

REVIEWS AND BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTICES.

XXIV.—*A treatise on Therapeutics and Pharmacology or Materia Medica.*

By GEO. B. WOOD, M.D., late President of the College of Physicians in Philadelphia, Professor of the theory and practice of medicine in the University of Pennsylvania Hospital. One of the authors of the United States Dispensatory, author of a treatise on the practice of medicine, &c., &c. In two vols, p.p. 1741. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. London: Trubner & Co. Montreal: B. Dawson. 1856. Price 40s.

We are indebted to the American press for several works of originality upon materia medica, as instances, may be specified, the treatises of Chapman, Bigelow, Bell, Paine, Harrison, Eberle, Dunglison, Mitchell, Tully, Wood, and Baché,—which, as productions of personal merit, are of a high order and deservedly esteemed. To these another has been added, that, we are persuaded, will not dishonor its forerunners. On the contrary, we predict it will occupy a prominent place in the front rank of excellence, and, therefore, we experience pleasure in entering upon its review.

The history of medicine is signalized by the many controversies that have been waged from era to era, concerning the nature of diseases. Of these the one, most talked of now, was that which subsisted between two contradictory schools. According to one school all diseases were seated in the fluids of the body, while the opponent contended for their residence in the animal solids. The espousers of these respective theories soon became illustrious, those of the first were named humoralists, and the holders of the last were designated solidists. Of course, as in every other *casus belli*, each champion believed himself to be infallibly right, and his adversary egregiously wrong. Both saw their days of fame—both rose and sank. It is not our purpose to dwell further upon them at present; we still have fragmentary evidences of their conception, but happily neither are now upheld with the same illiberalism they once were. Some think pathologists are again taking up exclusively fluid-like notions and returning to the primitive belief of their ancestors, but we believe instead of such a revolutionary system, men of our age are pre-eminently characterized by a tendency to form combinations in their views, and so harmoniously blend together antecedent disagreements. Hence, it is that we hear from the same individual opinions upon one subject that are purely humoral, and others on a different topic which are strictly solidical; and we find the pathology of to-day a double