

FLAGG (J. F.)

“IN ABSENTIA,”

BY

J. FOSTER FLAGG, D. D. S.,

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

LIBRARY  
SURGEON GENERAL'S OFFICE

MAR 10 1900

649



The New York Odontological Society held its regular meeting on Tuesday evening, April 10th, 1888, in the parlors of the New York Academy of Medicine, No. 12 West Thirty-first street.

The President, Dr. J. Morgan Howe, in the chair.

The President. We will now pass to the consideration of the subject of the evening:—

“METALS AND OTHER MATERIALS FOR FILLING TEETH.”

This is intended to include a discussion of the subjects of gutta-percha and amalgam, and especially the papers of Drs. Flagg and Bonwill, which there was not time to discuss at their reading. As Dr. Flagg's paper was the more recent and is fresher in our minds, we will consider that and the subject of gutta-percha first. I will ask Dr. Payne to favor us with what he has to say on the subject of gutta-percha.

Dr. E. T. Payne. The address delivered at our last meeting by Prof. Flagg would have been more profitable, it appears to me, if his remarks had been formulated for a paper which could have been read in forty minutes or one hour. Members could then have asked questions and brought out points which would have been instructive, and, I am inclined to think, more profitable than the protracted talk.

After eliminating the cavities where the speaker said gutta-percha was not indicated as a desirable filling for permanency, there can be no controversy as to its being the most permanent and useful filling for the class of cavities selected for its use. It confirms the judgment of men of experience—nothing more. Prof. Flagg distinctly said he did not want the material looked upon as a crutch to help us over difficult places, and spoke disparagingly of Dr. Atkinson, who had recommended it in that relation. His teaching in respect to this point will not be accepted by those practitioners who have kept sensitive, low-toned teeth quiet and comfortable with gutta-percha until something more permanent could be used. If young men do accept such teaching they will deny themselves a great help to usefulness.

I heartily indorse all that was said about using steam heat in preparing the filling for the cavity, and the heating of instruments also. Too much care cannot be taken in this matter. Heating any gutta-percha stopping over the flame of a lamp is bad practice, and generally results in more or less injury to the filling. Dr. Hill once told me he was convinced comparatively few dentists used gutta-percha in such a way as to obtain the best result. My experience induces me to indorse what he said so many years ago.

Regarding the longevity of gutta-percha fillings, I want to say that

FOR THE PUBLIC OFFICE

MAY 10 1888

649

undoubtedly it is true that in a few instances fillings made of gutta-percha remained in teeth twenty years or more. Prof. Flagg left it a fair inference that the same result would obtain now if the case was favorable and a good quality of gutta-percha was properly used. The inference is *misleading* and *untrue*.

In a paper on gutta-percha read before this society four years ago, I stated that the gum obtained by cutting the tree and scraping the inside of the bark was much superior to any obtained by tapping. It is to that superior quality of gum—which Dr. Hill used the first years of his experience—that the results so much talked about are due. The specimens displayed by the speaker, both the crude and that which was prepared for the teeth, are the product of tapping. Fillings made in the best manner with such material will not last longer than from two to eight years. Very few, indeed, will last more than four. Let us not deceive ourselves. It cannot be depended upon as formerly. The reason is the inferiority of the base. A fountain does not rise above its source.

I object to the speaker's position in claiming so much for the material. It is very useful, and the cause is weakened by claiming too much. Young practitioners should be taught these facts instead of accepting the fair inference from Professor Flagg's remarks that if his steam-made stopping is used all will go well for from five to thirty years. His statement that red gutta-percha shrinks more than any other may be proved by test-tubes, but my experience proves that it will last longer than the average stopping. One reason is it has less foreign substance incorporated into it. Pure gum would outlast any other, and if it could be used to advantage, it would be almost perfect as to its lasting qualities. Its color, however, is objectionable.

I repeat what I said in my paper four years ago, that, just in proportion as the particles are separated by a foreign substance, just in that proportion is the substance weakened both in strength and in ability to resist the fluids of the mouth.

We were told by Prof. Flagg that it is our duty to test the material before using it, as one can do so in a few minutes in his office. A little farther on we are told that so difficult is an analysis of the material that it is not known positively what substance Hill incorporated with his base. His statement that Hill's formula is unknown, because he did not happen to know it, is suggestive and amusing, to say the least. There was no intimation that gutta-percha stopping was not in every way as good now as it was twenty-five or thirty years ago when Hill and Bevans were using the gum before referred to. He knew, of course, that the best stopping in the market to day is very much inferior to the article which gave the filling material its deservedly high repu-

tation From such a source of learning and respectability we had a right to look for the whole picture. His assertion, for instance, that a good stopping cannot be made without steam heat, porcelain slabs, etc., is a dogmatic assumption which he refutes when he further says Hill's stopping lasted thirty years, etc. Hill never used steam heat.

From my experience with the preparation of the material I am confident steam heat is better than dry heat and kneading-sticks. But to say that good results cannot be obtained in the old way is not true. I experimented all one winter to make an improvement in the texture of the manufactured material, as there was such an evident falling off in quality, and I found the whole trouble was with the base. Until the material can be obtained as it used to be, by cutting the tree, I propose to use the filling for what it is worth, as I find it, not expecting too much from it, or what was once realized.

The President. The next contribution to the subject of the evening will be a paper by Dr. Bogue, which he will kindly read now.

Dr. E. A. Bogue then read the following paper, entitled:—

“FILLING MATERIALS AND METHODS,”

in which, after referring to materials and methods, he continued as follows:—

“I think we all owe our thanks to Dr. Flagg for his late discourse on gutta-percha, and especially for the clear way in which he has defined the class of cases where its use as a filling for decayed teeth is indicated. His enthusiasm leads him to say some things, however, that ought to be challenged. If he is right, it can be proven; if wrong, it is the function of this society to point it out.

“As one person, I regret that Dr. Flagg felt it necessary to excuse himself for the exclusive use of plastics, or that he cited the fact of his presence before this society as an ‘evidence that he had maintained his respectability.’ He ought not to need any such evidence. It has been the maxim of this society to ‘prove all things, and hold fast that which is good.’ So all men having ideas to present have been welcomed.

“It has been Dr. Flagg's effort for more than twenty years, of my personal knowledge, to save teeth that many other practitioners would extract. The good that he has accomplished commands sincere respect; but I cannot say as much for some of his statements and some of his methods. I regret to hear such words as these: ‘I want to induce you to try these things, for certainly you must understand that you know little or nothing about plastic fillings. You may have been told that my practice is among the rag-tag and bob-tail from the gutters of Philadelphia, but you know very well that my patients are among the very

best, the most intelligent, and the most wealthy of the people of that city, and are typical individuals of their class; and yet they are perfectly satisfied with the work I do for them.'

"Comforting the declining years of aged people, even if they are millionaires or members of the best society, by preserving their natural teeth, using the gentlest possible means, whether those means be gutta-percha or amalgam, is praiseworthy. But can we denominate as praiseworthy and strictly scientific a sentence like this: 'If I do not know when it is best to extract a tooth, I do not know which of you does.' Or a question so misleading as this: 'If you place your gutta-percha, properly prepared, where little or no wear can come upon it, in such wise that you know just as well as you know anything that a zinc-phosphate filling would not have lasted two little years, a gold filling would not have lasted five years, an amalgam filling would not have lasted more than ten years, and your gutta-percha filling lasted fifteen years,—then I ask of you if gutta-percha properly used is not the most permanent filling material we possess?' Dr. Flagg leads up to an answer which he seems to desire, but it should be recognized that his premises are not generally to be admitted without question, hence his inferences are often fallacious. Very few men, except Dr. Flagg, have seen many gutta-percha fillings fifteen years old, and Dr. Flagg himself is greatly elated by coming across such fillings. In such cases, undoubtedly it was the best material.

"But when Dr. Flagg's next sentence asserts interrogatively that gutta-percha, properly used, is the most permanent filling we possess, I think his enthusiasm would make his hearers infer more than he actually means; particularly when he continues by saying, 'I want to leave with you to-night the impression that you can work gutta-percha precisely the same as you work cohesive gold.' Yet farther on he admits the value of copper amalgam in desperate cases. Dr. Flagg counsels us to 'have our gutta-percha tested, so that we know exactly what it is composed of and the proportions of it,' and he says 'any man can test it in ten minutes in his office.' Three minutes later Dr. Flagg says: 'We have known positively for half a century that Hill's gutta-percha stopping was not made of quicklime and silex, but do not know what it was made of. So difficult is its analysis that we have not been able to say positively what Dr. Hill made his stopping of.' A little later in his address Dr. F. says: 'The only way for you to use gutta-percha successfully is to test the various materials before putting them into the mouth. It is the work of a life-time.'

"'Ten minutes' have lengthened into 'half a century,' and half a

century into a life-time very quickly—but, as Dr. Flagg says he tells ‘the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth,’ we must seek to reconcile these conflicting statements as best we may.

“Dr. Flagg says next: ‘I do not want *my* material to be looked upon as a crutch.’ He will, it is hoped, pardon the suggestion that this society was not aware that gutta-percha was a proprietary article, and it must regard all subjects brought before it as absolutely free for discussion. Dr. Payne asked how Dr. Flagg accounted for the protection of the tooth against decay when the shrinkage of a gutta-percha filling necessarily admits more or less moisture to the cavity, when disintegration of tooth would ensue if a gold filling leaked? (Please notice Dr. Payne’s admission of the correctness of the general belief that a leaky gold filling will allow disintegration of tooth-substance around it.) Dr. Flagg replied that the gutta-percha was a non-conductor of galvanic or electric currents, and that, *therefore*, no chemical action takes place between the gutta-percha and the tooth-bone. He says the only action that can take place is the leakage of moisture.

“Dr. Flagg, speaking of amalgams, says that ‘amalgam permits moisture to do good.’ He claims to recognize that fact, and, therefore, says that ‘amalgams that do not shrink are not as good tooth-savers as amalgams which shrink.’ He has much to say about tooth-savers, meaning fillings. His practice necessarily leads to inaccuracies both in excavation and in adaptation of filling materials. He has invited the worst class of cases and the worst class of teeth. As it would be a physical impossibility to use gold in most of those cases, Dr. Flagg has elected to use plastics in all of them. The results obtained are the sum of his experience. This experience, though strictly empirical, is most valuable, but it does not justify any one in dogmatic assertions that he cannot prove. All this galvano-electric current assertion comes under that head.

“If Dr. Flagg could be induced to answer concisely, according to his knowledge, he would agree that the causes of decay in teeth, leaving out of view heredity, which would have to do with form and position, may be summed up in very few words, viz.: that which causes solution. Now, solution of the enamel never takes place at any point where it is exposed to friction, but only in such spots or crevices as favor the retention of foreign substances which, under the combined influences of heat, moisture and atmospheric contact, speedily produce disintegrating acids in a nascent condition. The experienced dentist knows full well where to look for dental decay. The smaller the crevice the longer it takes for the enamel to break down, but Dr. McQuillen showed many years ago how, between two plates of sound

enamel, the substances that produce decay may reach the dentine, and so largely disintegrate it as to cause almost total destruction of the crown before the patient is conscious of disease. How, then, can we be told that leakage is a benefit? How can those amalgams that contract be vaunted as the best? How can gutta-percha be regarded as anything else than a valuable adjunct to our various filling materials?

“We must necessarily challenge the statement that ‘amalgams that do not shrink are not as good tooth-savers as amalgams which shrink,’ for both palladium and copper are recognized as being the best preventives of decay among all the amalgams, yet these two do not shrink. Dr. Flagg himself counsels copper amalgam in desperate cases.

“Dr. Flagg goes on to say: ‘In five minutes you can tell whether an amalgam will shrink or not.’ This is absolutely incorrect in regard to any strange or new amalgam. I have tested several amalgams that have continued to change their form for several days, sometimes shrinking, sometimes expanding.

“I think Dr. Flagg scarcely meant that he could ascertain in thirty minutes the composition of a new amalgam; still less its quantitative composition. Yet one might infer that from his saying that he could ascertain its composition in thirty minutes.

“In advocating gutta-percha for front teeth, Dr. Flagg failed to state that this material often becomes so dark on the surface as to be ‘more unsightly than many amalgams, and always changes color, becoming fluffy or soiled.

“Having thus called attention to a few of the inconsistencies and errors in Dr. Flagg’s address, I beg to call attention to another portion of that same address which contains the most precise, accurate and concise description of where and when to use gutta-percha that I have ever heard: ‘Gutta-percha is not presented as a material suitable for all sorts of cavities, but only those having circumscribed walls—comparatively round, shot-hole cavities in the buccal, distal and mesial surfaces of teeth, not on the articulating surfaces; where the cavity is small on the outside and large on the inside, and where the tooth is soft, of frail structure and highly organic; such cavities as would be prepared for gold filling by cutting away all the surrounding enamel walls until you get to strong walls—in filling such cavities with gutta-percha you conserve the enamel structure all that you possibly can.’ If you add frail and loose teeth and badly leaning ones to this category, it epitomizes the best features of the paper.”

\* \* \* \* \*

Dr. Perry. One good result of Dr. Flagg’s lecture is the most



excellent paper that we have just listened to from Dr. Bogue. I am in accord with almost every sentiment that he has uttered on that subject.

---

## REPLY.

“IN ABSENTIA.”

BY J. FOSTER FLAGG D. D. S., PHILADELPHIA, PA.

---

Honors conferred in this fashion are sometimes creditable and sometimes discreditable alike to donors and recipients. If creditable, then all is well, but if discreditable, either to donors or recipients, then all is not well.

At the meeting of the New York Odontological Society, held February 14th, 1888, I had the pleasure of speaking in behalf of gutta-percha stopping, and, after two months had passed, at a meeting of the same Society, held April 10th, 1888, reported in July *Cosmos*, p. 475, Drs. E. T. Payne, and E. A. Bogue gave utterance to comments upon my effort which are so discreditable to themselves, and which, if true, would be so discreditable to me that I deem it my duty to reply at once.

First, for Dr. Payne; I do not admit that my effort would have been more profitable as a paper than it was as an address, and I judge of this matter from the expressions of opinion as to its value which were given me by voice upon that occasion and which have been repeated by scores of letters received since.

As for members asking questions, I think the report in the *Cosmos* for May indicates that the questioning was pretty lively.

I wish to antagonize more emphatically than ever, if possible, the “*crutch*” idea as applied to gutta-percha and to insist upon just that degree of longevity for fillings of this material that I have always assumed, viz. from *twice* to *thrice* the durability of gold when used instead of gold in places which are frequently filled with gold and which *should be filled with gutta-percha*.

I deny the assertion that fillings made of the gutta-percha stoppings

of the present day are inferior to those of former times; and the statement made by the gentleman that such fillings will not last longer than from two to eight years, merely because he does not happen to know any better, is "suggestive and amusing, to say the least."

I have hundreds of such fillings made from such gutta-percha which are now more than ten years old and which, with the exception of very trifling wear, are as good as when introduced and which are saving the soft, frail teeth perfectly.

In my experience the average of well introduced good gutta-percha work of the last decade is equal to, if not superior to, that of thirty years ago; therefore, the inference that such results are obtained is *neither "misleading" nor "untrue."*

It is true that I did say that it was a duty that operators should "test" their gutta-percha stopping, that from such "testing" might be known the approximate degree of heat at which it softens (as I expressed it, "its heat-grade") and also exactly its composition, (as I expressed it, "*just the proportions of organic and inorganic matter*") and it is equally true that I said that an *analysis* was a very difficult piece of work, and the attempt to make a point on these two assertions merely because the gentleman did not happen to know the difference in gutta-percha work between "testing" and "analysing" is "suggestive and amusing, to say the least."

Regarding my assertion that the formula for "Hill's stopping," is unknown, I would say that I have, during the past twenty-five years, embraced every opportunity to ask those of our profession from whom I deemed it possible I might obtain information as to the formula of this (at first) excellent material, and, in every instance I was told by each individual that he "did not know."

It was from this fact that I said that our information was "*meagre!*"

And now I would ask further if Dr. Payne was a student with Dr. Hill, and if he made some of that material, *and if he knew* of what it was composed and *what were the proportions*, why has he not published all this long ago?

He tells us that if we used any of Hill's stopping of twenty-five years ago we used that which he made; but if my recollection serves me, it was *just about that time* that the quality of Hill's stopping commenced *markedly to deteriorate*. This might have been merely coincidental, but the reminiscence is "suggestive and amusing, to say the least."

That he thinks he knows I do not doubt, but that he knows I regard as an open question, and if it could be proven *by analysis* that he

thought he knew, but did not, *it* would also be "amusing, to say the least."

Students oftentimes think they know.

I do not see by what authority the gentleman states that *I* know, "of course, that the best stopping in the market to-day is very much inferior to the article which gave the filling material its deservedly high reputation," *for I do not know any such thing.*"

The gentleman speaks of Hill's and Bevans' stoppings, but my record of gutta-percha work was not made with either of these. I could not speak for gutta-percha with views based upon that material as given us "twenty-five or thirty years ago."

I refer to the gutta-percha *of* the last twenty-five years, with its gradual improvement in *lessened* quantity of inorganics with maintenance and *increase* of heat-grade; with its improved toughness and with its improved working qualities.

If the gentleman is not aware that as crude gutta-percha has deteriorated, gutta-percha stopping has nobly held its own, he should post himself before speaking, because "from such a source of learning and respectability we have a right to look for the whole picture."

And so, because Hill never used steam heat, the statement that it is essential to use it now, is a "dogmatic assumption!"

Hill had the crude gutta-percha of the cut-down trees. We, of to-day, have only the crude gutta-percha of the tapped trees—therefore, Hill could dispense with that care and nicety of manipulation which we of to-day find *essential* to the production of an acceptable result.

It seems to me that to assume that my assertion was a dogmatic assumption is itself a dogmatic assumption!

The gentleman states that he "experimented *all one winter*" to improve the texture of the manufactured material, but he found the whole trouble was with the base.

I have been systematically experimenting for the same purpose *for more than twenty years*, and I feel that I have been rewarded for my labor, which, however, would only seem to indicate that I can do more in twenty years than the gentleman can in "one winter"—which I guess is true!

---

Second, for Dr. Bogue; after having, in a paper on "Filling Materials and Methods," asked questions, given answers and drawn deductions just such as would have been accepted twenty years ago, but which I think would be seriously questioned in discussions of the pre-

sent day, the gentleman kindly covers me over with dental sweetness and then swallows me!

Truly Bogue-ish—and as such a position is not agreeable to me I shall strive to bring about a repetition of the history of Jonah and the whale.

The jaws open with this, as if quoting from me: “I regret to hear such words as these, ‘I want to induce you to try these things, for certainly you must understand that you know little or nothing about plastic fillings.’”

I never said so!

What I said was this, as reported: “I want to induce you to try these things, for certainly you must understand that *from such stand-points as I offer here to-night* you know little about plastic fillings,” which sentiment, I think, would not be cavilled at by, at least, a majority of those present, and I firmly believe would be *most* decried only by those *least informed*.

The jaws again open wider with this: “Can we denominate as praiseworthy and strictly scientific a sentence like this, ‘If I do not know when it is best to extract a tooth, I do not know which of you does,’” as if quoted from me!!

I never said so!

In speaking of banding together loose and shaky teeth, I said: “It has been said that teeth in this condition had better be extracted. Is it best? And if I do not know when it is best to extract a tooth, I ask you who of you does?”

Simply a question, and no assertion. I do not see that seeking information is *un*-praiseworthy, or that the position or question was absolutely *un*-scientific.

Again, the gentleman insinuates that I advocate the use of gutta-percha “precisely as I would use cohesive gold!” and he kindly calls *that* “enthusiasm” when the context of the report will show that *in truth* I was speaking against that kind of use of gutta-percha which would be likely to result from the idea that it was a *temporary* filling; then it was that I said that I wanted “to leave with you to-night the impression that you can work gutta-percha precisely the same as you work cohesive gold,” meaning carefully, with accuracy, and with the idea that with such work it would be compensatingly permanent; and this, *I have reason to believe, was generally and thoroughly so understood*.

The gentleman next, by a series of gyrations and one utter misquotation, lengthens “ten minutes” into “half a century” (not the *slightest* connection between the statements except the placing of them together

by the gentleman!) and the half century into a life-time, thus giving "not the truth, nor any part of the truth, but everything but the truth" in contradistinction to my usual method.

In "testing" gutta-percha the aim is to find out *two* things—the relativity between the organic and inorganic components, and the "heat grade" of the material tested—with these two factors one versed in gutta-percha can tell much as to the quality of his material—for those who do not know the difference between "testing" and "analyzing" it does not tell—much!

"Testing" can be done in "*ten minutes*."

The gentleman then mixes the next two quotations and draws *his* deduction with a child-like innocence which, for New York, is refreshing!

He says that *I* say: "The only way for you to use gutta-percha successfully is to test the various materials before putting them into the mouth. It is the work of a life-time"!!!!!!!

The admiration marks are mine, but I could not help putting them there, for again,

I never said it!

After, as he quotes, urging the "testing" of the various materials (gutta-percha stoppings) before putting them in the mouth, I said: "The testing of the *value* of the various inorganics is the work of a life-time."

The whole range of amalgam remarks in which the gentleman indulged are so indicative of utter superficiality that I shall simply pass them over as beneath my notice, merely intimating that *his testing* of "amalgams that have continued to change their form for several days, sometimes shrinking, sometimes expanding," is probably about as valuable and reliable as was his "little bottle and warm water bath" experiment to determine whether or no amalgam fillings would produce mercurial ptyalism!

But when the *gentleman* not only misquotes me, but *italicizes the word* I NEVER USED to give point to his assertion, I think it time that I should strongly denounce such unworthy and despicably unscientific conduct.

He says that *I* said: "I do not want *my* material to be looked upon as a crutch," and comments upon this as follows; "He will, it is hoped, pardon the suggestion" (how velvety soft is the odious phraseology!) "that this society was not aware that gutta-percha was a proprietary article, and it must regard all subjects brought before it as absolutely free for discussion."

I NEVER SAID SO!

After referring to Dr. Atkinson's former endorsement of gutta-percha as a "crutch," what I *did* say is this—"I do not want it to be welcomed on any such terms as that. I do not want this material to be looked upon as a crutch. I wish it to be looked upon as a reliable friend in need!"

Thus it will be seen that as no "proprietary" word or thought was indulged in by me, all his Mephistophilish sarcasm falls harmlessly to pieces from its own rottenness, *as it has not the slightest foundation in truth to rest upon!*

---

*Extract from Odontological Society Report, p. 487, July Cosmos.*

The President. Gentlemen, we have Dr. Niles, of Boston, with us to-night, and we would be glad to hear from him.

Dr. E. S. Niles. This is too great a subject for one to speak upon impromptu. We have considered the subject of amalgam in the American Academy of Dental Science for the last two meetings, and I must say that the result of the discussion is rather unsatisfactory. In fact, the present information on the subject discourages me in the use of amalgam. I now speak exclusively of copper amalgam. Since I have been in practice, I have been more or less dissatisfied with these fillings, as I think we all have, and have looked forward to some day when I might take up the subject for the purpose of making some satisfactory experiments. I regard the present investigation of amalgams as superficial, for the reason that when we speak of amalgams we may refer to any number of compounds, all of which may vary in their composition.

Etc., etc. for a page or more of remarks all of which seem to indicate that when the gentleman has "experimented" he, *perhaps* (?). will know more of the "great" subject upon which he is trying to speak.

He next continues as follows: "I was going to say in regard to the distinguished professor who addressed this society at its last meeting, that I am sorry he does not tell us fully and conclusively of what his compounds are composed, and in a way that would enable us to make similar preparations for ourselves. I am sorry, to say that such is not the case, as my own experiments, as well as the experiments of my brethren in Boston and other cities have proved. Some years ago, while attending school in Philadelphia, I boarded not far from Dr. Flagg's, and we used to have on the table what the mistress was pleased to call '*scrapple*.' I was very much interested to know of what it was composed, and was told it was made of bits that came from the table, into which she put eggs, pepper and various things. It might, therefore, be made of one thing one day, but of entirely different things the next. In reflecting upon this subject I have wondered whether the making of mysterious compounds in Philadelphia was confined to the manufacture of '*scrapple*' alone, or whether other combinations in that city may not have a similar origin.

"As long as the profession consent to use alloys the composition of which they are not familiar with, no complaint can be entered against those who make amalgams or '*scrapple*' alloys."

What a powerful reflector!

From his not knowing "fully and conclusively" of what my compounds are composed it is evident that he has not read "Plastics and Plastic Filling," in which work he would find just what "bits that

come from the table" are best adapted for each particular kind of "*scrapple*."

When it is remembered that "*scrapple*" is a compound of Indian meal and pork scraps (hence its name) it would seem that some Philadelphia wag was playing upon the credulity of the *scholar from Boston*, whose thirst for knowledge would evidently have been satisfied with the information that "*fish balls*" were composed of chicken and turnips.

And when it is also remembered that the *scholar from Boston* is the gentleman who conferred upon dentistry the inestimable boon of the "hermetically sealed tubes" for the maintenance of the integrity of phosphoric acid menstruum just *two years after* it had been experimentally proven *and taught* that such menstruum "changed" practically at the same time, whether kept in hermetically sealed bottles, ordinarily stopped bottles, or *in wide mouthed vessels open to the air!*

And when he is further recognized as the author of the exciting Newark anecdote of the young lady who asked him "if he was from Boston?" to which he replied that he "was from Boston," to which she replied that she, "also, was from Boston"—so they were *both from Boston!* it goes without question that to repel an attack from such a source would be merely to inaugurate another "Mosquito War!"

I visited New York in the acceptance of cordial and repeated invitation; I took with me for presentation, the carefully prepared results of many years of conscientious endeavor to add to the resources of our profession in its work of doing good.

I was unconscious of having either thought, said or done anything which was other than interesting, instructive and acceptable.

I was not only congratulated and thanked upon that occasion, but I have since received, from there, several written acknowledgments of interest and satisfaction.

I am accustomed to personal abuse, and I have always striven to live above it, but I must *openly* and *decidedly* protest against such comments and papers as those of Drs. Payne and Bogue, which with impertinent assurance accredit me with views which I do not hold; with knowledge which I do not acknowledge, and with fallacious deductions from what might be admitted if I "could be induced to answer concisely!"

And I must also say that I was not prepared to find, as I did from the April proceedings, that I was not only left alone to fight for myself

(which, I am thankful I feel completely able to do,) but such vile effort was characterized as "excellent!"

Candid, fair and honorable criticism of my views I have always earnestly invited, and when by time or argument I have been proven in the wrong I have always cheerfully and thankfully acknowledged it.

But when malicious sneers, deliberately concocted mis-statements and italicized perversion of the truth are returned for kindly effort, I think the right will be conceded me to feel that, *in certain degree*, I have been foolishly "casting pearls before swine."









