

A REVIEW OF THE PRINCIPAL EVENTS IN AMERICAN MEDICINE.*

BY JOHN URI LLOYD.

(Continued from June Issue, p. 535.)

PART III.

THE BEGINNING OF ECLECTIC INFLUENCE IN AMERICAN DOMESTIC MEDICINE.*

In all directions, the art of specializing seems dependent upon earlier, conglomerates of far separated processes. Chance discoveries of primitive investigators, in whatever field, being put on record, afterwards afford discriminative students in widely separated fields, studying from different view-points rare opportunities for individualism and classification. Thus such wandering empiricists, as Dr. Peter Smith, the "Indian Doctor," introduced to both the medical profession and to the laity, American botanical products before unknown, and also, himself as an observing explorer, who concerned himself in problems seemingly afar from domestic medicine. Better schooled, contemporary observers that followed, for example the Bartons, Samuel Smith, Historian of the Province of New Jersey, Rev. Manasseh Cutler, the botanist from Massachusetts, founder of Chillicothe, Ohio, and others of the early day, alike were searchers in the mineral, animal and vegetable wealth of the new world. In their homely way they recorded also the results of their investigations and observations. Widely separated were they in their locations, and personalities, strangely antagonistic, even combative, were they in many of their views, but yet close-linked in general efforts, ideals and processes.

Comes in this class to mind, the name of that remarkable man, C. S. Rafinesque, who was not merely a scientific man, a University scholar and professor, but a friendly observer and even a companion of the illiterate red man. As did the empirical, home-bred physician, he affiliated with and studied the processes and remedial agents of whoever took an interest in nature or medicine, be it the aborigine or the mother who made her home remedies and domestic teas, and thus introduced to her family the Indian cures of the American wild man.

Appointed in 1817 to the chair of botany in Transylvania University, Lexington, Kentucky, his field was cosmopolitan, embracing not only botany, but history, ichthyology, geology, and science generally. His "Medical Flora, etc., of the United States," issued in two volumes 1828 and 1830, was practically the first systematic work embracing botany and medicine issued to and from the Middle West. This eccentric enthusiast spent much time in studying medicines of the primitive peoples of the South, the Choctaws, the Chickasaws and the Cherokees, as well as tribes living north of the Ohio River. His study of their methods, their remedies and their habits, was distasteful to many of his systematically schooled associates, but yet these researches gave him a fund of information recognized, long afterwards, by such eminent authorities as Agassiz and Asa Gray. While his great publication followed "Schoepf's *Materia Medica Americana*" (1787), and even B. S. Barton's "Collections" (1781-1804), it yet stood alone, being more comprehensive and discursive, and cosmopolitan, than either

* Readers are referred to the work by Dr. Alexander Wilder, titled "History of Medicine." Also to Dr. H. W. Felter's "History of the Eclectic Medical Institute," Cincinnati, Ohio.

of these. Rafinesque was eccentric, but yet a genius. Highly educated for that period, he was in some regards childlike, self-sacrificing to a degree, patient, visionary and speculative. He occupied a field of his own, that, notwithstanding his self-bred liberties in some directions, must be recognized for all time to come.

Rafinesque was the originator of the principles that later led to the evolution of the *Eclectic School of Medicine*. Indeed, after describing the various classes of American physicians and "dealers" of his day, he defined and introduced the term "Eclectic" as later adopted by Beach (see Beach, p. 27), placing it in a position of its own, as follows:

The *Rational* medical men are liberal and modest, learned and well informed, neither intolerant nor deceitful, and ready to learn or impart information. They comprise the *Improvers*, *Eclectics*, and *Experimentalists*. * * * * * The Eclectics¹ are those who subject and adopt in practice whatever is found beneficial, and who change their prescriptions according to emergencies, circumstances and acquired knowledge.

Various names were given by Rafinesque to the plants observed by him, but while later botanists made many changes in plant nomenclature, it is to be noted that of the plants adopted by the Eclectic school of medicine, the name given by Rafinesque is to-day the principal name in Eclectic literature.² As typical of these, it is sufficient to mention *Macrotys*, universally known in Eclecticism under this name instead of *Cimicifuga*, by which later writers sought to displace the earlier name. Befitting is it that Wooster Beach, Alexander Wilder, John King and other Eclectics, should be considered as followers of Rafinesque, who believed that

"The state of medical knowledge is such in the United States as to require a greater diffusion of acquired knowledge, aided by freedom of enquiry, liberal views, and mutual forbearance,"
and who also believed that

"It is therefore necessary to spread still further correct medical knowledge."

We come now to the

FIRST PUBLICATION OF WOOSTER BEACH.—In 1833 appeared "The American Practice of Medicine, on Vegetable or Botanical Principles," by Wooster Beach, M.D. This work which passed immediately into the hands of the people, was in its Introduction prolific in attacks on medical processes of that date. For example:

"The world groans under the weight of medical publications, and is literally surfeited with them. But what are they? Are they such treatises, or such productions, as are calculated to cure diseases, or ameliorate the sufferings of mankind? They certainly are not, as we have fully demonstrated in the following pages. We have shown that the present practice of medicine, instead of exerting a salutary influence, is pernicious and dangerous in the extreme."

¹ This is the first application of the term "ELECTIC," to designate any school or class of practitioners of medicine established during the 19th century. The definition here given is sufficiently full and explicit to describe the physicians who afterward adopted the appellation. It is not so easy, however, to perceive why the other groups, the "Improvers" and the "Experimentalists," were not included with them, instead of being distinguished as separate bodies.

² Eclectics believe that an established drug name should not be changed to coincide with botanical alterations.

The "licensed physicians," with their heterogeneous processes and medicines, Beach describes as follows:

"They appear to be governed by no principles in the treatment of disease; or, if they have principles, they are at variance with the correct pathology of disease, which renders their treatment very defective, superficial, and often injurious, even more so than that pursued by common physicians. Some have receipts, but no principles; others again have theories, but no remedies. Thus we perceive the labyrinth difficulties in which the medical world are involved. One system succeeds another so quickly that a writer has been constrained to say there is "no uniformity in medical practice." This year a medicine is extolled as a specific; the next it sinks into oblivion. This year one view is entertained of disease, perhaps the next, one entirely opposite."

Recognizing the efforts as well as the mistakes of medical authorities of his time, Beach testifies as follows to the renowned Dr. Samuel Jackson, of Philadelphia:

"Dr. Samuel Jackson, a very respectable physician of Philadelphia, of the old school, thus remarks: It is a subject of well founded complaint, that it has been a prevailing vice with medical writers, to indulge in partial, encomiastic, and it is to be feared, sometimes fanciful representations of the powers and efficacy of some favorite remedy or mode of practice, to the introduction of which into medicine, they have been instrumental, but have not been justified by subsequent experience. Sanguine expectations have been, in this manner, too often injudiciously excited, that have terminated in disappointment dark and bitter, as the hopes they had nurtured were bright and pleasing. How many of the articles of the former *materia medica*, celebrated for their virtues, are now known to be *inert* and *useless*! How many of our present medicines have been invested with curative energies for formidable diseases, in which a sober and matured experience has proved them to be of none or of little avail! What different systems and modes of treatment, founded on *baseless* theories, partial views, and limited observation, have enjoyed their short-lived reigns, extolled and defended by misjudging partizans, but which now lie entombed in dusty and undisturbed tomes, and are brought into recollection only to display the *errors* they embraced, and the *follies* of their pretentions?"

In like manner, Beach credits the efforts of nurses, female practitioners, and root and "Indian" doctors. Let us quote:

"I have spared neither pains nor expense to acquire a knowledge of the practice of the most noted botanical physicians, retaining from each everything which I have proved by experience, to be useful. I have not thought it beneath me to converse with *Root and Indian Doctors*, and every one who has professed to possess any valuable remedy, or any improved method of treating any disease. The hints and suggestions of experienced nurses and female practitioners have not escaped my notice. For, says a former President of the New York College of Physicians and Surgeons, 'there is not a maxim or remark of any experienced female or nurse, which is not based upon sound pathological principles.' They are generally diligent observers of nature and often point out her indications in a correct and masterly manner, which often disappoints the physician and the friends of the patient. I have also availed myself of every advantage arising from a regular course of study in the University of the State of New York."

Finally, Beach appeals to "The people generally," regretting that therapeutic information was not being taught, authoritatively, to the laymen, contrasting with this neglect the processes adopted in other educational directions. He says:

"The different branches of philosophy have also of late been very universally studied by all who pretended to a liberal education. The advantages of this are manifest. It frees the mind from prejudices and superstition; fits it for the investigation of truth; induces habits of reasoning and judging properly; opens an inexhaustible source of entertainment; paves the way

to the improvement of arts and agriculture; and qualifies men for acting with propriety in the most important stations of life.

Natural History has likewise become an object of general attention; and it well deserves to be so. It leads to discoveries of the greatest importance. Indeed, agriculture, the most useful of all arts, is only a branch of Natural History, and can never arrive at a high degree of improvement where the study of that science is neglected.

Medicine, however, has not, as far as I know, in any country, been reckoned a necessary part of the education of a gentleman. But surely no sufficient reason can be assigned for this omission. No science lays open a more extensive field of useful knowledge, or affords more ample entertainment to an inquisitive mind. Anatomy, Botany, Chemistry, and the *Materia Medica*, are all branches of Natural History, and are fraught with such amusement and utility, that the man who entirely neglects them has but a sorry claim either to taste or learning. If a gentleman has turn for observation, says an excellent and sensible writer, surely the natural history of his own species is a more interesting subject, and presents a more ample field for the exertion of genius, than the natural history of spiders and cockle-shells."

Dr. Beach calls attention to the fact that it would be illogical to attempt to make physicians of the people at large. He believed, however, that they should be educated in the simplest form of anatomy and physiology, and should be instructed in the direction of simple ailments, as well as how to care for themselves in emergency cases. Such a course, he believed, would also protect them against superstition and quackery. Let us quote:

"We do not mean that every man should become a physician. This would be an attempt as ridiculous as it is impossible. All we plead for is, that men of sense and learning should be so far acquainted with the general principles of medicine as to be in a condition to derive from it some of those advantages with which it is fraught; and at the same time to guard themselves against the destructive influence of Ignorance, Superstition and Quackery."

In an altruistic manner he deprecates the methods of some of the leaders in medicine, as well as of the many concerned in medical politics. Very plainly does he speak:

"The veil of mystery, which still hangs over Medicine, renders it not only a conjectural but even a suspicious art. This has been long ago removed from the other sciences, which induces many to believe that Medicine is a mere trick, and that it will not bear a fair and candid examination. Medicine, however, needs only to be better known, in order to secure the general esteem of mankind. Its precepts are such as every wise man would choose to observe, and it forbids nothing but what is compatible with true happiness."

Criticizing the making of medicine as a close-communion professional trade, he advocates opening the door of knowledge to the people:

"Disguising medicine not only retards its improvement as a science, but exposes the profession to ridicule, and is injurious to the true interests of society. An art, founded on observation, can never arrive at any high degree of improvement, while it is confined to a few who make a trade of it."

Very severe is Beach on the mystery practiced by the licensed practitioner, linking the methods of even the honest physician who from the people disguises his processes, with those of the charlatan and the quack:

"The appearance of mystery in the conduct of physicians not only renders their art suspicious, but lays the foundations of Quackery, which is the disgrace of Medicine. No two characters can be more different than the honest physician and the quack; yet they have generally been very much confounded. The line between them is not sufficiently apparent; at least it is too fine for the general eye. Few persons are able to distinguish sufficiently between the conduct

of that man who administers a secret medicine, and him who writes a prescription in mystical characters and an unknown tongue. Thus the conduct of the honest physician, which needs no disguise, gives a sanction to that of the villain, whose sole consequence depends upon secrecy."

Attacking the method of protecting the physician by law, Dr. Beach advocates *the making of the people wiser*:

"No laws will ever be able to prevent quackery, while people believe that the quack is as honest a man, and as well qualified as the physician. A very small degree of medical knowledge, however, will be sufficient to break this spell; and nothing else can effectually undeceive them. It is the ignorance and credulity of the multitude, with regard to Medicine, which renders them such an easy prey to every one who has the hardiness to attack them on this quarter. Nor can the evil be remedied by any other means than by making them wiser."

To this he adds:

"The most effectual way to destroy quackery in any art or science, is to diffuse the knowledge of it among mankind."

In the following he strikes at the patent medicine man:

"A sensible lady, rather than read a medical performance, which would instruct her in the management of her children, generally leaves them entirely to the care and conduct of the most ignorant, credulous, and superstitious part of the human species."

Next we find a plea for good nursing and service to the poor:

"Many things are necessary for the sick besides Medicine. Nor is the person who takes care to procure these for them, of less importance than a physician. The poor oftener perish in diseases for want of proper nursing than of Medicine. They are frequently in want of even the necessaries of life, and still more so of what is proper for a sick-bed. No one can imagine, who has not been a witness of these situations, how much good a well-disposed person may do, by only taking care to have such wants supplied."

Dr. Beach closes his article by a plea in behalf of liberality of method and community education:

"To disenfranchise the public mind, medical men must cast off the whole garb of the charlatan, nor suffer anything to remain which shall confound medical philosophy with empiricism. The profession must seize every opportunity to educate the community to the first principles of medicine, and when this is accomplished, the medical scholar may, in public opinion, safely rest his ripened claims to reputation, which now is often wrested from him, when he will not resort to the degrading tricks of the charlatan to maintain it. * * * * *

"In addressing, therefore, the educated public, I conceive that I am indirectly subserving the true interests of my profession, while my direct object is the instruction of others. I consider, also, that it is an urgent dictate of humanity to furnish the community with a certain amount of knowledge, particularly in surgery, because at this time they are singularly ignorant of its simplest principles—because infinite mischief and suffering is created by its abuse—and because the maladies which demand the surgeon, are such as brook not a moment's delay. Accidents often occur which prove immediately fatal, when the knowledge of a single fact would enable any individual at least to arrest the hand of death till more efficient aid could be procured."

The entire Introduction of this work of Beach (often called the Father of Eclecticism) should be read by anyone interested in the problems discussed.¹ Enough has been cited to illustrate the position taken by Dr. Beach in this, the first balanced treatise on American medicine, designed for the American public.

¹ Foot-note preceding, considers Rafinesque to be the pioneer.—L.

In closing this phase of American medicine, let us now contrast the methods of Beach the "Father of Eclecticism" with those of his contemporary, Samuel Thomson.

1. Beach believed in education, in colleges of medicine, and in hospital service. Thomson, whose publications antedated those of Beach, opposed every phase of medical collegiate education, every phase of "licensed" medical practice, viciously assailing all the processes of the medical profession.

2. Beach believed in giving priority to vegetable remedies. So did Thomson. But Beach freely used whatever botanicals in his opinion served the interests of medicine, whereas Thomson excluded the use of all poisons, and bitterly assailed Beach and his followers for their use of such remedies as digitalis and hyoscyamus.

3. Thomson traveled over the country selling his patent rights to practice medicine, to whoever was in a position to purchase the same, whereas, Beach opposed patent and secret compounds.

4. Both Beach and Thomson believed in teaching the people how to care for simple ailments. Both were opposed to heroic medication, as practiced in their day. Alike they met the resistance of many excellent medical authorities who differed from some of their ideals. Each gave rise to a section in American medicine, one known as the Thomsonian, the other as the Eclectic.

Summary.—While a fraternal spirit existed between these independent schools of medicine, in that, both being ostracised and opposed by the "old school," they were at times forced to unite their efforts for their common protection, in some directions there existed between the Thomsonians and the Eclectics, greater bitterness than between either of them and the "old school."

For reasons that need not be there discussed, the Thomsonian school gradually lessened in importance, mainly because of the heroic processes adopted in its therapy. At the same time the Eclectic school increased in numbers, gradually forming a distinct organization and instituting several colleges in different parts of America, under the name "Reform" or "Eclectic." One of the oldest of these, founded under the direct auspices of Wooster Beach himself, was organized as the medical department of Worthington College under the name *Reformed Medical College of Ohio*. This institution was opened for instruction in December, 1830. In the winter of 1842-3 it was removed to Cincinnati, Ohio, where it still survives, a flourishing institution, under the title, *Eclectic Medical College*.¹

Eclecticism as Represented by Dr. John King.—About 1852 appeared the epoch-making publication of Dr. John King, "The American Dispensary," followed, in 1857, by his "American Family Physician or Domestic Guide to Health." Through their acceptance of the writings of King and other leaders, who followed Beach, the father of the school, the Eclectic school of medicine officially acquiesced in the view that the treatment of the people by balanced educational methods was an all important section of the physician's field. Let us then consider carefully the ideals of King, as presented in the Preface to his "Family Physician," the opening sentence of which reads as follows:

"In presenting this work to the public, it will be proper to remark that it is not designed to supersede the attendance of a physician in cases of disease, nor to make skilful practitioners of non-medical persons."

¹ See Felter's "History of the Eclectic Medical Institute."

In a pronounced manner King asserts that the physician is all important, in that disease as a whole can be rationally treated only by men of "medical education." He says:

"Medical education—a long and close study of the various departments of medical science, as Anatomy, Physiology, Materia Medica, Chemistry, etc., together with actual practical experience. Such knowledge and skill belong only to the educated physician, to whom it will always be found the most prudent and safest course to apply, whenever the symptoms of disease manifest themselves."

King admits freely the danger of illogical home practice, thus excusing educated physicians, as a class, for opposing it. Let us quote:

"Knowing the dangers to which the sick are exposed, when treated by persons not thoroughly conversant with medical science, the educated physician is usually opposed to the dissemination of popular works which instruct the people how to practice medicine, not because he desires to have them ignorant of such matters, but because he is aware that more evil than benefit is apt to follow the practice of even professing practitioners whose medical information is very limited."

Next we find a plea for general education in fundamental lines conducive to the care of the public:

"The better will it be for the liberal and unprejudiced physician, who is aware that the more the public know of the organization of the human system, its various functions, the causes of its impairment, as well as the means to repair it, because this knowledge, even limited as it may be, will aid in enabling the public to 'distinguish the man of merit from the pretender.'"

He argues, further,

"There very frequently are circumstances under which individuals may be placed, in which the possession of a work, written in plain language, with plain directions, may be the means of saving, not only health, but even life. * * * * *

"How often does it happen that a farmer becomes suddenly attacked with disease, or disabled by accident, in which delay would prove dangerous. A physician is sent for in haste, he resides many miles distant, and cannot be had for hours, perhaps days. If, however, a "Domestic Guide to Health" is at hand, the friends may refer to its pages, pursue the measures therein recommended, and not only save the patient much distress and suffering until the arrival of the physician, but perhaps, save his life. One life thus preserved, is a sufficient reason for the publication of a popular medical work."

Next he meets strictures already offered against home education, that will probably by some persons yet be offered:

"Although persons may undertake the management of minor maladies according to the book in their possession, it is rarely the case that they are disposed to trust themselves in the more severe forms, when the professional services of a physician can be had. In country places, and on plantations, patients are frequently lost, because the services of a physician cannot be procured in time; and at sea it is still worse, for weeks and even months may pass without the attendance of a medical man."

Having thus briefly covered the field as then presented in American practice he outlines the plan of the work, as conceived by him for the benefit of the people. His opening sentences are as follows:

"This work is more especially prepared for the purpose of meeting these emergencies, and, as the title imports, it is arranged to meet the wants of the physician, Families, and those residing on plantations, or traveling by sea or land.

"In the Introduction will be found valuable instructions for the promotion of health and longevity by hygienical and dietetical measures."

We are now prepared to comprehend more fully the aims of the author and the book itself, ("The American Family Physician"), which is dedicated *To The American People*. In this volume of 800 pages, Dr. King, in a plain, forcible manner, gives advice serviceable alike to physicians and pharmacists, as well as to the intelligent public. Throughout the entire work we find an effort made to teach the people the importance of the educated physician, and the necessity of leaning upon him excepting in emergencies, where they should be qualified, temporarily, to serve themselves. Let it be added that the ideals presented by King, no less than by Beach, permeated the physicians of the Eclectic school in America, and by fully establishing the fact that home treatment under advice of the physician, in the absence of the physician, was not antagonistic to the treatment of disease by the physician, helped physicians of other schools, as well as Eclectic. And thus King became, directly and indirectly, of incalculable benefit to the American people.

In the "Family Physician" were described, with processes for their home preparation, simple infusions and decoctions, as well as liniments, and simple remedial agents for emergency cases, such as diarrhea, eye affections, ailments of the skin, frost bites, coughs and colds, wounds and sprains. Many ointments and simple plasters were also described, as well as compounds that should be made by pharmacists and distributed to the people by physicians, to be kept in the home for use in the absence of the physician. Professor King believed that *the care of the family* was the responsibility of the physician, and that in the temporary absence of the physician, the family should not be deprived of his services. Nor did he believe that higher ideals, whether in medicine or in pharmacy, were advanced by the ignorance of the people.

We find that a whole line of domestic remedies became known to the people as presented under authority of Eclectic physicians. Thus, properly labeled and described, stillingia liniment became valued for throat ailments, lobelia compounds for threatened pneumonia, opodeldoc (not originating in King's School), for bruises and sprains, and various styptic powders and applications for the prevention of the flow of blood. Many remedies thus introduced, such as ophthalmic balsam as a substitute for "Pettit's Eye Salve," became very popular with the medical profession as well as the people, while King's "Neutralizing Cordial" which became so popular as, in 1860, to receive recognition, under the name *Syrupus Rhei et Potassae*, in the Pharmacopœia of the United States, is not the only Eclectic product contributed to the enrichment of that Standard.

Let us now pass to the next important work on domestic medicine, issued under the auspices of the Eclectic school of medicine.

Scudder's Domestic Medicine.—In 1887, thirty years after the issue of Dr. King's "American Family Physician," appeared the "Eclectic Family Physician," by Professor John M. Scudder, M.D., then a professor in the Eclectic Medical Institute, and a leading authority in the Eclectic school of medicine. Dr. Scudder had written several publications designed for the exclusive use of physicians, and yet believed that a publication that would bring families under the care of the physician, into closer touch with the medical profession, was desirable. He

accepted also that to institute home treatment of disease, under the authority of the physician, would tend to separate the people from the pernicious influence of advertised cure-alls, as well as objectionable, or even harmful, advertised preparations that should not be in the hands of the people. It will be seen that this line of reasoning agreed with the early processes of the eclectic school of medicine, as instituted by Beach and continued by his followers, including Dr. John King.

With these suggestive remarks, let us quote the opening sentence of the Preface to Dr. Scudder's "Eclectic Family Physician:"

"The present volume is offered to the public with the belief that there is an earnest desire by many to understand more of the structure and functions of their own bodies, and to qualify themselves to meet cases of emergency, when a competent physician cannot be obtained."

The following sentence comments upon the fact that a knowledge of human anatomy, physiology and ailments, was woefully lacking with the American people:

"Men and women know less of themselves than they know of anything else, and it is not only surprising, but often humiliating, to witness the gross ignorance displayed on these subjects by persons who are otherwise well informed."

Dr. Scudder next touches the question of hygiene and lack of good nursing, also the fact that the reasoning power of the sick is enfeebled, so that they cannot distinguish between the educated physician and the charlatan. He writes:

"It would seem, sometimes, as if man's reasoning powers were in complete abeyance when they or their families are sick, being as ready to employ the merest charlatan or nostrum vender, as the educated physician, and to disregard the plainest rules of hygiene, as to give the patient good nursing."

Commenting on the fact that life and health are dearer than worldly possessions, he criticises the people's lack of care in conserving good health:

"There is nothing that a man loves as he loves life, and life has no blessing like health; why, therefore, are people so indifferent to that knowledge that will enable them to prolong the one, and preserve the other?"

Having made these arguments, all of which are addressed to the laymen, he asserts:

"Men and women should care to understand the structure and functions of their own bodies, and how to avoid the causes of disease. So, also, should they use a sound discretion in selecting a medical adviser, and avoid ignorant pretenders, and patent nostrums, using their reason from absolute knowledge, and not governed by emotional impulse, or by novelty or superstition."

Having thus discussed the problems with his reader, he asks why these conditions exist. In doing this, he makes a genteel criticism of both the medical profession and the laymen:

"The reasons for this present themselves to me as follows: First, physicians in all ages have tried to confine a knowledge of medical subjects to their own profession, and have successfully accomplished their purpose by making it a breach of *medical ethics* to write on medicine for the people. Second, the public have been instructed to believe that these subjects are beyond the ordinary powers of comprehension; that there is something impure, if not sinful, in their study and that it would be a great breach of propriety, if nothing worse, to endeavor to learn that which has so strenuously been kept from them."

Accepting, as did his predecessors, that one danger in home medication lay in the fear that, through the emergency care of the afflicted and wounded, the minds of the laymen might be imbued with the thought that the care of the educated physician could be generally displaced by such processes. This phase of the problem is discursively met by Dr. Scudder, as follows:

"In undertaking to present that knowledge which I consider it the duty of every one to possess, I do not wish to be understood as holding the opinion 'that every man can be his own doctor.' Every person should know how to avoid disease, how to act in cases of accident and injury, how to treat simple cases of disease, and how to nurse and properly care for the sick. It is this knowledge that I have attempted to give in the following pages, using plain language that may be understood by all.

"I am satisfied that no person who will carefully read its pages, will be led into injudicious experimenting upon their own bodies, or their neighbors, but that they will be enabled, in most cases, to decide when simple remedies are sufficient, and when it is necessary to have skilled advice."

In one important respect, Dr. Scudder deviates from the methods of his predecessors. Instead of attempting to include in his volume under his own name, a problem of nursing, he refers his reader to the publication of "Miss Florence Nightingale," who for her self-sacrificing efforts he eulogizes, as follows:

"On the subject of nursing, I have preferred to give the small work of Miss Florence Nightingale complete, rather than write on the subject myself. Her devotion to the sick and wounded in the Crimean war, placed her foremost in the list of benevolent women, and gave her a world-wide reputation. In this small volume she gives the results of a lifetime's experience, and, addressed by a woman to those who have care of the sick, it cannot but make a good impression. The language is clear and concise, and her deductions are based on a very large experience, and upon the facts of science."

In his introduction (following the Preface), Dr. Scudder considers briefly the origin of medicine, and the differences between the various schools of medicine, all of which he conceded, are imbued with the same kindly tone and humanitarian ideal. After this he discusses briefly, neglected educational opportunities of the laymen, such as anatomy, which should be generally understood, physiology as being possible to a layman, and hygiene that should be comprehended by everyone. He takes up (Part III) "Medicine for Family Use," conservatively introducing the problem as follows:

"Medicines for family use should be few and simple, and such as will tend to favor nature's processes of cure. The harsher and more violent means of treatment should always be left in the hands of the physician, as it is not to be supposed that the unprofessional person can have such knowledge and experience, as will render their use safe and beneficial. Medicine should be used only when there seems to be absolute need for it, and in all, but the milder cases of disease, under the direction of a well educated physician. Still, there are many minor ills that may be appropriately treated by the family, and in many cases it being impossible to obtain a physician, even severe cases, will for a while, remain under domestic management."

With the confidence both of the physician experienced in family practice, and as one imbued with the highest ideals as concerns the welfare of both the laymen and the physician, Dr. Scudder in this book defines symptoms and describes prevailing diseases, in language that a layman can comprehend. Strange that anyone should oppose such processes. Surely the giving of information to persons

far removed from the physician, as in the mountains or on the desert, or the teaching of a mother how to meet a sudden attack of croup, or incipient pneumonia, how to bandage and dress the wound of a child, how to care for bee-stings and bites of venomous creatures, and what to do in other emergencies in the absence of the physician, is conducive to the true ethics of the profession, as well as the best interests of the people. A man qualified to treat sunstroke, how to resuscitate a person suffocated by drowning, how to manage burns, should not be forbidden to do so either by professional ethics, or by law. Just how far these processes may be carried into home life, depends upon the intelligence of the family, and the instruction given by the physician caretaker, but, here partial comprehension is better than total ignorance. In Dr. Scudder's opinion, the qualified physician, not the almanac, (too often the resort of others than the ignorant in his day), was the proper agent to determine this point, and to guide, as well as protect, the public. He went beyond Dr. King, in that he devised a *family medicine case*, to be placed in the home by the attending physician, or purchased from the pharmacist under his guidance, arguing that:

"Every family should keep such remedies in the house as will answer in trivial cases, and even to be given in the severer ones, until a physician can be obtained."

Dr. Scudder taught the people more explicitly and directly than did Dr. King, and extended his advice more technically, accepting that the people were then better informed than when Dr. King in 1857 presented his "Family Practice." In this he succeeded admirably. Even in a large city practice like that of Cincinnati, he established a record that may be taken as a typical example of professional service, rendered under ideals that made the physician a home adviser and family care-taker. Although Dr. Scudder's practice was large, few, if any patrons were left uninformed concerning self-care such as has been stated herein. The writer of these lines speaks by authority, in that, not only were these people made self-dependent in emergencies, but were drawn closer to Dr. Scudder than one could have thought possible. Instead of considering the physician as a dealer in the mysterious, or an autocrat of a superior class, their balanced judgment led to greater dependence on this man, who took even little children into friendly confidence. Instead of the almanac, Dr. Scudder became thus their therapeutic teacher. Instead of the newspaper, the medical profession as a whole became their recognized authority.

Seldom was a secret or advertised cure to be found in the family of a patient, either of Dr. King in former times, or later, that of Dr. Scudder. The harmless and yet effective family medicines introduced by Drs. Beach and King—such as Neutralizing Cordial, Stillingia Liniment, various home-made teas, decoctions and Infusions, well-known herbs, barks and roots, Dr. Scudder replaced with more elegant pharmaceutical preparations, previously unknown. Possibly in this sense one might even criticise the introduction to home use of some of the energetics constituting Dr. Scudder's medicine case, but so thoroughly informed were the recipients of the case that I have never known a harmful result to follow their use.

(To be concluded in August Issue)
