

THIS is what Hahnemann has to say on the more or less discussed question of the wearing from porcelain mortars by the process of trituration. It is to be found as a foot-note in *Chronic Diseases*, p. 165.

"There are hypercritical Homœopathic physicians who were afraid that even the sugar of milk might obtain medicinal qualities from being long kept in a bottle, or from long trituration. Long continued experiments have convinced me that this apprehension is unfounded. Both the raw and the prepared sugar of milk may be taken as nourishment in considerable quantity without the least disagreeable symptoms being experienced from it. Fears have also been entertained that, in triturating the medicinal substance in a porcelain mortar, particles might become detached from this latter, and that the triturating process might change them to powerfully active *silicea*.

"To ascertain whether such fears were founded, I caused one hundred grains of sugar of milk to be triturated with a new porcelain pestle in a porcelain mortar, the bottom of which had been recently polished; thirty-three grains were taken at a time. They underwent the process of trituration eighteen times, each trituration lasting six minutes. Every four minutes the mass was stirred up with a spatula. The object of this frequently repeated trituration, which lasted in all three hours, was to impart medicinal qualities, either to the sugar of milk, or, at any rate, to the particles of *silicea* which might have been separated from the mortar; but, from experiments which I have made upon highly susceptible subjects, I have been obliged to infer that the prepared sugar of milk is no more medicinal than the sugar in its raw state; its only quality is that of being nutritious."

A MEDICAL gentleman signing himself Dr. W. S. Strode, Bernadotte, Ill., in the *Western Medical Reporter*; makes the following fling: "Little did Hahnemann think that in the year 1889-90 the system which he promulgated would be taken up and elaborated—" and so on, and so on; the gentleman uses so many words in making his point that space and the importance of his paper does not warrant a full quotation. The point is that Christian Science and Homœopathy are the same thing, and he seems to labor under the impression that the former first appeared in "the year 1889-90." If Dr. Strode doesn't know any, better and really thinks that Homœopathy and Christian Science are the same, he should inform himself on the subject by reading a little; but he should have done this before he set about instructing the world on a subject of which he uninformed.

THE HOMŒOPATHIC RECORDER.

VOL. VI. PHILADELPHIA AND LANCASTER, NOV., 1891. No. 6.

THE PHARMACY OF TINCTURES.

Read before the American Institute of Homœopathy.

The writer has been honored by a call from the Executive Committee for a paper on the "Pharmacy of Tinctures," and begs to present the following in response:

In Homœopathic pharmacy no generally accepted rules for the preparation of tinctures prevail at the present time. Outside of the Continent each pharmacist follows his own preference in making what Hahnemann first styled "Mother Tinctures," with this general observance, however, that all, more or less faithfully, adhere to Hahnemann's precept to make all tinctures from the fresh succulent plants, as far as obtainable, gathered from their natural habitat at the time of their utmost vigor. All Homœopathic pharmacopœias, with one exception, acknowledge and uphold this principle, and to its general observance much of the sustained success of Homœopathy is due, and this also is the cause of the acknowledged superiority of our Homœopathic tinctures over those of the drug stores.

But while the Homœopathic tinctures of the different countries are similar as to constituents they differ in strength, and a uniform standard is very desirable.

Hahnemann adopted the juice of the plant as a unit, and divided the medicinal plants into four classes, as follows:

Class 1 comprised the most succulent plants. The expressed juice of these was mixed with an equal quantity of pure spirits of wine, set aside for a week and filtered, the product constituting the mother tincture.

Class 2 comprised plants less succulent and to three parts of the comminuted plant were added two parts of alcohol, this was macerated, expressed and filtered.

Class 3 comprised plants still less juicy, and to one part of plant were added two parts of alcohol, then macerated, pressed and filtered.

Class 4 comprised dried drugs such as *Ignatia*, *Ipecac*, *Nux vom.*, etc.; and to one part of the comminuted drug five parts of alcohol were added, and after eight or more days the tincture was decanted and filtered.

In accordance with these rules all mother tinctures were prepared until, in 1840, Carl Gruner, of Dresden, brought out a new Pharmacopœia, deviating from Hahnemann in that he divided the plants into three classes, of which *Class 1* comprises the dried drugs, which he macerated with alcohol for two weeks in the proportion of one part of the drug to ten of alcohol. His *Class 2* comprises very juicy plants; to the expressed pulp or magma, of these, alcohol equal in quantity by weight to the juice pressed out is added; after a few day's maceration the alcoholic tincture is expressed and the two liquids, mixed and filtered, give the mother tincture. His *Class 3* is identical with that of Hahnemann.

In 1843 Dr. Buchner, of Munich, published a Pharmacopœia, strictly following Hahnemann's precepts. His work is official in Bavaria to this day.

In the year 1872 Dr. Schwabe, of Leipzig, issued his Polyglot Pharmacopœia, printed in five languages: he also followed Hahnemann's original directions adding remedies later introduced in their proper order. He omits all descriptions of plants and mode of preparing chemicals with the exception of such as are not usually found in old-school handbooks.

In the year 1882 the American Homœopathic Pharmacopœia was issued. This adopted Schwabe's compilation of Hahnemann's processes with few modifications. But this work gives in addition a full description of plants and mode of preparing chemicals etc., thus rendering all references to old-school handbooks superfluous.

Several other Pharmacopœias were issued by Deventer, Caspary and others, but never secured general acceptance.

In 1870 the British Homœopathic Pharmacopœia appeared. This also gives a description of plants and tests for chemicals. In the preparation of medicines, however, a new departure is made, the compilers aiming at greater accuracy in tinctures. To this end it is required that a given quantity of a fresh plant be first thoroughly dried and weighed in order to ascertain the amount of water it contains, and then the alcohol, to be added is to be so proportioned that each minim of the finished tinctures

represents one grain of the dried plant or its soluble properties. This entails great labor, and seemingly to no practical purpose. Why should our school imitate the Allopaths in basing strength of tinctures on a certain proportion of the dried plant while using fresh plants whenever available? It is claimed that the English method is more accurate, but it must also be conceded that only a relative accuracy can be attained after all, for plants will contain varying proportions of extractive matter with varying seasons, and only a careful assay of the alkaloids contained in the plants, in each case, will ensure accuracy.

A more rational way would seem to be to base the strength of our tinctures on a certain proportion of fresh plant. This would be an improvement on the old ways in that a definite quantity of mother tincture be made out of a given weight of fresh plants. Naturally the tincture would vary somewhat in the proportion of juice to alcohol, for in a dry season plants are less juicy, or contain less water, than in a wet one. In practice however this variation would be of little or no moment. Or is there any one who will maintain that six drops of a tincture or dilution mixed with water and given in teaspoonful doses will materially differ in the effect from four drops in the same amount of water? And surely no greater discrepancy in strength need be apprehended; the identity of the plant, its proper habitat and the right time of collection being of chief importance.

It would seem, then, to be most practical and desirable that the future standard Homœopathic Pharmacopœia direct that all fresh plant tinctures be made in such proportion that one or two pounds, as agreed upon, represent one pound of the fresh plant or part of a plant, and that five or ten pounds of a dry plant tincture, as decided upon, represent one pound of the crude drug. This would give us a reasonably uniform strength, and these simple directions would readily be accepted by all, while the complicated system advocated by the British Homœopathic Pharmacopœia would defeat this object. It would, in the writer's opinion, surely fail of acceptance on the Continent even if adopted here, as it is in England, and this is a point worth serious consideration.

Another consideration would be that country practitioners frequently find opportunity to gather herbs and roots, while driving through their districts, for making their own tinctures, which, in accordance with above mentioned simple rules, would be an easy matter; whereas few would go to the trouble to follow out the complicated directions mentioned above, and so would either be led to make a tincture at variance with the new Pharmacopœia or abandon the practice altogether.

Of the necessity of a standard Homœopathic Pharmacopœia no two opinions can exist. For in a number of instances the present Pharmacopœias are even at variance concerning what part of a plant is to be used. Among a number of discrepancies it will be found that one work directs that the leaves, and another that the rhizome of *Caladium seguinum*, be used for making the tincture. One uses the leaves, and another the roots of *Phytolacca*; one uses the whole fresh plant of *Passiflora* for tincture, another directs that the inspissated juice of the leaves be triturated, etc., etc.

A Homœopathic dispensatory was published some years ago in the West, which directs that all European tinctures, even *Pulsatilla*, be made from dried herbs and roots. Dry-plant tinctures in this country cost less to make than the import duty alone amounts to on the imported fresh-plant article.

The same work also recommends that a certain proportion of cream of tartar be mixed with the sugar used in making pellets. Cream of tartar is used a good deal by confectioners; it "cuts" the crystals in sugar, and is used to produce the deliquescent or cream candies; it also makes very smooth soft pellets, but its admixture to Homœopathic pellets is altogether inadmissible and reprehensible.

Tinctures made from dry herbs are, as a rule, intensely green, and ignorance of this fact sometimes leads to misconceptions on part of physicians. Chlorophyl, the green coloring matter of plants, is soluble in stronger alcohol, which is generally used in making dry plant tinctures, while *Aconite*, *Belladonna*, and other tinctures made from fresh plants in accordance with the Homœopathic Pharmacopœias will invariably be a reddish brown.

A universally accepted Pharmacopœia would be of great assistance in regulating these matters.

A. J. TAFEL.

DOCTOR SAMUEL LILIENTHAL.

"Whom I call one of the princes of Israel."—*Rabbi Voorsanger*.

It is nearly a quarter of a century since I first met him who was Samuel Lilienthal. A series of introductory lectures were being delivered at the mother college in Philadelphia, and I preceded him by one night. I was the guest of Dr. Hering, who easily persuaded me to prolong my visit so that I might attend Lilienthal's lecture. O, wizard memory! I hear now his

opening sentence: "*Jacta est alea!*" I remember, too, that he crossed swords with Kafka, and stood like a rock on good old-fashioned Homœopathic ground. I did not agree with him; but the sincerity of his convictions disarmed criticism. How racy, too, his German-English pronunciation, for he religiously avoided our anserine *th* sound. It was always "Homœopatic," "Terapeutic," with him to the last. I recollect that after his lecture quite a party adjourned to the house of one Prof. Raue, and I shall carry to my grave the memory of a symposium that reached far into the wee sma' hours and left me a radiant recollection and a rousing headache. On the morrow we journeyed together from Philadelphia to New York, and thus began one of the pleasantest friendships that death has ever broken.

A few years later that restlessness which so often disturbs the country physician when he is deceived by the glamour of a "city practice," seized me, and I looked with longing towards Gotham. No sooner did "Old Sam" hear of my desire than he pressed me to come to New York, and to share his office,—and this, mind you, without paying a stiver of rent. He made it the more easy for a poor and proud spirit to become his almsman by urging that I should assist him in his literary work, revising his Teutonic English, discussing medical papers in the journals, and talking with him, "for the two of us can talk like the * * *, you know!"

I not only shared his office; I was also welcomed to a home circle which, though lacking a mother, had a gentle warmth that would melt the shyest. As a rule, it is soul-sickening to wait and wait in a strange place for "practice," but those days were halcyon, and between Lilienthal's company, literary work, reading in good libraries, and rummaging old book stores, I little recked whether I was getting into practice or not; and the days flew by.

But let me not forget the divine nights, for "Old Sam" was an ardent lover of music, and between the opera and Thomas's Garden we had our noctes in which we forgot every care. After the opera, or one of Thomas's concerts, came the late lunch, the "Pilsener"—for they had "Pilsener" in those days—and then home (even I had learned to call it "home"), and the soothing cigar, and the talk late into the night, and finally the sudden, "By tunder, Sam Jones, we must go to bed!"

No. 230 West Twenty-fifth street,—I am again sitting by the office window, and the perfume of the ailanthus tree is wafted in, and I have turned from my book and am waiting, not for the "patient," but to hear the well-known sharp staccato footsteps

that tell me "Old Sam" has finished his morning round of visits, and then his cheery greeting, and then the paper for the *North American* that must be read and criticised—and, I must add, accepted in spite of all criticisms: his heart continually running away with his head. And those days are forever gone; and the old familiar face is gone; and the warm heart is cold; and he is resting near the "Golden Gate"—so far from Munich; so near the great white throne!

* * * * *

Dr. Lilienthal was one of those, all too few nowadays, with whom Medicine is a calling—not a trade. To it he gave his whole self without reserve. He purchased its literature with reckless prodigality, though he was wisely frugal in all other expenditures. He seemed to live in the spirit of the Hahnemannian dictum: "In an art preservative of human life, ignorance is a crime." From an intimate acquaintance with both I can truly declare that Samuel Lilienthal spent more on medical literature in a single year than did the late Dr. Croesus in his whole lifetime. I believe that Croesus left far the larger estate, and of a surety I do know that he left it, for although they sometimes put a pocket in a shirt I have never heard of one in a shroud.

Lilienthal was also an indefatigable reader. Many suppose that this implies a limited practice; the inference is not valid in his case. He was indeed a busy practitioner. How did he find time to read? By utilizing the spare minutes. No sooner had he laid aside his visiting case than he picked up the journal that had been read up to the very minute of his starting upon his round of visits. Or if he did not begin reading the moment he entered his office, he took the unfinished manuscript from his portfolio, and with his nose close to the paper, for he was shortsighted, began writing at once. I have always detested interruptions when writing; but he husbanded the few minutes before dinner would be ready, and this will explain his productiveness. To his earnestness he added industry. I wish it could be computed for how many years of his life he had a pen in his faithful hand. It was a matter of surprise to me how much his pen could put upon a page. He wrote as small a hand as Hahnemann; and perhaps both learned that economy in the early days when writing paper was much dearer. Dear old soul! he actually prided himself upon his chirography, which often looked as if it had been done by a choreic spider on roller skates. We once edited journals that were printed at the same place, and I remember telling him how an incensed compositor had *exorcised*

me for the quality of my pot-hooks. "Is tat so?" said he, "Why, dey quarrel for mine." I did not tell him that the irate compositor assured me that he would be blanked if my "copy" wasn't almost as poor as Dr. Lilienthal's. But no compositor in that whole establishment would have breathed a word of complaint to Lilienthal himself, for despite his crabbed manuscript his sunshiny manner had won them all.

Only for Dr. Lilienthal the *North American Journal of Homœopathy* would have perished of inanition long ago. How chivalrously he came to the rescue; he felt as if fealty to those who had inaugurated that magazine demanded that he should put on his armor and leap into the gulf. How persistently he would buttonhole Tom, Dick, and Harry! I believe he would cheerfully have published a paper on *Sulphur*, from the "Old Harry" himself, on the *experio crede* principle—for a paper for "*De North American*." And how incessantly he translated, and translated, and translated for it! O, the drudgery of translating! No glow of composition to warm one; a mere hewing of wood and carrying of water for another! When I recall all that he has done I can but feel that he richly deserved the "translation" which befel him on the night of the second of October.

When one reads his "Therapeutics" it is to wonder when he found time to make so exhaustive a compilation. The secret is that whatever of note he read he made a "note" of on the spot. He didn't put it off until the more convenient season; down it went on the spot. He had many interleaved volumes, and in the appropriate one went the desired observation that he had just read. This is the only method by which one always gets the money's worth out of a book or journal. My only objection to his excerpts was that, like Hering, all was fish that came to his net. It mattered not who vouched for the printed statement, he accepted all without a challenge because he thought all as earnest and as truthful as himself. Alas! the statements in our literature are like the veal pies of which Weller declared "they are werry well when you knows the man wot made 'em." Our dear "Old Sam" would dine on a "deacon" as devoutly as though it were the "fatted calf" itself.

As an editor, I think he was lacking in the critical faculty, and I doubt if his editorial work will prove anything other than ephemeral. I do not think that any of his utterances on any of the questions that have arisen within the last twenty-five years, have, in any degree, moulded the opinions of his readers. He could be steadfast to his own convictions—no one more so—but he could not follow his convictions with fire and sword when

"the heathen raged and the people imagined a vain thing." When the fiery Lippe would fulminate his anathemas like a pistareen Pope, I recollect that Lilienthal would write him letters of such stern rebuke that I used to wish one of them might be published in the *North American*, if only to assure its readers of the sex of its editor. But it is due a dead man to say that he believed in the power of a "milde macht," which, I think, is vain when one is fighting the devil or any of his creatures.

* * * * *

I remember a portrait that hung in his bedroom; it was that of his Rachel who, long years ago, left him lonely, but with a love in his heart that time could not change. I have often wondered if it was not this unquenchable love for his dead wife that made his manner so charmingly tender and winning to all women. There was a blending of knightly courtesy with a fatherly fondness, and wherever he came he conquered. And now time has no mystery for him. A thousand years are but as a day, and the wife's face is not worn with pain, and the parting is as a dream that has faded. O, death, whose is the victory!

Blessed be God, that every stroke which makes the world poorer for us who linger, makes eternity the richer. The eye grows dim, the hand forgets its cunning, the memory falters, the tinsel of Vanity Fair grows tawdry, the illimitable boundary of the Unknown maketh the wise man become as a little child, and the years press heavily as a burden, and the City of God shineth in our nightly dreams with ineffable beauty, and the heart is filled with longings unutterable; and lo! the messenger cometh bringing the peace unspeakable.

Ann Arbor, 12th October.

S. A. J.

RANULA AND POLYPUS.

The article on *Thuja*, by Dr. Geo. Hering, in the September number of the HOMŒOPATHIC RECORDER, recalls to my mind several excellent results had with the drug in cases that have come under my care. The most striking of these is illustrated in the case of a man who came to consult about a growth under his tongue which he feared would result in cancer. He explained that it had several times been removed surgically by members of the old school, who assured him each time that it would never return but that it invariably resumed its full size in about three weeks' time. As a last resort, and at the suggestion of some of

his friends, he decided to try Homœopathy. An examination showed the presence of a bluish-looking growth as large as a child's play-marble directly under the tongue on the right side, causing him great distress and untold anxiety as to its future. It was diagnosed as a Ranula and he was given what to him seemed a few insignificant powders of *Thuja* 1x, with instructions to take one every four hours and to return as soon as they had all been taken. He left the office less the faith supposed to be essential to a cure of affections by Homœopathic means. At the expiration of four days he again presented himself and reported a decided decrease in the size of the tumor and a consequent belief in his ultimate recovery.

The prescription was renewed, and in less than three weeks the tumor had entirely disappeared, and although that has been three years ago he has never had any signs of a return, and frequently expresses his belief in the virtues of Homœopathy by availing himself of its benefits whenever ill.

Another instance of its remarkable effects was shown in the case of a public school teacher who had suffered from childhood with an offensive discharge from his right ear with almost total deafness in that ear. Immediately after a cold snap of weather he was troubled with considerable pain in his head, and I was consulted to treat what he termed an abscess in his ear. A careful examination showed a small growth just appearing on the membrana tympani which I took to be an abscess formation and prescribed accordingly. In about three weeks after this prescription he again presented himself at the office and asked me to make another examination, as he felt that there was something growing in his ear and that he could touch it with his finger, but added that it gave him no pain or discomfort, and was not even sore. The examination showed the presence of an aural polypus which had grown from the little elevation noticed sometime previous.

I prescribed *Thuja* 1x and, giving him a bottle of *Thuja* ϕ , ordered it painted every night and morning, and to take the powders, one every four hours. As he taught school some distance away from my home I was unable to see him as often as I wished, but told him to come and see me when he came in the neighborhood.

He presented himself in two weeks, and the polypus had grown to such an extent that it entirely filled the external auditory meatus, and I suggested its removal, although fearing that I should have much difficulty in performing the operation, as it seemed as if it would be almost, if not quite, impossible to insert

even the small wire of the ecraseur between the exterior of the fundus of the polypus and the interior of the meatus.

He objected to surgical measures, saying that he had so much trouble all his life with that ear that he was afraid of the consequences, and requested to have the medicinal treatment continued. I renewed my prescription of *Thuja* 1X, and directed painted as before, requesting him to come in a week. He came and the polypus seemed to be about the same, no pain, no distress, no headache, no symptoms. Renewed prescription and gave directions as before, still having faith in *Thuja*. The next week it was smaller, and next still smaller, and so on every week until at the end of the seventh week it had entirely disappeared; and although that has been over eighteen months ago he has never complained of that ear since.

W. H. POUNDS, M. D.

Paulsboro, N. J., Sept. 29, 1891.

OLIVE OIL IN GALL-STONE COLIC.

The subject of the action of olive oil has been recently discussed in many quarters, and the discussion revealed a wide divergence of opinion. With a view to settling the matter the therapeutic section of the Philadelphia Polyclinic Society sent out circulars making inquiries concerning the matter, and collected fifty-four cases of the disease treated with olive oil. The *New York Medical Journal* (October 3, 1891), publishes a chart of these, and makes the following comment on it:

"An analysis of these fifty-four cases shows that there were about one-third more females than males who suffered from gall-stone colic; that two died, that in three negative results were obtained, and that in fifty, or 98 per cent., positive relief was afforded. These results make a better showing still when we consider that one of those who died was suffering from adhesive obstruction of the bile ducts—a disease which no procedure, either medical or surgical, could have remedied. Now do these figures give us a true estimate of the favorable action of olive oil in this disease? for two of the observers state that they have treated forty other cases of biliary colic without a failure, but of which they had kept no record—making in all a collective return of eighty-nine cases—showing the great value of this drug."

"These cases illustrate, then, the positive efficaciousness of sweet oil in the treatment of gall-stone colic, and the question

naturally arises, therefore, as to the manner in which this agent acts. Dr. Rosenberg's experiments (Ueber die Anwendung des Olivenöls bei der Behandlung der Gallensteinkrankheit, *Therapeutische Monatshefte*, December, 1889, S. 542) demonstrate beyond a doubt that it largely increases the quantity of bile secreted, while at the same time it diminishes its consistency. But how does it accomplish this? Does it stimulate the biliary channels by coming in contact with their openings into the alimentary canal? Or is it decomposed into fatty acids and glycerin through the instrumentality of the pancreatic juice, and does the 'glycerin so liberated exert in the duodenum an action similar to that which takes place when it is introduced into the rectum,' causing a powerful reflex peristalsis—an ingenious theory suggested by Dr. D. D. Stewart? Or does it act in accordance with the hypothesis formulated by Virchow, who shows from his own experiments (*Therapeutische Monatshefte*, 1890, S. 86) that it is absorbed from the alimentary canal, is excreted by the liver, and is thrown into the bowels again through the biliary passages? The last of these theories appears to be most rational, because it explains certain well-known features in its action, and also places it on a level with the action of other cholagogues. We may conceive, then, that the beneficial influence of oil consists not so much in dissolving the biliary concretions as it does in increasing the biliary excretion, in flushing, and in lubricating and washing out the passages of the liver.

"Another point of interest in this collection is as to the proper dose of the oil. Are the large doses necessary which were administered to most of the cases in this collection? It appears not, for eight of the cases (Nos. 11, 12, 15, 16, 22, 23, 24, and 25) received only dessert-spoonful doses every three or four hours, and apparently with the same prompt and positive relief as that which was afforded by doses of from five ounces to one and two pints. If this should be confirmed by further experience, it would be a great practical gain in view of the fact that a great many persons show a strong aversion to all kinds of oil, especially if they are to be taken in large quantities."

From the chart we select the following typical cases:

Case 2. By Dr. H. T. Bahnson, Salem, N. C. Patient aged 50. Male. Seat of pain, right hypochondrium. Jaundice. Previous attacks, "a great many." "Other remedies, *Antipyrine* hypodermically, with temporary relief." "Took one pint (of olive oil) in two hours; complete relief." "No return for more than two years."

Case 6. By Dr. J. J. Cox, High Point, N. C. Patient, a woman,

aged 28. Seat of pain, gastric region. Jaundice. Previous attacks, eight or ten. Other remedies, *Sodium phosphate*, without benefit. Took, of olive oil, "one pint at a single dose. Complete relief." "No recurrence within a year."

Case 10. By Dr. Gloninger, Lebanon, Pa. Patient, a man, aged 31. Seat of pain, right hypochondrium. Jaundice. Previous attacks, "once every three weeks during fourteen years." Other remedies, "morphine and anæsthetics; temporary abatement." Dose of oil not stated, but after taking it "free from attacks for eleven months." "Previous sufferings were intense, requiring large doses of narcotics."

Case 20. By A. F. Magruder, M. D., of U. S. N. Patient, male, aged 46. Jaundice. Two previous attacks. "Ten hours after taking one quart of oil in divided doses, two large gall-stones discharged in the stools. Steady improvement." "Bowels had not been moved for four days before the oil was taken. Singultus existed for twelve hours before bowels moved."

Dr. D. P. Boyer, of Philadelphia, says he "treated about ten cases with the oil, and in all these was either a cure or benefit." His case (32) was a woman, and she "only received the oil for two days, when she was entirely relieved. Passed a number of calculi."

Case 34. By Dr. E. R. Mayer, of Wilkesbarre, Pa. Had about two attacks a year for fifteen years. "Six ounces of the oil gave prompt relief. This was the last attack the patient had."

Case 37. By Dr. H. C. Bloom, Philadelphia, Pa. Male, aged 68. Two previous attacks. Other remedies gave only temporary relief. "Dessertspoonful doses of the oil gave prompt and decided relief."

Case 41. By Dr. R. Kennedy, Kingston, Ont. Adult female. Suffering for years from attacks. "Full doses of the oil for two consecutive days. No return. Passed a large number of calculi. Relieved two other cases of gall-stone colic with the oil."

Dr. Gay, of Buffalo, says that "Olive oil is as much a specific in gall-stone and colic as sulphur is in scabies."

Case 43. By Dr. W. F. Langdon, of Cincinnati. "An operation had been suggested, but with the improvement (from olive oil) it was abandoned."

Case 46. By Dr. S. Rosenberg. Had "Liver enlarged and sensitive; gall bladder enlarged." Attacks "almost daily for five years. Obtained no relief from other remedies. Large doses of oil for two weeks. Relief. Free from attacks for eighteen months, up to the time the report is made. Passed hard concretions."

Of the unfavorable results, Case 5, by Dr. G. R. Fortiner, of Camden, N. J. After taking the oil for ten days, died. "Post-mortem investigation showed complete adhesive obstruction of bile ducts. Patient received a blow in hepatic region some time before."

Case 13. Also died. In neither this nor the case just quoted had there been any previous attacks.

Case 14. Obtained no relief from the oil and, like the two preceding ones, had had no previous attacks of the complaint. The remaining negative case merely states "negative results."

JOURNALISTIC "LAGNIAPE," THE "READING NOTICE" NUISANCE.

If there be any who do not know the meaning and significance of "lagniape," we will tell them. It is a word much in vogue in New Orleans and elsewhere amongst the Creoles, and signifies a bonus, a premium, something given for "good measure," or for good will; something "thrown in" when a purchase is made. So general is the custom in New Orleans that if an urchin be not rewarded by a stick of candy, or an apple, along with his purchase of a nickel's worth of soap or starch, for instance, he feels defrauded of his rights. The custom is recognized and adhered to by all the hucksters and grocers, market folks and retail dealers generally.

Whether known by that name or not, does not matter much,—it would smell as bad by any other,—the practice has invaded the realms of the medical journal, and is spreading to an alarming degree. True, the journals do not sell soap or starch, but they sell advertising space; and, although they do not deal in candy and apples, they are, almost without exception, addicted to "taffy," and deal it out in hunks, more or less, according to circumstances. We mean—to be more explicit—that it has become an established custom, in accepting an advertisement, to give a "notice" of it in the editorial page, to "call attention" to it; and this custom has grown and spread until the "reading notice is not only expected, but is considered a matter of right. We plead guilty to the charge; we are given to giving "taffy" as "lagniape," like all the brethren of the medical press, and we do it because it is the custom. It has reached that stage where a journal dare not refuse to insert "reading notices" for his advertisers,—he will be reminded that all others do; and one cannot