definite by Roger II, King of Sicily, in 1137, who forbade the practice of medicine within his dominions to any who had not taken the full course at Salerno, and thereafter practised an additional year with a physician. This monarch may thus be credited with the imposition of the *first State examination in medicine*, and simultaneously with the formation of a class of licensed lay-physicians, who soon spread throughout Europe the fame of the Salernian school. How far medicine had advanced in this corner of the world may be judged from the fact that surgeons were licensed only after they had devoted a year of study specially to surgery and anatomy. Now in the rest of Europe surgery was held in very slight esteem for centuries afterwards, and was practised only by barbers. Indeed it is not so long ago, only in 1745, that the Company of Surgeons in England obtained a charter of incorporation independent of that of the Company of Barbers with which they had formerly been united. As for anatomy, if we compare the provisions for its teaching with what existed centuries later in England, we shall see how far in advance of its time Salerno really was. We read, for instance, of the conditions which the Lecturer in Anatomy in Oxford had to observe in 1620. He was obliged to give three distinct lectures on a skeleton in the Michaelmas term, and to give an account of the bones, and their office, situations, etc., also four distinct lectures or demonstrations on the soft parts of the body of a malefactor during the Easter term.

For many years Salerno remained the chief European medical school, but Bologna, in the North of Italy, soon added a medical faculty to the existing ones of arts and law, an example followed by Paris at a later date; France having been previously supplied with its physicians from the University of Montpellier, long famous for its medical teachings. Another offshoot of the Salernian school was the University of Naples, established in 1224 by Frederick II, Emperor of the Romans, who appears to have attributed great importance to its medical side; while adopting the Salernian curriculum in medicine, he also framed careful laws regulating its practice. For example, the poor were to be treated gratis, and no partnership with the apothecaries of the day was permitted. But Frederick also accorded to the members of the university valuable privileges, such as were at a later date enjoyed by the University of Paris under Charles VI; among these were immunity from all sorts of taxes, customs dues, etc., the exercise of the profession of teaching being accepted as a full discharge of their obligations to the State. He, likewise, adopted certain plans for the protection of his university, such as imposing penalties on students going past its doors, and, above all, forbidding the inauguration of competing institutions within the realm. The constitution of the University of Naples, however, did not affect so much the character of the later institutions as did Paris and Bologna. The latter soon became a formidable rival of Salerno as a medical school, following the example of Salerno in admitting women as well as men to the privileges of the university, and outstripping our modern co-education movement so far that we read of women-doctors learned in the law and in medicine lecturing within the halls of the university, and even of a female professor of anatomy.

In spite of such advantages, the revival of systematic medical education in Europe, which had largely contributed to build up the universities, did not lead to such rapid progress as might have been expected, for the system of scholastic disputations extended to the medical as well as to the other faculties. In these disputations the candidate for a degree publicly defended a series of propositions, and was opposed in argument by certain of his fellows. The truth of the proposition was not held of so much importance as the form of the argument, and if the disputant succeeded in resting his argument securely on some dictum of Aristotle, Hippocrates, or Galen, he was considered to have established his position, however much at variance with facts an appeal to nature might have demonstrated his proposition to be. It is not surprising that such a spirit should have interfered with scientific progress, and yet it is wonderful that the reign of authority in medicine should have lasted as long as it did. Its persistence in England may best be illustrated by recalling that a certain Dr. Geynes was