

where. The ultimate end, then, of blood-circulation or nerve-propagation is to transmit the substance or influence to a part secondary to that of primary contact. There is unquestionable proof, inasmuch as it is ocular, of the vessels being channels for medicinal substances, and that the latter are absorbed, circulated and eliminated; while there is, morally speaking, just as strong evidence, because it is incontrovertible, of the nerves being channels for medicinal impulses, and that the latter are received, conducted, and extricated. And in receiving these facts, can we reject the obvious inference, proceeding from them, to the effect that the nerves are the media by which actions are transmitted, while the blood is the conduit through which the materials for action are conveyed. From such a *point d'appui* is it not therefore obvious, that the two theories are not antagonistic, since in reality the one must dovetail into the other, and either be subservient to its fellow. Innervation cannot be instituted without circulation, and *vice versa*, circulation is dependent upon innervation. The nerves can only conduct an immaterial principle, in other words an impulse; and the blood is on the other hand a distributor of physical agents, such as are in point, viz. drugs:—To return now to the second opinion we have expressed of these theories. Let us ask, do they merit the importance they have obtained? The negative answer is that which must be pronounced, and it is sustained by what has been previously advanced. Do we get the right understanding of the *modus operandi* of a remedy, by curtly saying it is a blood medicine, or it has induced its action by nerve influence? In such an assertion we cannot discover anything bordering upon a rational intelligence, much less of a lucid interpretation, for as the poet says—

“In other garb my question I receive,
And take my doubt, the very same I give.”

We can simply apprehend a mystified expression for the fact expressed, and are left as much as ever in the dark about the true causation. It has naturally appeared strange to us to find authors constantly stop short in their inquiries, after deciding with complacent satisfaction whether the humoral or solidical action was the more correct one. And it was with no slight gratification we found Dr. Wood describing the *secondary operation of medicines* or the action manifested subsequently to blood or nerve agency. He describes this operation as producible in 7 ways. 1. By depression following excitement. 2. By the reaction following depression. 3. Through the dependence of function. 4. Through the principle of sympathy or nervous transmission. 5. Through the principle of revulsion or derivation. 6. Through the efforts of nature to repair injuries. 7. Through the removal of the