

1st. The Eclectic philosophy is *progressive* in its aims.

2d. It is liberal in its teachings and spirit.

Medicine has as yet but poorly attained that eminence which entitles it to the rank of a science. Strong as is the hold which it takes on man by reason of the dangers which surround his mortal part, and the hopes of protection against such dangers, which it presents, little about it is *certain*. No absurder notion can find its way into the brain of one who takes to the study of medicine, than that the *Healing Art* has reached its culmination. Schools and speculations may have done so, but till Doctors agree better by far than at present, and have become much more practical, modesty of pretension will become them. Truth is progressive as it is imperishable. But little of truth in respect of the *prevention* of diseases, their causes and cure, so far at least as they apply to the human race, is *known* and settled. What men *call* science is often but the fanciful wrapped up in new covering; the workings and seethings of acute brains; "well enough in their way," but not reliable, as the results of wide-spread generalization, based on accumulated facts. A fact is one thing; hypothesis, another thing. The latter may be good in its place, but that place is not that which *fact* occupies. Thinking is good; speculation is admirable; but it is *ill* to put one's fantasies in the sphere appropriate only to established truths, and call these fantasies by the name of SCIENCE. It is as bad to do so in medicine as in theology. It makes men bigots. It cramps their souls till distortion takes the place of beauty, and they fall victims of their theories. Such men are almost always holding foregone conclusions; and are the least calculated to aid a great Art to make its way into the sphere where it may justly and proudly claim to be a SCIENCE.

The greatest boasters in the whole range of educated men are *Doctors*. They pride themselves on their *knowledge* of the laws of life and the sure methods whereby the supremacy of these laws can be maintained. Yet with all their assumed knowledge, they fall into such disagreements as to attract general attention. They part off into cliques and sectional associations, and swear that "knowledge shall die with them." Now their disagreements *prove* the uncertainties that cluster about what they are pleased to call undoubted facts. Anatomy and chemistry, which are departments of medicine, are capable of exact and precise study. But where is the exactness of Physiology? Separate the problematical from the demonstrable, cull the imaginative from that which is proved, and what have you left? Huge volumes would dwindle into primer books. So with Patholo