

rioting, *sans culotte*, in trickery, double-dealing and untruthfulness, we did not hesitate to give him the cobbling he seemed to invite, and, to make it more effective, we occasionally, I confess, dipped the shingle, before applying it, in a weak decoction of sarcasm. But even then, sir, we only mildly satirized offenders who richly deserved to have been severely lampooned—we did but gently fret the cuticle which we ought, in strict justice, to have excoriated or scorched. And yet, so violently do even an honest man's sympathies and associations warp his judgment and bias his sense of fair play, that, notwithstanding our careful avoidance of all that is low and reprehensible in controversy, the able and ordinarily just editor of one of our best medical periodicals ventures, in a recent article, to class us with our opponents, and professes to regard our methods as being no very great improvement on the questionable tactics pursued by them! From such a partial judgment we confidently appeal to the intelligence of the great body of our unprejudiced fellow-practitioners, who have probably perused the literature on both sides with a less jaundiced eye.

My own letters have especially offended our critics by their number and their length, and by their faults of style. My position as secretary of our association has naturally, in a large measure, imposed upon me the onus of correspondence, and I have not grudgingly devoted myself to it. I would gladly have made my published letters fewer and shorter had my opponents left me any option in the matter. In all serious public controversy, charges that are explicitly made, and facts and arguments that are distinctly set forth, are either frankly admitted or categorically refuted. Our adversaries, however, in this dispute, did neither the one thing nor the other. They adopted the unusual and somewhat fatuous course of pooh-poohing our whole indictment, and then trying to pose, before the medical electorate, as having triumphantly disproved every count thereof. This unworthy procedure compelled us, more than once, to repeat the entire arraignment, and to insist that our charges should be squarely met, or judgment suffered to go by default. Hence our long letters and a good deal of iteration and repetition. But, while freely admitting that my letters were long and frequent—necessarily so from my point of view, and that my style is by no means free from serious blemishes, I claim that it must be a matter of opinion whether it is justly open to the charge of verbosity. I may be permitted to point out that even a very short letter may be prolix to tediousness, while, on the other hand, a very long one may be sententious almost to laconism. I greatly admire a nervous, pithy and racy style of composition, and I have, in my humble way, earnestly striven to attain to it. If, as charged, I have been diffuse where I