

He said he would rather run the risks of the law than leave the King unaided, and so he drew some blood. The king recovered and the other physician concurred in what King had done.

Edward Browne went to Paris, Venice, Montpellier, Rome, and Padua. He was the means of bringing to England much stimulus in the study of medicine. He was a close friend of Sydenham. He was elected physician, to St. Bartholomew's in 1682, and became president from 1704 to 1708. He died in 1708. He may be taken as the type of the best education that fell to the lot of physicians of his day. He knew the older writers on medicine thoroughly. He could write and speak Latin, and was familiar with French and Italian. He was a close student of zoology, chemistry, botany, and pharmacology, in addition to the routine study of medicine.

But while much attention was being directed to anatomy, botany, pharmacology, and zoology, the practical study of medicine was not without its advocates. Of these Thomas Sydenham must come in for a full measure of praise. He regarded Hippocrates as "the divine old man." He took the strongest and most advanced position on the subject of practical observation and study of cases. He was a thorough going clinician and held that one who wished to treat the sick must do more than read books. His description of measles is for all time a classic.

Dr. John Caius was the first to write an account of a disease in England from his own observation. This was on the sweating disease, and is the first attempt by any one in Britain to write an account of a disease from nature. His description is lacking in coherence, and is overladen with speculation; but, nevertheless, it is a fine effort after the practical.

William Harvey made also a number of notes regarding cases which go to show that the clinical study of medicine was taking possession of him.

The first physician in England that stands out as a noted example of the true clinician was Sir Theodore Turquet de Mayerne. Mayerne's great work has already been mentioned. But his reputation as a true clinician rests upon his account of the deaths of Prince Henry and King James I. In the case of the latter, his report of the case is of the most exhaustive character; and reveals a keenness of insight, and a wealth of description that still have a unique charm. It also shows what a clear conception of disease, the functions of the organs of the body, and morbid anatomy he possessed. In his account of the illness of Prince Henry we have a very good one of typhoid fever.

In Francis Glisson we meet with another example of the clinical mind at work. In 1650 he published his account of Rachitis. In this