

removed seven teeth, all firmly set—five molars and two cuspidati or eye teeth. In extracting the first tooth, too much electricity was applied, and the patient complained of pain from the shock, but not from the removal of the tooth. In the second tooth too little was applied, and the tooth itself gave pain. After this, we were able to regulate the quantity, so that neither the electricity nor the extraction of the tooth gave much pain. Patient not at all nervous, and frequently expressed herself highly pleased with the operation. The feeling experienced during the extraction of the teeth, as she expressed it, was a benumbing sensation about the tooth, which appears to be attached only to the gum.

"Second Case.—Extracted six teeth. Patient somewhat debilitated from previous suffering with her teeth, and quite nervous. Suffered considerable pain during the operation, but would not allow one to be extracted without electricity.

"Third Case.—Extracted four teeth. Patient suffered but little pain.

"Fourth Case.—Extracted a molar tooth, that had been previously broken, for a highly intelligent gentleman, from a neighboring village. He was much pleased with the operation, and was very enthusiastic in his praises of electricity as applied to Dental Surgery.

"Fifth and last Case, that I will report at present.—Extracted ten teeth for an elderly lady. Expressed no fear or pain during the operation, and seemed to treat the affair as a mere trifle, which might be attended to any morning, without much inconvenience.

"The general expression by those who have tried it, seems to be decidedly in favor of electricity in extracting teeth.

(From the Dental News Letter.)

AMERICAN DENTISTS ABROAD.

BY W. L. TINKER.

I am a constant reader of your valuable journal, with the rest of the profession who are anxious not to be found in the back ground, in regard to the advanced and advancing state of American Dentistry. I use the word American Dentistry to denote the highest perfection of the art, a distinct term now used by the scientific world abroad, voluntarily conceded to us for our merit of discovery, improvement, and scientific attainment.

I regret to see it now too often abused by foreigners claiming to be American Dentists, in foreign countries. Having resided abroad a number of years, I have often met with many of these "genuine American" dentists. Upon a strict inquiry, I have found some to have resided only six months, others a year, and, in one or two cases, two years in the United States. All have studied with our most

eminent dentists in New York, Philadelphia, Boston or Baltimore. One or two had diplomas—by what means I do not know. all were "Doctors in Dental Surgery," as a matter of course. They seemed to have been apt students who had discovered the royal road to dentistry, leaping, Minerva-like, to full-grown D.D.S.'s (in their modest opinion, in most cases,) from our Dental Colleges, the doors of which they had never entered, not wasting their precious time or money (if they ever had any) in these preliminary studies, deemed of the utmost importance. Some had assumed English names. A Pole called himself "Johnson." A Frenchman belonged to the vast family of "Smiths." A Dutchman or Swede belonged to the "Browns." None of them could speak good English. I found a Spaniard, who had worked at mechanical dentistry, in Madrid, with an American Dentist, announcing himself as a "Dista Americano." I asked him what part of the United States he had seen? what cities he had practised in? and found, to my surprise, that Havana (Cuba) was the only American city he had lived in. He could not even speak two words of English.

Let the dentists in the United States be more careful in taking students, and especially foreigners, and extremely guarded about granting certificates, that the name of an American Dentist may continue to retain that elevated position it has heretofore had, and American Dentistry still continue to be held as the true distinction of superiority in the art.

"Have you an 'American Dentist' in this place?" is the first question asked by all enlightened travellers in foreign countries, when they require any operations in the art. The word American is always prefixed, to denote the best; and if there is not any, the answer is, "Well, I'll wait until I get to another place where I may find one;" unless the urgency of the case will not admit of any delay.

It is the greatest evidence of our estimation abroad, and let us still labor to keep that high rank which the world has conceded to us of its own accord, and be extremely cautious that the term American Dentistry shall ever be understood as heretofore.

"CHLOROFORM IN DENTISTRY.

There is an impression abroad amongst dentists that every man is his own keeper, and that his life is in his own hands. Lamartine says that it is strongly characteristic of the weakness and imperfection of humanity, and typical of our earthly nature, that man comes into the world impotent to save himself, or to add one day to his life when beneath the edge of the mortal shears, destitute and helpless, but armed with the power of annihilation and

self-destruction. This privilege the dentists of some sort are disposed to grant freely to their dupes. Chloroform is undoubtedly a mortal agent, an agent which may become inimical to life. Its risks have but too frequently and too fatally been shown by many recent accidents, and especially by the unhappy death at Epsom, on the 27th ult., of a person, to whom it was administered by a druggist. There is a moral as well as an intellectual side to our art, and to the art of the true dentists. It is time that the ethics of chloroformization were established. The extraction of a tooth is not an operation which in any way bears upon life; it is not in itself attended with any risk. The deaths which chloroform has occasioned, when administered to facilitate this process, are unbalanced by any corresponding gain of equal import. The moral duty of the dentist is therefore clear. He has not the right to risk the patient's life for the extraction of teeth. The timidity of the patient or her pressing entreaties are not more germane to this consideration of duty than her rank or her wealth would be. In the cause of life everything is permissible. It is justifiable to refute the arguments of her ladyship; it is right to give a flat denial to her grace. However crooked those cruel fangs, they are less pitiless than the fangs of death; and though the patient turns rebellious from the door, it is better than that she should have found there 'that bourne whence no traveller returns.' It is chiefly our fashionable ladies who demand chloroform. This time it was a servant girl who was sacrificed; the next time it may be a duchess. If a patient should press urgently for any dangerous poison it would not be administered to her, notwithstanding her own personal responsibility. Nor should chloroform, although only probably dangerous to life. Henceforward we think that this must be looked upon as a matter of conscience amongst operators. To our thinking they are bound to withhold chloroform for the extraction of teeth by every consideration of right and moral responsibility."—*Lond. Lancet.*

MORAL GREATNESS.

ONLY moral greatness is truly sublime. The gladiator may discipline his sinews, and almost compete in strength even with his maddened adversary. And there are modern as well as ancient names, which awaken pity, if not contempt, for their owners, on account of the fearful perversion of their splendid talents. But when we read or hear of Howard, the illustrious philanthropist, the soul—debased as it may be—bends with instinctive homage, and feels as if a ray from his beatified spirit illumined and purified its purposes.—*Dr. Warland.*