

facts for this résumé, certainly seems reasonable when he says that gonorrhœa could scarcely have been well known and recognized among the Romans, since Horace, Juvenal and Persius make no mention of it; for on similarly delicate subjects they fearlessly pronounce. Martial, again, scarcely through modesty, has not even hinted at it.

One eager seeker declares to have found in poor old Cicero evidence of his acquaintance with the disease; school boy memories of Cato Major de Senectute fail to recall a single line that would render it likely that Cicero would have been so mundane.

Legions of writers, since the year 950, could be named, who have dealt with gonorrhœa so called; but so great uncertainty existed as to whether or not it was the true condition (and some of these plainly have confused the condition with spermatorrhœa) that the evidence must in great part be rejected. Doubtless, however, gonorrhœa did exist at this time, and with the ravages of syphilis in the fifteenth century it either lessened in its extent or was overshadowed by the importance of the other. But about 1500, when syphilis had somewhat spent its severity, gonorrhœa again comes into prominence. In 1504, Cataneus gave the first really accurate description of the disease and its contagious nature; he was followed by many other writers during the next forty years, after which again history is for a time silent.

Paracelsus classed gonorrhœa as a variety of syphilis, an error which passed unchallenged until the protest of Cockburn in 1728—and which lived until the present century. Previous to the period of confusion, as far back as 1740, Astruc pointed out the non-identity of the two conditions, and his contention was upheld in the latter half of the century by Balfour and Benjamin Bell. From 1770 onwards the Edinburgh school taught with no uncertain voice that gonorrhœa was a disease '*sui generis*.' This teaching began to become general in London only about 1805, but, notwithstanding, it is interesting to note that as late as 1829 mercury was given for gonorrhœa in some of the London hospitals. Finally, Ricord in a publication, the date of which I have not been able to ascertain, clearly demonstrated the distinction between gonorrhœa and syphilis. For many years, gonorrhœa and hard and soft chancres, had been jumbled together, and errors were copied from book to book; but in 1852, Bassereau proved conclusively the distinction between the hard and soft chancre, and from that time, though there existed some doubt as to the syphilitic or non-syphilitic nature of the chancroid, there has been no confusion between gonorrhœa and syphilis.

No distinct mile post stands out on the road until 1870, when Neisser of Breslau announced that he had found an organism existing in gonorrhœal pus; and that it was identical with the organism of ophthalmia neonatorum. Immediately a host of observers followed