

we have gained immensely in the knowledge attained by post-mortem examinations and the so-called investigations of the products of the morbid changes produced in the various organs of the body by disease. This system was not confined to France, but its ideas were extended all over Germany and its influence felt in all foreign countries, especially Russia and Italy. Its influence was also felt in England, but less strongly than in what was called the Dublin School. In England it at first manifested itself as a continuation of the labours of the great English masters of the eighteenth century—a John Hunter and a Matthew Baillie. Even at a later period when this system had won considerable influence, and had, through the teaching of Rokatanski, one of the famous founders of the New Vienna School, gained a firm foothold in Germany, the English physicians preserved their independence, and never forgot that they had their own great masters. The Dublin School, on the other hand, coming more in contact with the French, adopted their system, and, notwithstanding the fame and excellence of the work done by the founders of this school, they were influenced for many years by the Pathologico Anatomical School of France. The amount of work done in Germany by Rokatanski in disseminating this system can be judged by the number of post-mortem examinations made annually by him, viz., from 1,500 to 1,800. The amount of morbid material thus furnished was so great that the general practitioner was unable to take advantage of it, and consequently specialties were established. This was the commencement of the age of specialties in Germany, and they far exceeded those of France, although the system was first adopted in the latter country.

In England, the rage for specialties never received the same firm hold that they did in Germany. Yet, while gross pathology seemed to hold the boards in Germany and France, and had its influence in England and Scotland, and especially in Ireland, the discoveries in connection with the nervous system by Charles Bell and Marshall Hall, directed the attention of the profession in the latter countries to a study of physiology and microscopy. In microscopic anatomy, as well as a portion of physiology, they accomplished more than the French, and can point to some important names, for example, Sir Everard Home, on the cells of the lungs; F. Keirnan, the anatomy and physiology of the liver; Sir David Brewster, on the microscope, stereoscope, kaleidoscope; R. B. Todd and W. Bowman, physiological anatomy and physiology of man; Richard Quain and William Sharpey, Goodser, Thomas Wharton Jones, and a number of others, whose works are familiar to those here present who were students in the early part of the century, and, in fact, to those of the present day.

Well do I remember the lectures delivered by my esteemed preceptor in the institutes of medicine, the late Dr Bovell, when he set forth the views and offered criticisms on the work done by Virchow, Lionel Smith Beale, Arthur Hill Hassell, Koleker, Rokatanski, and others with that eloquence and earnestness of which he was master. In fact, he was far in advance of the times in physiology and pathology in this Dominion. The impress made upon the minds of some of his students directed their future course in life. I may here mention one notable example, my friend, Dr. William Osler, now of John Hopkins University, Baltimore, who was a student of his and got his first ideas of the importance of a careful study of physiology, pathology and microscopy, from his teaching. Dr. Bovell was the first man in this province, so far as I know, who made use of the microscope in teaching physiology and pathology. Long before this time, even in the early part of the century, there were a number of men engaged in special work who were not particularly wedded to any school or