acteristics of British medicine he would find certain national traits sufficiently distinct for recognition. Three centuries cannot accomplish very much (and that period has only just passed since the revival of medicine in England), but the local conditions of isolation, which have been singularly favorable to the development of special peculiarities in the national character have not been without effect in the medical profession. I cannot do more than touch upon a few features, which will be useful as indicating the sources of influence upon Great Britain in the past, and which may perhaps be suggestive as to lines of progress in the future.

Above the fire-place in Sir Henry Acland's study are three pannelled portraits of Linacre, Sydenham, and Harvey; the scroll upon them reads *Litteræ, Praxis, Scientia.* To this great triumvirate—as to the fountain heads, we may trace the streams of inspiration which have made British medicine what it is to-day.

Linacre, the type of the literary physician, must ever hold a unique place in the annals of our profession. To him was due in great measure the revival of Greek thought in the 16th century in England, and in the last Harveian oration Dr. Payne has pointed out his importance as a forerunner of Harvey. He made Greek methods available; through him the art of Hippocrates and the science of Galen became once more the subject of careful, first-hand study. Linacre, as Dr. Payne remarks, "was possessed from his youth till his death by the enthusiasm of learning. He was an idealist devoted to objects which the world thought of little use." Painstaking, accurate, critical, hypercritical perhaps, he remains to-day the chief literary representative of British medicine. Neither in Britain nor in Greater Britain have we maintained the place in the world of letters created for us by Linacre's noble start. It is true that in no generation since has the profession lacked a man who might stand unabashed in the temple at Delos; but judged by the fruits of learning scholars of his type have been more common in France and Germany. Nor is it to our credit that so little provision is made for the encouragement of these studies. For years the reputation of Great Britain in this matter was sustained almost alone by the great Dee-side scholar, the surgeon of Banchory, Francis Adams—the interpreter of Hippocrates to English students. In this century he and Greenhill have well maintained the traditions of Linacre. Their work, and that of a few of our contemporaries, among whom Ogle must be specially mentioned, has kept us in touch with the ancients. But by the neglect of the study of the humanities, which has been far too general, the profession loses a very precious quality.