asked about a patient, "Did he then refrain from speaking nonsense?" Were the answer "yes" it would imply that he had been speaking it, but had ceased to do so. Were the answer "no" it would mean that he had spoken nonsense, and continued to speak in the same strain up to the time under discussion. Neither answer might be true, for if the patient had not spoken at all, as indicated, the fallacy lay in an assumption which had no existence. It would be begging the whole question, and neither a positive nor negative answer could cover the ground. This is only one specimen of a legion of such questions which often perplex beginners, and are propounded with that object in view, and a negative or positive answer demanded with legal pertinacity. When such traps are set and baited with sagacious design, a state of "masterly inactivity" is best, until the questioner goes back to legitimate interrogation A medical witness should never quote authorities, nor should he be entrapped into endorsing or refuting such, if they should be presented by council for his consideration. No published books on medical subjects are competent witnesses in court; nor is a witness compelled to give an opinion about the views the authors may advance. The writers themselves are the only legitimate persons who can testify to their theories and beliefs. I have often seen witnesses caught in this way, even before the opposing council could put a veto on the irregularity. "Do you agree with Maudsley in his view on this point?" "How does it happen that Bucknill and you differ in this respect?" "Can you give me Tuke's opinions on the subject under discussion?" "In Ray's Jurisprudence such and such theories are advanced, what do you think about them?" "You have read Taylor, will you state what he says about insanity in respect to competent wills, or suicide,