symptoms, shewing of course that each one of them has acted on its own specific sphere of the body, whether local or more general.

It is not necessary here at this time to go into the minutiæ of the action of either, although it would be a theme most worthy of the notice of the physician to observe the different parts which are affected by different materials, and the nature of these affections, because there might be some wisdom obtained by comparing a disease of these parts brought about by one cause, and a similar disease brought about by another and different cause, for the physician might find out, if he so chose, presented facts which would lead him by inductive reasoning thereupon, that there was a therapeutic law, which might be a safe guide to him in the selection of his remedial agents for the relief or cure of his diseased patients; but of course a description of the law or illustration of it would be out of place here, although I might be permitted in passing, to state that it is my opinion, which I think is well sustained, that the true mode of administering medicine scientifically is to select a remedy which is found to act dynamically, directly, and without injury on the cell forces of the different tissues which have made a departure from a normal state of health, be that departure the cell forces of muscle, liver, kidney, lung, brain, or other organ, because when it is known that a certain agent will reach a certain aggregation of cells, while the body is in health, we know that the same aggregation of cells will be reached by the specific agent in disease, and a living test is necessary to prove whether the administration of such a specific will lead to an amelioration of the disease or not.

If this is found to be true, after being fairly tried, then it will be seen that the aggregation of disordered cells cannot be reached by administering extraneous materials of large bulk, which are not permitted to reach the parts affected with disease situated exterior to the central alimentary tube, because the instinctive perceptions of the mucous lining, called columnar epithelium or villi, will in the most of cases, induce the peristaltic muscular action of said tube to throw the too frequently obnoxious and sickening drug adrift from the pale of absorption Instead of endeavouring to describe or multiply cases illustrative of specific action further, I will now cite some instances of the effects of more minutely divided material, acting either upon a part or the whole of the body, or perhaps, it may be said by some to be more physiologically correct, that a part or the whole of the body acts in the materials by having an affinity for them or a disgust to them; but in whichever way it is, some of the materials, which will be mentioned, may not be easily detected by the chemical analyst, but will only be known from their physiological action, as, for instance, a medicine which was manufactured in London, England, at one time, for the East India Company, named *Pulvis Jacobi*, or James' Powder. The East Company had found this powder very effective in the treatment of fever. Its composition was kept secret like many other popular nostrums, until the death of the Messrs. James, when from philanthropic motives their successors made known the recipe. It was said to be composed of oxide of lime and oxide of antimony. Soon every apothecary began to manufacture James' Powder. The East Company advertised for a large amount, which was furnished at a lower rate than by the Messrs. James, by a London manufacturer. But the medicine entirely failed in its remedial effects. The company refused to pay the bill, and a law-suit ensued. The best chemists in the country were called to analyse the article. It was found to contain the same ingredients, in the same proportions; but the Messrs. James compounded their phosphate of lime by calcining the bones of animals, while the London Company calcined the phosphate of lime rock from estramadura; every chemist declared that there could be no difference in the substances, and no one believed that there could be any difference in the effects, and yet when tested therapeutically the one proved remedial, while the other was valueless.