

one-half pint, strain, add sugar, simmer and skim. Add, when cold, one gill of the tincture of lobelia.—*B. M. & S. Journal.*

PATHOLOGY.

Within the last few years, Pathology has become a hobby constantly ridden by some medical men, and the whole community as well as themselves, are outrageously humbugged by the claims and pretensions set up by the amateurs of that *subject*. It is not, nor never can be, a science.

The old, stereotyped tale of the "golden age of truth," is again reiterated by every medical demagogue, as soon as he is pin-feathered. No opportunity is let slip unimproved, of telling the people what wonders "the late pathological improvements" have developed, and what great improvements have been made in medicine within the last few years, principally aided by pathological inquiry.

Now this is all sheer stuff, and all well read physicians ought to know it to be so. All the pathology on earth does not enable us to cure maladies one single particle—not one single particle. On this subject hear Prof. T. E. Bond, A. M., M. D., of the medical department of the Washington University, in an introductory lecture delivered before the medical class of that institution, November 11, 1849.

"There is a strong disposition to make medicine demonstrative, and to give it as far as possible the air of an exact science.

"The student is told that he must seek fundamental principles of practice, in the necroscopic examination of the dead, instead of observation of the sick.

"He is told that pathology, *i. e.*, a knowledge of the sensible changes produced by disease upon the appearance of parts, is the foundation of medical science, and he is encouraged to devote to this part of study a very undue proportion of his time.

"Even where pathology has won the greenest laurels, it has never been able to do more

than exhibit secondary consequences. The pathologist may point us to certain alterations of tissue and loss of parts in the lungs, and tell us that herein lies the cause of all those indomitable symptoms which we call pulmonary consumption, but it will instantly occur to a thinking man that these changes themselves are but results, that preceding these were other manifestations of disorder, and that after all, the pathologist has only succeeded in bringing to light another set of symptoms of the primary essential, and because essential, inscrutable disease.

"If the disciple of the pathological school, determined on reaching the ultimate truth, should seize a microscope and push his inquiries into the delicate tracery of tissues, inscrutable by unaided vision, and should he show you tiny vessels ruptured, reddened or enlarged, or some globules or atoms of morbid origin, you again, if you think at all, are compelled to ask whether these changes had no cause in prior changes, whether a microscope yet more powerful might not show that these conditions were but consequences.

"Pathology is and must always be imperfect, it is and must always be a science of consequences, and however curious, interesting and useful it may be, it is impossible to make it anything more than an important accessory to medical science.

"The human body has been inspected with a minuteness and particularly, which could not be exceeded. The most powerful microscopes have been used to pursue inquiries far beyond the limits of ordinary observation; and now how much are we the better able to cure diseases for all this labor? Has it added one solitary medicine to our *materia medica*; or has it taught us to cure one single disease hitherto incurable? Is not experience, and only experience, the guide of every judicious and successful practitioner of medicine? Does it not remain true, that many of these diseases with whose pathology we are best acquainted, are precisely those which we cannot control, while others of whose pathology we know little or nothing at all, we are in the habit of curing every day?"—*O. M. Examiner.*