

must ever continue to be a mystery. In this analogy of the functions of the elements, what, in the first place, is chiefly to be observed, is the unalterable character of each class of primary elements, under all circumstances, whether in or out of the organism; and, in the second, our ability to trace it, and to demonstrate its identity, whatever forms it may assume, or under whatever arrangement it may appear, first, in the air or in the soil, second, in plants, third, in animals, and, finally, after passing from the organism through the process of *eremacausis* or decomposition, appearing again in the air or soil. As the human body is a congeries of primary elements, having different forms of arrangement, and derived from vegetable and animal organizations, it is only by tracing, in this manner, the elemental functions, that we can arrive at a correct knowledge of the nature of a secretion; and as our ability to change a secretion must in all cases depend on a knowledge of the conditions of change, therefore is it necessary that an acquaintance with the conditions of change should take precedence of any attempt to act upon a secretory organ. This, it will be observed, is a controversion of the mode of procedure commonly adopted. A knowledge of the *rationale* of the process of change, is made to take precedence of any attempt to perform the act;—that is, in professional practice; for, as I have already stated, isolated experimental attempts merely, are always required to test the validity of theoretical conclusions.

What constitutes science is the conception of the *modus operandi* of the natural law. Nothing can be scientific which has not its foundation in a principle of nature. When Denys and Emerez, as related by Magendi, transfused the blood of a calf into the veins of an idiot, and reported that the idiot seemed to recover his reason, the proceeding was contrary to the dictates of science; because at variance, with that law of nature, which associates certain functions with specific structures of the organs. The exercise of reason, could not be predicated, where the organ of reason was wanting; and on that ground alone, the experiment was uncalled for and absurd; a conclusion which is borne out by the fact that, on subsequent repetitions of the same experiment, the idiot first became frantic, and afterwards died.

The curing of symptoms, though an error of a different class from that committed by Drs. Denys and Emerez, is equally irrational and unscientific. There can be no greater proof of the obliquity of mental vision, than to imagine that by cutting off our means of knowledge, the thing known may cease to exist. Yet this is exactly