

the anonymous (or editorial), the initialed (or hermaphroditic), and the entirely-signed (or purely individual). The last class may be passed over, because when a reviewer signs his whole name his opinions carry weight only according to his personal ability, and are recognised by all as simply one man's opinion. The neuter-gender review by initials is "neither flesh nor fowl nor good red herring." Neither the journal nor the individual is held responsible.

All reviews, like all editorials that have any respect shown them, or that have carrying-power, are anonymous, and for these the Journal must assume direct and absolute editorial responsibility. Any other course results in ludicrous and silly ineptitude and self-contradiction. If the periodical does not assume this responsibility, there is no right to use the editorial "we," and no right, human, or professional, or commercial, to review the book at all. The spectacle of an editor, for example, in one column, reviewing eulogistically a book that denounces on every page the germ-theory of disease, and maligning the motives of those who believe in the germ-theory, while, on another page of the journal, editorially upholding the doctrine—all this is illuminating—of many things.

We are thorough believers in the wisdom of the anonymity of editorials and reviews in medical journalism, and the strict holding of the journal to an accountability for every editorial utterance. It would seem that this position would hardly need defence. All high journalism has come to this practice, and it is the only condition of ethical and journalistic progress. There is something in the editorial "we" that cannot be gained by any ego-ism or individualism, however expert and able. *Nos* becomes *vous* by putting "you" into it. A good journal must have a character of its own that is different from that of any other journal, and from that of any one or more of its editorial staff. It is, in a word, if at all true to any ideal standards, an organ, the spokesman of many and of all, and must, consciously or unconsciously, trend to non-individualism, to action in the interests and aims of the many. It is this very impersonalism that gives its opinion weight and unselfishness; an editorial writer must merge his individuality, his personal peculiarities, into the larger general purposes, look for the light and truth that is beneath individual imperfections, struggling to larger issues and for the common good. Anonymity in men, if not in puppets, quenches whims, foibles, and crankeries, and leads to attention riveted upon the wants of and duties to the thousands of readers. Let every subscriber hold the composite editorial personality strictly responsible for what is