

suit of his work, so enthusiastic, so determined to realize rather than imagine the truth, that with his early death it is felt that there is left a gap that cannot soon be filled.

I do not think that Kanthack, had he lived, would have made a name among the great discoverers in medicine, if I may so express it. Discovery of new facts was not his aim, although his friends well know that he was the first to cultivate the actinomycoses hominis, and that Kitasato, but employed a simple method devised by him to gain readily pure cultures of tubercle bacilli from the sputum; matters in which he never claimed a rightful priority, in an age when any serious worker at the new subject of bacteriology is sure to make discoveries, if he so desires. Discoveries as such did not appeal to him, what he constantly sought was to make sure of his facts. He was content, nay anxious, to establish the ground work for others to build upon, and was impatient of nothing so much as of conclusions reached from premises not rigorously sound. I must acknowledge, that rare and valuable as is such habit of mind, it at times, I used to think, rendered him a little illiberal towards men who, gifted with the scientific inquisitiveness, were performing good work in propounding and testing theories, men who from their very gift were apt to express rapidly their conclusions, without indicating or appearing to weigh adequately the data from which their conclusions were deduced. But this very caution in arriving at conclusions, together with his untiring devotion to work, made Kanthack the ideal teacher. He taught those under him to investigate minutely, and imbued them with the true scientific spirit of careful analysis and balancing of facts and observations.

When the remarkable galaxy of talented British physicians and surgeons of this century is called to mind, and when we remember the brilliant advances that have been made by them in medical science, it is remarkable how, with scarce an exception, the best results have been obtained by independent workers, who in their turn had not passed on the mantle to any pupil. With the possible exception of the teachers at Edinburgh and at University College, London, during the third quarter of the century, there has been no live, well characterized school of medicine with the highest scientific traditions well sustained. No one in Great Britain has established a school of pathologists comparable, for example, to the Johns Hopkins School under Professor Welch, or to the school of physiologists created at Cambridge by Michael Foster. Roy founded such a school at Cambridge, but disease arrested his efforts after a few brilliant years. Horslev at University College, promised to accomplish much, and attracted men from afar, until surgical practice and medical politics forced him to resign his professorship. Coats, of Glasgow, has died just as admirable new laboratories have been provided for him. At Liverpool with the Yates Thompson laboratories recently opened by