

the circumstances. The *veracity* therefore of this statement is only surpassed by the ignorance and presumption which it displays. But it may be asked who were *the three professional gentlemen*, who made the examination (which never took place), and who *clearly ascertained* the disease to be one of three diseases—tubercles, ulcer, or gangrene of the stomach? We call upon these three illuminati, (if they exist,) to make a clear and scientific statement of the morbid appearances observed by them, and which led them to pronounce this positive (?) opinion on the nature of the case. But this would be impossible.

It is notorious that, during the latter part of Mr. Browne's illness, he was attended by Mr. Gamble the Homœopathist, and we believe this person was assisted by two other parties practising the same imposture. It is from one of these, we presume, that the foregoing concoction of falsehood, ignorance, and indelicacy has emanated.

The following able and stringent remarks by a British periodical, when reviewing a work emanating from one of the teachers of this false medical doctrine, are so apposite to this occasion that we quote them at length :—

“The human mind is ever prone to run to extremes. At one time we behold it admiring, and almost deifying, the creeds and systems of the past, because of the traditionary glory which invests them; at another, we see it rejecting as an idle dream the accumulated experience of successive generations, and eager in its pursuit, and fervent in its worship of whatever is *new*. These two opposite tendencies of our nature find their manifestation with more or less prominence in every sphere of thought, and in all the pursuits of active life. Every one is conversant with them as they are presented in the respective domains of politics and religion; but it has been reserved for these our own days to witness their full development in the arena of medicine. We have been long habituated to the antitheses denoted by Whig and Tory, Conservative and Radical, Old Light and New Light; now, we are called upon to mark the contrast implied by Allopathy and Homœopathy, otherwise Æsculapianism and Hahnemannism, otherwise Old Physic and Young Physic. .

“We consider that it falls not within the province or competency of non-medical journalism to venture a criticism upon Homœopathy, viewed as a system of medicine—to inquire into the truth or falsehood of its fundamental doctrine of ‘*similia similibus curantur*,’ and the alleged efficacy of its marvellous globules in their billionth and decillionth dilution. From the application of this remark, however, we ought, doubtless, to except such members of the political press as have been able, amid their multifarious pursuits and anxieties, to master the erudition of medical science, and who therefore feel themselves entitled to pronounce, *ex*