

# **Homoeopathy : all about it, or, The principle of cure / by John H. Clarke.**

## **Contributors**

Clarke, John Henry, 1852-1931.

## **Publication/Creation**

London : Homœopathic Publishing Company, 1894.

## **Persistent URL**

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/qtazfnsj>

## **License and attribution**

This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection  
183 Euston Road  
London NW1 2BE UK  
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722  
E [library@wellcomecollection.org](mailto:library@wellcomecollection.org)  
<https://wellcomecollection.org>




# Homœopathy

All about it

M17595





22101783959








With the Authors  
Comply






# HOMŒOPATHY:

ALL ABOUT IT.









# HOMŒOPATHY:

ALL ABOUT IT;

OR,

THE PRINCIPLE OF CURE.

BY

JOHN H. CLARKE, M.D.,

PHYSICIAN TO THE LONDON HOMŒOPATHIC HOSPITAL;  
LECTURER ON MATERIA MEDICA TO THE L.H.H. MEDICAL SCHOOL;  
FELLOW OF THE BRITISH HOMŒOPATHIC SOCIETY;  
EXTRAORDINARY MEMBER OF THE ROYAL MEDICAL SOCIETY OF EDINBURGH.  
AUTHOR OF "THE PRESCRIBER," "A DICTIONARY OF DOMESTIC MEDICINE,"  
"INDIGESTION, ITS CAUSES AND CURE," "RHEUMATISM AND SCIATICA,"  
ETC., ETC.; EDITOR OF THE "HOMŒOPATHIC WORLD."

*— 1894 —*

LONDON:

THE HOMŒOPATHIC PUBLISHING COMPANY,

12 WARWICK LANE, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

1894.




29160937

M17595

PRINTED BY OLIVER AND BOYD, EDINBURGH.

WELLCOME INSTITUTE LIBRARY	
Coll.	welMOmec
Call	
No.	<del>WB 930</del>
	<del>1894</del>
	<del>C59h</del>





## CONTENTS.

---


	PAGE
PREFACE, . . . . .	vii
CHAPTER I.—HOW I BECAME A HOMŒOPATH, .	1
CHAPTER II.—HOMŒOPATHY AND ALLOPATHY. THREE WAYS OF STUDYING DRUG ACTION, .	5
CHAPTER III.—MEANING OF THE WORD “HOMŒO- PATHY.” ADVANTAGES OF THE HOMŒO- PATHIC METHOD OF STUDYING DRUGS. EXAMPLES, . . . . .	8
CHAPTER IV.—SKETCH OF HAHNEMANN’S CAREER: THE SEARCH FOR A PRINCIPLE IN MEDICINE. TESTIMONY OF EMINENT ALLOPATHS TO HAHNEMANN’S GREATNESS, . . . . .	12
CHAPTER V.—HOMŒOPATHY AND PATHOLOGY, OR THE THEORY OF DISEASE, . . . . .	29
CHAPTER VI.—THE INFINITESIMAL DOSE, . . .	43
CHAPTER VII.—EXAMPLES OF HOMŒOPATHIC PRACTICE FROM HAHNEMANN’S WORKS AND OTHERS. SOME STATISTICS. HOMŒOPATHY IN CHOLERA AND TYPHOID FEVER, . . . .	54
CHAPTER VIII.—IS HOMŒOPATHY SPREADING? .	69
CHAPTER IX.—SOME OBJECTIONS ANSWERED, .	75
CHAPTER X.—THE HOPEFULNESS OF HOMŒO- PATHY. CONSERVATIVE MEDICINE, . . . .	86
CHAPTER XI.—CONCLUSION: HOMŒOPATHY IN APHORISMS, . . . . .	89
INDEX, . . . . .	95



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2014

<https://archive.org/details/b20392576>





## PREFACE.

---

IN a lecture published shortly after his death, the late Sir Andrew Clark said, in reference to a disease about which he was lecturing, "There are no fixed principles for the treatment of the disease;" and he immediately added, "MEDICINE IS THE MOST UNPRINCIPLED OF SCIENCES." A statement of this kind is such a grave libel on Hahnemann and his work that it calls for the most strenuous repudiation by whomsoever it may be uttered, and all the more when it is made by a man in the responsible position occupied by the late Sir Andrew Clark. Less than a hundred years ago it might have been said truly enough; but ever since the consciousness of a *want* of principle in medicine was impressed with crushing force upon the great mind of Hahnemann, and impelled

him to the gigantic labours by which he brought order out of chaos, the reproach of unprincipledness lies only with that section of the profession which has steadily refused to accept the gift he has offered to the world. How long it will take to bring about the change I know not ; but sooner or later the school of Sir Andrew Clark will have to open its eyes to the fact that medicine is not the unprincipled, anarchic thing they seem to delight in proclaiming it to be.

In the following pages I hope to give a bird's-eye view, as it were, of what Hahnemann has done for the Art of Healing and for mankind. I have often been asked by friends and patients for some handy work on homœopathy which shall give them the means of answering their friends (medical and others) when the latter affect to put down homœopathy and its adherents with a few contemptuous expressions. "*We* know," they have said, "that the doctrine of Hahnemann is true, for we have experienced its beneficent effects in our own bodies, and *that* reason we can give, and it ought to be



enough ; but we should like to be able to do more than this, namely, to meet all the erroneous statements allopaths are constantly making about homœopathy." Now there are numbers of works (especially the excellent publications of the Homœopathic League, from which I shall freely quote) which give the information needed, but not one which gives in handy form a sufficiently complete and compact survey of the question for everyday use. Such a work I have here endeavoured to provide. And I have kept in view (and hope to interest) not friends and foes of homœopathy alone, but also that large section of the community who have never found an opportunity of learning anything about the New System, either for or against. Finally, I have endeavoured to give a sufficiently comprehensive reply to those who have already advanced so far as to ask to be told "ALL ABOUT IT."

We are sometimes told that now homœopathy has taught the profession to dispense with bleeding and other deadly abominations, there is very little difference between

the practice of the two schools. That is not my experience. The prevalence of drugging is now as great as ever it was, though it is somewhat modified in form. The advertisements of rival pill-merchants that meet our gaze wherever we turn in town or country, prove how vast is the number of persons who are constantly under the influence of drugs. Then there is another form of drugging of an insidious kind. Chemists are so clever that they can make up into fascinating forms dangerous drugs of the "*Antipyrine*" order, with which patients dose themselves at their own sweet will, often to their very great detriment. Again, there is that modern invention, the hypodermic syringe, which is responsible for a vast amount of deleterious drugging.

Finally, there is the cruel and misleading system of testing drugs on vivisectioned animals, which is set up by the leaders of the old school as the very beau-ideal of scientific medicine. As Hahnemann showed, no serviceable knowledge of drugs is to be obtained in this way. But the cruel method is going on, and will go on until the system



of Hahnemann shall be made to prevail. Hence I consider it a weak, cowardly, and erroneous policy on the part of homœopaths to make light of the enormous difference that still exists between homœopathy and allopathy, even in these *fin de siècle* days.

In concluding this preface I may fitly append to the passage quoted at the outset from Sir Andrew Clark another utterance, also by one of the old school. I quote it from page 126 of Dr Granier's *Conferences on Homœopathy*, English translation, second edition.

In the course of a debate on "Revulsion," which took place in the Academy of Medicine of Paris about the year 1853, Dr Marchal of Calvi contributed a paper in which, whilst taking care to say "he did not constitute himself a defender of homœopathy," he thus described the want of principle in his own school, and the possession of principle or doctrine by the homœopathic.

"In medicine, there is not, nor has there been for some time, either *principle, faith, or law*. We build a tower of

Babel, or rather we are not so far advanced, for we build nothing ; we are in a vast plain where a multitude of people pass backwards and forwards ; some carry bricks, others pebbles, others grains of sand ; but no one dreams of the *cement* : the foundations of the edifice are not yet laid, and as to the general plan of the work, it is not even sketched. In other words, medical literature swarms with facts, of which the most part are periodically produced with most tiresome monotony ; these are called *observations* and *clinical facts*, a number of labourers consider and reconsider particular questions of pathology or therapeutics—that is called *original labour*. The mass of such labour and facts is enormous ; no reader can wade through them—but no one has any general doctrine. THE MOST GENERAL DOCTRINE THAT EXISTS IS THE DOCTRINE OF HOMŒOPATHY. THIS IS STRANGE AND LAMENTABLE, A DISGRACE TO MEDICINE, BUT—SUCH IS THE FACT.”

The disgrace to old school medicine in 1853 is very much greater when it is unblushingly proclaimed by one of its leaders in 1893, and this time without any reserve in favour of the only *system* that exists—the System of Homœopathy.

JOHN H. CLARKE.

30 CLARGES STREET,  
PICCADILLY, W.





# HOMŒOPATHY: ALL ABOUT IT.

---

## CHAPTER I.

### HOW I BECAME A HOMŒOPATH.

PERHAPS it may not be uninteresting to readers if I state at the outset how my own conversion to homœopathy came about. As is usually the case, I knew nothing whatever about it when I took my degree, since it is rarely mentioned by professors in the ordinary medical schools, and then only to be misrepresented. After my graduation at Edinburgh, by the advice of the late Dr Angus Macdonald (one of the best friends I ever had), I took a voyage to New Zealand in charge of emigrants. On my return, having fixed on Liverpool as a likely field in which to start practice, I asked Dr Macdonald to

introduce me to some of the leading doctors in that place. This he promised to do, and eventually did,—I have the letters to this day. They were never presented, for reasons which will be appreciated. The relatives with whom I was staying happened to be homœopaths; and they suggested that I might do worse than go to the Homœopathic Dispensary and see what was being done there. As the letters came not, by way of utilising my time I went. Like Cæsar, I not only “went,” but I “saw;” but here the parallel ended—I did not conquer; homœopathy conquered me.

I may say that at this period, having absorbed over 80 per cent. (if marks go for anything) of the drug-lore Sir Robert Christison had to impart, and having had sufficient opportunity for testing its value in practice, I had come pretty near the conclusion Oliver Wendell Holmes arrived at and put so neatly in his well-known saying:—“If all drugs were cast into the sea it would be so much the better for man and so much the worse for the fish.” I believed then (and the belief has become



rather fashionable since) that the chief function of a medical man was to find out what was the matter with people—if he could; and supply them with common sense—if he happened to possess any. His duty was to *treat* people; to *cure* them was out of the question; and it would be the better for his honesty if he made no pretence to it.

After a few weeks' observation at the Liverpool Homœopathic Dispensaries, a case was presented to me in private. A small boy of 5, a relative of my own, was brought to me by his mother. Two years before, he had been badly scratched on the forehead by a cat, and when the scratches healed a crop of warts appeared on the site of them. And there they remained up to that time in spite of diligent treatment by the family doctor. As an allopath I could do no more than he, so I turned to homœopathy to see if that could help me. I consulted the authorities, and found that the principal drug which is credited with producing crops of warts is *Thuja occidentalis*. I ordered this, more by way of experiment

than expecting much result, but I said if there was truth in homœopathy it ought to cure. In a few days improvement was manifest; in three weeks the warts were all gone. Rightly or wrongly I attributed, and still attribute, the result to *Thuja*, though it will no doubt be said that "charms" have done the same thing. Very well; if anyone will give me a *system* of charms that I can use with precision and produce with it such definite effects, and better, I shall be very glad to try it. As it was, I concluded that if homœopathy could give me results like that, homœopathy was the system for me. And, with all due modesty be it spoken, homœopathy has been doing this kind of work for me ever since—for a period, that is, of nearly eighteen years. Now I will leave personal matters and go on to my subject.





## CHAPTER II.

### HOMŒOPATHY AND ALLOPATHY. THREE WAYS OF STUDYING DRUG ACTION.

**I**T is a curious circumstance that when a man takes up a new line in medicine, and especially when he becomes a homœopath (and acknowledges it), he at once loses not only caste but position. All his juniors and inferiors who have hitherto looked up to him, henceforth look down upon him as from an immeasurable height.

Why the allopathic section of the profession should be so wrathful with Hahnemann is not a little surprising. For not only did he discover homœopathy, he discovered allopathy as well. Allopathy existed before his time, just as homœopathy did in a way, but it was unconscious of its own existence. The profession had been practising allopathy all its life—as M. Jourdain had been talking prose—without

knowing it. It was Hahnemann who gave it its name ; and if he is the father of homœopathy he is at least the godfather of allopathy as well, and on that account deserves to have his bust in all the medical schools.

Hahnemann said there were three principal ways of using drugs—the homœopathic, the allopathic, and the antipathic. The homœopathic is the like-to-like method, in which a medicine is given to a sick person because it is capable of producing a similar state when given to a healthy one—*similia similibus*. The *allopathic* (or *heteropathic*) method is that in which the drug given, being “without any pathological relation to what is naturally diseased in the body, attacks the part most exempt from the disease.” The antipathic is the opposite of the homœopathic, and is the treatment by contraries. This treatment is palliative merely. When a large dose of opium is given to overcome sleeplessness ; or when a patient in high fever is put into a cold bath to bring down the temperature—this is antipathic treatment. But many diseases, as inflammations, have no “opposites”



except health, and these cannot be treated by this method, and must be treated, if at all, in one of the other two ways.

When a mustard plaster is put on the soles of the feet to cure headache, an action is produced different in place and kind from the condition treated, and this is allopathy. Again, when anyone treats a headache by taking an aperient, he practises allopathy; and again, when a medical man puts a blister behind a patient's ear to cure inflammation of his eye. When, on the other hand, in a case of headache we give a drug like *Belladonna* or *Nitro-glycerine* (Glonoin), both of which produce a variety of headaches of great intensity when taken by the healthy, then we are practising homœopathy.

I know there are some doctors who scorn the idea of having any *rule* to guide them in practice, and who, for this reason, I suppose, on the *lucus a non lucendo* principle, insist on being called nothing else but "regular." If they did not scorn logic as well as rule, these practitioners would call themselves medical anarchists.



### CHAPTER III.

#### THE WORD "HOMŒOPATHY." ADVANTAGES OF THE HOMŒOPATHIC METHOD OF STUDYING DRUGS. EXAMPLES.

IT may be well here to make it plain that the *word* "Homœopathy" in no way includes "infinitesimally small" in its signification. It is of Greek origin, and means literally "like suffering." In its adjective form it occurs twice in the New Testament, and is translated in both instances "of like passions."

Curiously enough, St Luke, the physician among the Evangelists, is one of the two writers who used the word. How the notion of infinitely little became attached to this word is not difficult to trace; and the importance of Hahnemann's discovery of the power of infinitesimals will be dealt with later on; but Hahnemann chose "Homœopathy" as representing in a single



word the same thing as the Latin phrase *similia similibus curentur*—"Let likes be treated by likes"—in which he formulated his therapeutic rule. This, and this only, is the etymological signification of the word. The *idea* he did not pretend to have originated ; in fact, he very laboriously collected from previous writers in all ages a mass of evidence to show that others before him had recognised a relation between the diseasing action of drugs on the healthy and their curative action on the sick. What Hahnemann did that others had not done before, was to study drugs systematically by testing them on the healthy.

The other way of studying drugs is the one which has existed from earliest times,—that of trying them on the sick and seeing what will happen. And, I may say, a great deal of very valuable information has been gained in this way ; but until Hahnemann studied medicines by systematically testing them on the healthy, this information was more or less indefinite. Further, the old system had generated a sort of vicious circle

in medical thought. A drug "X" being found by experience to allay spasms in a case, is called an "antispasmodic," and the word "antispasmodic" is imagined to in some way explain its virtues. Henceforward it is given in cases of "spasms" *because* it is an antispasmodic. But in reality the dubbing of a drug "antispasmodic" tells us no more about its actual powers than Molière's "*Quia est in eo virtus dormitiva*" tells us of the soporific properties of opium. Hahnemann's experiments supplemented the old knowledge in this way: he showed that the drugs which have the power of relaxing spasms in the sick have also the power of *causing* spasms in the healthy; and he also showed that each spasm-producing drug had peculiarities of its own which would guide to its selection in any case of disease. There are no such things as "diseases" in the abstract to treat, only diseased persons; and each case must be individualised and treated on its own merits, and not according to the name of the disease by some drug that has been named the "anti" to it. To take a concrete



example, let us look at two drugs—*Bryonia* and *Rhus toxicodendron*. Each of these drugs, when taken by the healthy, produces intense rheumatic pains in the joints, ligaments, and muscles. But Hahnemann noticed in himself and fellow provers this marked difference,—that whereas the rheumatic pains of *Bryonia* caused the prover to keep as still as possible since every movement increased them, the pains of *Rhus*, on the other hand, made the prover extremely restless, motion giving temporary relief. This gave Hahnemann the key to their employment in disease,—*Bryonia* relieving cases in which the pains are made worse by motion, *Rhus* those in which motion relieves. It would have been of no service to have dubbed them both "anti-rheumatics," so he dispensed with these useless and misleading designations, and contented himself with recording their positive effects.



## CHAPTER IV.

### SKETCH OF HAHNEMANN'S CAREER: THE SEARCH FOR A PRINCIPLE IN MEDICINE.

**B**UT now it is time to tell something about Hahnemann himself, and how he came to discover this systematic method of studying the powers of drugs—to discover the principle in medicine which Sir Andrew Clark (as I have mentioned in my preface) recently said does not even now exist.

Samuel Frederick Christian Hahnemann was born at Meissen, in Saxony, on the 10th of April in the year 1755. At the age of 20 he commenced his medical studies at Leipsic, and earned his living by translating into German foreign scientific works at the same time that he pursued his studies. After two years at Leipsic he removed to Vienna, to gain practical knowledge in the



great hospitals there. He took his degree at Erlangen in 1779.

Hahnemann was an excellent linguist, being perfectly familiar with English, Italian, French, Greek, Latin, and Arabic.

Whilst yet a student he translated from English into German, among other works, Nugent's *Essay on Hydrophobia*, Stedman's *Physiological Essays*, and Ball's *Modern Practice of Physic*. From 1779 onwards he contributed to periodical literature, and in 1784, at the age of 29, he published an original work, "On the Treatment of Chronic Ulcers." In this, his first original work, he expressed pretty much the same sentiment as that I have quoted from Sir A. Clark as to the want of principle in medicine. He lamented the *absence of any principle for discovering the curative powers of medicines*. He could not deny their curative powers, but what he wanted was some principle to guide in discovering and defining what those powers were and the indications for their use. Hahnemann wrote much on chemical subjects. His book on *Arsenical Poisoning*, published

in 1786, was quoted as an authority by Christison in his work on Poisons. Hahnemann discovered the best test for arsenic in wine, having pointed out the unreliable nature of the hitherto used method, "The Würtemberg Test." In 1788 he announced his discovery of a new preparation of Mercury, known to this day as "Hahnemann's soluble Mercury," and still retained under that name in the German Pharmacopœia. His intimate acquaintance with drugs and their modes of preparation enabled him to write his *Apothekerlexicon*, or Pharmaceutical Dictionary, which appeared in several volumes from 1793 to 1799, and was for many years the standard work on that subject.

It is not by any means exclusively as the discoverer of the homœopathic system that Hahnemann is distinguished. He was a pioneer in many other medical reforms.

For example, it was he who was the first to adopt the non-restraint system of treating lunatics. I will quote from Dr Dudgeon an account of an historic instance of this:—

"In 1792 Hahnemann undertook the medical care of the celebrated Hanoverian statesman Klockenbring, who



had gone mad, and had already been treated in the usual barbarous manner of the period in an asylum of the ordinary stamp, with no benefit, but the contrary. Hahnemann treated this dangerous lunatic on a non-restraint plan, without the use of chains or corporal punishment, which were in universal use at that period. His treatment was perfectly successful, and Klockenbring was restored to his family and friends perfectly cured. Hahnemann says in an account he gives of this case:—  
 'I never allow an insane person to be punished either by blows or by any other kind of corporal chastisement, because there is no punishment where there is no responsibility, and because these sufferers deserve only pity, and are always rendered worse by such rough treatment, and never improved.'—(*League Tract 4.*)

After his cure, says Ameke, Klockenbring showed his deliverer, "often with tears in his eyes, the marks of the blows and stripes his former keepers had employed to keep him in order."

But we will now go back again a little. After 1788 Hahnemann seems to have given up practice in disgust. In a letter to Hufeland, the Nestor of medicine of his day (whose journal—*Hufeland's Journal*, to which Hahnemann was a constant contributor—occupied the leading place among the medical journals of Europe), he says his

withdrawal was chiefly occasioned by his disgust at the uncertainties of medical practice, *owing to the want of any principle for the administration of drugs in disease.* During this time he occupied himself with chemical researches and the translation of works on chemistry, agriculture, and medicine, from the English, French, and Italian.

It was whilst engaged in translating Cullen's *Materia Medica* in 1790 that he made the classical observation which has proved to the science of drug study what the falling apple observed by the boy Newton has been to physical science. As his mind was always occupied with the search for some guiding principle for the selection of medicines in disease, he was struck with the unsatisfactory nature of Cullen's explanation of the action of Cinchona bark in the cure of ague. That it did cure many cases of ague Hahnemann could not deny; and it occurred to him that if he took some of the drug when quite well he might obtain some clue to an explanation of its curative action. He took it in considerable quantities, and perceived in



himself all the symptoms of an ordinary attack of intermittent fever. The account of the experiment will be found in a footnote to page 108 of Vol. II. of the Translation of Cullen's *Materia Medica*. Here Hahnemann was in possession of two related facts: Cinchona bark cured ague, and it also in a sensitive healthy person caused symptoms indistinguishable from an attack of ague.

An observation of this kind was not likely to remain unfruitful in a fertile brain like Hahnemann's. In the following year, 1791, he translated Monro's *Materia Medica*, and in a note he again refers to his experiments with Cinchona. Four years later, 1796, being then 41 years of age, he published in *Hufeland's Journal* his "Essay on a New Principle for Discovering the Curative Powers of Drugs." In this he discusses the several ways in which drugs had formerly been studied and used, and then describes the similar method, the rule "likes to likes" (*similis similibus*) being first formulated in this essay thus:—

"Every powerful medicinal substance produces in the

human body a peculiar kind of disease,—the more powerful the medicine the more peculiar, marked, and violent the disease. We should imitate Nature, which sometimes cures a chronic disease by superadding another, and employ in the disease we wish to cure that medicine which is able to produce another very similar artificial disease, and the former will be cured,—*similia similibus*."

In this essay he referred to his early note on Cullen, and said after mature experience he could say that not only *probably*, but *quite certainly*, bark cured ague because it had the power to produce fever. He quotes examples of well-known drug actions to support his proposition, and sketched in a masterly way the characteristic features of a number of drugs.

In 1805, Hahnemann being now 50 years old, appeared two works of great importance : first, his *Æsculapius in the Balance*, which takes a general survey of traditional medicine and pronounces on it the verdict "weighed in the balances and found wanting"—a verdict which has since received very ample endorsement. Second, in two vols. in Latin, his *Fragmenta de viribus medicamentorum positivis sive in sano corpore observatis* (Fragments on the Positive



Powers of Drugs,—that is to say, their effects observed in the healthy body). This contained the first effort towards the reconstruction of the *Materia Medica* on a rational basis of pure experiment on the healthy human body.

In 1806 appeared his *Medicine of Experience*, in which is contained the first complete exposition of the homœopathic method now thoroughly thought out by him after sixteen years of unremitting work,—observation, experiment, and research. This was published in *Hufeland's Journal*. The same year Hahnemann published the last work he translated—Haller's *Materia Medica*, Haller being one of Hahnemann's forerunners in recommending the testing of drugs on the healthy body ; but Haller did nothing towards carrying his recommendation into effect.

In 1807 Hahnemann first used the word "Homœopathic" in the *title* of a work—an article contributed to *Hufeland's Journal* on "Indications of the Homœopathic Employment of Medicines in Ordinary Practice."

The year 1810 may be said to be the



birth-year of Homœopathy, for in that year appeared the first edition of the *Organon*, which is an expansion of the *Medicine of Experience* and a complete statement of the Homœopathic method. Four other editions followed; the last appeared in 1833. The following year (1811) saw the first part of the *Materia Medica Pura*, the third edition of which appeared in 1830.

During these years of independent thought and action, as may easily be imagined, Hahnemann had no very easy time of it with his medical brethren, whose ideas he was upsetting, or with the apothecaries, whose trade he bade fair to undermine. The latter were paid according to the number and quantities of drugs in the prescriptions they dispensed, and Hahnemann insisted on giving only one drug at a time, and not too much of that. Consequently he had been driven about from one place to another, but in 1812 he gave up all hope of influencing the older men in the profession, and determined to proceed to Leipsic and there devote himself to teaching the pupils of the medical department of the University.



The conditions were that he should write a thesis, and defend it before the Faculty of the University, and pay a fee of fifty thalers. In compliance he wrote his thesis entitled *The Helleborism of the Ancients*, and so amazed his auditors with his mastery of his subject and the immense learning and research his essay displayed, that the Faculty congratulated him publicly and granted him his license to teach forthwith. Anyone who wishes to read the treatise (which is exceedingly interesting still) may do so in Dr Dudgeon's collection of Hahnemann's *Lesser Writings*. At Leipsic he continued lecturing twice a week, giving two courses of lectures a year until 1821. During this time he collected an enthusiastic band of disciples, who helped him in proving medicines, and whose names are now immortalised in the Homœopathic Materia Medica by the experiments they made on themselves with different drugs.

In 1819 persecution was commenced by the apothecaries, who took action against him for preparing his own medicines (which they were incompetent to prepare). The persecution was at last successful, and

Hahnemann was driven from Leipsic in 1821 to find an asylum with a former patient, Duke Frederick Ferdinand of Anhalt, who made him his private physician, with liberty to engage in general practice at his capital town of Coethen. There he wrote his work on Chronic Diseases. In 1834 he removed to Paris, where he enjoyed an immense practice until he died in 1843 at the age of 88.

So much for Hahnemann himself, and how he came to discover and develop the Homœopathic method of studying drug action and prescribing drugs for the sick. It may serve to give an idea of the state of medical practice as Hahnemann found it, and at the same time to illustrate the courage and independence of the man, if I refer to two pieces of public criticism written in the early part of his career.

The one thing Hahnemann was blamed for by his contemporaries more than anything else was his neglect of blood-letting. "Seignare, purgare, clysterium donare" of Molière was still the rule in Hahnemann's time, and "fool," "criminal," "murderer,"



were the epithets applied to Hahnemann for his departure from the prevailing custom. "Without shedding of blood," as it has been put, "there was no salvation" for patients in those days. However, that did not prevent Hahnemann from speaking his mind.

The Emperor Leopold II. died after repeated blood-letting on the 1st of March 1792. Commenting on the case, Hahnemann said: "His physician Lagusius observed high fever and swelling of the abdomen early on February 28th; he combated the malady by venesection, and as this produced no amelioration, three more venesections were performed without relief. Science must ask why a second venesection was ordered when the first had produced no amelioration. How could he order a third; and, good Heavens! how a fourth, when there had been no amelioration after the preceding ones? How could he tap the vital fluid four times in twenty-four hours, always without relief, from a debilitated man who had been worn out by anxiety of mind and long-continued diarrhœa? Science is aghast!"

Another custom of the time (which has not by any means yet died out) against which Hahnemann ran a tilt was the prescribing of a variety of drugs in the same mixture. It was done quite artistically. There was a "base," a "receiver," a "corrective," a "helper," a "director," and more besides, in every prescription, and the larger it was the more the prescriber was thought of—by the apothecary at any rate, if not by the patient who had to swallow the dose.

In 1797, the year following that in which his "Essay on a New Principle" was published, Hahnemann contributed another notable paper to *Hufeland's Journal*, entitled, "Are the Obstacles to Certainty and Simplicity in Practical Medicine insurmountable?" In this article he delivers himself as follows on this practice:—

"Who knows whether the *adjuvans* or the *corrigens* may not act as *basis* in the complex prescription, or whether the *excipiens* does not give an entirely different action to the whole? Does the chief ingredient, if it be the right one, require an *adjuvans*? does not the idea that it requires assistance reflect severely on its suitability, or should a *dirigens* also be necessary? . . . The more complex our prescriptions are, the darker is the



condition of therapeutics. . . . How can we complain of the obscurity of our art when we ourselves render it obscure and intricate?"

I will conclude this sketch of Hahnemann by quoting the opinion of the man and his works expressed by eminent representatives of the opposite school. First, I will give the opinion of Hufeland himself; next, that of Sir John Forbes, editor of the *Quarterly Medical Review*; and lastly, of the eminent surgeon Liston. The extracts are from Tract VII. of the Homœopathic League Series, "Testimony of Opponents in favour of Homœopathy and its Founder."

"Hufeland, who knew Hahnemann intimately, repeatedly expresses his high opinion of his talents. Already in 1800 (it will be remembered that Hahnemann's first essay on the homœopathic principle appeared in 1796), he writes:— 'This principle enunciated by Hahnemann, may doubtless serve to guide us to the discovery of useful remedies.' Writing of homœopathy in 1826 he says:— 'The subject becomes all the more important if the originator is a man who commands our respect; and no one will be able to deny that this is the case with Hahnemann, and least of all one who is in the position of the author of this essay, whose acquaintance with Hahnemann is of long standing, and who, connected with him for more than thirty years by ties both of friendship and of letters, valued



him always as one of our most distinguished, intelligent, and original physicians.' Four years later he writes :— 'Added to this was the respect I had long felt for the author, which was inspired by his earlier writings, and the important services he had rendered to medicine. I had subsequently the opportunity of observing many instances of good results from the use of homœopathic medicines, which necessarily drew my attention to this subject, and convinced me that it ought not to be contemptuously pushed on one side, but deserves careful investigation. It is necessary to remind my readers that medicine has to thank Hahnemann for the discovery of the wine-test and of the soluble mercury, which is, in my opinion, still the most efficacious preparation of mercury, as well as for so much else. He has given sufficient proof in many of his earlier writings of a grand philosophical acumen and of a rare power of observation.' "

"Sir John Forbes, in his celebrated critique of homœopathy, says of Hahnemann (1846) :— 'No careful observer of his actions or candid reader of his writings can hesitate for a moment to admit that he was a very extraordinary man, one whose name will descend to posterity as the exclusive excogitator and founder of an original system of medicine, as ingenious as many that preceded it, and destined, probably, to be the remote, if not the immediate, cause of more important fundamental changes in the practice of the healing art than have resulted from any promulgated since the days of Galen himself.—Hahnemann was undoubtedly a man of genius and a scholar, a man of indefatigable industry, of undaunted energy. In the history of medicine his name will appear in the same list with those of the greatest systematists and theorists,



surpassed by few in the originality and ingenuity of his views, superior to most in having substantiated and carried out his doctrines into actual and most extensive practice. —By most medical men it was taken for granted that the system is not only visionary in itself, but was the result of a mere fanciful hypothesis, disconnected with facts of any kind, and supported by no processes of ratiocination or logical inference; while its author and his apostles and successors were looked upon either as visionaries or quacks, or both. And yet nothing can be farther from the truth. Whoever examines the homœopathic doctrines as enounced and expounded in the original writings of Hahnemann and of many of his followers, must admit, not only that the system is an ingenious one, but that it professes to be based on a most formidable array of facts and experiments, and that these are woven into a complete code of doctrine with singular dexterity and much apparent fairness. Many among his followers are sincere, honest, and learned men.' 'It is interesting to remember,' says Dudgeon, 'that these merely polite and candid statements respecting homœopathy and its practitioners proved fatal to the quarterly periodical which Forbes had conducted with eminent ability for more than twelve years. His subscribers would have nothing to do with a periodical which treated homœopathy with a semblance of fair play, and which admitted that its practitioners might be sincere, honest, and learned men; and so for lack of support the *Medical Review*, after lingering for another year, was compelled to terminate its useful and honourable career.' ”

“Professor Liston, the eminent surgeon, in a lecture reported in the *Lancet*, after detailing the particulars of

the cure of cases of erysipelas which he had treated with homœopathic remedies, says :—‘ Of course we cannot pretend to say positively in what way this effect is produced, but it seems almost to act by magic ; however, so long as we benefit our patients by the treatment we pursue, we have no right to condemn the principles upon which this treatment is recommended and pursued. You know that this medicine, belladonna, is recommended by homœopaths in erysipelas, because it produces on the skin a fiery eruption or efflorescence, accompanied by inflammatory fever.—I believe in the homœopathic doctrines to a certain extent, but I cannot as yet, from inexperience on the subject, go the length its advocates would wish in so far as regards the very minute doses of some of their medicines. The medicines in the above cases were certainly given in much smaller doses than have hitherto ever been prescribed. The beneficial effects, as you witnessed, are unquestionable. I have, however, seen similar good effects of belladonna, prepared according to the homœopathic pharmacopœia, in a case of very severe erysipelas of the head and face, under the care of my friend Dr Quin. The inflammatory symptoms and local signs disappeared with very great rapidity. Without adopting the theory of this medical sect, you ought not to reject its doctrines without close examination and inquiry.’ ”





## CHAPTER V.

### HOMŒOPATHY AND PATHOLOGY, OR THE THEORY OF DISEASE.

HOMŒOPATHY is essentially a science and art of comparisons. Taking the sum total of the effects of each drug on the healthy as a picture of its powers, and in every case of disease taking the sum total of the symptoms manifested, and the changes observable by the physician, together with all points in the heredity and history of the patient, as constituting the disease, the task is to find the drug which most nearly corresponds to the case. Homœopathy theorises about nothing. In its *Materia Medica* it admits no theories, no explanations of actions, but only the facts. It also, whilst accepting the proved facts of pathology (the science of disease), discards all merely pathological theories as

useless for drug selection. Hahnemann has been severely criticised for discarding pathology. It is very much to his credit that he did not accept the pathology of his day; but neither he nor his followers neglect anything which can help to throw light on the nature of disease. As a matter of fact, several of Hahnemann's most distinguished followers were professors of pathology, including Arnold of Zurich, Rapp of Tübingen, d'Amador of Montpellier, Zlatarowich of Vienna, and Henderson of Edinburgh. It very frequently happens that the symptoms which decide the choice of a drug are of little pathological significance (as in the instance of the differential indications of *Rhus* and *Bryonia* I have mentioned), but the symptoms are not any less valuable on that account.

A short time ago a picture appeared in one of the comic papers, showing two adjoining rooms in section,—in one a patient, and in the other two doctors who had just been examining him and had retired to consult over his case. The patient, wishing to get an unbiassed view of his state, had



got out of bed, and was shown with his ear at the keyhole of the door in the party wall ; and this is what he heard :—

*1st Doctor.*—“Have you any idea what is the matter with him?”

*2nd Doctor.*—“Not the least ; have you?”

*1st Doctor.*—“Not the faintest ; but never mind, it will all be cleared up at the *post-mortem*.”

I hope I shall not be accused of telling tales out of school when I say that there is many a case that is not cleared up even at the *post-mortem*. What is to be done in cases such as these to avoid the catastrophe? Here comes in the value of symptoms. They are of the greatest value in indicating a remedy, and many a case has been cured without having received a satisfactory name. Hahnemann protested against treating the names of diseases with the names of medicines. He said, truly, if you take the totality of the symptoms and changes in any patient, getting a complete picture of his morbid state, that is all that is required for purposes of treatment. The signs and symptoms give an accurate picture of the actual state of the organic life ; and if you

match that picture with that of a drug-proving, and give the corresponding drug, the symptoms will be removed and the patient cured.

If we had to wait until pathology settled what is the true nature of all diseases before we cured our patients afflicted with them, doctors might all retire from business at once without being much missed in the world.

Said the *Lancet* the other day (Dec. 30, 1893, p. 1624), "Our knowledge of the true pathology of most diseases is still indefinite." This is quite true; but still we go on treating our cases all the same; and taking Hahnemann for our guide, we have solid ground to build on. Pathological theories are bound to change with every fresh addition to our knowledge; but disease manifestations remain the same from the days of Hippocrates till the present.

It is a matter of no little importance to grasp the idea Hahnemann formed of the essential nature of disease. With him, disease was not primarily a change of structure or function, but an alteration of



the invisible vital force which animates the whole organism. The nature of this invisible change was outwardly pictured in the bodily changes and sufferings produced; and thus, according to his view, it was necessary to observe accurately all the symptoms occurring, in order to get a true picture of the vital disturbance in any case. Symptoms are the language of the disturbed vital force, and hence symptoms are the guide to treatment.

Superficial critics often accuse homœopathy of treating only symptoms. Nothing could be further from the truth. Homœopathy attaches importance to symptoms as revealing the real state of the patient; but it no more regards them as mere symptoms, than readers of Shakspeare's works look upon them as composed of mere words. In both cases they have a meaning in them, and are of significance only so far as that meaning is revealed.

In Hahnemann's day diseases were looked upon as something material, to be got rid of by bleeding, purging, vomiting, salivation, sweating, issues, or in some such way,

just as they are now looked upon as consisting principally of microbes to be killed. Hahnemann perceived that they were nothing of the kind ; that the critical discharges that frequently occur in disease were not the cause of the disease, nor the disease itself, but simply manifestations of the working of the vital force. A fit of anger in a nursing woman will so change the quality of her milk, that if she nurses her child just after it the child will be poisoned. But the poisonous milk is not the cause of the woman's mental disturbance, nor is it the disorder from which she is suffering. The invisible, intangible emotion has so disturbed her invisible, intangible vital force that disease has resulted. The changes in her secretion are symptoms of the inward change. So the causes of most diseases (excluding physical injuries) are of an invisible, intangible nature, — "dynamic" or "spirit-like," as Hahnemann called it.

The outward symptoms which reveal the nature of the inward change in the vital force only declare themselves after the



“dynamic” disturbance has been some time in operation. In any case of disease we can estimate the nature and gravity of the vital disturbance only by a careful survey of the symptoms and signs in the patient; so that, for practical purposes, the “totality of the symptoms” constitutes what we have to deal with, and the only way to get rid of these is to restore the vital force to its normal condition.

Now, as Hahnemann pointed out, drugs are capable of producing artificial disease; and, as his experience and experiments showed, they do it by virtue of their “dynamic” powers. They first act on the vital force, producing disturbances peculiar to themselves, which reveal their presence. It cannot be simply by absorption and distribution through the circulation that they act, for in that case their action would manifest itself with all drugs in the same period of time. This we know does not occur. Pure prussic acid acts with lightning-like rapidity, before it has time to be absorbed and distributed through the blood-vessels. Some other drugs do not show

some of their actions until many days after they have been taken.

I shall deal presently with the whole question of the infinitesimal dose, and how Hahnemann came to discover its power ; but I may say here that this discovery was subsequent to his discovery of the homœopathic principle. He did not discover homœopathy from any preconceived notion of the nature of disease ; but his views of disease were the outcome of his observation of the action of drugs on patients.

No account of Hahnemann's pathological views would be complete without a mention of his doctrine of chronic diseases. By chronic disease he did not mean exactly the same thing as is generally understood by the phrase—a disease that lasts a long time and is incurable.

I cannot do better than quote Hahnemann's own definition of acute and chronic diseases, from paragraph 72 of his *Organon*.

“The diseases to which man is liable are either rapid morbid processes of the abnormally deranged vital force, which have a tendency to finish their course more or less quickly, but always in a moderate time,—these are termed



*acute* diseases ; or, they are diseases of such a character that, with small, often imperceptible beginnings, dynamically derange the living organism, each in its own peculiar manner, and cause it to deviate from the healthy condition in such a way that the automatic life energy, called vital force, whose office it is to preserve the health, only opposes to them, at the commencement and during their progress, imperfect, unsuitable, useless resistance, but is unable of itself to extinguish them, but must helplessly suffer (them to spread and) itself to be more and more abnormally deranged, until at length the organism is destroyed ; these are termed *chronic* diseases. They are caused by infection from a chronic miasm."

A "miasm" is an infectious principle, which, when taken into the organism, may set up a specific disease. According to Hahnemann, there were not only miasms of acute, but also of chronic diseases. Among these he recognised three,—syphilis, sycosis, and psora. The first is the *lues venerea*, which is recognised by all schools alike. The second is allied to this, but is distinguished by the production of warty growths. The third is a discovery of Hahnemann's, about which there has been the greatest misconception.

Before giving an account of what Hahnemann meant by "psora," I will



give a familiar instance of a miasm which is on the border line between the acute and chronic miasms,—I mean vaccinia, the disease set up by vaccination. Vaccinia or “Cowpox” is extremely analogous to syphilis in many of its characters, and not the least in the appearance of secondary disorders after the primary illness is over. The course of the disease is well known. The virus is inoculated. In about a week inflammation appears at the spot, which goes on to form a vesicle, then a pustule, then a scab, and finally a scar when the scab drops off. During the time that this series of events is occurring, constitutional symptoms manifest themselves, chiefly in the form of fever. When the healing has taken place, there may be nothing more occur. The organism may have reacted perfectly and discharged the miasm. But this is not always the case. Often skin-eruptions occur, lasting for years, or various other kinds of ill health, lasting, it may be, as long as life lasts, and not seldom shortening life. When this occurs it is not (according to Hahnemann’s doctrine, though



he did not use this illustration) a succession of new diseases, but different evolutions of one and the same disease, the "miasm" of vaccinia.

In the early years of his homœopathic practice Hahnemann noticed that in certain cases the curative action of his remedies did not take place as he expected it to do. In these cases he found that he must not only take account of the malady from which the patients were then suffering, but of previous and apparently different maladies, and find remedies which corresponded to the whole course of the pathological life of the patient. Many cases he met with in practice in which the ill-health dated from the suppression of a skin disease, probably years before. That skin disease, said Hahnemann, is really a part of the present disorder. To take a common example, asthma is often found to appear after the "cure" by external means of a skin disorder. The patient is not suffering from two diseases; there is, according to Hahnemann's pathology, one *chronic miasm* at work producing the two effects.

The large majority of chronic diseases Hahnemann traced to the chronic miasm he termed "psora," and he maintained that the characteristic manifestation on the skin of this miasm was an eruption of itching vesicles, of which the itch vesicle was a type. It has been stated that Hahnemann ascribed to the itch the production of nine-tenths of chronic diseases, and he has been accused of ignorance in not knowing that itch was caused by an insect. But Hahnemann not only knew of the itch-insect, but he actually figured it in one of his works. But he maintained that in spite of the presence of the insect, that was not the whole of the disease—just as the tubercle bacillus is not the whole of pulmonary consumption. If it were, no doctors would escape death from consumption, since they inhale the bacillus constantly from their patients. "The itch," Hahnemann maintained, "is chiefly an internal disease." "Psora is an internal disease—a sort of internal itch—and may exist with or without an eruption upon the skin." "Psora forms the basis of the itch." To the reckless suppression of the chief



external symptoms of psora Hahnemann ascribed the prevalence of chronic disorders.

To put it in other words, the psora doctrine of Hahnemann is practically the same as the doctrine of certain French authorities who ascribe a great variety of chronic diseases to what they call a "herpetic diathesis," that is to say, a morbid state of the organism liable to manifest itself on the skin by an itching vesicular eruption.

The essential truth of Hahnemann's doctrine may be seen by taking a glance at the history of individuals and families. The skin eruptions of childhood, the late development of bones and teeth, the anæmia of puberty, and the consumption which finally carries off the patient, are not so many different diseases, but different manifestations of one and the same disease, whether we call it "psora" with Hahnemann, or "herpetic diathesis" with the French. Then, again, take a family: one member has enlarged and inflamed glands, one ulceration of the eyes, one a chronic cough, one hysteria, one eczema. They are all children of the same parents, with the same

elements of heredity, and their diseases are essentially one and the same, only manifesting itself differently in different individuals. This disease Hahnemann called a "chronic miasm." The seat of its operations is the vital force, which can only be freed from it by dynamically acting homœopathic remedies.

In his study of the chronic miasms Hahnemann found many other very characteristic symptoms besides the occurrence of eruptions on the skin; and he found remedies having corresponding symptoms, which he gave to patients with signal success. Among those remedies which he found produced symptoms likeliest to those occurring in psoric patients, *Sulphur* takes the foremost place.

It will be seen from the above sketch that Hahnemann's theory of disease is profoundly philosophical, and as far as possible removed from the tentative and fragmentary theories of disease current in his own and in our day. Hahnemann's pathology goes hand in hand with treatment, and is thus checked at every step by the test of everyday practice.





## CHAPTER VI.

### THE INFINITESIMAL DOSE.

IN an early chapter I mentioned that the infinitesimal dose has become in the popular mind the most characteristic feature of homœopathy, though the *word* "Homœopathy" itself in no way includes "infinitesimal" in its meaning. Its use arose in this way. When Hahnemann began to employ drugs with the precision his method required, he found that the ordinary doses acted much too powerfully, and caused great aggravation of symptoms before the cure took place. He then by degrees reduced his doses until he found he could get the curative effect without aggravating. In some instances he found that the attenuating process actually developed and increased the curative powers of the medicine. The method he adopted was to dilute tinctures in the proportion of 1

to 100 of rectified spirit, and to grind insoluble substances with sugar of milk in the same proportions. For the higher attenuations the process was repeated, the same proportions being observed at each step.

The importance of this method of preparing drugs is very great, scarcely second, in my opinion, to the enunciation of the law of similars. It is highly probable that but for the question of the infinitesimal dose, homœopathy would have been recognised by the profession at large long ago. But homœopathy (though it may be practised by those who never use anything but material doses) never can be dissociated from a belief in the power of the infinitesimal; hence the popular association of the two ideas is fundamentally true, though it may be etymologically faulty.

It will be seen that in Hahnemann's centesimal scale, each step of the process divides the original quantity by 100, and hence each higher number represents a higher degree of attenuation. But the attenuation is so graduated that, no matter to what high



figure it is carried, *something* of the original substances must remain, though it is far beyond the power of chemistry to detect or to destroy.

The researches of Faraday, Tyndall, Helmholtz, Crookes, and others have made it easier to conceive of infinitesimal quantities and their powers, and the infinitesimals of homœopathy should not therefore prove such stumbling-blocks to unbelievers as they have done heretofore. When we find Helmholtz saying that at the period when our planetary system consisted of a sphere of nebulous matter reaching to the path of the outermost planet, it would require "*several millions of cubic miles of such matter to weigh a single grain ;*" and when Faraday tells us that "*each atom extends, so to say, throughout the whole of the solar system,*" it is plain that the everyday conceptions of matter and its possibilities will have to be revolutionised. There is nothing more worthy of investigation by masters of physical science than the facts connected with the action of homœopathic infinitesimals. The human body is a much more

sensitive re-agent than anything known to themselves or natural philosophy, and in conceiving and demonstrating the powers of infinitesimal quantities Hahnemann was as much ahead of his time as in demonstrating the existence of the law of similars.

The quotations I have just made are taken from a pamphlet entitled *The Science of Homœopathy*,\* by Mr Buist Picken, in which the author seeks to apply the known facts of the phenomena in the world of physics to explain the fact of homœopathic cures. To this pamphlet (which the late Prof. Tyndall characterised as "marked by extreme ingenuity") I contributed a short introduction, summarising the argument, and it may be interesting to quote a passage. It will serve at once to show the line in which a scientific explanation of the apparent paradox of "like" curing "like" may be found, and of the other paradox of a smaller quantity of the right remedy being actually more powerfully curative than a larger one would be: ("Billows are

\* *The Science of Homœopathy*. By W. Buist Picken. Homœopathic Publishing Co., 12 Warwick Lane, E.C.



incompetent to produce effects which are readily produced by ripples.”)

“The forces of the human organism are identical with the forces of nature, and obey the same laws. Health and disease are dynamic or spiritual in nature, and originate in molecular and atomic motions. The laws of motion apply to the phenomena of health and disease, and the action of remedies is identical with the phenomena of ‘interference’ recognised in the natural sciences. As equal waves of water proceeding from different directions intersect each other (‘interfere’), and either increase (as summit corresponds to summit), or annul (as summit corresponds to furrow), the motion of the molecules of water, so a medicine (whose power is dynamic) acts in disease. When the molecular disturbance of the organism corresponds to the molecular motion of the medicine given, the intensity of the disturbance is either aggravated or annulled, according as the action is in the same or the opposite direction. The action of the curative agent is like in appearance, but contrary in direction.

“This appears to be the main contention of the article, but there are other points established of scarcely less importance, among which may be named the following : (1.) That each substance possesses the property of absorbing any motion which corresponds to its own molecular motion (illustrating the like-to-like formula). (2.) The fact that (in Prof. TYNDALL’s words) ‘the waves which are most effectual in shaking asunder the atoms of compound molecules are frequently those of least mechanical power. Billows, to use a strong expression, are incompetent to produce effects which are readily produced by ripples’—showing a possibility of elucidating a law of

dosage on strictly scientific grounds. (3.) That, as Boscovich says, atoms are to be regarded as 'centres of force;' or, according to Faraday, that 'force constitutes matter;'—that there is no 'space' other than some quality of matter between the particles of vapours, liquids, and solids alike;—that, for example, 'water is not two particles of oxygen and hydrogen side by side, but the two spheres of power mutually penetrated, and the centres even coinciding;' or, as he puts it in another place, 'Gravitation is a property of matter dependent on a certain force, and it is this force which constitutes matter. In this view, matter is not merely mutually penetrable; but each atom extends, so to say, throughout the whole of the solar system, yet always retaining its own centre of force.' 'What do you know of the atom apart from its force? You imagine a nucleus which may be called  $\alpha$ , and surround it by forces which may be called  $m$ ; to my mind the  $\alpha$ , or nucleus, vanishes, and the substance consists in the powers of  $m$ :'—which provides the highest scientific authority for the suggestion that it may be impossible to reach the limit of the attenuation to which homœopathic medicines may be carried."

There are not wanting signs that light is at last breaking in upon the old school in this matter of infinitesimals. Many old-school authorities have adopted homœopathic remedies into their text-books, but the effect on general practice has not been great, for the simple reason that they have not had the courage to adopt homœopathic



dosage. They reduced their own doses very far—as far as one-tenth or one-hundredth of a grain, or a drop of some remedies—but they have not gone further. Pasteur and Koch, who are working on homœopathic lines, have spoiled their work for the same reason. If Pasteur had simply taken the homœopathic preparation of hydrophobic virus, which has been in use since 1833, and which was prepared without any resort to cruelty, he would have gained no kudos, it is true, but he would have advanced science, and saved himself from the reproach of having killed numbers with laboratory hydrophobia. Koch, again, if he had taken the tuberculin of the homœopaths,\* and adopted the homœopathic dosage, might have spared himself the trouble of experimenting on guinea-pigs, and have saved Virchow the trouble of making a number of post-mortem examinations on bodies of human beings who died in consequence of his treatment. Koch reduced his dosage as far as he dared—down to

\* See Dr Burnett's *New Cure of Consumption*. 3rd Edit.  
Homœopathic Publishing Co., 12 Warwick Lane, E.C.

milligrammes — but these doses proved powerful enough to kill, and to scare most practitioners from ever using the drug again. Homœopaths, however, use it with perfect safety in their own dosage, guided by the effects it has produced on persons who took it in the trial that was made with it at first.

Hahnemann has been derided for his assertion that metallic bodies like flint and copper become, after being triturated to the fourth centesimal degree, so far soluble as to yield up their dynamic power to a watery solution, and beyond that to solution in alcohol. That such is the fact, the effects of these solutions on healthy and diseased human beings who have taken them abundantly prove; and now we have Professor Stokvis of Amsterdam, at the last International Medical Congress, held at Rome in April 1894, practically acknowledging the truth of it. Professor Stokvis's address appears in an English translation in the *Lancet* of April 26, from which I will make three quotations, the italics being my own:—

“How are we to understand the fact that *the ingestion of infinitesimal quantities of certain substances which pas*



*through the organism without causing in it the least change can provoke such disordered chemical actions as to occasion death?* How are we to understand the fact that different parts of the organism seem to be able to distinguish these substances one from the other? We must admit special elective functions proper to the life of the cells. How are we to understand the facts that nothing but a change in the quantity of their dosage, the duration of their administration, and the method of their application suffices to make of certain toxic substances stimulants or paralyzants? How are we to understand the fact that insoluble substances like arsenic, copper, and lead can defy that well-known axiom, *Corpora non agunt nisi soluta* (substances do not act except in a state of solution), and manifest therapeutic and toxic action. We must admit the presence and agency of some unknown power within the living cell. How, again, are we to understand the therapeutic power exhibited by solutions of iodine and bromine which have *apparently been diluted to the deprivation of all chemical action*, unless we attribute to the living cell the power of liberating the iodine and the bromine from such dilute solutions?"

"By warming pure chlorate of potassium we obtain pure oxygen, but the presence of the smallest quantity of chloride of potassium is sufficient to change part of the oxygen into ozone. In giving rise to this development of ozone the chloride of potassium remains itself completely unaltered; but, what is more remarkable yet, this chloride of potassium itself has, like peroxide of manganese—which acts in an identical manner—the property of destroying ozone."

"As for the manifestation of therapeutic and toxic

action by bodies considered to be insoluble, of which Naegli in a posthumous work has made so profound a study, they are also capable of the simplest interpretation. The insolubility of these bodies is not absolute, but only relative. If we throw, for example, metallic copper into water and wait for some days, we shall find that a certain proportion of the copper has dissolved—*i.e.*, *one part to seventy-seven million parts of water.*"

If Professor Stokvis can account for the power of copper to produce symptoms in the human body by its being soluble in 77,000,000 parts of water, where is he to stop? The only answer to this is, that there is no stopping anywhere. If "every atom extends throughout the whole solar system," there is no possibility of our finding the limits of its capacity for being attenuated.

Before leaving this part of my subject I must refer to Darwin's researches with the fly-catching plant, *Drosera*, or Sun-dew. Darwin found that solutions of certain salts of ammonia stimulated the glands of the leaves to turn inwards. He made this solution more and more dilute, but still the plant was able to detect the presence of the salt. Darwin was almost frightened by his results. Writing to Donders he says:—




“The 1-4,000,000th of a grain absorbed by a gland clearly makes the tentacle which bears the gland become inflected ; and I am fully convinced that 1-20,000,000th of a grain of the crystallised salt (*i.e.*, containing about one-third of its weight of water of crystallisation) does the same. Now I am quite unhappy at the thought of having to publish such a statement.” \*

Poor Darwin ! Where would homœopathy have been if Hahnemann had been so diffident about publishing proved but unpalatable facts ?

Hahnemann's conception of the “dynamic” spirit-like vital force animating the material organism, and the first and ultimate seat of all disorders which appear outwardly in disease, made it easier for him to apprehend the powers of medicines in the “dynamised” form,—that is, rendered by graduated attenuation spirit-like or dynamic.

\* See Dr C. H. Blackley's *Power of the Infinitesimal*, published as No. 31 of the Tracts of the Homœopathic League Series.



## CHAPTER VII.

### EXAMPLES OF HOMŒOPATHIC PRACTICE FROM HAHNEMANN AND OTHERS. SOME STATISTICS. HOMŒOPATHY IN CHOLERA AND TYPHOID FEVER.

EXCEEDINGLY few of Hahnemann's own cases have been published. He refrained from publishing many, lest his disciples should fall into routine ways and give certain medicines to patients because he had given the same medicines to patients with the same diseases, and not because the medicines corresponded to the cases to be treated. In the second volume of the *Materia Medica Pura*, however, Hahnemann gives, at "the request of some friends halting half-way on the road," two cases which I will now quote just to show the way in which he used to work, and also to show that homœopathy is not, as some would make out, a mere affair of a little



book and a box of pilules. Every genuine homœopathic prescription is made on the same plan as that in the two cases I am about to quote ; only, the working out of the problem is generally done mentally, and more rapidly than a reading of these cases might lead one to suppose.

The figures in brackets refer to the number of the symptom in the *Materia Medica Pura*.

I. "Sch——, a washerwoman, somewhere about forty years old, had been more than three weeks unable to earn her bread, when she consulted me on the 1st Sept. 1815.

"1. On any movement, especially at every step, and worst on making a false step, she has a shock in the pit of the stomach, that comes, as she avers, every time from the left side.

"2. When she lies she feels quite well ; then she has no pain anywhere, neither in the side nor in the pit of the stomach.

"3. She cannot sleep after 3 A.M.

"4. She relishes her food, but when she has eaten a little she feels sick.

"5. Then water collects in her mouth and runs out of it, like water-brash.

"6. She has frequent empty eructations after every meal.

"7. Her temper is passionate, disposed to anger.

When the pain is severe she is covered with perspiration. The catamenia were quite regular a fortnight since.

“In other respects her health is good.

“Now, as regards symptom 1, *Belladonna*, *China*, and *Rhus toxicodendron* cause shootings in the pit of the stomach on making a false step, but none of them *only on movement*, as is the case here. *Pulsatilla* (see symptom 386) certainly causes shootings in the pit of the stomach on making a false step, but only as a rare alternating action, and has neither the same digestive derangements as occur here at 4 compared with 5 and 6, nor the same state of the disposition.

“*Bryonia* alone has among its chief alternating actions, as the whole list of its symptoms demonstrates, pains *from movement*, and especially shooting pains, as also stitches beneath the sternum (in the pit of the stomach) on raising the arm (448), and on making a false step it causes shooting in other parts (520, 600).

“The negative symptom 2 met with here answers especially to *Bryonia* (638); few medicines (with the exception, perhaps, of *Nux vomica* and *Rhus toxicodendron* in their alternating action—neither of which, however, is suitable for the other symptoms) show a complete relief to pains during rest and when lying; *Bryonia* does, however, in an especial manner (638 and many other *Bryonia* symptoms).

“Symptom 3 is met with in several medicines, and also in *Bryonia* (694).

“Symptom 4 is certainly, as far as regards sickness after eating, met with in several other medicines (*Ignatia*, *Nux vomica*, *Mercurius*, *Ferrum*, *Belladonna*, *Pulsatilla*, *Cantharis*), but neither so constantly and commonly, nor with relish for food, as in *Bryonia* (279).



“As regards symptom 5, several medicines certainly cause a flow of water like water-brash, just as well as *Bryonia* (282); the others, however, do not produce symptoms similar to the remaining ones. Hence *Bryonia* is to be preferred to them in this particular.

“Empty eructation (of wind only) after eating (symptom 6) is found in few medicines, and in none so constantly, so commonly, and to such a degree, as in *Bryonia* (253, 259).

“To 7. One of the chief symptoms in diseases (see *Organon*, sec. 213) is the ‘state of the disposition,’ and as *Bryonia* (772) causes this symptom also in an exactly similar manner, *Bryonia* is for all these reasons to be preferred in this case to all other medicines as the homœopathic remedy.

“Now, as this woman was very robust, and the force of the disease must consequently have been very considerable to prevent her, on account of pain, doing any work; and as her vital powers, as stated, were not impaired, I gave her one of the strongest homœopathic doses, a full drop of the undiluted juice of *Bryonia* root, to be taken immediately, and bade her come to me again in forty-eight hours. I told my friend E., who was present, that within that time the woman would assuredly be quite cured; but he, being but half-converted to homœopathy, expressed his doubts about it. Five days afterwards he came again to learn the result, but the woman did not return then, and, in fact, never came back again. I could only allay the impatience of my friend by telling him her name and that of the village where she lived, about a mile and a half off, and advising him to seek her out and ascertain for himself how she was. This he did, and her answer was: ‘What was the use of my going back? The very next



day I was quite well, and could again go to my washing ; and the day following was quite well, as I am still. I am extremely obliged to the doctor, but the like of us have no time to leave off our work ; and for three weeks previously my illness prevented me earning anything.’”

II. “W.—, a weakly, pale man of 42 years, who was kept constantly at his desk by business, consulted me on Dec. 27, 1815 ; he had been already five days ill.

“1. The first evening, without manifest cause, he became sick and giddy, with much eructation.

“2. The following night (about 2 A.M.) sour vomiting.

“3. The subsequent nights violent eructation.

“4. To-day also severe eructation of fetid odour and sourish taste.

“He felt as if the food lay crude and undigested in his stomach.

“6. His head felt wide, hollow and dark, and as if sensitive internally.

“7. Sensitive to the smallest noise.

“8. His disposition is mild, soft, and patient.

“Here I may observe :—

“To 1. That several medicines cause vertigo with nausea, as does also *Pulsatilla* (3), which produces its vertigo in the evening also (7), a circumstance that has been observed of very few other medicines.

“To 2. *Stramonium* and *Nux vomica* cause vomiting of sour and sour-smelling mucus, but as far as is known, not *at night*. *Valerian* and *Cocculus* cause vomiting at night, but not of sour stuff. *Iron* alone causes vomiting at night (61, 62), and can also cause sour vomiting (66), but not the other symptoms that should be attended to here. *Pulsatilla*, however, causes not only sour vomiting in the



evening (349, 354), and nocturnal vomiting in general (355), but also the other symptoms of this case not found among those of *Iron*.

“To 3. Nocturnal eructation is peculiar to *Pulsatilla* (297, 298).

“To 4. Fetid, putrid (260), and sour eructation (302, 303).

“To 5. The sensation of indigestibility of the food in the stomach is produced by few medicines, and by none in such a perfect and striking manner as by *Pulsatilla* (321, 322, 327).

“To 6. Besides *Ignatia* (2), which, however, cannot produce our other symptoms, the same state is caused by *Pulsatilla* (39 compared with 42, 94, 98).

“To 7. *Pulsatilla* produces the same state (997), and it also causes over-sensitiveness of other organs of the senses ; for example, of the sight (107). And although intolerance of noise is also met with in *Nux vomica*, *Ignatia*, and *Aconite*, yet these medicines are not homœopathic to the other symptoms, and still less do they possess symptom 8, the mild character of the disposition, which, as stated in the preface to *Pulsatilla*, is particularly indicative of this plant.

“The patient, therefore, could not be cured by anything more easily, certainly, and permanently than by *Pulsatilla*, which was homœopathic to the case. It was accordingly given to him immediately ; but, on account of his weakly and exhausted state, only in a very minute dose, *i.e.*, half a drop of the quadrillionth [12th dil.] of a strong drop of *Pulsatilla*. This was done in the evening.

“The next day he was free from all ailments, his digestion was restored ; and a week thereafter, as he informed me, he remained free from complaint and well.”

I will now quote the case of the homœopathic cure of an animal. It is taken from *The Times* of Jan. 6, 1888, being communicated in a letter to the Editor of that journal in the course of the *Odium Medicum* correspondence. It was afterwards published by the Homœopathic Publishing Co., together with the rest of the correspondence and the two *Times'* leading articles, in pamphlet form, under the title of *Odium Medicum and Homœopathy*—a veritable magazine of wealth for militant homœopaths.

MEISSONIER'S TESTIMONY IN FAVOUR OF  
HOMŒOPATHY.

*To the Editor of the Times.*

"SIR,—In the present controversy on this subject, you may, perhaps, in your spirit of fairness, think the enclosed document worth publishing. It has been in my possession for some time.

"I was studying painting a few years ago with Meissonier, whose valuable dog—which had been given to him by his great friend Dumas—was struck with paralysis in its hind quarters; it had also its neck twisted.

"I had long studied Homœopathy for my own use, and my little globules were the subject of much good-humoured fun to Meissonier and his friends and family, who did not believe in them at all.



"The dog in question was condemned to death by a great 'vet.' in Paris, who attended to Meissonier's very valuable horses, as will be seen in the enclosed testimony. The same evening I was dining with him and his family, and the dog was in the room—a subject of much lamentation—when, in his sudden and animated manner, he challenged me to cure it with 'my Homœopathy.'

"I accepted the challenge and gave the dog at once in their presence a single dose of *Rhus tox.*, of a rather high dilution.

"The next morning I was at work with him alone in his garden studio before breakfast, when his clever and energetic daughter came rushing into the studio as if the house were on fire, crying out that 'the dog walked.'

"We ran out of the studio—Meissonier with his brush in his mouth and his large palette on his thumb, in his earnest eagerness about everything that freshly caught his attention—and there was the animal running about on its four legs as strongly as ever.

"It still had its neck twisted, however, and I was much puzzled to know how to proceed with my patient. I then perceived that its coat was rough and staring. Here came in one of the great principles of Homœopathy—that every symptom must be taken into account—and the proper remedy at once suggested itself. I gave it two doses of *Arsenicum* 3<sup>x</sup>; the dog quite recovered, and is, I believe, alive and well to this day. Yours faithfully,

"A PUPIL OF MEISSONIER."

"Messieurs Meissonier père et fils apprenant qu'on met en doute le guérison d'une petite chienne condamnée à mort par les vétérinaires de Paris, affirment que cette petite bête a été radicalement guérie d'une attaque de



paralysie extrêmement violente par leur ami ———  
 ———, qui l'a traitée par l'homœopathie. Cette petite  
 chienne de race très-pure va parfaitement bien et fait  
 l'admiration de tous."

"E. MEISSONIER,"

"CH. MEISSONIER, *fils*."

### CURE OF COUNT RADETSKY.

I will next quote from Tract 5 of the Homœopathic League Series the historic cure of the famous Field-Marshal Count Radetsky :—

"It is not only in acute diseases that homœopathy shows its superiority to every other method of treatment. Chronic diseases of the most obstinate and intractable nature, which have resisted all the appliances of the old school, are often rapidly and radically cured by the remedies of the new school. Diseases which have been pronounced incurable and necessarily fatal have, as every homœopathic practitioner knows from his own experience, been frequently perfectly cured by the mild but potent remedies of homœopathy. Not only has homœopathy lessened the mortality of serious but not necessarily fatal diseases, it has also extended the boundaries of remedial medication. The limits of this Tract will not allow us to give many proofs of this statement, but one which is of historical celebrity may be here mentioned. In January 1841, the celebrated Austrian Field-Marshal Count Radetsky was suffering from a tumour in the orbit of the right eye, which pushed the eyeball outwards and forwards. The tumour had been growing since the



previous October. The Emperor, with whom the Field-Marshal was a great favorite, sent his staff-physician Dr Jaeger, Professor of Ophthalmology in the Joseph's Academy of Vienna, to Milan, where the patient resided, to consult with Dr Flarer, Professor of Ophthalmology in Pavia, and the Field-Marshal's ordinary medical attendant, Staff-Surgeon Hartung, a homœopathic practitioner, to make a report upon the disease, and to advise as to the appropriate treatment. The three consultants met on the 26th of January, and after careful examination, unanimously pronounced the disease to be of a fungous cancerous character. The two professors held it to be incurable by any means known to them; that a fatal termination was only a question of time; and as they held medicine to be powerless in such a case, they would offer no suggestion as to treatment. Dr Hartung, while agreeing with the learned professors as to the hopelessness of a cure under ordinary treatment, thought that benefit might be derived from homœopathic remedies. The patient declared that he would have no other than homœopathic treatment. Under Dr Hartung's homœopathic remedies, this formidable disease in this septuagenarian patient steadily declined. By the 19th of March the disease was perfectly cured, and no difference was observable in the two eyes. Count Radetsky lived a good many years after this, and was sufficiently active in mind and body to win the decisive battle of Novara in 1849."

### COMPARATIVE STATISTICS.

From the same Tract I will now give a few figures of comparative statistics. The

first relates to cases of pneumonia, or inflammation of the lungs, treated in Vienna, and are taken from Dr Routh's pamphlet, *Fallacies of Homœopathy*. Dr Routh tries to discount the lesson of the figures by saying that in the homœopathic hospital "the severe cases were few and far between." Here, however, we have an independent witness, who actually saw the cases and testifies to their gravity.

"Sir William Wilde, the eminent Dublin oculist, who personally inspected the same hospital, says in his work on Austria: 'I am bound to say that the cases I saw treated in the Vienna Homœopathic Hospital were fully as acute and virulent as those that have come under my observation elsewhere.' Here are Dr Routh's statistics of the comparative mortality in particular diseases:—

*Pneumonia, or Inflammation of the Lungs.*

	Cases.	Died.	Mortality.
Under homœopathic treatment . . .	783	45	5·7 per cent., or 1 in 17
Under allopathic treatment . . .	1522	373	24·5 per cent., or 1 in 4

*Pleurisy, or Inflammation of Serous Membrane of the Lungs.*

	Cases.	Died.	Mortality.
Under homœopathic treatment . . .	384	12	3 per cent., or 1 in 32
Under allopathic treatment . . .	1017	134	13 per cent., or 1 in 7



*Peritonitis, or Inflammation of Serous Membrane of the Abdomen.*

	Cases.	Died.	Mortality.
Under homœopathic treatment . . .	187	8	4 per cent., or 1 in 23
Under allopathic treatment . . .	628	84	13 per cent., or 1 in 7½

The superiority of homœopathy in the treatment of cholera is almost too well known to need repetition. Here, however, are some of the figures.

At Tischnowitz in Moravia, Dr Quin, the introducer of homœopathy into Great Britain, witnessed the effect of homœopathy in an epidemic of cholera, and himself treated twenty-nine cases with only three deaths. The total number of cases treated is as under:—

	Cases.	Deaths.	Per cent.
Under allopathy, . . .	331	140	42
„ homœopathy, . . .	278	29	10
„ camphor only, . . .	71	11	15·5

Of the Vienna epidemic of 1836, Sir William Wilde says in his work on Austria (p. 275):—

“ Upon comparing the report of the treatment of cholera in this hospital with that of the same disease in the other

hospitals in Vienna during the same period, it appeared that while two-thirds of the cases treated by Dr Fleischmann recovered, two-thirds of those treated by the ordinary methods in the other hospitals died."

The superiority of the homœopathic treatment was so evident on this occasion that it led to the repeal by the Austrian Government of the ordinances prohibiting the practice of homœopathy in the Austrian States which had hitherto disgraced its statute-books.

The figures of the London epidemic of 1854 give the mortality at the Homœopathic Hospital as 16·4 per cent. against 51·8 per cent. in the allopathic hospitals. The credit of the above result is due to Dr Hamilton, Mr Cameron, and Dr Mackechnie, who treated all the cases brought to the Homœopathic Hospital; and the Government Inspector, Dr MacLoughlin, wrote to Mr Cameron, one of the medical officers of the hospital:—"All I saw were true cases of cholera in the various stages of the disease, and I saw several cases which did well under your treatment, which I have no hesitation in saying would have



sunk under any other." He further added that, though an allopath, if he were unfortunate enough to take cholera himself, he would have himself taken to the Homœopathic Hospital for treatment.

### CAMPHOR AND CHOLERA.

I will make a final quotation from Tract 5 before leaving the subject of cholera.

"In 1831, on the appearance of cholera in Germany, Hahnemann published a pamphlet, in which he recommended camphor as the true remedy for the first stage of cholera. The experience of homœopathic practitioners in that epidemic and in every subsequent epidemic amply confirmed the curative power of camphor in this stage of the disease. The most brilliant illustration of Hahnemann's prescient wisdom was afforded by the experience of Dr Rubini in the epidemic of cholera in Naples in 1854-5. With camphor alone he treated in the R. Albergo dei Poveri (corresponding to our workhouse infirmary) 225 cases of cholera without a single death, and 166 soldiers of the the 3rd Swiss Regiment with similar success. In the last epidemic in Naples, in 1884, Dr Rubini, then eighty-four years old, was absent from the town in attendance on a sick brother in the country, but the medical men attached to the homœopathic dispensary there treated 83 cases with camphor alone, and of these only three died. This extraordinary success of the camphor treatment in the early stage of cholera is a splendid testimony to the genius of Hahnemann and to the sufficiency of Homœo-

pathy to grapple successfully with the most terrible diseases."

In the *Homœopathic World* of July 1889 are given the comparative statistics of the treatment of an epidemic which visited Melbourne, Australia, in the first three months of that year. The following is a list of the cases treated at three hospitals, two of them allopathic, with the number of deaths and percentage in each case. They are taken from the *Melbourne Herald* of April 29th, 1889:—

	No. of beds.	No. of typhoid cases.	Deaths.	Per- centage.
Melbourne				
Hospital, .	318	431	78	18·1
Alfred				
Hospital, .	144	324	50	15·4
Homœopathic				
Hospital, .	60	305	22	7·2

It will be observed that the Homœopathic Hospital, with much smaller accommodation than the others, was able to treat nearly as many cases, the reason being that the patients were got well in a much shorter time.





## CHAPTER VIII.

### IS HOMŒOPATHY SPREADING?

CONSIDERING that homœopathy (dating from the appearance of the *Organon*) is only eighty-four years old, and that its founder has only been dead little over sixty years, the extension of the system throughout the world does not leave very much to complain of. In essential characteristics the medical profession has not changed much since the days of Molière. The famous saying of the men of Harvey's day,—“We would rather be in error with Galen than think rightly with that upstart Harvey,” sounds ridiculous in our ears, but the lineal descendants of these men are quite ready to say, either openly or in their hearts, the very same thing of Hahnemann and homœopathy at the present day. Considering, then, that in this comparatively short time, in the face of unheard of per-

secutions and difficulties, homœopathy has abolished bleeding from general practice, has done away with wholesale mercurialisings, and has spread itself to every quarter of the civilised globe, there is certainly no room for despondency. At the present moment there are some 15,000 duly qualified medical practitioners openly practising according to Hahnemann's method. How many more there are who practise homœopathy secretly, for fear of the medical scribes and pharisees, it is impossible to say ; but their numbers cannot be small. In the free atmosphere of the United States homœopathic institutions have flourished amazingly. Homœopaths have their own fully-equipped medical schools, in perfect equality with allopathic institutions in the eye of the law ; many most important Government hospitals and asylums are manned by homœopathic practitioners ; and other homœopathic institutions are partly subsidised by the more important of the States.

In the British Islands and on the Continent of Europe, the "Molièrian" conditions are too powerful to admit of the generality



of medical men looking at a question on its bare merits : they look at it in the light of the sentiments they have imbibed in the schools.

Have any of the scribes and pharisees believed? we are sometimes asked. Not a few, we reply, have stepped out of the ranks and emancipated themselves from the paralysing traditions of thier order. Others have made a show of liberality, but have been driven back again into evil ways by the force of the uninstructed professional opinion they encountered. An amusing instance of this occurred some years ago. At the Annual Meeting of the British Medical Association held at Ryde in 1881, Mr Barrow, the President of the Meeting, Dr Bristowe, President of the Medical Section, and Mr Jonathan Hutchinson, President of the Surgical Section, each, in his opening address, advocated the adoption, on the part of the Association, of a spirit of fairness towards homœopathy and homœopaths. Nothing more than this was suggested, yet the storm the suggestion aroused was such that each of the speakers

was promptly silenced, and has never ventured to refer to the subject in public again. The following year, at the Worcester Meeting, the Council of the Association reported on the incident as follows:—

“The question of homœopathy . . . unfortunately mooted in the addresses in medicine and surgery at the Annual Meeting at Ryde, has occupied much time and thought on the part of the Committee of Council.

“Immediately on the delivery of those addresses the idea arose in many minds that the views enunciated by the readers of the addresses had in some way been put forward [through them] by the Committee of Council itself”—terrible thought!—“and it was not until the President of the Council, Dr Bristowe, and Mr Hutchinson had severally and in the most public manner shown that this was not so, that the feeling was allayed.”

I quote the above to show the slavish state of feeling that exists in the profession. If men like Dr Bristowe and Mr Hutchinson, at the head of the profession, are capable of being coerced by the ignorance and prejudice of the rank and file in this ignominious way, how is it likely that much liberty of thought and action is to be expected of medical students. It is not likely ; and yet, in spite of the unlikeliness,



many do come forward to recruit the ranks of homœopathic practitioners. But the number who come is not sufficient to minister to the wants of the homœopathic public. Among the public, homœopathy is spreading rapidly ; but as many of the converts have no doctor of their faith to minister to them when taken ill, they are obliged to send for an allopath to advise them ; and they use their own judgment as to whether they will take his medicine or not.

The allopathic medical journals are always crying out against the multiplication of quacks and quack remedies. They have nothing but their own stupid prejudice to thank for it. A stiff and starchy professionalism prevents them from learning how to cure their patients, and the public are not slow to find this out. What wonder, then, that they largely patronize the skilful and daring advertisers of patent nostrums? Homœopathic practitioners are very little troubled with defections of their patients to the pill-manufacturer ; and if the old school would only consent to learn the art of

curing people from Hahnemann, its journals would have little cause to lament the success of unlicensed medicine-men.

In another way homœopathy is spreading,—by the adoption of its remedies into the practice of allopathic doctors, and their incorporation in allopathic text-books. This latter kind of “conveying” has been carried on wholesale by the authors of several medical works—almost invariably without acknowledgment of the source of the appropriations. The next step in this direction will be the general recognition of the power of the infinitesimal dose, and when that occurs the days of allopathy will be numbered.





## CHAPTER IX.

### SOME OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

IN the course of conversation at a public dinner the subject of homœopathy cropped up, and my neighbour, a layman of intelligence, frankly stated the objections he had to the system, looked at from the outside. He owned that he had no personal acquaintance with homœopathy, and had not studied it; but it seemed to him that a man who did not pin himself to a system was more free to use any and every means of benefiting a patient than one who did. Further, he thought that medicines which were of such an innocent nature that they could be safely prescribed in domestic practice, must have very little power of doing anyone good. I will take these two objections and discuss them in their order.

1. *Homœopathy tramples its Adherents.*

This is a very natural view for anyone not acquainted with the system to take. Really the very opposite is the case. Homœopathy does not fetter its adherents: it sets them free. It gives those who follow it a point of view from which they can discern clearly all remedial means that are brought forward, and judge them at their proper worth. By its double-sided method of studying drugs it can estimate their power and use them with a precision unknown to allopathy. Further, it can take advantage and make good use of the mistakes and over-dosings of the allopaths, which invariably occur with drugs newly brought out. For example, when chloral was first launched upon the medical world, it was declared to be perfectly harmless, and was given in large doses to numbers of patients. In some instances severe attacks of nettle-rash followed its use. This at once showed to homœopaths its power over skin disease, and it has been used by them in certain cases of nettle-rash ever since. Again,



when salicylic acid and its salts were first given in cases of rheumatism, it produced in many patients who were over-dosed with it, deafness, noises in the ears, and vertigo. The hint was at once taken by homœopathists, and salicylate of soda in its homœopathic form has cured many patients suffering from a disease which presents this distressing set of symptoms, and is called after the man who first described it, "Menière's disease." I may mention also the drug *Thyroidin*, lately brought forward as a remedy for a disease called myxœdema. This drug (prepared from the thyroid gland of a sheep) has produced alarming symptoms in many patients, and in the hands of homœopaths has been used successfully in cases presenting similar symptoms. Homœopaths are free to use anything,—just as free as allopaths; only they have this advantage: knowing the doublesidedness of drug action,—that a drug can cure conditions like those it can produce in the healthy,—they have a much more intimate knowledge of any drug that is brought forward than an allopath can have.



The latter has to blunder on in the dark, and learn from his mistakes as much as he can ; but his mistakes can never teach him so much as they teach a homœopath.

But, really, there is no comparison between the *system* of homœopathy and the *no-system* of allopathy. There is reason, light, and orderly progress in the one ; there is nothing but chaotic fragments in the other. Homœopathy no more tramels its adherents than the laws of Nature trammel the mechanician.

*2. Homœopathy is too harmless to be of any use.*

It is quite true that homœopathy is of no use for poisoning vermin or for killing patients. If patients must die, it prefers that they shall die a natural death. It is also true that the homœopathic preparations of deadly poisons may be used with perfect safety in household practice. But it does not follow that because a preparation cannot kill, therefore it cannot cure.

I may here mention incidentally another objection that has been raised :—" If homœo-



pathy is true," it is said, "a drug must cure in the same dose as that in which it has caused the symptoms for which it is given." But the objector in this case leaves out of account the difference in the sensitiveness in the human organism when in health and when diseased. Homœopathy simply demands that there shall be a correspondence between the disease symptoms and the drug symptoms. The rest is a matter of experience, and experience shows that in a normal healthy state the organism requires a larger dose of a drug to disturb it than it does to restore it when similarly disturbed by disease. The difference in the sensitiveness of an organ in health and disease may be seen any time. Take an inflamed eye and compare that with a normal eye in its reaction to light. A normal eye can bear a very strong light which to an inflamed eye would cause exquisite pain.

This fact supplies the answer to the objection to homœopathic medicines, on the score of their harmlessness. Remarking, by the way, that it would be well for the



world if all drugs were equally harmless, I may add that the sensitiveness of the diseased human organism to the homœopathically indicated drug is beyond conception. It is impossible to get the dose too small if attenuated in the graduated manner directed by Hahnemann. And even in certain individuals when not diseased there is a peculiar sensitiveness to certain drugs infinitely transcending the sensitiveness of *Drosera* to phosphate of ammonia, which gave Darwin such a fright. Some persons cannot be in the attic of a house whilst a few grains of ipecacuanha are being powdered in the basement without being powerfully affected thereby. In the *Homœopathic World* of July 1885 (again referred to in the *Homœopathic World* of November 1892), I have quoted a case from the *British Medical Journal* of February 7, 1885, in which a medical man nearly killed a patient by simply applying a linseed poultice, though the patient protested that every time such a poultice had been applied she had had an intense attack of asthma. The doctor pooh-poohed her



statement, insisted on the poultices being applied to her leg (which was ulcerated), with the result that three hours later he was "summoned to see her, as her sister thought she was dying." And he continues : " I found her livid, and struggling for breath, and certainly in as bad an attack of asthma as I ever saw." To an allopath an observation of this kind is a curiosity and nothing more. To a homœopath it is full of useful significance. What is an exceptional degree of sensitiveness in a healthy person is constant in persons when suffering from disease to those particular drugs which are capable of producing a similar state,—that is to say, which are homœopathic to their condition. Experience taught Hahnemann that a very much smaller dose of the corresponding drug was needed to cure than that required to produce the symptoms. Experience has confirmed the fact to thousands of his followers ; and it now remains established beyond the possibility of disproof.

I will now pass on to answer other objections we sometimes hear.

### 3. *Homœopathy has no Tonics.*

On the contrary ; every properly chosen homœopathic remedy is a tonic to the case treated. Again and again I have been asked by patients, " Was not that a tonic you gave me ? my appetite has been so much better since I took it," when it was merely the appropriate homœopathic remedy. By " tonic," people generally understand something which increases the appetite and the feeling of strength. The appropriate remedy will do both ; but this implies that the patient is in a state of debility. There are no such things as " tonics " in an absolute sense. Quinine is only " tonic " when given in debility ; when taken in health it is one of the most debilitating drugs known. The same may be said of *Arsenic*, *Iron*, *Phosphorus*, and *Strychnine*. They are only " tonic " to special kinds of debility like those they are capable of creating. There is thus an inconceivable amount of harm done by indiscriminate indulgence in " tonics." It is a relic of the old barbarous treatment of names of diseases by names of



drugs, against which Hahnemann protested. A patient is feeling "want of tone;" what could be simpler than to take a "tonic?" In nine cases out of ten the result is slow poisoning. In homœopathy we differentiate the different kinds of debility, and prescribe the remedy which corresponds, in a dose which is quite large enough to remove the debility without depositing a mineral or vegetable poison in the patient's body to breed future trouble. In a large number of cases of debility there is one of the chronic miasms at the bottom of it. Relieve the system of that by the appropriate homœopathic remedy, and the feeling of wellness and natural appetite at once return without the help of strong drugs.

#### 4. *Homœopathy has no Aperients.*

This is often alleged against homœopathy as a grave defect. Homœopaths hold themselves free to make use of the physiological effects of any drug if they think the occasion calls for it, only they do not delude themselves with the idea that they

are curing a patient of constipation by simply ordering a purge. Homœopaths have a much higher opinion of the unaided powers of Nature than allopaths, lay or medical, entertain. Some of the latter think that no natural function can be properly carried out unless assisted by some drug,—no meal can be digested without the aid of some digestive, or else some mineral water. The perpetual resort to aperients on the part of such vast numbers is another relic of barbarism, and a survival of the Faculty's teachings in the days when the whole of medical practice was summed up in bleeding, purging, and administering lavements. A young medical man, fresh from one of the London schools, recently told me that there was always a sigh of relief from the physician when examining a patient in the wards if he found that he had constipation, for then he knew what to prescribe—a purgative.

The thing that is lost sight of by allopaths is that constipation is a constitutional disease. A purgative does not cure it, but only gives temporary relief, and



aggravates the actual condition. Homœopathy cures constipation without any purging. The drugs most used by the allopaths to check diarrhœa—*Opium*, *Sulphur*, *Nuxvomica*, *Lead*, *Alum*, and many other so-called astringents—have cured in their homœopathic form the most inveterate cases of constipation without any disturbance whatever. Homœopathy has thus the very best of aperients ; and though it does not possess and does not want active purgatives, homœopathists are free to use drugs in that way if in any case they think it worth while as a temporary expedient. The need for that is so rare, however, in the practice of many homœopathists, as to be scarcely worth taking into account.



## CHAPTER X.

### THE HOPEFULNESS OF HOMŒOPATHY. CONSERVATIVE MEDICINE.

FROM what has already been said, many of the advantages of the new system over the old "no-system" will have become apparent to all. But there is one pervading advantage, and that is, the hopefulness of homœopathy as compared with allopathy. Homœopathy is a system of "cure," whereas allopathy professes to do nothing more than treat or palliate. Homœopathy actually restores sick persons to health; and if they are past cure it affords the most perfect palliation that can be found. The hopefulness of homœopathy is an outcome of the idea Hahnemann formed of the nature of disease, as not being so much a gross material alteration of the structures and functions as a disorder of the vital force.



Looking at disease in this light, homœopathists are not dismayed in the presence of tumours and changes of solid structures, as are the members of the old school. Homœopathists know from experience that a very large proportion of tumours can be acted upon by medicines, and the vital process which produced them can be reversed. Whilst the allopath knows no better way of dealing with morbid growths than by cutting them off (which, whilst it cuts off the growth, leaves the disease behind in the organism), homœopathists seek to get rid of the growth by curing the patient of the diseased state of which the growth is but a manifestation.

In the same way homœopathists approach many other diseases which in allopathy are relegated to the surgeon, such as fistulæ of various kinds, diseases of bones, and hæmorrhoidal tumours. This is what I venture to call "conservative medicine." In days gone by the remedy for most serious affections of the limbs was amputation. Later improvements in surgical methods have shown that it is possible

to save many limbs which were formerly condemned. This is what is called conservative surgery. But there is room for much improvement yet. Many operations which are now performed would be spared to the patient if only the conservative powers of homœopathic medicine were widely known.

It is true the ways of homœopathy are very gentle and unobtrusive, whilst surgical methods are attended with much pomp and circumstance—and expense. To cut off a breast for tumour, and leave a patient mutilated for life, is only the work of half an hour; to cure the patient of her diseased state, and leave her sound and healthy, may be the work of months or years. Many patients, who fancy the tumour is the whole of their disease, prefer the shorter plan, as they think it; and in the majority of cases it is the shorter plan, for it materially shortens the patient's life. Homœopathy, rightly understood and practised, saves the operating surgeon a vast amount of work.





## CHAPTER XI.

### CONCLUSION : HOMŒOPATHY IN APHORISMS.

I WILL conclude this treatise by quoting a series of Aphorisms in which I summed up the Elements of Homœopathy in the June number of the *Homœopathic World* of 1886 :—

#### I.—THE LAW.

##### I.

All medicinal substances have the power of causing disease when given to persons in health.

##### II.

Each medicine has a power of producing disease peculiar to itself.

##### III.

This power can only be known by studying the symptoms it has produced when given to persons in health.

## IV.

Hahnemann was the first to systematically study the powers of medicines in this way ; taking them himself when in health, and giving them to his friends ; observing and recording the effects which followed.

## V.

This he called "proving" medicines ; those who allowed themselves to be experimented on he called "provers ;" and the records of the symptoms produced he called "provings."

## VI.

Out of these provings he constructed his *Materia Medica* ; so arranging the symptoms of each drug as to present a picture of its disease-producing power.

## VII.

Drug diseases resemble natural diseases.

## VIII.

The Law of Similars affirms that, in a given case of natural disease, that drug



which has produced a morbid state most like the disease to be treated, will be the most certain, when administered, to work a cure.

## IX.

The practical rule which is the outcome of this law is formulated thus :—

“*Similia similibus curantur.*”

“Let likes be treated by likes.”

## X.

Homœopathy is the art of selecting and administering medicines in accordance with this rule and the principle on which it is founded.

## XI.

A medicine is said to be homœopathic to a given diseased condition when it has produced a similar diseased condition in a healthy person.

## II.—THE DOSE.

## I.

The susceptibility to the action of medicines varies greatly in different persons.

## II.

It also varies in the same person in health and in disease.

## III.

In disease the human body is infinitely more susceptible to the action of a drug which is homœopathic to that diseased condition than it is to the action of the same drug in health, or to the action of a non-homœopathic drug in disease.

## IV.

A drug which must be given in a large dose to produce a morbid condition, will remove that condition arising from other causes when given in a dose exceedingly small.

## V.

One and the same drug may be homœopathic to a great variety of diseased conditions.

## VI.

All that is needed is that the leading symptoms of a disease should find their



counterpart in characteristic symptoms produced by the drug.

## VII.

The drug may have produced many other symptoms which do not correspond to symptoms of the disease besides those which do, but this in no way impairs its efficacy.

## VIII.

When in disease we wish to evoke one part of the action of a drug for the cure, without exciting those other disease-producing powers of the drug which are not homœopathic to the case, we are able to do so by diminishing the dose.

## IX.

We are enabled to do this because of the increased susceptibility in disease, and because this increase of susceptibility only extends so far as the drug is homœopathic.

## X.

We can in this way use the most deadly poisons in disease without fear of producing anything but good effects.

## XI.

For this discovery, and for the invention of an effectual method of graduated attenuation of medicinal substances, we are also indebted to Hahnemann.

## XII.

There are some substances which, though inert or nearly so when taken in their natural state, become, when finely divided after Hahnemann's method, powerful agents both for deranging health and restoring it when deranged.

## XIII.

In many cases the more highly attenuated a medicine is, the more powerful is its medicinal action. There is as yet no definite rule for the selection of the attenuation in any given case.



## INDEX.

---

- Acute and chronic diseases, 36.  
Allopathy and homœopathy, 5.  
Allopathy named and discovered by Hahnemann,  
6.  
Aperients in homœopathy, 83.  
Aphorisms, 89.
- Barrow, Mr, advocates toleration of homœopaths,  
71.  
Boscovich on atoms, 48.  
Bristowe, Dr, advocates toleration of homœo-  
paths, 71.
- Cameron, Mr, treats cholera cases, 66.  
Cholera statistics, 65.  
“Chronic disease” defined, 37.  
Chronic miasms, 37.  
Clark, Sir Andrew, on want of principle in  
medicine, vii., 13.  
Complex prescriptions, 24.  
Conservative medicine, 86.  
“Conveying” by allopathic authors, 74.  
Darwin and infinitesimals, 52.

Dog, Meissonier's, cure of, 60.

"Dynamic" theory of disease, 34.

Faraday on infinite extension of atoms, 48.

Forbes, Sir John, on Hahnemann, 26.

#### HAHNEMANN—

Anhalt, Duke of, gives asylum to, 22.

Apothekerlexicon of, 14.

Arsenical poisoning, work on, 13.

Birth of, 12.

Blood-letting, on, 22.

Cases treated by, 55.

Cinchona, experiments with, 16.

Complex prescriptions, on, 24.

Forbes, Sir John, on, 26.

Hufeland on, 25.

Leipsic, settles in, 20.

Liston, Professor, on, 27.

Non-restraint treatment of insane by, 14.

Persecution of, 21.

Principle in medicine, laments want of, 13.

Translations by, 13.

Hamilton, Dr, treats cholera cases, 66.

Harmlessness of homœopathy, 78.

Hartung, Dr, cures Count Radetsky, 62.

"Herpetic diathesis" and psora, 41.

Holmes, Dr Oliver Wendell, on drugs, 2.



- Homœopathy an art of comparison, 29.  
Homœopathy and pathology, 29.  
Homœopathy defined, 7.  
“Homœopathy,” the word, 8.  
Hufeland on Hahnemann, 25.  
Hutchinson, Mr, advocates toleration of homœo-  
paths, 71.  
  
Infinitesimal dose, the, 43.  
  
Koch and infinitesimals, 49.  
  
Leopold II., remarks on case of, 23.  
Liston on Hahnemann, 27.  
Luke, Saint, uses the word “Homœopathy,” 8.  
  
Mackechnie, Dr, treats cholera cases, 66.  
Maclouchlin, Dr, vouches for cholera statistics of  
Homœopathic Hospital, 66.  
Meissonier’s dog, cure of, 60.  
  
Pasteur and homœopathy, 49.  
Pathology, *Lancet* on, 32.  
Pathology, Professors of, converted to homœo-  
pathy, 30.  
Picken, Mr, on *Science of Homœopathy*, 46.  
Professionalism and its effects, 73.  
Psora, 40.  
Psora and “herpetic diathesis,” 41.

Quin, Dr, treats cholera cases, 65.

Radetsky, Count, cure of, 62.

Routh, Dr, on statistics of homœopathy, 64.

Rubini, Dr, treats cholera cases with camphor, 67.

Sensitiveness of human body, 80.

Statistics, comparative, 64.

Stokvis, Professor, on infinitesimal dose, 50.

System, advantages of, 76.

Thuja, cure of warts by, 3.

Tonics in homœopathy, 82.


Tyndall's opinion of "Science of Homœopathy,"  
47.

Typhoid fever, statistics of, at Melbourne, 68.

Vital force, 33.

Wilde, Sir William, on severity of cases of  
pneumonia in Homœopathic Hospital, 64.

Wilde, Sir William, on cholera cases, 65.





WORKS BY DR CLARKE.

---

*Just published, cloth boards, price 1s. 6d.*

NON-SURGICAL TREATMENT  
OF DISEASES OF THE  
GLANDS AND BONES;  
WITH A CHAPTER ON  
SCROFULA.

"It is the province of Homœopathy to show the world the true method of dealing with the diseased human organism, and I publish this treatise as a practical protest against surgical interference with diseased lymphatic glands. Surgery (apart from the surgery of accidents) is no cure; it only gives the semblance of cure by cutting away diseased structures, whilst leaving the seeds of disease behind. . . . Gland diseases and Bone diseases are often very closely allied, and I have therefore included in the treatise a consideration of both, and also of the condition called Scrofula, on which both frequently depend."—*From the Preface.*

A BIRD'S-EYE VIEW OF  
HAHNEMANN'S ORGANON.

*Stiff covers, 6d.*

"An admirable condensation of this great work of Hahnemann."—*Medical Advance.*

"Dr Clarke is a clear thinker and a forcible writer, and his 'Bird's-Eye View of the Organon' makes many of the intricate problems of the book clear of comprehension."—*Medical Century.*

A DICTIONARY OF DOMESTIC MEDICINE.

Giving a Description of Diseases, Directions for their General Management and Homœopathic Treatment; with a Special Section on

DISEASES OF INFANTS.

*Cloth, 3s. 6d.*

THE PRESCRIBER: A Dictionary of the New Therapeutics.

*Fourth Edition, cloth, 3s. 6d.*

RHEUMATISM AND SCIATICA.

*Cloth, 2s. 6d.*

COLD-CATCHING, COLD-PREVENTING, COLD-CURING.

*Third Edition, cloth, 1s.*

---

INDIGESTION: Its Causes and Cure.

*Fourth Edition, cloth, 1s.*

---

CHOLERA, DIARRHŒA, and DYSENTERY: Homœopathic  
Prevention and Cure.

*Cloth, 1s.*

---

THERAPEUTICS OF THE SERPENT POISONS.

*Cloth, 1s.*

---

EDITED BY DR CLARKE.

---

THE  
HOMŒOPATHIC WORLD.

*Price 6d. monthly (by post, 7d.) or prepaid, 6s. per annum  
post free.*

IN YEARLY VOLUMES.

*Bevelled cloth boards, 7s. 6d.*

THE HOMŒOPATHIC PUBLISHING COMPANY,  
12 WARWICK LANE, LONDON, E.C.

---

Information respecting the

HOMŒOPATHIC LEAGUE

and its Publications may be obtained from the Hon. Sec., E. H.  
Lawrie, Esq., 16 Blandford Square, London, N.W.





