

*The Douche.*—The water is thrown against, or falls upon the skin of a certain part. Kneipp's apparatus for douching is very primitive, consisting of an ordinary sprinkling can, which has a set of nozzles to furnish different kinds of streams. In a case which is capable of reacting, Kneipp's douche is of great value. The cutaneous anæmia, produced partly by the cold water and partly by the force with which the water falls upon the skin, is well marked. The force of the falling water acts by mechanically pressing upon the tissues of the skin *en masse*, and thus affecting them after the manner of massage. The force of the douche is, of course, in proportion to the distance from which the water falls, and is also dependent upon the size of the stream. The cold douche is an alternative of great power. Its effects are prompt and profound. The reaction following it is, as a rule, very intense. Kneipp combines the douche in various ways with the other forms of water applications, the object being to *intensify reaction*, which, after all, is the object of all hydrotherapeutic methods. This object, in so far as it is the physiological purpose of hydrotherapy, is strictly scientific, and therefore legitimate. It is only the way in which the accomplishment of this purpose is sought which is at times open to criticism. Like all empirics, Kneipp does not know at all times how to adapt the means to the end. His method of giving douches is somewhat indiscriminate, and hence not infrequently objectionable. It cannot be gainsaid, however, that in suitable cases Kneipp's douches are of great service. They restore muscular tone and elasticity to a remarkable extent and stimulate local circulation and tissue change. Let me add that massage, in spite of Kneipp's protest, is, in conjunction with the douche, an excellent auxiliary measure.

In conclusion, let me ask: What can be said of Kneipp and his methods

from a strictly scientific point of view? Has he established or taught anything new or original? Nothing would be more erroneous than to assume that Kneipp or Priessnitz or Schroth, or any other exponent of common-sense applied to the *art* of healing, has added one iota to the *science* of medicine. Their success simply proves that after all it is the simple fundamental laws of hygiene and physiology that contain the principles of the art of healing. The *vis medicatrix nature* is willing and, *ceteris paribus*, able to do her work whenever we give her a chance. Above all things place every patient in the surroundings which the living organism by reason of its construction and destination requires. No plant can live without *light* and *air*. How can we expect the highly organized body of man to develop and thrive without light and without air? It is well known that the lower animals in captivity degenerate physically. They need *exercise* to keep them strong and healthy. How can you expect man to retain his mental and physical boyancy if you allow the perverted mode of living of to-day to make a machine out of him? Every member of the brute creation craves for the food adapted to the physiological requirements of its organism; it instinctively respects the science of dietetics. Why should man be allowed to disregard the voice of nature and *eat* and *drink* as his ultra-refined or vitiated appetite prompts him? Hygiene and dietetics, practically applied, are indeed, the preventers and healers of at least one-half of the diseases to which human flesh is heir. To act according to hygienic and dietetic laws is what I designated as "common-sense applied to the *art* of healing." It is the foundation upon which the magnificent superstructure of the science of medicine is erected.

The study of Nature's own plans and aims should be the prevailing spirit of all pathological investigations. We should learn to look upon disease as being a reparative