perfectionists in some of the religious bodies, who claim to have attained such a state of sanctity that they cannot commit any sin. It is not to be supposed that the Academy would take into its fellowship any one who was known to be a thief and black-leg; but if it should afterwards be found that any of its Fellows were of such a character, it would certainly seem desirable that it should have some means for getting rid of the offending members. As to whether any irregular practitioner will ever be received by it (against which, as has been pointed out, there is no restriction whatever in the constitution or by-laws), seems likely to depend on the men composing the committee on admissions hereafter. When the application of a candidate has been favorably acted upon by this committee, it is an almost unprecedented thing for the applicant to be blackballed; and, in the growing laxity of feeling as regards irregulars in this community, it is not by any means inconceivable that at some time a committee on admissions may give its endorsement to the application of a candidate of the kind alluded to.

Since the last letter was written a case has become known which would not have been referred to at all in this correspondence except for the strictures of the *Record*, but which furnishes a somewhat striking commentary on some of the statements made in that letter. A Fellow of the Academy having done some action (which need not be mentioned here) believed to be worthy of censure, a member of the Council, a gentleman of refinement and great eminence in the profession, was asked to remonstrate with him in regard to the supposed offence; but when the latter attempted to do this, on more than one occasion, if the writer is correctly informed, he was coolly greeted with the polite advice to "go to h—ll." Now what can the Academy do about it? In former times the course to be pursued would have been sufficiently plain, and there would have been no hesitation in taking suitable action.

INJUSTICE TO DR. BARNES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE JOURNAL:

Dear Sir:—My attention was to-day called to an editorial in your journal of the 10th inst., under the heading of "Injustice to Fancourt Barnes," which does me great injustice. I therefore request that you give this note equal prominence in an early issue.

My name having been misprinted "Cutler" in the review, and the fact that Barnes's book contains a greater number of words than mine, are claimed as proofs that the reviewer was not familiar with either book. A careful comparison shows that Dr. Barnes copied *all of my words and definitions*, with one or two exceptions. Most of the errors copied could not have been made so continuously and peculiarly alike had not the printer of Barnes's book used my printed page as part of his copy. Such uniform, exact and constant repetition of definitions, punctuation, etc., in their sequence throughout several thousand words could have occurred in no other way. Barnes's book contains very few strictly *medical* terms not found in mine. The mass of his padding consists of chemi-

cal, botanical and pharmaceutical terms to be found in all the general dictionaries. A prominent journal, in reviewing Barnes's book, said that his additions were "*not particularly or at all scientific*." In many cases, after giving certain of my words and definitions, he has repeated the same word and given another combination of definitions, evidently taken from the common dictionaries. The remark that "Barnes's dictionary contains errors in words that are not in Cutter's dictionary at all, and other errors in words that are correctly given by Cutter," is very true, and many of them present evidence that Barnes was not capable of writing an original work of the kind.

I assert that no "injustice in regard to this matter has been done to Dr. Barnes in this country," and that this claim of piracy is not a fable; neither is Dr. Barnes's book superior to mine, as a comparison of the two books will show any person capable of judging which is most reliable. I cannot expect to be afforded the space for citing the many facts at my disposal in proof.

In the concluding paragraph of your editorial it is stated that the firm who imported Barnes's book voluntarily, and without investigation, returned their importation to England. This suppression of Barnes's book did not take place until after a considerable correspondence, and a suit was about to be commenced. My counsel had prepared overwhelming proof that Barnes had pirated the whole of my book. I wrote to this effect to all the prominent British journals of medicine, but, with one exception, they refused to publish. So much for simple justice to one not in the country to defend himself.

My dictionary was an original work, exactly as claimed in the preface, and was the product of years of hard study. To steal such a work is to inflict a much greater injury than the reprinting of an essay or work of that nature. I should not have even protested had it been simply reprinted in England as "Cutter's Dictionary." I have no quarrel with any one, but I shall certainly protect my rights.

Respectfully, G. R. CUTTER.

52 Bedford Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y., April 17, 1886.

THE ADDRESS IN MEDICINE BEFORE THE BRITISH ASSOCIATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE JOURNAL:

Dear Sir:—I hope you will not take it amiss if an humble reader of THE JOURNAL dissents from your editorial statement in connection with the selection of Dr. J. S. Billings, of the Army, "to deliver the address in Medicine before the next meeting of the British Medical Association in place of the late Professor Austin Flint," that "the well known ability of Dr. Billings and his familiarity with general medical literature, makes the selection one *eminently* proper." The ability of Dr. Billings is, of course, well known, and his familiarity with general medical literature is unquestioned, but a great many have presumed to doubt whether the selection of a bibliothecary, however noted and conspicuous, who has often disclaimed any practical acquaintance with disease, who has probably not written a prescription for twenty years,