

named. They are the great books—Erichson's Surgery, Quain's Anatomy, Osler's Medicine. No German professional book ever has style; at least, it is not apparent to the Gentile mind. It is the business of the translator and editor to supply it, unless the book is to remain merely a translation, and so stated in the outset.

Dr. Thayer, the translator, writes English excellently well,—for a German; but, apparently, he had not much assistance from the editor, for Dr. Ewing, in his preface, considers the text has been rendered into "clear English." The rendering is neither clear nor correct. It is doubtful if there is a page which will not yield proof of this, and there are nearly six hundred pages in the book. The meaning of such a sentence as the following, on page 18: "these cellular elements, the very bricks of the edifice, are the actual carriers of life functions," is not clear, unless the cellular elements of the blood be thought of as bricks and the life functions carried by them as a roof to the edifice. In the same paragraph three subjects are named, and the last is referred to as "which latter." Upon the same page a "purpose" is referred to first as a "pathway" and again as a "foundation."

There is a straining after scientific exactness of definition common also in American books not confessedly translations, which destroys all fluidity and freedom of expression. The terms, "marantic edema" "universal and inclusive view," "expression of life," "concepts," "spontaneous injury," "signification of tuberculosis," "suggillation" are not essentially more correct than simpler expressions, and they give to the text a foreign sound, look and feeling.

Again, whole sentences, excellent in themselves, are interjected into passages where they only serve as obstructions. There is a good example of this on page 212 where the following occurs: "Baumgarten and Walz do not admit the existence of such alexins. *Natural immunity means that an animal is not a favourable medium for the bacteria invading it.* They rest their argument on the fact," etc.

The free use of "latter" and "former," "first" and "last" "the same," "the previous" is obstructive to the flow of thought. Adjectives are continually used in a substantival sense as "colloid," "amyloid." The sentence; "the arterio-sclerotic kidney is distinguished from atrophy with stasis by the over-filled veins of the latter, even when very much decreased in size," is not "clear" in its meaning nor agreeable in its form. When one comes upon such terms as "regressive," and finds upon reflection that they are strictly justifiable, he is inclined to think that terms like "arrosion," on page 485, are also so, but that is an unwarrantable inference.

If it be considered that these are mere subtleties, one may mention more obvious departures from normal writing, in sentences without subjects, in a lack of agreement between nouns and their verbs, in a wrong use of adverbial expressions and prepositions. One or two random examples of each will serve: "Occurs in the