Homoeopathy : What is it? : A statement and review of its doctrines and practices / A. B. Palmer.

Homœopathy: What is it?

PALMER

GEO. S. DAVIS, PUBLISHER, DETROIT.

Mary S. Hall,

given me by

Dr. J. Standford Sayre.

June, 1882.

Mary I. Hale, 1882.

HOMŒOPATHY,

WHAT IS IT?

A STATEMENT AND REVIEW

— OF —

ITS DOCTRINES AND PRACTICE.

—BY—

A. B. PALMER, M. D., LL.D.,

Professor of Pathology and Practice of Medicine in the College of Medicine and Surgery in the University of Michigan.

SECOND EDITION.

1881.

DETROIT, MICH., U. S. A.: GEO. S. DAVIS, MEDICAL PUBLISHER.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

SINCE the first edition of this brochure was given to the public, about one year ago, the work of disintegration of the Homœopathic system has gone on more rapidly, perhaps, than at any preceding period.

This has been the result, not so much of what has been said by its opponents, as of its own inherent weakness, and the general advancement of knowledge among all classes on scientific subjects. The present work, however, and one or two others in the English language, and one by a well known author (Prof. Juergensen) in the German, may have directed attention more distinctly to the subject; and the recent events connected with the illness of Lord Beaconsfield, in which one of the most prominent reputed homœopaths of England denied his adherence to the system, and declared his readiness to adopt any measures in the case which a regular consulting physician should advise, have been the occasion of calling forth expressions from a great number of sources, and have shown a state of things within the homœopathic fraternity which foretells its dissolution, if logic or consistency shall have any force.

Since the "Introduction" to the former edition was prepared, the writer has visited most of the medical centres in Germany, Austria, Switzerland and France, and has made further inquiries as to the standing of the Homœopathic system in those countries. He has found that nowhere has it any position or recognition in any government institution, or in

any great hospital or medical school, except in the single case of the University of Pesth in Hungary. Inquiries were made as to its success in that institution, and it was most positively declared by the distinguished pathologist, Prof. Romberger, of the University of Vienna, and others, that it could be said with almost literal accuracy, that *no* students were in attendance upon the homœopathic lectures.

The expression, so far as heard, everywhere among the members of the regular profession was, that as a science Homœopathy had no claims, and as a practice it was a pretense and a deception.

Those who have known most of it where it has received official recognition in this country, have seen nothing to change the verdict so generally pronounced in the region of its origin. These statements are not presented as proofs of the absurdity of its doctrines (these will be found in the body of the work), but their truth is well known, and must have an influence with those who have confidence in the common sense and common integrity and candor of the great body of scientific men throughout the world, who devote their lives to the most profound study of everything connected with medicine.

Another edition of this work so soon called for is an evidence that an examination of the doctrines of Homœopathy is in progress, the result of which must tend to the overthrow of absurdities so palpable, and to the establishment of medical truth.

A. B. P.

Ann Arbor, August, 1881.

INTRODUCTION TO FIRST EDITION.

IT may well be questioned whether the course which has generally been pursued by the regular Medical Profession toward Homœopathy and those who profess to believe in and practice that system, has been the one best calculated to suppress false doctrines and unfounded pretensions and to establish medical truth.

There has been, perhaps, no lack of opposition—no lack of denunciation and ridicule—of pooh-poohing its pretensions and refusing association with its practitioners. Indeed, a kind of opposition has been made which has given to the non-medical public an impression that there exists an unreasonable prejudice against a body of professional men, and a narrow illiberality towards a system of medicine professing to be an improvement on the ordinary methods of the regular practitioners; and this has given the Homœopathic fraternity an opportunity to appeal to public sympathy by the cry of persecution for opinion's sake.

During all this time very little has been done to teach the public or even the masses of the profession, the real doctrines of Hahnemann and his followers, to fairly examine these doctrines in the light of science, or to test the honesty and efficacy of the practice by open comparisons with that of the regular profession.

The Homœopathists themselves, though not backward in lauding in general terms their alleged discoveries and success, yet avoid informing the laity of the particulars of their

doctrines—of the actual character of their pretended "potencies," and the real extent of their officinal dilutions. They seldom explain the full meaning of their oft-repeated formula of "*Similia similibus curantur*," and still more rarely give an account of the other dogmas necessarily connected with this primary one, and constituting the Homœopathic system.

The consequence of this state of things is that very few, almost none of the laity, know what the system really is. Though several years ago Sir James Simpson, and some others, stated many of the Homœopathic tenets and exposed their absurdities, and some few short works on the subject have more recently appeared, yet these works have never obtained a general circulation, and now are seldom read even by physicians.

Very many educated and even scientific men have extremely vague ideas on the subject of medicine and the different medical schools. They have an indistinct, erroneous impression that there is some specific system of "old school" medicine called Allopathy, of a similar exclusive character, but opposed to the "new school" system of Homœopathy, and are without any definite, much less technical knowledge of either. They place them in the same general category of exclusive systems, but as opposed to each other. They are ignorant of the fact that regular, scientific medicine is no exclusive, dogmatic system at all. They do not understand that it is a science and an art, like agriculture and navigation —that it is a system of scientifically observed facts with certain practical deductions drawn from them, but without speculative dogmas, or canons of faith; and they therefore make no distinction between the broad science and art of medicine and the exclusive system of Homœopathy, except that they regard them as opposed to each other.

With these indefinite notions they resort to the one or the other class of practioners when they, or those dependent upon them are ill, or they become adherents of the one medical party or the other from mere accidental circumstances or influences, or at most from the inexact or unscientific observations they may have made, but without rational convictions from any proper examination of the subject.

Though there are serious difficulties in the way of a fair and sufficient comparison of the practice and the results of the practice of the Regular and the Homœpathic Schools, there seems no good reason why the professed doctrines of the Homœopaths should not be presented to the profession and to an intelligent public.

The general object of this little volume is to supply one of our defects in the treatment of the Homœopathic system; to give an exposition and fair discussion of its doctrines; to show what these doctrines really are as taught by its founder and the leading writers of the School.

There is no temptation whatever to exaggerate the peculiarities of these teachings, as they are sufficiently striking in the language of their authors; and as far as possible the exact words of the Homœopathic authorities are used. Great pains have been taken to have the numerous quotations correct, to present as much of the context as was necessary to give the true and unmistakable meaning of the authors, and to have careful references to the titles and pages of the works for verification.

The greater part of the matter which follows was originally given in lectures, by their request, to a number of medical students, belonging to the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the University of Michigan, and several hundred copies were printed by them; but the work was never offered

in the general market of the country, and the edition has become exhausted. Though these lectures have been frequently inquired for, other engagements have prevented a revision and re-issue; and since a visit to Europe was contemplated, the hope of learning something more of the workings of the system from professional gentlemen there, prevented any effort at accomplishing what so often has been requested.

During a sojourn of several months in Great Britain and on the Continent, many medical men were met with; but all inquiries failed to elicit any important facts respecting the system, except the general statement that it no longer received attention from the profession at large, and that it was not considered worthy of such attention. No prominent medical man was met with, who seemed to think the Hahnemannic theories worth arguing against, or the pretensions and practices of their professed adherents worth the effort of even denouncing. Though the system has thus fallen away from professional notice, it continues to be practiced to some extent, but nowhere is it in such favor or attracting so much attention as in our own country.

It was stated that, in the rural districts of England, the chief supporters of the waning system were to be found among the clergy, some of whom were supplied with cases of medicines and handbooks, and were in the habit of administering these medicines to some of their parishioners for their minor ailments. From these slight affections these patients, of course, often readily recover; and the tendency always is, when a measure of whatever kind is resorted to for the purpose of relief, and relief follows, for the administrators and the recipients to confidently attribute the result to the means used. Nothing is more deceptive than such experience is likely to be; and it is not strange that in the absence of more definite and enlarged

knowledge of the subject, false conclusions are arrived at, and grave responsibilities are assumed without proper preparation for them. Similar practices occur in this country, but, it is hoped, to a less extent among the clergy than among other less intelligent persons, but false conclusions are constantly arrived at from experiences of this kind, both in non-professional and professional hands.

A leading special object of the present publication is to furnish conscientious and intelligent persons, who favor Homœopathy, an opportunity of learning what the system with which they are dealing, or which is appealing to them for support, really is,—and it must be that such persons on reflection, will consider it their duty to learn definitely something of the means they are using, and of the system to which they are giving their sanction and influence, or upon which they are relying.

The writer was much aided in the preparation of the original lectures by the published writings and private correspondence of Dr. John C. Peters, of New York, who was educated and commenced practice as a Homœopathic physician; but who after an extensive course of reading of Homœopathic works, and after obtaining a knowledge of general Medical Science, abandoned the restricted system and his former associations, and has become a well-known and highly respected member of the regular profession.

The work, as now presented, is the result of a careful and candid examination of the essential doctrines of Homœopathy as taught by its founder and most authoritative expounders, and is a condensed statement of those doctrines, but no attempt has been made to give a full history of its many minor phases which might be found in the writings of its less distinguished adherents. This would have required more time,

both of the writer and the reader, than the subject could properly claim.

Soon after the printing of the lectures containing substantially the same statements of facts as in this work, a leading Homœopathist of this State, over his own signature, in a public newspaper, pronounced the lectures a gross misrepresentation of the System of Homœopathy, but without a statement of any particulars of which the alleged misrepresentation consisted. A reply was made in which I proposed to leave to impartial non-medical arbitrators, to be mutually chosen, the question as to whether such misrepresentations of the system were made as alleged, on condition that if the charges against the lectures were sustained, I was to pay all costs and make a liberal donation to the Michigan University Library for the purchase of works on the subject of Homœopathy; but if, by the decision of the arbitrators, the charges were not sustained, my accuser was to pay the expenses and pay the specified sum to the library. The proposition was evaded at the time; and although still holding good, it has not been complied with. I now wish explicitly to state that the proposition is continued in reference to the present publication.

HOMŒOPATHY.

I.

THE history of error, could it be fully written, would be more extensive than that of truth, as upon any particular subject "truth is one while error is many."

There is no subject of human thought or interest, whether of Theology, Metaphysics, Ethics, Government, Law or Physical Science, where errors have not abounded; and it is by no means surprising that in Medicine, a subject so extensive and complex—one in which there are so many inappreciable elements and unknown quantities, errors should have been numerous and conspicuous, even among its sincere and devoted cultivators. When in connection with its intrinsic complexities and uncertainties are taken into the account the popular ignorance of many of its simplest principles, and the illogical methods pursued in forming conclusions respecting it, it ceases to be a wonder that cupidity and conceit should have been attracted to so promising a field, that quackeries and deceptions should have so extensively prevailed, and that medical delusions should in all ages have been so numerous and glaring.

But notwithstanding this, the Science of Medicine, which is the arranged and organized knowledge of the conditions and circumstances which affect the health of human beings, and the Art of Medicine which is the application of the Science to the prevention of abnormal conditions, and to their removal or relief by any means which may affect the bodily functions

or mental operations—this Science and Art of Medicine is entitled to a high place among the noblest Sciences and the most beneficent Arts. In the light of the other modern Sciences, and by the aid of improved and improving instruments and methods, both the Science and the Art are rapidly advancing to a degree of certainty and perfection which justifies great hope for the future.

To expose errors and delusions, and eliminate them from a subject so important to human interests, is worthy of every effort inspired by a love of truth and of the race.

Of the many systems, the wrecks of which have been strewed along the whole pathway of Medical history, none have been more striking in their characteristics than the one extant at the present day, which has challenged the attention of the civilized world for the past three-quarters of a century, and which is the subject of this work; and though rejected by all the great lights of the profession, and having nearly disappeared from the seat of its origin, it still appeals to popular ignorance and a love of mystery and novelty, or at least to popular favor, for support.

This system, called Homœopathy, originated with Samuel Hahnemann, who was born at Meissen, in Saxony, in 1755. His father was a painter on porcelain, and had not the means of educating his son but, to the credit of his early aspirations, he became a Charity Scholar at a Provincial School, had a faculty for learning languages, became an assistant teacher in the school, and after he left it turned his attention to Medicine.

He received his medical education chiefly at Leipsic, where he stayed only two years and a half, and spent most of his time in translating books and giving lessons in German and Latin, in order to make his living; for he went to Leipsic with very limited means. Next he spent a few months in Vienna, and became influenced by *Mesmer*, and was led into Mesmerism and other transcendental absurdities. Then he went as librarian to Transylvania for one and three-fourth years. In 1779 he went to Erlangen, where he received his degree of M. D.; then to the little town

of Hettstadt, for nine months; thence to Dessau, for six months and, as he had but little practice, devoted himself to Chemistry, Botany, etc. His seventh place of residence was in a small village (Gommer) near Magdeburg, for two and a half years. He says no physician had been in this benighted place before him, and no one wanted one now. Next he went to Dresden and the village of Lœkowitz, near by. Dr. Dudgeon, editor of the British Journal of Homœopathy, says: "He does not seem to have done much in the way of medical practice." He now almost abandoned the attempt to become a physician, and devoted himself for some years to Chemistry. His tenth and eleventh places of residence were Leipsic and the neighboring village of Stottenitz. Again Dudgeon says, "Hahnemann could have had little or no opportunity for medical practice." In 1792 he had charge of an Insane Asylum for nine months. Next he moved to Walschleben, a little village. In 1794 he went to Pyrmont, a small watering place in Westphalia, and in the same year to Brunswick. In 1795 he went to Königslutten and from there to his seventeenth place of residence, Wolfenbüttel, where he remained—the very long time, for him, of four years. Then he went to Hamburg, but soon moved to Altona; and not getting much practice he went to Mollern, and from there to Eulenburg; then to Machern, and finally to Wittenberg.

In 1803, when he was forty-eight years old, we find him again in Dessau, which makes his twenty-fourth place of residence in twenty-eight years. In 1806, with probably less practical experience, especially in acute diseases, than almost any other physician fifty-one years old, he published his pamphlet on the "Medicine of Experience." Next he went to Torgua, and commenced to publish all his bitter denunciations of ancient and modern medicine, in a popular magazine of general literature and science. He now, for the first time, began to get some medical practice. In 1810, when he was fifty-five years old, he returned to Leipsic for the third time, and began to lecture on Homœopathy. In consequence of his want of means, and by the kindness of the professors, he had received free tickets to all the medical lectures thirty-four

years before; but this did not prevent him from being exceedingly bitter in his invectives against the prevailing teachings, so much so that his classes grew less and less, and in the course of two or three years he was obliged to give up lecturing for want of hearers.

From Leipsic he went to Cœthen, where he resided fourteen years, scarcely ever crossing the threshold of his house, so that he saw very few cases of acute disease—in fact most of his practice was by mail, in shape of letters to chronic patients. Afterwards he went to Paris, where he died.

It is not necessary to attack Hahnemann's private character, although he once did sell a secret ointment, made of a salt, found to be Borax, and he refused to sell the name of his pretended prophylactic against scarlet fever, until a purse of three hundred Louisd'ors was made up for him. Says Dr. J. C. Peters:

"It is evident, that he had not practical experience enough to become the guide of practical men. He was only a half-educated physician, with little or no practice, till he was over fifty years of age. He early became a dreamer of dreams, a fitting, but false guide for enthusiastic, half-educated, dreamy and impractical medical men."

His biographer and enthusiastic admirer, Mr. Sampson, says: "that in the year 1790, while translating the Mat. Med. of Cullen, being struck with the contradictory accounts respecting the action of Peruvian Bark, it occurred to him to test the action of this medicine upon himself." It is stated that "the first dose produced symptoms similar to those of the peculiar kind of intermittent fever, which the same medicine is known to cure." Repeating the experiments confirmed the first, and forced upon him the question:—"Can it be possible that this property which I now observe in Peruvian Bark, of producing symptoms analogous to those of the disease for which it is a remedy, is a property peculiar to medicines of all kinds? "From that moment he commenced," it is claimed, "a series of experiments on other substances—Mercury, Belladonna, Digitalis, Cocculus, etc., which in proportion as he extended them," says Mr. Sampson, "led him to the convic-

tion that his supposition had already embraced a *universal* therapeutic law."

From this he went on developing his *System* in other parts —writing numerous works, the most important being his "Organon," in which he expounds his principles, his "Materia Medica Pura,"—a voluminous work, and his work on "Chronic Diseases, in four volumes.

In the preface of his "Organon," he says: "The true art of healing remained undiscovered until *my* time." He and his followers have ever claimed that the law that "like cures like" expressed in Hahnemann's formula, *similia similibus curantur*, was an original discovery of this "Sage of Cœthen." But the fanciful *Stahl* before him, wrote: "I am persuaded * * that diseases are subdued by agents which produce a similar affection—burns, by the heat of a fire to which the parts are exposed; the frost bite, by snow or icy cold water, and inflammations and contusions by spirituous applications." And long before *Stahl*, in an earlier period of speculative philosophy, which was in vogue with many until after the time of Hahnemann—a mode of thought which has been aptly termed "the spider system of philosophy, in which the philosophers spun from the web-bag of their own imaginations theories which left their disciples tangled in their meshes like flies in cobwebs"—in this period of vague speculations upon almost all subjects, before scientific methods were adopted—before logical inductions from clearly established facts were regarded as the only basis of scientific truths, three general methods of cure had received a speculative recognition: The *Antipathic*, the *Allopathic*, and the *Homœopathic* were the systems. *Antipathic*—from the Greek *αντι*, opposite, and *παθος*, suffering—means, treatment by producing an effect opposite the disease. *Allopathic* —from the Greek *αλλος*, another, and *παθος*, suffering —means, producing an effect different from, but not opposite to the disease; and *Homœopathic*—from *ὁμος*, like, and *παθος*, suffering—means the producing of an effect like the disease; but no one before Hahnemann ever quite so

clearly declared, and certainly no one so vehemently insisted that it was the universal, "Sole law of Cure" in all diseases.

If this *similia similibus* be true as an absolute universal law, Hahnemann was, perhaps, a discoverer. If it be true that it is only one of the laws of cure, then was he preceded by others who had asserted quite as much.

Indeed the celebrated Paracelsus, who was born in 1493, and died in 1551, actuated by an intense hatred and opposition to Galen, who announced the law "*contraria contrariis curantur*," declared that this law never did hold good in medicine; but that a *hot* disease had never been cured by a *cold* remedy; nor cold diseases by a hot remedy; "but it is well done," says he, "when we oppose like to like." "Know all men," he exclaims, "that like attacks its like, and never its contrary."

Theophraste says a good deal about Specifics; but he thought they depended on the influence of the stars, and in some passages rejects the doctrine of Galen—*contraria contrariis curantur*, and says, "diseases are cured by remedies affecting the organism similarly to the disease."

Cardanus likewise doubted the maxim of Galen. But Basilius Valentinus is more explicit, and says, that "like cures like, but that *contraria* do not cure."

Other writers have explained the operations of specific remedies on the same ground of similarity.

Stoerk has gone further in this than any other writer before him. He suggests with a certain timidity that Stramonium might cure derangement of the mind, for the reason that it deranges the reason of healthy persons, interrupts the ideas, modifies the perceptive and functionary powers of the senses.—*Rau's Organon, p. 31.*

But none of these followed up the idea with a system of corresponding ideas. Still they all did enough to destroy the originality of the principle as a conception on the part of Hahnemann.

We shall find that nearly if not quite all of Hahnemann's notions had been suggested before his time. There is very little absolutely new under the sun—but yet the developments of the

distinct system of Hahnemannism must be regarded as belonging to the man who gave it his name. But the principle of *similia similibus* was not original with him.

Even in an old nursery rhyme, found in the collection of "Mother Goose," dating back, for aught I know, to the time when the "lost arts" were known, the principle is more than hinted at. It runs thus:

"There was a man in our town, he thought he was wonderous wise,
He jumped into a bramble bush and scratched out both his eyes;
And when he found his eyes were out, with all his might and main,
He jumped into another bush and scratched them in again."

But if it shall prove, as I suspect it may, on investigation, that in no proper sense can this be regarded as an important, or any law of cure at all—that scratched out eyes cannot be scratched in again, by a bramble bush acting similarly, then is Hahnemann not only not a discoverer, but something much worse than this negative character. Indeed he is a promulgator of a False Doctrine, if "*similia similibus*" is not the "only law of cure;" for this is what is distinctly and repeatedly declared.

On page 59 of his Organon (2d American Edition), he says, that to effect a cure of diseases, we should in "*every case*" give "a medicine which can itself produce an affection similiar to that sought to be cured." On page 73, he says: "The truth is only to be found in this method." "It is not possible" he states "to perform a cure but by the aid of a remedy which produces *symptoms* similar to those of the disease itself." On page 55, he says, that "like is cured by like," is "the only Therapeutic law conformable to nature." On page 100, he repeats: It is "the *only* Therapeutic law conformable to nature." On page 73, he says it is an Infallible"—page 78, an "unerring law"—page 153, "*The* great *sole Therapeutic law*" —"A mode of cure founded on an eternal, infallible law of nature."

The [real] followers of Hahnemann insist upon this general universal law. This is the central, essential feature of Homœopathy. In so far as any deviate from this principle, they cease to be Homœopaths. This must be regarded as settled—this is what Homœopathy means.

II.

It will be observed that, in accordance with the Homœopathic plan, medicines are used which produce *symptoms* similar to the disease.

In the case of Bark, it was not pretended that it produced the material poison, the cause of Ague; and nothing was said of the Pathology of that disease; but simply that it caused symptoms resembling Ague.

So in other cases in all their pretended "provings," or taking of medicines by well or sick persons to ascertain their effects, the symptoms they produced, they are supposed to cure. Thus in all the works of Hahnemann and his followers, remedies are placed in opposition to symptoms, ignoring everything else.

The symptoms are detailed at immense length which certain drugs have been said to cause in somebody; and these *drug symptoms* serve as the basis for their administration in disease. They are to be given when such symptoms appear. Take for instance Jahr's Manual—a leading work of the Homœopaths.

We find, looking at different parts at random, the following directions: "For absence of mind, irresoluteness"—(mere external manifestations)—remedy, "Alum." "Absence of mind with confusion of thought," "Cupr." "Making mistakes in writing," "Nutr. Carb." (Carbonate of Soda.) "Frequent Vanishing of Thought," "Ol. An." "Fear of Death," "Dig." "Pain in Big Toe as if Sprained," "Mosch," etc.

The same, substantially, is found in all their works on Materia Medica.

On this subject of Symptoms being the basis of all therapeutical appliances, Hahnemann is very explicit.

He lays it down as one of his "indubitable truths," as he

says, that "the sum of all the SYMPTOMS in each individual case of disease is the *sole* guide to direct us in the choice of a curative remedy."—Organon, p. 120—English Edition.

In ague, for instance, the remedy is not chosen in reference to its effects in removing the poison which is its cause, nor, indeed, in reference to its more essential internal conditions, but simply in reference to its conditions which are perceptible to the senses, either of the patient or the physician.

Again on page 81 (Organon—American edition), he says:

"In short, the *ensemble* of the symptoms is the principal and *sole* object that a physician ought to have in view in every case of disease—the power of his art is to be directed against that alone, in order to cure and transform it into health." Again, on page 84—"Only that which is necessary for the physician to know of disease, and which is fully sufficient for the purpose of cure is rendered evident to his senses." And, again, page 113 (English edition), he repeats—"The totality of the symptoms must be the principal—the *sole* thing the physician has to take note of in *every case* of disease, and to remove by means of his art."

This may account for the neglect of Anatomy, Physiology, Pathology, and other branches of Medical Science, on the part of some, at least, who claim to be authorities in Homœopathy. Thus, one of their leading authors, Dr. C. J. Hempel, in the *Philadelphia Journal of Homœopathy*, for March, 1856, in contending for the similarity of the cause of the sounds in bronchial respiration of pneumonia, and the bellows murmur of valvular diseases of the heart, says that *atmospheric air in a free state* is expelled from *the heart* at each contraction, and it is the passage of this *air through the uncovered orifice of the heart* that causes the blowing sound!"

It is proper to say that attempts have been made to explain away this explicit language of Hahnemann's respecting symptomatic treatment; but from the methods of ascertaining the powers of medicines, this symptomatic treatment is a necessity—is alone consistent with the plan. Deviations from this are deviations from what is legitimately regarded as true Homœopathy as a system.

"*Similia similibus*" is the central dogma of Homœopathy, but the system of Hahnemann is more than this—it embraces other parts.

It was not pretended by Hahnemann, neither is it, I suppose, by any of his followers, that medicine can produce the combination and succession of conditions and phenomena, constituting the different forms of disease; such as cholera in its totality, or small-pox, or typhoid fever, or pneumonia; but they claim that various medicines are capable of producing certain symptoms, resembling those that occur in the course of such diseases—certain pains, and flushings, and tremors, and the like; and that in the course of the disease these symptoms are to be looked for and counteracted by the agents homœopathic to them. The remedy must be used which covers the most of the symptoms present at any one time. If the symptoms combated disappear, then another observation is to be taken, and other remedies selected. This is the only way conditions can be met homœopathically. The disease in its entirety cannot be met homœopathically, because no remedy will produce a condition, even in the estimation of however imaginative Homœopathists, resembling the entire disease, but only certain symptoms; therefore symptomatic treatment is a necessity of the system. Remedies cannot on this plan be directed to causes. It is impossible—they can only be directed to effects —to the symptoms. This Hahnemann saw and insisted upon. This is a principle of his system—of the system whose central dogma is "*similia similibus.*" Now, according to the principles of rational medicine, a fever caused by suppression of the secretion of the skin is properly treated by endeavoring to restore that secretion, thus attempting to remove the cause—to eliminate by the skin morbid materials in the blood which cause the fever.

A pain in the intestines caused by the presence there of vitiated bile, producing *bilious colic*, will be best cured by removing that bile, and its recurrence prevented by correcting the character of that secretion.

The Homœopath in accordance with the system would regard the symptom of pain, directing his remedy to it, and

using a remedy which would tend to cause a similar pain. The remedy is directed to the symptom—the pain.

Some modern Homœopaths might say the remedy should be directed to the wrong secretion of the liver; but this is not "perceptible to the senses," and is in violation of Hahnemann's rule. But all Homœopaths, ancient and modern, must say that the remedy, if directed to the liver, must be one which would cause the secretion of vitiated bile, if given in proper doses. This could not be avoided. True or false, right or wrong, this certainly is Homœopathy. But this is not all of the System. There are other necessary parts.

III.

In giving medicine on the principle that "like cures like" —in giving Opium for stupor,—continued cathartics for diarrhœa, stimulants for fever, irritants for an inflamed stomach, cantharides for strangury, etc., in ordinary doses, it was found that the symptoms, the sole objects of treatment, were made worse instead of better, and this difficulty was met by the diminution of the dose.

"The suitableness of a medicine," says Hahnemann, in his Organon, p. 231, (English Edition), "for any given case of disease, does not depend on its accurate Homœopathic selection alone, but likewise on the proper size, or rather smallness of the dose. If we give *too strong a dose* of a medicine which may have been even quite homœopathically chosen for the morbid state before us, it must, notwithstanding the inherent beneficial character of its nature, prove injurious by its mere magnitude, and by the unnecessary *excessive* impression it makes upon the vital force which it convulses." For "a medicine," says he, in his "*medicine of experience*," "of a positive and curative kind, will, without fault in itself produce just the contrary (effect) of that which it ought to do, if given

in excessive quantity, by producing a greater disease than that present."

In the Organon, again, he observes—"a medicine even though it may be homœopathically suited to the case of disease, does harm in every dose that is too large, the more harm *the larger the dose;* and by the magnitude of the dose it does more harm the greater its homœopathicity."—p. 321.

Dr. Black, a standard writer of the School, says: "With large doses patients may be treated homœopathically; but then we may frequently expect a *positive increase of the disease, or even death.* The experience of such painful and dangerous aggravations, in no case necessary to cure, led Hahnemann to employ minute doses."

In the nature of the case, no less than from the statements of homœopathic authors, it is seen that small doses are a necessary part of the homœopathic system; and whenever the larger doses of medicine are given, they are not selected in accordance with the "Sole Universal Law of Cure."

In his later years, Hahnemann's "experience" led him, as he states, to the conviction, that the "minutest doses," to use his own words, "are *always* able to overcome the disease."

He denounces with great contempt those who affect to disbelieve the perfect and certain powers of drugs in their thirtieth dilution.

In his Organon, (p. 289, English Edition), he says: "The very smallest, I repeat, for it holds good, and will continue to hold good, as a homœopathic therapeutic maxim ,*not to be refuted by any experience in the world,* that the best dose of the properly selected remedy is always the VERY SMALLEST one, in one of the high dynamizations, (X or 30th dilution,) as well for chronic as acute diseases,—a truth that is the inestimable property of pure Homœopathy, and which, as long as Allopathy, (and the new mongrel system, made up of mixtures of allopathy and homœopathic processes is not much better,) continues to gnaw like a cancer at the life of sick human beings, and to ruin them by larger doses of drugs, will keep pure Homœopathy separated from these spurious arts as by an impassible gulf."

This statement, that no amount of experience can disprove the efficiency of small doses, reminds one of the speculations a philosopher stated to a friend, who told him the facts were not in accordance with his theory. "Ah then," said the philosopher, "so much the worse for the facts."

But the small doses are an absolute necessity to the system, and, of course, all the experience in the world cannot refute their efficiency!

As to what is meant by these "smaller doses" we shall now see. The popular notion of Homœopathy is, that it consists essentially in giving smaller doses of medicine, than what is called Allopathy gives. People speak of "little pills," and "big pills," as mere questions of dose—or of bulk of medicine, without any adequate conception of the infinity of the difference.

They sometimes say the pills are small, but they are the more active principles in a more concentrated or active form. I ask the patience of the reader while I endeavor to give an idea of Homœopathic doses, and show what "little pills" means.

The mode of preparation of Homœopathic medicines, as directed by the standard works on the subject, will alone give proper conceptions of the minuteness of its doses. In Hahnemann's Organon, second American edition, page 200, is the following passage:

"If two drops of a mixture of equal parts of Alcohol and the recent juice of any medicinal plant be diluted with ninety-eight drops of Alcohol in a vial capable of containing 130 drops (for the convenience of shaking), and the whole twice shaken together, the medicine becomes exalted in energy to the first development of power, or, as it may be denominated, the first potence. The process is to be continued through twenty-nine additional vials, each of equal capacity of the first, and each containing ninety-nine drops of alcohol, so that every successive vial after the first, being furnished with one drop from the vial for dilution immediately preceding (which has just been twice shaken), is, in its turn, to be shaken twice, remembering to number the dilution of each vial upon the

cork as the operation proceeds. These manipulations are to be conducted thus through all the vials, from the first up to the thirtieth, or decillionth development of power, which is the one in most general use."

With regard to solids, he adds on the same page, "these were, in the first place, exalted in energy by the attenuation in the form of powder by the means of trituration in a mortar (in sugar) to the third or millionth degree. Of this, one grain was then dissolved and brought through twenty-seven vials by a process similar to that employed in the case of vegetable juices up to the thirtieth development of power."

On page 207 of the same work, the same founder of the system says: "The best mode of administration is to make use of small globules of sugar the size of mustard seed; one of these globules having imbibed the medicine, and being introduced into a vehicle, forms a dose containing about a three-hundredth part of a drop of the dilution, for three hundred such globules will imbibe one drop of alcohol, by placing one of these on the tongue, and not drinking anything after it," * * * and then he adds: "But if the patient is very sensitive, and it is necessary to employ the smallest dose possible, and attain at the same time the most speedy results, it will be sufficient to let him smell once."

Dr. Hempel, (Mat. Med., vol. 1, page 92,) says: "In order to obtain good Homœopathic preparations, follow Hahnemann's rules as closely as may be possible and convenient," even in the mode of trituration, etc.

Dr. Rau, in his Homœopathic Organon, American translation, page 120, says: "One grain of the solid and one drop of the liquid substance, is mixed with ninety-nine grains of the sugar of milk, and triturated for one hour in a porcelain mortar with a porcelain pestle. * * * After an hour's trituration we obtain the first trituration. The second trituration is prepared by triturating one grain of the first trituration with an additional ninty-nine grains of sugar of milk. The third by triturating one grain of the second in a similar manner. Of this third we mix one grain with 100 drops of alcohol or water, and by shaking the mixture a number of times, obtain

the fourth dilution. Every successive dilution is obtained by mixing in a similar manner, one drop of the preceding dilution with ninety-nine drops of alcohol."

In the first dilution of one grain of the medicine with ninety-nine of sugar or alcohol, one grain of the mixture contains $\frac{1}{100}$ of a grain of the crude medicine. One grain or drop of this first is added to the next vial, thus forming the second dilution. A grain or drop of the medicine will contain $\frac{1}{100}$ part of $\frac{1}{100}$, which is $\frac{1}{10,000}$ part of a grain. The third dilution contains $\frac{1}{100}$ part of the second, and one grain of that contains $\frac{1}{1,000,000}$ part of a grain of the medicine. The fourth contains $\frac{1}{100}$ parts of the third, which would be $\frac{1}{100,000,000}$. The fifth, $\frac{1}{10,000,000,000}$, and so on up to the thirtieth, diminishing in this rapid geometrical progression—the denominator of the fraction representing each succeeding dilution being multiplied by 100, each one all the way through being 100 times less than the one just preceding; so that at the thirtieth dilution, a unit with sixty ciphers for a denominator, and a unit for the numerator, expresses the quantity of medicine, or the part of a grain which at that dilution is contained in a drop. This is the fraction:

$$\frac{1}{1,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000}$$

A drop of alcohol containing this part of a grain is to moisten three hundred sugar globules. The alcohol evaporates, leaving that fraction of a grain in the globules, and one of these globules is the dose.

The quantity of liquid required to dilute the whole of a simple grain to the thirtieth degree may be arrived at mathematically by taking another view from the data presented in the language of Hahnemann and Rau.

When using the medicine at the thirtieth dilution all the intermediate vials are discarded. If all, however, were used and brought to this dilution—if none were discarded, and the whole ultimately elaborated—a thing impossible except in theory, it would be as follows:

For the first dilution 100 drops of alcohol would be used. For the second, 100 times as many, which would be 10,000 drops,

or, as ascertained, about one pint. For the third, 100 pints. The fourth, 10,000. And now it mounts up rapidly at each dilution. For the ninth dilution it would require (10,000,000,000) ten billions of gallons, which is found by computation to be equal to the water in a lake twelve miles in circumference. For three dilutions more, the twelfth, it requires a million of such lakes—which, according to computation, would be equal to five hundred lakes as large as Lake Superior. The fifteenth dilution would require a body of fluid sixty-one times greater than the earth—and the thirtieth would actually take a quantity of fluid exceeding the volume of a quadrillion of suns.

Various calculations have been made by different writers with a view of giving as definite notions as possible of these infinitesimal doses.

The dilutions are divided by Dr. Hempel into four classes, viz.:

1st. Lower—up to the 6th attenuation.
2d. Middle—from the 6th to the 30th.
3d. Higher—from the 30th to the 200th.
4th Highest—above the 200th.

These go to the 40,000th.

Dr. Simpson (Sir James), of Edinburgh, has shown by his calculations, confirmed by the mathematical professors of the University of Edinburgh, that at the fifteenth dilution, a mass of sugar would be required out of which 61 bodies could be made, each as large as our earth. The 16th would require 100 times as many—*i. e.*—61X100=6,100. Multiplying each time by 100—from the 15th to the 30th—fifteen times—would make thirty ciphers joined to the 61. Making a bulk of 61,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000 times as large as the earth.

I give from Sir James Simpson, the following

"*Table showing the quantity of alcohol or fluid required to dissolve one single grain or drop of a homœopathic drug, (as sulphur, aconite, etc.) down into the following homœopathic attenuations or dilutions:*

Number of Attenuation, Dilution or Potency.	Relative quantity of the Drug and of the quantity of Alcohol in which it is dissolved in each Attenuation.
1st Attenuation.—	One grain, or drop, in one and a-half teaspoonfuls of alcohol.
2d Attenuation.—	One grain, in twenty-one fluid ounces of alcohol.
3d Attenuation.—	One grain, in two thousand and eighty ounces; or in one hundred and four pints of alcohol.
6th Attenuation.—	One grain, in thirteen million gallons; or in two hundred and six thousand hogsheads, or in fifty-one thousand tons of alcohol.
9th Attenuation.—	One grain, in a lake of alcohol with a volume of about fourteen cubic miles; or in a lake of fifty fathoms in depth, and presenting two hundred and fifty miles of square surface.
12th Attenuation.—	One grain, in a sea containing about fourteen million cubic miles of alcohol; or in a quantity of fluid equal to a sea six times the size of the Mediterranean Sea.
15th Attenuation.—	One grain, in an ocean of fourteen billion cubic miles of alcohol; or in an ocean about forty-six thousand times greater than the whole waters contained in all the oceans of the earth.
24th Attenuation.—	One grain, in an ocean of fourteen quintillion cubic miles of alcohol; or in a quantity sufficient to make one hundred and forty masses, each filling a sphere extending from limit to limit of the orbit of the planet Neptune.
30th Attenuation.—	One grain, in an ocean of fourteen septillion cubic miles of alcohol; or in a quantity sufficient to make one hundred and forty billion spherical masses extending from limit to limit of Neptune's orbit; or in a quantity equal to many hundred spheres each with a semi-diameter or radius extending from the earth to the nearest fixed star.

This thirtieth, or last, of these attenuations or dilutions is, according to Hahnemann, the most appropriate dose of every drug in every disease. For we have already found him strongly and solemnly

declaring (see page 62,) that "it holds good, and will continue to hold good as a homœopathic therapeutic maxim, not to be refused by any experience in the world, that THE BEST DOSE of the properly selected remedy is ALWAYS the very smallest one in one of the high dynamizations, (X or the 30th dilution,) as well for chronic as for acute diseases." Now, this 30th dilution, which Hahnemann thus asserts as indubitably "*the best dose*" of all drugs for chronic or acute diseases, consists of a decillionth of a grain of the drugs used; or, in other words, it consists of a *minute globule of sugar, moistened by being simply dipped in a drop out of an ocean of fluid one hundred and forty billions* (140,000,000,000,000) *times as large as our whole planetary system, and which enormous ocean has been medicated for the purposes of homœopathy, by having dissolved and mixed through it one single grain of the appropriate drug.*"

Dr. Simpson adds:

"Surely common sense and common sanity both dictate to the human mind that it is utterly impossible that any such dose, from any such an inconceivable ocean, medicated by a *single grain* of any drug dissolved and mixed in it, can have any possible medicinal effect upon the human body, either in a state of health or in a state of disease; and,—looking at these and the numerous and diversified facts; CONFIRMATORY IN ALL RESPECTS OF THE SAME VIEW, which have been already stated in the preceding pages, we cannot but conclude with a writer whom the homœopathists themselves regard as the mildest and fairest among their opponents, namely, Dr. Forbes, that in rejecting homœopathy, "we are discarding what is AT ONCE FALSE AND BAD—USELESS TO THE SUFFERER—AND DEGRADING TO THE PHYSICIAN."

Possibly we cannot deny the credit [?] of originality to Hahnemann, for insisting upon the efficacy of infinitesimal doses; and yet Cervantes in his inimitable sarcasm on Knight-errantry—in the third chapter of Don Quixote, says:

"In the plains and deserts where Knight-errants fought and were wounded, no aid was near, unless they had some sage enchanter for their friend, who could give them immediate assistance by conveying in a cloud through the air some damsel or dwarf, *with a vial of water*, possessed of such efficacy, that upon tasting a single drop of it, they should instantly become as sound as if they had received no injury."

Many of the statements of Hahnemann and his followers are very much after this style—are indeed quite as marvelous. In the case of the "Sage enchanters," unearthly powers were

supposed to exist; and when we go beyond our material and mortal sphere, nothing then is impossible.

But seriously this seems to deprive Hahnemann's idea of the efficacy of imponderable doses, of originality; for the drop was spoken of as water, doubtless treated in some peculiar way, producing a surprisingly rapid curative effect.

The method of trituration with sugar of milk has been attributed to the originality of Hahnemann. But the celebrated Baron Stoerk, when Hahnemann was only sixteen years old, published a work on *Pulsatilla*, (an article of medicine, by the way, claimed by the Homœopaths as belonging to them), in which he gives an account of rubbing it up in a marble mortar with sugar of milk, as Hahnemann after advised it treated, and the Baron thoroughly experimented with it also, by administering it both to the *healthy and to the sick*.

These, then, are the "little pills." This is what is meant by "infinitesimal doses." These are the methods and the extent of the dilutions.

I have found it a difficult matter to induce persons who have given no special attention to this subject, to believe that really such notions were entertained and taught by Hahnemann, and are professed to be believed in by his followers. Should the reader present these statements to the average man, without the most authentic confirmation, he will regard him as jesting or even falsifying, and he can hardly be blamed for doing so, for it seems impossible that sane men should seriously entertain such notions. It requires the actual studying of the homœopathic authors themselves to convince some persons that this is the actual teaching. Some readers may be incredulous as to this being the real teaching of Homœopathy; but such persons can only be referred to the works quoted (and they are those of the founder of the system and others of its most authoritative supporters), where will be found word for word the authority for every representation made. The calculations based upon the data given can be verified by any arithmetician.

IV.

In the preceding Sections, besides the statement of the fundamental doctrine of Homœopathy, expressed in the dogma of *similia similibus curantur*, the necessary additional doctrines of *prescribing for symptoms alone*, and the doctrine of *very small or infinitesimal doses*, were presented in the language of Hahnemann and his leading supporters; and an attempt was made to give a proximate conception of the minuteness of doses in their dilutions.

Now, to avoid the utter, repelling absurdity of regarding such quantities of common matter as efficient in producing medicinal effects, Hahnemann was driven to another position, viz.: That by the mode of the preparation of the medicine—by the triturations and shakings, an added dynamical or spiritual power was communicated to these crude material substances. They were declared to be "potentized,"—and the more they were divided and rubbed or shaken, the more of this power was said to be communicated.

In Hahnemann's own words, "a great, hitherto unknown, undreamt of change occurred in them."

So much of this new power did he regard as being communicated by these manipulations, that he was particular in directing that but two shakes should be given to each dilution or potentization, by bringing the arm down in a particular manner, lest the power developed should be too great; and he cautioned his disciples against carrying the medicines about their persons in a liquid form, lest their potency should become unmanageable.

It was mentioned in the account of Hahnemann, that he met with Mesmer and became imbued with his notions. This enthusiast, (Mesmer,) observing the power through sympathy which one person may exert over another, and the peculiar conditions into which some persons are thrown by certain men-

tal and physical excitements, induced by frictions and passes, etc., went to an absurd extent, and supposed he was able to communicate peculiar powers or qualities to inanimate bodies. To show the extent to which his notions led him, Mesmer was once asked what baths were most healthy; he answered: "Formerly it made no difference whether a bath was taken in a room or in the open air; but ever since I have magnetized the sun it is better to bathe in water that the sun is shining upon!"—*Rau's Organon, p. 23.*

A distinguished physician at Heidelburg was so strongly in the belief of his power, that he went through the form of *magnetizing* the University building, to inspire the students with a higher enthusiasm for science. Here may be seen the origin of spiritualizing notions. If Mesmer could potentize the sun, why could not Hahnemann add a new power to medicines?

Whether Hahnemann was a real believer in this peculiar power communicated to medicines by shaking, it is not easy to determine. It is charitable to presume that he was. In one of his works, entitled his "Lesser Writings," page 822, he says: "This result [of potentization] so incomprehensible to the man of figures, goes so far that he must set bounds to the succussion process, in order that the degree of attenuation be not overbalanced by the increased potency of the medicine, and in that way the highest attenuations become too active. If we wish, for example, to attenuate a drop of the juice of *Sundew* to the thirtieth degree, but shake each of the bottles with twenty or more succussions from a powerful arm, in the hand of which the bottle is held, in that case this medicine, which I have discovered the specific remedy for the frightful epidemic, whooping-cough of children, will have become so powerful in the fifteenth attenuation [spiritualized], that a drop of it given in a teaspoonful of water would endanger the life of such a child; whereas, if each dilution-bottle were shaken but *twice* [with two strokes of the arm], and prepared in this manner up to the thirtieth attenuation, a sugar globule, the size of a poppy seed, moistened with the last attenuation,

cures this terrible disease with this single dose, without endangering the health of the child in the slightest degree."

But while Hahnemann warned against administering "Sundew" that had been prepared with twenty shakes, Jenichens' preparation of that drug in the 500th dilution was shaken 6,000 times by machinery, at each dilution—30,000,000 times in all—and yet it did not annihilate patients, but cured whooping-cough like the other preparation.—*British Journal of Homœopathy, p. 446*—Such is infallible Homœopathic "experience!"

Common salt, which we swallow daily with our food in such quantities, when carried to the thirtieth dilution, becomes, says Hahnemann, "a powerful and heroical medicament, which can only be administered to patients with the greatest caution."

But the alcohol used in the preparation of medicines has medicinal properties, and should not they be increased? Hahnemann, to get over this, with a sort of method in his madness, throwing a dark suspicion upon his honesty, coolly tells the world that alcohol and wine, though having medicinal properties, are exceptions to all other substances, and are not *potentized* by these dilutions! His words are, "Wine and alcohol are the only excitants, the heating and intoxicating effects of which are *diminished* by their dilution with water."—Organon, p. 329.

But as to this "potentization," there is one thing he overlooked, or he would doubtless have had other exceptions. The sugar of milk used for trituration is not a simple, but a compound sugar. According to Lagrange and Vogtt, ordinary specimens of it contain forty-seven parts in 1,000 of phosphate, carbonate and sulphate of lime and potash; while Simon found thirteen parts in 1,000 of a very pure article, to consist of these salts. Hence in 100 grains of the first trituration of any homœopathic medicine, there is only one grain of the medicine, and at least one and three-tenths, and probably as much as four and seven-tenths, grains of the salts of lime and potash. In the second dilution there will be only $\frac{1}{10000}$ part of a grain of the medicine, and from one and three-tenths to four and

seven-tenths grains of lime and potash, or from 13,000 to 47,000 times as much lime and potash as of the article supposed to be potentized. In the third dilution there will be from 1,300,000 times to 4,700,000 times as much lime and potash. What it will be, in proportion to the other articles, in the thirtieth dilution, may be calculated from these data.

Now, it must be remembered that potash and lime are regarded as medicinal by homœopaths; lime being capable of producing over 100 symptoms, and capable of potentization; and it must also be recollected that at least a part of these comparatively large quantities of lime and potash receives as much potentization by trituration as the other articles. For the grain of medicated Sugar of Milk which is taken from the first dilution to make the second, contains triturated and *potentized* Lime and Potash, and so up to the thirtieth dilution.

All the so-called homœopathic cures with triturated medicines must be accompanied by potentized, or spiritualized, or magnetized Lime and Potash—for these are far in excess of any intended homœopathic medicine—having been triturated and potentized like them.

Accidental particles of Carbon and of other substances are more or less present in the air of all rooms, and in alcohol and water however carefully distilled, and these also mingling with the medicine would be triturated, shaken, and potentized as well as the infinitesimal particle designed to be treated; and the trituration in a "porcelain mortar, with a porcelain pestle," would necessarily disintegrate more or less these implements, and thus their particles being commingled with the mixture, would become potentized as well. Now, Hahnemann [Organon, page 311] says: "All raw animal and vegetable substances have a greater or less amount of medicinal power, and are capable of altering man's health, each in its own peculiar way;" and all medicinal substances are capable of this potentization, according to this author, except "alcohol and wine." Silex is the principal compound of most mortars, and this substance is particularly declared by homœopaths to be a medicine which, in its infinitesimal millionths and decillionths, is capable

of producing even many hundred symptoms more or less formidable.

According to *Jahr's Homœopathic Materia Medica*, Silex or Flint, commonly used at the thirtieth dilution, produces 372 different symptoms, many of them lasting as long as seven or eight weeks. These symptoms are arranged under twenty-five heads—twenty of them under the head of "*moral symptoms*," and are as follows, viz.:

"Melancholy and disposition to weep; nostalgia; anxiety and agitation; taciturnity—concentration in self; inquietude and ill-humor on the least provocation, arising from excessive nervous irritability; *scruples of conscience;* great liability to be frightened, especially by noise; discouragement, moroseness, ill-humor and despair, with intense weariness of life; disposition to fly into a rage, obstinacy and great irritability; repugnance to labor; apathy and indifference; weakness of memory; incapacity of reflection; great distraction; tendency to misapply words in speaking; fixed ideas, the patient *thinks only of pins*, fears them, searches for them, and counts them carefully."—*Jahr's Manual of Homœopathic Medicine, vol. 1, page 532.*

Hahnemann warns against the use of Silex in too large doses, seeming to forget for the moment that the "potentization" increases with dilution. He says: "In fact dilutions of *Silex* to the billionth or trillionth degree, produce effects much too violent; that of the sextillionth degree may be commenced with, but this only suits *robust* persons; in irritable subjects it is prudent to use only the decillionth dilution."—*Lee's Homœopathy, page 5.* Now this powerful agent as well as the Salts of Lime, etc., must be in every medicine treated by strong triturations in a mortar with Sugar of Milk, making the preparation a compound and not a single substance, thus violating another Homœopathic precept, as we shall soon see.

But I do not propose at this point to argue against Homœopathy, but simply to state *what it is.*

The account respecting the preparation of these Homœopathic medicines would be incomplete did I not give another mode of preparing them, practiced by some—first by Karsakoff

—and spoken of by Hahnemann. This is a method by a kind of *infection*, performed by shaking one duly medicated drug globule with several thousand unmedicated globules, these unmedicated globules becoming duly drugged by thus being in the neighborhood of the medicated one. "Experience" showed these globules as efficacious as any. Hahnemann in his "Lesser Writings," page 859, says: since a single dry globule imbued with a high medicinal dynamization, communicates to 13,500 unmedicated globules, with which it is shaken for five minutes, *medical power fully equal to what it possesses itself*, without suffering any diminution of power itself, it seems that this marvelous communication takes place by means of proximity and contact, and is a sort of *infection*, bearing a strong resemblance to the infection of healthy persons by a contagion brought near, or in contact with them."

The method of contagion is by particles of morbid *germinal* matter passing from a person affected with a particular specific disease, as small-pox, to another person through the air or by contact of the persons; and this living, morbid, germinal matter, multiplying in the blood and other parts of the body into which it is received, at length comes to exist in sufficient amount to produce the same disease. Thus a single germ, however small, by multiplication, receiving nourishment and the elements of growth from the body in which it is operating, becomes sufficient in quantity to produce effects. But medicines—particles of dead matter, incapable of growth and multiplication, can have no likeness to contagion in communicating their properties from one mass to another, or to the living body. It will thus be seen that the operation of very small particles of vaccine or other kinds of virus cannot, with any propriety, be used to illustrate the supposed effects of imponderable quantities of medicines upon the system, or to acccount for a medicinal effect being communicated from one globule to another.

V.

The next point of the Homœopathic plan is the method of administering these medicines thus prepared.

The most common method, perhaps, is by means of pellets, or little sugar globules, the size of a mustard seed, more or less—about 300 of which have had a drop of a "potentization" placed upon them when massed together, the liquid evaporating, leaving the medicinal "aura," as Hahnemann calls it, attached to these little globules. One or more of these are placed upon the tongue, often at intervals of some days, in chronic cases, the alleged effects frequently continuing for weeks. In other cases a drop or more of the liquid dilution is put in a tumbler of water and a teaspoonful more or less frequently given. It must be borne in mind that a single grain of the drug at the thirtieth dilution, the one most recommended, if the whole was elaborated into pellets or globules, and these were placed side by side in a continuous row, would form a line so long that light, traveling at the rate of six trillions of miles a year, would require millions, and millions, and millions of centuries to pass from one end of this line to the other, and any one of these globules, picked out of this extended row of them, is the proper dose! Or, if a solution be used, a single grain would be dissolved in an ocean of water, many millions of millions of millions of times broader and deeper than all the collected oceans of the earth, and one drop from this would be the best and most appropriate dose, curing with the utmost certainty!! Surely this is not less marvelous than the effect of Cervantes' drop of water.

We would suppose that Hahnemann had severely enough taxed the credulity of his followers in these recommendations, but as the result of his "Experience," in his later practice, he recommended that one of these globules should be merely smelled.

Writing, in 1833, Hahnemann observes—"all that homœopathy is capable of curing, will be most safely and certainly cured by this mode of Olfaction." "I can scarcely," he adds, "name one in a hundred

out of the many patients who have sought the advice of myself and assistant during the past year, whose chronic or acute disease we have not treated with the most happy results, *solely by means of this Olfaction*. During the latter half of this year, moreover, I have become convinced of what I never could previously have believed, that by this mode of Olfaction, the power of the medicine is exercised upon the patient in at least the same degree of strength, and that more quietly, and yet just as long, as when the dose of medicine is taken by the mouth; and that, consequently, the intervals at which the Olfactions should be repeated, should not be shorter than in the ingestion of the material dose by the mouth."—(Organon, p. 332.)

Dr. Gros, of Germany, a high authority, recommends the same method, with the higher dilutions, allowing but one smell, often, and waiting for *four weeks* or so for the completion of the cure.—(Dr. Forbes' Review, vol. xxii, p. 568.)

Hahnemann directed his patients to smell the dried globules, or dissolving one or two in water and spirits, the nose was to be held over this solution. He dwells upon the superiority of this method of administration, and says that a globule moistened with the thirtieth dilution and then dried, "retains for this purpose (of Olfaction) all its powers for at least eighteen or twenty years (my experience extends this length of time), even though the phial be opened a thousand times during that period, if it be but protected from heat and the sun's light." "In little children, it may be applied close to their nostrils whilst they are asleep, with the *certainty* of producing an effect. And this is much preferable to any other mode of administering the medicaments in substance by the mouth."—(Organon, p. 332.)

One of his disciples, a Dr. Crosiero, says--"My own wife was cured by him in this manner, of a violent pleurisy, in the course of five hours."

Not only did Hahnemann use by Olfaction medicines which in sensible quantities were evaporable, but also those which were not. In the following quotations from his work entitled, *Lesser Writings*, p. 821, we have not only this notion of Olfaction enforced, but a repetition of the doctrine of potentizations, and a statement of the method of trituration, and the surprising efficacy of this method of treatment.

According to Hahnemann, even the olfaction or smelling of substances which have no smell may produce immediately direct and decided therapeutic effects. "If," says he, "a grain of gold leaf be triturated strongly for an hour in a porcelain mortar with one hundred grains of sugar of milk, the powder that results (the first trituration) possesses a considerable amount of medicinal power. If a grain of this powder be triturated as strongly and as long with another hundred grains of sugar of milk, the preparation attains a much greater medicinal power, and if this process be continued, and a grain of the previous trituration be rubbed up as strongly and for as long a time, each time with a fresh hundred grains of sugar of milk, until, after fifteen such triturations, the quintillionth attenuation of the original grain of gold leaf is obtained, then the last attenuations do not display a weaker, but, on the contrary, the most penetrating, the greatest medicinal power of the whole of the attenuations. A single grain of the last (quintillionth) attenuation put in a small clean phial, will restore a morbidly desponding individual, with a constant inclination to commit suicide, in less than an hour to a peaceful state of mind, to love of life, to happiness, and horror of his contemplated act, if he performed but a *single Olfaction* in the phial, or put on his tongue a quantity of this powder no bigger than a grain of sand."—*Simpson*, p. 76.

Another of Hahnemann's rules in regard to the exhibition of medicines is expressed in the Organon, pp. 319, 320. "In no case is it requisite to administer more than one *single simple* medicinal substance at one time." The true physician "never thinks of giving of a remedy but a single simple medicinal substance," for, he adds, "it is impossible to foresee how two and more medicinal substances might, when compounded, obstruct and alter each other's actions on the human body."

I need not inform medical men that Opium, for example, contains seven crystalline active principles, besides some fifteen other less important distinct substances. Homœopathists often use some of these separately; as morphia, narcotin, etc., and opium with all its parts is often used by them.

But should a single simple medicated substance be used professedly, I have already shown that in the sugar there are others—and from the mortar which must be worn in the process of trituration, silex, alum, and other substances are detached, and "potentized" as well as the intended article. We see, therefore, that this dogma is not complied with.

Homœopathists constantly use compound substances, and to use Hahnemann's own expression, "A compound could never make a *simple*—in all eternity, never." By using the rules of trituration of solid substances with sugar of milk in a mortar, a globule never was made that was not a compound; if indeed, there is any medicine at all in each of these particles.

VI.

Another and essential part of the Homœopathic system is the alleged ascertaining of the *symptoms* which drugs are capable of producing, so as to know, on the principle of *similia similibus*, the symptoms they are capable of curing.

In order to obtain this knowledge, Homœopaths profess to have recourse to several sources of information; as, 1st, observing and arguing upon the known effects of special medicines in particular diseases. 2d. Noting the symptoms excited by poisonous doses of drugs on the healthy; but thirdly, and principally, they claim for this purpose to have made numerous direct experiments, or "provings," as they are termed, of various drugs, by exhibiting them either in large or infinitesimal doses, to people either in a state of health, or of disease, and then watching and collecting the effects, or "artificial symptoms" that ensue.

This is the last distinctive feature of the system of homœopathy which I shall, with much fullness, present; and I shall criticise it in passing, as I intend to criticise the other doctrines in review.

As to the first method—that of observing and inferring from the known effects of some medicines in special diseases the artificial symptoms that may be produced by them as a basis of their homœopathic use, it must be regarded as unphilosophical, and by no means in harmony with the other two modes of obtaining such information. For an example, the use of iodine is known to cure—to modify the morbid nutrition in the disease of the thyroid gland, known as goitre; but

iodine when taken by persons in health was never known to cause the goitre. Certainly I never knew a single person of the thousands whom I have known to take iodine or its compounds, to have goitre produced by it. It has never, so far as I know or believe, produced anything resembling goitre. If it cures this disease, it should, according to the homœopathic law, be able to cause it. But it does not. Whatever the theory, such is not the fact. Still, the "immutable law" has caused Jahr and others to place goitre among the "symptoms" of iodine. Whether this is reasoning in a circle, or reasoning at all, all can judge.

The symptoms produced by poisonous doses of medicine, as recorded in the works on Toxicology, homœopathists profess to make use of it in determining their effects. They regard these effects as symptoms which *infinitesimal* doses ought to cause, though to a slighter extent, and hence, of course, ought to cure.

Opium, for example, in poisonous doses produces coma, stupor, asphyxia, etc., and according to this law, is indicated in infinitesimal doses, or at least in some doses, in diseases presenting these symptoms; and though given in doses ever so small, theoretically, it must produce an effect—an artificial medicinal disease *somewhat greater in degree* than the stupor against which it is given. Hahnemann repeatedly says the remedy must produce a medicinal disease "somewhat greater in degree than that which existed before, in order to overcome it."

But these minute doses never produce any effects of this kind. Certainly no regular physician ever saw such effects, and many of our most eminent and conscientious men have looked for them with care. Still the homœopaths insist, when driven to the last point—and they must do so or yield up all—that these homœopathic medicines affect the system at the very point where the disease affects it, and in a similar manner, but yet so as to overcome the morbid action. But these are theoretical assumptions, unsustained by proofs; and, as we believe, contrary to both facts and reason.

Now the symptom, stupor, for which opium would be

given, because in large doses it produces stupor, may arise from a variety of proximate causes—from the state of the brain existing in concussion—from compression of that organ—from blood poisoning—from arrested nutrition of the brain in a great variety of diseases—from nervous exhaustion, etc. But in prescribing for symptoms "alone," as Hahnemann taught, these various circumstances are disregarded—the remedy seems to be considered as incorporating itself with the *symptom*, and through *similarity*, *antagonizing* it, and by a greater force, though in infinitesimal doses, overcoming it. This is the homœopathic claim. But what, we ask, is there to sustain this claim? Is there either fact or reason? These questions we are to consider as we proceed.

But the direct "provings" are mostly relied upon, and professedly from these chiefly the homœopathic books on Materia Medica are filled with "symptoms," some specimens of which have already been given. On these provings, Hahnemann says, "depend the exactitude of the whole medical art, and the weal of all future generations of mankind;" and modern homœopaths claim great credit on this score. The exactitude and "reliability" of these "provings," then, require our special attention.

Now, how have these provings been made? In conducting the experiments, Hahnemann and his disciples at first used the ordinary dose of the drugs; but afterwards they made their observations with infinitesimal globules and dilutions. The British Journal of Homœopathy, vol. vii, p. 342 says—"The bulk of symptoms of the so-called anti-psoric remedies recorded in Hahnemann's "Chronic Diseases," were derived, 1st, From trials with medicines given in globules in the thirtieth dilution; and 2d, From the observations of *patients* to whom the medicine was given for their diseases (also of the thirtieth dilution)."

Hahnemann in a later edition of his Organon, p. 218, advises the thirtieth dilution as the best doses for proving the medicinal power of drugs. He also says, while under provings, "all symptoms observed are to be attributed to the medicine." As these symptoms are laid down in Jahr's Manual, or

Hempel's Materia Medica, in most instances we are not informed whether the alleged facts are derived from a knowledge of the curative effects of the agents in special diseases, and inferences as to the symptoms that ought to be produced, according to the "infallible law," which "all the experience in the world" cannot disprove; whether from recorded observations of their poisonous effects, or from experiments or "provings" proper; and if from provings, we do not know, as a general rule, whether with ordinary doses or infinitesimals; whether upon well persons or sick; upon impressible imaginative persons, or those of cooler temperament; whether upon those who are truthful and reliable, or upon those who are untruthful and unreliable. We have, in most of the cases, only the symptoms themselves to judge from; and judging from them, what must be our conclusions? In the works, however, where some of the details of the provings are given, as is the case in Hempel's Materia Medica, and Dr. E. M. Hale's Homœopathic Materia Medica of the New Remedies, recently published in Detroit, by Dr. E. A. Lodge, they are with every variety of dose, from poisonous ones down to the thirtieth degree, centesimal scale; and the alleged effects on healthy persons at the thirtieth dilution are recorded with the same apparent confidence as the effects of the large quantities; and all aggregated together, they go to make up the medicinal symptoms which are to be the guides in selecting these medicines for application to similar symptoms of disease. The presumption then is, that in these accounts of the effects of medicines in *Jahr's Manual*, the data are of this miscellaneous character.

The best, however, that I can do on this subject of the provings is to give some specimens from standard homœopathic authors. As specimens, let us take from Jahr's Materia Medica an account of the effects of *Common Salt*, and *Carb. of Lime*, or *White Chalk*.

"Common HOUSE OR TABLE SALT (*Natrum Muriaticum*, as Jahr terms it,) when proved upon a healthy person, can cause above *four hundred and fifty* symptoms, and consequently, is capable, on the homœopathic principle, of curing as many of these symptoms when they occur similarly in different states of disease. According to Jahr,

House-salt is usually employed in doses of the 20th or 30th dilution, or, in other words, in doses of the quadrillionth or decillionth of a grain; and the duration of a dose of its effects lasts, in chronic affections, from forty to fifty days. He describes the symptoms supposed to be produced in man by doses of House-salt, and of other drugs, under the several heads of "General Symptoms," and symptoms, observed in the "Skin," "Sleep," "Fever," "Head," "Eyes," "Ears," "Nose," etc., etc. The mere enumeration of the symptoms produced in these various parts by House-salt, occupies about six pages in Jahr's works. To cite them all would, consequently, occupy more space than we can bestow upon them. But the following is an abridged list of some of the principal symptoms which this drug is averred to be capable of producing, and hence also of curing."—Simpson, p. 83.

Symptoms produced by Common House Salt.

"Rigidity of all the joints, when they are moved." "Tendency to experience dislocation, and to strain the back." "Paralysis." "Swelling of the glands." "Bad effects of a disappointment." "Great relaxation of all the physical and moral powers after fatigue." "Great drowsiness during the day." "Retarded sleep and sleeplessness at night, with ineffectual efforts to go to sleep." "Agitated sleep, full of vivid and lascivious dreams." "Frightful dreams of quarrels, murders, fires, thieves, etc." "At night, pains in the back, quivering, apparently of the nerves, frequent emission of urine, headache, colic, asthmatic sufferings, and great anguish of body." "Typhus fever, with debility." "Anguish, sometimes during a storm, but especially at night." "Hatred to persons who have formerly given offense." "Awkwardness." "Painful confusion in the head, vertigo, with shocks in the head, and dizziness." "Sensation on moving the head as if the brain wavered." "Tendency of the head to become easily chilled." "Spasmodic closing of the eyelids, especially in the morning, in the evening (during the twilight), and at night." "Tinkling, ringing, rumbling, and humming in the ears." "Numbness and insensibility of one side of the nose." "Boring in the bones of the nose." Drawing, like extraction of the teeth, extending into the ear and throat after a meal, and at night, with swelling of the cheek." "Speech embarrassed in consequence of the heaviness of the tongue." "Prolonged sensation as of hair on the tongue." "Spasms in the throat." "Loss of appetite, especially for bread, and repugnance to tobacco smoke." "Palpitation of the heart, and intermittent or accelerated pulse." "Disagreeable risings, after partaking of fat food or milk." "Shocks and clawings in the pit of the stomach." "Drawing, tension, pressure, pricking, and shootings in the hepatic region." "Pain and shootings in the splenic region." "Protrusion of hernia." "Excoria-

tion of the buttocks, especially when walking." "Excessive excitement of the amative feeling, or dullness." "Accumulation of mucus in the larynx in the morning." "Choking spasmodic cough in bed in the evening." "Wheezing respiration in bed in the evening." "Contusive pain and feeling of paralysis in the sacrum, especially in the morning." "Tearing across the loins and hips." "Nocturnal pains in the back." "Digging in the arms, shocks in the elbows." "Difficulty in bending the joints of the fingers." "Numerous flaws in the nails." "Burning in the feet." "Redness of the great toe." "Corns on the feet, with shooting and boring pains," etc., etc., etc.—(Jahr's Manual of Homœopathic Medicine, vol. i, p. 386, *et seq.*)

Let us take another example. CARBONATE OF LIME, OR CHALK (*Calcarea Carbonica*), exists in most vegetables, and is contained in greater or less quantity—but in doses larger than the Hahnemannic—in almost every water which man drinks. It is found (says Dr. Pereira), even in the purest of waters, viz., in rain water. Carbonate of Lime is, according to Jahr, usually employed in the dose of a decillionth, or in the thirtieth dilution, and the duration of its effects is fifty days in chronic affections. According to the provings of the Homœopathists, Carbonate of Lime is capable of producing above *one thousand* symptoms. Out of this immense number of effects, we select the following as specimens of the symptoms it may cause, and hence may cure.—(Simpson.)

Symptoms Produced by Chalk or Carbonate of Lime.

"Shooting and drawing pains in the limbs, chiefly at night, or in summer, and in change of weather." "Great tendency to strain the back in lifting." "Strong desire to be magnetized." "Emaciation, without failure of appetite." "Great plumpness and excessive obesity." "On walking in the open air, sadness with tears." "Visible quivering of the skin from head to foot." "Encysted tumors, which are renewed and suppurate every month." "Swelling and distortion of the bones." "Flaws in the fingers." "Sleeplessness from activity of mind, or in consequence of frightful and voluptuous or frightful images which appear as soon as the eyes are shut." "Snoring during sleep." "Dreams, frequent, vivid, anxious, fantastic, confused, frightful and horrible." Dreams of sick or dead persons." "At night, agitation, asthmatic suffering, anxiety, heat, pains in the stomach, and in the præcordial region, thirst, beatings of the head, toothache, vertigo, headache, fear of losing the reason, and many other sufferings." "Quotidian fever towards two o'clock in the afternoon, with yawning and cough, a desire to lie down at least for three hours, after which the hands become cold." "Tertian fever in the evening." "Disposition to weep, even about trifles." "Vexation and lamentation on account of old offenses."

"Anxiety and anguish excited by fancies, or frightful stories." "Disposition to take alarm; apprehensions." "Fear of being ill or unfortunate; of sad accidents; of losing the reason; of being infected by contagious diseases." "Discouragement and fear of death." "Excessive ill-humor, and mischievous inclination; with obstinacy, and a dispositlon to take everything in bad part." "Disgust and aversion to all labor whatever." "Delirium, with visions of fires, murders, rats and mice, etc." Head compressed as if by a vice." Dizziness after scratching behind the ear." "Vertigo after a fit of anger." "Headache from having wrapped the head in a handkerchief." "Pains in the head aggravated by spirituous drinks." "Drawing pains in the right side of the head." "Piercing in the forehead, as if the head was going to burst." "Pains of hammering in the head." "Icy coldness in, and especially on the right side of the head." "Movement of the brain in walking." "Immense size of the head." "Strong disposition to take cold through the head." "Smarting on reading during the day, or by candle light." "Flow of blood from the eyes." "Lachrymal suppurating fistula." "Pupils greatly dilated." "Confusion of sight as if there were a mist." "Great dazzling from too strong a light." "Purulent discharge from the ears." "Polypus in the ears." "Cracking and detonation in the ears when chewing." "Fœtid smell from the nose." "Sense of smell dull, or exceedingly sensitive." "Fœtid smell before the nose, as if from a dunghill, rotten eggs, or gunpowder." "Face pale and hollow, with eyes sunk and surrounded by a livid circle." "Fœtid odor of the teeth." "Fistulous ulcers in the gums of the lower jaw." "Ranula under the tongue." "Hawking up of mucus." "Repugnance to tobacco smoke; desire for salt things, for wine, and for dainties." "Pressure on the stomach, with squeezing as if from a claw." "Inability to wear tight clothes around the hypochondria." "Incarceration of flatulency." "Pressure of wind toward the inguinal rings, as if hernia were about to protude." "Before the evacuation, great irascibility." "After the evacuation, dejection, and relaxation of the limbs." "Frequent protrusion of hæmorrhoidal excrescences during the evacuations." "Burning eruption in the form of a cluster in the arms." "Wetting the bed." "Polypus of the bladder." "Prolapsus uteri." "Varices in the labia majora." "Pain, as of excoriation and ulceration, in the nipples." "Ulceration of the larynx." "Cough excited by playing on the piano." "Urgent inclination to inspire deeply." "Pains, as of dislocation in the loins, back, and in the neck, as if caused by a strain." "Swelling and distortion of the spine." "Rigidity of the neck." "Suppuration of the axillary gland." "Swelling of the veins of the hands." "Warts on the arms and on the hands." "Contraction of the fingers." "The

legs go to sleep when one is seated," etc., etc., etc.—(Jahr's Manual of Homœopathic Medicines, vol. i, p. 108, *et seq.*)

Perhaps it is proper to add, in order to show the fantastical affection of exactitude in these homœopathic provings and symptoms, that some of the homœopathic drugs produce, and therefore remove, particular symptoms, only when they occur under particular circumstances and conditions. We have seen above, that carbonate of lime causes, and consequently removes "cough," when "excited by playing on the piano." A dose of Rhododendron causes toothache during a storm, and hence cures toothache when it supervenes during a storm.—(Jahr's Materia Medica, vol. i, p. 488.—Simpson.)

The assertions that all these and many other equally remarkable and incongruous effects are produced by articles contained in sensible quantities in our daily food, is too absurd to be considered with patience. The most charitable construction we can give to all this flagrant nonsense is, that Hahnemann, like Mesmer, and Mohammed, and Swedenborg, and Joe Smith, and Ann Lee, etc., though in a different sphere from any of these, was an enthusiast—the founder of a sect; was followed by disciples; expected to upturn and destroy the system of medicine of his time, in the practice of which he had failed of success; and this added fuel to the flame within him, and like them, he "saw visions and dreamed dreams:" and as was said by Whipple of Swedenborg, "his perceptions of abstractions were so intense that they seemed to have reached that point where thoughts, and imaginations, and ideas, become sensible to sight as well as sensation, and *what he thought, he saw.*" And all these enthusiasts have found followers who through imitation have repeated their extravagances, or from interested motives have professed their faith.

Connected with this condition of mental excitement is not unfrequently a quality of disingenuousness, as in the case of Mohammed and Smith—their integrity being not above suspicion. However, in this respect, it may have been with Hahnemann, his "provings" were most fanciful, often absurd, and generally entirely unreliable; and, in this, his followers have certainly been led by his example.

Dr. John C. Peters, of New York, already referred to, formerly among the leading men in the Homœopathic School,

but who, long since seeing the absurdity of its doctrines, renounced it, and has taken an honorable position in the ranks of the regular profession, says it has taken him a great many years to find out that Hahnemann drew more upon the stores of our old Materia Medica for his indications for the use of medicines, than he did upon his own provings upon the healthy, or upon the law of "*Similia similibus curantur.*"

Thus Arnica, though claimed by Homœopaths to be their discovery, and homœopathic to bruises, etc., yet as early as the sixteenth century, had received the name of "*Panacea Lapsorum*," by Dr. Fehr; and a large number of continental physicians used it for bruises, ecchymoses, etc., but not on the Homœopathic principle, or in infinitesimal quantities.

The remedy most frequently used by most Homœopaths in acute diseases is Aconite. They pretend to have established by their "provings" that it is homœopathic to fevers and inflammations; and it is used in infinitesimal doses to counteract these conditions. But the fact is, Aconite, so far as I know, never caused a fever nor an inflammation. It acts much like Veratrum Viride, Tartar Emetic, and other depressing agents when given in perceptible doses. In infinitesimal doses, of course, it has no effect. When given in free doses, as it is by many Homœopaths, it is an *antipathic* remedy in inflammation and fever.

Dr. Hempel, though professing to believe in "potentizations" and "provings," by infinitesimal doses (he quotes such provings, and admits their value when they answer his purposes), in his *Materia Medica*, vol. i, page 58-9, says that much of Hahnemann's "provings," especially in the "anti-psorics," is entirely *unreliable*. His words are: "If we had no other testimony to offer in favor of Homœopathy than the provings of the anti-psorics, our cause would not be worth the ink it required to print them. * * * It seems incredible that such a mass of vague, childish, ill-defined symptoms as are recorded in the four volumes of the "Chronic Diseases," should have been accepted by earnest and sober-minded men as the pure effects of drugs. I do not mean to say that

attenuated medicines generally are unfit to develop symptoms; we have abundant evidence that the sixth, twelfth, and even *higher potencies* have affected the organism in health in their own characteristic and peculiar manner." He goes on to say: "Entertaining, as I do, a philosophical belief in the efficacy of attenuated drugs, and in the doctrine of Dynamization, as developed by Hahnemann; yet I cannot refrain from expressing a regret that the system of proving attenuated drugs should have been so extensively adopted in our school. * * * If the attenuations are used first without any previous saturation of the organism by the concentrated tincture of the original drug, perceptible symptoms are scarcely ever obtained beyond the third attenuation. * * * Our Materia Medica is unfortunately flooded with a deluge of trifling, unmeaning, unreliable symptoms. A perfect symptomania seemed at one time to take possession of our school. Such men as Hering, Bœninghausen, Gros, fanned this incipient aberration into a perfect fury of symptom-hunting. * * * Hering's provings in particular," he regards as unreliable. "Not one of the numerous provings with which this gentleman has overloaded our Materia Medica, will stand the test of rigorous critical analysis." But what will? He goes on to denounce them as "fancy pictures," and speaks of the "Augean Stable of our Materia Medica."

Speaking of a particular article on page 60, he says, "we shall find at a later stage of our course, that the effects of this poison, as exhibited in the "American Provings," are tainted with all the defects which distinguish many of our *modern provings generally*.

If then much of the more ancient provings of Hahnemann are "not worth the ink required to print them," and the modern provings of Hering, Gros and others who are regarded as the brightest lights of their school, are even still more worthless, "betraying," as he says, "a lack of accuracy of observation, correctness of delineation, and adaptability to the treatment of disease," what value can we place on any of these observations, all of them having apparently the same general character?

But an English Surgeon, A. Henriques, who is a professed Homœopathist and has written the most plausable apology for what he regards as Homœopathy of any I have seen, takes an entirely different view of the provings of the founder of the system, and of his rules of practice. He says, "Had Hahnemann simply contented himself with placing before the public the records of his *unparalleled experiments* with pharmaceutical agents upon his family and friends—had he been content with a mere exposition of his discovery of the rules by which remedial agents should be selected in given cases of disease—had he done this instead of exposing the absurdity of pottering in the 'dead-house' to discover the nature of diseases, and scoffing at the idea" (as he did) "of consulting the laboratory and the microscope to reveal the mysterious curative powers of the Materia Medica; it is my firm conviction that the reformed method of treatment according to the Hahnemannic School of Therapeutics, would long ere this have been recognized throughout the world, and received universal triumphant assent, as the best form of art devised since the Hippocratic Era."

Thus *this* disciple makes the provings Hahnemann's chief merit—while Hempel declares very much of them sheer nonsense; but yet he (Hempel) gives in his Materia Medica similar "provings," as the pure gospel of Homœopathy direct from Heaven.

Take for illustration the symptoms produced by sulphur, the chief alleged anti-psoric, an article contained in sensible quantities in most of our nitrogenous food, inhaled in very sensible quantities every time we light a match, an article which pervades our atmosphere from the coals we burn, infects us from the "rubber" we wear, and the "hair restoratives" many apply—this article so constantly within us—an element in many of our tissues, yet as "proved" by administering homœopathic attenuations, produces, according to Dr. Hempel, a catalogue of "symptoms" which would exhaust the reader's patience if enumerated in full.

He says, "The Vienna Prover's Union has instituted reprovings of Sulphur, which may be said to constitute one of the most brilliant and instructive pages in our Materia Medica"

—and it is presumed the symptoms about to be quotedare from this brilliant page. They are arranged under the various groups, Nervous, Cephalic, Orbital, Auricular, Nasal, etc., and were produced, some by massive doses of one or two hundred grains, while others were caused by "attenuations," the massives and infinitesimals apparently producing the same effects. Here are specimens of the symptoms: "Drawing, burning pain at the top of the head; dull headache, deep in the left orbit, sometimes increasing to a drawing throbbing; absence of mind; sensation as if a hair was pulled, in the case of a prover who is bald; rush of blood to the head with a roaring in the ears, burning and creeping in the face. A similar symptom was obtained by a prover during an experiment with the *high potencies;* heat and confusion in the head, with noise like the boiling of water, rushing out of both ears; *drawing and tearing* pains, especially in the fingers, long bones, back, muscles of the neck; *boring* pain in the ankle joint; *shooting* pains."

One case of proving, in a student of medicine, to which Dr. Hempel calls particular attention, I will venture to quote in full;

"For three weeks, I may have taken three times daily, five globules moistened with the *Tincture of Sulphur*" (how much will the spirits dissolve?), "when I experienced a shooting pain here and there in the abdominal parietes, especially in the inguinal region, at one time in the left, at another time in the right side; this pain sometimes lasted a short time, sometimes longer, but regularly went off in the warmth of the bed. As I did not believe that these wandering pains were caused by the Sulphur, I continued to take it. About a week after the first appearance of the shooting pains, there occurred after the slightest exercise a very troublesome feeling of fatigue. The shooting pains now gradually declined, but in their stead occurred contractive pains, especially in the muscles of the thighs, which often proved a serious obstacle to my walking. In four days, these contractive parties were felt deeper, as if in the bones, especially in the femora or right tibia. The head of the right tibia became very painful, and could not bear the slightest touch, and after the slightest exercise I had to go and

lie down. Now almost convinced that these symptoms must be the effect of the Sulphur, I intended to leave it off, but as I had a few more globules, I took them all. The consequence of this was that the pains attained such a degree of intensity as almost to render walking impossible. The very next day, when I took no more globules, the pains became less intense, and in three days more were all gone. I have gained the conviction that medicines, even in very small doses, are capable of producing the most violent effects."

Who that knows the quantity of sulphur we all daily take into our systems can believe that these sugar globules moistened with Tincture of Sulphur could produce all these effects? Is there not a possibility of this student of medicine wishing to make a sensation among these Homœopathic professors? Or if the effects occurred, were they not dependent upon some other cause?

But to proceed with other symptoms laid down by Dr. Hempel: "Quivering and luminous appearances before the right eye; lightning flashes before the eyes at night; fire burning like sparks on the skin of the right upper lid; shooting pain through the *pupils;* boring pains in the external meatus; inflamed spot on the nose; thickening and swelling of the right nasal bones; tickling in the right nostril, followed by discharge of thick blood; shining and swelling of the tip of the nose; sensation as if he were smelling soap-suds; raw pain in the left commissure of the mouth; burning on the right cheek, as from hot drops of fluid; itching of the left eye and cheek; a crack in the upper lip; digging pains in sound teeth; drawing pains in upper teeth; weariness after eating; sneezing with discharge of fluid mucus from the left nostril; raging pain in the sternum; spitting of blood; increased pulsation of aorta; sleeplessness with disturbed dreams about wild beasts and death, hence useful in tendency to *nightmare;* palpitation of the heart, during the attack, is characteristic of Sulphur."

But these will suffice. As to the dose, Dr. Hempel says: "curative results may be depended upon from the lowest as well as the highest dilutions; but in chronic pulmonary affections, you will find the middle and higher potencies preferable to the

lower." It will be remembered that the higher are the thirtieth degree and upwards.

Dr. Hempel closes his lecture on Sulphur with these words: "If you would conquer the great mind of the profession, then let me urge you to ever think of Homœopathy with hearts full of reverence for the *consistency* and universality of her teachings, as a doctrine of life, a heavenly truth which will not fail, if properly understood and universally applied, to link earth and heaven in one great cycle of sensual refinement, intellectual beauty, and social and religious harmony!"

This passage must have been inspired by the reflection upon Hahnemann's doctrine of the kinship of the Itch Miasm and original sin, and the hope of Sulphur curing both.

These extracts are from *Hempel's Materia Medica*, vol. i., pp. 810 to 826.

In looking at these Symptoms thus gravely recorded, and at the marvelous cures reported to have been effected by this and other similar Homœopathic remedies in infinitesimal doses, we are forcibly reminded of the language of Dr. Hempel, when criticising a reported cure of a child with an eruption of the skin, by apis, he said, "it had as much to do with the cure as the Comet's tail." This article, Apis, was reported by these provers to produce 1350 symptoms; reported in the same manner as other provings, and declared to be capable of curing all these symptoms, and "experience" in actual cases of disease was adduced as in other cases to confirm these views: and yet Dr. Hempel rejects it all with contempt and ridicule. He further confesses: "*Many* of our drugs have obtained a reputation and a name, not because their provings can at all be relied upon as therapeutic indications, but because an empirical use has secured for them a sort of prescriptive right. Lachesis is one of them." We, of course, believe that in infinitesimal doses all their pretended remedies are in this category; and that these articles have as much to do with the cures that are reported from them, as "the Comet's tail." He adds of *Lachesis:* "The halo of glory that has sur-

rounded this secretion, proves upon closer examination, to emanate from the smoke of fancy as much as from the light of truth."

I shall leave the reader to make the further application of this language, as we look at other statements of these men. We are not now groping in the regions of the past, calling up vagaries of remote and darker times.

It will be remembered that Henriques and Hempel are men of our day, and it is presumed representatives of certain present phases of Homœopathy, though the latter may be regarded by some of his School as belonging rather to the past. But the very latest work with which I am acquainted on Homœopathic Materia Medica, that of Dr. E. M. Hale, Professor of Mat. Med. in the *Hahnemann Medical College*, Chicago, published in 1867 (the work already referred to) presents us with "provings" of the same general character.

As an example we will take the "provings" of *Hydrastis Canadensis* or *Golden Seal*. We are informed that these provings were made by students of the Philadelphia Homœopathic College, under the direction of one of the professors, during the session of 1866 and '67. The "potentization" was made before the class after Hahnemann's direction on the "Centesimal Scale," (the one already described), carried up to the 30th degree, but instead of two, 25 hard shakes were given to each potency.

The first case related is that of Aug. Earndoefer, who on Nov. 7th, 1866, it being, as is stated, the "New Moon," "took one dose (whether a whole drop, or one of a cluster of sugar pellets moistened with a drop is not said), of the *thirtieth potency* of the new American tincture, prepared by Dr. Lippe, before the class." "Nov. 8th, 8¾ A. M.," related as the effect of that dose, he had—"Slight headache, first on the right side, mainly in the temporal region, then passing to the left temporal region, leaving the left, returning to the right, lasting a few moments and then leaving altogether." After relating some other sensations of a similar character, it is recorded that at "11 A. M. sneezing in the sun caused flickering in the eyes." This prover adds, parenthetically, that he had "been troubled

with this flickering for many years, when exerting himself or standing long in the sun."

He then goes on giving his sensations and *symptoms* on the 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th, 14th, to 20th, all from this one dose taken on the 7th, among which are the following: "Sharp pain behind the right ear for one moment, passing down to the right shoulder, back of the clavicle, about midway between arm and neck. At 11 o'clock, A. M., on the 9th, sneezing caused a fullness of the head, between temples and forehead." He adds, in a parenthesis: "I seldom ever sneeze when I have a cold, and can scarcely attribute this to anything but the medicine." The next day, "9 A. M., sneezing, causing sharp pain in the right breast, between the third and fourth ribs, to the right arm, down the arm and forearm, half way to the wrist." "Nose feels as if plug were in it, under the nasal bone;" "watery coryza from right nostril;" "a little blood and dry coryza from left nostril;" "bleeding from the left nostril quite profuse, nose itched a great deal after bleeding;" "flickering before the eyes in a bright, yellow light; *streaks* in *squares*, always making three sides of a square." "Constant sensation in both groins as if I strained myself from taking a very long step." "Sensation of a hair in the right nostril, under the nasal bone at its lowest border." "In writing, making long letters," etc., etc.

The next prover took five drops of the tincture on the 3d, 11 P. M. The next day he "sneezed after breakfast, from tickling in the right nostril, left stopped up." On the 6th he had "dryness and stoppage of the nose, with scabs in the nose,"—"great disposition to stretch the body backwards, arms upwards, with yawning." "Aching pain in the left elbow, with snapping in the shoulder joint in rotating the arm," etc., etc. On the whole, this man did not suffer quite as much from five drops of the tincture as the other did from the drop, or hundredth of a drop of the 30th dilution; a quantity so infinitely small as to be utterly inconceivable, as we have seen—but he suffered in a somewhat similar manner. In all probability both of them had a coryza, or what is properly called an "influenza cold," which was doubtless prevailing at the time.

Another prover took a dose of the *thirtieth* on his tongue, just before going to bed, and among a variety of other things, we are gravely told that on the fifth day after, he "had a desire for eggs." The day following this, "he took one drop on going to bed." The next morning, he "felt despondent; better after 'quizzing' in the evening. Quite cheerful at 11 P. M." These were all homœopathic students; but another man, "aged 25, a mechanic and clerk," had not so much made of his case. "Oct 31st—took a drop on his tongue, 3 o'clock." "Nov. 1st, on getting up a dull pain in the head which went away in a few minutes. In the afternoon had heart-burn, as he termed it, which he had not had before for almost a year. I could get no more symptoms from him, and he declined to take any more medicine, being somewhat afraid of it."

On p. 55, *et sequel*, much prominence is given to the "proving" in the case of "A, aged 34, sanguine-bilious temperament, troubled with constipation for the last five years; unrefreshing sleep, languor in the morning." "Oct. 31st, 11 P. M.—On retiring to bed, took one drop of the 30th potency in a tablespoonful of water. Slept well all night; felt quite refreshed in the morning, 5 o'clock. No desire for further rest—very good humored. Eyes somewhat agglutinated. Half an hour after breakfast had "usual movement of bowels" followed by "a profuse discharge of bright red, arterial blood, lasting for about a minute." "Had sensation all day as if hemorrhage might be repeated." "10 A. M., gloomy, taciturn, disagreeable towards his acquaintances. An hour after, headache—sleepiness in the P. M., etc. Nov 2d, another hemorrhage from the bowels." The account goes on to the 5th of Nov., giving symptoms of congestion of the liver and of a cold, or acute catarrh, affecting the bronchia; the bleeding from the bowels being caused, in all probability, by a hemorrhoidal difficulty the consequence of his protracted constipation and obstruction of the liver, aggravated into hemorrhage at the time by the irritation of the mucous membranes, the usual effect of such a cold. All this, so apparent to an intelligent physician, is recorded as the effect of the "proving"

of this single infinitesimal dose of this comparatively mild medicine!

On page 1093, we have an account of the "proving" by one who was quite ill at the time such "provings" commenced. The accounts say: "On Nov. 10th, a German, Henry Kusel, aged 23, came to me troubled with a sore throat, roughness and raw feeling when he talked, and severe cold in the head, together with some other symptoms." After going on to Nov. 18th—"I gave him a drop of the remedy, 30th. Next morning he complained of his cold being worse than it had ever been; but it soon commenced to abate and in the evening he felt very much better."

"Nov. 20th.—He said his cold was entirely gone, but that his throat was not so well, and had grown slowly worse since he had taken this medicine; he also spoke of being in high spirits; everything looked bright, and he felt happy and he wanted to sing."

I need not say that the time for the spontaneous breaking up of the cold had doubtless come, but this case is given as showing the effect of the medicine, and of "proving" its powers!

A considerable number of other "provings" are given, occurring from the 1085th to the 1102d pages of the work inclusive, all of the same general character. Among them three young women were subjects of the experiment. "Miss S., 30 years, temperament sanguine-nervous. Nov. 2d, 1866, took at bed time one drop of the 30th potency. Some time after 1 o'clock A. M., sleep disturbed by an irritation of the skin and pudendum, compelling scratching, which relieved."

Various sensations were experienced for a few days, such as irritation of the throat, bowels, etc., "with a dragging, bruised feeling in the ovarian regions;" and the account is closed with the remark, "during the proving *more cheerful than usual.* Affections active." p. 1096.

On p. 1099 the "provings" with "Miss M." are related. She "took one drop of the 30th." "Had pain at night but too sleepy to notice where." "The next day, morning, a spasmodic

pain commencing under the right clavicle and extending down to the right side of chest and back; felt the pain twice, severely, when laughing; could not finish the laugh; exhilaration of spirits, and a feeling of *lightness and happiness;* less languor from fatigue than usual."

On the same page the provings with "Miss V., aged 20 years, temperament lymphatic," are given.

She "took on Thursday evening one drop 30th; a sharp pain in the right side, in the region of the liver, extending to shoulder blade, etc. A yellow appearance of the skin, particularly around the mouth and neck; a feeling of sickness and languor, lested a whole week, with *depressed spirits*, and *sad* manner.

It will be particularly noticed that in these last three cases the same drop of the thirtieth dilution is described as causing in two of them, lightness of spirit and happiness, and in the other depressed spirits and a sad manner.

I have presented with so much particularity the account of these "provings" as conducted at the Homœopathic College at Philadelphia, and recorded in this new work of Dr. Hale, upon which conclusions are to be based respecting the virtues and homœopathic applications of Golden Seal, because of the great importance given by Homœopaths to this whole matter of provings; and we have here presented a phase of Homœopathy, not as it was held three-quarters of a century ago, before the light of the present advanced state of science was shed abroad, but as it is at the present time, in its latest manifestations. And what a picture is afforded!

Another circumstance connected with these experiments, all of which it will be noticed commenced about the same date, should be understood. On page 1085, Dr. Hale says: "These provings were the result of a mutual understanding between the teachers of Materia Medica at Chicago and Philadelphia. The provings of the students of Hahnemann College (Chicago) could not be finished and prepared for publication in time to be incorporated herewith." Why this was so, we are not informed. Could not "potencies" be prepared and given as speedily in Chicago as in Philadelpha?

Is Chicago such a *slow* place that the results could not be as readily recorded and prepared for publication there? Or does not the 30th dilution of Hydrastis operate as speedily or in the *same way* in the younger as in the older city?

It seems to me that no influenza or generally prevailing coryza was in Chicago at the time, as evidently prevailed among these students in Philadelphia; and similar "symptoms" are therefore not obtained. Facts within my own knowledge render this neither an unreasonable or uncharitable supposition. At the present time as formerly, then, in these "provings," ordinary and infinitesimal doses are used indiscriminately--the same effects are supposed to be produced by each, and the same upon the well and the sick.

Now, if by trituration and shaking a new power is added --"a new and unheard of power," would not this make a difference in the character of the effects? If an ordinary dose of *dewdrop* may be given without marked effects of any kind, but when just enough "potentized" it will cure whooping-cough; if too much, as Hahnemann asserts, it may kill a child, can the effects be the same of the drug in all of its conditions? So the matter is regarded in the "provings"—no distinctions are made.

Again, it is claimed by homœopaths that their remedies produce effects in disease in such small doses because of the great sensitiveness of the diseased parts to their action. They must then act more powerfully and quite differently in disease than in health. Indeed, it is claimed also, that they cure disease by seizing upon, and drawing out, and uniting with the morbid element. How different then must be the action in health and disease; and yet the provings are both upon sick and well persons, and the pretended symptoms from each are indiscriminately jumbled together in the works of homœopathic materia medica! When a symptom from a drug is given, we are not generally told in the text books whether the effect was realized (or imagined) from a large dose or a small one--a crude or a potentized article--operating upon the sick or well; We do not know whether from one or many doses—whether continued a long or short time. They make broad

distinctions between the primary and secondary effects of their medicines, but apparently not in the "provings." It cannot be too constantly borne in mind that homœopaths profess to regard these experiments as the bases of facts upon which their system mainly rests. They are constantly boasting of these researches as adding largely to the sum of human knowledge.

Dr. Hale says: "A medicine cannot be said to have reached maturity until it has been subjected to a thorough physiological proving. In other words," he continues, "it is in the hands of the homœopathic school *alone* that a medicine is capable of reaching complete development." The specimens of these "developments" are before us. We can but see that for the most part there is one loose, confused jumble of puerilities, inconsistencies and contradictions.

Need anything more be said respecting these "unparalleled experiments," "upon the accuracy and reliability of which depend the future interests of humanity?" "Humanity" must certainly be in a sad way if depending upon the accuracy and reliability of these homœopathic provings.

The Psora or itch doctrine of Hahnemann, embraced by many, but not all of his followers, as it is not essential to his system of therapeutics, I shall not fully explain. I will only say he believed in three miasms as the causes of chronic diseases—itch, syphilis and sychosis.

The itch prevailed much the most extensively, and was the cause of a very large proportion of chronic diseases—scrofula, cancer, consumption, rickets, etc.

He wrote before the "itch mite" was generally regarded as the cause of this disease, and as the principle or *materies morbi* of its contagion. He thought the suppression of the eruption from the surface dangerous, leading to all these bad results. It was to be cured by "potentized" sulphur.

It had some connection with "original sin" etc.; was hereditary, etc. But I refer to it as showing the visionary character of Hahnemann's mind, and not for the purpose of examination and criticism.

The method of *Isopathy*, whose author was Lux, of Leip-

zic, is often confounded with homœopathy, and requires a word: "This method is based upon the principle that to cure disease we must employ remedies that produce effects not *similar*, but the same diseases in the healthy organism."

The treatment of frozen parts by cold, and burns by heat, are examples; but as Rau justly says, "this can be accounted for without alluding to Isopathy." Sudden changes from a frozen to a thawed condition are dangerous. Snow thaws gradually in a warm room, and the results of the freezing are therefore less.

But certain drug diseases, it is alleged, may be cured by dilutions or potencies of the same drug.

Vaccination is spoken of as Isopathic. The most that can be said about this is that the susceptibility to this form of disease is exhausted by the person having it once. This will be more fully explained in another connection.

The Isopathists allege that itch may be cured by matter from the itch vesicles, which they call psoria or psoricum; scald head with psoria; gonorrhœa with gonorrœhein (the matter of gonorrhœa); pedicula by pediculin (potentized parasites), etc. But as these views are not insisted upon by homœopaths generally, they must not detain us.

Another very convenient doctrine is held by many Homœopaths, viz., that *aggravations* of symptoms in many cases are necessary at first, in order to effect a cure. Convenient, I say, as it enables the doctor to quiet the minds of the patient and friends when the symptoms are worse after treatment commences. I need not dwell upon it.

I have now presented all the essential principles of Hahnemannic Homœopathy, and in the language of its authors and supporters. Not a single passage has been misquoted, designedly garbled, or in the least degree misrepresented; and I challenge contradiction as to a single statement made. But do all Homœopaths hold to these views of Hahnemann? What is the present Homœopathic creed? In regard to "provings," we have brought the subject down to the present time. But this question as to the present standard creed of the Homœopaths generally is not easy to answer. There is, per-

haps, no absolute uniformity of opinion or practice as to any one of Hahnemann's doctrines.

It may be objected that the presentation of the doctrines of the older writers on Homœopathy is not giving a fair account of the system as at present held and practised, any more than quotations from the writings of Hippocrates and Galen, or from Brown and Todd, would fairly represent regular medicine at the present time. But there is a vast difference between the two cases. What is called Regular Medicine does not consist of any pretended newly discovered universal principle—is not based upon a single dogma with other dependent outgrowths constituting an exclusive system. It acknowledges no one founder, and has no specific creed. It repudiates the appellation of Allopathy, given it by Homœopaths, or any term indicating a restricted sectarianism. Scientific Medicine is as free from such dogmas and creeds and sectarianism as is the science of Botany or Geology, the art of Agriculture or Engineering. So far as it is a system at all, it consists of a collection of facts properly arranged and recorded, and of deductions from them constituting the science; and of certain observations and experiences, and practical inferences drawn from them constituting the art. Its members may differ on various theoretical and practical questions, as do Geologists abont the strata of the crust of the earth and their indications, or as do Botanists about the character of plants and their classifications; or as do Farmers about the best manner of managing the soil and raising crops; or as do Engineers respecting the best methods of constructing works or repairing their injuries. The science of medicine is constantly receiving accessions of new facts, and constantly discovering and devising new methods of procedure. Homœopathy is a definite, specific, dogmatic theory. Its name implies it, and its professions declare it. To question its articles of faith is to abandon its pretensions. To differ upon its essential principles is to break up the sect. It is *similia similibus*, or it is not homœopathy. It is Hahnemann's homœopathy or it is nothing.

VII.

In the preceding pages we were occupied with an account of the doctrines of Homœopathy as taught by Hahnemann, its founder. But little attempt was made to show the fallacy of these doctrines, except in ths case of the "provings," the character of which was illustrated by examples from standard works, and by quotations from homœopathic authorities respecting their unreliability.

Let us now review these chief doctrines in the inverse order in which they were presented, referring to the views of other homœopathic writers as occasion may require. The system of "provings" has already been sufficiently dwelt upon to have its value appreciated.

As to the rule of administering but a single medicinal substance at a time, I have sufficiently shown the impossibility of a compliance with it in the triturations; and I may add that many, if not most, or indeed all homœopathic practitioners now alternate medicines; and some advise compounds. Thus, Rau. in his Organon, which Dr. Hempel calls "a philosophical and argumentative exposition of the principles of homœopathy," on page 178, says: "If different systems and organs be affected, the cure is prompted by giving two remedies, one of which corresponds to one, and the other to the other affection, in alternation." "Thus," he continues, "digitalis and nux vomica may be given alternately in a complication of pneumonia and gastric symptoms; sulphur and nux vomica in chronic abdominal complaints," etc.

Again, on page 118, the same author says: "Mineral waters, which have such wonderful therapeutic properties, are compound substances." And again, "we possess several pharmaceutic compounds which we cannot reasonably reject in practice, provided they are always prepared in the same manner.

He continues: "There are compounds which have become

standard preparations in our pharmacopœia, and which we *have a right to retain* because we are fully acquainted with their therapeutic use. Such preparations are, for instance, calomel and opium, ammonia and tartar emetic, chinchona and sulphuric acid, etc."

Henriques, in his work, page 276, however, says: "A distinguishing characteristic of Homœopathic practice is, the administering one single remedial agent at a time."

Hempel says, vol. i, page 87: "The method of alternating two medicines at regular intervals is generally resorted to in acute cases only," mentioning many articles that may thus be alternated, and adds: "We hear of physicians (Homœopathic) using four and even six medicines, not only in the same case, but at the same time, alternating them in regular order; and Luz, he says, "in a late publication, has proposed to mix the remedies, instead of alternating them."

Thus we have the "consistency and universality" of homœopathic teachings, as "a doctrine of life, a heavenly truth," illustrated.

It will be remembered that Hahnemann strongly recommended medication by olfaction as the mildest and safest, and quite as efficient a method as by swallowing. Rau says, Organon, p. 178: "Very sensitive, hysteric females, are indeed affected by merely smelling of the medicine (I suppose he means the dilution), but the re-action occasioned by olfaction is very fleeting at any rate;" and Hempel says, "this should only be resorted to in purely nervous affections;" adding, "we doubt whether it can be depended upon in acute inflammations, or in disorders of any kind which may terminate in dangerous disorganizations." This method, I believe, has generally been abandoned; and it is not so much to be regretted, as Hahnemann averred that smelling of a globule at the 30th dilution, or putting it upon the tongue and not drinking after it, was *very much the same.* With this opinion I am prepared to concur.

The mode of preparing homœopathic medicines with many of the school has not changed since the time of its founder. In the Homœopathic Medical College of Philadel-

phia, the regular process of Hahnemann seemed to be followed, as we have seen; and Dr. Hempel, in his Materia Medica, recommends this method as the best. But he says, "the preparation of the ingredients in making our preparations has been considerably modified." "Instead of taking one grain of the medicine, or one drop to 99 grains of sugar of milk, 10 grains of the drug are taken to 90 grains of the vehicle." Hahnemann's scale is called the *centesimal*, and this new scale is designated as the *decimal* scale. "I believe," he adds, "that the decimal scale is now more generally used by homœopathic physicians than the centesimal."

Grüner, a leading pharmaceutist, accepts the decimal. Used at the first dilution with powerful medicines, as arsenic, strychnia, corrosive sublimate, morphine, etc., this change would make all the difference in the world. But with the weaker medicines, or with any medicines in the higher dilutions, as with snuffing or swallowing, it would be all the same.

While Hahnemann was so particular about all his processes, quantities and potencies, we must be struck with the indifferent manner in which the various methods and quantities are spoken of by modern homœopaths. *To deny the efficacy of the infinitesimals, would be to reject the testimony upon which the system of Homœopathy is founded.* To reject all the experience with the high dilutions, is to reject nearly all former reports of the great success of homœopathic treatment—is, in fact, to acknowledge that all, or, at least, most of the past is a delusion. This conclusion cannot be avoided. The 90 and 95 per cent. of cholera cases so ostentatiously and *falsely* reported as cured by Homœopathy, must all go to the wind if the efficacy of infinitesimals is denied; for these cases were *professedly*, though probably not really, treated by infinitesimal doses. Hence, belief is professed by these men in the power of such doses, while at one step the quantity of medicine in what they call the "potencies" is increased ten fold; and the first attenuations and even "Mother Tinctures," as they are called, and, indeed, the cruder forms of medicine, are unscrupulously used; but whether upon the principle of *similia similibus curantur*, we shall in due time see.

Indeed Rau, and Marcy, and Henriques, and Hempel, and nearly the whole of them, at times, seem to regard the matter of quantity—whether the decimal or centesimal scale, whether the crude article or the 45th dilution—as a matter of no essential moment. Thus, Rau, on page 183, Organon, says: "If the remedy is chosen in accordance with the principle of *similia similibus curantur*, the treatment is homœopathic, whether the dose be large or small." While, as we have seen, he doubts the efficacy of Olfaction, and on page 182, he says: "The weaker medicines must be given in the lower dilutions," yet, on page 181, he says: "In inflammatory affections of the meningeal membranes," (membranes of the brain I suppose he means), "with convulsions, in the case of children, I have seen the most remarkable curative effects from the forty-fifth potency of Belladonna!"—The quantity in the thirtieth, divided by one hundred, fifteen times!! Hempel says in effect much the same thing. Yet, in vol. 1, p. 79, Mat. Med., he says: "The use of infinitesimal doses is one of the characteristic peculiarities of our practice." Dr. Marcy, in his Practice of Medicine, on page 108, says: "What cared Hahnemann—what care his disciples—whether they use one or twenty drops of a tincture, or one grain of a twentieth attenuation?" But, he says, the attenuations originated with Hahnemann as a necessity, on discovering that the tinctures often produced too violent an impression upon the affected structure. Of course, when over excitement exists in an organ, or in the whole system, an excitant in sensible doses is very likely to do harm. If great depression exists, the use of depressing agents in sufficient quantity to produce effects, will lead to greater depression. These facts must ever have the effect of confining those who prescribe on the principle of *similia similibus* to very small doses. This is a necessity. But while Hahnemann declared in the most positive manner the high attenuations best in all cases, most of his followers of the present day give the lower ones, or crude articles, according to their notions, or their "*infallible experiences*."

This harmony, consistency and universality of the "heavenly truth" is indeed quite remarkable.

It seems, then, that a "Homœopathic dose" now means any quantity that may be put into a human stomach, or approximated to a human olfactory. Yet Henriques, agreeing with the remark already quoted from Hempel, says: "The administration of imponderable doses in the treatment of disease is a characteristic of Homœopathy."

But on the other hand again, Dr. Lobethal, a high German Homœopathic authority, says: "I am decidedly convinced, that in order to apply the Homœopathic treatment with success, we should take cognizance of the whole scale at our disposal, from the actual dose of the old school up to the highest dilutions of which any medicine is susceptible;" and Dr. Gros, of Germany, another high authority, says: "The physician may vary the dose from the highest dilution down to one or more drops of the undiluted tincture."

Amid this confusion and contradiction of authorities, it becomes difficult to define the present standard Homœopathic creed. Indeed, in the process of change and disintegration which is evidently going on, no standard creed now exists. Before we get through with the subject we shall see that each of the distinctive doctrines is denied and rejected by the homœopathic authorities themselves. Hempel, in his Materia Medica, vol. 1, page 801, says: "Of Hahnemann's original rules of treatment hardly one is followed by modern practitioners. Who treats a case of syphilis now by giving a single globule of the thirtieth potency of Mercuris Solubilis and no more, as Hahnemann advises? Or who treats a case of scabies with a single globule of the thirtieth potency of Sulphur, as he advises us to do? We have learned by abundant *experience* that we can do better in many cases, and unless we sometimes acted differently we should not be able to cure our patients." But Hahnemann's "experience" proved to him the efficiency of his single infinitesimal doses. What confidence can we place in any of his "experiences?"—especially when their pretended conclusions violate every principle of reason and common sense.

The doctrine of Potentization, Dynamization, or Spiritualization, so urgently insisted upon by Hahnemann, and the only

doctrine which can possibly save the infinitesimal doses from absurdity, and from the contempt of all sensible men, is, I think I may say, very generally abandoned by Homœopaths, at the present time. It is true there is not a single established fact tending to prove such "new and unheard of powers" being given to drugs by triturations and shakings; yet there is no inherent impossibility in the assumption; and there might be some analogy in the fact of electrical power being given to certain substances by friction. But Homœopaths of the present day reject the doctrine as a mistake or delusion of their "great Founder." I have already shown that it was a necessity to Hahnemann's system, and with the rejection of small doses the system must be abandoned. The rejection of this doctrine of potencies is the secret of the substitution of the decimal for centesimal method of preparation; and the substitution of the "mother tinctures" and crude articles for the dilutions. The effect of resorting to these larger doses, upon the principle of *similia similibus* as a general law, we can but see. A *system* of whatever kind consisting of parts dependent upon each other, cannot lose any of those parts without falling into dissolution.

> "In Nature's chain whatever link we strike,
> Tenth, or ten-thousandth, breaks the chain alike."

So in this artificial toy system of alleged principles, like the circle of bricks set up by children, when one is toppled over, all must fall. Some of the parts may be held up for a time, but the superincumbent pressure must at length prevail, and unlike the bricks, if once completely prostrated and abandoned by the large body who are now playing with them, they will never be set up again—certainly not, until after a lapse of years. Some future antiquarian may exhume them, and some future generation of urchins may re-enact the play.

But are the "potentizations" really denied by Homœopaths? By many, certainly.

Rau, in his Organon, p. 158, says: "Nor is it sufficient to assert that the quantity and quality of a homœopathic agent are in an inverse proportion, and that the power of the drug

increases as it is more highly attenuated. This is contrary to *experience*. We attenuate medicines to diminish their excessive action."

Now, to be sure, Hahnemann's *experience* was just the reverse of this; and besides, the Sage declared that "all the experience in the world could not disprove the *fact* (?) that the smallest doses were the best"—the most powerful for good, of course. This Homœopathic "experience" is a very curious affair. It seems to be able to *prove* anything that is desired. Rau, in the same paragraph, adds: "We know from '*experience*' that the dynamically disturbed organism is most powerfully affected by influences which have a tendency to realize a similar disturbance in the healthy organism. So, according to this evidence, that matter is settled. But *experience* has given the hundreds of symptoms recorded in the Homœopathic books as to the effects of charcoal, and sulphur, and silex, and chalk, and other things, even when given in infinitesimal doses —those symptoms which Hempel in one of his more lucid moments designates as "the tens of thousands of puerile and *utterly useless trivialities* which have excited the derision of both friend and foe." Mat. Med, p. 64. He adds as an explanation disapprovingly—that some provers "note down as drug effects every sensation which they may experience after taking the first dose" This is indeed the common fact.

In relating a homœopathic "cure" by a medicine which he did not happen to believe in, reported in the words of a man he evidently disliked, he said, it will be remembered, "the remedy had as much to do with the recovery as the 'comet's tail.'" Strange that it should not have occurred to him that the many cases he and others relate of recoveries, after a globule had been swallowed or snuffed, might not have the same relation to the supposed remedy; the relation of this remedy and the "comet's tail."

In reference to this question of Potentization, the position of Dr. Hempel is attempted to be expressed in his Mat. Med., vol. 1, p. 789. Here it is, and the reader will see what he can make of it:

"A Homœopathic medicine acts by carrying the war into

Africa; it acts like the lightning-rod inviting the thunders of Heaven. Here is the *stramonium-disease*, the *creative stramonium-force* having invaded the organism where it meets a kindred recipient faculty, a pre-disposition which it excites into a violent, palpable disorder. We act upon it by means of material molecules for which the stramonium-force or essence has a stronger attractive affinity than for the organic tissues. These material molecules are the stramonium drug in a suitable state of preparation. If the drug molecules are not endowed with sufficient force to draw the disuse to themselves, in other words to materialize it, to convert it from the dynamic or immaterial form in which it prevades the organism, into molecular drug-atoms of limited dimensions, and harmless as disease-producing agents, the cure fails. Either the disease was not a stramonium-disease or else the inimical force had so thoroughly assimilated the organic tissues that their dissolution had become inevitable. It is in this exact adaptation of our remedial agents to disease, that consists their *potency*—their power to act. *Potency has not reference to quantity or number, but to the curative adaptation of drugs to diseases.* In this sense a globule of the twelfth attenuation of arsenic, may be a far more efficient potency than ten drops of Fowler's solution; whereas, on the other hand, a few grains of quinine in fever and ague, may exercise a more positive curative influence, and therefore constitute a more efficient potency, than a few globules of the thirtieth attenuation.

Hahnemann taught the doctrine, and this doctrine is founded in Nature and Reason, that it is the drug-force which effects cures. By drug-force, we mean the *morbific essence* which *materializes* itself in the plant, and develops pathological lesions in the organism. This drug-force can never be wholly separated from the material molecules of the drug; but by resorting to various peculiar processes of shaking and triturition, this drug force may be set free, disengaged, and may be united with temporary vehicles, such as alcohol or sugar of milk." The triturating and shaking are to be described. "For the present," he adds, "let it suffice to know that it is the *in-dwelling* dynamic force of drugs which effects

our cures by *absorbing*, attracting, as it were, the *morbific essence* to itself, and amalgamating or incorporating it with the molecular atoms of the drug." He further says, "the process of rubbing and shaking is designated as an attenuation by those who look upon this proceeding as simply a mechanical division or separation of the drug-molecules; the term potency or dynamization is applied by physicians, who regard the process of shaking and trituration as a development of the indwelling drug-force."

He seems to hold that the *drug-force* is in great quantity, in a medicine, and is separated and let loose by shaking. This is a modification of Hahnemann's notion of an added force—a new and unheard of power *produced* by the shaking. Hempel develops or separates it by rubbing. One view is about as rational as the other; and practically they amount to about the same thing, viz.: that the power of the drugs in trituration and shaking is developed or increased. The medicine is potentized. But this is not the common view of Homœopaths. Potentization, by the masses, is relinquished. Hempel is not a representative man of his school. But who is a representative of modern Homœopathy? Rau finally explicitly says:

"It is my opinion that the virtues of medicines are completely developed in the first clear, transparent dilution. Some agents possess the power of deranging the organism in an extraordinary degree, compelling even Allopathic physicians to prescribe very small doses, lest the organism should be injured. This circumstance, of itself, is sufficient to show that the power of a drug is divided in proportion as the drug is attenuated. If that power were increased by the attenuating process, every remedial agent would be converted into a deadly poison."

Marcy, p. 119, says: "We infer that no new properties are developed by the homœopathic method of preparing drugs, except such as arise from the mere subdivision of their particles; and that all ideas respecting *spiritualization*, *dynamization* and *magnetism*, in the preparation of medicine, are erroneous and untenable."

If medicines were increased in power as Hahnemann taught, could the matter remain long in doubt? Could it not

be tested? Would any Homœopathists deny it? Here, as elsewhere, the discrepancies are seen.

It seems almost a waste of time to attempt an argument against the effects of infinitesimal quantities of the common matter of ordinary drugs, such as sulphur, lime, potash, golden seal, or the more powerful articles even, as nux vomica, aconite, mercury, arsenic, etc., at the thirtieth dilution, or any other above the very lowest, if potentization be rejected. It seems only necessary to remember the extreme minuteness of the quantities in these dilutions, as already shown. Yet to give a show of plausibility to the alleged power of such dilutions, the effect of imponderable quantities of specific and contagious poisons, and particularly of the poisons of small-pox and the vaccine disease, are constantly adduced as illustrations. I need hardly remind those who are medical men and acquainted with the doctrine of contagion, of the want of analogy—the total difference between the mode of operation of small-pox and vaccine poisons, and that of the medicinal substances referred to.

The infections or contagious poison is *germinal*, as has already been stated, is a living cell or molecule, capable of multiplication in the system. It must and does multiply before it produces its effects. The smallest particle of this germinal matter introduced into the system by inhalation in the air, or by inoculation into the skin, thus reaching the blood after a week or two, the period of incubation as it is called, so increases in the body, taking nutrient materials to itself, as to manifest the most decided effects—the phenomena of the disease; and producing the most sensible amount, even ounces, of the same kind of matter, in small-pox, passes off in effluvia, or accumulates in the pustules which are so abundant. But no one pretends that medicines are living germinal matters, thus multiplying in the system. Thus the analogy and the illustration entirely fail; and common sense and common sanity so strongly protest against the possibility of such effects, that I need say no more.

The next Homœopathic doctrine in the system to be noticed, following the inverse order in which they were men-

tioned, is that respecting the totality of symptoms. According to Hahnemann (I showed that it was a necessary part of his system), we cannot know anything of disease except the symptoms. The symptoms in their totality reflect the internal disease—the affection of the vital force.

But, says Rau, "the philosophical and argumentative expounder of Homœopathy" (Organon, p. 99), "*Symptoms* are only one portion of the clue which leads to the perception of the true nature of the internal morbid process. * * In some cases the symptoms are not so clear, and the real nature of the disease has to be determined by *a priori* reasoning." He goes on to urge at length the importance of inquiring into the history of the case, the tendencies of the constitution, the causes of the disease, the surrounding influences which are injurious or advantageous to the patient, as well as an appreciation of existing symptoms; and in speaking of the objects of treatment, he says, p. 313: "For a long time past it has been felt that the removal of single symptoms does not constitute a cure, any more than we can extinguish the flames of a burning house by directing the stream against one side of the house only. The fruitless attempt to combat the totality of the symptoms by a combination of remedies producing opposite effects, finally led to the conviction that every disease, in order to be cured, must be seized by the root. In this way the idea of rational medicine has first been started, and will ultimately triumph." On p. 156 he adds: "In treating patients symptomically, we often come in collision with the *curative efforts of nature*."

Scientific physicians know that it is more important to change patholigical conditions, and to remove morbid causes, than to aim the treatment at the mere palliation or removal of symptoms. But the homœopathic method, based upon the alleged similarity of effects to the *symptoms* of disease, cannot act on this principle.

Henriques, the forcible and plausible writer in favor of Homœopathy (as he understands it), already referred to, in summing up a discussion on this question, says: "I trust I have shown that the symptomatic school of Hahnemann is

correct in assuming the primary and radical seat of disease to be the vital force, and that the *only* elements of disease that can be of real importance in a therapeutic point of view, and which can constitute the great basis of medical science, are the vital signs and symptoms." (p. 228).

But here, as everywhere, there are differences of views among Homœopaths. Hahnemann's doctrine on this question seems to predominate. It is a part of the system, though denied and abandoned by many. *We* regard pathological conditions, arriving at a knowledge of them by all means possible. We take into the account causes and effects, all of the morbid phenomena as affording therapeutical indications as objects of treatment. It is unnecessary to urge considerations in favor of this view. But in thus representing the views of different Homœopathic writers on this subject, we may behold "with hearts full of reverence, the *consistency* and *universality* of the teachings of this heavenly truth!"—(Hempel.)

VIII.

We come back now to the first—the great central doctrine of Homœopathy—*similia similibus curantur;* the alleged universal therapeutic principle—"the *sole* law of cure."

We have found all the other essential doctrines of Hahnemann rejected and opposed by his professed followers, as not having sufficient plausibility or evidence in their favor to command the assent of all his disciples.

I fancy also that none of these views which have been commented upon have received the assent of the judgment of any one who has given attention to their statement. If we should now find that *this dogma* is also rejected by many of the same disciples and professed followers, and what is much more important, that it is clearly opposed to both facts and reason, what, in our estimation, will have become of this whole system, and its several parts?

Homœopathists in a general way, however, insist upon *this* as a great law and a great discovery—as the great central principle to which all others are subsidiary—and may say we ought to drop out of sight Hahnemann's other views, such as infinitesimal doses, potentization, spiritual medicinal influences, the itch-miasm as the cause of seven-eights of all chronic diseases, etc., etc., as mere subsidiary articles in the Homœopathic creed, to which all his followers do not implicitly subscribe, while we look to "*similia similibus curantur*" as the sole vital part of this medical system.

Dr. Scott, a leading English Homœopathist, and one of the most learned of their writers, says in the British *Journal of Homœopathy:* "The essential characteristic of the Homœopathic schools is singly and simply the adoption of a law of treatment applicable to ALL forms of disease, expressed by the words, *similia similibus curantur;* this," he adds, "we conceive to be the whole distinctive creed."

Most of the Homœopaths of the present day, in conversation, will declare this is the only principle upon which they insist, and by which they are governed in practice. But do they all adhere to it, as a universal principle—and are they all governed by it in practice? And what is still more important, is it true? Is it a universal principle? Is it even a general law? Is it, in fact any law at all?

Now as to whether Homœopaths, even in their writings, where coming down to facts and details, regard their law as universal, I will first refer to Rau, whose work is so strongly endorsed by Hempel, his translator.

Rau's first general therapeutic rule is stated to be "to remove all morbid influences;" and he remarks that many diseases disappear simply by removing the morbific influence. (Org., p. 138.) This, to be sure, is a simple dictate of common sense and common observation, but it disproves the dogma of *similia similibus*, as the *only* law of cure. On p. 140, he recommends an emetic when the stomach is overloaded, or contains foul matter from other causes. In such cases, he says: "The shortest and simplest way is to take an emetic." If warm water and butter will not do, he advises ipecac, in

proper emetic doses, followed by warm water; and after the vomiting is over, a cup of black coffee to restore the tone of the stomach. Coffee, he thinks, has a good effect in slowness of digestion; but frankly confesses, "The action is not homœopathic, but it is Enanthiopathic, in accordance with the principal '*contraria contrariis.*' I mention this," he says, "by way of advice to those who *condemn every kind of antipathic treatment without rhyme or reason.*" On p. 141, he recommends cathartics in constipation of the bowels. He relates cases where homœopathic remedies had failed, but where a cathartic, as of castor oil, had cured the patient! On p. 143, he says: "The object of treatment with the partisans of every school and system is to neutralize a morbid action by establishing a *contrary* influence." Speaking of the principle "*contraria contrariis sananda*," and the methods of treatment in accordance with it, he says: "These rules have been followed for three thousand years, sometimes with *great success.* This must be admitted." He then, to be sure, goes on to mention objections to the plan of large doses, giving examples of enormous ones which any of us would condemn; and relates remedies which he regards as having acted homœopathically, a specimen of which is, "Opium has frequently been employed with great success for incarcerated Hernia and Illius." Is that Homœopathic? The opium in such a case is given to allay the severe pain, overcome spasmodic action, and diminish inflammation. Does any one imagine that opium will produce, however given, Hernia or Illius, or any similar effects? Such a position would be simply preposterous. On p. 151, he says: "The living organism possesses the power to oppose and neutralize noxious influences, and when the morbid influence is weakened the organism *cures itself.*" On p. 156–7, in debility, adynamic conditions, he says: "So-called corroborants and stimulants have frequently been of great use." Page 177, "The derivative method has enjoyed great repute for several thousand years past, and, with much evil, has done some little good." "It is not my intention to defend cathartics, moxæ, setons, etc. I confess, however, that I never hesitate to avail myself of all the means at my command to relieve the patient;" and

then goes on to say he uses external irritation to the chest when measles are slow to come out, "changing the whole scene" —hot foot baths in congestion of the head, etc. Cold to head with ice or snow in reaction after concussion of the head, "with incalculable benefit." In swoons and apparent death he recommends stimulants--when the vital action is prostrate (p. 176). On p. 189, he advises palliation without regard to the homœopathic law. In all these ways he denies in the most positive manner that *similia similibus* is the only method of cure, or that in many cases it is the best, or indeed any method of cure at all. I need not insist that all these methods thus sanctioned by Rau are opposed to the law of Homœopathy, and subversive of all its essential principles.

Henriques, speaking of the principles governing the old and new schools—the old rule, he says, being *contraria contrariis curantur*, and the new being *similia similibus curantur*, on p. 240 remarks: "Nor can either claim the exclusive dignity of an universal law of therapeutic action. * * No doubt *both* are extremely useful, each in its respective and appropriate sphere, as empirical rules of practical guidance in the selection of a remedy; but *neither* can be considered as an absolute and universal law explanatory of the *modus operandi* of curative agents." He further says there can be "but one absolute principle of therapeutic art, which may be termed "*counter-action*," operating by a two-fold law—"*contraria contrariis*" and "*similia similibus*." Where, then, according to this authority, is the *Universal Law?*

"These formulas," he continues, "are simply expressions of the only two fundamental modes of relation, as yet discovered, between the remedy and the disease." There are others, but no matter now; according to this authority, Homœopathy is not the only one. Indeed, Henriques repudiates Hahnemann's "System of Medicine," and says there are three things which constitute the reformation of Hahnemann, viz.:

1. "The definite knowledge of the action and effects of pharmaceutical agents, acquired by direct provings upon man

in the normal state." We have seen how much value can be attached to these as conducted by Homœopaths.

2. "The rule for a selection of a remedy, derived from the harmonic relation existing between the known specific effects of the remedy in health, and the ascertained vital signs of the given morbid disposition."

But he has already stated that such relation is Antipathic as well as Homœopathic.

3. "The practice adopted in the exhibiting of single remedial agencies; and the administration of imponderable doses for the treatment of disease."

It will be remembered that I have shown that the exhibiting of single remedial agencies, triturated and reduced to imponderable doses, is an impossibility; and that most Homœopaths alternate their medicines, and some mix them.

From his standpoint, the "system" of Hahnemann is rejected; and of the three things which he retains, the first—that of the provings—is almost worthless, entirely unreliable, as seen by the recorded results of these provings by their standard authors, and as acknowledged by the Homœopathic authorities themselves. The second—the relation between the effects of remedies and tne symptoms of disease being one of *counteraction*—action against or in opposition to the disease, manifests itself in two modes—by antipathy, or antagonism; and Homœopathy, or similarity—similarity being simply a less degree of difference, as we shall see. And the third thing—simple agents in imponderable doses—the first part of this being generally repudiated by Homœopaths, and proved impossible; and the last part, considered by Homœopaths of the present day as at least non-essential, and which is in the way of repudiation. I have thus given the views of two distinguished European Homœopathic authors in opposition to the *universality* of the law of *similia similibus curantur*, as I have already given various other Homœopathic authorities in opposition to the other views of Hahnemann.

It is stated by those in the best possible position to know, that the condition of Homœopathy is far better in America than any other country—that is, there are far more Homœo-

pathic physicians, colleges, societies, dispensaries, books, etc., in this country than in any other; and this greater success of the American so-called Homœopathic physicians, is attributed to their departing more from Homœopathy, and adopting more from the Regular School here than anywhere else. It is not mere Homœopathy that is successful, but the adoption of much of the science and treatment of the Regular School, of the so-called Eclectics and Hydropathists.

"Very few," says Dr. Peters [and the fact is perfectly well known to all who have observed their practice] "of the American Homœopathic physicians confine themselves exclusively to the homœopathic remedies or homœopathic doses. The principle of *similia similibus* is not followed."

In the *New York Medical Gazette*, vol. 1, p. 328, it is stated: "Hahnemann taught that one grain of sulphur well rubbed up with 100 grains of sugar of milk, could be developed into a medicine of tremendous power and energy. But Dr. Barlow, of New York, who ranks as a Homœopathic physician of excellent standing, advises that 2 grs. of very pure sulphur be mixed with 126 grs. of conium, quinine and morphine. A favorite prescription is: Take

Sulphur pura..... 2 grs.
Ext. conium mac.....90 grs.
Sulph. quinia.....30 grs.
Sulph. morphine..... 3 grs.
Podophyllin..... 3 grs.

M. ft. pill. No. xxx. Dose: One or two several times a day.

Each pill contains one-fifteenth of a grain of sulphur, three grains of the conium, one grain quinia, one-tenth grain each of the morphine and podophyllin.

In the *Chicago Medical Examiner*, an article on Modern Homœopathy shows similar prescriptions and practices in the London Homœopathic hospital, and in the daily doings of various pretended Homœpaths in New York and elsewhere.

In the *New York Medical Gazette*, vol 2, p. 95, is a description of a medicine prescribed by Dr. Freligh to a rheumatic patient, consisting of a large quantity of Nit. of Potash,

and not quite so much of Iodide of Potassium, dissolved in the Tincture of Actea Racemosa, and given in one-half or whole teaspoonful doses. Dr. Freligh is in high standing among Homœopaths.

The *North American Journal of Homœopathy*, the largest and oldest homœopathic quarterly journal, in its prospectus, states that "it will maintain a recognition of 'Similia Similibus Curantur,' as the *only* Therapeutic Law, and the superiority of the practice founded upon this law over all other systems and modes of medical practice." It will also oppose all attempts to amalgamate Homœopathy with anything else, etc. But we find in it Santonine and Podophyllin prescribed in free doses by Dr. C. Judson Hill, of Utica, New York. Also an ounce or more of bruised pumpkin seeds, followed by two drachms of Sulph. Ether, and this by an ounce of castor oil. Dr. Hedges, of Chicago, recommends on excision of the part in hydrophobia, and to cauterize with Nitrate of Silver; then give Belladonna and Bromide of Potassium in free doses for six months. Dr. Henry A. Daniels, of New York, recommends in all cases of catarrh a solution of Sulphate of Copper, graduated in strength according to the necessity of the case. Dr. Steckers recommends an infusion of two drachms of Senega in pleuro-pneumonia; and Prof. S. B. Barlow reports three cases of goitre cured by 3d and 12th dilutions of Spongia—but adds an ointment of the crude remedy rubbed into the tumor each night.—*Journal for August, 1868.*

The Chicago *Homœopathic Quarterly* is filled with similar things.

A few years ago I was called to see a gentleman at some distance who had been my patient previously, and who was then in an alarming condition from an acute inflammation in the chest. Arriving by the cars late in the night, the attending physician was not present, but he had left a note for me, stating that the patient was taking morphine, and, I think, some other medicine, in the ordinary doses as prescribed by regular physicians. In the morning this physician came in and a consultation was held in the case, during which not an allusion was made or an expression dropped which excited

the least suspicion of an irregularity in the views or practice o the person with whom I was consulting. He spoke freely of other cases which had occurred in his practice, and of his treatment—among which I distinctly remember rheumatism, which he said he had treated successfully with large doses of alkalies; and pneumonia, in which the excitement of the pulse and other symptoms had been controlled by the usual doses of veratrum viride. A course of treatment for the patient was agreed upon, without there being the slightest reference to homœopathic principles; and not until he had left the house to procure the medicine, when I was informed of the fact, had I the least suspicion that this man I had thus met was a professed Homœopath. When he returned, in the presence of the family of the patient, I charged him with deception in professing a system he practically repudiated—for giving to Homœopathy the credit he had met with in the use of remedies given in accordance with the practice of the Regular School; and I enjoined upon the gentleman who had sent for me to convey my apology and explanation to the regular physicians of the town for having been unconsciously in consultation with a Homœopath, who, had he adhered to his professed principles, could not have agreed with me in any prescription I could conscientiously have made. This man was no obscure and unknown pretender, but, at the time, an *associate editor*, as I was informed, of a New York Homœopathic journal; was soon after, and I believe now is, a professor in a Homœopathic college, and is the author of the modern work on Homœopathic Materia Medica already referred to!

A few years since, a woman in Detroit, in the care of a Homœopathic physician, died suddenly with symptoms of narcotism. Before a coroner's jury it was proved that a very large quantity of morphine was left by this Homœopath and ordered to be administered—sufficient in the opinions of some of the physicians who investigated the subject, to cause her death.

Dr. Taylor, of London, in his Medical Jurisprudence, relates cases of poisons from morphine prescribed by Homœopaths.

Some months ago, in conversation with a distinguished clergyman and advocate of temperance on the subject of physicians so freely and indiscriminately prescribing alcoholic drinks, he said that he had occasion to know much of the practice of both the regular and Homœopathic physicians in his own city—Brooklyn, N. Y.—and that the latter, as much as the former, prescribed the different forms of alcohol, but neither upon the principle of *simila similibus* or in infinitesimal doses. Whisky by the glassful for symptoms of debility is certainly not honest Homœopathy, and in many cases where prescribed by men of any school, is not good practice. But, like the other cases, the use of this article by Homœopaths shows the practical abandonment of the professed principles of the system.

Dr. Cormack, of England, says patients that have been attended by Homœopaths often come to him, and he finds the commonest and coarsest of the "ordinary" means of cure, without the slightest reference to the Homœopathic principle, are used by them *habitually*.

Dr. Russell, of England, in an address published in the *British Journal of Homœopathy*, adduced it as a most gratifying reflection that, naturally, Homœopathy welcomed and could include within it the cognate sciences and curative methods, such as hydropathy, mesmeric cures, etc.

Recently a man came to me who had been under the care of a Homœopathic practitioner, who, after giving him imponderable doses for a long time with no effect, resorted to free ordinary doses, as he said, with some relief of his symptoms, but without effecting a cure.*

Many of these means, outside of their own medicines, they call "therapeutic auxiliaries"—helps of their homœopathic remedies. Treating patients with infinitesimals until they see something else must be done, they resort to these

*The case was one of cystic irritation. The man was a free drinker of strong coffee, and was advised to discontinue his favorite beverage, but no medicine was prescribed. Some days after he returned with the account of freedom from his long-continued and distressing symptoms. Had he taken sugar pellets with the injunction to avoid coffee, lest it should counteract their effects, he would have attributed his relief to the medicine. "Experience" would have proved its efficacy.

other measures, but attribute the cure to their "infallible specifics."

One is reminded of the story of the drummer-boy, who is said to have vaunted that he had defeated the French at Waterloo—though he allowed at the same time, that for this purpose he had incidentally used the English cannon, cavalry and troops as his "auxiliaries" in this work.

How diametrically opposite is this to all the teachings of Hahnemann and to real Homœopathy! "For," says Hahnemann, in his preface to his Organon, p. 11: "Homœopathy sheds not a drop of blood; administers no emetics, purgatives, laxatives, or diaphoretics; drives off no external affections by external means; prescribes no warm baths or medicated clysters, applies no Spanish flies or mustard plasters," etc.

We thus see, that Homœopathic professions and practices by no means correspond. It may be claimed that this system, like others, is progressive; but when it is claimed that any dogma in a system is essential, infallible and universal, any progressing, any change from it, is abandonment. The essential doctrine of Homœopathy—that without which it does not exist, is the universality of the principle that "*like cures like.*" To be sure, attached to this, as a necessity going with it, are several other principles or practices, such as imponderable doses, etc., and if one is abandoned the *system* is destroyed; and certainly if the fundamental, essential principle is given up, all is gone. The principle of *similia similibus* is so definite in its character, and so broadly and positively asserted as a universal law, that its abandonment in part is impossible—at least, is fatal to the claims of Homœopathy. Its distinct claim is to the discovery of an infallible, universal law of cure. We have brought sufficient evidence from the statements and practices of its own acknowledged authorities to show that this claim of universality is unfounded.

We shall now proceed to inquire into its claims to be considered as a law of cure in any sense.

IX.

As already intimated, we shall now proceed to the examination of the claims of this central dogma of the system we have been considering, not so much as to its being a *universal* law, as to its being any law at all.

That the principle of "*similia similibus curantur*," is not the *only infallible* law of cure, the testimony and practice of Homœopaths themselves, as already shown, have proved. Certainly it may be so regarded in the absence of any direct proof of the assumption.

But is *similia similibus* a law? Does like cure like with sufficient *apparent* frequency to enable us to regard it as a principle of at least any considerable applicability?

In the first place let us inquire, what, indeed, is meant by like curing like? How much *like*, must the effect of the remedy be to the disease.

No where in Hahnemann's writings, or elsewhere, so far as I know, has the amount or degree of similarity been accurately defined that will make the agent curative, or the degree of dissimilarity that will cause the remedy to fail. All is left vague and indefinite. To be sure Hahnemann has said the effect of the remedy must not be identical, but similar only. In similarity there is difference. Hahnemann further says, the similarity must be the greatest possible, yet nowhere does he specify the degree of similarity necessary for the operation of the "law." Measles is so similar to Small-Pox that for a long time they were confounded; yet one does not cure or prevent the other; and the case of Small-Pox and the Vaccine diseases so often referred to as illustrating the "law," entirely fails to do so, when closely examined. These affections do not cure, but they *prevent* each other; and each attack of either Small-Pox or the Vaccine disease will prevent other attacks of the same disease in the same person fully as effectively as they will prevent each other. *Identity* here prevents, as well as what is regarded as similarity; and the Vaccine disease exhausts the susceptibility of the system to Small-Pox because

of its essential identity with it. It is Small-Pox modified by having passed through the body of the cow. But the actions of medicines have no analogy to the actions of these diseases. Medicines do not, by impressing the system, exhaust its susceptibility to another impression, either of the same or a similar medicine; and they do not exhaust the susceptibility to a disease whose symptoms are similar to their effects. No one pretends this.

In the alleged examples of diseases homœopathically curing each other, adduced by Hahnemann, he has mentioned some exceedingly dissimilar, such as Small-Pox curing Dysentery, Small-Pox curing Amaurosis, and Dyspnœa, and Deafness. He seems as acute in seeing a likeness where he wishes to, as Polonius.

"Do you see," says Hamlet, "yonder cloud that's almost in shape of a camel?" "By the mass," says Polonius, "and it is *like* a camel, indeed." *Ham.* "Methinks its *like* a weasel." *Pol.* "It is backed *like* a weasel." *Ham.* "Or *like* a whale?" *Pol.* "VERY LIKE a whale."

It must be acknowledged that Small-Pox is not as like Amaurosis, etc., as is "possible."

How unsatisfactory in this respect, as in every other, is this whole system!

The principles of Alteration and Supersession are of frequent application in Scientific medicine. By Alteration is understood the action of a medicine upon some particular diseased process, changing its character or course, rendering it milder or shorter; and by Supersession is meant the substituting for a morbid process, a medicinal impression or action of a less severe character, or of shorter continuance.

These therapeutic principles are similar in their natures and objects, and are not always distinguishable from each other. Considered in a general sense as the same therapeutic law, it is illustrated in the application of an astringent or mild caustic to an inflamed or granular eye-lid, or to an ill-conditioned ulcer; and also in the application of Tincture of Iodine, or a solution of Bromine to Erysipelas, or other forms of external inflammation; and of the application of Nitrate of Silver,

or Oil of Turpentine, to a chronic or low form of irritation of the stomach or bowels. These instances are claimed by the Homœopaths as treatment in accordance with the principle of like curing like, as these articles applied to the healthy part would produce more or less disturbance, resembling in some degree the condition sought to be cured.

Now, if such changes—such alterative or substitutive effects—are Homœopathic, then is the Homœpathic principle one of the laws of cure ; but a law of cure which has ever been recognized from the dawn of medical science, and which ever will be recognized as long as the art is practiced. It is a law of cure of quite extensive application; but by no means applies to all, or even a very large proportion of cases.

But is this kind of action properly Homœopathic ? Is the cure effected in consequence of the similarity of the medicinal action to that of the disease, or is it in consequence of the medicinal action differing from the disease ?

Dr. J. C. Peters, of New York, already spoken of, raised this question some years ago, and his argument, which strikes at the very root and foundation of the Homœopathic "law," has never been successfully answered.

Certainly the substituted action is a different one, and it overcomes the morbid action, because it is different. Its producing in some cases somewhat similar effects is a mere incident, is by no means necessary to the curative action, and is as far as possible from being the reason of the remedial effect.

Dr. Peters justly says, that a thing which resembles another is not *identical* with it, but *differs* more or less. Resemblance always includes some difference. Hence, a remedy which acts similarly to a given disease also acts somewhat *differently* from that disease.

If there be an identity in the action of the remedy and that of the disease, then can there be no cure, but an aggravation. If the similarity or the homœopathicity between the action of the remedy and the disease be too great, then will there be aggravation instead of cure. But in proportion as the similarity grows less, and the difference increases, so will

the remedy alter, change, remove, take the place of, or cure the disease. Our remedies then produce an effect different from the disease. This difference may be so great as to amount to antagonism—antagonism being the greatest degree of difference—or the difference may be so slight as to merge into similarity ; for similarity is merely a lesser or least degree of difference.

No remedy can cure any disease, unless there is *some difference* between its action and that of the disease it is given to cure : otherwise it would not alter, modify, change, or substitute its action for that of the disease. If there is no difference between the action of the remedy and that of the disease then each dose or application of the drug would only add so much more to the disease—would aggravate it. In other words, the greater the homœopathicity, at least after going beyond a certain point, the more it will aggravate ; when, of course, a sufficient dose is given to produce a sensible effect.

Now, in a vast majority of internal diseases, where a medicine whose effect strongly resembles the disease, is given in doses sufficient to produce any sensible effect, an aggravation is produced—the patients are made worse but not better by the drug. In proportion as the similarity grows less between the action of the remedy and that of the disease to be cured, so, as a general rule, will the chance of altering, modifying, or changing the disease into something milder or better, increase ; that is, the less the similarity or homœopathicity, and the greater the difference or allopathicity (to use this term), so will the chances of improvement or cure increase; but of course the dose must be large enough to produce an alteration. or change, or modification, or lessening of the disease. Infinitesimals, certainly, unless potentized, will produce no preceptible effect. I repeat the point to which I wish to call particular attention, that the fact of an agent's producing a somewhat similar condition to the disease it modifies, where given to a person in health, is a mere incident or accident of its action, and is not an element of its curative nature. It is one of the strangest phenomena of the human mind, that this mere accident of some remedial agents should have been seized

upon and exalted into a law of cure; especially into one universal, *sole* law of cure.

But in the greater number of cases, says Dr. Peters, the remedies given by the Homœopaths have no kind of homœopathic relation to the disease intended to be cured; or at least a very slight one. Morbid conditions are so exceedingly diverse, and the Materia Medica of the Homœopaths is so limited; the effects of medicines are so imperfectly known, and their relations to symptoms are so slight and illy defined, that if the principle of "like cures like" were a true one, its application would be too imperfect and difficult to render it of value.

In examining the works of Homœopathic writers, one can not but be impressed by the extreme looseness and inaccuracy of their statements, admitting the correctness of their pretended law. They all seem to see likenesses where they do not exist, or where they are of the most obscure and doubtful character; and most absurdly attribute changes to the effects of their medicines which occur in the natural course of disease. The pretended similarity of the effects of their remedies to the phenomena of the diseases they are given to cure, has in most of the cases no reality. The Homœopaths, for example, declare that Pleurisy will be cured in twenty-four hours by Aconite. Will that agent cause a pleurisy, or anything like it? Who could have the hardihood even to pretend that such is the fact? Such similarity certainly does not exist between the effects of remedies and the phenomena of those diseases most certainly known to be cured by them.

If anything is certain in Therapeutics—if there are any specifics in medicine they are to be found in quinine for ague, in sulphur for scabies or the itch, in lemon-juice and succulent vegetables for scurvy, in iodine for goitre, and in colchicum, at least as a palliative, for gout. Now does the effect of any of these remedies resemble the symptoms of the diseases they are respectively known to cure? Will quinine produce intermittent fever, or anything like it? Of medical men I need not ask this question. Most persons have seen quinine administered in a great variety of doses, large and small; and for longer and shorter periods of time. Are cases

known where quinine has produced ague? General experience, in thousands upon thousands of cases, denies any such results; and particular experiments by Simpson, and others, have failed to produce any such effects. How quinine does operate in curing the ague, we may not positively know. Probably, either by neutralizing the malarial poison, or by restoring some needed element to the system, or by impressing it in such a manner as to prevent the effects of the poison; but in neither of these supposed modes of its action is there the slightest evidence that the principle of *similia similibus* has any part. On the contrary, it is certain that no such principle operates in the case.

Sulphur is well known to cure the itch. But will it produce it, or anything essentially resembling it? Genuine itch, which sulphur so certainly cures, is produced by a parasitic insect burrowing into the skin, which the sulphur kills, but does not produce. The idea that it produces its effects on the principle of *similia similibus curantur* is too absurd to admit of discussion.

Will lemon-juice and fresh vegetables cause the scurvy, or colchicum the gout? It has already been shown that iodine does not cause the goitre. The virtues of all these articles became known, not from experiments upon the well, and deductions from such experiments, but from observations upon the sick. The facts stand out by themselves, unconnected with any vague, absurd, or fanciful universal principle.

These illustrations might be extended indefinitely—at least as far as cures are effected by remedial agents; and on investigation we should find the same results. The prevention of small-pox by vaccination, so frequently adduced to illustrate the homœopathic "law," we have already seen has no analogy to the operations of medicine in curing disease; and if it had, the statement of Hahnemann that the remedy must be somewhat stronger than the disease, in order to overcome it," would lead to the position that the vaccine disease is somewhat stronger than the small-pox; a position that one who has observed both could not admit.

The application of snow to frozen parts has already been

shown to operate on a principle entirely different from the homœopathic law it is so constantly brought forward to illustrate. Rubbing snow on the frozen part, like pouring cold water upon a frozen plant, simply makes the thawing more gradual, and thereby preserves the vitality ; as the slow change from the frozen to the thawed condition of the potato deep in the earth, keeps it alive and fresh.

The effects of moderate, but not infinitestimal, doses of ipecacuanha in arresting some forms of nausea and vomiting more nearly resemble the operation of the alleged homœopathic law, than any other internal remedy which I can now call to mind ; but ipecacuanha impresses the stomach in such a manner, that a state different from the previous one is produced. But should we admit that there is a grain of truth in this principle—that it has a certain limited application—we are fully entitled to use it, as we profess no exclusive system, are limited by no dogmas, bound by no arbitrary rules, fixed in no grooves that keep us from any truth, new or old, coming from whatever source it may. We could act upon the principle, even without being indebted to the Homœopathic fraternity, as we have shown that it was taught long before the time of its founder. It appears to be a fact, which we cheerfully recognize, that some medicines produce in small doses effects quite different from—indeed to a certain extent quite opposite to—those which are produced in large doses. This is illustrated by the case of ipecacuanha just referred to, where occasionally small doses will relieve nausea and vomiting, while in large ones it produces these symptoms. The same is shown in the somewhat stimulating effects of quinine in small or moderate doses, and its comparative sedative action in larger quantities. This is far, however, from being a universal fact—from being true of all medicines ; and still further from being practically available in all cases in the treatment of disease. But whatever of truth is in this or any other principles, belongs to us by the most perfect right, as does the whole domain of truth.

> "No pent-up Utica contracts our powers,
> The whole unbounded continent is ours."

But it seems almost unnecessary to point out the ab-

surdities of the Homœopathic doctrines, since one after another they have been abandoned by their most distinguished and representative adherents, until now the most prominent members of the sect in Great Britain entirely repudiate the doctrine of *similia similibus curantur* itself, and declare that it is not held by "thinking Homœopaths." They even deny that this doctrine, which has given the name to the system, which was claimed as the great discovery of Hahnemann, which has been so many hundreds of times declared to be the one essential doctrine of the school—to be at the very foundation of the whole superstructure--they deny that it has been generally held as true! This would appear incredible without the most direct proof, but this is at hand.

Dr. R. E. Dudgeon, of London, one of the most prominent leaders of the sect, in a letter to the London Lancet, dated May 23d, 1881, says: "We are quite willing to grant that as far as the action of remedies is concerned, Homœopathy is a misnomer, and I do not know of any one in the Homœopathic School who has even plausibly contended for the Homœopathic action of drugs he homœopathically selects, unless, perhaps, Hahnemann himself in one of his earlier theories regarding the mode of action of remedies."

In a letter of the same date to the Lancet, Dr. Herbert Nankivell, another leader of the sect says: "Most thinking Homœopathists heartily acknowledge the law of similars to be a phenomenal, indicative law only; * * and many of us hold in consequence, that though selection of remedies is by the law of similars, the curative action of the small dose is by the law of contraries (antipathic).

Dr. Dyce Brown, another leading man in the same school, in another letter of the same date in the Lancet, says: "In 'Fletcher's Pathology' we find the author speaking of Homœopathic medicines and their theory of action, and saying, 'They cure not by the stronger, but by the opposite impression which they make, so that Homœopathic medicines, after all, operate on the antipathic principle.'" "Again," he continues, "Dr. Dudgeon, in his able lectures on the 'Theory and Practice of Homœopathy,' says: 'Whilst this (the law of similia), ex-

presses only the rule for the selection of the remedy, the actual curative process is rather *contraria contrariis*, for the impression we effect with our remedial agents is the opposite of the existing condition of the diseased part.'"

The operation of medicine—their curative effect is the whole question at issue. Like *cures* like is the Homœopathic motto.

But it seems that "thinking Homœopaths are driven to this statement, that they *select* their drugs Homœopathically, but these drugs *operate* antipathically. This it must be seen is the yielding up of every essential thing in the system. It is a complete yielding of the point which gives distinctiveness to the homœopathic theory. There is evidently but one step further that can be taken in giving up every vestige of their pretense to this really extinct system; and that step by nearly all the professed adherents of the system is practically taken. The very last step, which doubtless will be delayed as long as there is a demand for a practice which pretends to be peculiar and different from that of the Regular School, is the giving up of the sham pretense that remedies are always selected according to the fanciful law of similars. When this step is openly and professedly, as it is now actually taken, there will be nothing left of Homœopathy but its disreputable history.

Indeed, as more correct and philosophical views prevail as to the true nature of diseases, these discussions respecting vague general therapeutical principles tend to pass away.

In the comparative infancy of scientific knowledge among all barbarous people, diseases are regarded as evil spirits, or as some form of distinct entities—as something which seizes or gets into the body and is to be driven out by incantations, or noises, or odors, or specific medicines;—and these notions, or modifications of them, "relics of barbarism," still linger in the popular mind, and in the minds of some imperfectly educated physicians.

Many of the leading Homœopaths have the notion that diseases are distinct entities or principles to be overcome by specific means. Dr. Hempel, already quoted, says: "Here

is the stramonium disease;" (whatever that may be) "the creative stramonium-force having invaded the organism where it meets a kindred recipient faculty, a predisposition which it excites into a violent palpable disorder. We act upon it by means of material molecules, for which the stramonium-force or essence has a stronger attractive affinity than for the organic tissues." He goes on to speak of the drug molecules drawing the disease to themselves, etc., all showing that he imagines a distinct entity in the body which his remedies attract, repel, or in some way contend with.

Now, the only correct and philosophical idea of disease in the light of modern science, and that which is entertained by all advanced thinkers and writers of the present day is, that diseases are phenomenal, are simply modifications of physiological or normal actions, the actions being produced by the natural forces of the body, but modified in special phenomena and results by some obstructions or extraneous and injurious conditions or agencies.

The *causes* of diseases may be entities—material substances; but the diseases themselves are but modified actions.

As accurate observations and the means of scientific investigations increase, as the physical sciences advance, more clearly are distinctions recognized between *diseases* and their *causes;* and it is found that a large number of the best defined diseases, the whole class of zymotic and specific affections, are produced by peculiar poisons, germinal or chemical substances, calling for antidotes and eliminatives for their neutralization or removal. But not even the Homœopaths themselves pretend that antidotes act on the principle of *similia similibus.* These antidotes, however, must become the great remedies of the future.

From this and every other point of view, how extremely absurd do the pretensions of this exclusive system appear! Nothing can be more so.

Dr. Marcy, of New York, in his Homœopathic Practice, after vaguely referring to the principles of "Antipathy," and "Allopathy," and the Chemical methods of treatment, as

though the regular profession professed to be governed by these exclusive methods, says: "Allopathists do not, however, uniformly adhere to any of the above doctrines, but often encroach upon Homœopathic ground, and by practicing according to the law of *similia similibus curantur*, effect their speediest and safest cures." He afterwards goes on with an impertinence and disregard of truth which might be provoking were it not too puerile and ridiculous, and exclaims—"Gentlemen of the Old School, your practice too often belies your profession; you pretend to be Allopathists and Antipathists (precisely the thing we don't do—just the thing we repudiate), while constantly administering medicines after the manner of the Homœopathists." (Not this, either.) "Where is your pride, where is your consistency? You have the boast of antiquity, you have received your 'bundle of ideas' from Hippocrates and Galen, to whom you pay reverence and allegiance—you disdain innovations and despise discoveries and improvements; you have withstood the changes of more than two thousand years, and by your powerful dicta have continually discouraged all original inductions, and endeavored to crush in the bud every advancement in medical knowledge."

Every one acquainted with the regular profession knows how utterly and intensely untrue all this is. The man that could write such a paragraph as this is capable of anything in the way of reckless statement and outrageous misrepresentation. No confidence can be placed in anything he should affirm.

Instead of professing to be Allopathists and Antipathists, we repudiate these appellations given to us by these men; and ignoring all terms indicating the belief in exclusive systems, we call ourselves simply Physicians, and strive to administer medicines only after the methods which science, reason, common sense, and experience, may dictate. Although we have the boast of antiquity, and pay due respect to Hippocrates and Galen, but few of the principles upon which we now proceed are obtained from them; and as to disdaining innovations, we seek for, and embrace them, often with imprudent haste; and discoveries and improvements are our special claim and

highest glory. Instead of withstanding the changes of two thousand years, those we have *effected* are innumerable; and we are continually encouraging original investigations and inductions, and are promoting every advancement in medical knowledge. Most of the history of the triumphs of modern science would be included in that of the regular profession, and every material advancement in the science of life, of health, and of disease, is due to its members. Nothing, indeed, can be more absurd than the charge that the regular profession opposes discoveries and improvements; and this must be evident when we consider that in its ranks stand Harvey, Jenner, and Hunter; Paré, Sydenham, and Cullen; Boöerhave, Haller, and Henle; Andral, Laennec, and Louis; Larrey, Dupuytren, and Velpeau; Warren, Mott, and Mussey; Liebig, Owen, and Carpenter; Esquirol, Prichard, and Brigham; Bartlett, Drake, and Wood; Atlee, Sims, and Simpson; Garrod, Beale, and Johnson; Bernard, Charcot, and Brown-Séquard, and a host of others, equally worthy of mention, who with each issue of our periodicals, and in the more permanent productions of the press, are constantly presenting to the world of science, accounts of new experiments carefully conducted, and of new facts clearly demonstrated; and from these, new principles are deduced, new suggestions constantly are made, and new modes of practice instituted. Indeed so many *new* facts and principles are urged upon our attention, that we are in danger of neglecting the old ones which have stood the test of time. Thus changes are constant, and every real improvement is at once embraced. In no department of science or art are changes more readily effected, and improvements more rapidly made than in regular medicine.

For more than the three-quarters of a century that Homœopathy has numbered its adherents, to what single improvement in science can they point as the fruit of their labors? What single man can they show us among them, who has advanced Pathology, Surgery, Physiology, Diagnosis, Chemistry, or even their speciality, Therapeutics? Why, their own journals complain in the bitterest manner of their paucity of talent, and deficiency of progress.

In the Homœopathic *U. S. Med. and Surg. Journal* for Jan., 1867, p. 212, we find in the course of an article the following lamentation: "We want solid acquirements everywhere; we want in our schools more pathologists and learned physicians—as Bennett, Watson and a score of others. Writers, for instance, upon female diseases, and their surgical and mechanical treatment; and writers on obstetrics, such as Bennett, of London, Sims, Simpson, and Barnes. When will issue from our ranks writers of such worth as Rayer, Casenave, or Wilson, on diseases of the skin, Louis, Andral and Skoda, on diseases of the chest, West, on diseases of children, Ricord, on syphilis; or such pathologists as Rokitansky, Virchow, or Rock? Homœopathy is here a *humiliated beggar* to Allopathy." And calling upon eastern Homœopaths to arouse themselves, the writer exclaims; "Produce—produce! Were it but the pitifullest infinitesimal fraction of a product, produce it, in God's name!"

But this cry, like the calling upon Baal, though like his priests they cut themselves with stones, will be in vain. Men who believe, or even pretend to believe, in such doctrines as we have been discussing, will never produce such works as are called for. Never.

If we analyze the systems of medicine which are arrayed in opposition to the regular school, we shall find them based upon exaggerated notions of the importance of some one fragment of legitimate medicine. Thus the Thompsonian, and its successor, the so-called Eclectic School, are based upon the use of vegetable remedies, especially of the indigenous kind, and upon opposition to the use of mineral remedies, especially mercury. The Thompsonian school flourished for a time upon this strict basis. But now the Eclectics are coming back to the regular methods—using all our mineral remedies, even mercury, as they may judge occasion requires. Their doses and mixtures are not very different from their principles of practice are almost identical with those of the regular school. They quote all our leading authorities, and many of our standard works and our periodicals, for their knowledge of Anatomy, Physiology, Surgery, Pathology,

Obstetrics, and nine-tenths of their Materia Medica and Therapeutics; and what new remedies they have discovered (and for discoveries in the use of various American indigenous remedies they are entitled to credit), are being added to our common stock. The time is not distant when they will abandon their special notions, and will be merged in the regular profession which they are approaching.

The Hydropathists simply use cold water to the exclusion of everything else—a remedy which has always been a standard article in the regular profession. The same is true with regard to the "Movement Cure," Electropathy, Inhalation Cure, etc.

And this we have seen to be the case with Homœopathy. Embracing an idea always fanciful, but held from time immemorial, it has exaggerated it into a universal law—connecting with it a "bundle of ideas," growing out of the exaggeration these ideas are being rejected one by one—the exaggeration is losing its natural proportions, and all will in time return to the "*Statu quo ante bellum*,"—before the present war which this system has inaugurated against regular medicine.

While, however, the war upon legitimate medicine is profitable, it will continue. While there is a demand for this kind of practice there will be a supply; and our only hope of victory over the enemy—for enemies to true science we are obliged to consider the members of this Homœopathic fraternity—is in exposing their doctrines and practice to the public, and destroying the demand by a proper enlightenment of the people. The object of this discussion is to aid in this work.

We have now presented and reviewed all the chief and essential original doctrines of Homœopathy. We will readily call to mind that we have found them to consist of: 1st, The principle of *similia similibus curantur*, as a universal law. 2d, The prescribing of medicines for symptoms alone. 3d, Infinitesimal doses. 4th, Potentization—the development of new power by trituration and shaking. 5th, The special mode of preparation by trituration with Sugar of Milk, and by shaking with alcohol or alcohol and water, the dilutions on the centesimal scale. 6th, The prescribing of single, simple medicines at a time. 7th, The method of provings. 8th, The mode of

administration by placing the medicines upon the tongue, and by olfaction or smelling. 9th, The Psora or Itch doctrine; and some others of minor importance.

In the review we have seen that none of these doctrines will stand the test of critical examination; and each of them is repudiated by leading Homœopathic authors themselves, while all of them are generally ignored in the daily practice of their professed adherents.

What then, may naturally be inquired, is left of this system? As a system of medical doctrines, if not already extinct, it seems rapidly tending to dissolution. There is, however, a sect and an organization existing, constantly in the field, pretending to an improved method of practice, opposing with vigor the physicians of the Regular School, yet seeking on occasions to obtrude themselves into association with them; and without stating to the public their distinctive doctrines—generally concealing, if not denying, their infinitesimal absurdities—they are constantly pushing their claims to recognition, and appealing to that public for patronage and support, availing themselves of the ignorance prevailing on these subjects, and of the existing prejudices which they use every means to increase.

All deal in sugar pellets and tasteless solutions—sufficient at least to keep up appearances—but most of them use larger doses on what they would call Allopathic principles, according to their knowledge or presumption; and as a rule attribute every recovery which occurs in their practice, whether from the powers of Nature, or the effects of so-called Allopathic treatment, to the Homœopathic remedies.

Speaking, as it seems to me, without prejudiee, and certainly without passion, and with an earnest desire to present the exact truth—to say nothing which will be found to be otherwise—this is what I fully believe to be the present Homœopathy which surrounds us; and I appeal to the judgment of the candid reader whether this conclusion is not justified—is not, indeed, forced upon us by the examination in which we have been engaged.

X.

There remains but one thing farther to be considered, and it is the one which carries more influence with the public than everything else, and that is the claim of experience and success. It should, however, be remembered that all medical doctrines, however absurd, and all systems of practice, however useless or destructive, have claimed to be sustained by experience.

Tne testimony of the experience of the most reliable witnesses induced tbe British Parliament to pay a sum of money to Perkins for the communication of the secret of his useless Tractors; and all the nostrums of the present and the past are accompanied with testimony to their wonderful effects.

The evidence that is required to prove or disprove any proposition in medicine is of a peculiar kind. Says Dr. Moore: "It differs entirely from that species of proof which satisfies a court of law." The declarations or oaths of the most conscientious and able men are insufficient to establish or even render probable, in very many cases, the fact of a cure having been effected by a supposed remedy. "The reason of this is, that few men, even those of considerable capacity, distinguish between opinion and fact," especially in reference to medical subjects.

When a man or woman asserts that he or she has been cured of a particular disease by a drug, the impression is a confident one that a single *fact* is stated; whereas, *two opinions* are declared, both of which may be entirely erroneous. The first opinion is that the patient *had* the disease, and the second is that the medicine removed it. These opinions are made up, partly from the person's own sensations and previous information, and partly from the declarations of those around him. It is well known that sensations are deceptive, and their testimony imperfect; previous information may be meagre and inaccurate, and the statements of attendants may be erroneous or false.

A patient recovered from an illness, during which he has received attention and kindness, is induced by gratitude and all his better feelings to attribute his recovery to the means used, whether they are really efficient or not. He is thus easily prevailed upon to state strongly, or even swear positively to, the existence of a particular disease and the curative efficiency of the remedy employed; whereas, the truth may be that the disease he thought himself affected with never existed, and the medicine had nothing to do with his recovery. Indeed, he may have had the disease, and may still retain it—the cure not having been effected at all. Thus we have sworn statements, doubtless sincerely made, of cures of cancers and other diseases incurable, as well as of disorders which have disappeared of themselves—by their own self-limitation.

Dr. Moore says that in Europe, "clergymen, judges and peers are daily swearing that they have been cured of incurable diseases; but the meanest apothecary smiles with contempt when he reads their splendid testimonials." Whether the remedy be Bishop Berkley's Tar-water, Dr. Morrison's Pills, Mr. Perkins' Metallic Tractors, Priessnitz's Cold Water, Swain's Panacea, or old Dr. Jacob Townsend's Sarsaparilla, sworn certificates to any extent have always been obtainable from the most respectable sources. Illustrations of the fallacies of this kind of *experience*, even in scientific hands, might be adduced to any extent.

The late Prof. Chomel, of Paris, makes a statement as evidence of the care necessary in drawing conclusions, which I may be allowed to quote: "The common holly having been much praised as a remedy for ague, he determined to test it in the Hospital La Charité. * * Twenty-two cases of the disease were directed to him. After their admission he purposely abstained from all treatment for several days, in order to see that they were well marked cases. He found that of the twenty-two, *seven* never had another paroxysm, *four* had paroxysms of decreasing intensity, *eight* had nothing but symptomatic paroxysms, connected with slight inflammation of the mucous membranes, which yielded to simple antiphlogistic

treatment; *three* only were fit subjects for experiments, *i. e.*, had essential intermittent fever, preserving all its intensity for three or four paroxysms. The remedy (holly) was given to these, but entirely failed in all of them. Quinine was then given in the ordinary way, and the paroxysms were immediately stopped. If, from the day of admission, the remedy had been given to the whole, the conclusion would have been that it had cured 19 out of 22; and the three cases, the only ones proper to test the remedy, would have been regarded as exceptional."—*London Lancet*, 1841–2, p. 107.

The fallacious character of homœopathic experience, so often contradictory and absurd, we have observed as we passed over our subject.

In estimating the value of all experience in medicine, under whatever system, it must be remembered that a large proportion of sick persons as commonly met with in practice, would recover without medicine, under ordinary nursing and the direction of some one in whom they had confidence. It should also be remembered, when comparing the success of any plan or nostrum with orthodox medicine, that the efficacy of much of the latter, even when used *secundum artem*, is at least doubtful; and if unskillfully used, becomes positively hurtful. We must also take into the account the mistakes that are made in diagnosis; the uncertainties, in the most skillful hands, arising from differences of constitution and other peculiarities which cannot be anticipated, and the imperfections in the judgment of even well trained medical men. In accounting for popular judgment, we must remember that the people generally attribute all recoveries to the medicines used with that object; and in accounting for that judgment when applied to homœopathic treatment, we must consider the greatly exaggerated reports of favorable results; and the persistent reiterations of unscrupulous men and their enthusiastic adherents. When all these things are considered, we need not be surprised at the deceptions of experience, even when the homœopathic practice is adhered to; and where, as is often the case—I might perhaps say, constantly the case—it is abandoned, and efficient means are used in cases requiring active interference, the general evi-

dence of homœopathic experience becomes positively and entirely worthless.

But I must not deal in these general statements without illustrations and evidence. Two homœopathic physicians in Cincinnati reported that in 1849 they treated 1116 cases of genuine cholera, with a loss of only 35—5½ per cent.; and this statement has been the standing formula of the success of Homœopathy in articles, reports, addresses, etc., of the adherents of this school in this country ever since.

In the *British Journal of Homœopathy*, (vol. 15, p. 120) an account is given of the statement of a Dr. Stens, that the mortality of homœopathic treatment of cholera is only 8½ per cent., but the editor says: "We should rejoice very much were this the case; but alas! we know from sad experience that it is at least three times as high as here stated.

Dr. Gerstel reported (see vol. 13, p. 329) to an Austrian Medical Society that he had treated 300 severe cases of cholera with a loss of about 10 per cent.; but when an offer was made to him to practice under the control of the District Superintendent, Dr. Nushard, in order to establish the proofs of the success of such treatment, it was *declined*.

In the *British Journal of Homœopathy*, (vol. 7, p. 179,) Dr. Russell, one of its editors, says: "We cannot help deprecating the boastful tone we *so often* hear assumed by Homœopathists on this subject—the treatment of Cholera." "It would argue a singular callousness of feeling not to be penetrated with a profound sense of the comparative impotence of our art in arresting or even greatly modifying this terrible plague."

Dr. Tessier, of Paris, in charge of an excellent Hospital, St. Marguerite, admits a loss of forty-eight or forty-nine per cent.—(*Brit. Jour. Hom.* vol. 9, p, 693.) He was after transferred to another hospital, Beaujou, where the mortality was still greater. (Vol. 12, p. 698.)

Dr. Fleischman, of Vienna, has had the largest hospital experience of the homœopathic treatment of Cholera. He

says: "Every remedy which has been recommended has been tried and tried again by us, but I have little to say in praise of any of them."—*Brit. Jour. Homœopathy*, vol. 14, p. 27.)

Dr. Churze, of Marseilles, Homœopathist, reported so favorably of his success in the treatment of Cholera, in general practice, in 1846, that he received the order of the Legion of Honor, and an honor from the Pope. "In 1854 he was applied to by the Mayor of Marseilles, to take charge of two Cholera wards in the Hotel Dieu. Patients were to be sent on alternate days to the Homœopathic and "Allopathic" wards. Dr. Churze resigned his trust after three reception days. During those three days 26 patients were received and 21 died."—*Brit. Jour. Hom.* vol. 15, p. 173.) It is true Dr. C. complained of having the worst cases sent to him. This was denied, but the facts as to the mortality are not disputed.

Thus do these extraordinary claims of success when properly tested come to naught.

Belladonna in homœopathic doses has been greatly vaunted as a specific in Scarlatina, the most wonderful success being among the standing references; but the highest homœopathic authorities now admit its total inefficiency in the severe forms of the disease.

The celebrated Andral of Paris, years since, when Homœopathy was urging its claims, admitted some of the most celebrated of the School into his wards to try the efficiency of their treatment, and after a fair trial he reported to the Academy of Medicine that in no one case had he witnessed the slightest beneficial effect from the infinitesimals used.

The Russian Government is reported to have had this system of treatment under trial for some time past, and as the result of the investigation, the practice has been prohibited. I have not been able to obtain a full and authentic account of the particulars, but newspaper reports are to this effect.

But the inquiry may still be made, how a system so destitute ot merit should have had so much success in its spread among the people? But is a success, in this sense, a proof of merit or truth? Mohammedanism is a success, spreading over

the primitive seat of Christianity. Mormonism is a success; and unless the strong arm of the American Government is put forth in time, it threatens the establishment of a *nation* within its bounds. Modern Spiritualism is a success; it numbers its adherents by millions. Thompsonianism, and its modification Eclecticism in medicine, is a success, numbering more adherents to-day in the country at large, than Homœopathy. Hydropathy is a success; sustaining more "cures" in the country than there are Homœopathic hospitals.

But after all, if numerical success be the test of truth it does not lie with Homœopathy. The system has urged its claims for the last eighty years or more, Hahnemann having announced his doctrine in the latter part of the last century; and since that time up to 1855, to which the last authentic statistics on the subject within my reach are brought, at least two generations of medical men had come on the stage; but in Great Britain and Ireland in a population of 30,000,000 with about 30,000 physicians, (one medical man to 1,000 population being the average in all civilized countries), there were only 206 Homœopaths. This would make one in 150; while the other 149 vehemently protest against its truthfulness.

In counting the homœopathic physicians in the "British and Foreign Homœopathic Directory and Record," for 1853 and 1855, there are put down for France, 78; for Spain, 86; for Italy, 30; for Austria, 65; for Russia, 93; for Saxony, 48. From the data before referred to, of one physician to each thousand people, it is concluded that upon the continent of Europe there was at that time but one Homœopathist in 500 medical practitioners. No great change has occurred there, in the proportion, since that time. Of late it has not increased.

It is computed that in Europe and America about 3,000 medical men are engaged as public teachers of the Science of Medicine, in regularly established Medical Schools. Of this number not more than thirteen had expressed opinions in any degree favorable to Homœopathy—only one in about 250—while the other 249 denounce it as the greatest

absurdity. In this country there are about fifty Medical Colleges of the Regular School employing between three and four hundred professors ; and of all this number, perhaps not one has ever expressed opinions in the least degree favorable to the Hahnemannic System. These certainly are enlightened men and must be regarded as sincere in their convictions. They are as well qualified as any other class of men to judge of the truth in such matters, and their judgment is that the whole thing is a complete absurdity.

So far as I have information, there is at present but one educational institution in Europe supported by Government, and but two in America, where Homœopathy is recognized by the appointment of professors of the system, or by establishing departments of instruction in it.

In the Hungarian University at Pesth, two professors of Homœopathy have been introduced into the Medical Faculty, and lectures are delivered upon Homœopathic Materia Medica and Practice; but it is reported that the students in attendance upon such lectures have not exceeded five or six, and often the lecturer has for an audience only his colleague and his two assistants; and the comparison of the doctrines of the two Schools in the same institution has been so disastrous to the Homœopathic system, that when a similar arrangement was proposed for the University of Vienna, it was opposed and defeated by the Homœopathists themselves.

In the United States, the Legislature of Michigan and the Regents of the State University have established a separate College of Homœopathy, but its workings have been so unsatisfactory that recently a large number of Homœopathic practitioners have petitioned the Legislature to disconnect it from the University and remove it to some other place; stating that all the best sentiment of the University and the place is opposed to it, and that it has already proved a failure, and can never succeed where it is. There are those, however, who approve of its location, and who are laboring to sustain it.

In the State University of Iowa a Professor or two of Homœopathy has been introduced, but the circumstance has not attracted much attention, and but little is known or heard

about it outside of the locality, and I have no knowledge of its success. It may, however, be safely inferred that any system of doctrines so inherently weak and absurd, and depending upon the ignorance of the people of its true character for its support, must suffer disaster when brought to the light, and when its teachings are exposed to intelligent observation, and to a comparison with those of rational medicine.

Of the comparative number of people who patronize Regular Medicine and Homœopathy, I have no statistics which will give me a proximate estimate, but we all know the preponderance is vastly iu favor of the Regular School. That it makes a great deal of noise, and prevails to a large extent in certain places and circles, it is true; but when the whole population is taken into account, its numbers are comparatively insignificant. The simile is familiar of the *cricket* in the meadow, making more noise than a whole herd of oxen quietly feeding or reposing upon its verdure. But should that herd be aroused, its power would be felt. That cricket might be silenced. At present its chirpings are very discordant, and are becoming more faint. Is it not time for the regular profession to examine this subject—to enlighten the people respecting it—showing them its utter absurdities and inconsistencies, and appealing to their good sense to resist its aggressions ?

We are often accused of not examining this subject, and of prejudice and intolerance in regard to it. That we do examine it, these pages may afford evidence. Our prejudices, if they may be so called, are certainly founded on rational convictions; but how is it possible to be tolerant of a system so utterly absurd, and of men who denounce with such bitterness the principles to which we adhere, and the fraternity of which we are members; and who in practice, repudiating their own pretended infallible dogmas, so often follow our methods, and use our measures ?

Whatever views may be entertained of their doctrines or practice as a system for the sick, all must see its necessary incompatibility with regular medicine. Every impulse of a legitimate professional pride, every sentiment of fraternal allegiance, every feeling of self-respect, and every principle of

honor, impel us to refuse professsional associations with such a system, and intimate professional and fraternal relations with such men. How far they should be met at all with a view of exposing their doctrine and practice to observation and comparison, is a question upon which we may well expect to find differences of opinion.

It is impossible, however, that ordinary professional consultations should result in harmony and concert of action, where the principles and methods of treatment are so markedly in opposition. The object of a medical consultation is to arrive at a method of treatment which shall benefit the patient. The supposed honest Homœopathist, carrying out the principles he professes, could not assent to the methods which the Regular Physician could alone approve of. If the Homœopathist should violate all his professions of adherence to his exclusive system, by assenting to treatment he believed to be injurious and wrong, he would prove himself unworthy of association with honorable men; and experience has shown that wherever such consultations have been attempted, the results have been discord and strife, or a lowering of professional dignity and standing.

In the language of Dr. Rau, one of their own highest authorities: "The principle of *Similia Similibus* is the barrier which separates the New from the Old School. It is impossible to combine these two schools; any such combination would constitute a most miserable abortion."

There are differences of opinion as to the course, in various respects, which it is best for the Regular Profession to pursue towards this system and its adherents. That which has usually been pursued, of passing it by as unworthy of attention, or of simply denouncing it and its adherents, without presenting the reasons for opposing it, and of refusing it, as far as possible, all opportunity of bringing its teachings and practice to the light of observation and the test of comparison, has resulted in its advancing pretentions, in its assuming a boldness of front which it could not have done had its real merits been fairly and more fully discussed before intelligent people, and had it been more fully compared with Regular Practice,

as in hospitals, where the deception and wrong conclusions could have been reduced to a minimum.

Common sense is not extinct, and would be applied to medicine as to other objects was there a proper basis of knowledge for it to rest upon. The Regular Profession should be prepared to supply that basis. While refusing Homœopathy the support of approval, as our convictions must compel us to do, there can be no more contamination in its proximity, or in attempts to deal with it remedially, than in the diseases and their management which we daily encounter; or than in the religious errors or moral evils which the clergy attempt to correct. Where there are honest differences of opinion, charity should be exercised; but persecution, even of error, absurdity, or deception, fails to accomplish its purpose.

If, in the foregoing pages, the subject has not been treated fairly, it has not been for the want of an honest effort to do so. If sufficient reasons have not been given for rejecting and opposing the system of Homœopathy as presented in the writings and practices of its representative men, then the writer is incapable of properly appreciating the quality of reason, the principles of logic, and the force of argument. In the treatment of the subject there has been felt neither bitterness nor passion, but there has been the expression of convictions most sincerely entertained; and whatever may be the wisdom of this effort, or whatever may be its effects upon the cause of truth, the statements which it contains have a basis upon which they will securely stand.

But whatever particular course of silence or argument toward this or any other irregular system of medicine may be thought wisest, there is one means of opposing all false systems and wrong practices, and of inspiring respect for legitimate medicine, in regard to which there can be no question. This consists in the members of the profession acquiring a thorough acquaintance with the domain of science, in their obtaining a mastery of professional knowledge, in maintaining a high sense of honor, a contempt for trickery and deception, and in showing an enthusiastic devotion to the sacred duties of the profession.

GEO. S. DAVIS, PUBLISHER, DETROIT