harmonious work. His details are not all equally balanced some are exquisite, some are medicere, others are bad. The whole work, the whole operation, will not be the best possible for the saving of life; it is not all round a finished work of art. Therefore it is to be condemned.

The surgeon's art has in it not only the elements of boldness, honesty, and simplicity pertaining to the sculptor's art; it leads him in some of its departments into methods of working which may fairly compare with the most delicate amongst artistic pursuits. The finest work of the surgeon makes demands on the delicacy of the fingers little, if anything, less exacting than the demands made on the fingers of the etcher or the line engraver. The surgeon, as a painter, has to make pictures not only in life size, but in miniature; as a sculptor he has to do not only the full figure and the medalion; his work may also be compared to that of the graver of gems.

The operative art of surgery is truly a high art; the demands it makes on the hand, the eye, and the brain of the artist are the same for surgery and the fine arts. Surgery and fine art may indeed well be practised by the same man. We see it in our own time. The art in etching of Sir Seymour Hayden, and the art in surgery of Sir Henry Thompson, each supreme in its way, have two sides only on the surface; they are identical at bottom. And we have seen this in past times, sometimes to the loss of surgery, sometimes to its gain. The world lost a great surgeon in Leonardo da Vinci and gained a great painter: it lost a great artist in Sir Charles Bell and gained a great surgeon.

Now of this art of surgery, where and what is the teaching? Where and who are the masters who guide and correct the young artists in their work? It may be said at once, of masters there are plenty, but they do not teach. There is no real teaching of the art of surgery in our country. Here and there a favoured few, house-surgeons and assistants, are permitted to pick up what knowledge they