist could possibly upset. But light at last broke in even upon the sacerdotal mind, and VIRCHOW indicates how, thanks to the Papal physicians, aided by their Apostolic masters, MONDINI of Bologna obtained permission to dissect a dead body and exhibit its parts for the instruction of his students. The flickering flame thus kindled at the mother of universities was caught up by a genius who, in his complex progeniture, summed up the characteristics of five nationalities, VESALIUS, whose culture, however, was mainly Italian. But the freshly fanned light of anatomy, even under the fostering care of a VESALIUS, was not enough to achieve the emancipation of medicine. A direct front attack on the central point of the dogmatic line of battle had to be delivered, and this was done by the great, if not always sound, intellect of PARACELSUS, before whom the humoral pathology began to waver. Still that grand position of medical orthodoxy, though shaken, held its ground, even after such discoveries as HARVEY'S, ACQUAPENDENTE'S, and MALPIGHI'S, which, by emphasising the importance of the ubiquitous blood-streams, made it difficult to dissociate disease from fluidity and its manifestations. BOERHAAVE'S epoch-making studies were of little more avail than to insist on the importance of local processes, and even these were still set down to local disturbances. In VIRCHOW'S words, the circulation still kept the foreground in pathological consideration and the Paracelsian idea of the "vita propria" of the organs was pushed aside as a spiritualistic vagary.

At this point MORGAGNI intervened, and at Bologna, where he prosecuted his studies, found himself in an anatomical atmosphere. MALPIGHI, ARANZI, VAROLI—all anatomical heroes—were the inspiring names, and VALSALVA came later to favour their influence on the young pioneer of pathology. Justifiable patriotic pride, which not even an international congress can extinguish, leads VIRCHOW to a most interesting, most instructive demonstration that the first to react under the forces which were rapidly moulding the ideas of MORGAGNI were the Germans who frequented the same school—a fact which explains the celerity with which the new method and the new doctrine associated with his name were adopted in Europe. And what, briefly stated, were these? The localisation of disease and its study at the various seats it peculiarly affects. "De Sedibus et Causis Morborum" was the appropriate title of the book which embodied the grand message to the practitioner. Unlike the frequently uncritical and untrustworthy "sepulchreta" and "collectiones" of an earlier age, MORGAGNI'S observations were not only checked by experience and minutely revised, but they were so classified as to certify themselves anatomically, to fall into line with clinical research, and so to lay down and to establish sound indications for diagnosis and prognosis.

"De *Sedibus* Morborum," reiterates VIRCHOW, insisting on the inestimable value of MORGAGNI'S contribution to medicine. *Where* is the disease? There is no ailing body which would betray alteration in every one of its parts. "That," says VIRCHOW, "is the sense of the words 'Sedes Morbi,' which MORGAGNI has placed on the pinnacle of his experience as the quintessence of the same." Of course, pathological anatomy does not pretend to localise every disease or refer it to a particular seat. In the vast field of neuropathology, even in that of toxicology, there are cases in which anatomical research is not enough. Not, indeed, contends VIRCHOW, because there is no "sedes morbi," but because the disease has induced no visible alteration in the affected parts; and anatomy has only to do with the visible—a domain in which physiology and chemistry can intervene and, even of the invisible, can say: this is the seat of the disease. So true is this that no physician can ordinarily think of a morbid process if he is not in a position to refer it to a place in the body. "Ubi est morbus?" is always the question with which the examination of the living patient, as also that of his dead body, must begin, and "if," adds VIRCHOW, "this examination has yielded no practical indication, yet the examination itself is not at an end; rather does the new task begin out of the *ensemble* of 'previous history,' especially of etiology, to ascertain on the path of reflection where the seat of the malady must have established itself. The field of inquiry becomes co-extensive with the whole orbit of clinical medicine, but its pole star is still the leading question proposed by Morgagni—'Ubi est morbus?'"

It is difficult to assume the part of critic over a deliverance so thoroughly thought out, so conspicuously the result of observation checked by experience, as this monograph by VIRCHOW. Taking our stand on "the high *priori* road" we might indeed formulate objections or suggest doubts; but for the present at least we have no intention of doing more than recommending to our readers the perusal of a thesis which even in the country of MORGAGNI himself and at the hands of his most exacting worshippers has excited nothing but admiration and support.

THE science of prognosis has become a fine art, and it worthily formed the burden of the inaugural address which was delivered by the President, Dr. JAMES E. POLLOCK, at the first meeting of the Life Assurance Medical Officers' Association, and which is published at page 846 of our present issue. Many other topics were touched upon and some discussed, but again and again the refrain of prognosis became the motive of the theme. It must be remembered that in connexion with life assurance three distinct classes of medical men are employed — the medical attendant, who speaks of the past history, the medical examiner, who reports upon the present condition, and the medical officer, who advises about the future. The first two are usually asked for prognostic indications; but the actual responsibility for the acceptance and the rating rests entirely with the executive staff and with the chief medical officer, who have to bring the various