

and speaking on behalf of this JOURNAL, we of the Editorial Staff, who are at the same time proprietors of the JOURNAL, may state that so long as the JOURNAL has priority of publication, we are rejoiced when any article appearing in this JOURNAL is published elsewhere, whether in abstract or in its entirety. Being human we would make the proviso, that the fact be always noted that the abstract of the article has already appeared in our pages. We note with pleasure for example, within the last few weeks, that one of the leading Indian Medical Journals published conscientiously every word of one of our retrospects, reproducing even sundry unfortunate typographical errors.

But while thus we are willing to have our articles reproduced with due acknowledgment, we cannot but appreciate as publishers the other side of the question. It is quite true that every physician writes and publishes articles that every member of the profession may if possible learn of his work, but at the same time every author in all subjects writes and publishes with a like end in view, and if we mistake not, the number of authors or writers who obtain adequate remuneration is peculiarly small. In our experience men write to or for the leading and most flourishing journals, medical or otherwise, because by so doing they are likely to reach the greatest number of readers, and thus the publishers of the leading journals who through their business capacity work those journals up to their present high standard have more "say in the matter" than Dr. Gould would seem to admit. Let us suppose for example, that there exists a leading journal in medicine or any other subject, and that another periodical appears upon the market, the object of which is to publish fully the best articles appearing in that and other high class journals, we can well understand that the proprietors of the former should object when they see the possibility of the latter periodical being so well conducted that the reading public may prefer to procure it in place of their own organ and may prefer to have by them a careful selection of all that is best rather than to wade through a collection of what is good, bad and indifferent at more frequent intervals.

While it is true that medical writers work in general for no pay, we cannot, after careful thinking over the matter, see that medical literature is widely separated from other literature. Just as we feel that journals, like the *Review of Reviews*, which subsist by extracting at length all that is best in general literature, are harmful and ought to be suppressed, so do we feel that there should be a limit to the extent of the extracts made by year-books in medicine. Year-books ought not to take the place of journals, they ought merely to publish extracts sufficiently full and sufficiently suggestive to lead those who