

one of the acutest of observers, the author of that well-known work on the "Diseases of the Heart," in a new volume which he sent me only this month, called "Symptoms and Their Interpretation," refers thus to the question:

"Medicine has not attained that place in science which ought of right to belong to her. Instead of leading the scientific development and giving guides and indications to the allied branches, she is too often content to languidly follow in their wake or to pursue some erratic course of her own. The observations made in her name are frequently made more to support some vague speculation or far-fetched theory than to realize the actual condition of the observed phenomena. The sister sciences, in place of seeking for assistance from medicine, look askance at the wild speculations put forth in the name of medical science and at the loose thinking and play of the imagination which many medical writers deem legitimate in dealing with the phenomena of disease. To emancipate medicine from this position of inferiority and to secure for it that status which it ought to possess, an effort must be made as far as possible to free it from the habiliments that have hampered it in the past, and if this appears an unattainable goal at present its writers may at least aim at greater precision in thought and in observation. Although this doctrine may seem the commonest platitude, and teachers and writers of text-books are unwearied in inculcating it, nevertheless precision in thinking and in observation are among the rarest qualities. The power of acute observation and precise thinking is so seldom acquired, because methods have become stereotyped, that many observers do not realize that they are fettered in the bonds of tradition. Even in the writings of those who claim to be exponents of exact observation and logical reasoning, loose thinking too often appears, even when the scientist imagines himself supreme. What are called observations are but a mixture of imperfect observation and unwarranted deduction."

We must, I think, admit that these somewhat scarifying observations are only in the main too true, and if I can by this exercise train myself and help any of my hearers to more accurate study and clinical observation I shall feel myself amply rewarded.

Dr. Hurry in the papers referred to classified his vicious circles by their etiology into Organic, Symptomatic, Infective, Chemical, Mechanical, Neurotic and Artificial. He also classified them by the names of organs involved (only partially, as he would himself admit), into those of the Circulation, including