

therefore reject as untrue and obnoxious the term "*Allopathists*," as applied to the members of this association by *dogmatists* and *extremists* without its fold."

First reason—"Because it tends to convey the erroneous impression that we are restricted to the choice of remedies and the method of using them by other than the limits of *rational science*."

Second reason—"Because for any association of men, claiming to practice the profession of medicine, to adopt a name based upon *limited* and *conjectured* theories of therapeutics, for the purpose of designating a particular school of medicine, we have always held, and still regard, as unscientific in principle and dangerous in practice."

Now, gentlemen, does not the animus thus lurking under the *first* and *second* because, explain in some measure the condemnation of the New York code? "The hailing with gratitude every discovery in therapeutical science, by whomsoever made," surely could not induce the condemnation of the New York code.

"Rational medicine, based upon experience and pathological research" surely could not do it, then what evidence have we as a reason for the condemnation? Answer.—Because some "*dogmatists* and *extremists*, and associations of men, practice medicine based upon conjectured theories of therapeutics, have called them "*Allopaths*"!!! Big *reason* certainly. The term *Allopath* must partake of the power of dynamite; what is its meaning? "A mode of medical practice which cures diseases by producing a condition of the system opposite to that essential to the disease." Does the American Medical Association not act on this mode of practice. If it does, why get vexed; why is the term *untrue* and *obnoxious*? If it does not, then what is the "*rational medicine*" which it esteems. Let the American Medical Association, or any other, give cases to show what "*rational*" medicine consists of. Give us the therapeutic treatment of bronchitis, pneumonia, diarrhoea, dysentery, cystitis, peritonitis, etc., etc. According to their *rational method* let us have these clearly given, and we shall know, independently of codes of ethics, whether the term *Allopath* or *Homœopath* is a correct designation for this mode of treatment. People when they are sick in these days require to know, whether they are to be treated the one way or the other, because if the American Association hold Homœopathy to be "*conjectured theories of therapeutics*, alike *unscientific* and *dangerous*," they can-

not hail it with pleasure, as others do. No, it would be more consistent in them to repudiate that therapeutic science and give to it dishonorable epithets. Although they declare that they would "not prohibit their members from using any known and honorable means of combating disease," *similia similibus curentur* would never be that honorable means, seemingly. The way in my opinion to bring about a *rational* mode of consultation, other than for diagnosis and assistance in actual surgical operations, would be that the "*regular*" profession should study and test clinical Homœopathic therapeutics, "*based upon experience and pathological research*," thereby finding out the *modus operandi* of *specifics*. This should first be done by those who assume the cognomen of *regulars*; and in the meantime, while doing that, calm discussions should be permitted in your journals for the sole object of arriving at the truth, for its own sake, and not for individual and collective interest. Doubtless good would come of this.

Yours truly,

JOHN WANLESS, M.D.

Progress of Medical Science.

THE ANALYTICAL STUDY OF AUSCULTATION AND PERCUSSION.

By AUSTIN FLINT, M.D., N.Y.

[Though this paper was read in August last, before the International Medical Congress, and will yet appear in its Transactions, still, as few will see that volume, and few have carefully studied the interesting subject herein analyzed, the paper is presented, with great pleasure, to the readers of this Journal.—E. S. G.]

An offering of homage to the memory of Laennec is a fitting introduction to a paper having for its aim promotion of our knowledge of physical diagnosis.

Laennec was not the first to listen for intrathoracic sounds. Mention is made in the writings of Hippocrates of at least one auscultatory physical sign; and the prophetic intimation of Robert Hook, in 1705, has been often quoted.* Doubtless hundreds, before the time of Laennec, had applied the ear to the thorax, and heard pulmonary as well as cardiac sounds. But it was reserved for Laennec to study these sounds in order to discover the physical signs of different diseases, and

* "Who knows but that one may discover the works performed in the several offices and shops of a man's body by the sound they make, and thereby discover what instrument or engine is out of order."