

THE  
Health Reformer.

OUR PHYSICIAN, NATURE: OBEY AND LIVE.

VOL. 3.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., JANUARY, 1869.

NO. 7.

THE HEALTH REFORMER,  
PUBLISHED MONTHLY AT  
The Health Reform Institute,  
Battle Creek, Mich.,

Under the Supervision of an Editorial Committee of Twelve.

Terms: One Dollar per Year, invariably in Advance.  
Address "Health Institute," Battle Creek, Mich.

"HAPPY NEW YEAR."

A SWEET little maiden awoke from her slumbers,  
When first the bright morning began to appear;  
And when in his glory the sun rose upon her,  
She sprang up and wished him a Happy New Year.

"I thank you, my darling," the sun gaily said,  
As on her bright ringlets his radiance he shed;  
"I must give you something—pray, what shall it be,  
As a token for all your kind wishes to me?"

I'll give you, sweet maiden, the light of my shining,  
To greet you and guide you wherever you stray;  
And when clouds of sorrow your path overshadow,  
The gleam of my arrows shall drive them away.

Come now in life's morning when all things are thine,  
And give thy young heart to thy Maker and mine;  
And then when thy sun in the west goeth down,  
He'll set thee forever a gem in his crown."

The child was delighted to hear the sun talking,  
As upward in glory he went on his way;  
As she said to herself, "When comes the still evening,  
I'll wish the stars also, and see what they'll say."

She did; and found out that they too had a tongue,  
And hymned their Creator in triumphant song;  
And not only they, but there broke on her ear  
From all things around her a Happy New Year.

General Articles.

Bionomy.—No. 1.

BY S. WATERS DAVIS, M. D.

INTRODUCTORY.

ALL the Natural Sciences originated in superstition, and each of them has had its fabulous period. Astronomy originated in Astrology, and Chemistry in Alchemy. And now Physiology holds nearly the same relation to the Science of Life, that Astrology did to Astronomy, or that Alchemy did to Chemistry. The

Science of Life is at present little understood, even by persons possessing good general scientific knowledge, or those who lay claims to great knowledge in this specific direction. But it is hoped that this new science will soon outgrow the vagaries of Physiology, and take its rank as much above Astronomy and Chemistry as its objects are above the objects of those sublime sciences.

A very important part of any science is its nomenclature. The object of scientific nomenclature is to represent to the eye or ear, by oral or written words, the *Things, Phenomena and Principles* of which the science treats. It is very important that the terms used in a science be entirely free from all metaphors or figures of speech, and that each term should always represent the same idea, and that that idea be always represented by the same terms. Scientific terms should, also, not only be perfectly appropriate, but also brief, euphonious, and easy of pronunciation and remembrance. Accordingly the writer of this series of articles proposes to use such terms as accord with the above principles without much reference to the usages of physiologists, which are of little force, as the terminology of their so-called science is very obscure and uncertain; a great many terms being used, in many cases, to represent the same idea, and several ideas often being expressed by the same term. The writer will attempt to bring into these articles a systematic, clear, well-defined and euphonious terminology without encumbering them with a profusion of obscure, unpronounceable "jaw-breakers." Terms in common use which it is proposed to use here will be restricted to one meaning, and that their most appropriate and evident one.

*Physiology* instead of being a science, as it is often called, is a branch of *Natural History*.

*History* is a verbal, oral or written, representation of *Things and Phenomena*; an ac-

count of *bodies* and their *properties*, and of the *facts* relating to *events*, in the order of their occurrence in *time* and *place*. Now this definition when applied, specifically, to physiology, is perfectly appropriate. Physiology is a description of the phenomena of life; an account of the *facts* relating to the *events* in the life of living beings, set forth in the order of their occurrence in *time*. *Anatomy* is an account or description of living bodies, and their *properties*, set forth in the order of their *locality*. Hence Anatomy is another branch of Natural History, and as such is extremely useful, furnishing much of the data from which the principles of the Science of Life may be generalized. *Botany* is that branch of Anatomy which relates to Plant structure. Let me not be understood as underrating the value of these so-called sciences, for it is the farthest thing from my intention. I only aim to place them before my readers in their true place, and considering them in the light which I do, I heartily commend them to the earnest attention of all.

A *Science* is a classification and elucidation of the *principles* or *laws* of *things* and *phenomena*, and their *causes*.

A *Law* or *Principle* is a rule of action; an elementary proposition; a fundamental truth; a comprehensive fact obtained from a generalization of several facts, and from which other facts may be deduced.

*Life* is the aggregate actions of an organized body, or of all organized beings.

The *Laws of Life* are the rules which govern the actions of organized beings, or their several tissues and organs.

The *Science of Life*, then, is a classification, exposition, elucidation, and illustration, of the laws or principles of organized beings and the phenomena of life, and the causes of such phenomena.

*Art* is the principles of science reduced to practical rules, and in operation under intelligent guidance. We cannot disobey or violate a principle or law of science, but we may violate the rules of art. For instance, it is a natural, scientific law, that heat expands and cold contracts *all* substances. It is a rule in the art of blacksmithing, based upon this law, that the tire of a wheel be heated to such a degree that it can be readily slipped upon the wheel, and then allowed to cool until it contracts so as to fit closely and firmly upon it. Now the smith cannot violate the law of expansion by heat and contraction by cold, but he may violate the rule of his art, either by not heating the tire enough, or by leaving out other conditions of success, and

he will thus suffer the penalty of failing to accomplish the desired end. We cannot disobey a law of life, but we may, and very often do, violate the laws of health or hygiene.

*Health* is the normal, balanced, orderly action of a living organism. The intelligent use of means of maintaining health is an art; we call it *Hygiene*.

The rules of the Hygienic art are based upon the principles of the science of life, and may be violated as readily as the rule in the art of blacksmithing above cited, though the scientific law upon which such rule is based is inviolable. Ample illustrations of this idea will be given when I come to speak of the individual laws of life in future articles.

For the sake of convenience and uniformity of nomenclature, I have chosen the word at the head of this article, to express what I mean by the Science of Life.

*Bionomy* (from the Greek, *Bios*, "life," and *nomos*, "law,"—"laws of life,") is the science of life in its widest sense; a classification, and systematic exposition and elucidation of the laws of all organized beings, their phenomena and the causes of the same.

Bionomy is divided into *general* and *special*. *Special Bionomy* treats specifically of some division, order, class, etc., of living beings. There are three grand branches of Special Bionomy: 1st. *Phytonomy*, the science of Plant Life; 2nd. *Zoönomy*, the science of Animal or Brute Life; and 3d. *Anthroponomy*, the science of Human Life. This last grand division of Bionomy is divided into *Organic* and *Relative Anthroponomy*, and *Psychonomy*, the science of the Soul or Spirit.

*General Bionomy* treats of those grand, fundamental laws which govern the actions of *all* animated nature, from the simplest Infusoria to that sublimest and noblest piece of infinite workmanship, the Human Soul.

It is not my object, in this series of articles, to lay down a system of Hygienic rules, or to treat of the *Laws of Health* more than incidentally; but it is my aim to elucidate the scientific principles which underlie all truly Hygienic rules. I hope this will be borne in mind as the reader peruses each of the succeeding articles in this series. After I have accomplished my object in this series of articles, I may take up the subject of Hygiene, and demonstrate the soundness of the Hygienic rules, as taught in the REFORMER, by tracing them to the scientific principles upon which they are based, and which will have been elucidated; and also to show the fallacy of the prevalent modes of living, by demonstrating the utter want of any scientific

reasons for such rules of living. By these means I hope to furnish the Hygienic reader, if he has it not, with a reason for the faith that is within him, and the unhygienic reader with a reason for changing his faith and the works which follow it.

In order to get a fair understanding of the laws of life, it is necessary to first know something of the structure of organized beings and their actions. Accordingly I will devote one article to a consideration of the structure of living tissues, organs, and systems; one to a consideration of the functions or phenomena of life, and another to a consideration of the causes of living phenomena, consisting of an exposition of the nature of vital forces, and constituting a rational and scientific solution of the vexed question of Vitality. The remaining articles of the series will be devoted to the elucidation of the individual Laws of Life.

Many of the doctrines which I expect to set forth are original with myself; but I hope that none will entertain a lower opinion of them because of their humble origin, as I do not propose to *theorize* only. Nothing will be advanced without sufficient evidence to establish its truth in the minds of all reasoning and logical readers.

*Makanda, Ill., Dec., 1868.*

### Maternal Responsibilities in the Physiological Education of Children.

[MESSRS. EDITORS: I think the following article is well worthy of a place in your journal. I copy it from a weekly magazine, published in England, entitled, *On the Laws of Health*, by Elizabeth Blackwell. I wish there were more like her. JAMES THOMSON.]

"I stood, last week, by a grief-stricken young mother, who, with pale cheek and tearless eye, bent in speechless agony over her dying child. It was her first born. It had lain in her encircling arms six short months. Now it was torn from her love, and, helpless and despairing, she watched the feeble life ebb slowly away.

I could not say to this poor mourner, You yourself, unhappy mother, are the destroyer of your own child! Your thoughtlessness, your ignorance, your waste of the golden years of life, before this tender child was committed to your care, have caused this agony, this death! And yet these stern words to her, and to multitudes like her, would have been strictly true. Of what use to her, in that sad hour, were her many ac-

complishments, her grace, elegance, and literary acquirements? The fundamental study, the knowledge of the laws of health, had been entirely omitted in her education; and now her child was dead, and no after-knowledge could recall her dead to life. As a young girl, no habits of attention and respect to the requirements of the physical organization had been implanted by her mother; and she had entered upon the responsibilities of family life with no idea of what was needed for the care of her own health, or for the welfare of her children.

"Nature's laws are inexorable. No beauty, no love, no agony, will avert the penalty attached to the transgression of physical laws.

"The child, placed in unhealthy conditions, dies, though long life is its birthright. The young girl, over-stimulated with studies and accomplishments, or intoxicated with pleasures, or bowed down with cares, withers in her early bloom. The young mother, fragile as a flower, too feeble for her privileges and her duties, is wrenched away from her orphan children, or sinks into a querulous invalid.

"It is then essential that physical laws should be earnestly studied, for the practical guidance of life. There is an order of nature that must be observed in education, in life; and by that order *the physical takes precedence of the mental*. The physical powers become mature before the mental faculties, and although the cultivation of our true natures should always go hand in hand, *the development of the physical nature must always precede and be the foundation of all mental culture*.

"It is far more important to a young lady to possess a strong, active, graceful body, a clear, healthy skin, a bright eye, and a cheerful disposition than to be mistress of many accomplishments.

"It is of much weightier moment to the young matron to know how to manage her household with intelligence than to speak French or play on the piano. The one branch does not exclude the other; but a thorough acquaintance with all that concerns the physical well-being of a household, the prevention of sickness, the promotion of vigor and cheerfulness, is of fundamental importance to the young ruler of the precious home kingdom. If she knew how to ventilate her house thoroughly, in winter as well as in summer; to prevent injurious odors; to distribute an ample allowance of air to the lungs that must inhale it; to look upon stagnant air as a deadly enemy, by night as well as by day, then her children would not die of fevers,

nor be tainted by scrofula. If she can select a healthy and nutritious diet for her household; insure its proper preparation; vary it in quantity and quality, according to the needs of each member, then will she keep her household in good temper, from the oldest to the youngest, and her doctor's bills will be only nominal. If she understands the proper use of water; the moral, as well as physical, advantages of exercise; the importance of dress with due regard to warmth, lightness, and points of support, her children will live and not die. She will reign like a queen in the midst of her loving subjects; she will reach a good old age, surrounded by her children's children, and her memory will be cherished long after she is gone.

"Surely, hygienic knowledge, possessing such power for good, and bearing so directly upon the noblest works of woman, is worthy of time, and care, and zealous culture.

"It may be safely asserted that if the present generation of English women understood the laws of health as well as they understand the toilet, and expended the same interest in putting them into practice that they devote to dress, they might save one-half of the children who will die in the next generation, diminish by half its sickness, and increase by a third the average duration of its life.

"In what other way could they make an equally valuable contribution to the national welfare?"

### Bad Bed-fellows.

EXCEEDINGLY bad! No tobacco user is fit for a bed companion. He is giving forth pestilential vapors from all the pores of the skin.

He is an embodiment of perpetual miasm. The immediate atmosphere surrounding him is inevitably impregnated and polluted with the constant effluvia which emanates from his whole surface. He becomes a perfect walking distillery of the deadly essence, sending forth its fumes and vapors into the surrounding atmosphere. His mouth is the mill which grinds out the weed, and his whole body the distillery for the essence. Put a chewer or smoker into a vapor bath, with no tobacco in the room, and in a short time the whole room will be strongly scented with tobacco effluvia that emanates from his body. Put him into a warm bath, and get up a perspiration; then put that water upon flies or vermin of plants, and it will instantly destroy them.

D. F. NEWTON.

ALL are not thieves that dogs bark at.

### FAREWELL.

[The following lines are written as a token of grateful remembrance of kind care and true Christian sympathy received while at the Health Institute. MARTHA BAKER.]

FAREWELL, dear Institute, farewell;  
Wounded and bruised I came to thee,  
And like a wearied child I fell  
Within thine arms, upon thy knee.  
'Tis here I learned submissively  
To pass beneath the chastening rod,  
'Tis here I strove to humble be,  
And lean upon the arm of God.

I never can forget thy love,  
Thy sympathy and tender care;  
The thoughts of courage and of hope  
That in my heart inspired were;  
The words of truth, the earnest prayer,  
The songs of Zion that I love—  
All, all to me are tokens rare  
That thou art given from above.

No, ne'er can I forget thy scenes,  
The battles with the tempter fought,  
The victories through Christ obtained—  
All in my heart a good work wrought.  
The little artless, prattling child,  
Emblem of what we each must be,  
Free from hypocrisy and guile,  
In it Christ's image all may see.

Farewell, physicians, kind and true,  
My fellow-sufferers, helpers, all,  
Not always shall we say adieu;  
Soon will the Chief Physician call  
Each faithful one to dwell above,  
Where none in weariness shall roam,  
But all be union, peace, and love,  
Health, rest, and light, in that blest home.

### The Temperance Question.

THERE seems to be no greater confusion of tongues upon any subject than upon the temperance question, among those who aim to advance the best interests of humanity. An article by Prof. S. C. Bartlett, in *The Advance* of August 6, upon the question, "Is alcohol a poison," seems to exhibit some of this confusion. He starts out with the admitted saying, that "Alcohol is a poison, and is so declared by the highest scientific authorities. How, then, can the Scriptures countenance its use at all, or, if they do, how can they be defined? I propose simply to meet this difficulty. My positions in regard to the present duty of abstinence, I still maintain. But as the Scriptures do countenance the use, under some circumstances, of fermented wine, I address myself to the inquiry, How shall they be vindicated?" After quoting the medical sophisms of various physicians, and filling three columns in their aid, to get their help to aid those who lean upon the Scriptures for support in using alcohol, he winds up with the following language:

"The answer, then, to the difficulty, is to be firmly given, because it is true: that though alcohol, under circumstances now so common, acts only as a poison, yet, under other legitimate conditions, and in other modes of administration, it

is capable of producing most beneficial effects on the human system. Of those circumstances and conditions it is for the physician conscientiously to judge. I abate nothing from what I have said of our present dangers and duties. My sole purpose is the legitimate purpose of removing a difficulty that has been urged upon the Scriptures by statements, which, in their unqualified form, are not the whole truth.

In this and my previous articles I have aimed at the exact truth. If I have fallen into any errors on a very difficult subject, I shall be glad to be set right. I am aware that my positions can easily be misrepresented and misconstrued; but believing them to be sound, I have no hesitation in declaring them. Nothing is gained by warping or concealing the truth on such a subject."

I have seen no other article, on this subject, in *The Advance*. I beg the privilege of calling the attention of the writer and the public to the fact that the Scriptures in no case countenance the use of alcohol, but condemn it in the strongest terms. He assumes that the word wine, wherever used in the Bible, means the kind of liquor which is to-day called wine, and which contains alcohol. I affirm that such an assumption cannot be proved. The contrary has been clearly proved in a work written by Rev. William Ritchie, of Scotland, entitled, "Scripture Testimony against Intoxicating Wine," and published by the National Temperance Society, at 172 William St., New York.

This author tells us that nine different Hebrew words, in the Hebrew Scriptures, are translated into the English word "wine." One of them, *Tirosh*, used thirty-eight times, "means VINE FRUIT—the produce of the vine in the solid form of raisins, &c." Another word, *Shechar*, "usually rendered, by the translators of our English Bible, 'strong drink,' conveys no such idea." He says, "We have reviewed every mode of scripture expression regarding wine. We have discovered nowhere either an explicit or implied sanction of intoxicating drink." "We do not find one sentence of sanction or approval, in God's word, for the use of intoxicating wine." "Altogether there are about a hundred and thirty warnings and admonitions in Scripture against intoxicating drinks, while there are not over twenty instances of distinct approval of wine, under all its names, in the whole Bible. And these passages, as far as their evidence is explicit, show the wine commended to be of an un-intoxicating quality."

It was this kind of wine that was used by Jesus at his last supper. It was this kind commended by Paul to Timothy. The pure, unfermented juice of the grape is an excellent article to aid weak digestion. This is

why it was considered a great good in some passages of Scripture, not because degraded humanity loves the alcohol of its fermented condition. It would be just as reasonable to translate the Hebrew or Greek word signifying corn, into whisky, and then say that Scripture commended it, as to translate the word signifying grapes, or their juice, into our modern idea of the word wine, and call it right, because the Bible sanctions it. What stronger argument can you bring against the infallibility of your Bible, than to assert that it sanctions the use of what you know is degrading to our race?

The spirit of alcohol seems to so pervade our mental atmosphere as to blur the vision, and spread a torpor over the nerves, of many able thinkers, when they attempt to investigate this subject. How many Christian teachers can we find who dare to doubt that Jesus made intoxicating drinks to gratify morbid appetites at a social feast? How many of them dare say to their church members, It is wrong to celebrate His last supper with alcoholic stimulants? How many of them dare meet the medicinal, alcoholic prejudice, with an expressed doubt of its virtues? Look at the quotations of Prof. Bartlett to prove the medicinal virtues of alcohol, though acknowledged by himself and his authors to be a poison; and he does it in defense of the Scriptures.

"A moderate quantity ingested for a few days notably diminishes the exhalation of carbonic acid;" so will a close, unventilated room. Anything which excludes pure air from the lungs will do the same. Does not every scientific physiologist know that a healthy person exhales more carbonic acid than a consumptive—that such an exhalation of the burned carbon is necessary to health? But Dr. Flint, whom he quotes, explains it: "A moderate quantity of alcohol retards the destructive assimilation of the tissues, and thus the loss of weight consequent upon insufficiency of food may be temporarily arrested, and the unpleasant symptoms relieved, by the use of alcohol in moderate quantities." "Its influence as a therapeutic agent, in promoting assimilation in certain conditions of defective nutrition, in relieving shock and nervous exhaustion, in sustaining the powers of life in acute diseases characterized by rapid emaciation and abnormally rapid destructive assimilation, &c., is undoubted." It "retards destructive assimilation," if food is scanty, and promotes it if digestion is weak.

Remarkable agent! What intelligence it possesses in contact with a morbid stomach! But this agent is "not itself assimilated as

food, but eliminated, unchanged, from the system." Can any physiologist tell *how* an article can benefit the human system by passing through it, when no portion of said article is assimilated? Has the human system nothing of more importance to do than to exert its power, in the name of stimulation, to expel such intruders? "In moderate doses, it has a decided influence on the process of nutrition," "acts by temporarily augmenting the digestive power of the stomach. But, if the use be long continued, it weakens the vital functions in general, and digestion among their number." If the dose is "moderate," the system concentrates her vital power against it, and succeeds in its expulsion with a momentary apparent exaltation of power. Her vitality then swings as far below par as it has been raised above. "But if the use be long continued," nature finds the case hopeless, and ceases to struggle. The stereotyped wisdom of the past then says, "Its continued use has weakened the vital functions." But how it was done she ventures not to explain. The task is too Herculean upon the philosophic base where she stands. It is time for thinkers to dare to reason, nor spend more time in digging the musty past for strength to stand still while they shout, ADVANCE!

Ideas, when admitted as truth, seem to acquire a fixed position in the mind, and though subsequent investigation points to the possibility that they are error, they yet require "precept upon precept, precept upon precept, line upon line, line upon line, here a little and there a little," to remove them from the controlling position which they occupy in the human mind. It is thus with old ideas upon the alcoholic question. Men see its evil—its demoralizing effects upon humanity meet them at every corner; but the idea that some good result is occasionally obtained from it, at once sweeps away all objection to having it quartered among man's benefactors. But do they ever inquire whence this idea originated? Are they sure that it is not the offspring of man's morbid appetite? Can you point out the individual of mature years who has not seen persons running to destruction in all their domestic, social relations, under the influence of this mad appetite, yet claiming that they would die without some alcohol? You know better, and pity their hallucination; yet at the same time you believe that under other circumstances you would die without it, though you cannot tell why. You believe that man is corrupt, "from the crown of his head to the sole of his feet," that no purification can take place unless accompanied with the personal effort which leads from immoral to moral

practices; yet you scrape the walls of science in search of arguments to prove that humanity does not require the self-denial of the alcoholic appetite, to become entirely free from its degrading influence; and when such arguments are obtained, they misread history, trample upon reason, and slap each other in the face, as in the article under present review. And when you find a case that it appears to benefit, it is one whose physical constitution is so demoralized by his own, or his progenitors', bad habits, that any change makes him feel better only for the moment. Its continuance "weakens the vital functions."

A natural effect of the use of alcohol is a morbid appetite for more. This appetite increases, with indulgence, till it controls the individual, and demands the means for its gratification. Millions of human beings are engaged in producing and tendering the means for its gratification, and the customs of society appear to be enlarging the number of consumers. We seem, at present, to stand upon the pivot of moral influence upon this question. A little more encouragement by the moral and religious class of society will fasten the appetite upon the masses of the rising generation; then all is lost. Society will go back into chaos in search of means to gratify this insane appetite. It will then be too late for our learned Professors and religious teachers to attempt the reform which now pleadingly stretches out its arms to them for the help which they cannot give to-day, lest it offend some friend now secretly under control of this appetite.

Upon the other hand, if they had moral strength to take the stand of Paul when he exclaimed, "If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth," and say, If alcohol make my brother to offend, I will defend it no more while the world standeth, one mighty weight would be thrown upon the scale of the temperance arm. A voice against its use in any case, upon, or in, the human system, with positive labor to keep the rising generation from getting the appetite by tasting it, would complete the temperance victory. Confirmed drinkers will never be reformed to any great extent. The only salvation for our race is to induce the young to avoid its taste or touch.

WILLIAM CLARK.

Monticello, Iowa, Nov. 26, 1868.

BE slow in choosing a friend, and slower to change him; courteous to all; intimate with few; slight no man for his poverty, nor esteem any one for his wealth.

### Advantages of Temperance in Diet.

TEMPERANCE promotes clearness and vigor of intellect. If the brain be not in a healthy and vigorous state, equally unhealthy and inefficient must be the mind also. History will bear us out in asserting, that the highest and most successful intellectual efforts have been associated with the practice of those general principles of temperance in diet for which we plead.

It is the mighty minds that have grappled most successfully with the demonstrations of mathematical, intellectual, and moral science, that stand highest on the scale of mental acumen and power; and it is such minds that have found strict temperance in diet essential to their success. Let us advert to the history of a few of the master spirits of the human race.

Foremost on the list stands that eminent philosopher and mathematician, Sir Isaac Newton. The treatise of his, that cost him the mightiest intellectual effort of all his works, was composed while the body was sustained by bread and water alone. And in spite of the wear and tear of such protracted and prodigious mental labor as his, that same temperance sustained him to his eighty-fifth year.

That celebrated intellectual philosopher, John Locke, with a feeble constitution, outlived the term of threescore years and ten, by his temperance. "To this temperate mode of life, too, he was probably indebted for the increase of those intellectual powers, which gave birth to his great work on the human understanding, his treatises on government and education, as well as his other writings, which do so much honor to his memory."

Another intellectual philosopher, who saw fourscore years, was the venerable Kant. "By this commendable and healthy practice," early rising, says his biographer, "daily exercise on foot, temperance in eating and drinking, constant employment, and cheerful company, he protracted his life to this advanced period;" and, we may add, acquired the power for his immense labors of mind.

Few men have more fully established their claims to intellectual superiority of a very high grade than that American theologian, President Edwards. But it was temperance alone that could carry him through such powerful mental efforts. "Though of a delicate constitution, by the rules of temperance he enjoyed good health, and was enabled to pursue his studies thirteen hours a day."

The same means enabled the great German reformer, Martin Luther, though his days were stormy in the extreme, to make the

moral world bend at his will, and to leave for his posterity so many profound literary productions. "It often happened," says his biographer, "that for several days and nights he locked himself up in his study, and took no other nourishment than bread and water, that he might the more uninterruptedly pursue his labors."

The records of English jurisprudence contain scarcely a name more distinguished than that of Sir Matthew Hale. And it is the testimony of history, that "his decided piety and rigid temperance laid him open to the attacks of ridicule; but he could not be moved." In eating and drinking, he observed not only great plainness and moderation, but lived so philosophically that he always ended his meal with an appetite.

Perhaps no man has accomplished more for the world than he who has written such a commentary on the Scriptures as that of Matthew Henry. And it is, indeed, an immense literary labor. But the biographer's account of that writer's habits shows that temperance and diligence were the secret of his success.

Few men have accomplished more than the distinguished Methodist divine, John Wesley; and it is gratifying to learn that it was "extraordinary temperance which gave him the power to do so much, and to live so long."

In reading the poetical works of Milton, we are not so much delighted with the play of imagination, as with the rich and profound views which he opens before us. The fact is, he was a man of powers and attainments so great as justly to be classed among the leading intellects of the world. Nor were such powers and attainments disjoined from temperance.

Europe, as well as America, has been filled with the fame of Franklin, the philosopher; and no less wide spread is the history of his temperance. Early in life he adopted a vegetable diet; and thus he not only gained time for study, but "I made the greater progress," says he, "from that greater clearness of head and quickness of apprehension which generally attend temperance in eating and drinking." The habit of being contented with a little, and disregarding the gratifications of the palate, remained with him through life. —*Hitchcock.*

SCENE in a French hospital. The surgeon comes in, grave and disturbed. "How many dead this morning?" he asks of the nurse. "Nine." "Bother! I gave ten prescriptions last night, did n't I?" "Yes; but one did n't wish to take his."

## Editorial.

### Cure of Deafness, &c.—Report of Case.

CAME to the Health Institute, Nov., 1867, Miss I. G. Notes of her case show her condition to have been as follows:

Age, 21. When about a year old, had scarlet fever, leaving a running sore in the right ear, which has continued ever since without healing. Eight years ago took cold in the left ear, producing almost total deafness in it for some time, troubling her some, since, whenever she would have cold.

Had suffered much from headache. Within a year or two had rush of blood to the head, and catarrh. Throat never seemed clear, hoarseness troubling most of the time. Pain in the shoulders, acidity of the stomach, constipated bowels, with other dyspeptic symptoms; menstrual irregularities; cold extremities, especially the feet; at times, eruptions of the skin. Scrofula existed among the ancestors, on both the paternal and maternal side.

We prescribed for her a simple and rather abstemious diet of plainly-cooked vegetables and grains, with fruit; sugar, milk, and salt, to be used very sparingly, if at all; eating but two meals a day.

Being a person of pretty strong, vigorous constitution, and quite fleshy (weighing above 160 pounds), gave her considerable heavy treatment. At first she took three packs a week, from three-fourths of an hour to an hour long, with a fomentation up and down the spine and over the liver, at the same time, and, on coming out of the pack, a pail douche, with thorough rubbing; a sitz bath and a foot bath made up the hydropathic treatment for the week. As her symptoms and conditions changed, we diminished and varied the treatment.

She stayed at the Institute five or six months, then went west to visit a brother whose little boy, an only child, she found very puny and sickly. His parents, fearing that they would not be able to raise him, his future growth and development being matters of uncertainty, permitted her to take him home with her to the State of New York, to care for him hygienically. A few days since, we received the following encouraging letter, evincing the superiority of the way of living in harmony with the laws of health. It is one of the many testimonies we receive of the benefits derived from right relation to hygienic agents:

*Dear Dr:* I will try, in accordance with my promise, to write you a few words, believing you are always pleased to hear from the patients.

I can report favorably in regard to health. I am much better than when I left home one year ago this month; and, so far as hearing is concerned, would not trade ears with any one—tell Dr. Lay, not even for his. I find a steady improvement in this respect, also some favorable symptoms in my humor, the scrofula. I have been broken out very badly since my return home; have had a good many boils. This, I think, shows that my system is doing its work in getting rid of impurities. I have no cause to regret my stay at the Institute. It will not soon be forgotten by me, nor will the dear associations and acquaintances which I formed there. They will be cherished by me as long as I live. I cannot forget the kind spirit that I saw manifested by physicians, patients, and helpers. I believe that in the hands of God it will be a great blessing. When I go among the lovers of pleasure, those who live to gratify their appetites, I am thankful for the light of health reform.

The little boy, whom I took home with me, is a nice little health reformer; eats but two meals a day, has his rest hour, and is good natured from morning till night. I used no means but this to bring him to two meals: it was at first to have him eat regularly three times. He could not go to sleep without eating, and would wake in the night and cry for food. I soon broke him of eating in the night, and, before I was aware of it, he only ate when we did. He asks for nothing to eat except when he sees it around. His health is very much better, and his bowels are regular.

He had a very sore mouth—cankered. All he took for this was some pure cool water to drink, eating but little of the plainest food. Some ordered and advised several kinds of medicines, but I refused them all, thinking, and fully believing, nature to be the greatest restorative. I have no confidence in drugs, consequently shall never resort to them expecting to be benefited in the least.

Remember me to the dear friends at the Institute.  
Yours in much love, I. G.  
Jeff. Co., N. Y.

### Drug Murder.

MRS. CORNELIUS GIBSON, of Albany, being told that the oil of bitter almond's would cure the cough of her little child, gave it a dose, and in twenty minutes it was relieved of the cough and every other ailment and trouble in this world.

A host of other drugs that are taken as palliatives and curatives would occasion similar results, if taken in the same relative proportions. Did we wish to empty a barrel of water, we could dip it out with a ten-quart pail sooner than with a table-spoon; to knock out the head would do it more quickly still. All drugs are killative, that is, their use exhausts vitality—some less rapidly than others—but as surely. There is entire safety from their pernicious effects, only in letting them alone.

Mrs. Stanton says of Mrs. Winslow's soothing syrup, that she don't believe there is a Mrs. Winslow, and says that it is "compounded by some ignorant man in whiskers, broadcloth, and boots, who lives and fattens on his ill-gotten gains, while babies are sent by the hundreds to untimely graves, or made idiots or lunatics for life."

Would that the mothers of all the young babies in the land were as skeptical of the virtues of soothing syrup as Mrs. Stanton! It would prolong the days, and increase the comfort of the little innocents. Give babies the right diet, clothe them properly, let them have unrestrained use of the limbs and all the organs, minister to their natural needs, then let them alone to grow and develop. They will be good natured and happy. It is misuse and abuse that causes pain.

P. M. L.

### A Sensible Paragraph.

IN a recent issue of the *Christian Family Companion*, appeared an article on "Every-day Glory," containing the following paragraph, which is worthy of something more than a passing notice. In it we think the writer has touched upon one very important feature of the Christian religion, namely, correct habits in eating and drinking. And while the great mass of religionists at the present time eat and drink much the same as the non-professing world about them, it is really refreshing to see any one in the church who does fling his colors to the breeze, and utter a word of reproof to fellow churchmen for their gross, unhygienic habits. The writer referred to, very truly says:

"Man has not only fallen out of harmony with his kind, but with everything beneath him, so that he is prone to sin with inanimate nature in its relations to him. The food that is designed to nourish him, and qualify him for the service of God, is in many instances used in immoderate quantities, even by believers, and in combinations wholly contrary to the laws of our being, so that what was intended for our highest development and usefulness, only renders us more carnal, and feeds and fosters those powers which keep the leaven of holiness from expanding in our souls. Our tables have much to do with growth in grace and every-day glory. Conformity to the law of God in eating and drinking is a thousandfold more difficult and important than the separation of the church, in the matter of appearance, from the world. "These ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone." The Baptist's coarse fare of locusts and wild honey was not incidental, but a significant feature in his august mission as the inheritor of the Gospel dispensation. His doctrine and manner of life were perfectly correspondent; and our life in its development is not so detached from its *beginning*, as to require no restrictions in eating and drinking.

There is, perhaps, no matter of moment in which the children of God are so faulty as in their eating habits. Ignorance and violation here is the root of many evils. A pampering of the body with rich food, will invariably be followed by corresponding animal qualities. Perhaps there is no community throughout the brotherhood in which are not members who would be more manageable to themselves, and less troublesome to the church, if they would consent to a more rigid and persistent discipline in the matter of diet. There are some devils whom nothing can exorcise but fasting, and there are persons whose lower nature is so predominant that nothing will keep them properly reined but a life-long self-denial at the table. If we want our bodies and souls at command, we must lay the cross on every organ, member, faculty, appetite, and passion. The first sin entered by the mouth, and was connected with the gustatory element in man; and a thorough control of the natural appetite will deprive the carnal of much of its power."

Every word of the above is good, common-sense truth.

G. W. A.

### For the Weak in Faith.

I HAD a short conference, lately, with one of our most popular citizens—a drug doctor, in which I contended, with some force, I trust, that it should be his business, as it should be the business of every physician, to prevent, as well as to cure, sickness. I attempted, further, to show that if our legion of physicians would protest against the errors of society in eating, dressing, liquor-drinking, tobacco-chewing, etc., setting an example of the right themselves, sickness would soon be numbered among the things that were; and that in a generation or so human beings would be as healthy as wild animals. "Oh!" replied he, "if this is your business in your 'Cure,' you'll starve to death. About as well expect to make water flow up stream, as to reform society in these respects." Still later I had a talk with one of our city editors, in which I introduced about the same points. He admitted that I had the truth, but thought that as society still relied so implicitly upon medicines, I could not make a living by opposing them. He referred, if I remember correctly, to the fact that the maker of Wizard Oil had lately visited our place, and by beating drums, blowing horns, and raising a rumpus generally, had humbugged the people out of a cool thousand dollars. Hence my literary friend thought a little humbugging was absolutely necessary to make the truth go. It would be wise, he thought, to profess to give medicine, but really give bread pills, or some other harmless substance.

A few days after all this, I sat thinking how slow the people were to open their eyes

to the great and precious principles which we hygienists advocate. I was almost despairing of anything being accomplished. Like Moses (Exodus iii, 11), I was thinking, Who am I, that I should go unto the Medical Profession, and that I should bring the children of ignorance out of this Egyptian bondage. I began to feel that these gentlemen were right, that truth would yet be starved out. Suddenly I heard a beautiful, clear voice singing, "Dare to be right, dare to be true." Little did she know who heard, or how timely were the words. They came as a message from God. As a bath refreshes the body, so refreshed they my spirit.

Founded, as our cause is, in truth, it must prevail. Why should our faith waver, when the history of the world gives no instance where a single life devoted to truth has failed. It is a fact that many reformers have lost their lives, but still not their toil. Their death has accomplished more than their life. God is on the side of truth. He intends, it seems, that it shall prevail through human efforts. If he calls on his disciples to burn at the stake, or to be crucified, or to be beheaded, he gives them strength to meet their fate, and soon we see how the "blood of the martyrs becomes the seed of the church." Truth is to triumph, but oftentimes through blood. No one's planting will go for naught, though the harvest may be reaped by a future generation.

The old year is dying; it will have gone ere this article is read. Let us all remember that our lives are slipping away, and soon will we pass from behind the foot-lights on the great stage of life. While there are a great many good causes to battle for, it seems to me there is none so needy of recruits as that of Health Reform. Let each one of us lay our plans at once—mine are partially laid already—to do good service in this cause during the year 1869. Cannot each one make from one to a dozen converts. Labor zealously, labor in love, labor with faith. Some have a faculty of getting subscribers. Let them get the largest list possible for the HEALTH REFORMER, or any other good health journal, that these truths may be spread. Others can prevail upon their neighbors, especially those who have been sick for a "term of time," as I heard an illiterate doctor say lately, to change their habits for a month or two. Nine times in ten this short change will convert them. Others can write, and occasionally push their writings into journals that are not reformatory, where they will reach a class which need light badly enough. Others can lecture. I have by this latter

means, and the blessing of God, awakened serious doubts in the minds of many as to the truth of those principles which underlie drug-medication, and in some instances converted them to our faith. I want to write more, talk more, think more, and cure more, in 1869 than I have in 1868, that the great and benevolent cause of health reform may go forward. Can you, my dear reader, say the same, and will you supplement your intentions by hard toil?

E. PERKINS, M. D.

*Artesian Cure, Ottawa, Ill.*

### To the Needy.

As the chilling winds of autumn are sending forth the shrill announcement of their ruler—Boreas'—annual visit, my mind is drawn into sympathy with those health reformers who, preparing for his reception, may, like myself, be isolated from the association and assistance of others who have adopted the dress reform, and, in consequence, are compelled to resort to their own efforts in cutting, fitting, and adapting clothing for winter wear. It is a task of no small importance; and since many, from circumstances and organization, are not adapted to these duties which were formerly controlled by ignorant dress-makers, guided by suicidal fashion-instructions, this need must be supplied; they who are strong bearing the infirmities of the weak, until all, with well-balanced organizations, are fitted for *single* combat with error, if need be.

Where, then, is our "Jennie June," who, investigating and experimenting from the right basis, can suggest for those who have less time and talent for theorizing? One who, possessing an enlightened understanding of the human organism, as it *is* and *may* be, will offer only such styles as will allow and hasten physical perfection, and with morality guiding the artistic, will, whilst renouncing all that cramps and prevents the development of the vital organs, as fixedly discard the feathers, frills, &c., which as surely cramp, and utterly prevent, true soul development.

Hoping that such an one may soon supply our need, I will substitute a few hints, the result of earnest thought and trial, in which I clung only to that which seemeth good:

#### WINTER APPAREL.

The undersuit will first claim our attention. Regarding the proper material, there is a great diversity of opinion. Flannels are considered by many as too irritating; cotton flannel is good; knit garments I consider as better than either. As manufacturers have not sufficiently progressed to supply our exact

need, we must procure shirt and drawers from gentlemen's wardrobe. Cut the shirt down to the length you desire the waist, open entirely in front, and sew to the band of the drawers; this is better than buttoning. Face and button down in front, with slight change in drawers, which should not be left close. The suit is thus complete, securing every desired advantage much better than any home-made garment. The drawers should come to the shoe-top, inside of the stocking. High neck and long sleeves are strictly enjoined, as they secure equal warmth with perfect circulation.

Next in order come the pants, which, like the dress, should be made of dress flannel or cloth thickly lined. Those preferring Turkish pants should indulge the preference only during the summer season, as they leave the ankle insufficiently clad to withstand the severities of our climate. If the full pants are preferred, they may be gathered or plaited into a band, and long enough to fasten inside the shoe-top, thus securing all the advantages of the straight, or plain, ones. These should close at top, and button to a waist of muslin or drilling.

I think it best to dispense with skirts, lining the dress throughout instead. If the waist and skirt are cut separate, the skirt should be well gored, as much plaiting is attended with evil, producing unequal warmth amounting to congestion, inducing debility. A better plan is to cut the waist and skirt together. This can be modified from the fashionable gored dress, if none other can be procured. All should be cut loose enough to admit of the greatest possible expansion of the chest. Insert small pockets in each side seam, with neatly-stitched lapells, covering the opening, an inch, or half an inch, in width. This, with buttons down the front, is sufficient trimming for unperverted tastes. The plain coat sleeve is most convenient, and should fasten at the wrist, securing greater warmth than the open sleeve.

We now find the lower extremities more warmly clothed than the upper. This difficulty may be supplied by wearing a short dress sack, which should button up in front. If the sack is open and rounded in front, the dress must have an extra lining sewed in where the sack leaves the lungs exposed. All such unequal distributions of clothing should be avoided. The sack should be but little longer than the dress waist. If it is made without sleeves, sleeves of equal warmth should be sewed inside the dress sleeve; as these may be made of different cloth, it may prove an advantage where there is a lack of

material. The sack is a pretty accompaniment or addition to the short suit, lessening the temptation to which many foolishly yield, of making the dress to fit very closely.

Old customs of tight-lacing and padding have left a strong impress on human ideality, to which there should be no yielding, unless *reason* dictates what is pleasing. Rigid discipline must be employed whilst reconstructing our ideas of the beautiful. The sack may be bound with tailor's vest binding, or neatly stitched with any colored thread.

If the dress does not stand out from the limbs sufficiently, a double, bias fold of the same material may be sewed on a few inches from the bottom, in form of double tucks. An over-garment cut looser and with less fullness of skirt than the dress, reaching a little below the knees, secures greater comfort than shawls.

If high shoes are worn, they should never be laced so tightly as to impede free circulation, or weaken muscular action. Let all bear in mind that the *short*, is not the *reform*, dress, unless free from all that hinders physical and spiritual growth. May you all be enabled to labor unflinchingly for that march of mind which must ultimately lead to a more general adoption of the reform dress as the American costume.

JENNIE, JR.

### The Sugar Question Again.

BY J. S. GALLOWAY, M. D.

IT is important that we, as health reformers, should know what is, and what is not, promotive of health. It is not less important that we should be able to demonstrate the truth of our doctrines, and defend them against all opponents. Failing in this, though truth be on our side, it will pass for nothing better than falsehood. Such were some of the thoughts suggested by the articles on page 28 of the August, and 68 of the October, number of the REFORMER.

To settle the question whether sugar is, or is not, food, a clear idea of the definition of food is essential. What, then, is food? According to Dr. Webster, it is—"1. In a general sense, whatever is eaten by animals for nourishment, and whatever supplies nutriment to plants. 2. Whatever may be eaten for nourishment. 3. Whatever supplies nourishment and growth to plants. 4. Something that sustains, nourishes, and augments." Gardner defines food thus: "A substance containing any of the principles which exist in the body, is digestible, and not combined with a poisonous ingredient." He also no-

tices particularly three kinds of food: 1. The azotized. 2. The non-azotized. 3. The oleaginous. Foods belonging to the first of these classes, he adds, are the only ones capable of sustaining life by themselves.

Here are the definitions. It is easy to see that they take in a wide range of substances varying from the most perfect to the lowest grades of edible materials. In this form we must accept them, or, refusing to do so, must array ourselves against the high authorities quoted.

1. Is sugar eaten for nourishment? 2. Is it digestible and not combined with a poisonous ingredient? 3. Does it contain any of the principles which exist in the body? If these questions must be answered affirmatively, sugar *is*, if negatively, it *is not*, food.

That sugar, separate from its natural combinations, is digestible and nutritious, may be denied; but the denial of it is not easy to harmonize with well-established facts. An example, well known to the writer, may serve as an illustration. Many similar ones might be cited. A worthy and reliable gentleman, now past the meridian of life, and whose health has been uniformly good, says he does not doubt that, for upwards of twenty years, he has used daily at least one pint of molasses. As an active and energetic business man, he has few superiors. How much better he might or might not be, living more physiologically, it is not our province to discuss at this time.

Dr. Wright, in his "Medicinal Plants of Jamaica," as quoted by Pereira, says, "During the sugar season of the West India Islands, every negro on the plantations, and every animal, even the dogs, grows fat." Similar to this is the uniform testimony of persons familiar with the production of sugar in every region of the world.

Sugar is by ultimate analysis shown to consist of carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, or, more briefly stated, of carbon and water. These are so combined as to be free from any poisonous ingredient. The same elements enter largely into the constitution of the human body, as any work on animal chemistry will fully confirm. Hence it appears that these questions admit only of an affirmative answer, and according to the definitions, *sugar is food*.

But it is said, REFORMER, page 28, that sugar is an inorganic structure, &c. Is this correct? Organic substances are substances which proceed from, or constitute, organic bodies.—*Webster*. Sugar is the product of organic action. It is never found except as the result of such actions. How, then, can it be called *inorganic*? To call it so because

it is devoid of cell structure, is certainly not in harmony with the definition.

Organic chemistry is defined as the chemistry of organic matters, or *such as are directly or indirectly derived from plants or animals*. Sugar is derived directly from plants, and consequently comes within the province of organic chemistry. If further proof is needed, here it is: An *important characteristic* of organized bodies is the complexity of their composition, and their *high equivalent numbers*. The chemical formula for cane sugar is—carbon, 12, hydrogen, 11, oxygen, 11; for grape sugar, carbon, 12, hydrogen, 12, oxygen, 12, water, 2. Can a single example of so high combining proportions be found in the whole range of inorganic matters? If not, with such a preponderance of evidence to the contrary, why call sugar an inorganic substance?

1. "People suppose that very sweet fruits contain sugar, but this is not the case."

2. "To say that sweet fruits contain sugar because sugar can be made from them, is like saying that grain contains alcohol because this poison can be distilled from it."

3. "And when chemists tell us that certain fruits contain sugar, malic acid, &c., because these substances can be obtained from them by a chemical change, it is no more correct than to say that rye or molasses contain alcohol because it can be distilled from them."

4. "The prominent quality of sugar is sweetness. Dates are sweet, and therefore are said to contain sugar."

"The prominent quality of vinegar is sourness. Currants are sour, and therefore they contain vinegar."—*Reformer*.

1. Saccharine matter exists in both vegetables and animals. In the former it is very generally distributed."—*Pereira; Food and Diet*, page 55. The quantity of sugar contained in a variety of substances is found there also, as well as the names of the learned authorities by whom the analyses were made.

2 & 3. The argument here is fallacious. Sugar is obtained from the juice of sweet fruits, not by a *chemical*, but by a *mechanical*, process. Expression and evaporation alone are required to obtain it.

There are no chemical reactions—no decompositions nor recombinations of simple elements nor of compound radicals involved in it. It is simply a separation of vegetable juices from plants by mechanical means and the removal of the solvent water by evaporation. If plants do not contain sugar, we cannot obtain sugar from them.

On the other hand alcohol can never be obtained from sound grains or fruits, except

by a chemical change in their constituent principles. It is produced by the oxydation of the sugar of plants. This is one of the first steps in the process of decomposition. Sugar is destroyed. Alcohol is produced. The next step is the further oxydation of the alcohol and the production of acetic acid, or vinegar. Dr. Trall says, in speaking of the comparative value of raised and fermented bread: "The evil, then, with raised bread, is the presence of common salt; and that of fermented bread is the *destruction of the sugar*, one of the proximate elements of the grain;" and in the next paragraph, "It is true that a part of the sugar is destroyed by fermentation," &c.—*Hydropathic Cook Book*, page 152.

Is it not clear, then, that an argument based upon alcohol as being analogous to sugar is fallacious? And much more true is it that acetic acid and sugar cannot be brought upon the same platform. The one is a more or less constant constituent of all edible plants, fruits, and seeds, in a sound state; the others are never met with until decomposition has begun, and a chemical change in the constituent principles has taken place.

It may be true that fruits, &c., are sometimes sweet without containing sugar. But if it is so, it does not militate against the well-established fact that almost the entire range of articles suitable for food does contain sugar in greater or less proportions.

4. The fallacy of the argument drawn from the natural acidity of fruits, as compared with vinegar, is of the same kind. Fruits contain malic, citric, and other acids, when fully ripe and fit for use. These acids belong to them in a healthy state, and are not in any case the result of decomposition. Vinegar, as we have seen, is produced by fermentation of the sugar of plants, and is produced only in the process of decay. It bears no analogy to acids which exist only in sound plants, and are destroyed by fermentation.

Whatever arguments, then, hold good against the use of sugar as food must be derived from other grounds than these. If such grounds exist, and are tenable, we are right in the view we, as health reformers, take of sugar as an article of diet. If they do not exist, or existing are not tenable, the sooner we change our front on this field, the better for us and our cause.

These grounds will be briefly examined in our next communication.

REPLY, BY R. T. TRALL, M. D.

Whether sugar is, or is not, food, is not to be settled by Webster's Dictionary. Dic-

tionaries give us the significations of words according to popular usage. The definitions may or may not be scientific. It is our business as teachers to explain principles, and let the dictionaries take care of themselves. The absurdity of undertaking to determine a scientific problem by a dictionary definition is so well illustrated by Dr. Galloway himself that I wonder he did not notice it. Thus he quotes *one* of Webster's definitions of food to be, "Whatever may be eaten for nourishment." Alcohol is regarded by some as "respiratory food," and is *eaten* in minced pies, cakes, puddings, &c. Salt is eaten by many "for nourishment," on the supposition that it is essential to nutrition. Offal and other substances are sometimes eaten, though they contain no particle of nourishment.

And now what is food? For vegetables inorganic elements are food, as carbon, phosphate of lime, ammonia, &c.; but animals cannot feed on inorganic elements. The food of animals is the combinations of the inorganic elements into proximate principles, as fibrin, casein, albumen, sugar, starch, &c., and of these into compounds, as wheat, apples, potatoes, &c. Proximate elements are not food proper. This rules out sugar. No animal can long subsist on any one proximate element. The experiment of feeding animals on butter, sugar, lard, starch, gluten, gelatin, albumen, fibrin, &c., has been many times tried, and always with the same result. The animals died of inanition.

Dr. Galloway urges the hackneyed argument that, in sugar-making countries, during the sugar season, negroes, dogs, &c., grow fat. So do pigs and bullocks when sty-fed and stall-fed; so do fowls, geese, and turkeys, when confined in a dark place, and stuffed with alimentary abominations; so do human beings when of sedentary habits, and addicted to slops, stews, gravies, and dishes of which sugar and starch are the chief ingredients. But in all these cases the animals and persons become diseased. Their fatness is not an evidence that they are well nourished, but that their depurating organs are obstructed, and their bodies loaded with impurities.

Prof. Dalton (*Physiology*, page 94,) says: "In Louisiana and the West Indies, during the few weeks occupied in gathering the cane, and extracting the sugar, all the negroes employed on the plantations, and even the horses and cattle that are allowed to feed freely on the saccharine juices, grow remarkably *fat*; and they again lose their superabundant *flesh* when it is past." Dr. Dalton is one of our most careful and accurate physiologists, but he has made a bad blunder in confounding

fat with flesh; and Dr. Galloway is in the very same predicament.

Now it is entirely immaterial to our argument, whether sugar is an organic or inorganic substance; whether it is, or is not, a proximate principle of vegetables; whether it does, or does not, exist in foods as *sugar*. Phosphate of lime, carbonate of lime, soda, chloride of potassium, chloride of sodium, phosphate of magnesia, iron, &c., are found or *produced* as the product of chemical analysis. But no one pretends they should be eaten as food, or can be used as food if eaten. They are food for vegetables, but not for animals. Nor are, as already remarked, sugar, starch, fibrin, or other alimentary principles, foods proper, although animals might live longer by their use than by eating nothing. They are, at most, only component parts of food. It is food itself, not its ingredients in their separate state, that can sustain prolonged nutrition. Even grain, the most nutritious of all foods, cannot sustain the health permanently, when deprived of the bran.

I need not dwell on the absurd distinctions into azotized, non-azotized, oleaginous, saccharine, (and Liebig and Pereira give us an alcoholic) alimentary principles; for, as these are not foods at all, they do not apply to the question in issue. The muddlement of Dr. Galloway, and of the whole medical profession, consists in confounding alimentary principles with aliments. Oxygen and nitrogen are constituents of atmospheric air; but either alone cannot maintain respiration. Oxygen and hydrogen are constituents of water; but either, in its separate state, is not drink. Sugar, or starch, or fibrin, &c., may or may not be a constituent of the living solids and fluids; and whether it is or is not, it is not food *per se*. It may be one of several substances, which, when arranged and compounded in a certain manner (not chemically, but organically), constitute food. Indeed, we do not know the actual constituents of any form of food. Chemical analysis decomposes and destroys more or less of them, and instead of proving what the proximate elements of food are, chemistry only tells us what substances we have in hand, after the food has been destroyed. You might as well analyze the brain chemically, to ascertain the qualities of the mind, as to analyze a potato chemically to ascertain the properties of food. The processes of life, development, growth, and organic structural arrangement, can never be explained by the laws and manipulations of dead matter.

As to the case of the man who took a pint of molasses a day, and kept about his busi-

ness, it is easily enough disposed of by the well-authenticated cases of old toppers who have taken "an honest quart a day" of rum, for forty years. Such examples may prove that humanity is tough, but they do not prove that sugar, or rum, or sugar *and* rum, are wholesome food, or food at all.

I do not see that the chemical constitution (as it is called) of sugar has any relevancy whatever. It may consist of carbon, oxygen, and hydrogen, and nothing else, and these elements may exist in the "constitution of the human body," and yet sugar be in no sense food. Aqua fortis is composed of oxygen and nitrogen, and these elements exist largely in all the tissues of the body, yet aqua fortis is neither food nor drink. When Dr. Galloway understands that the matter at issue is not a chemical, but a physiological, problem, he will be better prepared to investigate it.

### Isn't It True?

WE think but few, who use it, are aware how much injury they are receiving from chewing, smoking, or snuffing tobacco. Neither are they aware how offensive it is to those who do not use it; for if they were, we feel sure they would quit it at once, to please their friends, even if there were no other reason; but when we consider its injurious effects upon the physical, intellectual, and moral constitution of man, there are reasons for breaking this bad habit which should lead every one to bid it an eternal farewell.

In one of our exchanges an able writer, who makes no profession of religion, when contrasting the moral effects "of liquor or beer drinking, and the use of tobacco," says, "the latter at least is the equal in its immoral tendency to any other bad habit. Millions are the unconscious criminals, and millions the unconscious, innocent sufferers. Thousands are, day by day, wearing their lives and health away, as well as that of those to whom they are the most intimately related."

We are most fully satisfied that this is true. We are glad to find the attention of our brethren and sisters is being called to this subject, and that many have already broken off from the bad habit, and now feel much better than when they used it. Let others follow their example.—*World's Crisis*.

BENEFIT your friends that they may love you still more dearly; benefit your enemies that they may become your friends, is an old Arabian maxim worth cultivating.

THREATENING a bad habit does not kill it.

"LIVE WHILE YOU LIVE,"

At noonday by his table, spread  
 With all that epicure could wish,  
 Is seen a man, who, though well fed,  
 Untasted leaves no dish;  
 But each successive one that's brought,  
*That* he must try! Who ever thought  
 Of leaving ere he was quite full?  
 For when enough he had to eat,  
 No other man himself could beat;  
 And then it was, oh! such a treat—  
 Always had been his rule.

At noonday in his stomach, though,  
 A great commotion meets the sight,  
 And, by the wrangling, one may know  
 That all is not just right;  
 For there is war within to-day,  
 And *Gastric* holds the foe at bay,  
 As he has done before.  
 And *Saliva* above is heard,  
 Disputing loud with earnest word,  
 For anger is within him stirred,  
 Choice liquors downward pour.

Time passes on—the man still eats—  
 The stomach still at work;  
 When up above is heard a shout,  
 Down there! It comes! Look out! Look out!  
 The flood-gates ope,—down come the beets,  
 Custards, gravies, puddings, and meats,  
 Cucumber sauce, and venison jerks,  
 A half a pie, some pickled tripe,  
 Spare-rib, salt pork, and now a snipe.  
*Gastric* is heard to cry,  
 Stop! or I shall just now expire!  
 Stop! or I'll burn you up with fire!  
 Stop! ere you're laid down with your sire!  
 Stop quick, before I die!

The stomach worked both long and well,  
 Digesting food it did not need;  
 It conquered, but a martyr fell  
 To appetite and greed.  
 Such scenes repeated every day,  
 Soon make the stoutest frame give way;  
 Despairing nature yields.  
 Dyspepsy, sorrow, pains and woes,  
 Drive far from such, a night's repose;  
 The wound is never healed.

E. H. S. R.

False Ideas of Comfort.

"I MEAN to take all the comfort I can while I do live, if it is n't but a few years," said a young man, as he took a dram of liquor when at work in the field, and was reproved by a friend, at the same time telling him that it would shorten his life. Poor, deluded man!

But go with me to the churchyard, dear reader, and I will show you the grave, without a headstone, to mark the spot where that man sleeps. He has taken "all the comfort" he could with delirium tremens caused by stimulants, and has lain down in the tomb.

Others lie in close proximity to the one above mentioned, who shortened their lives by "riotous living," or, as they express it, "taking comfort." But you are familiar with such cases, for a great portion of the human family have been deluded by this same deception of Satan, viz., that comfort can only be taken through the channels of a perverted ap-

petite, and the exercise of their various passions and lusts. We regret that people should make such a wrong definition of the word; for what comfort can be taken when the body is full of pains and disorders which are brought on, or made worse, by a wrong way of living.

"I see you go in for health," said a lady to me not long since; "but, for my part, I am going to have anything I like, and everything, whether it is healthy or not." Well, thought I, you alone must suffer the effects of wrong living, and if you can take any pleasure in having bad health, of which you have just been telling me (she had informed me of her poor health), then you are certainly welcome to it. But for me, out of many who will bear the same testimony, I think there is more solid comfort in cleansing ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh, perfecting holiness in the fear of God. And I am glad that God, in his good providence, has shown us "the more excellent way," and I hope that very many may prefer to walk in it.

P. A. MINER.

RESULTS OF BEER DRINKING.—Dr. Cox, a prominent physician in Ohio, after thirty years' experience, declares that beer, although it is often recommended by the medical profession, is most pernicious to the human system. When disease has taken hold of the children of beer-drinking parents, he has often been astonished to see how suddenly and easily they succumb and die, compared with the children of those who drink water. Cases requiring surgical treatment, and ulcers and sores, are much more difficult of management in beer-drinkers than even in whiskey-topers.

PHYSICIANS OFTEN TO BLAME.—The "Catholic World," in a recent article, referring to the prevalence of whisky drinking in this country, which it styles "the dominant curse, the crying evil of the day," truly exposes one great source of this fearful calamity. It says, "Thousands have become habitual drinkers, and ultimately confirmed inebriates, through the advice of their medical advisers. In accordance with some absurd hypothesis, or perchance to please their patients, too many medical men, during the past twenty years, have ordered the habitual use of whisky, rum, brandy, and other stimulants. The calamities thus entailed are fearful to contemplate, and those thoughtless physicians who have contributed so largely in extending this great national vice will bear to their graves a dreadful responsibility."

DR. TRALL'S  
Special Department.

Saccharum Logicorum.

THE sugar question threatens to become interminable. The sweet-tooth of people, the chemistry of Liebig, the definition of Webster, stomacheic proclivities, ancient usages, modern customs, early impressions, and ingrained errors, come rushing "like the sound of many waters" against our position that sugar is not food. The last demonstration "of the enemy" comes from R. L. Lamb, of Ransomville, N. Y., in the following words:

"R. T. Trall, M. D.: *Dear Sir*, According to the measure of light vouchsafed me, am I trying to live a health reformer. I was a subscriber to the *Herald of Health* till you left it, then took the *Gospel of Health* while you published it, and now receive the HEALTH REFORMER, which, saving its small size, is my model of what we need. I have never yet abandoned the use of sugar; yet I seek to know truth, regardless of individual habits. In the September REFORMER, replying to "S. T.," you say, 'We have yet to learn that sugar exists in those articles' (apples, beets, berries, &c.). Now I readily see that alcohol and vinegar cannot be claimed as existing in grains and fruits; for until fermentation has destroyed the saccharine principle, these are not found. But is this true in regard to sugar? When we subject the juice of the beet, and the sap of the maple to the process of evaporation, which we can perform in one minute, we find that sugar is obtained as a result. Now if it did not exist in our juice or sap at the outset, how have we, by evaporation of the water therein, obtained it?"

Mr. Lamb will find his queries answered in our reply to Dr. Galloway, which we need not repeat in this place. We will remark, however, that juice and sap are not sugar. You might as well call ice, water. Neither ice nor sugar can circulate in the living organism. Again, the elements or materials which exist in the juice or sap, and which are said to constitute the saccharine principle, may undergo changes when out of the living structures, and exposed to atmospheric air, oxygen, and other gases, and to an altered condition of temperature. Chemical and organic affinities are each subject to conditions of light and temperature also. Elements that will combine or separate in one condition of "material forces" will not in another. The same chemical or organic elements that will form certain kinds of substances when subjected to a given temperature, or to a given "mode of motion"—heat, light, electricity, magnetism, &c.—as gold or muscular fiber, will, under different elementary conditions, produce very different substances—gas or sugar, &c. Hence

all "organic chemistry" is deceptive. We can never know what exists in a living structure by the products obtained from chemical analysis. But, even admitting that sugar is a normal constituent of beets, maple trees, grains, fruits, &c., it by no means follows that sugar is food, as explained in our article to Dr. G.

In conclusion, it may be interesting to sugar-eaters to learn that nearly, if not quite, all the brown sugars of commerce are largely infested with a little insect, the "*accaris sacchari*." This insect very nearly resembles the itch insect, if not identical with it. It is a hideous and disgusting "varmint," somewhat resembling the sea-crab in appearance. Mr. Robert Nichols, of Greenock, Scotland, has recently published a tract with wood cuts of these animals, and they are certainly hideous to look upon—more so than any spider—ugh! Mr. Nichols has examined, microscopically, nearly two hundred specimens of raw sugar, in each of which were found myriads of these infinitesimal monsters. From 100,000 to 200,000 were found in a single pound of sugar. The "grocer's itch" is supposed to be occasioned by these creatures.

The Penalty Problem.

"DR. TRALL: *Dear Sir*, I am thankful to you for explaining the difference between antidotes and medicines so fully; and I am satisfied with your answers to my questions, with the exception of 'escaping the penalties.' Suppose a man swallow a large enough dose of poison to kill him in a short time, say in an hour, but promptly takes an antidote, and lives for years; is not this escaping the penalty, or effect, in part at least? Which I think would not be strict justice."

Suppose a person should throw a stone at your head with sufficient momentum to kill you in an instant, and just before the stone strikes you, you should dodge and not be injured at all. Would this be escaping the penalty entirely? In the case of the poison the penalty is precisely proportioned to the quantity of the poison, and the time it remained as poison in the stomach. If it only remained a few seconds, the penalty (effect) would be slight; and if the quantity had been small, and it had remained a long time, the penalty would also have been slight. In the case of the stone, there was no violation of organic law, hence, no penalty. Swallowing (in the case of the poison) is not a violation of vital law; but the poison, or thing swallowed, is. Hence the penalty pertains to the thing, its quantity and the time it is in contact with the living system; for, as vital resistance continues as long as the poison is

present, so the penalty (effect or consequence) accumulates.

### Gospel of Health, and Health Reformer.

WE have received several communications like the following, and therefore take this occasion to explain:

“Waterbury Center, Vt., Nov. 3, 1868.

“Dr. Trall: *Dear Sir*, I see by a notice in the *Phrenological Journal* that you are to resume or revive the *Gospel of Health*. By the circular you put out for the HEALTH REFORMER, I should judge the contrary. I wish you would inform me definitely in this matter. Several of my acquaintances also desire the information.

“TIMOTHY WHEELER.”

The circular is right, and the *Journal* is wrong. The announcement in the *Phrenological Journal* was probably intended for one year ago, but got laid over by accident, as we did then resume the *Gospel* after a suspension of six months.

### “Vegetable Cattle Powder.”

SOME one has sent us a circular explanatory and proclamatory of the marvelous virtues of Breinig, Fronfield & Co.’s invention for causing cattle, horses, pigs, and perhaps sheep and poultry, to be healthy, and for causing cows to yield a much larger quantity of milk and butter on the same amount of food. We have no doubt the powder will be extensively purchased by our agricultural community. Nothing is required to make a patent nostrum sell, be it food or medicine for man or beast, but an advertisement full of silly pretensions, absurd assertions, ridiculous statements, and nonsensical phrases. Therefore, we judge the cattle humbug will be a success.

The proprietor says, “The powder will act on the animal system just as manure will act on the soil; it stimulates, but in a natural way, without any injurious effect afterwards.” As there is no such action of manure on the soil, this ought to be satisfactory to all inquiring minds. Manures mingle with the soil, are decomposed, and then their elements (manures no longer) are taken up by plants. There is no stimulation of the soil, and no action on the soil. But the nonsense of the statement is all the better to make the stuff “take.” Then again says the learned proprietor, “Its operation is purely a chemical one.” As there is no chemical action in living structures, this is a good hit again, commercially speaking. But greater marvels are to come: “It will convert *effete matter* [the italics are his] in the animal stomach into a

nutritious element.” This is not only a “whopper,” but a pronouncement so transcendently silly that the powders ought to go off like a thousand pounder. The proprietor is a genius. The success of a humbug is always to be measured solely by the skill of the proprietor in advertising. Every thing depends on his method of stating the case. And the cattle-powder man has stumbled on something original. It will probably make his fortune, as a hundred quack adventurers before him have made their pile before the “original discovery” was detected. To convert the excretions (the ashes, or *debris*, of the worn-out tissues) into food is certainly an achievement. It ought to save the farmer the trouble and expense of feeding his cattle any thing except the powder.

Some years ago, after the fattening properties of cod-liver oil had been discovered, several English farmers conceived the brilliant idea that it would be economy to feed their cattle a few ounces of cod-liver oil. And it was found that a less amount of food was necessary to fatten them. But it was soon found that the animals became unhealthy; their flesh became soft, flabby, and hemorrhagic; their gums inclined to bleed; their fat had a putrescent odor; and the whole carcass had a tainted appearance: and the experiment was finally abandoned. The same will be the result of the cattle powder; but, perhaps, before the credulous farmers ascertain by experience that animals, like humans, can never have pure blood, sound flesh, and normal secretions, unless they are restricted to natural food, the cunning empiric may acquire a competence.

### An Interesting Case.

THE following communication contains several particulars of interest, especially to those who are not familiar with the effects of opium and other drugs, therefore we give it in full:

“Campbellville, Cal., Oct. 17, 1868.

“Dear Dr. Trall: My wife has recently had a troublesome patient to treat, and wishing your advice, we send you the particulars. Mr. D. V. Thompson came to our house three months ago very sick; his hands and feet were covered with putrid, running sores, which were very offensive; he was also affected with slight chills and considerable fever; skin very yellow; severe pains across the loins and between the shoulders, indicative of a bad condition of the liver, complicated probably with disease of the kidneys.

“We treated him with warm packs, sitz-baths, foot-baths, wet cloths around the loins, and tepid injections. At the end of four days, his fever disappeared, and in ten days his sores were healed. But soon his fever returned, and con-

tinued until he was reduced to a perfect skeleton. Each forenoon he would be in a stupor similar to a person under the influence of some narcotic drug. We could not account for this feature of the case as he received nothing in the shape of drug medicine at our hands. We inquired if he was taking morphine or laudanum, and he said, No. His debility and stupor continuing to increase, we feared, with reason too, that he would die unless we could find some means to relieve him soon. Suspecting that he was using medicine of some kind, we searched his pockets, and found a lump of opium as large as an egg. The mystery was now solved, and on questioning him he confessed that he was a slave to the habit of opium-eating, and had been for nearly eight years, his regular daily dose being two heaping teaspoonfuls of the pulverized drug. Now we understood why his liver and kidneys were so torpid, and why he could not bear cold, nor even cool, water to touch him.

We took the opium from him, and because of his protestation that he would surely die if we took it all away at once, we diminished the quantity gradually to two grains, then took it all away, giving him instead two tablespoonfuls of brandy. After we had reduced the doses of opium, his chills and fever abated; but, if possible, he grew weaker, and there seemed to be very little prospect of his recovery. At length he began to gain in flesh and strength, and is now able to sit up all day, and to walk short distances. We continue treating him with sitz-baths, wet bandages across the loins, and daily enemas. His principal trouble at present is severe pain at times in the loins, with occasional swelling of the feet.

Now, dear sir, we desire you to answer, either by letter or through the REFORMER, whether we could have done better in the treatment; also what course of treatment to pursue in the future, especially with regard to the swelling of the feet. We are surrounded here by enemies of the hygienic system, and have but few friends to help us in the good cause, so that a word of instruction or encouragement from you will be highly appreciated. You are at liberty to make any use of this letter you please.

Our friends, the drug doctors, assured us that our patient would die.

Yours sincerely,

J. E. EDDY.

#### REPLY.

The case was very judiciously managed on the whole. We have had many similar cases to manage, and have always taken away the opium at once, and have never used brandy nor any other stimulant as a substitute. There is no danger whatever of dying because of the sudden abstraction of opium, tobacco, alcohol, or any other poison, although the patient generally feels very wretched for a time, and seems very much like dying. But he will finally recover much sooner and with less wear of constitution than he will if the poison is diminished gradually. His kidneys are in a bad condition. The persistent pains in the loins and the dropsical tendency indicate *albuminuria*, or Bright's disease; and if

this has already progressed till the whole substance of the kidneys has become soft, flabby, and ulcerous (fatty degeneration), the patient may be incurable. The dietary should be very strict, and milk and sugar strictly prohibited.

#### Answers to Correspondents.

SPINAL IRRITATION.—F. E. C.: "Dr. Trall: What is the matter with a woman's back-bone when the lower portion is so tender as to be painful while sitting? and what is the remedy? My wife is affected in this way. She is not often troubled except when seated, and then is frequently so sensitive that she cannot sit upright. This pain was first experienced some five years ago, soon after the birth of our last child; then disappeared for awhile, but is now nearly constant."

Hemorrhoidal tumors in the lower bowel, or displacement of the uterus, with some degree of chronic inflammation, will account for the symptom. Possibly both causes may co-exist. Before the precise treatment can be indicated, the exact nature of the case must be understood.

SCROFULOUS OPHTHALMIA.—D. B. W.: "Dr. Trall, *Dear Sir*—Please inform me, through the REFORMER, of the cause and remedy for my diseased eyes. They have been troubling me for five or six years. The passages to the nostrils appear to be closed. Some physicians say that they have grown together, and others that the stoppage is occasioned by swelling. There is some inflammation always present, with pain in my head. They discharge continually, and my vision is very dim. Can they be cured without having pins put in them?"

The lachrymal ducts are closed by the inflammation and swelling, and the lids are in a state of chronic inflammation. The ducts are sometimes kept open by the introduction of silver tubes or pins; but we are of the opinion that a few months of strict hygienic treatment would restore the eyes without surgical appliances of any kind, unless, possibly, caustics to destroy granulations. You should not undertake home treatment.

WET GIRDLE—BROWN BREAD.—D. T.: "Would it not be better for me to wear the wet girdle during the night in the cold weather? Which kind of brown bread is the least objectionable, that raised with hop yeast, or that raised with salt rising?"

1. Yes. 2. There is very little to choose.

SHINGLING THE HAIR—SORENESS OF THE SCALP—SALT: "Dr. Trall—Would it be

well to have the hair shingled on the back part of the head, when a person is sensitive to cold? What is the cause of occasional soreness of the scalp? Do you think it safe to abstain from the use of salt in all cases, and at once, especially in feeble constitutions, and also when convalescing from acute diseases?"

1. No. 2. Foul stomach. 3. Yes.

**AGUE CAKE.**—T. M. S.: This term is usually applied to a chronic enlargement of the spleen; but sometimes to enlargement of the liver. Persons who have taken large quantities of quinine are very subject to glandular indurations. A very strict and spare diet is essential to their successful treatment. The wet-sheet pack and wet girdle are usually indicated. There is seldom any difficulty in removing the tumors in young or middle-aged persons.

**NEURALGIA.**—M. A. Y.—No doubt the horrid sufferings of the patient, whose case you describe, are owing entirely to the mercury, iron, and morphine, which she has taken. The management of such patients is very difficult, and they ought to be at a "Cure." Fomentations to the painful parts, cold wet cloths to the head, and hot bottles to the feet, are among the measures to allay the pain, and prepare the system for full hygienic treatment.

**SCROFULA.**—A. S. L.—Tumors and ulcers of the neck can, in nearly all cases, be entirely removed and healed in young persons, by a rigid course of hygienic treatment. In extreme cases, it may have to be persevered in for two or three years. The dietary should consist principally of good fruit; and, unless the patient is emaciated, one meal a day is better than more.

**NURSING SORE MOUTH.**—H. H.—The latest theory of the causes of this malady, and that of aptha, or thrush, in infants, is that they are caused by parasitic fungi which accumulate on the mucous surfaces, analagous somewhat to the itch insect (*acarus scabei*) which burrows under the cuticle. Carbolic acid may kill them, but pure food and perfect cleanliness are sure preventives.

**ALCOHOL VS. RATTLESNAKE.**—R. S. S.: "Is it a fact, as is often asserted, that drinking freely of alcoholic beverages will cause the poison injected by the serpent into the system to be innocuous? If so, has not the alcohol neutralized the virus? And hence shall we not be compelled to believe that alcoholic stimulants may be used, in at least one case, with beneficial results?"

Alcohol does *not* neutralize the virus of the rattlesnake, nor render it innocuous.

**WHEAT OIL.**—R. L. S.: "In what part of wheat is the fat or oil contained?"

In no part of it. You might as well inquire, In what part of the beet, or maple tree, is the sugar contained?

#### ONE WORD.

I WOULD add my testimony in favor of health reform. I have tried it for six months, and would not return to flesh diet and three meals a day for anything. I can work hard, and sleep better, and relish my food better than I used to. I have been troubled with kidney complaint for a number of years, and now I am almost free from the pain I formerly experienced from this difficulty. I believe it is good to keep the commandments of God and live out the health reform. I tried the reform as an experiment, and would advise all the readers of the REFORMER, who have not done so already, to try it, and they will never regret it. D. R. LEIGHTON.

#### DAILY WATCHFULNESS.

Sum up at night what thou hast done by day;  
And in the morning, what thou hast to do.  
Dress and undress thy soul. Mark the decay  
And growth of it. If, with thy watch, that too  
Be down, then wind up both. Since we shall be  
Most surely judged, make thy accounts agree.

In brief, acquit thee bravely—play the man.  
Look not on pleasures as they come, but go.  
Defer not the least virtue. Life's poor span  
Make not an ell, by trifling in thy woe.  
If thou do ill, the joy fades, not the pains;  
If well, the pain doth fade, the joy remains.  
—George Herbert.

**ARTICLES WANTED.**—The *Rural Southerner* hits off the fashionable airs of the present day in the following style:

Wanted—An intended bride, who is willing to commence housekeeping in the same style in which her parents began.

Twenty fashionable young ladies who dare to be seen wielding a dust brush, or darning their brothers' stockings, if a gentleman should happen to make an early call.

Ten independent young ladies, "of good families," who dare to wear their last winter's bonnets to church on a fine Sunday.

Fourteen young ladies, "who are anybody," who dare to be seen in the street wearing shoes thick enough to keep their feet warm.

Fifty young ladies of sufficient age "to go in company," who dare confess that they have ever made a loaf of bread or a pudding.

A GOOD life keeps off wrinkles.

## Items for the Month.

THE NEW YEAR—"Again we change our final figure," and write '69, as we enter the last year of the decade of sixties. Another year is numbered with the past, with all its privileges, opportunities, and blessings. To the thinking mind the close of a year always brings a train of retrospection. As we realize that our time for doing good, in the service of God and our fellowmen, has been shortened by just one year, we naturally look over the year which has gone, with an instinctive feeling of inquiry as to what we have done, and how well it has been performed.

To the true reformer this spirit is most natural. His work is aggressive, and, if fruitful, progressive. As the record of the long weeks and months of a weary year's toil become matters of history, the inquiry comes home to the mind, Have I made the record of the past year a chapter in the history of a misspent life, or has my progress been such that it can be reviewed with a degree of satisfaction in view of the good accomplished in the cause of reform?

But with the death of the old year comes the birth of the new, upon which we may look with the feeling of hope that if our lives are spared we may, perhaps, to some extent, redeem the errors and follies of the past. The experience of the past should be our help in the future, and wherein we have acted or spoken unwisely, let us remember it through all coming time, lest our identity with the cause of truth be a hindrance to its progress, instead of a help.

With this hope animating us, and earnestly desiring its fulfillment for all our readers, we cordially send to them our greeting, and wish them, one and all, A HAPPY NEW YEAR.

A correspondent asks: "How many kinds of wine are mentioned in the Bible?" The following from Rev. Dr. Nott will answer the question:

"No less than nine words are employed in the Hebrew Bible to express the different kinds of vinous beverage formerly in use; all of which kinds of beverage are expressed in our English version by the single term 'wine,' or by that term in connection with some other term expressive of quality. The term 'wine,' therefore, as used in our English Bible, is to be regarded as a generic term, comprehending different kinds of beverage, and of very different qualities; some of which kinds were good, some bad; some to be used frequently and freely, some seldom and sparingly, and some to be utterly, and at all times, avoided."

To which the *Hygienic Advocate* adds the following comment:

"The wine that dishonored Noah, defiled Lot, caused the prophets to err, priests to turn aside and fall; the wine that brings woe, mocks, and deceives; the drink prepared by harlots, and de-

sired by libertines, cannot be the wine which wisdom prepares and Evangelists offered at the communion table; which made glad the heart of man, and was a fit emblem of God's mercies. There is a wine that is condemned, in connection with drunken feasts, and also a wine that is recommended, not for its intoxicating qualities, for it has none."

We commence in this number the publication of a series of articles on "Bionomy," from the pen of S. Waters Davis, M. D. As some of the ideas put forth will be new to many or all of our readers, we ask for them a careful and critical perusal, as indeed we do for all the theories advanced in our columns.

Several excellent articles are necessarily crowded out of the present number for want of space, and will appear next month.

SPECIMEN COPIES.—We have reason to believe that specimen copies, sent for by those who wish to act as agents for the REFORMER, have sometimes failed to reach their destination, by some fault in the P. O. department. Those who have ordered specimen copies, and failed to receive them, will please renew their requests.

The article on page 124, headed "The Temperance Question," from the pen of Wm. Clark, is of more than ordinary interest and merit. The subject is handled with an excellent spirit, and in an able manner.

"THE SUGAR QUESTION."—We hope our readers will not get tired of this subject, about which so much has been said of late in the REFORMER. Whatever may be our opinions as to the degree of harm resulting from its use, the real question as to whether sugar is food, ought to be settled in the minds of all intelligent reformers. To such the articles of Dr. Galloway, and the reply of Dr. Trall, will be interesting, as throwing light upon this "vexed question."

We will send Specimen Numbers of the current volume on receipt of a stamp.

NEWSPAPER DIRECTORY.—G. P. Rowell & Co., the New York Advertising Agents, are about issuing a complete American Newspaper Directory. It is a compilation much needed, since nothing of the kind having any claims to completeness has ever been published.

Messrs. Rowell & Co. have spared no pains or expense to make the forthcoming work complete. We understand the book will be a handsome octavo volume of about 300 pages, bound in dark cloth, and sold for Five Dollars per copy.

As the publishers are Advertising Agents, their issuing a work containing so much information, usually jealously guarded by those in that business, shows that they are confident of their ability to be of service to advertisers, or they would not so readily place in their hands the means of enabling every one to communicate direct with publishers if they so desire.