radiotherapy and anaesthetics have been re-written or revised by specialists in these subjects. In the preface to this edition it is stated that "the specialist is far too prone to try and crowd into the undergraduate teaching technical details of a specialty which are the concern of the postgraduate." This may well be the case at times, but it cannot apply to such subjects as "shock" and "burns" which the authors treat with but scant reference to modern work; most certainly it is no justification for presenting a great branch of surgery, which occupies nearly one quarter of the entire text, as it was a quarter of a century ago, when, in reality, its whole practice, indeed its very spirit, has changed. If this is what present-day undergraduates are to be taught of orthopaedic surgery, out-patient departments will continue to be crowded with patients whose general practitioners should have been competent to advise them. It is hoped that in the tenth edition much old wood will be pruned from many sections and that a surgeon who has specialised in orthopaedics will be invited to *re-write* chapters 12 to 22 of volume I.—Philip WILES.

ROSE AND CARLESS' MANUAL OF SURGERY. Edited by Sir Cecil WAKELEY, Bt., K.B.E., C.B., LL.D., M.Ch., D.Sc., F.R.C.S., F.R.S.E., F.R.S.A., F.A.C.S., F.R.A.C.S. Fellow of King's College, London. President of the Royal College of Surgeons of England. Assisted by Eighteen Contributors. Eighteenth edition. $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6$ in. Pp. xix+1,471, with 1,007 figures, 18 in colour. Two volumes. Index. 1952. London: Baillière, Tindall & Cox. Price 63s. the set.

It seems harder to keep an old book up to date than to write a new one. It goes against the grain to throw away old clothes however shabby they have become, and this is just what an editor of a text-book for students must do. Judged by these standards the eighteenth edition of this famous text-book is a failure. The book has a more modern appearance but it has not discarded enough. Does anyone nowadays "bipp" a wound? If reference must be made to "bipp," the reader should be told what it is and how it is applied. The author of a text-book should be a kindly man; he should spare his readers and not burden their memories with useless facts. For example, the enumeration of the possible causes of hernia does no one any good; it helps neither in prevention nor in cure. No two people will agree on the relative importance of a subject, but two pages devoted to the methods of operating on tumours of the pineal body is excessive. The chapters on orthopaedic surgery might have been written years ago with their insistence on rickets as a cause of deformity. It is not to be expected that a general surgeon should be *au fait* with what the specialist surgeon is doing, but surely it is wrong to teach a student to diagnose a fracture of the neck of the femur by examining Nelaton's line. In spite of its many failings the book does give a comprehensive picture of surgery. It includes everything; for example, the chapters on eyes and ears are admirable for an undergraduate. To criticise is easy, but is there a better book to recommend to students?—George PERKINS.