

wha could unnerstan' them, jabberin' bodies?" I do not vouch for the theology—but there can be "nae doo't" that the ability of one to understand another makes for sympathy and harmony.

In the past the terminology of the physician was not difficult—at least, anyone with a little knowledge of Greek and Latin could easily follow it—the language of the law was indeed derived in large part from the Latin, but with the most extraordinary perversions from the original and classical meaning. The other day, at a meeting of the Bar of one of the United States I told them that I looked upon myself as a brother: their terminology was familiar, and especially their Latin; and I added "If I find myself in a body of men who pronounce Latin correctly and according to quantity. I may be amongst scholars, but I know that I am not amongst common-law lawyers."

There were in the old law many terms which were used in what anyone but a lawyer would call a non-natural and certainly a wholly technical sense. Let me tell you a story. A doctor and a lawyer were disputing about their respective professions, and the doctor particularly found fault with the language of the law. "For example," said he, "who can understand what you mean when you speak of 'levying a fine'?" "Oh," said the lawyer, "no doctor can be expected to understand that, for it is equivalent to 'suffering a common recovery.'" I do not wonder that that story has fallen flat; no one who has not studied the old law can even understand the language—at a dinner of lawyers, the story is always a brilliant success.

Now all that mystery of the law is about gone—our laws are becoming simpler and so is our language—for the intricacy of the old rules is being substituted common sense. Except in real estate, there is not much that a layman cannot follow and understand.

The very opposite is the case in medicine; the microscope has revolutionized not only the principles, but also the nomenclature. Not many years ago Huxley could say that the student of medicine should put two full years at the beginning of his course on the study of anatomy and physiology alone—in anatomy to such an extent that he *knew* it, not simply that he could recollect if he had time, but so that if he were waked up in the middle of the night and asked he could immediately answer (because he knew his anatomy like the multiplication table) any question on any bone, muscle, nerve, vessel or tissue in the human body. Now, I venture to think, no one would advise so much time to be taken up even in anatomy and physiology when so many other things are to be learned—and if not known, at least known about. No