

"The Head and His Parts," in a book of medicine of the sixteenth century. Galen sayeth: "The head is divided into four parts; in the fore part hath blood the dominion, choler the right side, melancholy in the left side, and flegma beareth rule in the hindermost part." In anatomy and physiology such ideas as these prevailed: The spleen was the centre of wit; the size of the brain increased and decreased with the moon; the function of the liver is the seat of love; the lungs were employed to fan the heart, which, in turn, was the centre of animal heat. Based on such physiology, you will readily understand the scientific necessity for this prescription: "Take the right eye of a frogg, lap it in a piece of russet cloth, hang it about the neck, it cureth the right eye if it be inflamed or bleared; and if the left eye be grieved do the like by the left eye of the said frogg." *Similia similibus curantur*. History repeats itself: We have heard of the homœopathic surgeons in the progressive republic to the south of us. Here we have homœopathic ophthalmology in the fifteenth century.

I have thus dwelt somewhat at length on this period in the history of medicine, on account of the effect which chemical views and knowledge had on the diagnosis and treatment of disease. The solution of the problem sought by these old physicians was, of course, impossible. On the other hand, the attempt to see in every occurrence in the body a process of fermentation and decomposition capable of explanation by means of chemical reactions had this beneficial effect: the doctors became accustomed to the thought that they might expect little from tradition and speculation, and everything from the examination of facts. Medicine owes much to the perception of this circumstance. Its effect lasted long after the absurd hypothesis which gave rise to it had passed away. Afterwards a new school of physicians arose, who regarded disease as the result of mechanical disturbances, such as stagnation of the blood, and, as they expressed it, of stagnation of the contents of the nerves. A violent controversy raged between this new dynamic school and the followers of Glauber and Libalius. The result was a partial defeat of the chemical doctrine of disease; but the inconsistencies and one-sidedness of both of these systems of pathology ultimately led to a blending of the two. Medical chemistry came thus to occupy a