ere would ask his pupils. He would succeed in that way to make the student believe he had not been led to make the diagnosis, but had really found it out by himself.

Under the direction of such an able clinician, the clinic of Leyden, gained such reputation that phycisians were coming from every part of Europe to attend it, and for a long time it was considered as the best institution of this type.

It was in 1644 that this form of teaching was introduced in France by Renaudoct, and it became a regular part of the medical studies; but it is only at the end of the 18th century that we see permanent clinical services established in the hospitals of Paris, London and Strasbourg.

The first clinic in Germany was in Vienna in 1753, and in Leipzig only in 1798.

Since those remote times clinics have always become more and more numerous, and we have some now a days in every city where there is a university. In fact there is no Medical School without its clinic.

However the clinical teaching is not understood every where in the same manner.

In Germany, for instance, and in all countries which follow its methods, the disease more than the patient is the object of study. The clinic is only one of the means by which pathology may be established on a rational basis. The German clinicians study minutsly the symptoms, analyse, by means of the most improved apparatus, the slightest organic and fonctional alterations; using for that purpose: laboratories of chemistry, bacteriology, radiography and so forth, in order to obtain a thoroughly accurate diagnosis, but they pay very little attention to the study of etiology and prognosis and neglect somehow the treatment; in a few words they do not catch the peculiar caracteristics which imprint upon the disease a particular aspect as we see it in every day practice.

In other contries and in France particularly the way they proceed is intirely different. With them the clinician never loses sight of the patient though the disease is carefully examined by all the means that modern science has put to his disposal, he does not only study the disease of its present state, but more especially its morbid evolution in its continuity; trying to explain what he finds, to establish between the succession of the morbid phenomenas the pathogenic link that binds them together, so as to show their intimate relation of cause and effect.

He does note lose sight, even for a moment, of the fact that if the clinic, by the information it has obtained, constitutes pathology and suc-