

the attempt! Did not Theophrastus Bombastus Paracelsus flourish in 1540? And what say the "authorities" of him?—"A vain, ignorant, arrogant, drunken quack, fanatic, and imposter. He burnt publicly the works of Galen and Avicenna, [because they contained too much of *nature and common sense*,] declaring that his shoe-strings possessed more knowledge than those two celebrated physicians, and asserted that he possessed the elixir of life!—[just the style of a consummate quack.] He was a cabalist, astrologer, and believer in the doctrine of signatures." And yet they tell us, in the next breath, "He conferred several important benefits on medicine; he overturned Galenism, introduced chemical medicines, [*mercury among the rest*,] and substituted tinctures, essences and extracts for various disgusting preparations." Very "important benefits" these, indeed! By their own showing, this "drunken quack" and "astrologer," and not *Hippocrates or Galen, is the true Father of Orthodox medicine!* He did not add to the science, he made it anew, *ab initio*, and that as late as the year 1540! Verily the father *was* a quack, and his progeny are "like unto him."

And who has been the "authority" among Allopaths since the days of Paracelsus? Who has furnished them with a creed? They have none. Van Helmont, Boerhaave, Hoffman, Brown, Cullen, Rasori, Broussais, and many others, strove for the honor, but the result of their labors, and of the contentions growing out of their theories, has been to tangle and unsettle the doctrines of Allopathy, rather than to fix and systematize them. From these greater names we pass down through all grades of authority and shades of conjecture, to the commonist country practitioners, no two of whom can be found to agree in doctrine and practice. In fact, the *Allopathic creed*, is a pretty fiction, invented to terrify the refractory, and to carry a scientific face before the people.

To come nearer home, where shall we find the creed of the Eclectic School? I mean not to bring a charge of divisions here, but simply to show that here as elsewhere "doctors disagree." Indeed, I believe this diversity of opinion, growing, as it does, out of freedom from bigotry and constraint, is the boast of every true Eclectic. Does not radicalism range a little higher here than at Cincinnati? Did not the Reform effort at Worcester start on the Eclectic platform, and from that descend far into Thomsonism? Is not our elder sister there still suffering from an overdose of lobelia, from which she has hardly yet obtained relief by protracted emesis? Canvas the medical beliefs of Professors and Students present to-day, and will you find any two who agree? Of course, not. The thing, among thinkers, is an impossibility. The only real cause of astonishment is, that any sensible man or body of men should ever have dreamed of *making a creed*, or of having real followers thereto, and so should waste ink in writing that which nobody ever could subscribe to but themselves!

But I need not have dwelt so long on this point in an *Eclectic School of Medicine*. I shall not here be compelled to "define my position," nor suffer excommunication because, with a very human and pardonable vanity, I