

one, in which is written descriptions not only of the abnormal organs but also of the morbid fluids of the body. Out of the ancient stock of humoralists, and solidists sects sprang up who narrowed down the old ideas to a very small compass. One referred disease in general to the blood, while the other settled it wholly in the nerves. Very interesting, indeed, is it now to learn that the modern opinions, as published, concerning the *modus operandi* of medicines is precisely identical with those just decreed in explanation of the nature of diseases. Among pharmacologists there is discoverable a restrictedly humoral, and an exclusively solidical belief. By the first class all medicines are asserted to act by the blood, while from the other we are told that these agents act through the nerves. A few, however, remain who are less dogmatical and more conciliatory than the former, and admit that remedies may act through both channels. Undoubtedly an amalgamation such as this, is to say the least a safe resource, particularly for those who feel, with Sir Roger de Coverly, that a great deal may be said in favor of and against both sides. Dr. Wood is of this class; he inclines to the action by blood, but cautiously concludes his observations on operation through the nerves with these significant remarks: "It is, therefore, I think, premature to reject altogether this mode of medicinal operation, and, indeed, it is not impossible that some substances may operate in both ways, giving rise to an impression through nervous transmission, which may be afterwards strengthened and perhaps modified by the immediate action of the medicine through the circulation."

It has always appeared to us remarkable why these two kinds of action should be considered antagonistic, and, yet more singular that they should have received the attention they have engaged. Antagonistic, they certainly are not, for after an elaborate investigation of the entire discussion what is the honest and simple conclusion that must be forced upon the unbiassed mind of a candid inquirer after truth. Why, truly, this, that each theory at most only explains *the channel* by which medicinal substances or influences are transmitted through the system after having been applied to a part. And that even after granting the accident at times of the double action or coalition movement, such as Dr. Wood has stated, or yet further, admitting it in any of its modifications, as in the hypothesis of Morgan and Addison, only differing from Dr. W.'s in a reversal of the order between nerve transmission and circulation:—Even after multiplied concessions, we reiterate, like these the fact is indisputable, that neither theory throws any light upon the *real* *modus operandi*, but each, at furthest, implies that medicines are conveyed to some distant organ, from changes in the normality of which the therapeutical effects proceed, and thence radiate or extend else-