Homoeopathy in 1851 / edited by J. Rutherfurd Russell, M.D.

Contributors

Russell, John Rutherfurd, 1816-1866.
University of Glasgow. Library

Publication/Creation

Edinburgh, 1852.

Persistent URL

https://wellcomecollection.org/works/bkv4dy4k

Provider

University of Glasgow

License and attribution

This material has been provided by This material has been provided by The University of Glasgow Library. The original may be consulted at The University of Glasgow Library. where the originals may be consulted.
This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

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

wellcome collection

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

HOMŒOPATHY
IN
1851.

No. B65-h.11 1878.
GLASGOW
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY.
HAMILTON COLLECTION.

With the Editor's Compts.


Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016

https://archive.org/details/b24923060



Samuel Hahnemann.

HOMŒOPATHY

IN 1851.

EDITED BY

J. RUTHERFURD RUSSELL, M.D.

Published for the Association by
JAMES HOGG, 4 NICOLSON STREET, EDINBURGH,
AND
R. GROOMBRIDGE & SONS, 5 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON.

MDCCCLII.

EDINBURGH: PRINTED BY J. HOGG.

PREFACE.

When it was made known that a Student of Medicine had been refused the degree of Doctor at the University of Edinburgh, because he announced his intention of devoting himself to the study of Homœopathy, there was a general jubilee among the most determined opponents of the new system. At a meeting of "The Faculty," held at Brighton, the thanks of the body were unanimously tendered to the University which had so nobly set the example of crushing the pestilent heresy in the bud; and a writer in "Tait's Magazine," who speaks as counsel for Old Physic, significantly hints that at length the right step has been taken to prevent the increase of the new sect. But these notes of congratulation quickly died away, for no sooner was the public made aware of the fact, than there was a general feeling of indignation at this daring *coup d'état* in medicine, and a resolution to demonstrate to this upstart medical hierarchy, that it had mistaken the age and the country suitable for so sudden an exhibition of despotic power. To undo the wrong al-

ready perpetrated, and to prevent its repetition in future, an association was formed last autumn for the protection of Homœopathic students and practitioners. A threefold object lay before them—to obtain a degree for the injured student, to check the persecution in the University where it had begun, and to afford the public an opportunity of forming an opinion of the character of the whole affair.

To accomplish the first, a communication was made to the Homœopathic College of Pennsylvania, stating the nature of the case, and transmitting the testimonials of the student, showing the course of study he had successfully pursued. For it was maintained that the value of a university did not consist in the degrees it conferred or withheld, but in the instruction conveyed to its alumni; that the degree was merely a certificate that the *alumnus* had diligently employed the opportunities of acquiring knowledge there afforded; and, if any other degree-granting body could be satisfied of this, it would be perfectly entitled to confer its honours upon the adopted children of another not "*Alma* Mater." To effect this, it has been proposed by those who preside over the American College to appoint a commission in this country, to examine the student whose case gave rise to the application, and, in the event of the examination proving satisfactory, to waive the rule which requires personal attendance, and transmit across the Atlantic the rights of medicine refused to the ingenuous youth by his native and. The association has thus set the example of

the practical value of an Anglo-American alliance—the alliance of the public of the two great sister nations. It should be understood that this Pennsylvanian College has a large and well-appointed staff of teachers, and it must not be confounded with such an institution as the University of St Andrews, which grants degrees in medicine although there is but one medical teacher there. To show that it is a *bonâ fide* school of medicine, we shall extract the following statement from the last annual report:—

"A more full and complete course of instruction is given in this institution than is usual in other medical colleges. The endeavour will be made by the teachers to present the different objects of study in a manner to sustain attention; and this is the more easily accomplished, in consequence of the highly philosophical and comprehensive law of Homœopathy imparting a stimulus to more minute and scientific research. This deeper interest is elicited not only from witnessing the effects of minute doses of medicinal atoms upon the animal economy, but from the fact that many of the recent developments in various branches of science, reveal phenomena as the results of causes, either very attenuate or even inappreciable, excepting in their effects.

"The law of *simile* leading to a closer approximation of the causes of phenomena, and their more rigid observation, and thence to their more ready solution, infuses into the teachings of all the branches of medicine an extraordinary interest.

"The Professor of biology [*i. e.*, physiology] and pathology, therefore, will, in addition to a general description of healthy and diseased function, demonstrate the minute structure of organs and tissues, their peculiarities as exhibited in

health and in disease, and explain those differences of sensation which are expressive not only of the nature of the morbid action, but of the kind of structure affected; thereby obtaining the indications for the remedial measures to be adopted.

"From the chair of anatomy, instructions will be given both of a general and special nature—those parts will be particularly dwelt upon, an accurate knowledge of which is necessary for a successful surgical practice. When upon the distinctive characters of structure, for example, upon the tissues or cerebro-spinal system, opportunities will be afforded for remark upon phenomena connected with an abnormal condition of such parts, and their specific therapeutical indications.

"Throughout the course of lectures upon materia medica and therapeutics, there will be pointed out the relative value of medicinal symptoms, as well as such as are characteristic; likewise, those diagnostic qualities by which to select from numerous medicinal symptoms, apparently corresponding with those presented in disease, the properly adapted medicine. All the facts necessary to be known in the history of plants in their connection with medicinal properties, the parts used, the cautions to be observed, and the means to be employed in their preparation, will be fully explained. Similar instruction will be given in relation to the articles obtained from the animal and mineral kingdoms.

"It will be the duty of the chair of Homœopathic institutes and practice of medicine to expound the law of *similia similibus curantur;* to divest it of all hypothetical embarrassment, and present it in its simple, and, therefore, in its most forcible aspect as a great law of nature. To explain, also, the rules of its application; and, in further confirmation of its truth, show how it adapts itself to every modification of morbid action. The histories of disease will be succinctly given; but to their symptoms,

diagnosis, and prognosis, and especially to their treatment, the most minute directions will be bestowed.

"It will be the province of the clinical instructor to teach the proper mode of examining patients with a view to the most correct appreciation of their condition, and to designate the appropriate means of relief. An important part of these examinations, in a very great number of cases, is auscultation; the knowledge of which is indispensable to correct diagnosis, prognosis, and treatment. To this chair belongs likewise instructions in regimen, clothing, ventilation, and such other circumstances which not only aid nature in her restorative efforts, but are absolutely necessary to the favourable action of medicinal agents.

"The course of chemistry and toxicology will be full and complete. This branch of science, when studied specially as an aid to medical practice, is invested with additional interest to the Homœopathic student; in which relation much greater nicety and precision are required in the preparation of medicinal agents. The interest is likewise increased from the striking analogous facts which this science furnishes in support of the law of *similia*, in the minute division of atoms as detected by chemical tests, and in the wonderful phenomena effected by agents which are possessed of neither weight, volume, nor colour—viz., light, heat, and electricity.

"The teachings of the chair of surgery will be in accordance with the great reform which the Homœopathic principle has wrought in all other branches of medical science. By its influence, the field of medico-surgery is completely reformed and enlarged, and the surgeon is enabled to relieve, without resort to painful operations, many diseases which were formerly surrendered to the knife. But, as all operations performed may again be necessary, and as many of the subjects of accident or disease can be relieved only by surgical contrivances or operations, they will be taught in all their minutiæ by this chair. The most approved

methods of operating will be shown upon the subject, or illustrated by models, &c., and, when opportunity offers, on the patients before the class.

"The female sex is subject to many and varied ailments. Whilst the peculiarity of her organisation renders her more obnoxious to disease, it, for the same reason, causes a greater susceptibility to medicinal action. In no branch of medicine is the power of Homœopathy more frequently and strikingly witnessed than throughout the entire range of the diseases of females. The period of utero-gestation, which, under Allopathic management, may, with truth, be regarded as a pathological condition, under Homœopathic guidance, is what nature designed, a physiological process. In the diseases of the puerperal state, as well as those occurring during lactation, Homœopathy exhibits its incomparable superiority. Upon the instrumental part of obstetrics, the most minute instructions will be given. To the chair of midwifery belong, also, the diseases of children; to a consideration of the most serious of their complaints a portion of the course will be devoted.

"The remaining chair to be noticed is that of botany and medical jurisprudence. As a necessary adjuvant to materia medica, the necessity of a knowledge of the former of these subjects is obvious. A large portion of our remedial agents is obtained from the vegetable kingdom, and from the same source we expect to receive, hereafter, many important acquisitions. In addition to the regular winter course of lectures, a summer course, given by the botanical professor, affords students, in rambles over the country, a favourable opportunity to acquire a practical knowledge of this subject. To medical jurisprudence, in most colleges, little, if any, attention is given; and yet upon its possession may rest, not only the individual reputation of the physician for a proper knowledge of his profession, but upon the amount of such knowledge may depend also the reputation, property, or even lives of individuals, who,

whether innocent or guilty, are arraigned before the tribunals of justice. The vast importance of the law of simile in times long past, had it been known, would afford, were this the proper occasion, a curious as well as interesting subject for consideration."

From an institution so organised and conducted, and recognised by the state, it can be no dishonour to hold a diploma; and, be it remembered, the only real value of any diploma, even an Edinburgh one, is the social status it confers, and the assurance it conveys to the public that the holder of it has enjoyed the advantages of an academic education. Beyond that, its privileges are too insignificant to be enumerated.

So much for the first object. To attain the second —to recall the University to its duty as a *university*, and not a mere Medical Maynooth—it was resolved to petition the Town Council, as representing the public and enjoying privileges within the University, to require of that venerable body to disclaim the intention of enforcing upon aspiring graduates so unreasonable a test as an abjuration of Homœopathy—its practice or its study—during their whole life. The terms of the petition, with an account of its signatures and the reception it met with by the Town Council, will be found at the end of this volume. Whether the Senatus have given a specific reply or not, is not yet known; if they do not, then, of course, there will remain for the student the option of the American degree, until a better system can be organised in this country.

The last remaining object of the association—to

supply materials to the public for forming its own opinion—has been attempted in this volume, where will be found the greater number of the articles, of a controversial character, which have appeared for some time back up to the beginning of the present year. The Press, so far as it has spoken, has been quite unanimous in condemning the conduct both of the College of Physicians and of the University; and the agitation of the question has raised Homœopathy into "a topic of the day." Under this title, a very temperate and able article appeared in the last number of the "Eclectic Review," which contains so much sound reflection, that we gladly avail ourselves of some extracts from it, with which to conclude our prefatory remarks.

"'A topic of the day,' the title might belong to any one of many different subjects:—emigration, or papal supremacy; mesmerism, or the health of towns bill; the condition of the working classes, or the results, social and political, of the recent gathering of all nations. But on no one of these do we mean to encroach in the present article; what we propose is, to offer a few remarks on Homœopathy, viewed in those aspects which may interest the general reader. Beyond such limits, as our title implies, we shall not pass. To do so would be out of place in our pages, where a medical disquisition would hardly be looked for. On Homœopathy, then, we will make some general observations; Homœopathy, that word of varied acceptance in different quarters; in some, standing for a deep and dangerous imposture; in others, merely for shallow quackery, of a mild and painfully feeble description. Some view its progress as betokening a satisfactory revolution in medical practice; others, as a revolution indeed, but such only as

might belong to Chaos come again. What one party hails as the day-star of a new and better era, another regards as the cloud no bigger than a man's hand, which, if not speedily dispersed, will expand until the sun of medical truth is veiled irremediably from our unworthy eyes. With how many more is this question, so extensive in its bearings, so important as to its truth or falsity—in reality nothing more than 'a topic of the day.' To a large, and we believe a gradually augmenting class, the contradictory theories circulating among us induce a total loss of confidence in all medical systems whatsoever. A spirit of inquiry on most subjects is abroad. Whether the intellectual habits and mental training of the masses be such as to qualify them for its successful direction, may be a question, but one we are not called to enter upon here. Suffice it that we notice its practical results. A state of uncertainty is so painful to the human mind, that men will often seek refuge in a stony scepticism from the pressure of questions whose pertinacious adhesion disturbs and disquiets them. And as such disquiet must be in proportion to the magnitude of the question agitated, it need not surprise us that it is precisely on all the most important of these that disbelief finds exercise. The ordinary results of such defeated inquiry are—internally, scepticism; externally, inaction. We think that man must be either above or below the common standard who escapes these consequences. Some one has said that 'a misanthrope is only an honest man who has been a bad seeker;' he is misanthropical, not because he has gone too far, but because he has not gone far enough. A parallel observation might be made on most important subjects of inquiry; but, though we have had unsuccessful searchers in plenty, and honest men, we maintain, not a few, how small a portion, even of these honest, will acknowledge that they have indeed been bad seekers. Such a recognition appears to belong to the intellect; and many will feel that they have failed, for one who sees that

the cause of error has been in himself. It is worthy of notice how often we find the results we have alluded to—scepticism and inaction—in those characters where the moral nature is *proportionally* higher than the intellectual capacity. It would seem as if the felt needs of the former were greater than the ability of the latter to meet them. We are sensible that this is not in accordance with the common opinion, which inclines to look on disbelief in *any* generally-received doctrine as proof of active intellectual power; and, however unreasonably, of defective moral feeling; but, while we are far from intending to generalise on the statement, we believe it is one that would repay investigation. The inquiry would be interesting, but unsuited to our limits, and we must pass on; only protesting against being suspected for one moment of favouring that pernicious tendency common in our day, which would place the intellectual above the moral. Our belief is simply that they act favourably the one on the other; that both may be cultivated together; and that each loses by separation. The truth seems to be, that a high intellectual development is the best medium through which a high 'moral' can be correctly seen and shown. Other media mislead. The sun is *the* thing; but we only benefit by it *viâ* the atmosphere."

After putting in a just plea to respect and consideration in behalf of the medical profession at large, with their lifelong conviction, it proceeds:—

"On the other side, no accusation of affectation, or would-be notoriety, can affect our judgment of those who, often at personal sacrifice, are led to embrace and practise Homœopathy. Their convictions may be erroneous, but, having such convictions, how could their conduct be other than it is? What rational ground is there for imagining that they do not act on conviction? If we must again

refer to those narrow personal interests which some persons,

'With that half wisdom half experience lends,'*

are ever seeking out as the hidden mainspring in any unusual course of conduct, we can only say, that, even granting some might be so influenced, here as elsewhere, it would be difficult, with any plausibility, to lay such to the charge of Homœopathists as a body. If they professed to hold some important uncommunicated discovery, some secret by which disease should be cured, the mystery might attract, and the monopoly might profit. But where we find outward appliances few, simple, and unattractive, no mixed compounds (not even a hieroglyphic prescription), and means explained, investigation courted, hospital and other professional data thrown open, we are driven to the conviction that if these men be, what they are so often and so vulgarly called, quacks,' they have their trade yet to learn. We feel it almost a disgrace to pen any notice of such language; how much more disgraceful is it that prejudice can have gone so far as to leave any opening for such comments, which unfortunately are only too well called for. If Homœopathists are either deceiving or deceived, they are sacrificing their professional prospects to a present of reproach and ridicule, with a future of unlimited contempt. One point seems overlooked: if we grant, for the sake of argument, that Homœopathy is a truth, what other or better course could its advocates have followed than that they have adopted? or, if it be even a possible truth, how else could its claims be satisfactorily adjusted? or, supposing it an error, what shorter way to explode it, than exposing it to the test of experience? In all this we owe them thanks, yet they too have something to guard against; for they are exposed to the temptation

* Wordsworth.

of being drawn as far from the truth by the charm of novelty, as their opponents by the charm of habit.

"Something of mutual concession would be no bar to the progress of science, while it would further those higher interests—the development of liberality and liberty, candour and equity—in comparison with which, or deprived of which, even the advancement of science is a poor thing. Why may there not be an honourable rivalry, stimulative to both parties, beneficial to the public, and favourable to the elucidation of truth? Why do we still see in some quarters something very like a determination, not only that Homœopathy has not been proved a truth, but, moreover, that it *shall not* be proved such? Why should some parties oppose inquiries which, on their own statement, could only demonstrate the infallibility of their own positions. It is curious that intolerance and impatience of opposition are often found precisely in an inverse ratio to the amount of conviction. It would seem as if the mind sought to convince and establish itself by means of the very vehemence and stringency of assertion employed towards others. But why may not 'truth, substance of the world,'* be trusted in virtue of its own immutability to survive any amount of investigation?

"However, amid the prejudices which may affect all parties, we readily attribute to the profession, as a body, a sincere desire for the establishment of the truth, and that result is best promoted by free inquiry and open discussion. The present subject has already excited great attention in our own and other countries, and certainly is one that cannot be summarily suppressed. In Prussia, and other of the German states, in France, Belgium, Italy, and the United States, Homœopathy has many proselytes—is, in short, a 'recognised' agency, and the footing it has gained would of itself, without other claims, entitle it to notice

---

* Schiller.

and inquiry. Let us now look a little more closely into the matter." * * * * *

"Having stated the leading characteristics of Homœopathy, we may as well notice some of the objections most frequently brought against it. In this we can hardly offer much novelty. Every philosophic objection can have but its one philosophic answer; where such are produceable, Homœopathists have not been backward to produce them. To us there appear difficulties yet to be solved; but, on the other hand, there are some objections so carelessly made, so frequently brought forward, and so uncandidly persisted in, that we cannot pass them over in silence, though on other grounds they would hardly deserve much notice.

"One grave error in the attacks on Homœopathy is that of treating the infinitesimal doses as the essential characteristic of the system

"Now this is not the case. We know that every greater revolution brings in its train numerous lesser ones, which to many become the most important part of it, and are substituted for the primary aim and true essentials. For example, the object of the Reformation was not the destruction of images, but to a large party in this country that became the chief pursuit, and the name of iconoclast equivalent to that of reformer. Again, religion inculcates temperance, but temperance societies do not constitute religion. Temperance is Christian, but it is not Christianity. Such illustrations abound, and always will, for there is a certain class of minds apparently unable to discriminate between essentials and non-essentials. They have no sense of proportion, no perception of perspective: the great and the little, the far and the near, are all one to them; such minds are like the paintings on Chinese screens, where the man is as big as the house he is entering, and an obtrusive butterfly, in a supposed background, bigger than either.

"In the present case, what are the facts? The assertion is so far from the truth, that it appears Hahnemann had formed his theory for a length of time on his primary principles (already stated), ere he considered this reformation as to amount of dose necessary; and even now great differences exist among his disciples as to the strength of the doses to be employed. In Germany, Homœopathic medicines are oftener given in larger quantities, that is, in appreciable doses; it is said, with less successful results than among ourselves; but as to this we are not prepared with any definite statement; nor is such in any degree requisite to our point, which is merely, as we have stated, that the infinitesimal dose is no necessary constituent of Homœopathy.

"This has been stated repeatedly, but apparently to little purpose; nor do we expect to be more fortunate than our predecessors, for the popular mis-statement affords shelter to a whole colony of jokelets, which must be all ceded, if the simple truth and justice of the assertion are to be attended to. A sacrifice like this we are not so unreasonable as to expect; and, as such a treatment of such a subject can injure none but the perpetrators, we need not be very severe on this point; only, speaking æsthetically, a little novelty of attack would now be a great relief. * *

"Another objection, or rather opposition, raised is, that the cures of Homœopathy are effected through the imagination; and people go on talking of belief and unbelief, 'faith' and 'want of faith,' as if they spoke of some mysterious abracadabra, some mystic incantation, which could only take effect upon the faithful. As to this imagination hypothesis, it must surely have been a lively one which originated it. Anything more unpretendingly simple never was propounded in medicine. What the imagination can find to feed on in Homœopathic globules, rather than in the potent pill-boxes and many-coloured draughts of Allopathy, we confess ourselves unable to discover. But it is

something that the cures are admitted, and only the means questioned; while such a suggestion from the administrators of 'those precious simples,' laudanum and calomel, comes strangely. If imagination can cure disease, by all means let her work, and give her all the credit, but *don't* give her the calomel, for you see she does not need it. If globules or bread pills suffice, anything more becomes superfluous cruelty.

"At any rate, there is one class of patients who cannot well be supposed to be victimised by the freaks and vagaries of the imagination—that of young children, in the treatment of whom Homœopathists have always laid claim to signal success. Let this be looked into. If correct, there is at once a moral gain in the absence of irritation and annoyance, and consequent habits of peevishness, which we too often see superinduced in them under severe medical treatment.

"But in fact we suspect imagination has favoured Allopathic practice far more than the Homœopathic may venture to expect. Many people like the formalities and etiquettes of invalidism, its fuss, and sympathy, and importance; and if they do not positively enjoy their miseries, they do most indubitably like something of excitement and outward appliance in getting out of them. We once heard an invalid lady gravely founding her distrust of the efficacy of Homœopathy on the absence of all suffering. 'Why, said she, with the manner of one stating an unanswerable argument, 'I never should know I was really cured in that way.' We ventured with becoming diffidence to suggest, that a fact of that kind might be allowed to speak for itself. 'No, no,' said she, with an air of logical acuteness, 'there is no *satisfaction* in that sort of thing.'

"We agree with her, that there is to the many so little satisfaction in 'that sort of thing,' that it is not calculated to attract. It is certain, that be Homœopathy true or be

it false, it would be far more rapid in progress, find a far readier and more general acceptance, if it dealt more in tangibilities. Something refreshingly nauseous, re-assuringly unpalatable, would find more favour, absurd as the assertion may appear; for to many, in medicine as in morals, good is not good until it has been duly absinthiated. It is somewhat to the credit of Homœopathists, that they have so strictly abstained from playing into the popular weakness. To communicate something of colour, taste, and substance to their medicines would be the easiest thing in the world—but what then?

> 'And why should witless man so much mis-ween
> That nothing is but that which he hath *seen*?'*

"Glasses of what looks like pure water, and tiny boxes of fractional globules, may seem weak agents, but if the retreat of a malady is effected, and its return prevented, then the absence of a more marked agency need not act more unfavourably on our serenity than the fact that we do not see the grass grow nor hear the snow fall. The effects may be gradual, and thus less striking; but they are so far in accordance with those of nature, which does not generally work by convulsions. All her more usual and most beneficent operations are silent, gradual, and progressive. To the same class of objectors or demurrers belong those who would refer the cures of Homœopathy to superior attention to minor rules, simplicity of diet, &c. If this be so, why was it not sooner found out and acted upon? How thankful we may be for the innovation; but if diet can cure disease, what becomes of Allopathy?

"After all, let success be the test. To use the words of a German writer, though in a sense which he certainly never contemplated, 'Everything through which we are *bettered* is true.' Whether this test would prove favourable to Homœopathy we cannot decide, nor are we solicitous to

---

* Spenser.

do so in this place. We have only entered on the subject as one belonging to our day, and which calls for investigation. We have no favour to one party more than the other, and have wished to show none, unless something of a desire to befriend the oppressed, *as* 'oppressed,' rather than the oppressor *as* 'oppressor,' should be so construed. We have sincerely desired to keep simply to the truth, and all we wish is the examination of the subject by competent inquirers. In objective science there is not the same ground, or shadow of a ground, for opposing inquiry, which some minds find for disliking its incursions into the regions of speculative philosophy. In science, inquiry and error must ever act antagonistically—one will and must extinguish the other. Errors in science, in their very nature, have a limited life. By allowing their free development, we secure their removal; by suppressing it, we prolong their existence, and cherish a vital energy which their natural growth would never have supplied. Let Homœopathy be investigated in a spirit and manner suited to the subject. It may be a mixture of truth and error; if so, let us accept the good without caring whence it comes, and reject the evil in the same way; or it may be a great truth, in which case let us have it by all means. Or, finally, it may be altogether erroneous; if so, in the name of common sense, let that be made clear, and the whole concern swept into nonentity, to leave the path clear for something better."

To which we say Amen.

J. R. R.

Since this was sent to press, the Indian mail has brought the following important intelligence, contained in the "Friend of India," of November 27, 1851,

showing that the little flame kindled in Leipsic fifty years ago, has now its responding beacon-lights in all the quarters of the globe:—

"We have the pleasure of publishing the prospectus of a Homœopathic Hospital about to be established in Calcutta, under the patronage of Sir John Littler, and the superintendence of Dr Tonnerre; and, at the risk of being considered heretical, beg to recommend it to the earnest attention of the community. We had occasion some months ago to notice the erection of a Homœopathic Hospital in London, from the subscriptions of those noblemen and gentlemen who had experienced the benefit of the system, and were anxious to see it extended to others, and it is fitting that we should have a corresponding institution in Calcutta. We have no professional knowledge of either Homœopathy or Allopathy, and are as unable to explain the principles of the former, as the blind man mentioned in Scripture was unable to explain to the unbelieving Pharisees *how* He opened his eyes; but, as the object of His benevolence replied, 'this one thing I know, that whereas I was blind, now I see,' so do we ground our recommendation on the successful results which we have ourselves witnessed of this mode of treatment. Even if we were to follow the usual rule, and believe only half we see, we should have sufficient evidence of its efficacy, in almost all the cases to which it has been applied within our knowledge; and, as a natural consequence, we do not believe one tithe of what we hear against it. It is not pretended that Homœopathy will cure all diseases in all stages, and thus bestow the gift of immortality on the human family; it is enough that its simple process has been triumphantly efficacious in the removal of many diseases, when they had been previously pronounced all but incurable, to establish the necessity of a close and fair investigation of its merits and its results. We are fully aware that it has encountered

the severest opposition from those who have been accustomed to the Allopathic system throughout their professional career; and, so far as this opposition can be attributed to a firm and conscientious adherence to what they consider the soundest principles of medical science, it is entitled to respect. But it is quite possible to carry this feeling so far that it degenerates into a strong personal attachment to preconceived opinions, and an unwillingness to acknowledge that they were not altogether correct. Bigotry is not confined to religious opinions. There may be medical bigotry—perhaps we may dignify it with the name of incredulity—as there is also legal bigotry. But we cannot but consider it the bounden duty of every medical practitioner who demands the confidence of his patients, to prove his title to it by a calm and unbiassed investigation of the merits, and, above all, the results of a medical system, different from his own, which is stated on unquestionable evidence to have been efficacious in relieving pain and removing disease. The science of medicine has been progressive in Europe for three centuries, and it is only through investigation, observation, and experience that it has attained its present eminence;—there may be other modes of cure than those which are dreamt of in the present philosophy of the profession, equally, if not more efficacious, and it behoves those who are intrusted with the health and lives of their fellow-creatures to use the utmost diligence in ascertaining whether the Homœopathic system of treatment may not come within this category. Homœopathy has of late made considerable progress in the confidence of the public in Calcutta; but it is worthy of especial remark that there is not a single case in which those who are its advocates have not been converted to it through a conviction of its efficacy, by a personal experience of its happy effects, either on themselves or their friends. To decry it without examination, would be to act in the *spirit* of those who sent Galileo to the dungeons of the Inquisition for as-

serting that which at the time appeared to be an astronomical paradox. We trust Dr Tonnerre will meet with such encouragement as to be able fully to establish the hospital; that the mode of treatment pursued by him and its results will be impartially studied by the members of the faculty; and that the blessings it has conferred on our own friends and relatives may be extended to others."

CONTENTS.

Page

Letter to John Forbes, M.D., F.R.S., on his Article entitled "Homœopathy, Allopathy, and Young Physic," contained in the "British and Foreign Medical Review." By William Henderson, M.D., Professor of Pathology in the University of Edinburgh 1

On the Observation of Nature in the Treatment of Disease. By Andrew Combe, M.D., Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh, one of the Physicians in Ordinary, in Scotland, to the Queen, &c. &c. 83

Homœopathy *viâ* Young Physic. Ry J. Rutherfurd Russell, M.D. 125

Medical Toogoodism and Homœopathy 144

The Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh and Homœopathy 176

Our College of Physicians 191

The New Test Act 196

Dr Ransford's Reasons for Embracing Homœopathy . 244

Fulminations Against Homœopathy 261

Homœopathy and Allopathy 265

The Royal College of Physicians and the Homœopathists 270

The Brighton Protest Analysed 285

A Letter addressed to Dr Rose Cormack. By the Rev. Thomas R. Everest, rector of Wickwar 294

Page

The East *versus* the West 317

Proposed Inaugural Address for 1852, to be delivered to the Medical Graduates of the University of Edinburgh by the Professor of Materia Medica Pura 321

Trial and Confessions of Professors Syme, Christison, and Simpson 343

Dr Russell's Address at the Second Congress of Homœopathic Practitioners. Held at London on the 23d and 24th July, 1851 371

A Trip to Leipsic.—The Hahnemann Jubilee. . . 384

Proceedings of the Town Council of Edinburgh in Reference to Homœopathy 398

Appendix—Names of the Members of the Association . 408

LETTER

TO

JOHN FORBES, M.D., F.R.S.,

On his Article entitled "Homœopathy, Allopathy, and Young Physic,' contained in the "British and Foreign Medical Review."

BY

WILLIAM HENDERSON, M.D.,

Professor of Pathology in the University of Edinburgh.*

Sir,—It is not the irritability of an author subjected to a rigorous criticism that prompts me to address to you the following remarks on your late review of Homœopathy, for I can say with sincerity that you have given me, personally, scarcely any ground for complaint. Indeed, both as an author and an adherent of the system which you have reviewed, I can justly pay you the compliment of stating that you are the first public opponent of Homœopathy in this country who has treated it with the courtesy of a gentleman, and the candour, if not of an unbiassed unbeliever, at least of one who does not recklessly assert what is untrue.

Nor is it solely on account of the importance of the omissions and mistakes you have made that I address you at present. Far greater than any you are chargeable with, and deliberate misrepresentations to boot, have been committed by some of your contemporaries, which the feebleness of their influence either for good or bad has rendered unworthy of notice. It is, however, otherwise with you, and the pro-

---

* This letter was first published in the "British Journal of Homœopathy," in April, 1846.

ductions of your pen; and though I might, with little anxiety for the result, leave your article on Homœopathy to do the important work for which it is in many respects so well suited, without any comments of mine, it has occurred to me that the inaccuracies and defects to which I have referred may, under the sanction of your name, have more influence with many than they deserve to have, and may thereby retard the progress of an inquiry in which the profession and the public are very seriously concerned. I gladly avail myself, therefore, of the apology for my interference which is afforded by the circumstance of my having a place in your review, in order to supply some of the omissions, and correct the principal mistakes of that article.

Though I give you full credit for having undertaken and prosecuted your examination of the subject with a desire to act fairly by it, I am far from admitting that you have succeeded in your object. While there is much in your paper that is just, and a little that will be regarded as even liberal, there is a great deal that is the reverse of both. Some of what comes under this latter designation is, no doubt, the result of imperfect information—of views which, as you acknowledge, have been "suddenly and prematurely" forced from you. A large account, however, remains that cannot be regarded in this light, but which affords some curious illustrations of the psychological infirmity that often leads men to exhibit doctrines which they dislike to as much disadvantage as they can, without absolutely affirming what they know to be untrue.

To this infirmity I must ascribe the suppressing of explanations that might lessen or remove an objection; the ready admission of whatever appears likely to tell against your opponents; the prompt repudiation of everything like a presumption in their favour; and the recourse to denials or affirmations regarding points on which you are not entitled, by your actual knowledge, to offer an opinion.

Added to all this, there are so many misrepresentations of facts and doctrines (so plainly stated by Homœopathic writers, that it is difficult to conceive how they can be misunderstood), that it will be scarcely surprising should many, who do not know you personally, doubt the possibility of their being unintentional.

It is easy to perceive that you started on your inquiry with your mind fully made up on the more important merits of the case; and the following are clearly the "views relating to the general subject which have long occupied" your thoughts. You have been long satisfied that the treatment of diseases, according to the old system, was, for the most part, radically bad,—with some exceptions, simply *powerless* as to the cure of diseases, and in many, if not in most, of these exceptions, worse than powerless, positively injurious; you were familiar, therefore, with the belief that the majority of the supposed *cures* of diseases, including acute inflammations and other dangerous maladies, under the old system, were due to the *power of nature* acting independently or even in spite of the treatment; you have heard not a little of the success of Homœopathy, and the difficulty of conceiving that the means you supposed it to employ could act in any way on the body, suggested an explanation of this success, which chimed in with your estimate of the power of nature. The riddle was thus easily solved. The recoveries under the old system are mostly due to nature, *ergo*, the recoveries under Homœopathy can be due to nothing more.

In order to guard myself from misrepresenting you, I shall quote your own words. The inferences you specify as the result of your deliberations are:—

"1. That in a large proportion of the cases treated by Allopathic physicians (that is, of the old school), the disease is cured by nature, and not by them.

"2. That in a lesser, but still not a small proportion, the disease is cured by nature, in spite of them; in other

words, their interference opposing, instead of assisting, the cure.

"3. That, consequently, in a considerable proportion of diseases, it would fare as well, or better, with patients, in the actual condition of the medical art, as more generally practised, if all remedies, at least all active remedies, especially drugs, were abandoned. * *

"Although Homœopathy has brought more signally into the common daylight this lamentable condition of medicine regarded as a practical art, it was one well known before to all philosophical and experienced physicians.

"It is, in truth, a fact of such magnitude—one so palpably evident, that it was impossible for any careful reader of the history of medicine, or any long observer of the processes of disease, not to be aware of it. What, indeed, is the history of medicine but a history of perpetual changes in the opinions and practice of its professors, respecting the very same subjects—the nature and treatment of diseases? And, amid all these changes, often extreme and directly opposed to one another, do we not find these very diseases, the subject of them, remaining (with some exceptions) still the same in their progress and general event? Sometimes, no doubt, we observe changes in the character and event, obviously depending on the change in the treatment, and, alas! as often for the worse as for the better; but it holds good, as a general rule, that, amid all the changes of the treatment, the proportion of cures and of deaths has remained nearly the same, or, at least, if it has varied, the variation has borne no fixed relation to the difference of treatment."—Pp. 257–8.

"The foregoing elucidations, it will not be doubted, disclose a lamentable state of things; but it is not a state to be despaired of, much less is it one to be concealed as something disgraceful. It is more our misfortune than our fault that it is as it is; but if it were our fault, still it ought to be made known. There, as in morals, the more sensibly

we feel our defects, the more openly and heartily we confess them, the more likely are we to get rid of them. As thus reflected in our critical mirror, the features of our ancient mother assuredly look somewhat unattractive. She seems neither happy nor prosperous—yea, she seems sick, very sick, yet not sick unto death. On the contrary, we believe that she is more vivacious and vigorous than at any preceding time; her countenance is merely 'sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought,' from the strength of her inward throes; 'the genius and the mortal instruments are now in council, and her state, like to a little kingdom, is suffering the nature of an insurrection.' And such, in truth, do we believe to be, literally, the condition of physic at this moment. Things have arrived at such a pitch, that they cannot be worse. They must mend or end. We believe they will mend. The springs of life are yet untouched; the constitution retains its rallying power; the vis medicatrix is in action; and we flatter ourselves that their is yet enough of young blood and energy and wisdom in our ranks to redeem the past, and to achieve that glorious regeneration, which has been long announced by infallible signs and portents in these latter days. Old as we are, we yet hope to see raised the standard of 'Young Physic,' though we cannot expect to see it furled after the destined victory is won."—P. 261.

So much for your estimate of the old system—one which has long occupied your thoughts, and which, I may be permitted to say, was so entirely mine also, that I thought it worth while to examine the pretensions of a new system.

Then, as to Homœopathy; in commenting on a general comparison of its success, with that of the old system, as shown in the tabulated results of Fleischmann's practice in the Homœopathic Hospital of Vienna, and of several French and British Hospitals, you say—

"The remarks above made are even of more importance, in relation to the general subject now under consideration,

than they may seem to be at first. They not only show that the *kind* of successes and failures experienced by the Homœopathists, is precisely the same as that experienced by the Allopathists; but they also seem to show that the medication of the former can boast of no *peculiar* virtue whereby it can achieve triumphs in fields altogether forbidden to the latter. Under the influence of medicines, all of which must be considered *new*—new absolutely, or new in their form, mode of administration, and principle of action—we would have hardly expected the old relations of curability and incurability exactly preserved. Does not this fact, common to both, seem to point to a *community of power, or want of power*, in the two classes of agents, rather than to a speciality of action and potency in one?"—P. 244. And so determined are you to make out your point against the old system, as possessing little, if any, potency as a system of *curing*, that you behave very liberally (as your Allopathic friends will think) to the recorded successes of Homœopathy; but with the purpose of bringing both the old and new systems to the level of your power of nature.

"These tables (Fleischmann's Homœopathic tables), for instance, substantiate this momentous fact, that all our ordinary curable diseases are cured in a fair proportion, under the Homœopathic method of treatment. Not merely do we see thus cured all the slighter diseases, whether acute or chronic, which most men of experience know to be readily susceptible of cure under every variety of treatment, and under no treatment at all; but even all the severer and more dangerous diseases, which most physicians, of whatever school, have been accustomed to consider as not only needing the interposition of art to assist nature in bringing them to a favourable and speedy termination, but demanding the employment of prompt and strong measures to prevent a fatal issue in a considerable proportion of cases. And such is the nature of the premises, that there can hardly be any mistake as to the justness of the inference.

Dr Fleischmann is a regular, well-educated physician, as capable of forming a true diagnosis as other practitioners, and he is considered by those who know him as a man of honour and respectability, and incapable of attesting a falsehood. We cannot, therefore, refuse to admit the accuracy of his statements as to matters of fact; or, at least, to admit them with that liberal subtraction from the favourable side of the equation which is required in the case of all statements made by the disciples and advocates of new doctrines. Even after this rectification, we see that enough remains to justify the inference above deduced. No candid physician, looking at the original report, or at the small part of it which we have extracted, will hesitate to acknowledge that the results there set forth would have been considered by him as satisfactory, if they had occurred in his own practice. The amount of deaths in the fevers and eruptive diseases is certainly below the ordinary proportion; but, for reasons already stated, no conclusion favourable to Homœopathy can be thence deduced. It seems, however, reasonable to infer that, even in these cases, the new practice was not less favourable to the cure than the ordinary practice. In all such cases, experienced physicians have been long aware that the results, as to mortality, are nearly the same under all varieties of Allopathic treatment. It would not surprise them, therefore, that a treatment like that of Homœopathy, which they may regard as perfectly negative, should be fully as successful as their own. But the results presented to us in the severer internal inflammations, are certainly not such as most practical physicians would have expected to be obtained under the exclusive administration of a thousandth, a millionth, or a billionth part* of a grain of phosphorus, every two, three, or five hours. It would be very unreasonable to believe that out

* I shall by and by show that this account of the doses is altogether incorrect.—W. H.

of three hundred cases of pneumonia, two hundred and twenty-four cases of pleurisy, and one hundred and five cases of peritonitis (in all six hundred and twenty-nine cases), spread over a period of eight years, *all* the cases, except the fatal ones (twenty-seven in number), were slight, and such as would have seemed to us hardly requiring treatment of any kind. In fact, according to all experience, such could not be the case. But, independently of this *a priori* argument, we have sufficient evidence to prove that many of the cases of pneumonia, at least, were severe cases. A few of these cases are reported in detail by Dr Fleischmann himself, and we have ourselves had the statement corroborated by the private testimony of a physician (not a Homœopath), who attended Dr Fleischmann's wards for three months. This gentleman watched the course of several cases of pneumonia, and traced their progress by the physical signs, through the different stages of congestion, hepatization, and resolution, up to a perfect cure, within a period of time which would have appeared short under the most energetic treatment of Allopathy."—P. 243.

Again, in reference to the cases published in my treatise, you say of two "well-marked cases of acute rheumatism," and two of "severe neuralgia," that "it would be unfair to deny that the result obtained in these four last cases would have been regarded as very satisfactory under any mode of Allopathic treatment," p. 245; and of the cases generally, "we do not hesitate to declare that the amount of success obtained by Dr Henderson in the treatment of his cases would have been considered by ourselves as very satisfactory, had we been treating the same cases according to the rules of ordinary practice."—P. 250.

Now, all these admissions have the appearance of fairness, and considering the manner in which the facts both of Fleischmann and myself have been misrepresented by uncandid reviewers, they will seem startling and extreme

to most of your professional readers. Yet they are fair only in a degree—only to the level of your hypothesis regarding the power of nature, and far short of the truth. A greater amount of success than the old system you will not admit Homœopathy to procure; you allow it to run neck and neck with the former in the treatment of some of the most dangerous inflammations even, but not a hair's breadth more. It must not pass the line of your preconceptions, let the "hard words, and harder figures of statistical tables" say what they may.

But the subject is far too important to be slurred over in a way so summary and inaccurate, and I therefore hope you will excuse me if I keep somewhat closer to the facts than your hypothesis finds it convenient to do. To get rid of the overwhelming evidence of the superiority of the Homœopathic practice, as shown on a comparison of Dr Fleischmann's tables with similar tables of Allopathic physicians, you object to all the statistical tables that profess to exhibit the comparative results of treatment of any kind. The genius of the diseases at different seasons, the influence of the sex, age, and condition of the patients, are so many circumstances that seem to you to deprive the statistics, hitherto published, of value in such a comparison. And you are right to this extent, that we have as yet no statistical details sufficiently minute, or so carefully classified, as to enable us to determine to a fraction what is the amount of superiority which one kind of treatment possesses over another. But a degree of precision such as this is not necessary in the inquiry we have in hand. We want to know, simply, on which side, the Homœopathic or the Allopathic, the advantage lies, and not the exact amount of the advantage. And to settle this point there is an ample accumulation of sufficiently minute information to leave no room for doubt respecting it. In large collections of cases of any disease, the sex, age, and condition of the patient, and the date of the disease when brought un-

der treatment, become so much equalised, that there is no danger, in comparing them, of drawing an erroneous inference as to the *general fact* of which group has been the most successfully treated—which treatment has been, on the whole, the best, and the most worthy of future confidence.

I conceive that no one will be inclined to dispute that three or four hundred cases of a particular disease, on each side, taken indiscriminately from both sexes, at all ages above infancy, at all periods of the disease, according as the persons affected happened to present themselves for treatment, at all seasons, and during a series of years, present very fair grounds for ascertaining the comparative value of two kinds of practice. It is in the very nature of statistics, collected in such circumstances, and embracing so large a number of cases, to do away with accidental sources of error, and to bring out a general fact that might be misrepresented by more limited data. The comparisons I am about to give possess all these safeguards against mistake, and the proofs which they afford are as completely decisive in respect to the general fact of the superiority of the Homœopathic practice as any proofs we have in medicine on any point whatever.

Dr Fleischmann treated in the Homœopathic Hospital of Vienna during the nine years beginning in 1834, and ending in 1843, two hundred and ninety-nine cases of inflammation of the lungs. Of these nineteen died, or about one in sixteen.

With these cases I contrast, first, the experience of Chomel in the Hotel Dieu of Paris. He does not, in the account from which my information is drawn, specify the number of cases that had fallen under his care; but when we consider the frequency of pneumonia in Paris, the size of the hospital in which he practised, and the length of time to which the account refers, we must admit that the number cannot have been less than that treated by Fleisch-

mann. The period of ten years, from 1832 to 1842, during which Chomel's cases occurred, will be allowed to have been sufficiently extensive to have prevented any possibility of error from the variable genius of the disease, coinciding so nearly as it does, too, with the period of Fleischmann's practice. And in order to do away with the possibility of any prejudice to the comparison, in favour of Homœopathy, that might be conjectured to arise from the cases of Fleischmann having been accidentally of an age more favourable to recovery than those of Chomel, I select from the statements of the latter what he says of the mortality during that period of adult life, when the average success is the greatest, and contrast this with the results of Fleischmann's practice among persons of all ages. It appears, then, that between the ages of twenty and forty, Chomel had a mortality of *one in eight, or double that of Dr Fleischmann at all ages.* The Homœopathic physician does not mention the ages of his patients; but the table he has given proves that his hospital is, like other general hospitals, devoted to the reception of all kinds of disease; and, judging from the nature of the diseases he specifies in his table, it is clear that the persons admitted were mostly past the period of adolescence. Thus, of the diseases the most common in early youth—scarlet fever, measles, hooping cough, convulsions, general scrofula, varicella—only one hundred and eighty-seven cases were admitted in the nine years, while the whole number of patients was six thousand three hundred and twenty-two.

Again, if we compare the mortality of pneumonia under the ordinary treatment, within limits of age still more favourable to recovery (for you know that the mortality is less as the age is earlier—that of early infancy excepted), we still find it greater than that of Fleischmann at all ages. Barthez and Rilliet give us one hundred and sixteen cases between the ages of sixteen and thirty, and

Leroux* one hundred and eighty-two cases between the ages of thirteen and thirty, including a period of seventeen years, in which the mortality is at the lowest, after the age of puberty, in the ordinary practice; and thus we have almost exactly the same number of cases as Fleischmann adduces, and collected, too, in various years and seasons. The mortality was more than one in twelve, or one-fourth greater than that of the Homœopathic practice. All that can be said or imagined, by any experienced and reflecting person, of the sources of fallacy in statistics, cannot subvert the conclusion from these facts—that the Homœopathic treatment of inflammation of the lungs is vastly superior to the ordinary treatment. The exact amount of its superiority may not be such as these facts represent; it may be greater or it may be less, but that is of no consequence to the present inquiry. What we want to determine, I repeat, is simply which practice is the most successful, and not the precise amount of the difference; and yet it is only to this latter, and, in a practical point of view, altogether secondary and insignificant consideration, that your objections to statistics actually apply.

What makes the comparisons I have made still more important and conclusive is, that the mortality of pneumonia increases after the age of forty, so that from forty to sixty, during Chomel's ten years, it was one in five; and above sixty, one in two. This progressive increase in the mortality with increasing years, appears, according to M. Grisolle, the most learned writer on the subject, "to be the same in all countries, in hospitals as well as in private practice."—P. 520. And yet, with all the disadvantage of a comparison of cases, in which a portion must have belonged to periods of life at which pneumonia increases in danger and severity, with others drawn from a period when it shows much less of a dangerous tendency, the suc-

---

* Grisolle.

cess of Homœopathy is indisputably greater than the ordinary practice.

In order to convey some idea of the superiority of the Homœopathic over the ordinary treatment of pneumonia, at all ages, I adduce the following accounts, of which the Allopathic facts are derived from Grisolle's work, and the Homœopathic from the statistical tables of Fleischmann and Reiss, carried down to 1844. On the Allopathic side we have Louis, Trousseau, Grisolle, Laennec, Bouillaud, all eminent practitioners of a country whose medical practice you hold up to the emulation of British physicians. Together, they furnish five hundred and thirty-one cases of inflamed lungs; of which eighty-one died, *or one in six and two-thirds.* In this number there are included fifty-seven cases by Laennec, of which he says only two died. He is accused of having overstated his success, having confessedly given his account only from memory. And it is affirmed, on the authority of one who attended his wards, that his loss was actually much greater than he has allowed. Still, I have taken his own account of the matter.

On the Homœopathic side we have, in addition to the two hundred and ninety-nine cases of Fleischmann already noticed, forty-four treated by him in 1844; and thirty-four cases of Dr Reiss, treated in the Homœopathic Hospital of Linz* in 1843 and 1844—the only cases of pneutomia, treated in that hospital, of which an account has been published. In all, then, three hundred and seventy-nine cases, and nineteen deaths, or one in twenty—the last forty-four of Fleischmann, and the thirty-four of Reiss, having all recovered!

It is well known that among females the rate of mortality from inflammation of the lungs is higher than among males, though females are much less liable to the disease. The number of the latter that occurred among the cases of

---

* Oesterreichische Zeitschrift für Homœopathie.

Fleischmann and Reiss is not mentioned. But it is certain that the accommodation for females in Fleischmann's hospital is such, that no cases of pneumonia among them were more likely to be excluded than among the males; and there is no reason to suppose that females are less liable to pneumonia in Vienna than in Paris. In the account given of a small number of cases treated by Skoda in an Allopathic hospital in Vienna, the proportion of females is noted—there were nine to twenty males. Among the five hundred and thirty-one cases that occurred in Paris, the proportion of the sexes is stated by some of the physicians; and we find that, of three hundred and fifty-one cases thus classified, only seventy were females; so that no considerable proportion of the immense general mortality could have been due to that source.

It does not appear that any deduction should be made from the success on the Homœopathic side, on the ground that the statements come from the partisans of a particular system, which ought not to be equally made from the alleged success on the other side; for the several physicians, on whose authority the latter is given, were contending, some of them acrimoniously, for the superiority of their respective measures of treatment.

It is curious that while you eschew "any close comparison" of Fleischmann's tables with those of Allopathic physicians, on the ground of an absence of sufficient detail, no statement that can tell in favour of your own views is too vague and meagre to be admitted in evidence. One might almost suspect, therefore, that, had a close comparison been likely to show Homœopathy to disadvantage, it would not have been so scrupulously avoided. You quote Grisolle's account of the expectant practice, or no practice, of Biett and Magendie, with the purpose of putting that on a footing with Homœopathy in its claims to suffrage. And yet, while the Homœopathic records are distinct as to the number of cases that were treated, and

the mortality among them, in hard statistical figures, neither the one nor the other is mentioned of the cases that were left by those physicians to take their own course. Biett's mortality is said, merely, to have been "very inconsiderable" during the year that he treated his patients with only emollient drinks and cataplasms. Magendie's is *not mentioned at all;* the only information we have regarding his treatment of pneumonia being, that "he employs *no* other treatment" than the expectant.* "Very inconsiderable," with Grisolle, would doubtless mean one death in every five, or four, or perhaps three, cases, seeing that his own practice, which he stoutly defends against M. Bouillaud, furnished no less than one in six and one-third. The "very inconsiderable" was clearly meant to be coupled with "considering that the cases were left to nature." His own mortality was very considerable beyond all dispute; and if he meant to say that Biett's was, in the plain, absolute, and unqualified sense of the words, very inconsiderable, he was bound to adopt, and to recommend it to others, instead of laying down rules for the use of blood-letting and tartar emetic.

Equally vague and unsatisfactory is the statement you make on your own authority:—"We may add that, to our

---

* There is a small mistake in your account of this. Grisolle uses the word "*guè* ," which is not *no*, but *scarcely*. Even Magendie, notoriously bold and unfeeling as he is, dared not habitually to give up all treatment. The mistake, however, favours your side of the argument. For it would be a presumption, and you employ it as such, in favour of *no treatment*, and in the same measure against the claims of Homœopathy to be *some* treatment, if any physician saw good reason to relinquish the employment of medicine in the treatment of pneumonia. But even Magendie did use some remedies, though apparently neither very active, nor *very successful;* for your Dublin contemporary for February, who appears to speak from personal knowledge, affirms that the mortality was held by lookers-on to be greater under the distinguished physiologist than under his colleagues, *and therefore much greater than under Homœopathy.*

knowledge, the same plan has been followed in one, at least, of the large hospitals of Germany, and the result was considered to have been far from unsatisfactory."—P. 246. This abandonment of the old practice, in favour of none at all, is scarcely the most obvious tribute to its efficiency. In this we agree; and as to the German result, to which you refer in such *very precise terms*—so much preferable to hard statistical tables—it amounted, we may suppose, to the loss of only a third, or a fourth, of the cases; a result certainly "far from unsatisfactory," as the consequence of no treatment at all, when even *active* treatment loses between a sixth and a seventh, or, if I may adduce the experience in one at least of the larger hospitals of Britain, *a third!* How would you have dealt with the luckless Homœopath who should attempt to encounter the statistics of Allopathy, with such miserable statements as you oppose to those of Dr Fleischmann?

Although I have said enough to satisfy any unprejudiced and intelligent person that the Homœopathic practice in pneumonia is very much more successful than the Allopathic, I cannot quit the subject without affirming, that you give the latter less than its due, small as that may be. Grisolle, as you know, left eleven *slight** cases of

---

* In alluding to them, you say, "Dr Henderson misjudges these cases in terming them 'slight,' in comparison with the one treated by him. They seem to have been fully as severe."—P. 246. I persist, notwithstanding, in calling them slight, unquestionably slight, cases. For Grisolle not only says that the general symptoms were mild enough to satisfy him that he might leave them to themselves without danger, but he says that the inflammation was "*of small extent*" in all of them. Why did you not notice this most essential particular? If you had, you could not have added that they were "fully as severe" as the case of mine to which you allude. That case is stated to have had the lung condensed "as high as the spine of the scapula," and from "the axilla all down the lateral aspect of the side"—about two-thirds, at least, of the whole lung. No small extent truly. In what other respects they were as severe, neither you nor I have any means of

pneumonia to take their own way undisturbed by treatment, and he gives an account of the time during which the characteristic expectoration, pain, and fever continued, and of the period at which the phenomena of auscultation began to decline, and when they disappeared. He does the same in reference to the cases that were treated by blood-letting, and tartar emetic, and affirms, justly, that the latter were convalescent sooner than the former.

The details are to the following effect: 1. In the eleven left to nature, the pain *did not cease in a single case before the seventh day;* in several it lasted till the 20th, 25th, and 27th days; *the mean was fifteen days.* In four he was forced to have recourse to cupping, owing to the persistence of the pain, and one of them required a blister in addition. [He helped the power of nature a little, after all.]

In the cases that were bled (two hundred and thirty-two in all), the *mean duration of the pain was seven days.*

In those that were treated with tartar emetic alone (forty-four in number), he does not mention the mean duration of the symptom. But he says, "the first sign of amendment consisted in a diminution, and sometimes a

---

knowing. Grisolle himself, the only authority on the subject, says nothing of the frequency of the pulse, or of the respirations, of the state of the mental faculties, or of the state of quiet or restlessness—the very points on which, much more than on any local signs, an opinion of the severity of a case of pneumonia ought to rest. But you take it for granted that his cases had delirium—pulses above 120, respirations 48, and much restlessness night and day! All of these symptoms existed in my case, and must have existed in the eleven if they were as severe. No experienced physician can maintain that the mere fact of the disease having reached "the stage of red hepatization" is a proof that it was severe. A small extent of hepatization, and mild general symptoms, constitute slight cases of pneumonia if the disease can ever be slight. I mention these particulars only to show how strangely you depreciate what is Homœopathic, and magnify beyond all warrantable compass what may serve to bolster up your hypothesis.

total cessation of the pain, which was often very pungent and acute." In five cases of the latter sort it had *completely ceased after the first day of treatment.*

2. In the eleven, the mean duration of the characteristic expectoration was ten days.

In fifty cases bled in the first stage, the mean was seven days. In one hundred and eighty-two bled in the second stage, it was nine days.

In thirty-five cases treated with tartar emetic, the state of this symptom was noted; and in seventeen it existed in the highest degree; and in them the expectoration was rendered more or less colourless in twenty-four hours after the treatment was commenced.

3. In the eleven, the phenomena of auscultation did not begin to decrease *till the end of the second week*, and persisted still in various degrees till between the twenty-second and thirtieth days.

In the cases bled within the first four days of the disease, the phenomena began to decrease *between the sixth and seventh days.* In those bled later, the mean of the commencement of the decrease was the tenth day.

In the forty-four cases treated by tartar emetic, the phenomena began to decrease in thirty-six, *between the end of the first and the fourth days of the treatment.*

So much for the course of *slight* cases left almost to nature, compared with that of severe cases treated by the ordinary means. I think that you will feel yourself in a dilemma when I present to you the plain inferences deducible from those facts, and your account of the course and duration of cases treated Homœopathically. You admit, on the competent testimony of a physician (not a Homœopath), who attended Dr. Fleischmann's wards for three months, and watched the progress of several cases of pneumonia, through the different stages of congestion, hepatization, and resolution, up to a perfect cure, that this result occurred "within a period of time which would

have appeared short upon the most energetic treatment of Allopathy."—P. 243. Now, the energetic treatment of Allopathy appears, beyond all question, as Grisolle's narrative proves, to cure pneumonia within a period of time much shorter than the power of unassisted nature can do. What is then the demonstration which follows? Let us see if you have not given us a fine specimen of the *reductio ad absurdum*.

Energetic treatment cures pneumonia much sooner than no treatment at all. Homœopathy cures pneumonia in as short a time as energetic treatment; *ergo*, Homœopathy cures pneumonia only as soon as no treatment at all! *Quod est absurdum*. I am the more astounded at this result of your argument, because the very facts which I have quoted from Grisolle, in proof of the advantage of the ordinary treatment over *no* treatment, are contained in a previous number of your own review.

You have been unfortuate in not having considered attentively the means which Dr Fleischmann used in the course of his remarkable success in inflammation of the lungs. Had you done so, you might have avoided the blunder which I have now exposed, for you would have discovered that the solutions of phosphorus, which formed his principal remedy, contained a notable quantity of that very active substance. If you had consulted Fleischmann's notice of his practice contained in the "British Journal of Homœopathy," No. 5, you would have found that his *first* attenuation of phosphorus contains, in every hundred drops, a grain of the drug; in the *second*, nearly one-tenth of a grain; and in the *third*, about one-hundredth. These are the attenuations used by Homœopathists in severe cases of pneumonia, as you will perceive from the cases detailed by Fleischmann and myself. Now, if you had considered that the dose of this medicine, when given after the rules of your own school, is only about the fiftieth of a grain—or only double the dose of the first Homœo-

pathic attenuation—you can hardly have concluded that the Homœopathic treatment of pneumonia is incapable of producing any positive effect. You would have perceived that it is not by the millionth or the billionth of a grain of phosphorus that the Homœopathists claim the credit of curing pneumonia so much more successfully than others. And I may here remark, in reference to acute diseases, that the lower or stronger attenuations of the medicines are those almost universally used, a circumstance which you do not seem to have known when you made the general remark at p. 229, that "the primary dilutions, or attenuations, are used comparatively rarely," otherwise you would, doubtless, have made an exception in respect to inflammations, and thus have silenced the clamour of these opponents who labour to frighten the public out of its propriety, by representations founded alike on malice and ignorance. Whatever may be thought of the higher attenuations and their alleged value, in chronic diseases, there can be no doubt, in the mind of any rational man, as to the lower, both actually containing a very sensible quantity of medicine, and being capable of producing a sensible effect, even though experience had not abundantly proved that they do.

I feel the more desirous of removing misconception in the minds of professional opponents on this part of the subject, because it is in the treatment of acute inflammations that Homœopathy possesses the most momentous advantage over the ordinary practice. I have already dwelt on this superiority, as shown in the case of inflammation of the lungs. But the tables of Flesichmann and Reiss show an equally remarkable superiority in regard to other inflammatory diseases. From these we learn, that of two hundred and fifty-eight cases of erysipelas, chiefly of the face too, only two died; of one hundred and twenty-six cases of peritonitis, only six; of forty-five cases of inflammation of the membranes of the heart, not one died; of

two hundred and forty-eight cases of pleurisy, only three. I need not institute a detailed comparison of such results, with the tables furnished from Allopathic hospitals. You know that this is done in the excellent Introduction to Homœopathy, edited by Drs Drysdale and Russell; and you know, also, the vast superiority which the comparison exhibits in favour of the Homœopathic practice. I may further observe on this most important point, that it would be strange indeed, contrary to every principle of probability, that the circumstances you mention as liable to vitiate the inferences that may be drawn from a comparison of the kind, should, in so many separate instances, be *accidentally* so entirely in favour of Homœopathy.

Although I have commented with some rigour on a few of the errors of narration, and of inference, which disfigure your allusions to Homœopathy as claiming the credit of a mastery over acute diseases, which no other plan of treatment possesses, I sincerely believe, that if you had entertained but a suspicion of the truth, you would have honestly and manfully avowed it. I am far from supposing that the man who has had the courage and candour to proclaim to the world the unsoundness of the ordinary practice; the necessity of a thorough *regeneration* of practical medicine; that "things (in Allopathic physic) have arrived at such a pitch, that they cannot be worse," —and that "they must mend or end;"—I am far from thinking that he who could utter such truths as these, so unpalatable to the general taste, so truly *Hahnemannic*, would hesitate to declare that the claims of Homœopathy were just, if he only knew enough of the subject to qualify him to decide. You have borne a testimony to the character and genius of Hahnemann, and to the ability and good faith of many of his followers, that must satisfy your readers that you would scorn to rank among those who are filching his discoveries, and arraying themselves in his hard-earned honours. And if, in your tribute to him,

you have stopped short of his greatest merits, and have failed to give him credit for having effected any *positive* good in the practice of medicine, the defect must be ascribed to the limited extent of your acquaintance with his labours, rather than to any unkindly feeling towards his memory. The length you have gone, however, is new in this country among the adherents of the ancient school, and gives you a claim to such marked commendations as are usually paid to justice and generosity when they are scarce.

These virtues appear to flourish better among our professional brethren in Germany, so that it seems to confer no particular claim to distinction among them, that a man should give honour to whom honour is due. They are generally much better informed, also, than our English physicians are, and, therefore, if the propensity to pilfer were exercised by any of their number, he would be sure of being speedily detected and pilloried for his crime. Hence it is, that while in this country one of the most valuable discoveries of Hahnemann's method of ascertaining the curative properties of medicines, has been stolen from Homœopathy, without a word of acknowledgment to indicate the source from which it was originally taken, his more just and candid countrymen, while they take advantage of his labours, award the discoverer the encomiums to which he is entitled. "It was Hahnemann," says Professor Maly, of Gratz, "who first recommended the use of *Aconite* in pure inflammatory fevers, with or without eruption, as well as in inflammatory diseases generally, in obedience to his principle, *similia similibus*, by which the effusion of blood, except in certain exceptional cases, is wholly obviated. *Even were we under no other obligation to Hahnemann, by this simple discovery he would, like Jenner, deserve to be ranked among the greatest benefactors of suffering humanity.*" Professor Maly teaches Materia Medica in an established university—is no Homœopath, in the technical sense of the

term—publishes his series of observations on the subjects of his professorship in an Allopathic periodical, and yet seeks no warrant in these circumstances for plagiarism and injustice. It would be well if others would follow the honourable example in regard to this and the other discoveries of the same illustrious man, with which they are enriching their monographs and journals without once mentioning his name.

While on this subject, it may not be disagreeable to you to be informed of a few other particulars of the homage that is paid on the Continent to the value of Hahnemann's contributions to the Materia Medica, and they will doubtless receive the more favour with you that they are not furnished by those who enrol themselves under his standard.

The same Professor (Maly) observes, of the Helleborus Niger, after commending its use in dropsies of various kinds, and other diseases, that "Hahnemann's proving of the medicine upon those in health, will be found the best guide" to a knowledge of what it is capable of accomplishing.

Of Pulsatilla he says, "The healing power of this medicine in rheumatic complaints, acute as well as chronic diseases of the eye, and the various affections complicated with derangement of the catamenia, &c., is taught *in the experience collected to so large an amount in the Homœopathic writings.*"

Another writer in an Allopathic journal for 1845, Dr Popper, of Winterberg, eulogises the use of Belladonna in inflammation of the throat, and acknowledges that he was indebted for his acquaintance with it to "the numerous indisputable testimonies of many intelligent and experienced Homœopathic physicians," and concludes in the following words:—"A more frequent employment of this medicine, in many diseases, is to be recommended to the use of impartial physicians; and the best source of information upon its virtues is the Materia Medica of Hahnemann, and the writings of liberal Homœopathists."

I give these as samples only of the general estimation in which Hahnemann is held by those who do not rank among his followers, who cannot be suspected of a spirit of partisanship, but possess honesty and information, and are not enslaved by prejudice. Similar testimonies might be easily multiplied, but I leave the consideration of those acknowledgments which have been made of the importance of Hahnemann's contributions to the *details* of the Materia Medica, in order to notice, what is more cheering still—because pregnant with the future recognition of all the valuable parts of his system—the acknowledgments of the excellence of some of his fundamental principles.

At the Scientific Congress held at Strasburg in 1842, the Medical Section, with Professor Forget at its head, passed the following resolution :—"The Medical Section is unanimously of opinion, that experiments with medicines on healthy individuals are, in the present state of medical science, of urgent necessity for physiology and therapeutics. * * *"†

Dr Siebert,‡ an Allopathic writer in an Allopathic journal for 1823, observes, "It is not to be doubted that the complaints so loudly made, for some time past, in regard to the want of a foundation for therapeutics, have produced a beneficial effect in two ways; the first is negative, consisting in greater scepticism in the existing Materia Medica; and the other is positive, *being the proving of medicines on persons in health*, and more accurate experiments with them in disease. * * * To outward appearances, Homœopathy stands as much opposed to the old regime as ever; but I do not believe it does so in reality. Under the impulse given by this doctrine, medical science continues to direct more attention to the effects of medicines upon the healthy animal frame; while, on the

† British Journal of Homœopathy. January, 1846.

‡ Ditto.

other hand, Homœopathists are every day directing more and more attention to the physiological aspects of diseases which they had before much neglected."

In the "British and Foreign Medical Review" for January, 1846, the learned editor, Dr Forbes, among the best expedients for bringing his art out of its present deplorable position, recommends the future cultivators of it "to re-consider and study afresh the *physiological* and curative *effects of all our therapeutic* agents, with the view to obtain more positive results than we now possess," and "to endeavour to substitute for the monstrous system of Polypharmacy now universally prevalent [in the old school W.H.], one that is, at least, vastly more simple, more intelligible, more agreeable, and, it may be hoped, one more rational, more scientific, more certain, and more beneficial." Professor Maly, of Gratz, already mentioned, urges the exhibition of medicines one at a time. Dr Siebert, too, advocates the greatest possible simplification of the number and form of drugs in prescribing.

Now in these, and similar advices from various Allopathic authorities, and which have been partly carried into practical effect, though to a very small extent, by Allopathic physicians, both in America and Europe, a very satisfactory testimony is given to two of Hahnemann's fundamental principles, which he thus expressed, whilst those who now echo his words were enjoying the polypharmics of the nursery:—

"There is no way more certain, or more natural, for finding infallibly the proper effects of medicines on man, than to try them separately, and in moderate doses, on healthy persons, and to note the changes which result from them in the physical and moral condition."—P. 194.*

"It will never enter the mind [of the true physician] to

---

* Exposition de la Doctrine Medicale Homœopathique, 2d edition. Paris, 1834.

give as a remedy more than a single simple medicine at a time."—P. 280. *

I have said that the adoption of these principles of Homœopathy is fraught with the future recognition of the most valuable parts of Hahnemann's system. And, first, for this reason, that the *proving* of medicines on healthy persons will convince medical men of the accuracy of Hahnemann's experiments, and thus effectually silence the objections which have been drawn from the supposed impossibility of such medicinal symptoms as he describes ever having been produced. If the new *provers* of your "Young Physic" proceed courageously and skilfully in their work, this cannot fail to be one result of their labours and sufferings. The transactions of the Homœopathic Society of Vienna abundantly warrant the anticipation. The members of that body have begun to subject the Materia Medica of Hahnemann to a rigid experimental scrutiny, and as their mode of proceeding is worthy of being followed as an example, I transcribe this short account of it, and its bearings on the credibility of Hahnemann.

"The members meet, and to each is given a portion of the medicine to be experimented with, without telling him what that medicine is. At home they take this medicine in various doses, and write down all the effects they have observed; they then meet again, and each reads over the symptoms it has produced on him. Thus, there is obtained a series of testimonies from well-qualified and independent observers. They have found that the general results of Hahnemann's provings are perfectly accurate, and have expressed their admiration of his skill as an experimenter and faithful describer of his experiments." †

You who have never *proved* a medicine, I presume, oppose your notions of how medicines ought to behave themselves

* Exposition de la Doctrine Medicale Homœopathique, 2d edition. Paris, 1834.

† British Journal of Homœopathy, p. 8, January, 1846.

when taken by a person who does not need them, to the deliberate and oft-repeated experiments of Hahnemann and his friends.

"No unprejudiced person," you affirm, "who examines these records ever so superficially, can for a moment believe that one-half, or one-tenth of the symptoms recorded, were, or could be, produced by the medicaments swallowed."—P. 234. Then Hahnemann and his friends have told falsehoods regarding the more severe symptoms, and recorded many that were trivial and accidental.

I will not accuse you of making the imputation of falsehood, for you have already allowed the integrity of Hahnemann. But that Hahnemann *did* err in recording trivial occurrences among the symptoms that followed the taking of the medicines, no Homœopathist denies; nay, the provers in Vienna, who "have expressed their admiration," &c., proclaim the fact, and reject many of these symptoms. But does his error in the smallest degree affect the practical use of his provings—supposing, for a moment, the Homœopathic principle to be correct, that regulates the selection of a remedy? No, certainly. That principle requires that the symptoms of the disease to be treated, should find in the provings of the remedy phenomena that correspond with them—with *all* of them, if possible, with the chief and most characteristic of them at least. It matters nothing that there should be in the *proving* many more truly medicinal phenomena than there are symptoms in the disease; and, of course, it matters as little that there should be as many more trivial jottings, that neither correspond with the disease nor are due to the medicine. Hahnemann himself anticipated your objection, but he thought it best to err on the safe side—to note down phenomena that might be accidental and unimportant, rather than run the risk of excluding what might be of consequence. If the line must be drawn nicely between the genuine and the false phenomena, who was to decide on the precise qualifications that

entitled a symptom to be retained, or marked it for oblivion? Surely not the first prover, nor the first few provers. It must be the prerogative of the many, who, having summed up their own experiments and those of their predecessors, thus ascertain what bears the characters of constancy and genuineness, and what seems to be inconstant and accidental. The risk in all provings is rather from genuine symptoms being excluded, than from accidental ones being admitted. At least the Homœopathist feels so, who knows of what importance sometimes are seemingly inconsiderable particulars.

With all the exuberance of Hahnemann's details, the case is not nearly so incredible as you make it appear. You ridicule the idea of one thousand and ninety symptoms being producible by one medicine. And yet a very little attention to the proving of Calcarea, the medicine you specify, will show you how unfair the inference is that you allow to be drawn by the bare transcription of the numerals which stand at the close of the list. The fact is, that scarcely one-tenth of the number consists of distinct and separate symptoms (true or false). For example, the first nine figures (the seventh excepted), relate strictly to only *one* symptom; and this is multiplied into what appear to be eight to one who does not read the sentences corresponding to the figures, by the degrees of the symptom (vertigo) at different times of the day being separately noted, and by the circumstances of its being present in the open air, on walking and sitting, on moving and lying still, being also noted and numbered separately. In the same way, for the purposes of distinctness and easy reference, are all the other symptoms split up, as it were, and numbered. This was Hahnemann's method with all his provings, and you perceive how small a degree of explanation deprives your objection of its weight, and how little attention was necessary on this, as on other occasions, to save you the uneasiness of a misrepresentation.

But your objections to the provings of Hahnemann extend to other particulars besides the number of the symptoms. You object to the *nature* of the symptoms also, and lay special emphasis on the absurdity of including *surgical* diseases among them. As I do not know where you fix the disputed boundaries of surgery and medicine, I may not be qualified to feel all the surprise which appears to have pervaded your mind, when somebody gave you to understand that many surgical diseases are recorded among Hahnemann's provings. Possibly visions of compound fractures, concussions of the brain, popliteal aneurisms, and carcinomatous tumours, were called up by the intelligence. If so, I can quiet your concern on the subject, by assuring you that neither Hahnemann nor any of his assistants went to so great a length in their devotedness to science, as to incur the risk of such serious consequences; and that they do not anywhere allege that they ever experienced them. There is a little work which you do not seem to have read, called a "Defence of Hahnemann and his Doctrines," &c., that exposes the source of your error. Allow me to refer you to it for information on this point, and on many of the same kind, that I may be spared the tedious task of correcting so many errors of detail.

It is barely possible that you may consider every disease that is treated by a *surgeon* as a *surgical* disease. If that be your definition of the term, although it is somewhat of the oddest, we shall, no doubt, agree that many surgical diseases are mentioned among the provings. Surgeons treat erysipelas—belladonna produces it; surgeons treat boils—pulsatilla produces them; surgeons treat ophthalmia—aconite, belladonna, &c., produce it; surgeons treat cystitis—cantharides produce it; surgeons treat caries—mercury produces it; surgeons treat psoriasis—arsenic produces it; and so on with twenty other disorders common to *surgeons* and the *provings*. You deny all this, but Hahnemann and his company of provers aver it, and (you

will pardon in so important a discussion, my plain speaking) they were far better entitled to know.

But you deny this also: "Not a shadow of *proof* exists that the symptoms were the consequence or direct effect of the medicine; while a thousand reasons can be adduced for supposing the contrary."—P. 234. What sort of proof would satisfy "philosophers and hard-headed sceptics like ourselves," it is not for me to say. Philosophers are not always the wisest men in the world. One endeavoured to prove that there was no such thing as motion; another, that there was no difference between right and wrong; a third, the father of a philosophy that finds its disciples in modern times, that we should give no credit to our senses, and so sincerely did he act upon his principles, that "if a cart run against him, or a dog attacked him, or if he came upon a precipice, he would not stir a foot to avoid the danger. He had friends, however, who, happily for him, were not such great sceptics, and took care to keep him out of harm's way; so that he lived till he was ninety years old." Again: "hard-headed," or "unlimited scepticism," as Dugald Stewart has it, "is as great a proof of imbecility as implicit credulity is." Philosophers and sceptics may carry their principles too far, it would seem; and if they wanted more proof of the source of their sufferings (in case they should take to the proving of medicines on their own bodies) than what I am about to specify, would stand very much in need of the "care of their friends."

Suppose some half-dozen men, who had a certain confidence in the evidence of their senses, to set about *proving* the effects of a particular medicine on their own persons, they being at the time in health, and, on the whole, accustomed to enjoy a tolerable share of bodily comfort. And suppose, further, that they took special care to avoid all irregularities in regimen while their provings were going on. Well, one of them finds that in a quarter of an hour or so after swallowing a dose, say of aconite, "giddiness

and headach" come on. Has he reason to conclude that the aconite was the cause? Possibly not. He had no giddiness or headach for many a long day before—but let that pass; they may have been accidental. As soon as he is well again, or some days after, he takes another dose, and in ten minutes he finds his giddiness and headach return. On comparing notes with his colleagues, he finds that the other five have all experienced, at one or more trials, something of the same sort in various degrees and combinations. Is he to believe his own senses, and the concurrent experience of others, or, like Pyrrho the Elean, to discard all such fallacies, and, unless the care of his friends prevent him, swallow the whole bottle of poison to vindicate his principles, and show his contempt for common sense!

Again, though naturally possessing a good digestion and a peaceable stomach, he discovers that very soon after a dose of this pernicious aconite, he feels a very inconvenient disgust for his victuals, or such qualms as threaten to end in something worse, and sometimes actually do so, or is tormented with pains in his entrails or his liver. He repeats the experiment again and again, asks his comrades how they felt after their doses, and consults old authors concerning their experience and observation on the subject; and after all his researches and trials, he finds that there is a remarkable concurrence of evidence that those who knew no abdominal ailments for weeks or months before, did, after every dose of that particular potion—some sooner, some later—undergo afflictions of various kinds: some nausea; some nausea and vomiting; some pain, pressive, shooting, or constrictive; some diarrhœa; some vomiting and diarrhœa; some mere regurgitations; some vomiting of blood; some of bile. And he finds, besides, in himself and others, that, after the interval of a day or two, from the use of the medicine, he and they eat, and relish, and digest their food as well as ever. He thinks all this affords some ground for believing, on the principles of common sense, that aconite

produces certain serious evils in the digestive organs. He notes down his sensations and doings under its influence, as they occurred at different periods after the several doses he had taken—as they happened to be solitary or combined—or as they varied in character and duration; he notes down all he can learn from his friends of the same kind, or gather from other credible authorities; and he numbers them separately to keep them distinct, though they are sometimes the same, sometimes but little different from one another, and so the list becomes long. In the same way, tedious and toilsome, he gathers a list of sufferings experienced, if any, in every region of the body; and as he is very precise, and very anxious to be correct, all the symptoms—their diversities, and degrees, and shades of difference or of sameness—are classified and numbered; and the last number of the last shade turns up five hundred and forty. He might have omitted some repetitions, and some trifling differences, and some trifling sensations; but he is precise, and he puts them down; he may have felt certain of them often before, independently of medicine—at all events, he feels them now, and their presence can do no harm.

Many years after, a number of men, some twenty or so, anxious to prove this medicine over again, take dose after dose, on numerous separate occasions, and their experiments corroborate all the principal details of the original proving, and add some considerable items to the number. They, too, are healthy men, accustomed to no such aches and pains as they experience while taking the physic; and they, too, on the principles of common sense, refer their sufferings to the same cause, and in their simplicity never consider that "a thousand reasons can be adduced for supposing the contrary to be the fact!!" Two or three good reasons will satisfy them entirely, I have no doubt, and when they are favoured with these, they will take to aconite afterwards as kindly as goats to milkthistle, or pigs to henbane!

Besides these objections to the provings in general, you single out some substances as peculiarly liable to be considered utterly incompetent to produce any symptoms at all. Thus you say—"When we find the Homœopathist maintaining that substances utterly powerless in a state of sensible bulk, even in the greatest amount, acquire astonishing powers by mere subdivision, without any discoverable change in their physical or chemical properties, can any proposition be submitted to human apprehension that seems more utterly impossible, more ludicrously absurd?" —P. 235. And you ridicule the idea that the decillionth of a grain of such substances (charcoal and carbonate of lime) can produce any symptoms. But neither Hahnemann nor any one else ever affirmed that the decillionth of a grain of charcoal or carbonate of lime is capable of doing anything of the sort. Hahnemann, in reference to substances commonly esteemed inert, while he maintains that it is only after many triturations that they acquire any power of acting on the system, says, that in experimenting with them on the healthy body, the high trituration selected for the purpose must be taken dose after dose in increasing quantities, and for many days, until their effects become sensible. That they do produce sensible effects when taken in this manner, is substantiated on the same grounds as those which have, I trust, rendered the provings of aconite abundantly credible to any one but a disciple of Pyrrho. If it be not, either Hahnemann could not "have been sincere in the belief of his doctrines," as you say he was, or he must have belonged to another extreme in philosophy from that maintained by the sceptics, that every real event was imaginary; he must have believed on a large scale in the occurrence of the most painful bodily sufferings, which had no actual existence! He must have imagined several distressing aches in his bowels and his brains, spasms and palpitations, that never actually occurred. He and those who experimented with him on such substances had been well and

hearty when they partook of them; yet, again and again, as they returned to them, they became affected with sufferings of no equivocal or contemptible kind. You do not seem to be aware that the potency of minute division, in giving activity to substances innoxious in the gross state, has other advocates besides the Homœopaths. Fluid mercury, you will admit, has been swallowed in ounces and pounds without producing any serious evil; yet there are undoubted examples of persons inhabiting places in which a quantity of this metal was kept, having become violently affected by the "infinitesimal" dose of it that found its way, at the ordinary temperature, into the air they breathed. Some think that the mercury had become oxidised, and had thereby acquired an activity not possessed by it in its reguline state. But Orfila, the greatest authority I could produce to you on this subject, ascribes the effect simply to the minuteness of the division in which the metallic mercury was afloat in the air. Buchner and Pereira concur with him in the opinion. It seems, then, to be no "gratuitous outrage" to the reason of the most able and best-informed men, whatever it may be to that of others, to assert that substances which we can take "into our stomachs with no other inconvenience than their mechanical bulk," in "ounces, nay, pounds," can produce the most formidable symptoms when in a state of very minute division. The fact is believed, you perceive, by very high Allopathic authorities. The *principle*, therefore, of your objection is the reverse of an acknowledged one among scientific men; and the only difference between Allopathy and Homœopathy on the subject is, that what Orfila and others assert of mercury, Hahnemann asserts of charcoal, carbonate of lime, and some other substances; and he has this advantage over those who impugn his opinions, that he has experimentally tested their truth, and his opponents have not!

Of the same complexion with your statements on this subject is the following:—"We hold the great alleged fact

from which the doctrine took its rise to be no fact at all; or, at least, not to be a fact of that generality of manifestation which a theory said to be of universal applicability ought to rest upon. We deny, on the other hand, that many of the medicines said by Hahnemann to be capable of exciting artificial diseases in the healthy body, are really possessed of such powers. We instance, in proof of our assertion, the very medicine which gave rise to the idea of the doctrine in its author's mind—cinchona. We deny that it will produce ague, or anything like ague, or any other form of fever, in the majority of human beings; and so of a large proportion of the Homœopathic remedies in common use."—P. 234. This extract is brimful of mistake, gratuitous assumption, and false inference. The "great alleged fact" on which you strangely imply that the doctrine *rests*, is, I may inform your readers, that Hahnemann, when trying on his own person the effects of cinchona, says he became affected with the symptoms of ague, a disease, as is well known, generally treated by that medicine. You might just as well say that the great fact on which the theory of mutual attraction, or gravitation, among the heavenly bodies *rests*, is Newton's having witnessed an apple fall from a tree! That very small fact "gave rise" to the train of ideas in the philosopher's mind which issued in the discovery of a great law; but I nowhere learn that it is made the *basis* of his doctrine. That basis is found in calculations and facts, which embraced an ample range of observation. The small fact suggested, and found its explanation in the general law, but would have made but a poor basis for so magnificent and comprehensive a theory. Just so with Hahnemann and cinchona. The effects of the drug suggested and found their explanation in the Homœopathic law, but are as innocent of being a *basis* as the fall of the redoubtable apple. The *great fact* on which the doctrine rests is, that diseases like those which may be produced by medicinal substances, admit of being

cured by such of those substances as, in their effects on the healthy body, resemble those diseases; and that fact, or general law, *is based* on experiments that embraced an ample range of observation too. But, say you, agues, or any other fevers, do by no means so universally follow the taking of bark, as apples fall to the earth when loosed from the tree. Well, be it so: the latter is a great fact, then, because universally true; and the other is not so great a fact, because not universally true. But does it follow that it is no fact at all? that it has so little of fact about it, that it had no business to "give rise to the idea" of the Homœopathic law? If the excitement of febrile symptoms by cinchona were but occasional and accidental, Hahnemann had as good a right to be the subject of them as any one else. He seems to have been so, and has made a better use of the accident than most men would have done.

But is the occurrence of fever from the free use of cinchona so incredible or rare a thing as you affirm? I do not know whether you deny that it ever occurs, or merely that it occurs often. You say, first, that "the great alleged fact from which the doctrine took its rise is no fact at all;" and afterwards only deny "that it (cinchona) will produce ague, or anything like ague, or any other form of fever, in *the majority* of human beings." As there is some obscurity, or contradiction, here, I shall construe the passages in a way the most favourable to you, and presume that, in the first clause, you mean to say that it is no fact at all that cinchona produces the symptoms of *ague*, and in the second, that it will produce "any other form of fever" only in a minority of human beings.

In answer to this latter allegation, I refer you to any authentic work on Materia Medica. Dr Pereira, describing the effects of bark on healthy persons, says, that, by large doses, "a febrile state of the system is set up (manifested by the excitement of the vascular system and dry

tongue), and the cerebro-spinal system becomes disordered, as is shown by the throbbing headache and giddiness."—P. 1404. He does not pretend to determine what proportion of men will be so affected, but seems to think the operation in question rather characteristic, by the use of the indefinite article. "If *a* man in perfect health," &c., take a considerable quantity of cinchona, febrile action is set up. So much for the production of fever, in regard to which property of cinchona, you will acknowledge yourself either to be mistaken, or to have no countenance whatever in the authority of those who know most upon the subject.

Then, as to the power of bark to produce *ague*, meaning by the term a fever, consisting of certain stages, completely ceasing for a time, and recurring in paroxysms, I fully agree with you that we have no evidence that such a power exists. But if you imply, in the passage I have quoted, that Hahnemann alleges that he experienced an *ague*, in this sense, from the use of cinchona, you are very much mistaken. He nowhere says so. His words are: —"How is it possible (if not by Homœopathic action), that the tertian and quotidian fevers which I have radically cured, some weeks past, by a few drops of the tincture of cinchona, should have presented symptoms almost identical with those which yesterday and to-day I have observed in myself, when, by way of experiment, I have taken by little and little, though in perfect health, four drachms of good cinchona?"—*Lettre à un Medicin.*

Now, I confess, I never could see any reason for supposing that he meant anything more than this—that the bark (taken in doses, frequently repeated, observe) produced chilly feelings and shiverings, followed by heat of the surface and perspiration. If he be also said to affirm that the proper periodicity of ague was produced also by the bark, then he is made to say that he had a quotidian and a tertian at the same time, which is ridiculous. And

if you look at his *proving* of the medicine, you will find that he says nothing of a succession of such stages being followed by an interval of cessation, and that again by a new paroxysm. Shiverings, chilliness, flushing, and perspiration, compose the most characteristic symptoms of an *ague* when the fit is present; no symptoms at all characterise it when it is *not*, that is, in the intermission. And when cinchona cures ague, I suppose it does quite enough when it cures the febrile symptoms, in the same sense as other means cure spasmodic asthma, epilepsy, and other paroxysmal diseases; that is, prevents their return. That cinchona does produce the chilliness, shiverings, heat, sweatings, and other febrile conditions that commonly characterise a fit of ague, is attested by twenty other authorities besides Hahnemann. You will find their names appended to the symptoms they had severally witnessed, in his Materia Medica; and you will distinguish among the number some that belonged to the same school as yourself.

It is possible that you meant, in alleging that the "great fact" is not "a fact of that generality of manifestation which a theory said to be of universal applicability ought to rest upon," to signify that such is the case, because cinchona fails often to cure ague, even in Allopathic doses, and this may be one of the cases in which you say Homœopathy failed where it ought to have succeeded. If such be your meaning, it originates from misapprehension. Cinchona does not produce all the diversities that may occur in the symptoms of ague in all manner of persons; and when one is affected with an ague, the paroxysms of which are distinguished by symptoms which do not closely resemble those producible by cinchona, Homœopathy declares that cinchona will not cure that ague. The simple fact of its being an ague is never alleged by Homœopathists, and was never alleged by Hahnemann, as being all that is necessary to make it curable by cinchona.

It must be an ague, with symptoms of a particular kind. This is the doctrine of Homœopathy in respect to cinchona and agues, and in respect to every other medicine in relation to disease, be it true or false. As every diarrhœa is not curable by the same medicine, neither is every ague, nor every stomach complaint. And the peculiar difficulty of the practice lies in selecting that medicine, among several that may appear to suit, more or less, the particular disease, which suits the particular *case* of that disease. Your allegation, therefore, that certain private trials by those who were strangers to the practice (and it can be to such only that you refer) were unfavourable to the claims of Homœopathy, is the weakest of all conceivable arguments; and, with a few others of equal calibre that I have yet to notice, shows an eagerness *nugis addere pondus*, which proves that you must have been at a sad loss for argument, and can scarcely have left any stone unturned in search of objections.*

Among the *nugæ* more particularly connected with the *provings* of medicines, aud their value as guides to practice, I may notice here an objection you make on the ground that some diseases are *latent*, and can, therefore, afford *no* symptoms to guide us in the selection of a remedy. "How many diseases," say you, "have been detected only on dissection after death, and which have escaped the recognition of the most experienced physicians?" How would a Homœopath treat such cases, is the implied interrogation? How would you? How would "the most experienced physicians?" For my own part, I humbly confess, I should not know how to treat them. Homœopathy makes no claim to the power of resuscitation. But as you allow that the members of your side of the profession "continue to be almost as ignorant of the actual power of

* Andral is the only Allopath who has published trials of the Homœopathic practice, and his are, as is proved by Dr Irvine, as absurd as can well be imagined. See "British Journal of Homœopathy."

remedies in modifying, controlling, or removing diseases" —p. 253—as they have been in all times past, and that the changes which follow their treatment are, "alas! as often for the worse as for the better"—p. 258—it seems pretty clear that they must sometimes procure, or hasten, the fatal issue of the maladies they undertake to cure, an amount of potency which you do not grant to Homœopathy, and which Homœopathists, to do them justice, are not ambitious of claiming;—as Allopathy, I say, appears thus to possess the power of killing, it is possible that it may aspire to make alive, were it only as a matter of simple compensation. If such be the fact, Homœopathists give way at once, acknowledging the imperfection of their art in this particular, an imperfection which has reduced them to the necessity of consigning their dead to the treatment of the undertaker.

You next observe, "Every physician, for example, has met with cases of chronic pleurisy, with extensive effusion into the chest, which presented *no pectoral* symptoms, and which were only detected by auscultation. How could the fitting remedy for such cases be selected on the principle of *similia similibus*?" This is a fair question, and the cases fair ones for practice, if you mean to bend so far to the imperfection I have acknowledged as to let us try our skill before death and dissection. In the first place, then, a Homœopath, ignorant of auscultation and percussion, could not treat such cases at all, any more than an equally ignorant Allopath could. But Homœopaths study auscultation and percussion quite as much, and know them as well, as your Allopaths, whether of the old, or young, physic school; and as pleurisy is not always latent, but is commonly attended by *pectoral symptoms*, they have been able to determine what remedies are useful in the ordinary cases. When, therefore, extraordinary cases of the kind you mention occur, they still use the same remedies, and on the very rational supposition, that if they cured the

pleurisy *with* the pectoral symptoms, they have a fair prospect of curing it *without* them. Analogy, it is true, suggests the means in such latent cases; but the *similia similibus* furnished the initiative. At the same time, I admit that the *similia similibus* principle does not apply to the latent disease individually. We must be contented with having got our treatment of it in a roundabout way, and with finding that experience justifies its adoption.

But a more important circumstance is involved in this part of the subject than answering the question you have put. It is this, that in every disease, of which the pathology is so far known as to enable the physician to ascertain the nature of the anatomical changes and morbid actions of the part of the body which is diseased, the Homœopathist regards *them* as of *primary* importance in guiding his practice, and the more remote concomitant symptoms of inferior, often of no consequence to that end. It is thus that in pneumonia, pleurisy, and other well-defined diseases, in which the conditions of the parts affected are known and can be ascertained during life, the remedies which the Homœopathist uses are few, notwithstanding that the symptoms which may attend such diseases are numerous and variable. He conceives the more constant and characteristic conditions of the disease, when these can be ascertained, to be the surest indications for the treatment, because denoting with the most certainty the part that is affected, and the distinguishing peculiarity of the affection. To him, the anatomy and physiology of disease, when they are not mere conjectures or assumptions, but ascertained truths, are of infinite value, and, therefore, he regards pathology (in this its only scientific sense) as a department of medicine which he is not merely entitled, but, for the progress and perfecting of his art, imperatively required to study. If he knew as much of the pathology of all diseases as he does of those I have specified, he would in every one of them, I have no doubt, find occasion to make the pathological condition

the more immediate object of his concern, and the director of his practice; and would regard such symptoms as were not necessarily connected with, and indicative of, it as claiming little of his consideration. As it is, he regards the most constant and characteristic symptoms as alone of consequence in pointing out the proper remedy in cases where the true pathological condition which causes them is unknown. When he varies his remedy, in diseases commonly considered the same, although their pathology is unknown, or imperfectly known, he does so only when the particular cases of that disease differ in such a way that the symptoms of one resemble the characteristic effects of *one* medicine, and the symptoms of another the characteristic symptoms of *another* medicine; and he acts thus in the very reasonable belief that, when the distinguishing symptoms of one case differ from those of another, the difference depends on *some* difference in their pathology, notwithstanding the general similarity of the cases. If he had any direct way of getting at the difference in their pathology, in all diseases that are closely related, as he has, by auscultation and percussion, of ascertaining the different pathological conditions of inflammations within the chest, *that* way would be much preferred by him in practice to the less certain method of selecting his remedy by external phenomena and sensations. Yet, in this preference, he would not be giving up the law *similia similibus;* for, of course, the medicines have their *pathology* (in order to produce the symptoms of the provings) as well as the diseases; and all that is wanting *to make pathology the basis of Homœopathic practice is, a correct knowledge of the pathology of both the diseases and the medicines.* Where that double knowledge exists, the Homœopathic practice is founded essentially on pathology—as in bronchitis, pleurisy, pneumonia, peritonitis, nephritis, cystitis, gastritis, dysentery, and many others—the more variable symptoms of these diseases leading to the use of various remedies, but only

of *such* remedies as produce respectively bronchitis, cystitis, &c., of *some* sort, and with varieties in the more important symptoms that correspond to those of the remedies. Where such knowledge does *not* exist, there is no help for it. If we know nothing more of the diseases and the medicines than their symptoms, we must be content to make the similarity of the symptoms of the one to those of the other the rule of practice; and well does it answer; so well, indeed, that in the great majority of those cases even whose pathology is known, and known by experience to require particular remedies, the ordinary symptoms serve to indicate these remedies to one who does not know the pathology of the diseases he is treating, as well as to one who does.

In a minority of such cases, however, the pathological practitioner has the advantage; and I may illustrate the statement by the example of pneumonia. When the complement of its symptoms has the usual amount and degree of completeness, he who neglects auscultation can prescribe for the disease as well as he who relies on the assistance of auscultation; but when, as happens in some cases of pneumonia, the symptoms are very few, or of a nature that does not distinguish it from pleurisy or bronchitis, the former may be unable to select the most suitable and successful remedy; while the Stethoscopist, by the aid of his additional means for ascertaining the pathology of the case, is able to do so with certainty and ease. Both may succeed eventually in their object, even with this disparity of knowledge, in the majority of instances; but he who has the aid of the more accurate diagnosis will succeed the soonest, and the most frequently.

While the explanation I have given of the manner in which some cases of disease are now treated by Homœopaths, which have had no actual parallel in the effects of the *provings* of medicines on healthy persons, shows how the principle—*similia similibus*—has led to the practice,

there are, undoubtedly, not a few instances in which remedies have been introduced among Homœopathists without having been suggested by that principle. These are termed by Homœopathists empirical remedies, because they did not spring from the general law, but were discovered by chance, or something akin to it, like the empirical remedies in general. They believe such remedies to cure Homœopathically, because they do so in the same doses as the Homœopathic remedies in general do. This belief may be right, or it may be wrong; but the fact explains how diseases may be maintained by Homœopaths to be curable Homœopathically, which it may be difficult to conceive were ever experienced by a *prover*.

As you seem to have read no other work on the doctrines of Homœopathy than those of Hahnemann, and to be unacquainted with the practice as now almost universally pursued by the physicians of his school, it is not surprising that you should have given a very inaccurate account of the actual state of the Homœopathic art and doctrines. It never seems to have struck you that the third of a century might have led to considerable alterations in such parts of the system as admitted of being corrected or modified by experience; or that it was possible that those who embraced the leading precepts of the practice could differ from their author on the soundness of some of his views. To go back to works of Hahnemann, published twenty or thirty years ago, for an account of Homœopathy to be presented to the public of the present day as a fair exposition of the system, is about as just as if one were to affirm the views and statements of Laennec to exhibit, in all respects, the existing principles and practices of auscultation. That distinguished man has had many disciples (among whom none in this country deserve to rank higher than yourself), who have added much to auscultation that he had overlooked, and corrected many errors into which he had fallen. Yet auscultation, with

all the additions it has gathered in the last five-and-twenty years, and with all the refinements which have been introduced into it by the multitude of its acute and zealous students, is, in point of magnitude and difficulty, utterly insignificant compared with Homœopathy. While it, however, has altered and expanded, by the assiduity and acuteness of its cultivators, Homœopathy must not be allowed to move a pinion, or change a feather. Its principles and practice, as they came from their author, must be stereotyped, and go down to posterity with all their imperfections on their head. What work is there in medicine, whose contents twenty, or even ten, years have not rendered more or less antiquated and obsolete? I cannot charge my memory with one; and if such have been the fate of medical dissertations, down even to the smallest on the smallest subjects in the "orthodox" school, how unreasonable and unfair to admit of no modifications and improvements of the original views and precepts of a system which embraces almost the whole field of practical medicine! I need not say more to satisfy a man of your understanding and literary attainments, that you have committed a very palpable violation of justice in the course you have adopted, and that it is incumbent on you to correct the error into which you have inadvertently fallen. Meanwhile, in order to remove the false impression which your review is calculated to make on those whose information does not extend farther than yours, I may inform your readers that there is a very great difference between *Hahnemannism* and modern Homœopathy.

The customs and doctrines of Hahnemann, which are now either abandoned or regarded as open questions by Homœopathists, are his *psoric theory* of chronic diseases, or that which refers them generally to the *miasm* of psora, or itch, contaminating the constitution; his *potential* or *dynamical* hypothesis, which maintains that, by triturations and shakings, medicines undergo an increase or development

of virtue, in addition to that which proceeds from the finer division of their substance by mere dilution or attenuation; the employment of the higher or weaker attenuations in acute diseases; the necessity of very long intervals between the doses of medicines. And it is but fair to Hahnemann and to Homœopathy to add, that, latterly, he saw it necessary to abandon in his own practice the two last of these.

To my mind, if I viewed the subject from the same point as you do, it would appear a very suspicious circumstance if the original propounding of a system, so vast in its compass as Homœopathy, had been brought forth in a form so seemingly complete and perfect as to admit of no alteration in its theoretical principles and practical details; if, as the exposition of one man's opinions and precepts, however profound his genius, it had received the unqualified acquiescence of all his disciples; if its hypotheses had not met with opposition among them, and its practical rules had not been modified by their larger experience. The history of every great discovery in art and science, of every new announcement that proved to be fundamentally true, would mock its pretensions, and throw a just suspicion on its adherents, if Homœopathy, after more than forty years' existence before the world, had remained exactly as it came from its author. On the other hand, I affirm that it is no small testimony to its truth, that in no particular of essential consequence to it, as a rule of practice, has the long period of its searching probation found it to be false (for the whispers to the contrary are too contemptible to be thought of); and that, where it has been modified, it is in those very points where a large and varied experience might have been expected to modify it; and that there should be so general a concurrence, among the hundreds in almost all countries who have made it an experimental study, on the particulars in which it ought to be modified.

As early as 1824, Dr Rau, of Giessen, published both

his high opinion of the Homœopathic treatment and his dissent from the extreme and hypothetical dogmata of Hahnemann. Since then, the moderate Homœopathy, which employs the lower attenuations for the most part—the very lowest, and even the original or "mother" tinctures in some diseases, more especially the acute—which administers them at short intervals, even every hour in severe acute diseases—which discards the psoric theory and the potential hypothesis—which contends for the practical importance of the knowledge afforded by the pathology of internal diseases, and for the value of the most careful diagnosis, has grown up, and is the almost universal Homœopathy of the present day. With all this the *Homœopathic law*, the *similia similibus* principle, the only fundamental principle of Homœopathy, remains the motto and the maxim of this, the true—the only possible "Young Physic."

Now, what is "degrading" in this Homœopathy? You make use of the opprobrious epithet on two occasions in your review, and under the avowed conviction that the system is "calculated to destroy all scientific progress in medicine."—P. 251. But the manner in which you work out your conclusion, if it were not palpably the result of ignorance, would call for a very strong term of reprobation to characterise it. You first misrepresent the subject of your criticism in a manner that may be excused in the obscure editors of our monthly and weekly prints, but is altogether unworthy a man of your place and reputation; and then you pelt it with your scientific contempt. You, indeed, qualify the sneer I have quoted by saying, that if, by Homœopathy, "diseases were to be better treated and more speedily and frequently cured, it would be not only absurd, but transcendentally wicked to sacrifice the welfare of humanity for the sake of a scientific phantom." What is the scientific phantom that you would thus magnanimously sacrifice for the good of humanity? Phantom!

I suspect humanity will think it a strange phantom—somewhat of the gouhl or vampire sort—that would make the glory of the physician to consist in diagnostic and pathological acuteness, more than in the recovery of his patients. "I am sometimes disposed to doubt," says an eminent disciple of this phantom school, "whether the untoward event of a disease, which his science had enabled him to predict, and which he had assiduously endeavoured to avert with all the resources of his art, is not productive of *more real satisfaction*—as it *certainly is more creditable*—to the philosophic practitioner, than the recovery of a patient of the nature of whose disease he is ignorant."* A remarkable sentence,—and all the more so because containing not the opinions of an individual merely, but of an entire school—the modern school of ultra-pathological physic. It is no wonder that those who entertain such opinions should think that even if Homœopathy were partially true, and, therefore, that it might fairly be received as one of the recognised methods of treating diseases, yet owing its success to the guidance of the bare empirical formula *similia similibus*, as that is commonly understood by the ignorant, it would "be very unfortunate for medicine if this were done." Unfortunate for medicine! No matter what for humanity. When we consider the paucity and feebleness which you acknowledge in the resources of the ordinary practice, we can suppose that the cup of superior satisfaction and credit habitually overflows.

But wherefore unfortunate for medicine? Homœopathy, as is known to all who are familiar with the history of its progressive improvements within the last twenty years, overlooks no pathological knowledge that can be of consequence to a practitioner of whatever school, and if there would be anything unfortunate to medicine in its being received as one of the recognised methods of treat-

---

* Dr Forbes.

ing diseases, on the supposition that it is partially true, the misfortune would consist, along with others, in its furnishing the physician with the means of treating diseases whose internal pathology is avowedly unknown (with a degree of certainty that he cannot derive from any other source), by a careful study of what is *known* of such diseases, and the application to *that* of the Homœopathic principle of therapeutics. In your work on diseases of the chest you affirm, "that there are many diseases of the pathology of which we are entirely ignorant; and there is every reason for believing that not a few of these, if really consisting in any change of organic structure, are of such a nature as will never be exhibited beneath the knife of the dissector;" and, though the progress of science since that sentence was written has lessened our ignorance of pathology, you will not deny that the statements it contains are, notwithstanding, still extensively applicable. In regard to those diseases whose pathology is yet unknown, are we to do nothing in the way of improving our treatment, little satisfactory or creditable as it may be even when successful, save by the fluctuating empiricism that tries this drug and the other, without a rational guide or motive? *Est ridiculum* (says the orator), *ad ea quae habemus nihil dicere; quaerere, quae habere non possumus*—at least for the present. When pathology succeeds in doing anything to remove the darkness that still hangs over so many maladies, Homœopathy will as gladly take advantage of the new disclosures as your Allopathy can do; and if there be any degradation in treating such diseases, till then, without the light of pathology, it seems to me to attach much more to the senseless empiricism of the old school, than to the regulated method (empiricism if you please) of the new.

As Homœopathy, then, seeks avowedly for all the assistance that pathology, or an intimate knowledge of all that can be known about diseases, can afford it, what is

the branch of medical science which it neglects? Anatomy and physiology are necessary to the pathologist, and, therefore, cannot be discarded by Homœopathy. Materia Medica, including botany and chemistry, are necessary to the distinguishing, identifying, and preparing of drugs, and, therefore, cannot be discarded by Homœopathy. A knowledge of the action of medicines on healthy persons is now called for on all hands, and Homœopathy has anticipated the general voice, and added an immense amount of information to that department of science—nay, has made it a branch of science peculiarly its own; for on your side there is no proper information on the subject, and I shall by-and-by show that you could not use it if there were. What is there, then, in the science of medicine that Homœopathy has not? Antiquity. Yes, simply antiquity! That is the only particular in which it is wanting. Now, apart altogether from the general opinion (erroneous it would appear) that science is not the better of being old —that the science of a century or two ago is scarcely equal to the science of to-day—pray, what is the difference between the antiquity of the present Allopathy and its Homœopathic rival? Homœopathy, we may say, is fifty years old; how much older is the Allopathy you admire? Pathology, physiology, botany, and so forth, are the same in both; it is in therapeutics alone that they differ. And yet, while you contend in one page (240) for the weight of the "accumulated materials supplied by millions of observers during an experience of two thousand years" as telling vastly in favour of Allopathic therapeutics, you tell us, very candidly and deliberately, in another (260), that "this department of medicine must indeed be regarded as yet in its merest infancy." In the interval between the two quotations you adduce abundant evidence that the latter opinion is correct. For example, you say of the ordinary practice—

"This comparative powerlessness and positive uncertainty of medi-

cine is also exhibited in a striking light, when we come to trace the history and fortunes of particular remedies and modes of treatment, and observe the notions of practitioners, at different times, respecting their positive or relative value. What difference of opinion; what an array of alleged facts directly at variance with each other; what contradictions; what opposite results of a like experience; what ups and downs; what glorification and degradation of the same remedy; what confidence now—what despair anon in encountering the same disease with the very same weapons; what horror and intolerance at one time of the very opinions and practices which, previously and subsequently, are cherished and admired!

"To be satisfied on this point, we need only refer to the history of any one or two of our principal diseases or principal remedies, as, for instance, fever, pneumonia, syphilis; antimony, blood-letting, mercury. Each of these remedies has been, at different times, regarded as almost specific in the cure of the first two diseases; while, at other times, they have been rejected as useless or injurious. What seemed once so unquestionably, so demonstrably true, as that venesection was indispensable for the cure of pneumonia? and what is the conclusion now deducible from the facts already noticed in the present article (p. 246), and from the clinical researches of Louis and others? Is it not that patients recover as well, or nearly as well, without it? Could it have been believed possible by the practitioners of a century since, that syphilis could be safely treated, and successfully cured, without mercury? Or that it could even be questioned that mercury was not specific in the cure of this disease? And yet what are the opinions and the practices of the surgeons of the present day, and the indubitable facts brought to light during the last thirty years? Are they not, that mercury is not necessary (speaking generally) to the cure of any case, and that it is often most injurious, in place of being beneficial? The medical god, Mercury, however, seems as unwilling to be baulked of his dues as the mythological. If he has lost the domain of syphilis, he has gained that of inflammation; and many of our best practitioners might possibly be startled and shocked at the supposition that their successors should renounce allegiance to him in the latter domain, as they themselves had done in the former. And yet such a result is more than probable, seeing that there exists not a shadow of more positive proof (if so much) of the efficacy of the medicine in the latter than in the former case.

"The same truth, as to the uncertainty of practical medicine generally, and the utter insufficiency of the ordinary evidence to establish the efficacy of many of our remedies, as was stated above, has been almost always attained to by philosophical physicians of experience in

the course of long practice, and has resulted, in general, in a mild, tentative, or expectant mode of practice in their old age, whatever may have been the vigorous or heroic doings of their youth."—Pp. 258–9.

The general testimony of millions of physicians for two thousand years amounts, then, but to a very small matter; and if you prefer Allopathy on evidence of that kind, you may, on as good, prefer believing in ghosts too. It was precisely on such testimony that Johnson did so. "This opinion," says the sage, "which perhaps prevails as far as human nature is diffused, could become universal only by its truth."

One word more, and I have done with this question of antiquity. You never once advert to the notorious and admitted fact, that some of the medicines long used in the old school act *Homœopathically*. Nor do you hint that, so far back as the time of Stahl, at least, that is, about 150 years ago, the Homœopathic principle, *similia similibus*, was expressly enforced as the proper rule for the prescription of remedies!*

If what I have said of the existing state of Homœopathy shall convince you or your readers that, in giving Hahnemannism—that is, the theories, hypotheses, and practices, without exception or modification, of the founder of the system—as the Homœopathy of the present day, you have made a great mistake; it may be replied that you

* In the following terms, "The rule admitted in medicine, to treat diseases by remedies contrary or opposite to the effects which they produce, is completely false and absurd. I am persuaded, on the contrary, that diseases yield to agents which produce a similar disorder (*similia similibus*)." This passage is quoted in Hahnemann's "Organon;" for Hahnemann does not lay claim to the discovery of the Homœopathic law by which remedies act, but to the merit of having determined the methods by which it may be carried out into full practical effect; as the provings of medicines on the healthy body more carefully, and the diminution of the doses—two *desiderata* which had rendered the law, before his time, of very limited use in practice.

have, at least, beat Hahnemann out of the field, and, to that extent, have accomplished the purpose of your review. This would be a mistake, however, quite as glaring as the other. For anything that you have said to controvert his principles and practices, they stand just where they were before you engaged in the conflict. Not an argument, or the shadow of an argument, appears in your paper that touches a single position of Hahnemann. Hahnemannism might, in every particular, be received as truth itself, if no more could be adduced against it than is contained in your attack upon it. In proof of which assertion, I shall briefly notice the manner in which you think you dispose of one or two of its precepts and doctrines, in addition to those I have already considered.

After detailing the manner in which Hahnemann recommended the medicines to be prepared for use, the triturations and scrapings of the dry preparations, and the shakings of the liquid attenuations, you say, "altogether, it must be admitted that the whole complexion of the thing bears a much closer resemblance to what we have heard or seen of magical ceremonies and the tricks of conjurors, demonstrations for effect, and to produce an impression, than to any operation of a scientific or *bona fide* character"—a sentence which you justify, because, "in the first place, it is manifestly *impossible* for any human being, during the course of a long life, much less in the course of a few years, to have performed a sufficient number of experiments, or made a sufficient number of comparative trials, to enable him to state, with any degree of certainty, that these particular manipulations, and none others, were the exact and exclusive means to produce the desired effect. * * * In the second place, it certainly has a very suspicious look of a foregone conclusion, rather than of a legitimate deduction from facts, that all the scrapings and rubbings to which each remedy is subjected, in each single stage of its transmigration, should

occupy exactly *one hour*, and not one minute more or less." —P. 238.

In reply to all this, I remark, first, that Hahnemann nowhere alleges that he had been led to adopt the six minutes' friction in the mortar, and the four minutes' scraping to detach the powder from the instruments, preparatory to renewed friction, by having found these preferable to any other number of minutes. The precise directions given by him for the preparation of the medicines, is universally known by Homœopaths, and might have been easily ascertained by you, to have for their object a *uniformity* of medicinal power in the several attenuations, by whomsoever manufactured. Indeed, within fifteen lines of the place where your translation of his directions stops, he says as much. He there lays down additional rules for carrying on the attenuations to the higher degrees, and he does so expressly, "in order to institute some uniformity in the preparation," &c. Quite enough to have made it evident to any unprejudiced person, not eager to put a disparaging construction on his proceedings, that all his directions were for the same purpose, and yet you actually say, "we cannot find in Hahnemann's writings any explanation of, or reason for, the *precise* and *peculiar* mode and amount of the manipulations prescribed."—P. 237. The explanation and the reason, notwithstanding, lie in the very pages you must have read; and, of all the misstatements into which you have fallen in the course of your article, none surprises me more than this. Hahnemann states, in the plainest language, that he believes the power of all remedies to be exalted by *trituration* (distinct from mere subdivision); and though experience has proved that such is not the fact, that belief of his, and the desire that the preparations everywhere should be made of a uniform potency, are the very obvious explanation and reason for the precise and peculiar mode and amount of the manipulations, and ought to have pro-

tected him from the sneer about juggling tricks and magical ceremonies.

Homœopathists, with few exceptions, do not concur with him in thinking that medicines acquire any such increase of power by trituration besides what is due to mere minuteness of division. They admit, however, that in chronic diseases the higher attenuations sometimes act better than the lower *as remedies*, either because the fineness of the division of the particles, or the smallness of the dose, is more suitable to the exigencies of particular cases.

Then as to the "exactly one hour, and not one minute more or less," to which you remark that the frictions and scrapings are precisely limited, I confess that I felt with you on the point—that it was very ridiculous; and, besides, that Homœopathy must have an intense vitality indeed, nothing short of that which invaluable truth alone can give, to have survived the unfortunate notions which Hahnemann has tacked to it. Still, as I knew he was no pretender to magic, no conjuror, and as I had occasion to observe that you were not an accurate historian of his proceedings, it occurred to me that I might as well consult himself in regard to this awkward particular. I did so, and, while my mind was immediately relieved regarding Hahnemann and his directions, I acknowledge that I did feel a momentary uneasiness about Dr Forbes. Magic there may have been, nay, there must, in the conversion of six sixes and five fours (minutes) into "exactly one hour, and not one minute more or less." But who is the conjuror—Hahnemann, or you? I fear you must plead guilty, as Hahnemann says nothing on the point, but innocently leaves his arithmetical readers to find out that the sum of the minutes he specifies for rubbing and scraping is just fifty-six! which, it may be necessary to add, is four minutes less than an hour—that magical division of time which you have selected for your commentary.

Hahnemann, it seems, is not very intelligible to you

when he speaks of as great an *amount*, but lower *degree*, of medicinal power being developed by some differences in the preparation. A knowledge of his doctrines would have prevented your difficulty. He thought friction and agitation developed, or brought out, the *latent* virtues of medicine, so that the same quantity of medicine might, according as it was triturated or not, have its powers either partly latent or fully developed. Here, also, he may be wrong, but his meaning is intelligible enough. And, in one sense, he cannot be held to be very palpably wrong, when supported by the authority of Orfila, and Buchner, and Pereira. According to their views of mercury in fine division, as compared with mercury in a crude, undivided state, a grain of the latter, though it contained the same actual amount of power or capacity of action, would exert far less medicinal energy than after having been finely divided by trituration with some inert powder.

In all that you have said, then, on the manner in which Hahnemann directs the medicines to be prepared, and of the effects of that preparation, you have not succeeded in proving him to be absurd; and, if any of your readers thought that you did, their opinion must have rested on your inadvertent misstatement of the facts.

Lest it should be thought that the differences between Hahnemann and his followers on the points just adverted to are of a nature that necessarily vitiates and invalidates his claims to success as a practitioner, I may remark that the one difference relates only to a hypothetical explanation of the reason why the high attenuations are capable of acting as remedies, namely, whether it is merely that in a state of extremely minute division they are still capable of acting, or that their activity depends on their virtues being augmented and developed by friction and agitation; and that the other is a question which relates solely to the energy of their action. Modern Homœopathists do not deny that the high attenuations exert a remedial action in

many chronic diseases; but they consider that the lower are preferable in general, because they act more speedily and energetically. Similar differences of opinion exist everywhere among other physicians, while they profess equally to be guided by experience, and neither party is entitled to assume that the mode adopted by the other is without its measure of success.

That Hahnemann erred on this subject, simply practical as it is, was, doubtless, owing to his attachment to his potential hypothesis—an hypothesis which necessarily enforced the employment of the higher attenuations, as signifying the greatest degree of energy. Why he was so misled by an hypothesis, may be a proper subject for the derisive inquiries of those, if such there be, who have never been misled by hypothesis themselves, but have always walked by the unerring rules of demonstration.

Men who, like Hahnemann, have discovered important truths, and are endowed with an ardent genius, learn, it may be too easily, to place implicit confidence in the suggestions of faculties which had already penetrated far into new and unexplored regions of science. They do not always wait for the tardy steps of induction; but, as the history of almost all the great discoveries, as well as of the great errors, of genius declares, grasp by anticipation at conclusions which future experience is left to confirm or annul. The latter is much the more frequent result; and hence, if genius be the benefactor of philosophy, "it is genius also, and not the want of it, that adulterates philosophy, and fills it with error and false theory." Such being the frailty common to minds of that class to which he belonged, it can be only ignorance and injustice that would found on the acknowledged errors of Hahnemann an argument or a sneer against the whole of his system. The more especially that, from the very nature of the subjects to which his hypothesis referred, many difficulties arose to prevent a speedy and conclusive proof of its fallacy; and

that the particular view which he took of new and extraordinary phenomena was countenanced, and, it may have been, suggested, by certain facts, which seemed to admit of no other interpretation, namely, the actual acquisition of medicinal energy, by means of trituration, by substances otherwise inert. Minute division, and the solubility which it bestows, appear to be the true explanations of these facts —explanations, however, which could have been afforded with certainty only by long and unbiassed observation.

I must, however, do you the justice to acknowledge, that you do not argue in the way I have condemned; you admit that, though the theory, doctrines, or principles of Homœopathy were proved to be false, "we have no demonstrative evidence that it is false in its practical bearings —false, that is, powerless, as a means of cure." If this be true of the doctrines in general, it is very plainly so in reference to the potential hypothesis, which has nothing to do with the main law of Homœopathy—the *similia similibus* principle. The former is disproved by Hahnemann's own followers, and by them only; the latter they hold to be demonstrably true.

The psoric theory, or rather hypothesis of Hahnemann, is, perhaps, the most unfortunate of his speculations. Not, indeed, on account of anything essentially unphilosophical in either its pathological or practical bearings, but because of the peculiar light in which the disease from which it takes its name is regarded—at least in this country. And as I, like yourself, am an undeniable Caledonian, I am not less sensible than you are that there is something of the ludicrous about it. But, if we lay aside our national feelings on the subject, and look at it in sober seriousness, we must admit, I think, that it may bear a construction discreditable neither to the pathological acuteness of its author, nor to his practical sagacity. It amounts essentially to this, that the majority of chronic ailments are due to a constitutional taint, which betrays

itself by a variety of symptoms and sensible effects in different persons, or in the same person at different times; and that, in order radically and effectually to cure those chronic disorders, it is not enough that the physician should direct his treatment against them individually or collectively, but that he should also have regard to the state of the constitution from which they spring. There is nothing new in all this. Every one knows that in one form or another the doctrine is applicable to a multitude of troublesome and dangerous disorders. Scrofula, gout, syphilis, rheumatism, are each held to be constitutional affections, and any one of them may persist for years, or for a lifetime, sometimes latent, or lulled into inaction, sometimes betraying itself by more or less considerable disorders of one kind or another. In the treatement of these occasional outbreaks of disease, the prudent physician does not always content himself with seeing *them* disappear, but follows up his treatment of them by means that are supposed capable of improving the condition of the system, of modifying or subduing the constitutional evil.

Had Hahnemann admitted psora to rank but as one among many constitutional taints that might from time to time discover itself by various local symptoms, I do not know that any one would be prepared to convict him of error. Nay, it is certain, that his opinion would be strengthened by the concurrence of more than one respectable authority. For it is not a doctrine peculiar to Hahnemann, that the disappearance of the psoric eruption from the skin gives occasion to other evils of a more serious kind. One of his opinions is, that the mischief to the constitution is less when the eruption is abundant on the surface; and it is at least some excuse for his notions on the subject, that when the persons affected with the disease are enfeebled by chronic ailments, of one kind or another, the eruption is much less considerable than in the vigorous and robust, as Biett justly observes. He may be wrong in having

supposed that the chronic disorders of such persons are due to the "miasm" of psora being thrown in upon the system; but the two facts—first, that the eruption is abundant when it affects the robust; and, 2d, that it is scanty in the feeble and otherwise unhealthy—form as good grounds for his particular view of the matter as many of our common pathological opinions regarding cause and effect can boast of. And when it is further considered that such a man as Pringle, not to mention earlier writers, avers that the psoric eruption is sometimes critical, or appears on the surface just when some serious internal maladies have ceased, and apparently in a pathological connection with their cessation, we see some additional reason for regarding the doctrine of Hahnemann on this subject with leniency.

I confess I have not given the subject so much consideration as to justify me in giving an opinion on the question—Whether psora is ever the cause of a constitutional taint which may appear in the form of chronic maladies of various characters? And I hesitate all the more to give an opinion regarding it, that the question is answered in the affirmative by men who are held, even in our day, as no contemptible authorities in medicine. For example, Autenreith advocates the doctrine in the following remarkable terms, and at great length in the same strain:—

"The most formidable, and in our country the most frequent, source of the chronic diseases of the adult are, the psoric eruptions badly treated by sulphur ointment, or generally by other active greasy applications. I have so often seen here the misery which by psora occurs to the lower classes, and to those who have a sedentary occupation, and I see it daily in such a manifold, melancholy aspect, that I do not hesitate a moment to declare it loudly as a subject worthy of the observation of every physician, and even of every magistrate, who lays to heart the health of those committed to their care."*

* Versuche für die praktische Heilkunde, p. 229. Tübingen, 1807.

I may notice that pulmonary consumption is one of the diseases he traces to this cause.

Again, Schönlein, the present professor of pathology and therapeutics in the University of Berlin, in his Clinical Lectures for the year 1840, is reported to have expressed himself to the following effect:* (The case under observation was one of organic disease of the heart, with dropsy.)

"What is the cause of this affection? On looking backwards, we find no other complaint than the itch. Latterly, the admission of sequelæ of the itch, that old medical dogma, is not only become dubious, but has been abandoned and turned into ridicule. Among the older physicians, we particularly notice Autenreith, who wrote a masterly treatise on this subject, so that it was remarkably impudent in Hahnemann to pretend that he was the first to point out the sequelæ of the itch.† * * * I must confess that, according to my own observations, and to those of many other physicians who deserve the fullest confidence, I have no doubt whatever about the existence of sequelæ of the itch."

And then he goes on to show reasons for his opinion, and the grounds on which he presumes that the chronic disease under consideration took its rise from the itch, which had existed nine years before.

If the errors of one set of reputable physicians can be admitted as some extenuation of the errors of another, supposing them to be in error on this point—and they do so extenuate in the way of dividing the unenviable distinction of being wrong—we can adduce some nearly parallel examples of an unwarrantable pathology. Stahl, you know, restricted all chronic diseases to affections of the vena portæ (porta malorum). Portal ascribed all hereditary diseases (and they include a pretty long catalogue of chronic ailments of all kinds) to scrofula; which, again, in all its multitudi-

* Lancet, 1844, p. 211, &c.

† Hahnemann did not do so. He claims only the credit of having traced *almost all* chronic diseases to the itch, which is more than others had done.

nous forms, Astruc, Lalouette, and others (Portal himself among them), conceived to be degenerated syphilis.

Once more, and I have done with my apology for the psoric hypothesis. Psora is the most common of diseases in all parts of the habitable globe. No age, sex, or condition can resist its pestilent infection; and back to a remote antiquity its attachment to the family of man is recorded with humiliating certainty. The poor it attends everywhere with the fidelity of a shadow, intrudes wherever men gather in numbers, from the workshop of the tailor to the tent of the soldier. Wherever a chronic disease can creep in, psora can lead or follow. And if it be argued that chronic diseases often afflict persons who never had the eruption of psora, it may be replied that no one can tell with certainty how long the infection, which is commonly betrayed by the eruption, may remain latent in the system. Biett admits that it may for months; Hahnemann thought that it might much longer, and even never cause an eruption at all.

But all this is no proof of Hahnemann's hypothesis. It is not intended to be so; if it be received as some extenuation of his error, my object is gained. He, in common with Autenreith and Schönlein, has failed to prove it, or even to make it very probable; yet it is not utterly and absolutely absurd, whatever "the half-educated multitude" may think of it.

The really important inquiry in reference to this hypothesis is, whether it affects the practice of Homœopathy, so as to involve in its overthrow the pretensions of the latter to success in the permanent cure of chronic diseases. That it does, is the drift of your jocose observations on the subject; that it does not, is the unquestionable inference, from a candid consideration of the "antipsoric" treatment. All that is really of consequence in Hahnemann's instructions respecting that treatment is, that chronic diseases in general can be radically cured

with certainty only when the remedies which are used for the purpose are selected from among those which cure psora. I have no doubt that he regarded this circumstance as an additional proof of the accuracy of his psoric hypothesis, and if the circumstance be as he says it is, I should consider his inference from it by no means contemptible. That it is true, I do not believe any further than this, that Hahnemann had some reason to conclude, from experience, that the so-called antipsoric medicines produced a more lasting benefit to the constitution than many other medicines. A much greater range of observation than one man can overtake in a lifetime would have been necessary to have warranted him in saying more. His psoric hypothesis probably appeared to him sound enough to supply the deficiency of actual observation.

It is of some consequence to notice one peculiarity of Hahnemann's psoric hypothesis which you seem to have misapprehended. You make it appear as if he affirmed that when a *chronic disease* is not treated antipsorically and Homœopathically, *it* must infallibly relapse, and get worse, until *it* ends in death. He says nothing of the kind. So comprehensive is his psoric hypothesis, that it makes chronic diseases, with few exceptions, to be of one family—the offspring of the same blood. Hence, though *one chronic disease*, in the common acceptation of the term, may be perfectly and permanently removed, yet if *another*, though totally different in its symptoms, should at any time subsequently appear, Hahnemann would have called it merely a different *form* of the same radical distemper, of the same chronic disease. So that if a man who once had some chronic disorder of his bowels should, twenty years after it was removed, become affected with palsy, in Hahnemann's opinion, it would have been the old disease recurring in a new form, either because the constitutional psora had not been cured along with the former illness, or because the taint had been contracted anew. This

affords an explanation of what he means by chronic diseases occurring in a worse and worse form as age advances; and the fact that they very often do so you will hardly deny, although you may reasonably demur to the doctrine that would make them all essentially the same, however dissimilar in their symptoms; and their occurrence to depend on the one constitutional taint having been uncured. You are, doubtless, sufficiently aware that it is too commonly the characteristic of even the same chronic disease to go on from year to year gradually gaining strength, and becoming less and less amenable to treatment, until it eventually ends in death. This unfortunate course is not witnessed only under what Hahnemann would have termed improper Homœopathic treatment. It is common enough under Allopathy, and every other "pathy," despite of antipsorics. At the same time, my conviction is, that Homœopathy can do more for many such chronic complaints than any other treatment can; and it may be that the "antipsorics" are the most useful of the Homœopathic means.

When you speak of the "antipsoric" treatment being as chronic as the diseases, in referring to the "two years" that it requires in order to eradicate them, you mistake the meaning of Hahnemann. He refers not to the cure of what *you* would call the chronic disease, but to the removal of the psoric taint in the system—*his* chronic disease. And I do think that the time he demands is not unreasonable in that view. Most men would be very thankful if they could get scrofula or gout eradicated in two years, or ten; though they might think either period rather long for the cure of a single fit of the latter, or of the sore eyes or glandular swellings of the former.

Once more on this subject. When Hahnemann says that your power of nature cannot cure chronic diseases, he still plainly refers to the "psoric miasm," the constitutional distemper. If his psoric doctrine be regarded as true, the affirmation in question is also true; for psora is well

known never to disappear spontaneously. But waiving the psoric doctrine, it is pretty certain that the power of nature does not, in the sense of Hahnemann, *cure* the liability of human beings to become affected with chronic ailments, from time to time, throughout their lives; and *that* is what Hahnemann considered a proof that nature does not cure chronic diseases, or psora with its many heads. There is no small difference between this, the true view of the doctrine, and your version of it. The latter you give in italics, as if to appeal to every man's experience to testify that Hahnemann was grossly in the wrong; whereas he made no such allegation as your words imply.

But I must shortly notice my second reason for believing that the course of *provings* which you and so many others recommend to "Young Physic," must pave the way for a universal adoption of Homœopathy. Suppose the task executed, and executed well, what can you gain by it, as Allopaths, but some additional purgatives, emetics, narcotics, antispasmodics, diuretics, diaphoretics, and such like, of which you have a store already ample enough to melt the mammiferous creation from off the face of the earth, or to lull it into an endless sleep? I can understand how you may stumble on remedies for particular diseases by trying drug after drug, as each comes to hand, on persons that are ill. This is the method that has been pursued for two thousand years, or thereby, and it has brought some useful remedies to light, of which some, probably the most, act Homœopathically where they act with advantage. But what you can learn of the virtues which a medicine, tried on the healthy body, shall exert on the diseased, beyond its probable evacuating and nauseating, and narcotising, and one or two other energetic influences long since abundantly supplied, I am at a loss to conjecture. Will "Young Physic," then, allow all his pangs to go for nothing? Was it only for this that he has panted, and groaned, and writhed, and coughed, and spit, and sneezed,

and bled? That he has endured headaches and colics, stitches and twitches in every section of his frame, and so many a fac-simile more of the ills "that flesh is heir to?" Can he make no use of them Allopathically, or Antipathically; or must he be contented to let them stand as penances?

Supposing he should try to turn them to some remedial account, what he can make, Antipathically* or Allopathically,† of such an effect of a medicine as a racking pain in his stomach, for example, or a fiery redness of his nose? Why, *Allo*pathically, he can get up an artificial pain in his stomach, to remove a natural pain from his head, or his feet; or he can set his nose in a blaze, to cure an erysipelas of his legs, on the principle that one fire puts out another. But will the cure not be as bad as the disease? Then, *Anti*pathically, how will he manage to make a practical use of his voluntary afflictions? I can understand how he may succeed, when his nose is disagreeably white, in striking the more becoming hue by a skilful administration of the reddening remedy,—but I am at a loss for the useful employment of the pain in his stomach. The *opposite* of a painful is an agreeable sensation, and I know not an instance of a pleasurable feeling in the stomach playing an important part in pathology. Yes, there is one such. You will find it in the treatise of worthy Dr Underwood, on the diseases of children. The "inward fits," quoth he, are betrayed by a frequent and sweet smiling during sleep; the which is provoked by wind pleasantly tickling the stomach. Now, for just such a dose of the ache-causing remedy as shall nicely strike the balance between a pleasure and a pain! What an opportunity for our infant Hercules, our young Antipath! to still the apprehensions of a fond mother, and disappoint the forebodings of the lugubrious nurse.

---

* *Antipathy*, I may remind the reader, means the treatment which aims at producing a state *opposite* to the disease.

† Allopathy,—the treatment which aims at producing a state merely *different* from the disease, or in a different part of the body.

Seriously, what can be made of nine-tenths of the knowledge of the effects of medicines taken in health by the Allopathic or Antipathic methods? The Homœpathic turns them all to account, and no *prover* suffers in vain. Because, for every morbid symptom or effect it seeks a corresponding medicinal one. Let your new provers but bring their experience of medicinal diseases to corroborate that of the Homœopaths, and the universal adoption of Homœopathy is at hand. They cannot leave their knowledge of the provings of medicines to lie useless while others turn theirs to the advantage of mankind. They will try if they cannot do the same, and for a rational man to try Homœopathy is tantamount to his conversion.

But when they do try to employ the medicines they have proved on the healthy body, as remedies for disease on the Homœopathic principle, does it follow that they must adopt the Homœopathic doses? May they not continue to use them in the larger quantities of the old practice? These are points which they must determine by experience for themselves, if they will not extend their confidence to those who have practised Homœopathically before them. I may, however, in the meantime observe that, even in the old system, nothing is less determined than the proper doses of medicines. A sagacious and experienced Allopathic physician, not very long ago remarked to me, in reference to this subject, "What do we know of the proper doses of medicines?" Almost everything has yet to be determined among you on the subject, for it does by no means follow that the utmost quantity of a drug which a patient can swallow without speedy and obvious detriment, is the right quantity for curing his disease, although this is unquestionably the principle which guides the common practitioner in his prescriptions. In regard to the doses of medicines, and the frequency of their repetition, Professor Jörg, of Leipsic, the very opposite of a Homœopathic practitioner, made the following suggestions twenty

years ago, which his brethren have been slow in adopting: "The smallest doses of medicines that are yet effective, exhibit their essentially curative powers with most purity and most certainty, and secure us best against any secondary or concomitant medicinal effects. * * * Most of the powerful medicines are at present taken at far too short intervals, and the recovery of the patient thereby greatly retarded, if not altogether prevented, by his becoming affected with medicinal disease in too great an extent."* Jörg is esteemed a great authority among your best writers on Materia Medica; and he is almost the only physician, as he certainly was the first of the old school, who followed the example of Hahnemann in proving medicines on the healthy body. You will not, therefore, despise his opinion on the doses that ought to be given, when medicines are employed Homœopathically.

"Medicines operate most powerfully upon the sick when the symptoms correspond with those of the disease. A very small quantity of medicinal arnica will produce a violent effect upon persons who have an irritable state of the œsophagus and stomach. Mercurial preparations have, in very small doses, given rise to pains and loose stools when administered in an inflammatory state of the intestines. * * * Yet why should I occupy time in adducing more examples of a similar operation of medicines, since it is in the very nature of the thing that a medicine must produce a greater effect when it is applied to a body already suffering under an affection similar to that which the medicine itself is capable of producing."—P. 16.

In the last number but one of your review you had occasion to lament the loss of a physician who took a Homœopathic remedy in Allopathic doses. "The case," you say, "may be a most useful warning, and speaks more powerfully than any reasoning as to the absolute necessity of caution in the use of aconite." Let us hope it will be so. Had the unfortunate gentleman taken the medicine in the Homœopathic doses, he would have experienced all the good effects it was capable of affording, and he might yet have

* Materialien zu einer Künftigen Heilmittellehre, p. 9. 1825.

been alive. In the work which is reviewed in that article, there are several cases mentioned in which patients narrowly escape destruction from the same medicine, by the instructions of the physician having been misunderstood. And thus it is that the discovery of a medicine which justly entitles Hahnemann to rank among the greatest benefactors of mankind, is made to peril or destroy human life —to leave it at the discretion of careless or stupid attendants, by the doggedness of practitioners who sneer at his advice for its safe and efficacious employment.

On your criticism of the cases which I have published I have little to say. You affirm that the recoveries are all due either to nature or imagination, while you admit "that the amount of success obtained by Dr Henderson in the treatment of his cases, would have been considered by ourselves as very satisfactory, had we been treating the same cases according to the rules of ordinary medicine." No doubt they would, but why not consider them a great deal more satisfactory than those rules can enable you to effect, seeing that the acute cases were cured without the effusion of blood, the pains of purgation, or the miseries of nausea and blistering; and that not a few of the chronic cases had resisted the rules of ordinary medicine, though applied, and in the most serious instances too, by some of the wisest practitioners of your art. I know no reason for presuming that the rules of ordinary medicine in other hands could have effected what it could not in theirs; though I feel very certain, that if any ordinary practitioner had had the opportunity of trying, and had succeeded, he would have regarded the cases as both *very* satisfactory, and his treatment very superior to that which had failed. Since you think that the medicines employed in the cases I have published, deserve no credit for the success, a way is open for you to place the pretensions of Homœopathy on their proper footing. Produce a hundred and twenty-two cases of the same kind, treated by

your bread pills (farina 30), and the experiment will be complete. You have already endeavoured to prove that that favourite remedy of yours was as useful in an epidemic diarrhœa of considerable violence, as "a course of orthodox physic." It was unnecessary to make any argumentative exertion to prove that it was so, for all Homœopaths (and your argument is specially addressed to them), will heartily concur in your conclusion, and believe, moreover, with you, that it would be far better for mankind if the farina practice were more generally adopted in preference to orthodox physic.

I have given one half of an experiment, give you the other. It can cost you no other difficulty than keeping notes of your cases; you can have no scruples, founded on the advantages of the rules of ordinary physic, to overcome, considering that the amount of success in my cases was, in your estimation, *very* satisfactory, though by means which you deem no better than doses of flour. Such is your assertion in favour of your crumbs, and the *onus probandi* on that point lies with you. Bread pills seem to be one of your *recognised* methods of treatment; you have shown them to be preferable to orthodox physic; show them next to be preferable, or equal to Homœopathy, in the same kind and number of cases as I have published; and not only will your professional sagacity be magnified, but you may aspire to the thanks of the agricultural interest, at present much in need of consolation.

Hard-headed scepticism and credulity go hand in hand. Those who are sceptical on one subject, are very easily satisfied on another; and their unbelief arises quite as much, or more, from a blind attachment to the notions they cherish, as from a deficiency of probability or proof in favour of the doctrines they reject. Hard-headed scepticism of this, the ordinary quality, utterly unfits men for philosophical and scientific investigations on a subject to which they are opposed. If it be beset with sources of

mistake, the biassed mind of the sceptic can see nothing but these; lays hold of them with avidity, and delights itself in the sapient conviction that, because there are some things fallacious in the subject of its hasty and partial study, there can be nothing that is true. If Jenner had started on his researches regarding vaccination with the antipathies of a hard-headed sceptic, wedded to a foregone conclusion, as all hard-headed sceptics are, his studies might easily have issued in a deliberate refutation of the popular supposition, in his neighbourhood, that cow-pox was a protection against small-pox; and the world might yet have wanted the blessing of his discovery. As it was, with all his determination to know the truth, he almost yielded before the sources of fallacy he had to encounter. How speedily would a hard-headed sceptic,—whether an Ingenhouz, or a Rowley,—have closed his inquiries on the subject, when he had ascertained that the cow milkers often contracted sores on their hands in the course of their occupation, and were not, therefore, exempt from small-pox. What a clear proof that all the whispers to the contrary were old women's fables! What truly sceptical spirit could want more satisfactory evidence? But Jenner's head having been made of penetrable stuff,—not yet become indurated and sapless by the seasoning processes of scepticism,—admitted the idea that, though the circumstances in question were undeniably true, they might not constitute the whole truth. He persevered in his researches, and obtained a glorious reward of his labour.

Scepticism is much more a matter of feeling than of judgment; and there is ample reason for believing that the general scepticism of the profession regarding Homœopathy is owing far more to a *dislike* of it than to any *convictions* of the understanding at variance with its pretensions. In almost utter ignorance of its principles and practice, many, no doubt, like yourself, think the general adoption of it would be "very unfortunate for medicine,"

and, therefore, *hate* it with all the sincerity of hard-headed scepticism, as the supposed enemy of their favourite "phantom." And yet it is this temper which men ridiculously mistake for the philosophic,—for that which preserves the mind neutral in the investigation of contending claims,—which shuts the door against no evidence, but impartially weighs and listens to the arguments on both sides. With this spirit they strangely confound the one-sided scepticism which locks the door against all new comers, or says, with the man in the play, "I'm fixed, determined; so now produce your reasons. When I'm determined, I always listen to reason, because it can then do no harm." And this scepticism, too, which was once held to be a very fine thing, the property of these quite superior minds, which ought not to believe with the vulgar, appears to have overflowed its receptacles among the lustrous population of the higher regions of mind, and to have gravitated to those low-lying valleys of intellect, where there can be but little reflection, because there is little light, and where scepticism is easily accommodated, because there is little to dispute with it the virgin soil. In reference to Homœopathy, at least, it can be said truly, that scepticism is no indication of superior wisdom, for if there be men of talent and learning (on other subjects) opposed to it, it is undeniable that, among the bitterest unbelievers are to be found, both in and out of the profession, a host of persons distinguished alike by their ignorance and their incapacity.

In the course of your strictures on my work, you extract three cases apparently as samples of the whole. If this was the intention with which they are given, I can only say, and say with justice, that you could hardly have acted more unfairly. Even on the supposition that all the recoveries were due to your power of nature, the proceeding is unfair. There are cases, and not a few, among those I have published, the recovery of which, within the period specified of each, and more especially considering the time

during which the diseases had lasted, and the nature of the sufferings, was sufficiently remarkable to have entitled them to notice, were it only to show how much better *no treatment at all* was than the ordinary treatment. There are cases, also, which had been under no treatment for a long time before the Homœopathic was employed—and some of these might have been noticed as striking examples of what your power of imagination can do, or of the remarkable coincidences that sometimes happen between the commencement of a particular treatment, and the spontaneous termination of a disease. Your readers might then have formed some conception of the reasonableness of the *shifts* by which you endeavour to explain away the apparent efficacy of the practice. They would have been able to discover the rules by which one shift or another was selected, as thus:—

First,—That when cases recovered, promptly, from chronic diseases that had resisted the rules of orthodox treatment, continued down to the time when the Homœopathic was adopted, the results must be ascribed to the lucky cessation from orthodoxy.

Second,—That when cases recovered, promptly, from chronic diseases that had *not* been under orthodox treatment for a long time before the commencement of the Homœopathic, the results must be ascribed to the power of imagination, or the accidental and spontaneous cessation of the diseases.

Third,—That when the persons affected were too young to be the likely subjects of this power, the result must be ascribed *only* to the spontaneous cessation of their diseases.

Referring your readers to the work itself for the particulars which you have withheld, I have no hesitation in affirming that no candid and experienced man can peruse the cases *attentively*, and say with sincerity, that he has no doubt that the results are adequately accounted for under one or other of these three heads. This is the utmost that

I expected the narration of the cases to accomplish; and this, I am satisfied, it is fitted to accomplish. I did not dare to hope that it would overcome the strong prejudices of the hard-headed, or silence the opposition of the feeble-minded and malignant. These are conquests which no record of cases can ever achieve.

To those who do not belong to this corps of invincibles, I would suggest the propriety of calculating the probability of the causes you assign for the recoveries under Homœopathy. In regard to one of these causes, the *coincidence* of recovery and the use of the Homœopathic remedies, some approach to a mathematical estimate of probability may be obtained; as, for example, a disease having lasted, without improvement for six, eight, twelve, twenty-four, or two hundred months, and having no ascertained natural limits, what are the chances of its ceasing of itself, in one, two, four, or six weeks, after a certain day? With every instance, in a given number of unselected cases, in which the amendment commences shortly after that day (on which a particular practice has been commenced), the probability lessens of its being due to chance; until, if nine-tenths of the cases do so amend and recover, no probability is left that chance can account for the results. As to the influence of imagination in producing the benefits in the cases to which I advert, I think that reasons satisfactory to all but the invincibles can be shown for its absence in the majority of them, while it remains only as a presumption or possibility in the others. Thus, in some cases the *coincidences* occur in persons who are too young for the work of fancy; in some, the persons affected have no notion of the marvellous nature of their physic, and are very plainly incapable of being moved by the knowledge if it were imparted to them; in some there is a total want of expectation of any result whatever; and in some the remedies given are not at first correctly chosen, according to the rules of the practice, and produce no effect; but when

afterwards they are better selected, the good effects follow. These, however, are particulars which can be properly estimated only by the man who practically examines, and experiments for himself. No printed records and statements can impress them on the reader as they impress themselves on the practitioner, and therefore it is that documentary evidence can never settle the question in all its divisions.

But why is the subject left to be settled in any measure by documentary evidence? If the practice of Homœopathy has grown to the vast extent which you allow, all over Europe and America—has learned, experienced, and honest men among its practitioners—is so successful as you admit in the treatment of acute, as well as chronic, diseases, and so forth, that you "can refrain no longer" from noticing it —if "as an established form of practical medicine, and as a great fact in the history of our art" (p. 239), you are obliged *nolentes volentes* to consider Homœopathy—why should you restrict your consideration of it to *documents*, which cannot, in regard to every particular, furnish conclusive evidence, and to omit the practice in person, or to recommend it to others? This is the only way of considering it that can lead to a definite result on the general question. No man will believe in Homœopathy, in all its extent, on the testimony of those who have practised it, because testimony in practical medicine is so easily evaded by the doubter; and no man ought to disbelieve on the authority of those who *have not.*

Some of my cases you object to as trivial. Now, apart from the fact that a disease does not need to be deadly, or even severe, in order to test the action of a remedy, the objection has probably been founded on the very success of the practice. Take, for instance, the cases of dysentery, and others among the acute cases;—*after the practice was begun* their course was mild enough certainly, and their recovery was for the most part very speedy. Does it, therefore, follow that the cases were slight? Would any

man be entitled to say from the first report of them, before the treatment, that they were slight of their kind? I say no. And it *is* rather too much to urge the *very success* of the practice, as lessening the evidence in its favour! If the cases had continued as at first, or had increased in intensity, for a number of days, you would call them severe, no doubt; and you would at the same time have evidence, which no Homœopath could gainsay, that the practice was useless. We are entitled to the converse of this, however—the cases decreased rapidly in severity after the treatment was begun; affording some evidence that the practice was not useless.

Of three cases you quote, there are two concerning which a few remarks are called for. The one is that of a gentleman who had become, from necessity, dependent on aperient medicine for above two years. He took some Homœopathic medicine, and soon became restored to perfect health. The result you consider to have been due to the pill system having been discontinued. Possibly you may be right, and possibly you may not. But you act unfairly in conveying the impression to your readers that I adduced the case as a proof of the marvellous effects produced by the millionth part of a grain of nux vomica. You profess to have read the introductory part of my work, and quote from it a passage to the effect that I published every case of which an account had been taken down at the commencement of the treatment. You seem also to have read the summary at the end of the work, in which it is stated that I do not mean to assert that all the recoveries were due to the Homœopathic remedies. These statements might have suggested to you that, in publishing the cases, I committed myself to no opinion of the cause of recovery in any individual case (one of the cases of pneumonia excepted), but acted the part merely of a faithful transcriber of the details of a series of experiments —contenting myself with the remark, that I could not be-

lieve the very favourable course and issue of so large a proportion of the cases to be due to accident, or imagination.

You may say, indeed, that if a case were of such a nature that its recovery could not help us to form an opinion of the value to be attached to the treatment, it was useless to detail it at all. But then you forget that, though the recovery of a case may not prove anything in favour of the treatment, its *not* recovering may help to prove something against the treatment. Had the case in question, and others of the same kind, undergone no improvement under the treatment, would you have sneered at them as contemptible. I suspect not—and you would have been right.

The other case to which I refer I transcribe, with your comments upon it.

"A young lady, aged 19. Aug. 3.—For between two and three years has been subject to diarrhœa, with pain in the bowels, after intervals rarely exceeding a week. The attacks last for several days, and the bowels are moved from six to ten times a-day. She is ill at present with one of them. Pulsatilla, 6, twice a-day. 29th.—A day or two after last report, the diarrhœa ceased, and has not recurred. 10th September.—Continues without having had a return of diarrhœa; a length of interval which she does not remember to have occurred since the complaint began.

"When the intervals *did* exceed a week, how much did they exceed it? Did they ever reach four weeks? If the young lady could not *remember* this, Dr Henderson should have inquired of those who could, before he adduced this flimsy case as evidence of the potency of the billionth of a grain of Pulsatilla. Does Dr Henderson think it a strange thing in the economy of nature, and only to be explained by the *Deus ex machina* of Homœopathy, that a case of diarrhœa, *characterised* by intervals of health, should stop *as usual*, although an incomprehensible something was given, and that it should not return for a few days longer on one particular occasion? These may seem little things to comment on, but surely little things will not be despised by Homœopathists of all men; and here they very significantly show the sort of philosophy we have to deal with. Men capable of admitting cases of this kind as evidence—and we could extract fifty from Dr Henderson's book much feebler than this—are demonstrably disqualified to treat of things which demand for their handling the stern logic of a masculine mind."—P. 249.

The severe observation which the last sentence contains on myself I let pass without remark, as I have reason to believe that you regret it. I may say, however, that it gave me no uneasiness, because I felt it to be undeserved. As to your inquiries about the case, I confess I am puzzled to know to whom I should have applied for the particulars you desiderate so very much. Who ought to know more of such matters than the person chiefly concerned, when arrived at years of discretion? I know no one who took so lively an interest in the transaction as she, or who had a better right to do so; and if *she* could not remember, who knew all the outs and ins of it, whose memory could have been trusted? It is certain, however, that she could have remembered whether, for two or three months before, she had had an interval of four weeks' freedom from her complaint. That, I think, will be allowed. Then, she may be allowed to have had no such interval for several months, at least, before the commencement of the practice, as she had immediately after. Still the case does not prove that Homœopathy was the source of her improvement. Granted: but had the complaint continued to recur with intervals "rarely exceeding a week" after that treatment was begun, as it had done for some two or three months before (her memory may be trusted so far, surely), the case would have proved that Homœopathy had *failed*. In a series of experiments regarding the truth of an allegation, the failures are of no less importance than the successes—nay, in physic they are of far more value as evidence, for successes may be only apparent, may be fallacious, whereas about failures there can be no mistake.

You say that you can extract fifty much feebler cases than this from the book. You cannot extract one that does not bear upon the investigation in the same way, and with even more significance than this; and though the view of these experiments which I have now given appears never to have occurred to you, it is not the less an

important one, or one which you ought to have seen without my help.

The cases in general were of that kind which composes the great majority of the ailments which are treated by the rules of orthodox medicine, by purgatives, antispasmodics, emmenagogues, leeches, blisters, anodynes, tonics, antacids, mercurials, &c., and yet without any of these they recovered, as you admit, very satisfactorily. Some of them were of a more serious description, and had resisted the orthodox rules, though applied in a few of them by some of the best practitioners in this city; and yet of these the majority recovered, or were greatly benefited also; and in a very short time. Those that did not, were mostly of a kind, or in a stage of disease that defies all medical treatment, with the exception, possibly, of the Irish. For, though your new contemporary of Dublin,* with a racy Irish *equivoque*, proclaims that results which you term very satisfactory, would, in the hands of Dublin Allopathy, "have been widely different"—I will suppose the writer to mean that the Dublin practice would have proved more successful; that the Allopathy of the favoured Isle, where the "vulgar regard the physician as scarcely second to the priest" (p. 179), and where the polite, we presume, regard him with much less reverence —would have been more fortunate than the Allopathy of Edinburgh, or of London—for modesty does not flourish everywhere. I leave you and your contemporary to settle the point between you; while I content myself with the fact, that the results of my cases must have appeared to the said writer too satisfactory to be published in his review, seeing that in his report of them he has taken such liberties with the text as, I trust, are not to be regarded as specimens of Irish honesty, among priests or physicians,

* The Dublin Quarterly Journal of Medical Science, No. 1, February, 1846.

the vulgar or the polite. It promises little for the character and prosperity of a new periodical that it should come into the world with disingenuousness stamped on its forehead. For, unwilling as I am to make a grave charge against an opponent as long as charity can suggest an excuse for him, in the present instance no choice is left me; —and I accuse the writer of that review of having studiously misrepresented the cases he has quoted. How sad it is that an uncandid spirit should befoul the current of criticism in questions of science and humanity. In the words of Hazlitt, "a writer who assumes the garb of candour, and an inflexible love of truth, to garble and pervert it, to crouch to power, and pander to prejudice, deserves a worse title than that of a sophist."

If the literal truth were known, I suspect it would appear that the cases are something of a puzzle to you Allopaths.—One will have it, that the recoveries are so satisfactory that they must be due to the cunning hand of nature,—whose works so far excel the doings of man; another, that they are so incredible that the cases must have been too highly coloured—(the "Lancet," 1845); a third (the "Dublin Journal"), that Allopathy could have done better. On the whole, then, the cases and recoveries may be regarded as tolerably good.

That portion of your article which is specially addressed to the practitioners of orthodox medicine, and lays down rules for the future guidance of "Young Physic," does not lie within the scope of what I proposed to myself in this letter, and I shall say little about it. Almost the only thing that strikes me as worthy of remark, in connexion with it, is, that your Dublin contemporary is somewhat unkind in receiving so coldly your scheme in reference to a "Young Physic," considering that you propose that a part of his nursing should be according to a genuine Irish receipt. Your ninth rule runs thus:—

"To discountenance all active and powerful medication in the acute

exanthemata, and fevers of specific type, as small-pox, measles, scarlatina, typhus, &c., *until we obtain some evidence* that the course of these diseases can be beneficially modified by remedies."

"I'll never go into the water again till I learn to swim"—was the wise resolution of the Irishman, as the story has it, who narrowly escaped being drowned. "Use no physic in the acute exanthemata till we learn that it is of use," is the new practical rule of a system strongly suspected of having drowned not a few in its day.

Even the young "Dublin Quarterly" has some doubts, although not very definite, of the great advantages to science of such a contemplative method as this; and ventures, very innocently, to surmise that "Young Physic, if it ever germinate at all, cannot possibly be expected to bear any fruit till our children, and our children's children, have been gathered to their fathers." If I mistake not, the treatment of the acute exanthemata will not have commenced even then, unless Young Physic apply to mesmerism for a revelation on the point.

On looking over the extracts I have made, in the foregoing pages, from your review, I observe that they do not include your reservations in favour of a mild and judicious Allopathy. As it would be unjust to allow the readers of this letter to carry away with them the impression that you condemn the ordinary practice altogether, I am bound to inform them that this is not the case. While you boldly arraign the medical art, as generally practised, denounce the too indiscriminate and profuse administration of drugs, and lament the existing ignorance respecting their remedial powers, you distinctly affirm that Allopathy is a system "which, with all its faults, contains a considerable amount of truth, and a yet greater amount of good."

This statement, indeed, does not refer specially to the Allopathic *art*, but appears to include its pathology, and other branches of medical science. These, as I have already said, are equally the property of Homœopathy,

and therefore no Homœopath will desire to controvert your opinion. Yet, supposing it to include a little of Allopathic *practice* also, I can offer no objection to its justice. For while embracing Homœopathy, in the sense in which I have explained it in this letter, I do not think that it contains the whole truth of therapeutics, though I believe it to contain much more than any other system. I am aware that in making this avowal I shall not please the bigots among the disciples of Hahnemann, and may incur the sneer of the suspicious and sordid (the sordid are always suspicious), among their opponents of the old school. I count either event a very small matter, persuaded that, when the candid and intelligent on both sides come to know one another, and understand one another's views and methods better than they do at present—when the dusts of controversy have had time to settle, and the atmosphere is clearer, they will find that they are not so very far asunder as they at present suppose. Yet we may have many a tough encounter before we "sheath our swords for lack of argument"—a prospect which we Homœopaths rather rejoice at. We claim nothing but a fair field and no favour; and are ready to fight it out, without a shadow of doubt as to the issue.

The contest may be conducted as it becometh gentlemen to contend, without the rash imputation of unworthy motives—without appealing to the prejudices and passions of the ignorant—without wilful unfairness, and without discourtesy. You have set the example of an onset free from those degrading vices of controversy, and I trust that I have in this defence been also successful in my endeavour to avoid them. If not, I shall be heartily sorry for my failure.

With every sentiment of esteem, I am,

Your obedient servant,

WILLIAM HENDERSON.

Edinburgh, March, 1846.

ON THE

OBSERVATION OF NATURE IN THE TREATMENT OF DISEASE.

By ANDREW COMBE, M. D.,

Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh, one of the Physicians in Ordinary, in Scotland, to the Queen, &c., &c.*

Edinburgh, 25th January, 1846.

My Dear Sir,—I have now carefully re-perused your article in the recent number of the "British and Foreign Medical Review," and rejoice that you have spoken out openly and honestly what you believe to be truth, regarding both Homœopathy and what is antithetically but incorrectly called Allopathy; and as I consider a consciousness of our faults to be the first step to improvement, in medicine as well as in morals, I feel no regret that you have made the confession so complete. In all probability you will be attacked for having spoken too disparagingly of "Allopathy," and too favourably of Homœopathy; but the result of discussion will be to extend the consciousness of such defects as are real, and to prompt to their removal, so that truth and the interests of humanity will gain by the course you have pursued. If I were to judge merely from the general tone of your remarks, I should say that you *have* exaggerated the defects of ordinary medicine, and that this has arisen from your not having been sufficiently careful to distinguish between its essence, and what may

---

* In a letter to the Editor of the "British and Foreign Medical Review, or Quarterly Journal of Practical Medicine and Surgery." April, 1846.

be more justly termed its errors and imperfections. Writing, as you did, for the express purpose of directing attention to the defects of ordinary medical practice, with a view to future improvement, you were in a manner forced to give them a prominence which was calculated to throw the real solidity of its foundation and the best part of its superstructure into the shade, in the minds of those readers at least who had not previously thought much on the subject, and hence were unlikely to discriminate for themselves. But, disregarding minor inaccuracies of expression and of opinion, and looking to essentials only, I should say that although, from the above causes, it might be easy to quote detached sentences from your review, which betoken an utter want of faith in medical art, yet it is evident that such was not your meaning, and that you have perhaps a stronger sense of its truth, beneficence, and importance to mankind, than many of those who will blame you for your broad avowal of its faults.

If you had been careful to make the necessary distinction between medicine as a practical science, based on the laws of nature, and only requiring the steadier application of sound principle to its cultivation, to lead to more certain and beneficial results, and that *soi-disant* medicine practised by so many of its votaries without regard to principles of any kind, and consequently often involving in its train no small amount of mischievous as well as merely negative consequences—between medicine, in short, and the abuse of medicine—and restricted your condemnation to the latter alone, you would have given less room for misapprehension and difference of opinion, and at the same time rendered your article both more acceptable and more instructive. Even as it is, however, you have not left yourself altogether defenceless. In two or three passages you admit, cursorily, indeed, but distinctly enough, that the defects you complain of are not inherent in, and inseparable from, medicine itself, but are only attributable to

a large portion of the prevailing practice; and while you denounce unsparingly the faults and omissions of its disciples, you are so far from being sceptical of medicine itself, that you pronounce it to be, even in its present state, "a noble and glorious profession," and destined to become as truly "grand and glorious in actual performance, *as it is now in its essence, its aims, and its aspirations.*"

Believing your censure, then, to be directed against the faults of medical science, as at present practised, and not against its principles and truths, I am so far from thinking it undeserved, that I have been for years impressed with similar convictions to your own regarding them, and felt an earnest desire to contribute any little aid I could towards their correction and removal. From an early period of my professional life, I was struck with the exclusiveness with which relief was generally sought from drugs or active treatment, and the indifference with which the *lædentia* were often allowed to remain in undisturbed operation, and the *juvantia* left entirely to chance or the whim of the moment. And yet experience demonstrates that, in the great majority of cases, the drug is only one influence among many, and that it is by the intelligent regulation of these external conditions, far more than by active medication, that the physician can effectually contribute to the comfort and recovery of the patient. Disease is a perverted state of a natural organic action, and not a something thrown into the system by accident, and which obeys no fixed laws. In the cure of disease, therefore, the business of the physician is not to supersede nature, but carefully to observe what is wrong, and to aid the efforts made by her to re-establish regularity and order. Accordingly, experience shows that the physician and the remedy are useful only when they act in accordance with the laws of the constitution and the intentions of nature; and hence, in chronic, and even in acute diseases, the most effective part of the treatment is generally the hygienic, or that

which consists in placing all the organs under the most favourable circumstances for the adequate exercise of their respective functions. If this be done systematically, every effort of Nature will be towards the restoration of health; and all that she demands from us in addition, is to remove impediments and facilitate her acts.

So far, however, is this from being the prevailing view of the proper sphere and duties of the physician, that even many medical men habitually act and speak as if they considered their only business to be the prescription of drugs, or some active external remedy, such as a blister or a bleeding; and in ordinary medical education, no attempt whatever is made to direct the attention of the student to the value of preservative or preventive treatment, or to those important auxiliaries to recovery from illness which it is the province of hygiène to unfold. The consequence of thus considering drugs as our only or chief resource is, that, when called to the bedside, we are apt to fix our attention exclusively upon the prominent symptoms, and allow obstacles to recovery to continue in operation or start up unsuspected, which often go far to counteract the best devised and most active treatment. This is the more to be regretted, because the practitioner himself is, or ought to be, the source of one of the most powerful and beneficial hygienic influences to which a patient can be subjected. Taking a high and just view of his position, his aim ought to be, on all occasions, to procure for the family of which he is the confidential adviser the highest health of which it is capable; and had the public, on their side, a just sense of his duties, they would resort to him for advice not only during actual illness, but regarding the management of their own health, and the education and management of their children. As a general rule, however, the practitioner attends only to the individual *sick* member to whom he is called in; and, so far from taking cognisance of the causes of disease amidst which the family

may be living, he, unless specially called upon, rarely thinks of laying down precautionary rules for the *future* guidance even of the one who is ill. He prescribes for him, and the present attack once over, he leaves him to the mercy of accident, to sink or swim, as chance may direct. Nay, if we look into the families of medical men themselves, it is rather an exception to see any rational precautionary treatment in systematic use, or any one advantage secured, which an acquaintance with hygiène would suggest as worthy of our attention. Breathing vitiated air, for example, is universally known to be one of the most active causes of scrofula, and yet I have more than once seen the scrofulous offspring, of otherwise sensible and well-informed medical men, sleeping three or four in a small room, with closed curtains around their beds, while an unoccupied, well-aired room was close at hand, and reserved perhaps for a stranger. Again, it is by no means uncommon to see the children of medical men suffer in health from habitual and indiscriminate indulgence of the appetite, neglect of air and exercise, and over-working of the brain, without even an attempt being made to prevent the evil by the adoption of a better regimen; and if they thus, from indolent indifference or practical blindness, neglect the protection of their own flesh and blood from evils which may be guarded against, how can we expect them to feel any interest, or use any foresight, in protecting the children of others? It is not indifference, however, that causes this inattention. It is simply that *they have never been taught* that such concern is a duty incumbent on professional men; and they have never been so taught because hygiène has ignorantly been considered to be a subject which concerned nobody but old women and hypochondriacs, instead of being, as it is in reality, both in its preservative and in its therapeutical applications, one of the most important and most beneficial elements of our professional knowledge.

It was a deep sense of the evils resulting from this state of things which led me, about sixteen years ago, to begin the preparation of the first of the three works I have since published for the purpose of inculcating the importance of physiological and hygienic information both to the public and to the profession. It was the same deep conviction which induced me, in 1838, in a letter on medical education to our friend Sir James Clark, which was printed but not published, to comment strongly upon some of these evils and their origin in the defective state of professional education. And it was under the same feeling that, in January, 1842, when disabled from practice by the illness under which I still labour, I became so desirous to rouse attention to the subject, that I embodied an outline of my views in a letter to my brother, Mr George Combe, then resident in Germany, to be made use of by him, if I did not survive to bring them out in a more satisfactory form. This I have never yet been able to do, although I have never lost sight of the subject; and, in this state of matters, perhaps the best answer I can now make to your appeal to your brethren, for suggestions in aid of your own efforts, is to lay that letter before you. To yourself, its perusal will be gratifying, as exhibiting the pre-existence of views in many respects in harmony with your own, as to the present state and future prospects of medicine; while to your readers, also, it may not be without interest, as affording in so far a presumption of the truth of the principles which have led us both, by almost parallel although different roads, to nearly the same conclusions concerning the sources from which the improvement of medical practice is to be obtained. But to bring out this coincidence more clearly, it will be useful, before subjoining the letter, to notice briefly the analogy which subsists between its objects, and the results at which you have yourself arrived.

The aim I had chiefly in view in writing that letter was

to show that, before undertaking the treatment of disease, we ought to make ourselves acquainted, 1st, with the laws which regulate the action of the different bodily organs during health; and, 2dly, with the *natural history or course of diseases*, that we may be able to read aright the indications of nature in their treatment, and take special care neither to counteract her efforts nor to substitute another method of cure for hers, unless where we have positive evidence that the *vis medicatrix*, judiciously aided by us, will prove unavailing. I then proceeded to show that it is from losing sight of the order and indications of nature, and neglecting the aid to be obtained from their observance, that no small portion of ordinary medical practice is fallacious, and some of it even hurtful, from actually interposing obstacles to the operation of the restorative power inherent in the living organism. In other words, I wished to direct attention in a special degree to the propositions, that *nature is the active agent in the cure of disease*, as well as in carrying on the ordinary operations of life; that the physician can never be so well employed as when he acts intelligently and consistently as the *naturæ minister et interpres;* and that there is small wisdom and less glory to be obtained from attempting either to substitute other devices for her arrangements, or to put her to the rout by main force, and by the use of means at variance with her laws.

Your propositions, on the other hand, are:—"1st, That in a large proportion of cases, as at present treated, the disease is cured by nature and not by the physician. 2d, That in a lesser, but still not a small, proportion the disease is cured by nature in spite of him; in other words, his interference opposing instead of assisting the cure. And, lastly, that, consequently, in a considerable proportion of diseases it would fare as well, or better, with patients in the actual condition of the medical art, as more generally practised, if all remedies, at least all active remedies and more especially drugs, were abandoned."

Such are the inferences which you have deduced from a general survey of medical practice, and I need hardly stop to point out how completely they harmonise with the conclusions at which I had arrived. This will be apparent to every reflecting reader, and will become still more so after perusing the letter in which my views are more fully developed. Here, however, it will be useful to remark that an omission occurs in your article which will tend to the further diffusion of a misapprehension already too prevalent on a point of vital importance. When you speak of "leaving the patient to the efforts of nature," as the alternative of abandoning what is usually called "active medical treatment," you, in common with most other writers, unguardedly use the phrase as if "trusting to nature" were equivalent to consigning the patient to chance or caprice for his guidance, to do anything or nothing exactly as the feeling or whim of the moment may suggest. This is at once an erroneous and a pernicious interpretation, because it is calculated to lead to indifference and carelessness, under the very circumstances in which vigilance and discriminating attention may prove most useful. So far from sanctioning inactivity on our part, an intelligent reliance on nature implies that we shall exercise, throughout the whole course of the disease, the most watchful observation over its phenomena and progress, and not only timeously remove obstacles which may interfere with its proper course, but rigidly fulfil all the conditions which a sound physiology shows to be most conducive to the well-being of the various bodily organs, and to their restoration when disordered. In this way, the physician may often exercise the most salutary influence, nay, even be the means of saving the patient's life, and yet not give one particle of medicine. In No. 14 of your "Excogitanda," and in a few other places, all this is virtually implied; but you nowhere bring out the principle with that clear and prominent distinctness which it so eminently deserves, and

which is so essential to a right understanding of the question in dispute between Homœopathy and ordinary medicine. I regret this omission, because the more I see, the more I am convinced that it is only by the intelligent observation and study of nature that a sound system of medical doctrine can be obtained, or medical practice ever be made to confer those benefits on mankind which it seems to me fully capable of rendering. In proportion as we proceed upon this solid basis, every step taken will be in advance, and every new discovery in physiology, anatomy, chemistry, &c., will tend to enlarge our power over disease, by enabling us more and more to give nature fair play. Instead, therefore, of medicine being superseded, as many suppose, by taking nature for our guide, it will, on the contrary, only begin to take just rank as a science, when our allegiance to nature shall become practical, enlightened, and complete. One word more of preface. In reading the subjoined letter, you ought to keep in mind that it was written merely as a private record of my opinions, and consequently bears the marks of haste both in its arrangement and language. If it had been intended for the public eye, I should perhaps have modified some parts of it, and been more careful in others to guard against any misapprehension which might arise from the imperfect development of my views. But as these are blemishes which do not affect the accuracy of its general statements or reasoning, and which I may safely leave to the indulgence of the reader, and as it is desirable to show the pre-existence of my opinions, such as they are, I shall not venture to make any alterations by way of removing the defects.

"TO GEORGE COMBE, ESQ., MANNHEIM.

Edinburgh, 8th January, 1842.

"My Dear George,—The great defect in the study of medicine, and in all investigations connected with it, at present, seems to me to consist in the nearly total absence of guiding principles, and in the neglect of the great rules

of Bacon, and more especially of *the observation of nature*, as the only solid foundation on which medicine or any other science can rest and advance towards perfection. This last will seem to many of my brethren a very singular charge, because if there is one circumstance on which the profession prides itself more than another at this moment, it is on the ardour with which observation is pursued and facts are sought for. Nevertheless, I believe the charge to be supported by incontrovertible evidence, and I attribute the small progress really made to this very truth. I admit that, everywhere, observations are made and facts stored up with an industry, accuracy, and zeal, which, under better guidance, would soon accomplish great things. But these observations and facts are incomplete, and therefore partial, and, if relied upon, apt to mislead. They are *phenomena or occurrences* rather than ultimate facts, and, their conditions and relations remaining unknown and unconsidered, they lead to no useful results. Hence, the multitude of observations daily recorded in the writings of medical men serve more to oppress the memory and puzzle the inquiring mind, than to advance science and improve practice. Hence, too, the thousand and one facts of the one year disappear under the shade of the thousand and one newer facts of the succeeding year. *All*, indeed, are not of this description. Some few out of the many are *complete* facts, and have a meaning which becomes daily brighter, and bears a direct relation to practice. The sum of these constitutes the real amount of the progress made by medical science, and the proverbial uncertainty of medicine affords a pretty accurate indication of the relative amount of incomplete or false facts gathered into the granary.

"The grand object of medicine is to preserve and restore the healthy action of all the different organs and functions of the human body, so as to ensure their efficiency, and fit the individual for the successful discharge of the duties devolving upon him as a created being and a member of

society. Here, then, the first step to be taken is obviously to become acquainted with the mechanism of the body, the structure of its constituent organs, the conditions or laws under which these act, the purposes which they respectively serve in the animal economy, and the relations in which they stand to each other, and to the external agents by which man is surrounded and acted upon from the moment of conception down to his latest breath. In other words, the first step towards rational principles of cure must consist in *a knowledge of the laws of the healthy functions*. The second ought to be the observation of the manner in which the various disturbing causes act upon the different functions, and the *kind*, *course*, duration, and termination, of the morbid action which they produce. Having investigated these points, we become qualified to inquire, in the next place, what circumstances will best favour the intentions of nature, and remove the obstacles which may have arisen to impede or thwart her efforts. To succeed in these aims, or even to make a rational attempt at succeeding, we must be profoundly impressed, or I may say *saturated*, with the great principle or truth, that all the operations and actions of the living body, whether healthy or morbid, take place according to *fixed and discoverable laws*, and that God has left nothing to chance. With this grand fact before us, it becomes palpably evident that we can do nothing rational, in the way of either prevention or cure, except in so far as we act in accordance with these laws. Many medical men have, however, a very different impression from this. A good physician will always seek to be, and never aim at being more than, Bacon's '*servant and interpreter of nature*.' A greater than he created man and ordained the laws of his being, and no surer road can be found than that traced by the hand of his Creator. Overlooking this truth, and viewing disease as an entity ungoverned by any definite laws, and not destined to run through any definite course, many medical men talk as familiarly of *their* 'curing' and

'arresting disease' as if they had an absolute control over the whole animal functions, and could alter their laws of action at pleasure. To my mind, no clearer proof of presumption and philosophic ignorance can be found than this usurpation of the prerogatives of Deity; and its results are often very unsatisfactory.

"That there are forms of disease in which a determinate nature and course cannot be easily traced, is quite true; but there *are* many more in which the natural course is as obvious as that of the sun. Take the familiar example of cow-pox, small-pox, fever, or ague. The disease is regulated by fixed laws in such a palpable manner, that every medical book describes with perfect accuracy the appearances which each will present on given days of its progress in an average constitution. The same holds with measles, scarlatina, and many other acute affections; and less clearly, but still perceptibly enough, with gout, rheumatism, and inflammation. All of these go through a regular course, in a shorter or longer time; and when everything goes according to rule, we feel assured that the constitution is safer than where some unusual accident has interrupted the natural progress of events. This, be it observed, is the course towards health which the Creator, in constituting man, considered best for him; and the wisest thing we can do is to act in accordance with it, and seek only to remove impediments. It is not we to whom the cure is intrusted, or by whom it is effected. The Creator has perfected all the arrangements for that purpose, and our sole business ought to be to give these arrangements full play. Man, however, is too full of his own importance to view things in this light. He wishes to be master and to control disease by his own act, and accordingly he has in all ages been seeking for the means of 'arresting' disease at its onset. Not many years ago, the cold affusion was in this way in high vogue for *cutting short* fever, and its praises were loudly sounded. Gregory applied it even in scarlet fever,

and I rather think in measles. In many cases nature was so far vanquished, by repeated cold drenching, that the disease was apparently cut short during the commotion, and (probably from relief being obtained through another channel) without visible bad effects. But in many more, nature stood firm, and additional mischief was added to the original evil, in the shape of affections of internal organs, which ended fatally. Now affusion is laid aside, and its legitimate substitute, tepid or cool sponging of the surface, is usefully employed, because in harmony with the natural course of events.

"Here, then, is a type or standard to guide us to the correct investigation of nature in other less determinate affections. Is it not presumable that they also have a certain nature, and course, and termination, which it would be well for us to observe and promote? Take even a severe cold, with which all are acquainted more or less. Everybody knows that when once set in, treat it how you like, it will run through a determinate course of increase, maturity, and decline, and that all we can do is to shorten a little the duration of its stages by diminishing its intensity; or lengthen it by increasing its severity. Occasionally, it is true, an incipient cold may be stopped by a 'heroic' remedy, such as a tumbler of warm punch at bed-time; but much more frequently the heroics leave the patient worse than they found him, and the common experience of mankind shrinks from their use. Even a common boil on the fingers runs through its regular stages of inflammation and decline, or of suppuration and ulceration, each stage being hastened or retarded by external or constitutional causes, but never inverted. But if we apply to the one stage the means which are adapted only to the succeeding one, the result will be injurious; or if we lower the system so much that it becomes inadequate to carry on the regular succession of actions required for recovery, mischief must once more be produced. Let us take a case

of pleurisy in an individual of average strength as an example. We know that, in ordinary circumstances, the excitement goes on increasing during a period varying from two to five or six days; that effusion of fluid into the cavity of the pleura ensues, that the inflammation then begins to abate, and after a few days more passes into an inactive state; that the natural action of the part then begins to be restored, and the fluid to be absorbed, till by and by recovery is completed. Or, if the inflammation endangers life, it either goes on longer than usual, or gives rise to effusion of a quality and quantity incompatible with recovery, and death at last ensues. In a case of average severity in a healthy constitution, left simply to the quiet and abstinence which nature almost compels, we know, from observation, that such are the stages by which recovery is brought about; and all that the physician need attempt or care for is to use every precaution to prevent excitement from running too high or going on too long, and to meet any contingencies which may interfere and impede recovery.

"Very different, however, is the general course of proceeding. Relying on the testimony of an incomplete fact (viz., that bloodletting produces excellent effects in inflammation, without attending sufficiently to the influence of the *adjuvantia*), the moment the practitioner ascertains the existence of 'inflammation,' he pulls out his lancet and bleeds the patient copiously. The oppressed vessels being thus partially emptied, much relief is experienced, and both patient and physician are pleased with the hope that the disease will be 'cut short.' This we shall suppose to have happened at the end of twenty-four or forty-eight hours, or first third of the *ascending* stage of the inflammation. In a few hours, however, the vessels have contracted, and they and the heart adapted themselves to their diminished contents, and nature thereupon resumes her attempt to carry the disease through its proper stages.

The pain returns, the pulse rises, and the oppression augments. Bleeding is again resorted to with immediate relief, and the same phenomena recur. At the third bleeding, we arrive at the period of the *natural* decline of the disease, and consequently no more excitement appears. 'Now, then, we have cut it short at last,' says the doctor, smiling complacently. 'Yes,' says the gratified patient, 'that last bleeding did the business; but what a pity you did not take more at first, and stop it at once.' With care and good management all goes on well, and by degrees the patient returns to his former diet and habits. If, however, he happens to be a person not of a robust constitution, matters go on more doubtfully, and after partial recovery he finds his strength permanently shaken, or perhaps falls into chronic disease, and ultimately dies, or after a long struggle he may regain his former health.

"If we attend to the observation of nature with a view to *co-operate with her*, and not simply to take her by storm, we shall be guided in our practice by the indications which she presents. In small-pox, for example, or measles, the excitement often runs very high in the first or eruptive stage, and means are required to moderate it. But if we bleed too freely, it is well known that the eruption (which we shall suppose to have come out) will generally disappear, and increased danger to life ensue, because the order of nature being forcibly interrupted, some internal disease is brought on, or the system sinks exhausted. Whereas if, instead of bleeding excessively, we keep the patient very quiet, in a cool well-aired room, and administer cooling drinks, mild laxatives or antimonials, and reserve bleeding for cases of necessity, the probability will be much in favour of recovery. To apply this to the pleurisy. Instead of being intent *on cutting it short*, the moment we ascertain its existence, we would have respect to its natural course and duration, and reserve our means to carry it safely through its regular stages. So far as my observation goes, cures would

be more numerous and complete were this principle followed. If a severe bleeding disturbs fatally the progress of small-pox eruption, may it not also, when unseasonably used, injuriously influence the course of internal inflammation, and lead, for instance, to fatal oppression or effusion? We know that *de facto* it is a very rare thing to cut short a smart inflammation by a severe bleeding; but is that a reason for bleeding again whenever the pain returns? I think not. If the inflammation threatens to run very high and endanger life, then depletion becomes a reasonable alternative, but not so if it resumes merely its normal or regular course. If regard were had to the nature of the disease, I am convinced that many cases in which blood is very freely drawn would do well and better by much milder means; and that in many where blood-letting is really needed, a great deal might be spared in point of quantity, with much future advantge to the constitution. Take, again, the beginning of a severe cold or influenza. We know that *de facto* it will increase for several days, after which the feverish state will decline. If, to force it away, we begin with hot drinks and sudorifics, we invariably increase the fever by adding to the excitement; but if we keep quiet in bed, moderately cool, eat little, and drink mild tepid fluids when inclined for them, abstain from mental excitement and annoyance, the feverish state will be kept down; and if we *then* give a good sedative antimonial, we shall rarely fail to elicit free and relieving perspiration, and to break the force of the disease. If we go out during the *rising* stage, we make the cold more severe, but in the second stage we do good. In the former, meat is injurious, in the latter, useful. The principle holds with a slighter cold, but is of course modified in its operation.

"Even the causes of disease, and remedies, themselves produce their effects in a regular order, according to fixed laws which we ought to study and respect; but in practice

we disregard this. It is no answer to say, 'Oh, they have acted quite differently in A. B. from what they did in B. C., and therefore they can have no determinate effects.' But find out the disturbing cause which interrupted the regular course in B. C., and the uniformity will become apparent enough. Such a cause must exist, whether we know it or not. Having practically no regard to the laws of the constitution, we are apt to overlook their influence on the operation of causes of disease, and to consider nothing in the light of a cause which has happened more than a few hours before. We forget that there is always an interval of hidden action in the system itself before the effect becomes palpable to sense. Take hydrophobia as a very striking example in proof. A person is slightly bitten on the finger, wipes it with his handkerchief, and forgets all about it, till at the distance of two or three months symptoms of hydrophobia suddenly show themselves, and he is speedily carried off. In the interval, he was unconscious of any change going on, and none was remarked by his friends. Yet nobody can deny that during all that time the poison was in the system, and producing changes of which the fatal paroxysm was the result. Even in the ordinary contagious diseases of small-pox, scarlatina, fever, &c., *several days of silent internal working* always intervene before the poison takes visible effect. This indicates the operation of fixed and determinate laws presiding over the production and course of diseased as well as of healthy actions. We never see a disease start up instantly after the application of its cause, nor full health suddenly take the place of active disease. We see the inhalation of fixed air induce immediate death; but it acts not by giving rise to disease, properly speaking, but by withdrawing one of the essential conditions of life. It is no proof of the absence of fixed laws and a determinate course, to say that the same cause does not always produce the same results. The constitutional state upon which the cause acts is often

different, and hence an impossibility of the result being identical under every variety of circumstances.

"By thus insisting on the necessity of a more complete and faithful observation of the course of nature, and of acting more systematically according to her guidance, I am far from meaning that we are to sit with our hands across, and allow things to take their own way. So far from it, it is certain that the principle I inculcate would demand more watchfulness, and give room for a nicer exercise of judgment, and a more consistent and, I believe, successful treatment. Disease arises either from the habits of the individual, from accidental causes, or from peculiarities of constitution acted upon by these. Hence, on being called to a patient, the first step in the *natural* investigation is to examine the constitutional qualities, to make ourselves acquainted with the mode of life, feelings, &c., and to trace the manner in which the cause has acted or continues to act. All these influence vary greatly both the nature of the disease and its probable course. They also bear directly upon the kind of treatment and its probable success. If, however, we are content to regard disease as an entity, arising by chance and observing no laws, we shall have no inducement to trouble ourselves or the patient with any of these inquiries. Such is in fact the practical faith of the great majority of professional men. They discover the existence of an entity, which in medical works has a certain name, and, knowing that in the same books certain remedies are said to be good for that entity, they prescribe them accordingly, without giving themselves much concern about their mode of action or fitness for the individual constitution, age, or stage of the disease, and without inquiring whether there is anything in the mode of life tending to reproduce the malady or not. In many chronic ailments, removable causes are thus often left in full operation, while the effect is partially mitigated, but not cured, by the use of active medi-

cines, and in a short time the whole evil returns in its full force.

"Whereas, if, proceeding according to the order of nature, we can trace the disease to any error in the mode of life, to any external source of danger, or internal peculiarity of constitution, aggravated by either of these two conditions, we can convince the patient of the fact, and give him a rational and confiding interest in the changes which we may recommend, and thus not only promote his recovery, but render him proof against all the seductions of quackery. According to the prevailing kind of intercourse between patient and physician, viz., unhesitating dictation on the one hand, and ignorant obedience on the other—blind faith is the pivot on which their mutual connection turns, a faith which is thus necessarily at the mercy of the chapter of accidents, and is often supplanted by reliance on the first bold and confident quack who comes in the way. People wonder that quackery abounds, and medical men ask for power from the legislature to put it down. They themselves, however, are in no small degree its abettors, and they have the remedy already to a great extent, although not wholly, in their own hands. *If they who are educated, and should know better, accustom their patients to the principles of quackery, by themselves treating them empirically*, can they wonder that patients who are not professionally educated, and are trained and treated on purely empirical principles, should be as ready to listen to the assurances of the quack as to those of the regular practitioner, whose manner of proceeding is often so nearly allied in kind, as to present no very obvious marks of distinction from that of the quack? In fact, medicine, as often practised by men of undoubted respectability, is made so much of a mystery, and is so nearly allied to, if not identified with, quackery, that it would puzzle many a rational onlooker to tell which is the one and which the other. And this being the case, it requires no ghost from

another world to explain why the profession has decidedly sunk in public estimation, and does not exercise that wholesome influence on public opinion which it ought to do. If the mass acts empirically, it can, in the very nature of things, expect only the amount of respect due to empiricism. The public mind has advanced immensely within the last fifty years, in elevation of view as well as in extent of knowledge. Medicine, however, has advanced only in knowledge; and, on looking back to the writers of 80 or 100 years ago, I incline to think that it has actually *lost* in elevation and comprehensiveness, and even in the perception of its own *nobleness* of sphere. If this be so, we must look within for the sources of regeneration, and for the means of regaining a dignified and honourable place in society. The public mind has advanced, while, in scope and general principles, the professional mind has stood still. To regain respect and relative position, the latter must shoot ahead again, and, on doing so, will regain its influence also.

"Let us, however, return to the case of pleurisy as an illustration. It is in general a well-marked disease; its nature is supposed to be well known, and the indications of treatment as clearly understood as those of any malady to which the human frame is liable. It is, therefore, rather a favourable example of the state of professional knowledge and principles of treatment. And yet, what do we find? Are medical men agreed how it should be treated? They *ought* to be, as it is frequent enough in its occurrence to give ample opportunities for experience: but they are not. In this country, many place their chief reliance on free and repeated blood-letting and mercury. In France, the plan of bleeding *coup sur coup*, in small quantities frequently repeated, is somewhat in vogue. In Italy, bleeding was given up by many, and large doses of tartar emetic were resorted to. In Germany, the cure was often intrusted to Homœopathic doses of 'medicaments.' The strange thing is, that

pleurisy is cured by, or at least pleuritic patients recover under, each of these plans, while also many recover under the 'médecine expectante' plan of lying in bed, drinking ptisan, and waiting upon Providence. Even in this country, however, a change has come o'er the spirit of my brethren within my own brief day. When I first opened my professional eyes, the lancet was in great vigour, and a well-employed medical man almost lived in a stream of blood. '*Vigorous practice*' was the order of the day. In typhus as well as in inflammation, the lancet was the sheet-anchor of many, and quantities of strong purgatives were administered, sufficient to put disease of every shape and hue to the rout. Take the same men of vigour now, at the distance of twenty-four years, and they will tell a different tale. It is no longer, 'Be bold and decided and prompt in what you do;' but, 'Be watchful, and trust *something* to nature.' This diversity of opinion and practice seems to me to have arisen partly from different constitutional states, arising from changes of atmospheric or other influences affecting the prevailing character of diseases, but much more from all parties disregarding nature's indications and efforts, and acting heterogeneously and without *any* rational principle. In this way, I believe that under each plan of treatment individual cases recovered which would have terminated fatally under a different mode; but, also, that under all of them many died who might have been saved by a more rational and close adherence to sound physiological principles. To these we may be partially led even by a reference to the symptoms usually present. The sense of cold and shivering, which commonly precede, would lead to the avoidance of exposure. The pain, increased by breathing, inculcates absolute rest and refraining from speaking. The oppressed respiration requires, of course, *purity* of air more than ever. The heat and thirst which soon arise demand cooling, simple drinks, and occasionally tepid sponging of the arms and face. The

local stitch asks for mild emollients, such as bran poultices, and the impaired appetite requests the stomach to be let alone. If the bowels are oppressed, a mild laxative or lavement are indicated.

"Suppose the exciting cause not to have been violent or long-continued, and the attack, consequently, one of moderate intensity in an average constitution, the probability is, that by the adoption of the above means alone the disease will run through its course safely, and leave the constitution unimpaired. In this case, effusion of fluid will as usual take place, be moderate in quantity, and be gradually absorbed. This effusion of serum, be it observed, is a natural provision,—1st, for the relief of the vessels of the inflamed part; and, 2dly, for preventing adhesion between the pleura of the ribs and that of the lungs, and, consequently, for the preservation of their free play upon each other. When two surfaces, one of them inflamed, are placed in juxtaposition, and no fluid intervenes, adhesion takes place, and hampers their mutual action. Within certain limits, then, there is no advantage to be gained by *preventing* the effusion, supposing we could always do so. *If we watch attentively*, and find all going on regularly and smoothly, according to the method by which nature removes the inflammation, why should we step in to prevent, say, any effusion? I believe that many of the extensive adhesions actually met with after death in persons who had at one time suffered from active pleurisy, are the results of over-active treatment interfering disadvantageously with natural processes. Adhesions occur also, however, but generally of small extent, from inflammation so slight in degree as to have suppressed the usual secretion, without leading to any effusion at all.

"Again, suppose the exciting cause to be very energetic, the habit inflammatory, and the attack violent. We, of course, ought to be doubly rigid in the use of the means above mentioned, and in addition we must watch closely,

and come in time to nature's assistance to prevent mischief. The reaction may run so high as to induce disorganisation, or the effusion of an albuminous or semipurulent fluid, or to over-excite the brain or heart, and produce distinct disease in them. Or the individual may have some infirmity of body, which renders it more dangerous to wait the usual course of events than to attempt to shorten or arrest it. The thinking physician will take all these contingencies into account, and decide to act; but when he does so, he will still time his measures according to the law of nature.

"18*th January*.—So far I had got, bit by bit, in my exposition; but, as writing fatigues me, I must now break it short, and send this away. Keep it merely as a rough and unfinished outline, and not as a proper embodiment of my views. To bring out these, would carry me into writing not a letter but a book. I shall, therefore, not resume the subject, nor for a time must you expect any more letters from me.—Yours, &c. A. C."

Assuming the general accuracy of the views contained in the preceding letter, we shall be warranted in inferring from them that the radical fault of a large portion of the prevailing medical practice consists—1st, in prescribing for the abstract disease, irrespective of the constitutional condition of the patient; 2dly, in placing the chief reliance, even in cases where the active interference of the physician is not at all required, on the use of drugs and active means, the operation of which, from their administration being guided by no principle or well understood rule derived from experience, tends not unfrequently to impede and disturb the restorative efforts of nature; and, lastly, in the general and often entire neglect of those physiological or hygienic arrangements which, from their co-operation with the intentions of nature, contribute so powerfully to the well-being of the individual when he is in

health, and to his recovery when attacked by disease. But much as these defects impede the present efficiency of medicine as a practical art, they do not in the least disprove its firm foundation in the laws of nature, or detract from the value of its principles, when properly applied (as they also often are) under the guidance of reason and experience. On the contrary, by laying bare the causes of the blemishes by which the medical superstructure has been disfigured, we not only show how they may be removed, but hold out the prospect of medicine being ultimately brought to as high a degree of certainty and perfection as any *estimative* science can attain. For even were all its constituent elements as fixed and certain as those of mathematics, their application must still be made by men of varying powers and knowledge to patients of different ages, sexes, habits, and constitutions; and it is plain that, under circumstances so inherently variable, there must always be such a wide field for the exercise of individual judgment and skill, as to render absolute similarity or equality of practice a moral impossibility. Approximate results are all that can be looked for.

Keeping to essentials then, and believing as I do, from the force of evidence, that ordinary medical science rests on a solid and natural foundation, I see great reason for endeavouring to improve and purify its doctrines and practice, but none whatever for abandoning the principles on which it is based. So far from this, I am more than ever persuaded that the observation of the order of nature is at once the surest guide we can have in the study and treatment of disease, and the only means by which we can arrive at a correct estimate of the special action and relative value of every therapeutic agent, whether Homœopathic or eclectic. The same remedy prescribed at different stages of the same disease may be followed by consequences so widely different as wholly to mislead us, if we do not use the necessary discrimination. Thus, an infinitesimal dose

or an ordinary drug administered just at the crisis or turning-point of a disease will be *followed* by an alleviation of all the symptoms; but surely it would be unreasonable to infer, merely from that sequence, that the dose or the drug was therefore *the cause* of the amendment. On the other hand, when a medicine in itself useful or harmless, given eclectically or Homœopathically during the increase of the disease, fails to prevent that increase from taking place, are we on that account warranted in inferring that it was the *cause* of the subsequent aggravation of the symptoms? Certainly not; and yet such inferences are so frequently drawn on equally slender grounds, that I, in common with most of my brethren, have had the mortification to receive unmerited praise and gratitude on the one hand, and blame on the other, for good and bad consequences which I was conscious were wholly independent of and unconnected with the drugs which were supposed to have caused them. In both instances all that could be *justly* said was, that the phenomena which ensued were *subsequent in point of time* to the administration of the medicine; and hence, unless we discriminate carefully between mere sequence and actual causation, we may easily be led by supposed experience into the most grievous errors. A case illustrative of this principle occurred a few days ago. A young lady complained of troublesome palpitation of the heart brought on by unusual agitation of mind. At the very time when the exciting cause was removed, a Homœopathist was consulted, and prescribed a globule. In a day or two the symptoms began to subside, and in a few days more they ceased. The Homœopathist knew nothing about either the existence or cessation of the exciting cause, and therefore would naturally consider the result as produced by his medicine. In reality, however, the supposed cure was so palpably the mere return of quiescent and regular action in a healthy subject, after the exciting and disturbing cause had ceased to operate, that the Homœopathist himself would

never have thought of ascribing it to anything else, if he had been fully aware of all the facts of the case.

It is from not taking sufficiently into account the many modifying causes which may influence the progress and results of disease, altogether irrespective of any drugs which may have been administered, that the most opposite conclusions may be honestly arrived at regarding the efficacy and merits of the treatment pursued. In the preceding letter, taking small-pox as an example of a disease known to pursue a regular course, I contrast the safety and advantage of a treatment conducted according to the indications of nature with the mischief which may be done by interfering violently with her order of proceeding; and show how differently the same indications may be interpreted when we have no sound principle to guide us. A few weeks ago, two cases of this disease occurred, so strongly illustrative of both propositions, and so entirely in harmony with the views we are both advocating, that I cannot refrain from shortly alluding to them. The first patient was attended by a general practitioner, who, it was said, had improperly resorted to copious and repeated blood-letting at the beginning of the attack. The eruption did not come out freely, and the patient sank. The second case occurred in the same family, but was attended by a judicious and watchful Homœopathist, who adopted what I have described as the natural treatment, but with the addition of certain infinitesimal doses. The result was, that the disease went through its regular course, and terminated in complete recovery. By some of those interested in the two patients, this result was proclaimed to be a triumph of Homœopathy over "Allopathy;" but, considered impartially, and assuming the accuracy of the statements made to me, the triumph, if there be any (for it does not follow that because the first patient died under the treatment pursued she would *necessarily* have recovered under the Homœopathic), may more justly be regarded as that of rational over

irrational practice. Not having seen either of the cases, and not being accurately acquainted with their details, I shall not pretend to pronounce a positive opinion concerning the influence of either the bleeding or the globules; but as the results in both instances coincided exactly with those specified in my letter, written four years before they occurred, as likely to attend *good* as contrasted with *bad* general treatment, I can scarcely be accused of uncharitableness in still doubting whether the globules had any real share in bringing about the recovery which report ascribed wholly to their agency.

Connected with, and arising out of, the same neglect of the natural history of disease is another difficulty, which greatly impairs the value of many of the cases published as illustrative of the efficacy of either system of treatment. In the majority of instances, the vagueness and meagreness of detail are such as to render it impossible for the reader to form, *from the data before him*, even a rational conjecture how the disease has arisen, or what constitutional or external causes are in operation to influence its intensity and affect its duration. It is precisely the obscurity inseparable from these omissions which often renders it difficult for the practitioner to appreciate the real agency of a new remedy or mode of treatment, where the unprofessional friends, from unconsciousness of their own ignorance, see only the clearest evidence of its efficacy, and are apt to express amazement and indignation at what they consider the wilful blindness or prejudice of the practitioner, who, still feeling a doubt, asks for further evidence before sharing in their enthusiasm. Not aware of the many sources of fallacy which lie in the way, the bystander attaches unhesitating faith to the narratives of cure, the very marvellousness of which is sufficient to call for the exercise of a prudent caution before perilling the lives of others on the assumption that the narratives contain a pure embodiment of truth.

It is for this reason, also, that I consider the numerous cases published in some recent Homœopathic works to be individually valueless as *proofs*, either of the action of Homœopathic remedies, or of the superiority of the new system to the old. Taken in the aggregate, their results may constitute a fair ground for further inquiry; but, individually, little weight can be attached to them as proving the specific virtues of any particular medicine, or the reality of its influence on the cure. They contain a mere statement that certain symptoms were complained of, and certain remedies prescribed, and that certain changes followed; but they afford no concomitant information regarding the mode of life and causes which led to the disease, or the hygienic observances by which the exhibition of the remedies was accompanied; and, consequently, the reader is not enabled to form an opinion of his own as to the agency by which the cure was effected. To the Homœopathist himself, who watched the cases, they may be pregnant with meaning, because he may have satisfied himself on these points; but to his readers they are nearly barren as items of evidence. This, indeed, is a defect inherent in a large proportion of ordinary as well as Homœopathic cases, although in a smaller degree; and, as a consequence, cures are often ascribed to the use of drugs, which have in reality had nothing to do with them. A case in point occurred to myself shortly before I relinquished practice. A delicately-constituted boy fell into a state of health which excited the alarm of his friends, who consulted several practitioners about him without benefit. The treatment prescribed seemed to have been in many respects appropriate, but little advantage was derived from it. This led me to minuter inquiry, and I found that the guardians of the boy, in their anxiety for his mental progress, kept him at school from an early morning hour till late in the afternoon, and thus prevented him from obtaining a due supply of nourishment to support his strength,

till, by the mere lapse of time, he became exhausted and irritable. They conceived a biscuit or a piece of bread in the forenoon sufficient for him, because it seemed to be so for other boys. I prescribed a mild tonic for immediate relief, but insisted that he should have a longer interval in the forenoon for exercise in the open air, and an early dinner of plain nourishing food. The decided amendment which speedily ensued was attributed by some of the friends *to the medicine;* but, in reality, it was due almost exclusively to the regimen being brought into harmony with the laws of nature. Similar medicines prescribed by others had been of no use; but, conjoined with the required change of regimen, their operation, so far as it went, was beneficial. Every medical man must have met with similar cases, and also with many in which it remained difficult for him, even after the most careful consideration, to determine what was the real agent in the recovery which ensued. If, in the case of the boy, I had prescribed a Homœopathic globule instead of the simple tonic, recovery would, I believe, have equally followed; but would the infinitesimal dose have been on that account entitled to the credit? I refer to this because I am acquainted with several cases of Homœopathic cures equally equivocal as this would have been, but to which much importance has nevertheless been attached; but I need not occupy your space with their details. To my mind they do not indeed *disprove* Homœopathy, but they do show that nature, duly seconded by the arrangements of the practitioner, is adequate to the cure of many diseases, without his resorting to drugs of any kind.

Speaking, then, from a general view of medical practice, I should say that it is open to the charge of being carried on without due regard to the period and natural course of the disease, or to any other recognised principle which can yield us safe guidance, and that this is the cause of much of the uncertainty and contradiction for which our

art is proverbial. We too often, I repeat, attack the disease as if we had to deal with an entity, and not with a state *of a living being* of a determinate constitution, who is suffering under it, and whose qualities, tendencies, and powers of endurance, consequently require to be taken into account as well as the disease itself. These defects, however, are not inherent in, and inseparable from, medicine. They are simply the defects of its cultivators; and if we were to begin by making ourselves acquainted with the laws of action of the different bodily organs, with the natural history of the diseases to which they are liable, and with the physiological conditions most favourable for their restoration, and then endeavour to deduce our curative indications from a general consideration of all those circumstances, there is every probability that we should make a nearer approach to unanimity of opinion, because then every one would set out from the same starting-point, and proceed in the same direction towards the goal. It is true that as yet we know so little of the course and tendencies of many forms of disease, that we might often be at a loss what treatment to adopt; but the clear recognition of our ignorance is the first step towards the acquisition of knowledge, and more enlightened observation would gradually remove the obscurity which at present prevails.

If any of these remarks should be considered by some to imply a want of faith in professional aid, I have only to reply that no conclusion can be more unfounded. With all its imperfections on its head, medicine, in the hands of discriminating and experienced men, seems to me already to be the source of the greatest benefits to suffering humanity. When cultivated with more constant reference to sound principles, it will become still more beneficial in its applications. It is a deep conviction of this truth which makes me so desirous to assist in the good work of medical improvement to which you are now devoting yourself.

It would be easy for me, were it needful, to point out numerous instances in practice, in which medicines were prescribed without reference to any guiding principle, or natural tendency in the system at the time, and in which, consequently, results ensued which were wholly unexpected. In this respect I cannot exempt myself from the censure I have bestowed upon other practitioners; and I must further admit that, even after I became fully alive to the importance of endeavouring on all occasions to act as the assistant and interpreter of nature in the treatment of disease, I continued to meet with many cases in which I could not discover what the real order of nature was, and in which, consequently, I was obliged to resort to purely empirical treatment, and with necessarily varying success. But even then I had this advantage on my side, that the abiding consciousness under which I lived of nature's presence and power inspired me with watchfulness for the observation of her earliest indications, and induced me in the meantime to borrow all the aid I could from her, by placing the various bodily functions, as far as possible, under the conditions most favourable for their healthy operation. When doing so, I have sometimes been rewarded by the gradual disappearance of difficulties which seemed at first irremediable, and by an amount of improvement which served to increase my faith in the restorative powers of nature even under unfavourable circumstances.

The one great principle, then, to which a comprehensive review of Homœopathy, "Allopathy," Hydropathy, and all other systems of medicine, seems irresistibly to lead is, that, in all cases and on all occasions, *nature is truly the agent in the cure of disease; and that, as she acts in accordance with fixed and invariable laws, the aim of the physician ought always to be to facilitate her efforts, by acting in harmony with, and not in opposition to, those laws.* Disease, as already remarked, is a mode of action of a living organism, and not an entity apart from it. In accordance with this view,

experience shows that when we favour the return to a normal action by simply natural means, recovery will ensue in most cases, without the use of drugs at all. So far from being always necessary to a cure, drugs are required only where the power of nature to resume her normal action proves inadequate or is impeded by a removable obstruction. Even then, it is still nature acting in accordance with her own laws that brings about the cure. She may be *aided*, but *she ought never to be thwarted;* and medicine will advance towards the certainty of other sciences only in proportion as we become saturated with this guiding principle.

A few words now on Homœopathy in particular. I am very glad that you have brought the question of its truth and merits seriously before your readers; for, of all methods of advancing the interests of science, that which consists in the supercilious neglect of alleged new discoveries, merely on the ground that they differ from what is already known, is assuredly the worst. We know far too little of the constitution of nature, and more especially of animated nature, to be able to decide *a priori* what can or cannot be true regarding the mode in which vital operations are conducted, or in which they may be modified by external influences. Medicine itself is in its very essence an estimative science, and the truth of the principles on which it rests can be ascertained or verified only by careful and extensive observation. Theoretically, these principles may be rendered more or less probable in the eye of reason, but they never can be demonstrated except by an appeal to experience. Medicine, moreover, considered as a system or body of doctrine, is still at the best in a very defective state. Every page of your Review admits and laments this unfortunate truth. We ought, therefore, to extend the hand of welcome to every man who is able either to correct an established error, or add a new truth to the existing store; and much more so, if the offered contribution should be that of a new

and important principle capable, if true, of modifying and improving the whole field of medical practice. Not that we are by any means called upon to run after and examine every new theory or alleged discovery in medicine, merely because it is announced to be such. If we did, we should impose upon ourselves a never-ending and most useless task. But surely we are bound not to be too rash in rejecting, without examination, facts and principles which come before us, attested by men of experience, skill, and integrity, and who can have no motive for deceiving us. Judged of by the standard of our own opinions, these facts and principles may seem at first sight to be altogether absurd; but, if so, the question then comes to be, is our standard itself undoubtedly a correct one? Or may it not be that ignorance has misled us to adopt it as infallible, and that it would be wiser in us to compare both it and the alleged discoveries with nature before assuming either to be demonstrably true? Had this reasonable course been followed with the discoveries of Harvey, Jenner, and Gall, how much idle and acrimonious disputation and professional obloquy might have been avoided, and how many benefits might have been obtained which were lost for years to suffering humanity, by the opposite course of first rejecting and ridiculing, and then examining evidence only when compelled to do so by a humiliating, because tardy and ungracious, necessity.

Let not this wholesome lesson, then, be lost to us who are the living successors of those who acted so unwisely. To use your own words, Homœopathy, whether true or false, comes before us for examination with "claims on our attention which cannot be gainsayed." It is, you say, an ingenious system, "professing to be based on a most formidable array of facts and experiments," and "woven into a complete code of doctrine with singular dexterity and much apparent fairness." Its discoverer and chief cultivators are, as you believe, "sincere, honest, and learned

men." Dr Fleischmann, perhaps the most eminent among them, is considered by you as "a regular, well-educated physician, as capable of forming a true diagnosis as other practitioners," and as "a man of honour and respectability," whose testimony as to matters of fact "you cannot therefore refuse to admit." Even in acute diseases, the results of his treatment are such as "would have been considered as satisfactory by any candid physician;" and, according to you, even his own narrative affords ample evidence that many of his cases *were* severe; and you candidly add that this was confirmed to you by the private testimony of a competent physician who followed his practice for three months, and himself traced the progress of the pneumonic cases by careful auscultation through all their stages up to perfect recovery, which took place in as short a time as under the most energetic treatment. In some eruptive and febrile diseases, the mortality is stated by you to have been below the ordinary rate. Let us scout quacks and pretenders as we may, here is surely too strong a *prima facie* case to warrant our dismissing it with mere ridicule and contempt, and one which amply justifies you in the course you have adopted of seriously investigating its claims. I am aware that you have been blamed by many for occupying your pages with even a refutation of "such trash;" but so far from participating in this feeling, my chief objection to your review is that it does not go far enough to be *conclusive*, either for or against Homœopathy. You have admitted too much, and denied too much, to warrant your either pronouncing a definitive sentence, or reposing in *mere opinion* against its truth. Had you shown that the general results of its practice were *less* favourable than those of ordinary medicine, you might legitimately have held yourself absolved from going further; but in your present position you can no longer stand still. If, as you admit, the truth of Homœopathy is a *question of fact and experience*, which no mere argument can set aside, you are bound in

reason and in logic *to test its facts* for yourself before pronouncing authoritatively that it is not true, and more especially before stigmatising it as "useless to the sufferer and degrading to the physician." However improbable its doctrines and practice may be in an *a priori* point of view, it is not by argument or ridicule that its alleged stronghold of facts can be successfully assailed. *As a matter of theory*, supported only by argument, Homœopathy produces no conviction whatever on my mind of its truth, or even of its probability; but as *a question of fact*, claiming to rest "on the irresistible ground of its superior power of curing diseases and preserving human life," and on the alleged experience of able and honest men, as competent to judge as most of those who oppose them, I cannot venture to denounce it as untrue, because I have no experience bearing especially upon it to bring forward, and we are still too ignorant to be able to predicate *a priori* what may or may not be true in the great field of nature. But after the presumptive evidence which you yourself have produced, if I were now in practice I should hold myself bound, without further delay, to test its truth by careful and extensive experiments; because, where truth is really our aim, the shortest and least encumbered approach to it is always the best; and even a few well-defined and carefully observed facts would carry far more weight, as *items* of evidence, than volumes of general or controversial reasoning. In instituting such an inquiry, however, we ought to be prepared to lay aside prejudice, and to scrutinise facts with the fairness and liberality characteristic of a love of truth, and not regard them with dislike and distrust, as if they were as many live embers purposely laid down to burn our fingers the moment we touched them. View the question as we may, *one of three things must be:* either Homœopathy is true, or it is false, or it is a mixture of truth and error. Let us suppose the worst, and hold it to be false in its foundation, and false in its superstructure, what harm can

result from putting it to the test, and ascertaining the fact demonstrably? None whatever, but, on the contrary, much good. We shall at least *have gained the power of giving a direct and authoritative negative to its allegations*, which we shall then prove to be fallacious, and which have been suffered to reign and diffuse themselves for thirty years from the absence of *direct* counter-evidence by which to rebut them. We shall thus be able also to put the profession and the public on their guard with some chance of being listened to, and shall have obtained the inestimable advantage of keeping our own minds open to the admission of new truths, and of showing that in our estimate of evidence, and in our conclusions, we are actuated not by any mean jealousy or dogmatic assumption of authority, but by the single and simple desire of advancing the interests of science and humanity to the best of our ability. The *very worst* that can happen in the event of its being wholly untrue is, that we shall have bestowed some time and pains in obtaining the means of more effectually putting down a great error; while, as a compensating advantage of no small value, we shall have at once increased our knowledge and cultivated and strengthened our intellectual and moral faculties, by the very nature of the mental exercise which such a scrutiny requires; and surely these will be rewards well worth all the time and trouble which they may cost us.

If we adopt the supposition that Homœopathy embodies an *admixture of truth and error*, the inducement to institute a rigid and careful inquiry into its claims becomes still more imperative, that we may obtain possession of the one, and carefully avoid the other. The degree of success, be it more or less, which all admit to attend Homœopathic practice, as conducted by such men as Fleischmann, is sufficient to show that either the system or its advocates possess *some* advantages in the treatment of disease, which it would be useful for ordinary practitioners also to examine

and adopt. Whether the means which afford these advantages be derived from the domain of hygiène, of materia medica, or even of the imagination, is of comparatively little practical consequence, provided *their utility to the patient and the best mode of reproducing and applying them to the treatment of disease* can be clearly established. This, however, can be done only by careful investigation, and that such investigation would be amply rewarded may fairly be presumed, from the good already effected by Homœopathy in demonstrating the evils attendant on that over-active medication which characterises so much especially of English practice. Ordinary medicine is now not nearly so heroic and undiscriminating in the use of strong measures as it was some years ago, and this improvement is unquestionably due in part to the progress of Homœopathy, as well as to the natural increase of our knowledge.

The remaining, although unlikely, supposition, viz., that Homœopathy shall prove to be *essentially true* in its fundamental principle, and consequently fraught with benefits to science and humanity, as its advocates affirm it to be, need not detain us more than a moment. *If true*, how much more shall we then have reason to rejoice that we did not look upon its claims with prejudiced eyes, or reject and condemn it unheard and unexamined! Had Harvey's detractors examined his facts first, and then given their verdict, how different would the results have been to themselves, to him, and to mankind! And yet in our own day the profession acted towards Jenner, and also towards Gall, as if Harvey's name and memory had been blotted from the page of history.

I press all these considerations upon you, not from any particular leaning towards Homœopathy, or any other new and disputed branch of knowledge, but because of the transcendent importance of cultivating science in a right spirit, and offering truth a ready and unprejudiced welcome from whatever quarter it may come. Ridicule and

declamation may be rightfully employed to explode errors *after they shall have been proved to be so;* but they are most unfit instruments for the primary investigation of truth, and as such ought to be banished for ever from scientific discussion, and a candid spirit of philosophical inquiry be instituted in their room. I have had no personal experience of Homœopathy, and am, consequently, as little inclined to admit as to reject its claims, but I should wish to steer clear of prejudices regarding it. There are perhaps a few analogies in its favour, but its doctrinal expositions embody much that is crude and contradictory, and most of its practical evidence, in the shape of published cases, is rendered nugatory by the same sources of doubt which render so much of professional experience and testimony inconclusive, if not worthless. Sufficient discrimination is not used, or if used not recorded, to warrant much reliance on the alleged connection between the remedy and the recovery in individual cases. As in ordinary medicine, the *post hoc* is too universally assumed to imply the *propter hoc.* If I am not mistaken, the more intelligent Homœopathists themselves admit this, and in consequence do not claim *belief* on the ground of the recorded cases, but affirm that, on the contrary, rational belief can be produced only by personal and extensive experience. But, while I refuse belief, I can see no reason for that deadly hostility which many feel towards *the principle* of Homœopathy. If it be true, such hostility is misplaced and injurious. If false, it is needless and supererogatory; for the hostility will vanish with the non-existence or destruction of its object. And, after all, why should either party delight in representing Homœopathy and ordinary medicine as *in every respect* opposed to each other? In a large proportion of cases, the more rational and enlightened men of both parties employ the very same hygienic and general means which we have already seen to act so large a part in effecting recovery; and the chief difference between them re-

lates to the principle on which the requisite medicine is to be selected. The Homœopathist prescribes according to the principle of *similia similibus*, because experience, he says, proves this to be the safest and most efficacious plan. The ordinary practitioner, on the other hand, prescribes that which rational, or it may be routine, experience has led him to believe the best adapted for cases of the kind before him; and without stopping to inquire whether its action is homœopathic, allopathic, or antipathic. Surely there is no necessary cause of quarrel in all this, but merely results to be tested by careful experiment. "True," you may say, "but then the infinitesimal doses are so absurd." They certainly look very absurd; and I at once admit that nothing short of demonstration and personal evidence will ever inspire me with a conviction of their power to do either good or harm. But then all Homœopathists say that it is the principle of *similia similibus*, and not the dose, which constitutes the essential element in their system, and that the infinitesimals may be discarded, and yet the great principle of Homœopathy remain unshaken. This latter, then, is the great fact to be proved or disproved, to settle the question for ever; and why should it not be put to the test? Let experiments be made on a sufficient number of healthy persons with quinine, or any other drug, to ascertain whether it really has the property ascribed to it of exciting certain groups of symptoms in a sound constitution, and, after carefully varying and repeating the experiments, faithfully record and publish the results. Surely there is nothing unphilosophical or undignified in instituting such an inquiry, and nothing so difficult as not to be easily overcome by judgment and patience. Having tried their action in health, try the same remedies *in the usual doses* in the treatment of disease with as much care and discrimination as possible, and again record the results. If the principle holds good, let us adopt it, and be thankful we have now a surer guide

than before. If it fails, our exposure of its fallacy will tell with tenfold effect, from being founded on direct experience. In the same way with the infinitesimal doses, let us go at once to facts, and leave mere disputation to the idle speculator. All truth is harmonious, and what is true in the one sytem must harmonise with and throw light upon what is true in the other, and, consequently, it would be better for science were both parties to endeavour to find out the points of contact rather than those of repulsion. In the very nature of things, certainty or absolute identity of opinion is, and ever must remain, an impossibility; and it ought never to be forgotten that in this respect there is a radical difference between medical and physical science. Physical science is *fixed* and *positive* in its principles and in its details, because its facts are always accessible for examination under the same conditions, or under such variations as can easily be traced and allowed for. Medicine, on the contrary, is and ever must be an *estimative* science, because its facts and phenomena are subject to continual variations from varying states of the body and mind of the patient, which we can neither control nor appreciate with entire accuracy. Its cultivators, too, are men differing in intellectual power, knowledge, skill, and experience; and even, if they were all equal, their judgment is constantly liable to be impaired or disturbed by any slight disturbance of health or excitement of feeling, or even by a little extra fatigue; and hence, although its principles are fixed and determinate, because also founded on the laws of nature, the soundness of the conclusions deduced from them for the guidance of treatment must ever depend on the soundness of the estimate formed by the physician of their operation and influence in the individual case. Very rarely, indeed, can they be absolute, and hence the wide field for the exercise of sound judgment, skill, and discrimination, on the part of the practitioner, and the mischief which may attend a practice founded on mere routine.

Hence the forbearance and charitable construction which, as members of a liberal and useful, but most difficult, profession, we are bound to exercise towards each other; and for the exercise of which there is, I fear, ample occasion in this very letter. But restrained as I have been by impaired health, as well as by the impossibility of doing full justice within your limited space to a subject at once so extensive and so important, I could not always express my opinions with the precision which I wished, and therefore I must trust to your good sense and right feeling not to give undue importance to any isolated or dubious expression which you may meet with, but to adopt that meaning which is in accordance with the general spirit of my remarks. My only anxiety has been to help you in the good work to which you have dedicated yourself with so much zeal, energy, and talent, and for which you will, I have no doubt, one day have your reward in a rich harvest of useful results.

I remain, my dear sir, very sincerely yours,

ANDREW COMBE.

P.S.—To prevent the recurrence of a very common mistake, may I be allowed once more to call the attention of your readers to the broad distinction which subsists between the principle of *similia similibus*—which alone constitutes the basis of Homœopathy—and the doctrine of the infinitesimal doses, which has been engrafted on, but does not constitute a necessary part of it? This caution is the more required, because the two propositions are more frequently confounded than distinguished, and we are surely bound to take the word in its correct meaning, as used by Hahnemann and his followers.

In a practical point of view, also, it is important to note the distinction, because, while it would be comparatively easy to verify the specific powers or mode of action of any drug given in ordinary or appreciable doses, and thus to *test the real principle* of Homœopathy, it would be far more

difficult, and require a much longer and more varied inquiry, to obtain precise and conclusive proofs, were the same drugs to be administered in doses altogether inappreciable to sense, as in the decillionth of a grain. We ought, therefore, to begin with the most important part of the inquiry first, and to leave the doctrine of the infinitesimal doses to be tested in its turn, if need be, after the *viability* of its parent shall be decided.

A. C.

HOMŒOPATHY *viâ* YOUNG PHYSIC.

By J. RUTHERFURD RUSSELL, M. D.*

There is a point in the development of a complex science, such as medicine, at which it seems to be overburdened by the multitude of its facts and the insufficiency of its generalisations. When it has reached this stage, and come to a dead lock, it gets no aid from those who have the reputation of being its most successful cultivators. For the very endowments which gave them renown at the time when the science required merely the accumulation of materials, or the critical selection of facts and their lucid arrangement, disqualifies them from the higher task of grasping the subject as a whole, and viewing it by the light of general philosophy, discovering the true centre from which it must be re-organised. This great achievement requires more than the highest powers of analytical acumen; it requires the intuition of synthetic genius. And

---

* Although I have no hesitation in allowing this paper to appear even in its present form, yet, had I time, I should feel inclined to make many material alterations in it. While I still feel that I must radically differ from Dr A. Combe in his views on the relation of the laws of nature as they affect man whether in health or sickness, yet I wish to add my trifling tribute of admiration to the blameless purity and active benevolence which distinguished the life of that most liberal and beloved physician.

when the voice of the great discoverer, who is destined to renovate his department of knowledge, makes known the central truth, there is none on whose ear it falls more repulsively than on that of the high priest of the special science itself. Great discoveries belong to philosophy rather than to science; and no class of minds is less prepared to receive them than are those who have devoted themselves to the study of scientific details alone.

There is nothing more strange or more lamentable than the total absence of philosophical discernment displayed by those who are now the appointed guardians of medicine. While deploring its present uncertain and unscientific character, they do not seem at all aware of the real cause of its poverty, and propose remedies which would be as useless if got as they are impossible to get. Their inability to perceive what medicine stands in need of, arises from the same cause as their rejection of Homœopathy. If there be anything more striking in Dr Forbes' memorable article than this, that throughout the whole of it he speaks of theory in medicine as if it were quite an unimportant thing, and as if the whole end of the labours of the medical philosopher were attained if he made himself sure of a sufficient number of facts, it is the constant recurrence of the expression, "philosophic practitioner" —whose philosophy seems to consist in doubting much and in doing nothing. Unsparingly as he condemns Homœopathy, as tending to degrade physic by making its practitioners artisans, the position he would appoint to medicine is singularly opposed to the usual requirements of an art and a science. Science is certain knowledge, giving the power of prediction; art is the application of that knowledge. But his science consists in knowing that we can know nothing, and the art he recommends us to practice is the *dolce far niente!* He speaks of Homœopathy as "an ingenious system of medical doctrine, tolerably complete in its organisation, tolerably compre-

hensive in its views," and says that "it is as good and rational a theory as most of our medical theories." With the great leader of philosophic practitioners, it seems a very light matter whether a theory be right or wrong. He seems to regard it very much in the light of the shell of an oyster, useful only for containing a nutritious body of facts. It is not surprising that, considering theory to be so very insignificant a matter, he lightly observes, with an inconsistency which might be culpable in one who took a more serious view of the value of theory, "that we may indeed have sufficient proof to satisfy any reasonable mind that the theory, or doctrines, or principles of Homœopathy are false," although he does not enter into any such proof, but waives it till a more convenient season. He turns away contemptuously from the consideration of the theory, doctrines, or principles, and eagerly asks what the *facts* are worth.

The facts arrest and startle him. He finds that under the guidance of this theory practitioners of medicine restore to health more patients than under the orthodox method, which disdains, as an infringement upon the liberty of the faculty, to acknowledge obedience to any theory whatsoever. This fact of the greater success of Homœopathic treatment, is a hook in the nose of Allopathy, which must in some way or other be extracted. The problem is this:—By the most authentic returns, more cures are effected in certain dangerous diseases under Homœopathy than under Allopathy; how, then, is the inference to be prevented that, therefore, Homœopathy is good, and the position to be established that it is radically bad? This is done in the simplest and most ingenious way. Good and bad are relative terms: it is the same thing to say that a man is better than a monkey, as to say that a monkey is worse than a man. It merely requires the transposition of the predicates. If we say Homœopathy is better than Allopathy, we suppose some good in the former—more good,

at least, than in Allopathy. But we have only to say Allopathy is worse than Homœopathy to get rid of the dilemma. And this is the position our great antagonist assumes! But it is urged, if Homœopathy be bad, and Allopathy still worse, how do you retain your allegiance to Allopathy? To this he answers: it is bad *in esse*, but good *in posse;* it contains the germs of its entire renovation, and it only requires proper attention to foster the latent rudiments of good into vigorous growth. How comes it, a sceptic might inquire, that you, who have so long held a chief place in the cabinet of medicine—you, her appointed, acknowledged, respected minister—should, till now, never have whispered your belief that the system you have been directing requires a thorough reformation? How is it that this momentous truth has been forced from you by the doings of so insignificant a body as the Homœopathists? Surely in the history of our art, among the triumphs of Homœopathy will be recorded,—"It forced Dr Forbes to give his candid opinion of the state of medicine. It forced him to make confessions during his life, which otherwise he might have reserved for his testament."

But let us follow out the process of Young Physic, and see exactly what it is, and to what it leads:—Allopathy and Homœopathy are both bad. In their hospitals many patients die, although more recover. The average mortality in both is much alike; the kind of diseases which kill them is much alike. It is plain that, as there is no great difference in the amount of recoveries under the two systems, they must both derive their efficacy from the same cause. Now, as the methods of treatment are wholly opposite, the benefit must accrue from something beyond or outside of the treatment altogether. The only thing beyond that, common to both, is the natural power of recovery. Here, then, is the real explanation of the cause of the equality in the mortality and recovery in the two sets of hospitals:—that

those who are able to stand the treatment and the disease get well; and those who are unable die. The practice of medicine (*medendi*, curing) turns out to be nothing. All that the physician can do, is to open his wards and see fair play between nature and death. If the struggle between them end in favour of the latter, he has the satisfaction of confirming his diagnosis; if in favour of the former, of dismissing his patient.

Is it, then, really come to this—that, after two thousand years of observing disease, we are no further advanced in its treatment? In what respect is Young Physic superior to Hippocrates? They both advise the same thing: Watch, say they, the progress of disease, but do not interfere. Young Physic, however, remarks, that all who have deviated from this rule have done mischief. All that his greater experience has taught him is, to have greater confidence in the canon of Hipprocates. How long is this new cycle to run? Are we to stand, like sentinel-stars, for other two thousand years, silently watching the course of disease, while ever and anon an eccentric man of action suggests some practical innovation, till, at the expiry of this double millennium, another Forbes arises, and with his critical crowbar demolishes the systems of these practical men, and dooms his fellow-mortals to endure all the pangs of sickness, with nothing but the consolations of philosophy to alleviate them? In short, what is the germ in Allopathy on which Dr Forbes rests his hopes? The only positive recommendations we can find are—carefully to watch the progress of disease, to employ all proper hygienic measures, and *to use the numerical method in noting down the effects which have been or may be observed to follow the administration of the medicines.* The first two recommendations, however excellent, can hardly be considered as at all differing from those given by Hippocrates; and, as Dr Forbes evidently expects much good to accrue from the last, it is to it we shall now direct our sole attention: and

if we can establish that the only results of such a method are increasing perplexity, rank error, or total disbelief in the powers of medicine, we must acknowledge the incapacity of Young Physic to be of any use—except in the way of a pioneer.

"*Ars longa, vita brevis, observatio fallax;*" how, then, can any man, in the short term of his life, discover for himself what remedies are certainly useful in the all but infinite variety of diseases he has to treat? Suppose even that he has the advantage of a large hospital, is it possible for him to make experiments in such a way as to arrive at certain knowledge? The Young Physic school, which prides itself upon its philosophy, recommends the use of the numerical method, that, by noting down the result of each medicine in each form of disease, we may at length arrive at positive data to direct us in future cases. Let us inquire what philosophers of established reputation think of this plan.

M. Comte scouts with the same severity as Dr Forbes all ontological speculations, and founds his system on the ascertainment of positive phenomena alone, leaving the mystics to pry into the cause of these phenomena. He has, moreover, a profound respect for mathematical science, places it as the first and fundamental science in his scheme of human knowledge, and is most anxious to carry the numerical spirit as far into general science as it will legitimately go. He would apply the method of numerical notation to every department of human knowledge where it could be of any avail. Surely, if any philosopher of note is likely to countenance Young Physic's brave attempt to reform medicine by introducing into it the accuracy of arithmetic, it must be M. Auguste Comte. His opinion is given in the following words:—

"Indeed, the spirit of calculation tends in our day to introduce itself into this study *(Physiology)*, especially into that part of it relating to medical questions, by a much

less direct method, under a much more specious form, and with infinitely more modest pretensions. I wish to speak of that pretended application of it which is called the statistics of medicine, from which many savans [*e. g.*, *Young Physic*] expect wonders, and which, from its very nature, can lead only to profound and direct degradation of the medical art (reduced by it to a blind enumeration). Such a method, if we may be allowed to call it by the name of method at all, cannot, in reality, be anything else than absolute empiricism, disguised under the frivolous garb of mathematics. Pushed to its extreme logical consequences, it will tend to make all rational medication radically disappear from medicine, by conducting the practitioner to make chance trials of certain therapeutic measures, for the purpose of noting down with minute precision the numerical results of their application. It is evident, on principle, that the continual variations to which all organism is subjected, are necessarily even more pronounced in a pathological, than in a normal state, as a result of which, the cases must be even less exactly similar, whence results the manifest impossibility of making a judicious comparison between two curative methods derived from data furnished by statistical tables alone, independent of some sound medical theory. No doubt some direct experimentation, restrained under proper limits, might be of great importance to medicine as well as to physiology, but it is precisely under the strict condition that it shall never be simply empirical, but that it shall always attach itself either in its institution or in its interpretation to an entire system of corresponding positive doctrines. *(A l'ensemble systematique des doctrines positives correspondantes).* Notwithstanding the imposing aspect of the forms of exactness, it would be difficult to conceive of an opinion in therapeutics more superficial and more uncertain than that which rests solely on the easy computation of fatal and favourable cases, to say nothing of the pernicious

practical consequences of such a manner of proceeding, where one could not beforehand exclude any kind of attempt.

"It is really deplorable that geometricians have sometimes honoured with some kind of encouragement such a profoundly irrational aberration, by making vain and puerile efforts to determine, by their illusory theory of chances, the number of cases sufficient to make these statistical results legitimate."—Cours de Philosophie positive par M. Auguste Comte. Tome 3me pp. 418, 420.

We must again remind Young Physic that M. Comte is one of the first of living mathematicians, and one who, more than any other philosopher, insists upon the prolongation of the mathematical method as far forward into the more special and complex sciences as it can be made to go.

There can be no greater contrast than that presented by Dr Forbes, as a destroyer, and as a builder. Nothing can be clearer, more precise, more acute, than his objections to the systems or practice of others; but when he makes his own system known, he becomes vague and obscure in the extreme, and falls into declamation about the medical profession being "grand and glorious in its essence, aims, and aspirations!" Wearied, it would seem, with the work of demolition, he sinks into the state described by Horace, when he says, "*Auditis? an me ludit amabilis insania?*" and in the dim perspective he sees the future progeny of Young Physic flit past like Banquo's shadowy race, but cannot catch or paint their lineaments.

The system which is thus faintly suggested in the article of Dr Forbes is more fully expounded by Dr A. Combe, in his letter "On the Observation of Nature in the Treatment of Disease." This letter is very remarkable for its candour and high moral tone. It contains also much truth, and shows that the writer, to some extent, perceives the real cause of the backward state of medicine when he says

that, "notwithstanding the ardour and success with which facts are sought for, yet, inasmuch as the ultimate facts remain unknown, the others lead to no useful result." If, by ultimate fact, Dr Combe means the largest possible generalisation—and this is the only idea that a disciple of Bacon can attach to the phrase—then we entirely agree with him, but we look upon the Homœopathic principle as being that ultimate fact which he seeks. Although to a certain extent Dr Combe feels the necessities of medicine, and truly says it is by the ascertainment of an ultimate fact, that is, a general law, that we can advance our science, yet the means by which he strives to reach the point of vantage are as vague as his general conception of what it would be, when gained, is just and exalted.

The system which Dr Combe expounds is founded on a radical error in philosophy. His view is this:—If we observe the progress of disease, we shall find that it runs a determinate course; it has its origin, its growth, and its decline; in these it obeys certain fixed laws given to it by the Creator. It is for man to learn these laws—to interpret these laws, but not to interfere with them. Nature alone cures, not man. It is presumptuous in man to usurp the prerogative of nature, and attempt to improve upon her efforts. Man is the interpreter, not the master, of nature. Such seems the general drift of his opinions, as contained in the preceding article.

The great error contained in this view consists in confounding the so-called laws of nature with the laws of a moral Creator. The tap-root of the false school of philosophy to which Dr Combe seems to belong, and which has recently been fully expounded in many popular works, is confounding the real obligation of man to obey the moral laws of his Creator with his assumed submission to the laws of the creation. The so-called laws of the creation have no existence out of the mind of man. They are but the summary expressions of his knowledge; they are but

the ultimate facts or laws he has arrived at. "Ultimate laws," says Mr Mill, "are observed uniformities of nature which cannot be resolved into more general laws."—Mill's Logic, vol. ii, p. 3. All that they express, in any case, is the constant relation of certain facts to certain other facts. This is all that gravitation expresses. Because gravitation is a law of nature, would any sane man argue that therefore it ought not to be interfered with? What is the whole active life of man, but a struggle with this great law of nature? What is death but a sinking under it—becoming obedient to it—being let down, pulled down, we might say, in submission to this grand natural law? It cannot, then, be argued, that because a process occurs in obedience to a law of physiology or pathology, that on that ground alone we ought not to interfere with it. It must be shown that it would be inexpedient to the patient if we did. This, which is the only real point at issue between us and the naturalists, Dr Combe does not attempt to touch. He shows, indeed, that in certain cases it is very hazardous to use the ordinary depleting measures; but he does not even attempt to show that there are not, or may not be, means which are innocuous, yet potently beneficial. He does not show that there may not be a science of therapeutics, or curing; but he implies, from the position he at first assumes, that there cannot.

Miserable as are the conclusions Dr Combe arrives at, we believe they are the logical consequences of working out Dr Forbes' system; and for this reason we attach much value to his letter, independently altogether of the high and generous tone which pervades it, and which gives great weight to its influence over others. If ever medicine suffer utter degradation, it will be brought about by means of this new school. The leaders of the profession are engendering a scepticism in medicine which, unless counteracted, will blight it to the core. Practitioners of physic will become divided into two classes—the one believing

nothing, but yet acting as if they did, and giving the countenance of their high talents and acquirements to the rankest hypocrisy; the other class believing anything or everything, but having no substantial grounds for their belief: cold, cultivated sceptics will be the aristocracy, and ignorant but energetic dupes of their own credulity the democracy, of this noble and glorious profession. No wonder that one of Dr Forbes' correspondents exclaims, "What more melancholy fact can be presented to the mere prescriber, when he first enters upon the duties of his benevolent profession with the enthusiasm of unsoured philanthropy, than the continual assurance of the Nestors of the profession, that the greater our experience the more positive our conviction that we can *do* nothing? And it only proves the immense force of habit that, with such convictions, we do not see men quit a profession which, under such circumstances, requires a constant exercise of hypocrisy, and a constant sacrifice of principle." There are examples of physicians being so conscientious as to make the sacrifice, and one of these is Hahnemann.

While the great majority of those who have expressed their opinions on the state and prospects of medicine, agree in the main with Drs Forbes and Combe, yet a few avow their dislike at being thus consigned to the negative pole of usefulness. The best exponent of the views of this class seems to be Dr Bartlett, who says, "The seat, the character, and the tendencies of the disease being known, the next thing to be done is to find out the best means of preventing, modifying, and of curing it." To do this, he goes on to say, "We must know the effects and influences which all substances and agencies in nature are capable of producing upon it, and this we can know only by direct observation of the effects themselves." That is, we may suppose medicine improved by a system of experimentation with individual drugs upon individual diseases. This is what another writer likewise proposes. Let us again apply

to some philosopher of acknowledged reputation, to ascertain what may be expected from such experiments when not conducted in the light of some previous theory.

It most fortunately happens that the very case in point is used as an illustration by Mr J. Stuart Mill, in his work upon logic. That highest modern authority upon the subject writes thus:—"Let the subject of inquiry be the conditions of health and disease in the human body, or, for greater simplicity, the conditions of recovery from a given disease; and, in order to limit the question still more, let it be confined, in the first instance, to this one inquiry, Is, or is not, a particular drug, mercury, for example, a remedy for that disease? * * * When we devise an experiment to ascertain the effects of a given agent, there are certain precautions which we never, if we can help it, omit. In the first place, we introduce the agent into the midst of a set of circumstances which we have exactly ascertained. It need hardly be remarked how far this condition is from being realised in any case connected with the phenomena of life; how far we are from knowing what are all the circumstances which pre-exist in any instance in which mercury is administered to a living being. This difficulty, however, though insuperable in most cases, may not be so in all; there are sometimes (though I should think never in physiology) concurrences of many causes in which we yet know accurately what the causes are. But, when we have got clear of this obstacle, we encounter another still more serious. In other cases, when we intend to try an experiment, we do not reckon it enough that there be no circumstances in the case the presence of which is unknown to us; we require also that none of the circumstances which we do know of shall have effects susceptible of being confounded with those of the agent whose properties we wish to study; we take the utmost pains to exclude all causes capable of composition with the given cause; or, if forced to let in any such causes, we take care to make them

such that we can compute and allow for their influence, so that the effect of the given cause may, after the subduction of those other effects, be apparent as a residual phenomena. These precautions are inapplicable to such cases as we are now considering. * * * *Anything like a scientific use of the method of experiment in these complicated cases is therefore out of the question. We can, in the most favourable cases, only discover, by a succession of trials, that a certain cause is very often followed by a certain effect.*"—Mill's Logic, vol. i., p. 529. We find, then, that logic as unceremoniously discards the experimental method proposed by Dr Bartlett, as philosophy condemned the statistical method sanctioned by Dr Forbes. Indeed, the two methods are very nearly allied, the one almost invoking the other; and if they both be abandoned, and if young physicians be not content with being the mere spectators of disease, and superintenders of the diet and ventilation, and revolt at the idea of hospitals for the cure of the sick being nothing but museums for the study of morbid natural history and registries of mortality, to what side are they to turn for escape from the alternatives presented to them? How shall they be followers of nature, and yet energetic? How shall they know all that is to be known, and not be sceptical, and do all that is to be done, and not be dangerous?

If the simple observation of the natural course of disease; if the application of the numerical method to all recorded cures; if experiments with various medicines upon various diseases, are each and all fallacious modes for the improvement of medicine, what conceivable method yet remains by which it may be raised from its present uncertainty to become amenable to known laws, by which it may be worked? The answer to this we have already anticipated at the commencement of our article. The accumulation and complexity of facts in medicine rendering the inductive process inapplicable, it is absolutely necessary, for the regeneration of the science, that some successful hypothesis be made

which shall express the law of relation between the curative and some other discoverable property of a given drug, by which we may know beforehand what we are to select in a given case of disease. There has been but one such attempt in medicine (for we need not stop to show that the old Galenic maxim, "*Contraria contrariis opponantur*," is not such an hypothesis, involving, as it does, the previous ascertainment of conditions as impossible to recognise, as they are incapable of being tested), that is, *that medicines tend to cure diseases similar to those they tend to produce.** This is a perfect hypothesis for the circumstances, because it embraces all the circumstances coming within the range of medication, and it is possible to establish the truth or falseness of it by experiment. How vain and ignorant it is of those who profess themselves philosophic practitioners, to reject this proposition, and to stigmatise the practice thence flowing, on the ground of its being at the first hypothetical, is shown from the fact that all complex sciences have become perfect by means of some successful hypothesis. What was Kepler's law of planetary motion, which has introduced such accuracy into astronomy, that the accession of a new member to our system can now be infallibly predicted, but an hypothesis verified by calculation? What was Dalton's atomic theory, which has given such systematic beauty to chemistry, but an hypothesis verified by calculation? What was Torricelli's grand discovery of the pressure of the atmosphere, which introduced a new era in physics, but an hypothesis verified by an experiment? It is the same with Hahnemann's great law of medicine—it is an hypothesis proved true by its results.

Had Dr Forbes and his followers been alive to the necessity of such a discovery, had they perceived that *it was not*

---

* We believe this is the most acurate way of stating the law of Homœopathy, and it would obviate many objections if this mode of expressing it were generally adopted.

a Bacon, but a Newton, that medicine stood in need of, they would have formed a very different estimate of the grandeur of Homœopathy; they would not have harped with puerile pertinacity upon the assertion that Hahnemann was mistaken in supposing that the symptoms of ague he felt stood in relation of cause and effect to the doses of cinchona bark he had previously taken. They would have perceived that it was of very little consequence what gave rise in the mind of Hahnemann to an hypothesis which, if substantiated, would make medicine a deductive science, instead of an empirical one; and they would have directed all their energies to ascertain whether this hypothesis be true or false; for, if true, it must for ever change the whole character of their art.

There were three possible ways open for disproving the truth of Homœopathy: first, by showing that it was opposed to some already established natural law; second, by showing that the facts on which it rested its claims for belief were either false or too few; third, that when tried as a guide in practice, it led to failure.

The first way was never attempted. No one has yet ventured to assert, that the proposition that a medicine tends to cure diseases similar to those it tends to excite, is radically opposed to any general fact. Nay, were this the place for it, it would not be difficult to demonstrate, that this primary law of Homœopathy presents many striking and interesting analogies with some of the most important doctrines that have recently been advanced by the greatest writers in the various fields of physics, ethics, and psychology.

Neither Dr Forbes, nor any of his school, have devoted themselves to the task of undertaking the second way, and showing that there is not a marked similarity between the curative and noxious effects of very many drugs. Nay, Dr Forbes himself admits, in these words, that there is such a resemblance. "Indeed, it is supported by several

strong analogies, afforded both by pathology and (allopathic) therapeutics."

The only other way which remained was to show, that where this law had been applied for the cure of diseases, it had entirely failed to effect its object. How far our opponents have succeeded in this, we leave those to determine who have carefully and critically studied Professor Henderson's letter to Dr Forbes, as well as the evidence from which his arguments are drawn.

Hitherto we have contemplated Homœopathy as an abstract scientific truth, "won from the void and formless infinite" by the genius of its discoverer—a truth which would remain the same, although disease were to disappear, and there were no occasion for its application to human affairs; and we have considered the reason why the value of this truth has not been appreciated by the foremost men in our profession. But between such an abstraction and the requirements of daily life, there lies the province of art. The truth might be revealed, but might remain for ever unprofitable to us, if we were not instructed in the mode of its application. Art is to science what action is to thought. The discovery of the law of Homœopathy made medicine as a science perfect; it required another discovery before an element of perfection was imparted to medicine as an art. Discoveries in art are of a wholly different kind from those in science. They are simply empirical rules obtained from observations or experiment, and proved true by experience. They never can have the same absolute value as fundamental scientific principles, nor are they susceptible of the same amount of proof. The rules of art occupy, as it were, a middle point between science and its application. They rest upon a surface of fluctuating observations, and they derive their coherence and stability from a source different from that of their origin. That source is the abstract scientific truth to which they are united. In estimating the value of these rules of art, it is necessary always to

keep in view this, their double connection; and it would be as unfair to judge of them, separated from their connection with the scientific principles which gives them support, as it would be to insist upon a child living in its mother's womb after the umbilical cord had been divided. This is the injustice which has been practised upon the rule of art connected with the science of Homœopathy;—the rule that medicines when administered in accordance with the principle "*similia similibus*," should be given in minute quantities. If the proposition had been advanced that medicines, in doses infinitely minuter than had even hitherto been imagined, were capable of curing diseases, as a simple fact of observation, it might fairly have been met with the ridicule that has assailed it. But when advanced under the protection of a more general proposition, it ought to have been always viewed as related to that general fact; and in that light, whether it be true or false, it ceases to be ridiculous.

While, then, we charge Dr Forbes with committing a fundamental error in philosophy, by not appreciating the necessity of some general hypothesis by which the science of medicine may be made deductive, we charge him and his followers with a second error in judging of a rule of art without taking into consideration the cognate scientific principle from which it derives half its force. This misapprehension of the proper point of view, on the part of all English writers, from which the system of giving small doses ought to be regarded, is the less excusable, since those who have adopted their side of the controversy in Germany have admitted and given full prominence to the fact, that the dose must vary according to the principle by which the medicine is selected. "On the other hand," observes Dr Jörg, medicines operate most powerfully upon the sick when the symptoms correspond with those of the disease. A very small quantity of medicinal arnica will produce a violent effect upon persons who have an irri-

table state of the œsophagus and stomach. Mercurial preparations have in very small doses given rise to pains and loose stools, when administered in an inflammatory state of the intestines. Yet why," he exclaims, "should I occupy time by adducing more examples of a similar operation of medicines, since it is in the very nature of the thing that a medicine must produce a much greater effect when it is applied to a body already suffering under an affection similar to that which the medicine itself is capable of producing?"*

Another great error which the various writers upon the subject have fallen into, when treating of minute doses, is confounding the amount of force required to originate a series of changes in the animal system, and that which is required to modify those changes where already going on. It is, if we may so express it, applying to a question of dynamics calculations derived from data afforded by statics. Contented as the disciples of Young Physic are with allowing morbid processes to proceed without any intervention, and simply supporting the powers of life, that the system may not sink under the continuance of the disease; and accustomed as they and all Allopathic physicians are to look upon therapeutic agents as operations beyond, or on the outside of, the sphere of the actual morbid forces (the derivative system of medicine), they do not perceive that, if it be possible to introduce a force within the actual sphere of diseased action, that force will be incalculably intensified in its operation by acting on other forces already in a state of preternatural and violent activity. A breath of air will deflect an arrow from its course, although shot from the bow of Apollo. We do not intend to dwell upon the point last mooted, partly because

---

* Materiellen zu einer künftigen heillmitellehre durch versuche der Arzueien an gesunden Menschen gewonnen und gesammelt von Dr Johan C. G. Jörg, page 16.

our space is exhausted, and partly because they have already been fully and ably handled by various writers. We would here recommend a recent popular work by Dr Henry Madden, which contains a good exposition of this part of the subject.

Before we close this fragmentary and elliptical paper, the design of which has been rather to discover, if possible, and to indicate the chief sources of the errors of our opponents, and in this very search to point to the refutation of those errors, than to expose, by argument, the numerous fallacies which have marked their winding course throughout the controversy, we wish to do full justice to Dr Forbes. We look upon him as the ablest exponent of the sceptical era in medicine. He expresses for the medicine what others have done for the philosophy of our period, which has been characterised as "an age of unbelief, and yet afraid of scepticism." By giving expression to prevailing scepticism in medicine, Dr Forbes has rendered an immense benefit to the profession; *he has brought out and made curable the hitherto latent psora.* The element of faith which he would fain mingle with his confession of general unbelief is too foreign to the rest of the system to have any influence upon his disciples. The reform he has so powerfully advanced will soon become a revolution beyond his power to control. His influence for the future will be purely destructive. But destruction of the bad must precede construction of the good; and for having with great talent and boldness attacked and shaken a dynasty whose speedy termination is with certainty predicted by this revolt of its chief supporter, for having rendered this service, and opened the gate of scepticism for the admission of truth, we feel deeply indebted to him, and we have no doubt that his school will prove to many the halting-place between Old Physic and Homœopathy.

MEDICAL TOOGOODISM

AND

HOMŒOPATHY.*

[For some time after the appearance of Dr Forbes' article, which caused an immense commotion among the medical profession, there was comparative inaction in reference to Homœopathy, and nothing of any importance, in a controversial point of view, was written by either party till Dr Toogood, of Torquay, published a pamphlet on the "fraud and folly of Homœopathy," which called forth the following reply from the pen of a metropolitan physician.]

THERE is something *fatal* in names. The actions and the characters of men have frequently been prefigured by the names given to them in their infancy. The words Alexander, Cæsar, and Napoleon, by which are known three of the world's wonders, have a remarkable significance. Dr Guillotin gave his name to the instrument of decapitation he invented, and the use of which has given him a sort of sinister immortality. The epithet *Uncle Sam*, well denotes the characteristics of our transatlantic offshoot; *John Bull* admirably expresses the character of the English. Without dilating on this theme, it is sufficient

---

* From the British Journal of Homœopathy, April, 1849.

to observe, that no name can be more expressive of the professional instinct and impulse against reform than that of the gentleman who has furnished our vernacular tongue with a new and significant word. As the word *Rome*, applied to a city and nation and empire, denotes strength and stability; so the word Toogoodism, derived from the name of Dr Jonathan Toogood, signifies that sturdy and unrelenting conviction of a class, or of a profession, that its present holdings, prescriptive advantages, and prospective hopes, are too good to allow for a moment the entertaining any proposal for any reform, or any important modification, in its actual condition. Their old ways, their good ways, are the ways for them. He is their pilot that weathers the storm who the most strenuously opposes any radical change, whether it be in the way of rapid progress, or of a new direction, or of a re-consideration of principles. To each partisan of each class or profession, the witty bishop's definition of orthodoxy and heterodoxy applies. Orthodoxy is *my doxy*, and therefore right and just and true; heterodoxy is the doxy of another, and therefore a very improper and dangerous and dissolute sort of thing. Homœopathy is the heterodoxy of the medical Toogood, Allopathy is his doxy. Let us beware that we do not, in turn, make a doxy of our Hahnemannian doctrine. *Mundis omnia munda.* If we pursue any truth in a truthful spirit, for the good of all, and not for mere selfish and personal advantages, nor for the advancement of a class interest, we escape this reproach of bigotry and illiberality.

The word Toogoodism we expect will become as current to express this bigotry and illiberality and hostility to reform of a class or profession, as the words socialism, chartism, and many another *ism*, which are used to denote various classes moved by opinions and swayed by doctrines which are peculiar to each, and which make up the orthodoxy of each.

In our last number, we briefly noticed Dr Toogood's "Illustrations of the fraud and folly of Homœopathy." Whether he be an actual historical personage, or a mythical, as Niebuhr holds Romulus to have been, matters not. For our purpose, his name is the best of him. We use *that* as an impersonation of the breathing and yet vigorous hostility to our doctrine which still distinguishes our medical Allopathic brethren. We refer those who take pleasure in *inky* war to the tract of Toogood, and the reply of Aliquis.

Mr Sampson's paper is an excellent exposition of the professional Toogoodism which opposes itself, tooth and nail, to Homœopathy. We mean this article to be a running commentary on his text; but we cannot forbear expressing our sense of his valuable and important services to our cause. We should be glad to see his paper separately printed, and widely circulated; it now appears in the annual volume (for 1849) of the British Homœopathic Association, which is a meritorious body acting in concert with the British Homœopathic Society. The object of this association is to diffuse among the public at large a knowledge of the doctrine and practice of Homœopathy; and the present volume is a proof that this is modestly and wisely done. In addition to Mr Sampson's paper, there are Hahnemann's first essay on the Homœopathic principle; a paper on the Homœopathic treatment of Asiatic Cholera; and Mr Kidd's narrative of his Homœopathic treatment of the famine fever of Ireland in 1847. We have adverted to this volume for the purpose of recommending our readers and well-wishers to obtain as many subscribers as possible for this association, the character of which is at once unobtrusive and energetic.*

Every reform, whether of the body politic, or of a school of doctrine and practice, is, in fact, a revolution, and every revolution is more or less an experiment: if it should be

* The British Homœopathic Association ceased to exist after founding the London Homœopathic Hospital.

completed and established, it is an experience founded on a series of experiments. These are valuable and durable in proportion as they are based or not on the immutable truths of nature; the science of mechanics, so far as these truths were then known and applied, was as true in the days of Archimedes as it is now.

During the process of experiment everything has to be tested anew; old and new theories are to be sifted and valued at their true worth; the exaggerations and obliquities and eccentricities that may have crept in are to be got rid of; what is extraneous must be pruned; what is sound and good must be retained. Sometimes a truth, bringing with it vast consequences, has been grasped, as by intuition, by some favoured seer; at another time, after many experiments through many an age, some master-mind appears, to whose comprehensive intelligence is assigned the task of condensing, winnowing, arranging the materials that many minds have for long been anxiously collecting. Either of these, whether known or unknown to fame, is a benefactor of his race; but it often occurs that those who pass beyond the circle of thought embraced by their fellows and contemporaries are misapprehended, persecuted, and even despised by those who do not understand them. It was the sense of being so misunderstood and undervalued which induced Bacon to dedicate his Philosophy to posterity. Such men as Bacon and Luther and Hahnemann have known how difficult it is to swim against the tide of opinion; to carry out an honest, vigorous, human undertaking against the current of prevailing sects and the eddies of a vulgar and indiscriminating prejudice. Of this truth, every one who advocates a new principle, attempts to correct an old abuse, or withstands a long maintained oppression, is soon made painfully aware. Happy is it for such great spirits as are appointed to such undertakings, when they can (self-centred, yet in humble dependence on the Infinite One, whose agents they are)

realise in the sanctuary of their inner being the fact that a duty done, a righteous service rightly performed, is itself the highest reward: all human recompense, fame and honours and wealth, soon pass away, but

> "The self-remembering soul sweetly recovers
> Her kindred with the stars, nor basely hovers
> Below, but meditates the immortal way
> Home to the source of light and intellectual day."

The founder of Homœopathy was of the order of spirits we have described; his was a vigorous man's strong intellect, and stronger will, and still stronger heart. He had a vocation and a mission: he worked like a man; and he left to his followers, *longo intervallo*, the task of filling up the design he sketched with a master's hand, of following out his plan, and of making his discovery more and more available to the well-being of his race. Not vain nor profitless is this preamble, if it induces even one of our readers to reflect on the responsibility of all of his followers, each according to his degree and power, to do his best to promote the Hahnemannian Reform of Medicine. It is no light thing to profess a love of truth; nor can we lightly consider such a subject as this—"Truths and their reception considered in their relation to the doctrine of Homœopathy."

The law of Homœopathy—*like cures like*—it has been repeatedly shown, was not discovered by Hahnemann, as the law of gravitation was by Newton. The law was partially known, and partially acted on, before the Christian era, and in all the intervening ages from that time to this. Hahnemann's claim to originality, in respect of the law, is, that he first demonstrated its general applicability to the healing art, that it was *a truth of nature*—the law of the application of remedies for the cure of disease. His method of applying the remedies, the dose, the fact that by minute subdivision the medicines acted more *in extenso*, and more appropriately, and the other fact, that certain substances in themselves inert acquire medicinal virtues by trituration

with an indifferent substance; and furthermore, his explanation of the nature and character of chronic diseases—these were his discoveries. Multitudinous experiments made by himself and his devoted adherents and disciples, on the properties of a great number of medicines, their *provings* of the various remedies, make up, in sum, the experience of the master-mind and of his acolytes, to which he gave the name Homœopathy, to express the relation between the curative agent and the ailment or disease. It is this collective experience, proposed as the basis at least of a radical medical reform, not dealing with externals and comparative non-essentials, but insisting on a re-consideration of principles, and of an entire re-construction of therapeutics, that the hostility of the *soi-disant* orthodox or Allopathic school of medicine at first pretended to ignore, then denounced as a system of illusion, delusion, and collusion. Let us then speak of Homœopathy, in the general sense of its being an attempt at a thorough medical reform, as the discovery of Hahnemann. The public made up of individuals, dependent for their general medical notions on the medical body opposed to this method as an innovation, would naturally look on it with suspicion and mistrust. Their oracles on this subject were not dumb, but all agreed in their denunciations of it with more or less vehemence as occasion might seem to require. The very persons whom the non-medical world look up to for guidance on a medical doctrine, from the very nature of the case, were, as *a class*, the direct adversaries of the Hahnemannian discovery. This remark applies to every discovery of which we have a record; namely, that the opposition to it has mainly and directly proceeded from the orthodox and established ministers of the system to which the new discovery may have applied.

Take, for example, the silversmiths of Ephesus (and all men who get their living by a profession or trade are in one sense silversmiths), and of those who were leagued with them to prevent the introduction of the most benefi-

cent doctrine that has been declared to man. The great advocate of this new doctrine was resolved to stay in Asia for a season. "And at the same time there arose no small stir about that way. For a certain man named Demetrius, a silversmith, who made silver shrines for Diana, brought no small gain unto the craftsmen; whom he called together with the workmen of like occupation, and said, sirs, ye know that by this craft we have our wealth. Moreover, ye see and hear that not alone at Ephesus, but almost throughout all Asia, this Paul hath persuaded and turned away much people, saying that they be no gods, which are made with hands; so that not only this our craft is in danger to be set at nought; but also that the temple of the great goddess Diana should be despised, and her magnificence destroyed, whom all Asia and the world worshippeth. And when they heard this, they were full of wrath, and cried out, great is Diana of the Ephesians. And the whole city was filled with confusion. * * * Some therefore cried one thing, and some another. * * * And when the town-clerk had appeased the people, he said, ye men of Ephesus, what man is there that knoweth not how that the city of the Ephesians is a worshipper of the great goddess Diana, and of the image which fell down from Jupiter."

This is an illustration, for all time, of the opposition any class or profession is ready, as an orthodox or established body, to make to any new discovery or doctrine which may be applied to the modification or reform or re-construction of its particular system. They erect it into a sort of visionary temple, and to touch it in the way of alteration is to offend their prejudices of education and custom and calling, and so is something absurd or shocking in their estimation. There are idols many, some of the individual and some of the class. Every one has his *chamber of imagery*, if he had the heart and the will to look into it with the purpose of seeing those idol prejudices in their deformity, and of

breaking them in pieces: comparatively few, however, dare do this, and some that have the courage have not the will. And so this new discovery, that offers to let in light on those prejudices, is scoffed at and derided, or virulently opposed and rejected. It was hard, in the first instance, to persuade the miners to use Sir Humphrey Davy's safety lamp; and the West India planters will not be persuaded, even now when they are being ruined from the want of labourers, to substitute mechanical inventions, wherever applicable, for manual labour.

The love of novelty is supposed to be a characteristic of the human mind, and so it is where there are no strong counteracting prejudices against the novelty. Then the hatred of what is proposed as something new and antagonistical to preconceived opinions, becomes the rule. The novelty of Homœopathy has been adduced as an argument against it. We know that the doctrine and the practice are now more than half a century old; but still they are new to some. One of the best informed clergymen of the Anglican Church said not long ago to a Homœopathic physician, "The novelty of Homœopathy is to me a strong objection against it;" to which it was replied, "On that ground, then, had you been a priest of Jupiter Tonans, or of Juno Moneta at Rome, when Paul preached there, you would have rejected his doctrine because of its novelty." This was an *argumentum ad hominem* which he could not resist, and he withdrew his objection.

Professional men are not fond of indoctrinating their clients with their professional knowledge. Those who play at physic with "Graham's Domestic Guide," and who play at law as *unsalaried* magistrates and country justices, have a very fractional knowledge of medicine and law. But there is no subject of which the general public is so ignorant as that of medicine; and thus they are compelled to take the opinion of their medical advisers on any medical subject, and these we have shown are, from the

nature of the case, opponents of any new discovery like Homœopathy. The opposition of reforms and discoveries is not, however, confined to those which apply to medicine. We avail ourselves of Mr Sampson's able paper to enumerate some of the instances of that opposition. His first selection is made from the records of moral progress.

The difficulty in persuading the legislature to modify and mitigate the sanguinary laws for the punishment of criminals, is his first instance. It is well known that lawyers and judges, on whose opinion of the laws the public chiefly relies, were the parties most opposed to any amendment or mitigation of the worse than Draconian code which so long disgraced the statute book of Christian England. "When Sir Thomas More, in 1529, first ventured to question the advantage of putting men to death for petty offences, the lawyers, it is said, all fell upon him, and charged him with ignorance of judicial affairs. So true is it, that there is a propensity in all professional men to resist every deviation from established usages."

His next illustration is taken from the history of physical science. It is the familiar story of Columbus, who, when he had matured his theory of the existence of a Western Continent, offered his services to several maritime powers, whose "business was in the deep waters," with the view of ascertaining the fact. His offer was refused by those knowing navigators with scorn. His proposition "was rejected as the dream of a chimerical projector." So, in the annual summary of the progress of medical science for the year in which Hahnemann died, there were long obituary accounts of persons already forgotten, and at the end of them all it was carelessly observed, "this year died also the theorist Hahnemann." In the case of Columbus, a monk and a physician persuaded Queen Isabella to entertain his proposition; all the world knows the rest.

Similar illustrations might be given from the history of religious advancement. The *odium theologicum* has passed into a proverb. Every one knows how strong are the feelings of class interests among different sects; and how those who ought to love one another are in a position of hostile demonstration one against another. The histories of Wicliffe, Huss, Luther, and many other worthies of the Church, are too well known to be mentioned in this place.

Of "the starry Galileo and his woes;" of that Bishop who was burned for asserting that there existed Antipodes; of Oliver Cromwell, who prematurely died of ague because his physicians would not consent to give him Jesuit's bark (cinchona), at that time newly made known in England; of Harvey, stigmatised as a quack from one end of Europe to the other; of Jenner, the despised of the medical faculty when he first made vaccination known—who requires to be told?

We give Mr Sampson's quotation of an admirable scene from Miss Martineau's "Game Law Tales." It is an account of the reception of Harvey's theory of the circulation of the blood. It is in the form of a dialogue between Lords Holland, Seymour, and Southampton, a clergyman, and a physician.

"'One object of old Parr's going up to court is, that Harvey may study the case, and see if he can gain hints from it for lengthening our lives.'

'But surely,' said the clergyman, 'it can matter but little what Dr Harvey concludes and gives out about the case of this old parishioner of mine, or any other case. No one can have any respect for his judgment in the face of the wild doctrine he gives out about the blood.'

'Does he adhere to that?' asked Lord Southampton.

'Yes,' replied Lord Holland, 'he will ere long publish another tract upon it. It is astounding to see a man, who seems otherwise rational and sensible, lose himself on this one point. There is no making any impression upon

him; he persists as quietly as if all the wise people in the world agreed with him.'

'Quietly,' said Lord Seymour; 'I thought he was a passionate, turbulent fellow, who thought all the world a fool but himself.'

'Whatever he may think,' replied Lord Holland, 'he says nothing to give one such an idea; on the contrary, the most amusing and yet melancholy part of the business is his entire complacency. He is so self-satisfied that nothing can move him.'

'Dr Oldham,' said Southampton to the family physician, who sat smiling while this description of Harvey was given, 'you have looked into this business, this pretended discovery, what have you to say to it?'

'But little, my lord; it is not worth so many words as just have been spent upon it. There is not a physician in Europe who believes in this pretended discovery.'

'After examination?'

'Surely, my lord. Any announcement of a discovery made by the physician whose merits have raised him to Dr Harvey's post, cannot but meet with attention from a profession, whose business it is to investigate the facts of the human frame and constitution.'

'Then known facts are against him?'

'Entirely. No point, for instance, is better understood than that the arteries are occupied by the vital spirits, which are concocted in the left side of the heart, from the air and blood in the lungs.'

'And what says Harvey to this?'

'He controverts it, of course. Neither the opposition of all living physicians, nor even the silence of Galen on this notion of his, has the least effect upon him. It is sad and pernicious nonsense, and ruinous to a man who, but for this madness, might have been an honour to his profession. Of course, his opinions on any subject are of no value now.'

'In the profession, do you mean, or out of it?'

'I believe there are a good many out of the profession who listen to him, open-mouthed, as to every professor of new doctrines; but it is an affair in which no opinions but those of physicians can be of any consequence; and, as I said, not a physician in Europe believes in Harvey's doctrine.'

'It ought to be put down,' said Lord Salisbury, to which the clergyman gave an emphatic assent; observing, 'that, in so important an affair as a great question about the human frame, false opinions must be dangerous, and ought to be put down.'

'And how is new knowledge to fare when it comes?' said Lord Southampton. 'By my observations, Dr Harvey's notion is so following the course that new knowledge is wont to run, that I could myself almost suppose it to be true. It has been called nonsense, that is the first stage. Now, if it be called dangerous, that is the next. I shall amuse myself by watching for the third. When it is said there is nothing new in it, and it was plain to all learned men before Harvey was born, I shall know how to apportion to Harvey his due honour.'

'I thought, my lord, you had held my profession in respect,' said the physician, with an uneasy smile.

'Am I not doing homage to a most eminent member of it, perhaps the most eminent in the world?' said Lord Southampton; 'and it appears that I am rather before than behind others in doing so. There is no man, not even the greatest, who may not stand hat in hand before the wise physician; and I, for my humble part, would do even so.'"

This excellent scene so well describes the kind of opposition such a discovery as Homœopathy has to encounter, and especially from the medical faculty, that we cordially thank Miss Martineau for it.

To proceed:—the experience of our own times shows that the same opposition is to be expected whenever any

discovery is declared which shocks the prejudices of a class, and (through that class) of the public. The insensibility to pain produced by mesmerism, was proved by many authenticated cases in England, and very many in India, in the practice of Dr Esdaile. The surgeons, great and small, *pure* and general, laughed it to scorn. Sir Benjamin Brodie went so far as to assert, that pain under operations was necessary to the safety of the patient. Dr Elliotson, the great medical mesmeric authority, was compelled to resign his offices in connection with the University College of London. He was lampooned and libelled in all the medical journals, great and small. The mesmerically induced insensibility was a pretence: mesmerism was a mass of illusion, delusion, and collusion. The medical faculty almost to a man rejected the discovery that insensibility to pain could be produced by mesmerism; almost to a man, refused to believe that mesmerism was, where indicated, a curative agent. Animal magnetism, some said, was a juggle; others, that it was trash and nonsense; others, that it was diabolism. Great was the triumph of the other medical officers of University College when Dr Elliotson withdrew from their body. But, very soon after, a person in America discovered that insensibility to pain under operations could be produced by ætherisation. Æther was a pharmacological fact—a Galenical virtue; this was a legitimate property of a legitimate remedy, and it is on record that the first successful experiment in England to produce insensibility to pain, from ætherisation under operation, was performed at the hospital of that University College, the medical officers of which had rejected with scorn Dr Elliotson's proposition, that insensibility to pain under operations could be produced. The mesmeric power was not in accordance with the trained ideas and the narrow range of vision of medical men; but they believed in gaseous exhalations. Chloroform has now superseded æther; but surgeons are averse as ever to mesmerism.

This is an apt illustration of the bigotry and prejudice of a class or profession, in respect of a new discovery which they are not prepared from their education and conventional notions to entertain; while they readily embrace one which is in accordance with their general views, and which comes within the sphere of their commonplace ideas. They can understand the law of Homœopathy as being sometimes applicable, but not as generally applicable; and they cannot tolerate the Hahnemannian doses, because the philosophical induction from innumerable experiments is quite beyond their everyday habits of thought; so they reject at once the philosophy and the experience.

The difficulty of overcoming a class prejudice is shown by the opposition of the officers of the army and the navy to the proposition to do away with the corporal punishment of soldiers and sailors. According to them, the cat-o'-nine-tails gives discipline and soldierly ability.

The opposition made to the benevolent views of Captain Maconochie for the reform and moral regeneration of transported criminals—views amply borne out by the most satisfactory evidence of their truth and reality—is another instance of class prejudice. His results are admitted, but the hereditary and septennial legislators will not legislate in accordance with them.

It is well known with what difficulty those who have the management and superintendence of the insane, were induced to try the effects of moral treatment—to do away with instruments of confinement to one position, with fetters and the scourge. All honour to Dr Conolly, Dr Woodward, and the first few supporters of their benevolent attempts to introduce this happy change in the treatment of the *sacred* insane! The results are such, that there is no fear they will ever again be submitted to the cruel and barbarous usage which was their lot even a few years ago.

These illustrations are sufficient to show the opposition

of men of a class, or of a profession, to any discovery or reform which is not in accordance with their conventional customs, ideas, and principles. It is true that such a discovery or reform, if just and true, makes its way. A few earnest spirits, who would not rather be wrong with Galen or Dr Williams than be right with the author of a discovery which the former had no opportunity of examining, and the latter chooses to reject disdainfully without examination, take up, investigate, become convinced, and do their best to promote such a discovery, say Homœopathy. And as the truth made its way in the case of the discoveries of Harvey and of Jenner, so will it be in the case of the Hahnemannian reform. The public are not justified in rejecting it, because the great body of the medical profession in England disdain it. It was introduced into this country in 1827. In 1844, the British Homœopathic Society was established. The "British Journal of Homœopathy," now in its seventh year,* is the organ of this doctrine. Its medical practitioners increase year after year. It has modified materially the ordinary medical practice: the lancet is much less frequently employed; the consumption of drugs is marvellously diminished; a more simple treatment has been substituted for the heroical or savage. Some of our remedies, not before used by the Allopathic school, are getting into daily use. Our good public may perceive from these signs that our doctrine and practice are not the trash and nonsense our opponents try to make them appear.

Take a few instances of the *animus* of the class opposed to our progress.

A very distinguished metropolitan physician, and deservedly so, after having been for some time in attendance on a young lady suffering from marasmus from mesenteric

---

* As this was written three years ago, the Journal in question is now in its tenth year.

disease, left the case as hopeless. The father called in a Homœopathic practitioner; she soon showed some signs of amendment, is in good condition now, and is almost entirely restored to good health. A few days ago, the Allopathic physician met the father, and was surprised to learn from him that she was so much better; but, on hearing that she had been under Homœopathic treatment, said, "Oh! the improvement in her health is not from Homœopathy, which is nothing: nature has done it."

An Allopathic hospital physician was in attendance on a gentleman suffering from neuralgia, diarrhœa, &c. As the patient had told him he had before derived benefit from the Homœopathic remedies, and he found he could not bear the ordinary medicines even in very reduced doses, he of himself proposed that he should again try Homœopathy. The diarrhœa, which was his most distressing symptom, did not recur after he took the appropriate Homœopathic remedies; the Allopath went to see him, as a friend, every three or four days; he acknowledged the amendment, but would not allow that the remedies had any effect; and when, after three or four friendly visits, he found the patient and his family convinced that the benefit was derived from the Homœopathic treatment, he wrote him a letter to assure him that Homœopathy was a mere delusion. Some little time after the patient died from cerebral and other disease, and it is to be presumed that, in the Allopath's judgment, he was done to death by Homœopathy, though he had himself left the case as hopeless.

The case of Malibran is another instance of the prejudice we have to contend against. She had lived during more than half her life in a state of constant excitement. Her fine organisation and exquisite susceptibilities, for she was a genius as well as a woman, were kept on a constant strain by her professional ambition and the excitements incident to her public career. She could not be kept in check; her genius, and the love of the applause derived

from its exercise, were her spurs to exertions beyond what nature could sustain for any lengthened time. At the age of thirty-three, after the unbounded triumphs of a London season, the concert in the morning, the theatre every night, and the brilliant society, of which she was the most sparkling ornament, after the theatre, far into the small hours of the succeeding morning, she went to keep an engagement at Manchester. She fainted at one of the performances, and was attacked with nervous fever; she was attended by several of the leading Allopathic medical men of Manchester of that day. She was bled; the heroical practice was exercised on her. She succumbed. During her London career, Dr Belluomini had always been her medical attendant; he was sent for, and arrived not long before her death, perhaps from twelve to twenty hours. He saw and said the case was hopeless—but Homœopathy killed her! It was so advertised in the papers. Thousands upon thousands believed it; some believe it to this day. "J' etouffe," was her last utterance—and so *the nightingale was stifled.*

Let these instances suffice to show how far the prejudices of even honourable men can carry them in their opposition to an innovation they cannot stomach, to a proposed reform that bears on their own profession when they are not prepared for it.

But many great men of the medical profession, though they adopted not Homœopathy, have honourably distinguished themselves by declaring their respect for Hahnemann, and their conviction that his doctrine should be carefully examined. We have pleasure in enumerating the names of Hufeland, Broussais, Brera, and Valentine Mott, among these happy exceptions. Some of the foremost men in England, Scotland, and Ireland, are now willing to make, have made, the same allowance and partial acknowledgment of our method. These men, and others like them, do not concur with the recorded opinion of the

Westminster Medical Society, that "Homœopathy is a tissue of absurdities offensive to common sense—the wild, visionary, and ridiculous theory of a German enthusiast, too absurd to merit anything like argument, and practised by its disciples only from sordid motives." The late eminent surgeon, Mr Liston, did not so judge of it, nor Dr Millingen, nor Dr Fletcher, the eminent physiologist and pathologist. We quote, at length, from Dr Fletcher, his favourable testimony:—

"Every day's experience furnishes us with examples of the truth of the Homœopathic doctrine, at least in some instances the several substances operating in producing and curing, each its own class of diseases, sometimes directly, at other times indirectly or by sympathy. Do we not continually give *purgatives* in the cure of diarrhœa, for the purpose, as is erroneously supposed, of carrying off some offending matter, the presumed cause of the discharge? and how often is *aloes*, one of the most common causes of piles, a means of effectually removing them when already present? Among the diuretics, also, Cantharides, as well as the turpentines and balsams, are not more effectual in removing gleet and catarrh of the bladder when present, than they are, under other circumstances, in occasioning them. Among the diaphoretics, *tartar emetic* has, according to our own personal experience, excellent effects in stopping a diaphoresis, effectual as it is, as everybody knows, when no such affection exists, in exciting it. The sweating sickness was treated formerly by diaphoretics. Further, among the tonics, *cinchona*, the chief remedy of intermittent fever, is said to be capable of producing it; and indeed it was from noticing this effect upon himself that Hahnemann was first induced to prosecute and systematise the theory in question. Tartar emetic also, which, as every one knows, is one of the most efficacious means of combating inflammation in general where it exists, is almost equally sure to produce it when it does not exist, if

given in large doses, when it is rather to be considered as a tonic than as a nauseant, a diaphoretic, or a sedative. But the medicine which is most illustrative, in its various operations, of the truth of the Homœopathic doctrine, is *mercury*. The occasional effects of this mineral in producing laryngitis, iritis, ptyalism, and numerous other inflammations and their consequences, are abundantly well known; yet what remedy is so effectual in removing, as is generally acknowledged, the two former affections, and the third also, as was not long ago proved by Dr Duncan and others? Nay, the influence of mercury in curing *lues venerea* is dependent probably on its power of producing disease, if not identical with it, certainly very similar to it in its specific effects on the throat, skin, bones, and other organs. Lastly, among the narcotic medicines, the effects of alcohol in removing, as well as exciting, *delirium tremens*, in all its degrees, have been attended to, and are sufficiently well known. Not only medicines, however, but other remedial agents, furnish equally conclusive evidence of the truth, in certain cases at least, of the Homœopathic doctrine. Thus, what is the blacksmith's remedy when he has scorched his finger?—is it not again holding it to the fire, for the purpose of drawing out the heat as he expresses it? And what is Dr Kentish's treatment of burns in general?—is it not by heated oil of turpentine and other stimulating applications, for the purpose, as he presumes, of bringing the inflamed part gradually, not suddenly, down to the line of health? This is not the true explanation of the benefit so derived, but the benefit is nevertheless unquestionable. Again, the occasional effects of electricity in removing amaurosis, palsy of the tongue, &c., are no less certain than the fact that these diseases have often resulted from electricity; and its effects in either producing or removing nervous apoplexy, according to circumstances, were beautifully illustrated on one occasion by Dr Currie, who found that, by passing an electric shock through the

head of a rabbit, he could alternately stupify and revive it, for an almost indefinite number of times. * * * Upon the whole, Hahnemann's book is an original and interesting one, and displays more reflection in every page than many of his decriers will evince in the whole course of their life and conduct for half a century."

The good seed of Dr Fletcher's physiology and pathology was sown in a good soil. Had that excellent man and scholar and philosopher been spared, his genial spirit would have been delighted with the Homœopathic development that has been manifested in Edinburgh, where he delivered his lectures, not the least of the great men who from time to time have adorned that royal and classical city. Some of his pupils are in the number of our most distinguished Homœopathists.

The eminent Dr Forbes, late editor of the "British and Foreign Medical Review," though he professed not to receive himself the Hahnemannian doctrine, yet spoke out, in a very powerful article, in favour of the character of Hahnemann and his school, and even *acknowledged the cures*, though he tried to explain them on the ground of our leaving our patients more to nature than drug-givers do. What a condemnation of the drugging system! Let us quote what he says of Hahnemann:—

"No careful observer of his actions, or candid reader of his writings, can hesitate for a moment to admit that he was a very extraordinary man. He was undoubtedly a man of genius, and a scholar; a man of indefatigable industry, of undaunted energy, surpassed by few in the originality and ingenuity of his views; superior to most in having substantiated and carried out his doctrines into actual and most extensive practice. It is but an act of justice also to admit that there exist no grounds for doubting that he was sincere in his belief of the truth of his doctrines, and that many at least of his followers have been, and are, sincere, honest, and learned men."

This is very different language from that of Dr Toogood, whose name has supplied us with the word Toogoodism. Very different also is the language of Dr Forbes, in regard to the Homœopathic system of treatment, from that of the Toogood school of assailants.

"Homœopathy," writes Dr Forbes, "is an original system of medicine, as ingenious as many that preceded it, and destined probably to be the remote, if not the immediate, cause of more important fundamental changes in the practice of the healing art than have resulted from any promulgated since the days of Galen himself. By most medical men it has been taken for granted that the system is one not only visionary in itself, but that it is the result of a mere fanciful hypothesis, disconnected with facts of any kind, and supported by no processes of ratiocination or logical inference. And yet nothing can be further from the truth. Whoever examines the Homœopathic doctrines, as announced and expounded in the original writings of Hahnemann and many of his followers, must admit not only that the system is an ingenious one, but that it professes to be based on a most formidable array of facts and experiments. * * * We think it impossible to refuse to Homœopathy the praise of being an ingenious system of medical doctrine, tolerably complete in its organisation, tolerably comprehensive in its views, and as capable of being defended by feasible arguments as most of the systems of medicine which preceded it. * * * As an established form of practical medicine, as a great fact in the history of our art, we must, *nolentes volentes*, consider Homœopathy. * * * Not only do we see all our ordinary curable diseases cured in a fair proportion under the Homœopathic method of treatment, but even all the severer and more dangerous diseases which most physicians, of whatever school, have been accustomed to consider as not only needing the interposition of art to assist nature in bringing them to a favourable and speedy termination,

but demanding the employment of prompt and strong measures to prevent a fatal issue in a considerable proportion of cases."

The late Dr Andrew Combe, whose reputation as a medical philosopher is so widely diffused, is another of the happy exceptions among medical men, who have written or spoken wisely and fairly of the Hahnemannian doctrine and practice. This is his language:—

"Let us scout quacks and pretenders as we may, Homœopathy presents too strong a *prima facie* case to warrant our dismissing it with ridicule and contempt. * * * *As a matter of theory*, supported only by argument, Homœopathy produces no conviction whatever in my mind of its truth or even of its probability; but, as *a question of fact*, claiming to rest on the 'irresistible ground of its superior method of curing diseases and preserving human life,' and on the alleged experience of able and honest men, as competent to judge as most of those who oppose them, I cannot venture to denounce it as untrue, because I have no experience bearing especially upon it to bring forward, and we are still too ignorant to be able to predicate, *a priori*, what may or may not be true in the great field of nature. After the presumptive evidence which has been produced, if I were now in practice, I should hold myself bound without further delay to test its truth by careful and extensive experiment."

Yet another instance of the fair and honourable interpretation of the claims of Homœopathy on the medical profession for a candid and full investigation. It is the testimony of Dr John Wilson, inspector of naval hospitals and fleets, who, in his "Medical Notes on China," makes this statement:—

"In the cholera cases the doctrine of the Homœopathists, *similia similibus curantur*, is partly admitted. Whatever may be thought of the theory on which the practice is founded, there is no doubt that the practice is often

highly beneficial. At the invasion of many febrile affections, involving important organs, and leading, if not speedily arrested, to dangerous, perhaps destructive lesions of those organs, it often acts with an absolutely curative effect."

These examples of honoured and honourable men, of high standing and great reputation among the Allopathic practitioners, who favour Homœopathy so far as to think it worthy of a careful and determinate examination, should satisfy our good public of Great Britain that the outcry of the general body of the medical men against our doctrine is not at all indicative of its being what they represent it, but that their very opposition, as that of a class prejudiced and resolved to condemn it, is an argument in its favour. It has been declared to be nonsense; it has been pronounced dangerous; the next stage is that all should pronounce it to have been what was always known.

Nine-tenths of the men of every profession or class are quite content with the knowledge of one's every-day things; few endeavour to ascertain the value or the reality of a philosophy that is beyond their normal comprehension. Like the fruit-seller in Mahommedan countries, it is easier for each of them to cry, "In the name of the prophet, figs!" whether that prophet be Galen, or Coke, or Warburton, or Peel, than to investigate any matter of inquiry for themselves. Nothing could be more direct or intelligible than that a medical man, for instance, should prove by experiment whether such a doctrine as Homœopathy is false or not; but the vast majority profess, instead, to condemn it without examination. This is the very essence of Toogoodism. Two medical men in the year 1841 met a common friend in the broad-walk near the spa of Cheltenham. This friend of the two physicians was a diligent student of Homœopathy. He had been a personal friend as well as disciple of Hahnemann. He began to discourse of Hahnemann and his doctrine, and spoke wisely and

well of the great medical reformer, and of his peculiar views and practice. One of his two hearers said, "I know nothing of the merits of this practice, but I will certainly inquire into it." He did so, and is now a well-known Homœopathist. The other of his hearers said, "I want to know nothing about it; I know as much of my profession as I wish to know, or as any man needs to know. I would not take the trouble to make any experiments of the kind. I am sure it is all stuff and nonsense." He remains an Allopathist, and is a good specimen of that Toogoodism we have been endeavouring to illustrate.

In the "Confessions of a Homœopathist," one is depicted as everything that is vile and detestable: he repents at last, and confesses himself to have been a villain. In some of the medical journals, it is recommended that whenever any one dies under Homœopathic treatment, the practitioner should be indicted for manslaughter. Dr Jonathan Toogood says that all Homœopathists are unprincipled charlatans. We can afford to pity this pitiful way of treating a question of immense public interest, and of profound philosophy. There is no more certain sign of ignorance than the proclaimed and angry unbelief in, and rejection of, a thing, because one does not understand it, and will not even take the trouble to make the effort to understand it. The case is worse in relation to Homœopathy, for many a person who could make nothing of its deeper philosophy might satisfy himself, by experiment, of the truth of the practice.

When any person dies under Homœopathic treatment, there is immediately an outcry against the practice. Myriads may perish under the drugging system, but this is the established way of doing to death. The friends of the departed and the public should not judge from isolated cases; it is a matter of figures: so many children, suffering from scarlatina, treated Allopathically, so many deaths; so many treated Homœopathically, so many deaths. And

so also of any other disease. By this test we are willing to abide. We know, to our cost, the unfairness, the dishonesty, with which our medical opponents treat us. A few days ago, a clergyman, who is in attendance on a gentleman supposed to be past hope of recovery, suggested to the medical attendant the propriety of trying Homœopathy, as he had avowed that the ordinary treatment was of no avail. "Sir," said this specimen of Toogoodism, "never mention the subject of Homœopathy to a surgeon" —looking the while all the scorn he felt. Now, what *great harm* would have been done in trying our remedies? A patient is left as hopeless by an Allopathic practitioner; a Homœopathist is called in, and the patient dies. As a matter of course, he was killed by Homœopathy. At one time it is said that there is nothing in our medicines: at another time, that they are concentrated poisons. Last winter, an infant was found in the morning dead, at Torquay, when there was every reason to think it was overlain by its nurse. One of the medical men of the place was sent for to see it, and asked if it had taken any medicine lately? "Only a globule of Homœopathic medicine." "Ah! those are dangerous remedies, strong poisons. What was the medicine?" "A globule of chamomilla." "Oh! certainly chamomilla is not a poison."

We are almost ashamed to write such things, but they show the *animus* of Toogoodism. Men of that *ism* endeavour, through thick and thin, *per fas vel nefas*, to abuse, vilify, put down whatever they think is in the way of their craft. What care they for divine philosophy? Good enough, easy, well-meaning men, they would not hurt a fly that did not tease them, but run a-muck—like a savage Malay, creese in hand—against whatever offends their prejudices, or seems to threaten their interest. This Toogoodism, then, is a part of our poor human nature. We are sorry for it, and would gladly see it amended.

A medical gentleman of Philadelphia, of considerable re-

putation, and an Allopath, lately wrote to a friend in this country who has recently embraced Homœopathy; and, after expressing his regret for his adoption of the Hahnemannian doctrine, went on to declare to him that Homœopathy was held in contempt or indifference in the United States; that the persons who practised it were sent to Coventry, and never received into good society; and that there were no men of any sort of respectability practising it. Constantine Hering, one of the most distinguished medical men and naturalists in the world, a man of great genius and of the most sincere and gentle goodness, so far as the word good can be applied to any human being, lives and flourishes in Philadelphia. He is a thoroughly truthful man, and he told us some three years ago, when he was in Europe, that the difficulty in the United States was not to get medical men to join the Homœopathic ranks, but to keep them back from pressing prematurely and too rapidly into our array. We believe, from all that we can gather, that there are more than a thousand Homœopathic practitioners in the United States: yet this well-to-do Allopathic doctor of Philadelphia laughs at the notion of Homœopathy having made any way in those States. This is another instance of Toogoodism.

We think it must be manifest to all who will take the trouble to examine the subject dispassionately, that the great body of the medical profession must, in the first instance, almost as a matter of course, judging from the analogy and history of all similar discoveries, have rejected Homœopathy. It has been shown that some few eminent men, from Hufeland half a century ago to Dr Forbes of our day, have ever and anon proclaimed their belief that it was a subject well worthy of the serious attention and anxious investigation of medical men. During that half-century, this doctrine has been adopted and the practice pursued by about three thousand duly qualified and well-educated practitioners, in Europe and America. It has

made quite as much progress as could reasonably have been expected in Great Britain, since its introduction in 1827. The public, then, can only come to one conclusion, if they will use their own faculties of judgment and comparison —that Homœopathy is a true doctrine, and the practice worthy of an honest, careful, and extensive trial, to say the least of it. Taken *per se*, the mere opposition of the bulk of our medical men argues nothing against it, but rather the contrary. The testimony of some of the most able and enlightened, who have yet stopped short of embracing it, says much more in its favour than the blind prejudice of the multitude does against it. We trust we have fairly, though rapidly, sketched the present relation between Medical Toogoodism and Homœopathy. The past history of our doctrine records the struggles of Hahnemann and his followers, the ups and downs of the conflict, and the triumphant issue in many places. The struggle and the conflict are still going on in Great Britain: the result cannot be doubted.

The Homœopathic practitioners should be a compact and united body, because union is strength. The friends and patrons of Homœopathy among the public can aid our progress by unity of purpose and a resolute will to have the doctrine fairly tested. There ought to be an Hospital and School of Homœopathy in each metropolis of the three kingdoms—London, Edinburgh, and Dublin—and this without delay. The non-medical adherents of our doctrine are sufficiently numerous and wealthy to provide ample funds for this purpose. This is a most important step that should be immediately taken. It is a downright neglect of a positive duty to let selfish considerations interfere with the advancement of a public good. Homœopathy is not for the benefit of this or that medical practitioner, or for this or that patient only, but should be diffused for the benefit of all. Such towns as Liverpool, Birmingham, and Manchester, should each have a Homœopathic hospital. We

ask for nothing but what is fair and equitable. Some of our advocates say that in time our Homœopathic practitioners will be elected to the hospitals and other public institutions already existing. But when? Little do such persons know of human nature and of the manner of the election to such hospitals. It were fitting that those who have been the pioneers of this doctrine in Great Britain, through good report and ill report, should have the satisfaction, before they depart hence and are no more seen, to know that their labour has not been in vain—that they have testified worthily to an established school of medicine. Those of high place, and possessed of wealth almost realising an oriental dream, who have for themselves and families derived incalculable benefit from this method of practice, should be awakened from their unconsciousness of the duty they owe themselves and the public, and the Giver of their wealth, in this respect. Life was not intended to be the voluptuous pastime of a Sybarite, or to be passed in a sort of philosophical indifference to the well-being of society. Life is, or should be, a series of struggles after good. The greatest amount of happiness for the greatest number of people, is the true rule of good government; the greatest possible amount of relief from pain and physical suffering and disease, for the greatest number of people, is the true rule of practical philanthropy on a medical question.

In every town where Homœopathy is practised, there should be a branch society in connection with the London British Homœopathic Association,* and the object of the main trunk and of each branch should be the obtaining of sufficient funds for the establishment of hospitals, as well as for the diffusion, by books, of the Homœopathic doctrine and practice.

Let us be allowed to conclude this paper with a brief

* There is such a branch in Liverpool.

survey of medicine from our august Father Adam to the present time. When man lived in Eden, there was no place for medicine or the healing art; his body was then incorruptible. But, when he was expelled from that garden of delights, he became subject to corruption and decay and death. The seeds of disease were then lodged in his body, and from these, ever since, myriad forms of ailment, aberrations from health, have continually sprung. In the beginning, simple herbs were the probable remedies for most of these ailments; a traditional knowledge of this or that simple being good for this or that ailment would be handed down from father to son. Persons who live a natural life are not subject to what we call chronic diseases. So that the Nomadic tribes of the East would not, in the first ages, be perplexed with a great variety of disorders. Among the native tribes of North America, even to this day, the treatment of disease is by such simples as we have indicated. If a person suffers from the poison of the rattlesnake, they have their infallible remedy for it; their simple remedies for all their ailments are essentially specific. Experience and the healing art so grew up together.

But in time, when men began to congregate and dwell in towns and cities—when luxury came in with its baneful seductions, and science began to speculate and account for experience by theory—the order of the healing art became inverted. Experience was in a great manner neglected, and the so-called science of medicine was founded on various theories and hypotheses. It then became the custom to theorise on diseases and their cure, and to substitute remedies in accordance with such theories for the medicine of experience.

As theories became fashionable, simples were more and more neglected, till at last they became exploded and forgotten among the nations called civilised. New and complicated prescriptions were introduced, more or less dangerous, requiring great discrimination and judgment for

their safe application; till medicine became as it were an abstract science, out of the reach of non-professional persons; and this was the beginning of a separate class—physicians.

At the first, from their lofty pretensions, these were held in admiration, as having a knowledge almost superhuman; wealth and honours flowed in to them, and it became their interest to make a mystery of their art; so that medicine grew into a mystery. How influenced in successive ages by astrology, astronomy, the mechanical and the chemical philosophies, and a series of ever-varying theories, we stop not to discuss. Those who would fain recur to the use of simple remedies, as they founded their practice on experiments instead of theory, were called *empirics*. The legitimate physicians of course scouted them. They worked into their polypharmacy, which appears to us so monstrous, all manner of incongruous things, exotics from every region, chemicals, and Galenicals, acrid poisons in mighty doses, strange and mysterious compounds, wonderful prescriptions. Great men and wise men and good men have never been wanting to dignify this body of physicians, notwithstanding. Hippocrates, Galen, Boerhaave, Caius, Sydenham, and very many others, might be enumerated. Yet let any one look at the writings of the best of them, and it will be seen how such men even as these were subject to the tyranny of their education and the barbarism of this polypharmacy.

Well, as the ages rolled on, a man was born and lived and died, who was known among men by the name of Samuel Hahnemann. He discovered that the order of medicine was inverted, and he boldly and wisely returned to the primitive custom—to the medicine of experience. He at once dashed aside all the theories that trammelled his predecessors and contemporaries. The fine-spun hypothesis was to him apparent for what it was, a profitless jargon. He came back to experiments and experience. He gave one medicine at a time. He said this remedy, in ac-

cordance with the law of healing, will cure such an ailment. If we can cover all the symptoms of such a patient with such a medicine, he will be cured. He consulted only common sense, experience, and the common interests of mankind. "Like cures like" was the law of healing, as illustrated by him, the Homœopathic law. Every aberration from the normal state of health has its specific remedy, if we knew it. Hahnemann's followers are bound to follow out his design. Polypharmacy, and medicines given merely in accordance with a theory, are rejected by us. Ours is the medicine of experience; call us, then, if you like, in the classical sense of the word, *empirics*. Call Homœopathy, if you choose, this medicine of experience.

We have thus in a few sentences contrasted Allopathy and Homœopathy. Allopathy having no law of healing of general applicability, while Homœopathy has: Allopathy ever changing its pharmacy and its compounds of drugs, Homœopathy having a definite law for its guidance in the choice of remedies. Homœopathy capable of taking in and using all the real knowledge of all the medical schools from Hippocrates to the present day; availing itself readily of every accessory of science, and of experience; bound by no contrarious theories; untrammelled by the tyranny of the schools; while Allopathy is tossed about with every wind of doctrine—to one thing constant never. We freely confess that cures are often made, have been often made, and so long as it lasts will be often made, by Allopathy; but we believe that these cures are frequently to be explained by the fact that the practitioners, quite unconsciously of course, give medicines Homœopathic to the cases. We use all their drugs of any worth, and many medicines of whose properties they are altogether ignorant.

We see no signs of the school of New Physic they were called on by their Coryphœus to erect. We should be happy to concur with them, if they would co-operate with us, in the attempt to put their practice on a more satisfac-

tory foundation. We respectfully and earnestly invite them to study the writings of Hahnemann; to repeat his experiments, and those of his followers. *We seek not theirs, but them.* We ask them to see whether or not they are under the influence of the Toogoodism of a class, and then to rise above it, and examine for themselves our doctrine and practice.

While we write, the Asiatic Cholera is in England, Scotland, and Ireland, fierce in some places, comparatively mild in others. It is avowedly confessed that the resources of Allopathy cannot meet this disease: the mortality is great under any practice; but very much less under Homœopathic treatment than under Allopathic.* We put it to our Allopathic brethren how they can fairly refuse to test our remedies in such a disease.

We have not even the shadow of a doubt that the truths of Homœopathy will be received by a goodly number of the medical men of these kingdoms at no distant date. It is for their sake, and that of the living generation of our fellow-subjects, that we are anxious our voice in favour of Homœopathy should be heard.

---

* The result of the treatment fully justified the anticipated success. See Russell's "Treatise on Epidemic Cholera." Headlan . 1849.

THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS OF EDINBURGH, AND HOMŒOPATHY.

The state of comparative inaction of the medical profession, in reference to Homœopathy, was very distasteful to the "Lancet," which had been goading the different public bodies to take some aggressive steps against the pestilent heresy; the English colleges treated the plebeian tribune with silent contempt; but in Scotland, historically famous for persecution, the instigation to attack was not thrown away, and the muttering precursor of the brooding storm prepared by the College of Physicians was emitted by the "Witness" newspaper of the 29th of May, in the following paragraph:—

"In our paper of Wednesday week, we gave publicity to a rumour which had reached us from several quarters, and to which the 'Lancet' gave strength by an article that we quoted, to the effect that the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh had resolved to expel from its body all those who practise Homœopathy. Since then, we have seen the resolutions referred to, and find them to be not nearly so severe in their tone as the article from the 'Lancet' might have led us to expect. They are not intended for publication, and, therefore, unless they find their way to the public eye through the medium of some of the medical

journals, we shall not be in a position to present them in detail to our readers. It may be sufficient, meanwhile, to indicate their general character, and to mention that they were passed unanimously, at a very full meeting of the College, and that the Royal College of Surgeons have since adopted resolutions very similar in character, so that the medical profession may now be held to have spoken out as a body on the subject of Homœopathy. The resolutions thus unanimously adopted are four in number. The first asserts that the College, several years ago, declined to admit into its body a Homœopathic practitioner, and thus publicly expressed its opinion of Homœopathy; the second states the regret of the College, that, in the face of this known fact, one or two of its fellows, after being admitted as regular practitioners, have endangered the reputation of the College by becoming Homœopathists, and calls upon them to retire from the body, announcing that the College repudiates them, and that from their connection with it they can derive nothing else than a false position and a spurious credit; the third resolution alludes to the fact first announced by the Homœopathists themselves, as to the impossibility of practitioners of the two systems meeting in consultation, and urging this as an additional reason for their voluntary retirement; while the fourth hints pretty plainly that the College has the power to take other and still more decided steps, should they be so advised.

We cannot see that the practitioners of Homœopathy have anything to complain of. The resolutions, though decided in their tone, are calm and dignified, the separation requested, the College asserts, has been virtually made in fact, and almost every professor of Homœopathy, from Hahnemann downwards, have filled their pages with abuse and ridicule of the regular profession. It seems natural that the men so insulted should decline their intercourse. As for the public, they can still make their election. The only possible way in which this decision can affect them is,

that, if they employ a Homœopathic practitioner, they do so knowing that they cannot in extremity avail themselves, as has been too often hitherto the case, of the services of the regular faculty; and further, that they are having recourse to a system which has thus been calmly and decidedly considered by the unanimous voice of the most educated and most accomplished practitioners in Edinburgh."

This may be considered as the first movement of the Absolutists in the campaign of 1851, and it was immediately followed by the counter movement on the side of independence which the succeeding letters disclose.

DR HENDERSON TO THE EDITOR OF THE "WITNESS."

61 Northumberland Street, Edinburgh,
30th May, 1851.

My Dear Sir,—Although I cannot but deprecate the discussion of medical questions in the columns of a newspaper, and consider so public a notice of the miserable squabbles and jealousies of medical men to be extremely humiliating and disgraceful to the profession, I am compelled, by the repeated admission into your paper of offensive paragraphs from a pen on one side of what may be termed the great medical controversy of the day, to ask you to publish this letter, and the accompanying documents.

In giving publicity to the resolutions of the Edinburgh Royal College of Physicians, I do not transgress that law of the College which requires, that no fellow shall *divulge* any transaction of the body which "may tend to the prejudice or defamation of the same," for these resolutions have been substantially divulged already by the Medical Secretary of the College, who was, doubtless, the source of the article in your paper of the 29th. Whether they are "calm and dignified," as that article affirms, I leave with confidence to the judgment of any educated gentleman.

On each of the resolutions I have a few words to say, not of a critical kind, but plain statements of fact, which I also leave with confidence to the judgment of the candid and courteous reader. I would first, however, mention the apparent cause of this new ebullition of the College. As I understand the matter, what they term Homœopathy—probably without knowing very well what it means—in addition to its wide and increasing diffusion among all classes of the public, has lately gained the support of a Fellow of the College of Physicians, whose defection is aggravated by the following circumstances:—That he was not long ago the bitterest enemy of Homœopathy in the whole College,—that he had been for many years the honoured treasurer of the Royal College,—that about two years since, on his leaving Edinburgh for a new sphere of practice in England, the College presented him with a silver tea-pot, tea-kettle, or tea-urn—I don't know which—and a hundred pounds sterling, all in token of their high consideration and affectionate gratitude.

On the first resolution, I would observe that the exclusion of the candidate to whom it adverts was far from having been unanimous. In the wise and liberal minority that voted for his admission were, I have the best reason to believe, the late Dr Hope, the well-known Professor of Chemistry, and the late Dr Davidson, who has not left his superior behind him in the College.

The second resolution pre-supposes that the mere fellowship of the College gives a *peculiar* title to the confidence and respect of the public. How far this is true, let the reader judge from the following undeniable facts:—1st, The fellows are admitted by ballot, altogether irrespectively of their professional attainments, provided they have acquired the title of M.D. at any British University, even at St Andrews. Consequently, any young man who graduates in this country is qualified for admission into the College of Physicians. 2d, The College is composed,

for the most part, of the common medical practitioners of the city, respectable in their station and character, it may be, but not superior in these respects, any more than in professional knowledge, to the ordinary practitioners of other large towns. 3d, The title of Fellow of the College of Physicians is *not* regarded in the profession as a considerable distinction, and is not thought to be the smallest evidence of superior attainments. 4th, The advantages and privileges of the College are chiefly these:—the reception by some Medical Boards of the class-tickets of such fellows as choose to lecture; a news-room; a good library; a museum of drugs; a very handsome hall, where tea and a lecture of some sort are given once a-month; and the right of regulating the practice of physic in certain parts of Edinburgh, namely, to use the words of the charter, in "the Canongate, the West Port, St Leonard's Street, and the Potterrow."

The third resolution declares that no Fellow of the College can meet "Practitioners of Homœopathy" in consultation without dishonour! The President of the College, who was in the chair when the resolutions were passed, has been in the habit of acting in the very teeth of that declaration whenever he was asked. Others have, I believe, done the same. But let not the reader suppose that such consultations have been frequent, or that there are many fellows of the College accustomed to be consulted by any party at all. Three, or at the most four, compose the whole number; and how much we are dependent upon them for their professional aid may be gathered in some measure from the fact, that I have had occasion to meet with only one of them in practice for two years past,—namely, with the President, twice, in his capacity as surgeon. The increasing confidence of those who are treated on the principle which the College affects to condemn, has put an end to such consultations; and I can say with most significant truth, that the cases "in extre-

mity" which resort at last to what I hold to be the better method, vastly exceed in number those whose weakness in disease permits them to yield to the solicitations of *friends* who are hostile to the safer treatment.

The article in your paper of the 29th concludes with saying that Homœopathy has been condemned "by the most educated and most accomplished practitioners in Edinburgh." This may be true; but I have yet to learn that it has ever been condemned by any man, in any part of the world, who had the smallest title—by any knowledge he had of it—to utter an opinion on the subject; and it is a melancholy fact that education and accomplishment should as readily play the "world-old tragedy" of persecution for opinions and beliefs in the nineteenth century as ever did heathen darkness in the second.—I am, yours very truly,

WILLIAM HENDERSON.

The following resolutions were transmitted to Dr Henderson by the Secretary of the College of Physicians, in an envelope addressed to "Dr Henderson, Practitioner of Homœopathy:"—

"At Edinburgh, and within the College Hall there, the ninth day of May, one thousand eight hundred and fifty-one years, an extraordinary meeting of the Royal College was held, pursuant to a resolution agreed to at the last quarterly meeting, and of which extraordinary meeting due notice was given by billets sent to all the Fellows.

"Dr SIMPSON, President, in the chair. Roll called, and absentees fined.

"Dr ALEXANDER WOOD, the Honorary Secretary, reported the circumstances which led the Council to believe that the time was now come when it was necessary to take some steps in regard to those Fellows of the College who had professed themselves Homœopathic practitioners.

"The following resolutions were moved, seconded, and *unanimously* agreed to:—

"1. That the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh did several years ago publicly express its opinion of Homœopathy and Homœopathic practitioners, by peremptorily declining to admit into its body a candidate for its fellowship who belonged to that denomination, and consequently that no Fellow of the College can possibly be ignorant of the light in which all those who practise Homœopathy are regarded by the College.

"2. The College regret that, notwithstanding this decided expression of their opinion, more than one of its fellows, after being admitted in a different character, have endangered the reputation of the College by becoming Homœopathic practitioners, and the College express an earnest hope that these fellows, seeing that they have thus virtually separated themselves from the College, will *spontaneously* sever their further connection with an institution which repudiates them, and from which they derive, as merely nominal fellows, nothing else than a false position and a spurious credit.

"3. The College feel the more bound thus to express their opinion, inasmuch as those of the fellows who have become Homœopathists, or any other medical practitioners who follow Homœopathy, must necessarily be aliens to the other fellows, and to the profession at large; inasmuch as no Fellow of this College, nor any other physician, can, by any possibility, without derogating from his own honour, and from the honour of the profession, meet practitioners of Homœopathy in consultation, or co-operate with them in the other common duties of professional life.

"4. That, although the College has hitherto not thought it expedient to take any active steps for disclaiming those fellows who have become Homœopathic practitioners subsequently to their admission to the College; nevertheless, since it has the power of dealing summarily with those who

act in a manner so unbecoming the character of a physician, it reserves its right to exercise this power when it shall be so advised.

"It was further moved—

"That the College having found it necessary at length, and very reluctantly, to take action in regard to those fellows who, having entered the College in a different character, have subsequently avowed themselves to be Homœopathic practitioners, remit to the Council to direct copies of this and the foregoing first four resolutions to be transmitted by the Secretary to all such fellows as are now, or may hereafter, be known to have acted in this way, trusting that this may lead them to withdraw from the College."

This resolution was also unanimously adopted.

DR HENDERSON TO THE SECRETARY OF THE COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS.

61 Northumberland Street,
12th May, 1851.

Sir,—I have to acknowledge the receipt of a copy of a series of resolutions adopted by the Royal College of Physicians on the 9th curt., and which, you say, you have been instructed to send me.

Some parts of those resolutions are so intemperate and insulting, as to be discreditable to the body from which they emanate; and though you take pains to inform me that the resolutions, as they stand, were unanimously adopted by the College, I shall do some of the fellows the justice to believe that they have so much good sense and gentlemanly feeling as to be incapable of impugning the honour of any one because he differs from them in the choice or dose of a drug; although they may, from absence or inadvertence, have appeared to acquiesce in the sentiments of some less scrupulous associate.

To the framer of these resolutions, I would willingly con-

fine the disgrace of what is outrageous in their tone and tenor; but, as they are sent forth, in their present offensive shape, in the name of the College, I am precluded from replying now to such parts of them as may fairly be mooted among courteous and upright men, nor can I reply to them at any time until the College shall address me in a more becoming style.

The unusual title of "Practitioner of Homœopathy," with which you endorse your letter to me, is doubtless intended as an additional insult. Whether suggested by the Royal College, or the spontaneous fruit of your own taste, I receive the proposed indignity with composure; for I fully believe, and have long acted on the belief, temperately, yet firmly, and undeterred by much misrepresentation and abuse, that what is termed the "Homœopathic principle," is by far the most important and the most extensively useful of the principles, hitherto discovered, which ought to regulate the practice of medicine; and if physicians are to be classed by distinctive epithets—as Homœopathic, Allopathic, and Antipathic, according as they prefer one therapeutic principle or another in their practice —I am abundantly satisfied, and the reasonable part of the public will, I have no doubt, concur with me, that under each designation, whether belonging to a Royal College or not, there will rank the usual proportion of worthy and of questionable men. Before the College commits itself further on this subject, however, I would caution it against a difficulty it will encounter in the attempt at classification, and the other measures it may have in view, by reminding it of the discussion which took place on the occasion to which its first resolution adverts, in which it was strongly, and no doubt truly, urged by a president of the very same body, that those who were designated Homœopathists had no exclusive right to that title, seeing that the Homœopathic action of remedies was as distinctly admitted by the profession at large as it was by them.

I write to you, of course, in your official capacity, and, therefore, have the honour to be, your very obedient servant,

WILLIAM HENDERSON.

It may be proper to add, that the Secretary has acknowledged the title referred to above to have been given on his own responsibility, while he has ingeniously regretted that it should have been taken as an insult. It never was so taken, but was simply asserted to have been *intended* as an insult; and who can doubt that it was who has read the resolutions.

W. H.

DR RUSSELL TO THE EDITOR OF THE "WITNESS."

Edinburgh, 75 Queen Street,
May 29, 1851.

SIR,—In the "Witness" of to-day, I observe an article likely to give rise to serious misapprehension, from the following paragraph. After detailing the resolutions recently adopted by the College of Physicians, it goes on to say—"We cannot see that the practitioners of Homœopathy have anything to complain of. * * * As for the public, they can still make their election. The only possible way in which this decision can effect them is, that, if they employ a Homœopathic practitioner, they do so knowing that they cannot in extremity avail themselves, *as has been too often hitherto the case*, of the services of the regular faculty."

Now, I for one am not entitled, nor inclined, to complain of this antiquated burgh-corporation making itself ridiculous, although it outdoes the Pope and the Emperor of China in the bravery of its words and the impotence of its actions, as I have not the dubious honour of its fellowship. But that we, who practise Homœopathy, are in the habit of receiving aid from the *soi-disant* "regular faculty"

who constitute the College, when our patients are in extreme danger, is utterly false. I have now been in practice for ten years, and only once have I sought such assistance. I applied, in that case, against the patient's wish (who was a female), to the Professor of Midwifery, who at once complied with my request. The case was of a very unusual nature, and half a century might elapse without my meeting with such another.

On the contrary, it happens frequently that, when the efforts of the old school are quite baffled, death seeming inevitable, we are called upon to try to avert the fatal termination.

I remain, Sir, your most obedient servant,

J. Rutherfurd Russell.

DR WIELOBYCKI TO THE EDITOR OF THE "WITNESS."

Edinburgh, 55 Queen Street,
June 22, 1851.

Sir,—You will not deny to me, a foreigner, the privilege you allow to your townsmen; and, therefore, I must beg of you the indulgence of bearing with my imperfect power of stating my case, reminding you that, though at present this country is at the height of its prosperity, no one knows but that, before long, you or your children may have to plead their cause as exiles in a foreign land, and in a foreign speech.

Although altogether unused to literary warfare, I was very young roughly taught the use of arms; having, when only sixteen years of age, taken a part with the rest of my family in the last (1830–31) war of independence, which terminated so disastrously for my country. Forced to assume a German name, I studied at Cracow, Bonn, and Berlin, and obtained the degree of Doctor in Philosophy at the last of these Universities, intending to settle in Cra-

cow; but I was soon recognised, arrested, and imprisoned. After undergoing many hardships, I escaped, and made my way, through dangers of all kinds, to Hamburgh, where I embarked for Leith, and so got here twelve years ago. I was ignorant then of your language, but met with great kindness; and, attending the University here, took my degree as M.D., and was for two years assistant-surgeon at the now termed Royal Maternity Hospital. At this time, the Homœopathic Dispensary at Stockbridge, conducted by Drs Black and Russell, was in full operation, and having been treated by this system, when a boy, at my father's in Poland, and having conversed with many distinguished Homœopathic practitioners in Germany, I determined to attend it. I met with every facility and encouragement from the physicians, who have been my steady friends all along; and, since then, I have been unmolested in my practice. What I sought as an asylum has become a home; and, before I purchased my present house, I obtained letters of naturalisation, so that I am now a British subject. My attention being directed to a paragraph in your paper of May 29, and seeing letters from Professor Henderson and Dr Russell denying the statement therein made, I think it right to make some few observations upon it and the documents published in your paper of May 31.

As I had studied at the College, I supposed there might be some analogy between the University College and the College of Physicians. But I find this is an entire mistake. The University College, which gave me my diploma, is an institution for education. The degrees are only given after years of study, and are the reward of industry. But the College of Physicians seems only to be a sort of trade-guild, such as is common in Germany. For example, the shoemaker, the tailor, and other mechanics, have all certain guild privileges; and no one is allowed to make shoes or trousers who is not a member of the Guild

of the town. This seems the same with this so-called College; for it requires no examination from its candidates, but only the payment of £100; and everybody who has a degree from any British University is eligible. It has a monopoly of the practice of some parts of the Old Town, the Potterrow, and Canongate, &c. It is true, I find it stated in your paper, that it is composed of the "most educated and most accomplished medical practitioners in Edinburgh;" but, as this statement is made by one of themselves, of course it has no great weight; for, possibly, the writer's idea of education and accomplishment are of a narrow guild character, not estimated by any European standard. It is certain that the preliminary education required here is far less than what is thought necessary to make an educated or accomplished man in Germany, where Latin is in ordinary use in all clinical teaching; whereas here a mere smattering of that language, and no knowledge of French or German, is often met with among those who call themselves learned physicians, and, as such, would monopolise the right of practice, and repress the development of any new idea in medicine. It would be presumptuous in me to say what my idea of a highly educated and accomplished physician was; but I must say, that, if the paragraph referred to be written by such an one, it is very unlike the kind of composition which I was taught on the Continent as characterising your distinguished men of letters. However, with that I have nothing to do. What passes for talent and accomplishment in one place, may not be so admitted in other places; and you cannot always expect to have men of European celebrity—such as Cullen and Gregory—presiding over your colleges. But one statement in this article is untrue, as refers to my practice, and I wish to give it a public denial. In no case of extreme danger have I ever called in the aid of any Member of the College of Physicians during the last eight years of my

practice. I don't know who the parties are who have been too often in the habit of doing this. Professor Henderson says it is not he. Dr Russell says it is not he; and I say it is not I. I think I may answer for my fellow-countryman, Dr Lyschinski. When in doubt, I have the other Homœopathic physicians to apply to, who, besides being educated exactly as the Fellows of the College are, have the advantage of a knowledge of the action of Homœopathy, so that there could be no reason for my seeking extra professional assistance. It would be going from the more educated to the less educated; for, in some parts of Germany, when a person takes his degree of physician, he is asked if he intends to prosecute Homœopathy; and, if he does, he has to pass *an additional* examination; so that Homœopathic physicians are simply ordinary physicians, whether members of the town corporation or college or not, who, to the usual knowledge required by examining boards, have acquired, either in this country or abroad, the knowledge of a more refined and difficult system of administering drugs. And if the reverse had not been stated in your paper, I should have imagined that they, from this reason, would be the more accomplished, as they are certainly the more educated, of the two.

Perhaps it would prevent future difficulties, if the College would mention what they intend to proscribe next—whether all who practice mesmerism are to be excommunicated by the Edinburgh Vatican. If the principle of expelling every member who adopts a new method of practice is rigidly enforced, before many years are past, all the members may be expelled, one after another, till one only is left to reign in solitary grandeur over the hall and the tea-table. Four fellows are included in this proscription; but the next *auto-da-fe* may be more handsomely celebrated, if the mesmeric mania denounced by some of the members, and courageously propagated by the Presi-

dent and one of the Professors, continue to prevail during the dog-days.

I must apologise for this long letter. It is not easy to acquire the art of concise writing; but, if I have made myself intelligible, and said nothing offensive or improper, I trust you will excuse the faults, and admit the contradiction into the organ which gave such extensive circulation to a misrepresentation.

I remain, Sir, your obedient humble servant,

DIONYSIUS WIELOBYCKI.

OUR COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS.*

Our readers already understand pretty clearly the nature of the Homœopathic movement in medicine, since we have thought it our duty as journalists to inquire concerning so striking a scientific phenomenon, and also to lay the results of the investigation before the public. Not that we presumed to enter on a scientific estimate of the Homœopathic doctrine, for that would certainly have been beyond our province; but we were anxious to know what it is, who originated it, and by whom it is received, inasmuch as we were never done hearing of it in society. In short, Homœopathy had become such a notable thing in the world around us, that we were bound (as professed teachers) to seek some information on the subject, and report our findings to our readers. They are, therefore, aware that this Homœopathy is essentially a theory of cure, propounded by one Hahnemann some fifty years ago, practised upon by a rapidly increasing minority of our own doctors, and trusted in by all sorts of lay people, from his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, to his Excellency the Chevalier Bunsen, inclusive of a rare variety of intellectual character. It keeps up dispensaries, founds hospitals, edits journals, gains large private practices, as they are called, writes books, and makes converts. Its professors

* From the "Edinburgh News" of June 7, 1851.

are regularly graduated doctors of medicine, and its patients are gentle and simple, learned and unlearned, men of genius and men of none, Jews and Gentiles, but certainly as fair an average of contemporary society as presently rallies round any new cause. Whether, then, Homœopathy be a discovery, a half-truth, or one more medical error in history (a thing we are not competent to decide, of course, or even to pronounce an opinion upon), it is at least clear that it is not a thing to be sneered down, nor yet an ignoble creature to be thrust out of good men's doors. Indeed, it seems too vivacious and aggressive to suffer much damage at anybody's hands. To say nothing of some hundred and fifty other practitioners, it has within these few years won four of the Fellows of our College of Physicians to its standard—Professor Henderson, Dr Neville Wood of London, Dr M'Leod of Benrhydding, and Dr Ransford of York, the last of whom was lately the treasurer of the good old institution. So much for the first part of our story; now for the second.

The majority of the Royal College (for it is royal!) could not stand this conversion of its learned fellows any longer, it seems; and they have actually, within these few weeks, passed a series of resolutions insisting (by implication) on the withdrawal of the new converts. They do not expel them, indeed; but why? Simply because the four extruded fellows would be down on the College with as many actions of damages, say to the tune of £10,000 a-piece; and the damages would assuredly be awarded. But the said majority did their best right royally—they invented, worded, heard and adopted, the resolutions (formerly quoted, p. 181–183).

Such is the series of memorable resolutions which draws its slow length along the College minute-book, like an unmistakeable Alexandrine as it is—in our opinion, a clumsy wooden substitute for a curt and manly vote of expulsion. Such, too, as we learn from the "Witness," were the con-

tents of an envelope, addressed thereupon, not to Professor, but to Dr Henderson, practitioner of Homœopathy, by Professor Alexander Wood, the honorary secretary of the orthodox body under contemplation.

This College has now much more work before than behind it, we suspect. Mesmerism has always been in their black books, and they must proceed speedily to thrust forth Professor Gregory—perhaps even Dr Simpson, the president, good as he is at saving appearances, being a true *a posteriori* man of science! Next comes phrenology and the phrenologists; could Dr Bennet, or any other orthodox fellow, not prove the former to be a humbug, and the latter to be dupes and quacks, in the space of five-and-twenty minutes, by any stop-watch in the kingdom? Does phrenology not modify a man's whole treatment of the insane, and a portion of his therapeutic practice in general? In sober earnest, the College is bound in its duty to the public to insult phrenology and mesmerism without delay. But it wont, for discretion is the better part of valour. It has no particular taste for persecution merely for persecution's sake. Like the tiger and the domestic cat, it is not brave; it only does brave-looking things under the impulsion of hunger, under the pressure of alimentiveness, as the phrenological fellows would say, under the inspiration of *avaritia vulgaris*, or common greed. Phrenology and mesmerism do not touch the regal pocket yet; but Homœopathy does, and it must be put down, for the craft is in danger. There were clearly representatives of Alexander the coppersmith, and sons of Simon Magus; but it would have been better still if there had been even one town-clerk of Ephesus at the fatal meeting. But they were unanimous, for "a fellow feeling makes us wondrous kind."

We need not say we deplore all this—the thinking portion of the public will despise it. Be Homœopathy right or wrong, this treatment of its honest and learned advocates is insolent, tyrannical, ignorant, vulgar, and utterly

repugnant to the spirit of the age. As a fact, indeed, it is impotent; but, as an example, it is infamous. It is an insult to the thousands of thoughtful lay adherents of Homœopathy, for they have conscientiously chosen their physicians. It is an insult to the public at large, for it is an endeavour to dictate their selection. It is an insult to mankind, for it is a tremendously feeble attempt to fetter thought and will. It is an insult to science, for science expires as soon as it is denied the air of freedom, and the everlasting right of growth.

It is also a bungle—yes, an egregious blunder. It draws public attention to the subject. It interests people's feelings of natural justice, patronage, good nature, and sympathy, in favour of the condemned inquirers. It drives the Homœopathists, both professional and passive, into stricter leagues of resistance, aggression, and victory. In one word, if Homœopathy be an error, the world will one day blame our College of Physicians for doing what they could to consolidate and perpetuate it.

But if Homœopathy turn out to be not an error? If it prove to contain some important germ of truth? If it be yet destined, like the Copernican astronomy, like the circulation of the blood, and like vaccination, to eventual victory? In brief, if there be a glorious immortality in reserve for it, will not our learned doctors be found to have been fighting against truth? Will Edinburgh, in 1851, not be remembered in history, in that not impossible case, as the metropolis of bigotry and impotence? Will it not be chronicled that—Professor Simpson in the chair, Dr Wood leading out, Professor Christison moved, and our College of Physicians adopted, these stand-still resolutions; while the "Witness," a *Free* Church organ of the time, bestowed its approbation on them, and no journalist condemned them but ourselves? Be it iterated and reiterated, and reiterated again, that these resolutions are disgraceful in any event; but, in the possible event referred to, they are worse.

It is but fair to mention, that the "Witness" has done Professor Henderson the justice to publish a letter on this business; and a clear, pointed, manly letter it is. We are not friends, far less partisans, of Homœopathy, except in so far as respect for the intellectual and moral attitude of its disciples, and the securing of a fair field and no favour for all kinds of investigation after truth, naturally carry us; but we can confidently assure the Homœopathists of Edinburgh, that their position in the sympathy and esteem of their fellow-citizens is now better than ever. Let them go on fearlessly—not as disputants, not as sectaries, but as perpetual inquirers. If they find their doctrine wanting, let them give it to the winds; if they find it sufficing, let them stand on it as a rock. Conscience is more royal than the College.

THE NEW TEST ACT.*

My Lord Provost and Gentlemen,—Few of you can have lived in such happy seclusion, as to have heard nothing of the medical disturbances which every now and then arise to agitate our quiet city. Justly or unjustly, the medical profession has the reputation of being wonderfully prolific of quarrels, and of indulging in a virulence of recrimination on such occasions, from which most others deem themselves debarred by considerations of propriety. I have thus prefaced my statement, only to assure you that the matters I have now to bring under your notice are quite of another sort; otherwise, not being of that profession, I should not have felt called upon to meddle in the business. What I have now to direct your attention to appears to me, and I think will appear to many, at least, if not all, of you, to be of great public importance to the community and to the University; and I feel so sure of an open ear as to everything which touches the welfare of an institution so especially bound up with many of our dearest recollections, that I shall use no entreaties or arguments in order to obtain from you a patient hearing.

It is now matter of notoriety that the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh has pledged itself, and each of its assenting members, to have no dealings with certain of its own fellows, or with any other physicians, although

* A Recent Conspiracy against the Medical Practitioners of Homœopathy and the Public, by the College of Physicians and the Faculty of Medicine: considered in a Letter to the Patrons of the University of Edinburgh, by an Alumnus. July, 1851.

also graduates of our University, who agree in observing a doctrine and practice in medicine generally known as the Homœopathic. It is true that these resolutions state no reasons for thus putting the medical practitioners of Homœopathy beyond the pale; and if, as I trust, I shall satisfy you that the principle, or rather the arbitrary rule of communion inculcated by these resolutions, is a matter of public concern, we shall have the more interest in inquiring, what the grounds can be upon which the College of Physicians suppose so unusual a course of conduct to be meritorious or defensible. It is the more necessary to call your attention to these resolutions, as I regard them to be essentially connected with other proceedings, more directly affecting the University, to which I shall presently advert.

Few words will be required to show, that if one party, or sect, or persuasion of the medical profession resolve that they will not meet in consultation with any member of a different party, or sect, or persuasion, the public are injured; and, as a question of principle, it cannot be decided by counting the respective numbers. The proscribed minority may in this case be small; but let us once admit the principle, and the effects may be disastrous. We may have the whole body cut up into sects; and instead of, as heretofore, having free choice of the whole medical practitioners in Edinburgh, in case of desiring assistance in consultation with our usual medical attendant, we shall have to consider to what sect he belongs, and how many members of it there are. In short, a supplemary list will have to be published yearly in the Almanack and Directory for our guidance, showing the actual state of parties. Suppose that Dr Henderson is my family attendant. He is considered an excellent stethoscopist; he examines my chest, and, as the result of such examinations and his knowledge of the history of my health, comes to the conclusion that I am in a consumption, and orders me, with

directions as to treatment and medicine, to Madeira. Well, it is a long way and a serious change of life; and I should like to have the opinion of Dr Alison or Dr Simpson before leaving home. I tell Dr Henderson that I wish a consultation with one of them on the subject. "Oh!" he replies, "that is perfectly impossible; neither of them can meet with me without loss of character. So the College of Physicians has determined." "Why on earth cannot they meet with you?" I ask. "Are you not a graduate, and one of the medical professors, of the University, a member of the College, and of reputable private character?" "I believe I am all these," he answers me; "but the reason is, that I am a Homœopathist." "And pray, Dr H., what may that long terrible word mean? Is it the Greek for a liar, or a quack, or for what, that it operates as an impassable bar to the benevolence and professional zeal of other members of the College?" "Oh no," he answers, "it is nothing at all so detestable." "What is it, then, to be a Homœopathist?" "Well, I will tell you shortly what it means. It imports a belief in the prevalence of a general law by which to be guided in the selection of remedies; *similia similibus curantur*, expressed technically; or, in plain English, that the substance which produces in the healthy a resemblance of the disease will cure it in the sick." "And is this law universally repudiated by the other members of the College?" "By no means," he tells me. "In fact, I remember that, on the occasion of the rejection (after a vote by ballot) of Dr Black's petition for admission as a member, the President said, that the Homœopathists had no right to the exclusive use of the title, for that on occasions they all practised Homœopathically. Indeed, the truth is, that all the specifics in common use are given in accordance with the Homœopathic law."

I ask again—"Is that *all* that is implied in being a Homœopathist?" "Strictly speaking, *all*," he answers. "Every

physician practising according to that law is a Homœopathist; but there is a farther difference in practice arising out of this law: that we always give medicines in much smaller quantities than they are otherwise usually given." "Nothing more?" "Nothing more, I believe; for I don't suppose that the practice of never giving but one medicine at a time, and of always testing the medicines upon healthy persons before giving them to the sick, is deemed seriously objectionable, however little practised, by the other members of the College." "Then, the practical result to me is, that because you differ from most of the other members of your College on the principle of selection, and on the right quantities of medicine (upon neither of which, as I understand, the others are at all agreed among themselves), I am deprived of the benefit of having the advice of any of them?" "Precisely so," he answers.

I shall waste no more words in establishing my position, that these proceedings of the College of Physicians are of general concern; and it is not inadvertently, but considerately, that I have described this transaction as indicating a conspiracy of the College against the public. It appears to me a violation of all propriety, that a body so constituted should pass such resolutions; and, as they have done so, it is well the public should know it. If the medical practitioners of Homœopathy are thus insulted by the College, no less are its lay adherents, among whom are many of the most enlightened and influential of our citizens. Nor is it to be supposed that these notable resolutions will affect those only who are now adherents of the proscribed system. On the contrary, if, as will presently appear, that system is rapidly becoming extended by daily conquests, it would be rash to say of those who now regard it with indifference or aversion, that they may not soon be included among its adherents. Obviously, it is personally unsafe for heathens to be consenters to the burning of christians, until they can be assured that they will not

themselves become disciples of the new advancing faith. Besides, persecution in all forms, as the history of the nations has abundantly taught us, is a game but too easily learned; and the weapons which we have forged for others may ere long pierce ourselves.

Before asking your attention more particularly to the terms of these resolutions, and to the proceedings of the Medical Faculty of the University, I shall take leave to say a few words on the history of the introduction among us of the Homœopathic system, and of its progress hitherto—a progress so remarkable, that, where it does not lead to serious, calm inquiry, it is likely enough to lead to intense, ignorant hostility on the part of the great body of practitioners; who will regard it as an intolerable, monstrous innovation, to be put down at all hazards; if possible, by force; otherwise, by calumny.

That the language I have now used is not too strong, will be readily confessed by all who are familiar with the history of medicine. It is notorious, that one after another its great reformers have suffered martyrdom at the hands of their fellow-practitioners; and to the law that each remarkable improvement in medical practice has entailed upon its author general obloquy and loss of practice there are probably very few exceptions. On such a subject there is no need to refer to authorities; but, in case of any doubting what I say, I shall quote a sentence or two from a recent paper by Dr Simpson, the present distinguished President of the College of Physicians.* I quote the following passage the rather that it seems to me expressly applicable to the large-minded, sagacious Hahnemann—undoubtedly one of the most accomplished men of his day in science and philosophy, whatever judgment may be formed of the merits of his therapeutic laws. "From time to time,"

* "Etherization in Surgery." Part I. "Monthly Journal of Medical Science," September, 1847. Pp. 146—152.

writes Dr Simpson, "in the march of medicine and other allied sciences, some earnest and expanded mind conceives and elaborates a great and novel thought, destined, in its practical application, to ameliorate the condition, and promote the happiness, of mankind. But, hitherto, almost as often as the human intellect has been thus permitted to obtain a new light, or strike out a new discovery, human prejudices and passions have instantly sprung up to deny its truth, or doubt its utility; and thus its first advances are never welcomed as the approach of a friend to humanity and science, but contested and battled as if it were the attack of an enemy. Practical medicine, in its past career, is full of instances illustrative of this remark." Of the truth of these remarks, it seems to me there can be no reasonable doubt; and I am glad to find my views so distinctly corroborated by the very learned and talented President of the College. *Vaccination* is the instance he makes choice of in the paper from which I quote (and to which I refer those who may be interested in the inquiry); in reference to which, perhaps the greatest of commonly received modern improvements in medical practice, "by which hundreds of thousands of human lives throughout Europe are estimated to have been saved," the author of the article adduces more than abundant evidence that it formed no exception to the general law of resistance and persecution—the intensity of which may surprise some of our readers. Indeed, with all the violence of denunciation directed against the Homœopathists by their fellow-graduates, we believe the following, directed against Dr Jenner's great discovery, has hardly been exceeded. "The vaccine," exclaimed one enemy of cow-pox inoculation, "was the damnedest thing ever proposed; he wished the inventors were all hanged, and he would give his vote for its being done."* Again, Dr

* "Moore's Reply to the Anti-Vaccinists," 1806, p. 14. Quoted in the paper referred to, p. 150.

Simpson writes:— "The history of cow-pox is certainly calculated to teach us this one lesson, that, in relation to the truth of any novel doctrine or practice, such as vaccination or etherization, adverse opinions and pre-judgments are—however strongly entertained, or however strongly expressed—not in themselves adequate, as some at the present time would seem to believe, to decide the whole matter in dispute, either in one direction or another." How far the learned writer, who found it necessary to make such remarks by way of obviating opposition to his own greatly beneficial innovation, the use of chloroform, is prepared to apply them to Hahnemann's, I cannot tell. He was in the chair, as President of the College, when the famous resolutions were unanimously passed; and I am not aware that he has in any way disclaimed the part in their adoption which will naturally be allotted to him. I should be sorry to think that he has so imperfectly learned the lesson which he was enforcing upon others, when he wrote the sentence last quoted. Whatever he may do, I have no difficulty in making such an application of his words; and I am confident that I carry with me the judgment of unprejudiced and wise men when I say, that to pass such a sentence against Homœopathy and its practitioners, without inquiry, or reasons alleged, on the part of the College, is a course of conduct to be justly reprobated; that their decision on the matter is one of those "pre-judgments which are not adequate to decide the matter in dispute," and which are in truth entitled to very little respect. If it shall appear, then, that the great therapeutic law proposed by Hahnemann, and alleged to be proved by induction, has met with strong opposition from the general body of the profession, and has been denounced by colleges, even with extreme violence of language; such facts will to the cautious inquirer afford no sort of presumption against its truth and final establishment. If it be true, of course it will, perhaps after long waiting, but certainly in the end,

prevail; even if it be in whole or in part untrue, these are not the legitimate or effectual means of proving its falsity. If the system have no foundation in nature, careful, patient, dispassionate investigation is the right way of showing it to be so; and they will be only the foolish or timid, whose judgments on the subject will be much influenced by the *impromptu* denunciations of colleges. Like everything else, it will stand or fall according to its true merits, which only those can profitably pronounce upon who have fairly investigated them; and there may be apparent such a measure of animosity as will disqualify for such an investigation those who would be otherwise deemed well prepared for it. I have now, according to my promise, to say something of the introduction among us, and of the progress, of Homœopathy.

Ten years ago, the name was almost unknown to the public of Edinburgh; for it was in October, 1841, that the inhabitants of Stockbridge were puzzled by the superscription over the door of one of the houses in that district of the new strange word. The sign bore "Homœopathic Dispensary." The institution was under the charge of Dr Rutherfurd Russell and Dr Francis Black, who are stated to have independently, but simultaneously, determined to pursue in Edinburgh the practice of their profession, according to the system thus indicated. As they regarded the mode of treatment they intended to pursue to differ most importantly from the more common modes, they appear to have thought it only a duty to their patients to let that be known by a sufficient designation of the institution. Whatever may be thought of the prudence, every one must admit the manly courage of such a course. For two young men thus to throw down the gauntlet before their equals and seniors, in a place where the practitioners of medicine are so many and so influential as they are in Edinburgh, indicated either strong faith or reckless daring. The consistent zeal and perseverance of both these gentlemen, in

the exclusive practice of the Homœopathic system, seems to entitle them to credit for an unswerving faith in it. They were young men at that time; and both were graduates of the University of Edinburgh. I am led to understand from their associates and teachers that, as students, they were distinguished for ability and industry; and it appears that, after taking the degree of M.D. in Edinburgh, they had the advantage of foreign travel, and of study at one or more of the celebrated continental schools.

My only purpose in these personal remarks (for which I hope to be pardoned by the gentlemen to whom they refer), is to establish this fact—that it was by graduates of our own University, and these noways inferior in status or acquirement to other medical practitioners, that this method of practice was first introduced into Edinburgh, or, at least, publicly professed. The next medical practitioner of it who appeared on the field was Dr Wielobycki, a native of Poland, who (as he states in a recent letter to the Editor of the "Witness,"*), after having obtained the degree of doctor in philosophy at the University of Berlin, intending to settle in Cracow, was imprisoned, like many of his countrymen, for political reasons; and, like few of them, having escaped, made his way to Edinburgh, ignorant of our language, about twelve years ago. Having pursued his studies successfully, he obtained the degree of M.D. from our University; and, after having been for two years assistant-surgeon at the Maternity Hospital, began to attend the Homœopathic dispensary. The result was, that he also became a confirmed convert to the new faith, which he has now practised during many years; his abilities and indomitable energy having secured for him, in spite of all the disadvantages of a foreign origin and mother speech, a large and lucrative practice; indeed, a strong position in the hard-fought field of our Scottish metropolis. From Dr

* See ante, p. 186.

Lyschinski, another native of Poland, and a graduate of Edinburgh University, who has attached to himself many influential friends, also a devoted disciple of Homœopathy, there is no published statement to which I can refer. The next convert whom I have to name is Dr Henderson. It is quite superfluous to say anything on the head of Dr Henderson's distinguished acquirements. The fact that he was selected by the patrons, out of all the candidates proposed for their consideration, as the best qualified for the chair of general pathology in the University, speaks volumes. It is also quite notorious, and indeed appears from the certificates produced by him, that he held a very high place in the estimation of the members of his profession, until he was found to have been experimentally testing, and finally to have adopted, the Homœopathic system. His "Inquiry into the Homœopathic Practice of Medicine" was published so long ago as 1845; and the large experience he has since acquired, in a very extensive practice, appears to have fully confirmed to him the convictions, which were the result of careful but more limited experiments on the subject of the action of Homœopathic remedies. He began, and it was his intention to have pursued, the practice of this method in the infirmary, as Professor of Clinical Medicine, and one of the physicians to the institution; but, the managers having requested that he would discontinue such practice, he felt it his duty rather to resign, which he accordingly tells us he did, at the termination of the course of lectures which he was then delivering. It is to be regretted that so good an opportunity of testing the value of the Homœopathic system should thus have been lost.

It seems unnecessary for my present purpose to inquire how many other disciples from among the graduates of the Edinburgh University the new doctrine can justly boast of. I am told they are not a few. It may, perhaps, be worth mentioning what is told of Abercrombie; that, some one having mentioned to him that Dr Henderson was engaged

in the investigation of Homœopathy, he said something to this effect—"I am glad of it; now we shall see whether there is any truth in it;" and of Davidson, that he said to a friend, that, had he been a younger man, he should have thought it his duty to study the system. We have few, if any, remaining who deserve to be named with such men as these. It appears also, from a published letter of Liston's, that, before his death, he had become convinced of the efficacy of the Homœopathic remedies.

If it be asked, What has been the progress of Homœopathy among our laity? the question is not easily answered. We learn from the last annual report of the Homœopathic Dispensary, now before me, issued under the authority of a most influential committee of management, that the institution was founded more than nine years ago, having been in effective operation the whole of that time; during which "there have been in all above fifteen thousand patients entered on the books;" and, from one of the previous annual reports, it appears that patients have come even from distant parts of Scotland for the sake of attending it. Looking over the list of subscribers to this institution, one would say that it is distinguished as containing the names of many persons of the highest respectability. It may be in the recollection of many of our citizens, that, during the prevalence of cholera in Edinburgh (1847–48), the physicians of this dispensary, with the assistance of a resident house-surgeon, gave attendance at all hours, day and night, for the relief of the poor; and the second annual report states the returns communicated to the Board of Health to show, that no fewer than 236 cases of cholera were thus treated; the physicians visiting patients in all parts of the city and its suburbs. The results of this treatment seem to have been eminently beneficial.

But the system is not native to Scotland, although introduced among us by graduates of our own University. It had been practised in England before it was practised

here. Still earlier, it had been extensively practised on the Continent.

It is now just one hundred years since Hahnemann was born at Meissen; and in Leipsic, from which he was banished, while as yet an "unaccredited hero," there is to be a statue erected to his memory, during the month of August, in one of the most public squares of the city. There, as well as in Vienna and elsewhere, there have long been in operation hospitals in which the practice is exclusively Homœopathic; and the system, at first prohibited, is now distinctly recognised by the respective governments in Austria, Prussia, and Saxony, not to mention the lesser German States. It has long been extensively practised in Paris; and the distinguished M. D'Amador, Professor of Pathology in the University of Montpelier, has, for many years, publicly taught it, as yet without molestation. In England, its progress has been very rapid. Ten years ago, there were probably not ten physicians practising it. Now, as appears from an alphabetical list appended to the last number of the "British Journal of Homœopathy," it numbers, in Great Britain and Ireland, no fewer than *one hundred and forty-eight* medical practitioners. Recently, two hospitals have been opened in London and one in Manchester for the practice of it. I have before me a copy of the constitution of one of those in London, termed "the Hahnemann Hospital," with a list of subscriptions annexed. It is under the distinguished patronage of the Chevalier Bunsen, the Duke of Hamilton, and the Earl of Wilton; and Lord Robert Grosvenor is president; three of the five vice-presidents being Members of Parliament. I think you will agree with me, that the adherents of Homœopathy, among whom are included such variously distinguished men as the Archbishop of Dublin, the late Dr Arnold, the Chevalier Bunsen, Principal Scott of Owen's College, the Marquess of Anglesea, and Richard Cobden, are not likely to

allow themselves to be put down by the Edinburgh or by any other College of Physicians. Perhaps some of our courtly friends will be interested to learn, that last month there was a grand bazaar in London, for the benefit of this hospital, under the auspices of no less august a patroness than H.R.H. the Duchess of Kent.

I have mentioned the "British Journal of Homœopathy." It was begun in 1843, and has now reached the ninth volume. It is not popular, but strictly medical; and, so far as I have had occasion to read it, will bear comparison, I think, with the best of the other medical journals. However that be, that a quarterly journal should have been maintained for so long a time, is a fact, the significance of which I need not point out. As illustrative of the wide extension of the same views in the United States of America, I may mention that Radde, a publisher in New York, has found it worth his while to reprint this journal, and, as he states, to the large amount of one thousand copies.

Such being the origin in Edinburgh, and such the present acceptance of the Homœopathic doctrines, I have no doubt you will agree in my conclusion, that, whether true or false, it has claims to respectful attention; if not for its own sake, for the sake at least of those who are its resolute and conscientious adherents and practitioners. I shall now call your attention more particularly to the treatment which it and they have lately received at the hands of our Royal College of Physicians. The resolutions which afford the text for my remarks will be found elsewhere (pp. 181–3); but, indeed, after what has been already said, I think it quite unnecessary to make many observations upon them. Disregarding their clumsy, ungrammatical form and phraseology, the substance of them seems to be as follows:—(1.) That the College had said before that it would have no dealings with the Homœopathists; (2.) That it requires those of its members who have adopted the forbidden views

to resign; (3.) "Inasmuch as no fellow of this College, nor any other physician, can, by any possibility, without derogating from his own honour, and from the honour of the profession, meet practitioners of Homœopathy in consultation, or co-operate with them in the other common duties of professional life;" and (4.) That unless they so resign they may look for expulsion.

The first, second, and fourth I may take together; the third I shall consider separately. The three together just seem to amount to this—that the College never has tolerated, and never will tolerate, Homœopathists; the other (3) expresses the only reason—because it would be in derogation from the honour of any fellow of the College to meet a Homœopathist in consultation. How or why it should be so, the College does not deign to inform us. *Ipse dixit* that it is so—is not that enough for us and for them? Not exactly, I am afraid. It wont do just to say, "I am a better soldier." We add—"Let it appear so; show us in what respects you claim superiority, and we shall give you all due honours. All that the public know in these respects is, that you are the more numerous of the two—that, at the meeting referred to, you were even unanimous. If you be many, and they be few, such measures taken against a small minority may expose you to the charge of cowardice, as well as injustice. And if it be the case, as is alleged, that, in some five years, as many of your members have become converts to the new faith so devoutly abhorred by you, while, on the other hand, you have made no converts from their ranks, there is no great room for your boasting. It is a mere matter of time and figures to calculate in how many years, at the same rate of conversion, the majority will be on the other side; or, in how much longer a period, should the threatened expulsion of all converts be put in execution, your College will have become extinct by this process of exhaustion."

It appears, indeed, from the first resolution, which as-

sumes that Dr Black's rejection, on a vote by ballot, was upon the sole ground of his having made profession of Homœopathy—that, otherwise, he would have been admitted. There was then no alleged inferiority in status, reputation, or professional attainment, except that he had embraced this hated heresy. In short, the College says, that the practitioners of Homœopathy are inferior to the other members, because the other members are superior to them; it all rests on their good opinion of themselves; possibly a reason for great complacency on their part, but hardly a sufficient answer to the Homœopathists. What if they say, as some of them do in too unmeasured terms, that *they* are the superiors, the others the inferiors? If the matter is to be at all decided, we must have a more objective independent test than their respective opinions of their own merits. Two obvious tests suggest themselves: the course of general and medical education attested by graduation, and the relative success in practice. On the first of these, the College has nothing to say. It cannot pretend, with any plausibility, that its fellows are in any respect better educated than the practitioners of Homœopathy whom we have named. Nay, on the contrary, the Homœopathists seem fairly entitled, in this respect, to claim superiority, inasmuch as, besides being familiar with all the medical and general knowledge required as the condition of graduation, they have also acquired, as the condition of Homœopathic practice, familiarity with a detailed and delicate system of pharmacy. On the other head—success in practice—the comparison is not so easy. This, however, it is right to say, that the converts to the young faith are always anxiously challenging the comparison, and, so far as in their power, by the publication of hospital and other credible statistics, facilitating the inquiry. It will hardly be thought to the disadvantage of Dr Wielobycki, that he was already in possession of the degree of doctor in philosophy from the University of Berlin, when he obtained also that of doctor

of medicine from our own. Were the College in a position to say, "We have not condemned Homœopathy blindly; we have made full, anxious trial of it, and found it wanting," then there would only be a conflict of judgments, neither being entitled *ex facie* to preference. If, on the other hand the College cannot say this (and they have not said it), and have not alleged any reasonable ground for their conduct in this matter, are we not entitled to conclude that their pretended superiority is mere insolent boasting, highly discreditable to themselves, and not likely to have much weight with others? In one sense, it is true, that, to acknowledge the claims of Homœopathy, is derogatory to their "honour." There is a vast swarm of contemptible creatures hovering about the outskirts of that, as of every profession—alas! some in the very midst of it, who will praise this unworthy attempt of the College to crush by force an advancing rival system, which they have not yet overcome by arguments or experiments; and will be ready with any required amount of aid in the form of calumny, imputation of motives, invention of lies, to support their friends within the College whom they are now loudly applauding. Who but the basest would receive "honour" from such as these?

I have always observed, that the fires of persecution burn brightest when men's faith is decaying. It is not he who feels deeply the universal supremacy of truth, who will lightly cry out, "Heretic! to the stake!" Rather it is he who feels that he leans on the people and things round about him, and fears that, if these were shaken, his own beliefs would be left without support. And it is worthy of remark, that the energetic faith of the young school in medicine stands remarkably contrasted with the powerless scepticism of the old. I say not that it will prove itself to be altogether well founded—very probably not; but I say emphatically, that, well founded or not, there are those who believe in it, and, so help me God, I will

do what I can to insure them free scope for their convictions.

It cannot have escaped your notice, that, in these resolutions, the College have given no definition of what it is they mean to condemn. I have already stated the Homœopathic law to be, *similia similibus curantur*—"like cures like." Does the College, then, mean to commit itself to the persecution of every member who at any time shall act in accordance with this law? Hardly, I suppose. The other peculiarity of the condemned system is the smallness of the doses. Will the College, in its sublime dignity, adjudicate upon each prescription? Before they proceed to the extremity of expulsion now contemplated, they may find it necessary to pass acts or statutes against Homœopathy, the violation of which shall infer that penalty. But, in that case, they will probably have to be more explicit than in these resolutions; they will have, I suppose, to define, with something approaching to precision, what it is in practice which constitutes the capital offence. With a view to see how the thing would look on paper, and not trusting myself in a matter of such importance, I have applied to the learned Paulus Pleydell, junior, and, by his aid, have prepared the following two clauses of the required statute, of which the Royal College is quite at liberty to make free use in framing its anticipated laws on this subject. The first clause runs thus:—

"1. No fellow of this College shall, under the pains herein provided, prescribe, give, or administer, or cause to be prescribed, given, or administered, to any patient, any drug or medicine which shall be calculated to produce, or shall be capable of producing, or shall be supposed to be capable of producing, in or upon the body of any person in health, any symptoms, appearances, or effects at all resembling, or similar to those which, for the time being, shall be seen, understood, or imagined to be present in or upon the body of such patient."

The second takes the following form:—

"2. No fellow of this College shall, under the pains herein pro-

vided, prescribe, give, or administer, or cause to be prescribed, given, or administered, to any patient, any drug or medicine in any other smaller quantity than is indicated in Schedule A annexed hereto."

Note.—[Schedule A to contain a list of all known remedies, including chloroform and mesmerism, with the *minimum* dose of each, the *maximum* being left to the discretion of each physician. Great care will be required in framing this schedule, as there are many Homœopathic remedies in use, the qualities and powers of which are nearly unknown to the members of the College; and it might be inconvenient were the *minimum* quantity indicated in any case a poisonous one.]

I cannot take leave of this branch of the subject, without calling the special attention of the College to the remarkable statement of their late esteemed treasurer, Dr Ransford's "Reasons for Embracing Homœopathy," which I have just been reading in the new number of the "British Journal of Homœopathy." There are disclosures in it which, if they do not throw light into the recent hidden recesses of the College, at least make their darkness visible.

Leaving the College of Physicians to complete its statutes against Homœopathy, and to act farther in the matter as it shall be advised, I will now call your attention to the second act in the development of this conspiracy; one directly touching the University.

It appears that Mr Alfred Crosby Pope (son of the Rev. Mr Pope of Leamington, a man of high reputation) has been pursuing his medical studies in Edinburgh. The certificates of the various professors, copies of which I have seen, bear that he was "very regular" in his attendance on all the classes; and I understand him to have the character of being a very diligent student. After having gone through his first examination, and the greater part of his second, without any difficulty, he was subjected to an examination by the Medical Faculty, in the month of June last; and the following is his statement of what took place. It is extracted from the 37th number of the "British Journal of Homœopathy" (July, 1851), pp. 512–14:

"The Medical Faculty of this University have, it appears, decided that if any of their candidates intend to investigate the merits of Homœopathy, they shall be remitted until such examination shall have satisfied them of the fallacy of this proscribed system of medicine. I am, I believe, the first who has lost the degree of M.D. under these circumstances; and, since this is the case, my friends have thought it right that I should give as correct an account as possible of all that was said to me at the examination on this point: and therefore, without any farther remark, I will proceed to the matter on hand.

"During the first part of my examination, no reference was made to Homœopathy; and it was not until after Dr Christison had examined me on materia medica, and expressed himself as satisfied with me on that point, that he put the following question:—He said (as nearly as I can recollect), 'I have been informed, Mr Pope, by a colleague, that you are intending to practise Homœopathically; now, I don't believe it; but tell me, is it the case?' I replied, that I could not give a decisive answer, until I had fully studied the subject, which I had determined to do, as I felt it to be a duty, seeing that so many men of acknowledged talent were daily becoming converts to this new system. Mr Syme, who was present, then asked me if I would burn my diploma, or return it to them, if I became convinced of the truth of Homœopathy. To which I replied, that I saw no necessity for doing so, considering, as I did, that my diploma was merely an attestation of the amount of medical knowledge to which I have attained. Mr Syme then said, that he could not see how any honest man could practise Homœopathically, and call himself a doctor of medicine of a university which repudiates him. After this, Mr Syme remarked, that they had nothing more to say to me there, but that they were quite satisfied with the examination. When I had been examined on the remaining subjects, I requested the porter to obtain my dis-

charge for me, on which I was told to return to-morrow, at 4 P.M., when there was to be an extraordinary meeting of the Medical Faculty. The next day I waited at the University from 4 until 5 P.M., when the meeting terminated, and I was informed by Dr Balfour, the Dean of Faculty, that he was desired by the Medical Faculty to announce to me that they were not satisfied with my examination, and, in the second place, that they were not satisfied with the line of practice which I intended to adopt. I then said, that I did not understand what was meant by the first part of the objection raised against me by the faculty, as last evening all the examinators seemed perfectly satisfied with me. On this, Dr Balfour told me, that I knew very well that I was very deficient in medical jurisprudence and surgery, and that I should at least require to be re-examined on these subjects. I then asked him if the Medical Faculty would require anything more of me than my examination, if I came up again in July. 'Oh!' said he, 'we shall want to know whether you intend to give the decillionth of a grain of *nux vomica*, or one or two grains, which is the ordinary dose.' Said he, 'You know quite well that we grant degrees here licensing to practise that system of medicine which is at present established, and therefore we must know whether you intend to do so before you can graduate.' I told Dr Balfour that I had a perfect right to study what I chose, and that I thought it my duty to study Homœopathy. To which he replied, 'But what is the necessity, if you are satisfied that you can do good with what has been taught you, and particularly when you hold the degree of M.D.?' To this I replied, that if any one offered me a method of treatment by which I had a greater chance of curing my patients than that which was at present in vogue, I should certainly feel it my duty to investigate it. 'Well,' said the dean, 'you must certainly know whether you intend to practise Homœopathically or not. You must be quite decided on that point, and, as I am merely

telling you what I have been desired to do by the Senatus, I have nothing more to say to you.'

"After this, of course, I left. My remission, or repone-ment, is therefore grounded on a want of sufficient know-ledge of surgery and medical jurisprudence, and on my most decided determination to investigate Homœopathy most carefully and impartially. With regard to the first objection to my graduation, I wish it to be observed, that, were that a real objection, I should have been apprised of it on the evening of the examination, for I have the highest authority for stating, that a rejection for want of knowledge was never remitted to an extraordinary meeting of the faculty, but done at once at the examination—two or three professors club their heads together at the time, and the thing is done. I had understood that Professor Miller, who examined me on surgery, was satisfied with me; but he has since informed me that I was 'rusty' on some points. I can, however, honestly state, that there was, I believe, only one question out of a great many that he asked me which I did not answer.

"More than one of the professors has informed a friend of mine that my examination was unexceptionable. But Professor Miller stated to me, personally, that he had no doubt they would pass me in July, were I convinced by that time of the fallacy of infinitesimal doses; volunteering this information out of private friendship, and hoping that I would make no farther use of it; an amount of consi-deration which so much friendship and so little wisdom cannot look for at my hands.

"The above facts are, I think, sufficient to prove that it is not from a deficiency in professional knowledge that I have been remitted, but solely on account of my fixed determination to study Homœopathy.

"37 Clemens Street, Leamington, June 21, 1851."

The following account of the transaction, which will be found substantially the same as Mr Pope's, has been since

published by the examinators in the "Monthly Journal of Medical Science."—No. 128 (August, 1851):—

"Mr Alfred Crosby Pope, having appeared before the second division of examiners of the Medical Faculty in the middle of June, underwent the usual written examination on the practical branches of medicine and surgery, and was afterwards subjected to an oral examination on the same subjects. He had satisfied several of the examiners; but his surgical knowledge was evidently defective. While under examination in midwifery, he was asked what doses of calomel, opium, tartar-emetic, and aloïn he would give in certain diseases. In reply, he stated correctly the doses usually given in medical practice; and, when asked whether these were the doses which he would himself prescribe, he replied that they were. He then underwent an examination on materia medica, the professors of that branch and of clinical surgery being present. His replies were satisfactory enough; the only objection of any moment indeed being, that his doses of medicines were somewhat large. The faculty having been furnished with positive information that Mr Pope had avowed his purpose to become a Homœopathic practitioner after graduating, it was determined that he should have an opportunity of answering to the charge. The question was put to him by Dr Christison, and the following are the very words of the conversation that ensued:—'Well, Mr Pope, I am satisfied so far with your answers; but there is another point on which I wish to be informed; and, as it is best not to beat about the bush, I shall put to you a plain question, in order that I may get a downright answer. I am told by a colleague that he has been informed, on good authority, that it is your intention to become a Homœopathic practitioner after you graduate; *after the answers you have this day given me*, I feel bound to say I do not believe it. Am I right?' To which Mr Pope replied, 'I am not now a Homœopathist; but, after graduation, I mean to inquire

into the truth of it.' Professor Syme then remarked, 'Now, Mr Pope, suppose that this inquiry which you meditate were to confirm your belief in the truth of Homœopathy, what would you do with the diploma received from us? would you burn or return it?' 'No,' replied he, 'I would keep it.' 'For what purpose?' 'To show that I had regularly studied.' 'Studied what? Delusions! Fallacies! Nonsense! It would only show that you had misspent four or five years of your life in studying what could not possibly be of any service, according to your own view; and I am sure that, on reflection, you must see how inconsistent it would be with common honesty or common sense to use a diploma, after ceasing to entertain the principles which were professed in order to obtain it. But recollect, Mr Pope, I offer this remark to you as a friend, and not as a professor.' Mr Pope then withdrew, and in what remained of his examinations he made a satisfactory appearance, except in medical jurisprudence, in which, as in surgery, he was defective. The case being a new one, it was referred by the examiners to the whole Medical Faculty for decision. Of the thirteen members, eleven were present. After considering the whole circumstances, the faculty unanimously resolved—'That serious doubts are entertained as to the soundness of Mr Pope's principles of practice; and that on this account, as well as his insufficiency on some subjects of examination, he shall be remitted till the end of July, by which time he will have had ample opportunity of making the inquiry into the truth of Homœopathy which he says he contemplates.' This resolution, which admitted of his graduating this year, in the event of his satisfying the Medical Faculty, was communicated to him in conversation by the dean. Mr Pope, however, withdrew at once from the list of candidates."

The result then is, that Mr Pope has been rejected. It is needless to say, that, if this has been done wrongfully, the

wrong is of a most serious nature. That a student of medicine, who had pursued his studies in our University with regularity and diligence—who had spent much money, and more precious years, in preparation for a profession to which he looked forward as his only way of acquiring a position in society, and, indeed, the very means of living, and who appeared just on the eve of obtaining the university degree, which was to be his title to enter upon that profession, should have found himself suddenly stopped on the very threshold by an obstacle altogether unanticipated and unprecedented—this, you will admit, if a wrong, is a very great one. I shall have to consider presently how far the introduction of such an impediment can be justified. In the meantime, let us look in the other direction, and see how far Mr Pope's statement touches the honour of the Medical Faculty, and, indeed, of the Senatus of the University.

If the rejection be PROFESSEDLY on the ground of his having intimated an intention to investigate the merits of Homœopathy, and if the investigation justified it to practise that system, such rejection may be undignified, inconsistent with the advance of medical practice, in violation of all usage, eminently discreditable to the University, and illegal, but the honour of the examinators will not be necessarily impugned. If, on the other hand, the *real* ground of rejection was a supposed toleration or preference for the Homœopathic system, and the *professed* ground be deficient knowledge in medical jurisprudence and surgery, the honour of the University is seriously compromised. It will be justly condemned for refusing degrees upon false pretences. If such be its corruption that this is possible, the public can have no security that it will not also *grant* them on false pretexts; to those to whom indifference or inclination towards Homœopathy seems such a vice as to justify this extreme punishment, inveterate hatred of it may seem such a virtue as to cover many grave deficiencies.

I need not say to any honourable man, that, while it is exposed to such imputations, our University is justly in disgrace—a disgrace which will attach also to the other members of the Senatus, in whose names the medical degrees are granted, although all the guilt will rest with the Medical Faculty.

I have not said that such guilt has been incurred; but no one can help seeing that on the very face of Mr Pope's statement it is more than suggested. I shall now inquire what is the just inference from that statement—in the meantime assuming it to be substantially true.

I say, *substantially;* for, in such reports of verbal proceedings, precise accuracy is not to be looked for; but it would be very singular if one in Mr Pope's position misunderstood the import of the dean's momentous communication to him. That a student should, in such circumstances, venture to make a false accusation against his examiners, seems to me highly improbable; and all that is to be gathered of Mr Pope's reputed character tends to the same result.

Upon this statement, then, it would appear that there were two distinct grounds, solemnly announced by the Medical Faculty of the Senatus, of refusing a degree: insufficient attainments in two of the branches of study, and objectionable views with reference to Homœopathy (or *principles of practice,* as they term it). It is certainly very unfortunate that these dissimilar grounds of judgment should not have been so separated, that each might have been dealt with singly; and were Mr Pope again to offer himself, and to pass an approved examination upon the two unexhausted subjects, the question would then be the very simple one—Whether or not the avowal of adherence to any medical creed, or to any system of practice, as well as the sufficient knowledge of medicine, be a legitimate condition of graduation for the Medical Faculty to impose? But, although not in so pure a form as might have been conceived, this question does seem to be sufficiently raised

by Mr Pope's account of his remarkable interview with the faculty; for, on his asking whether anything beyond such an examination would be required of him should he again appear for examination, he was answered by the dean, as the organ of the faculty, "Oh! we shall want to know whether you intend to give the decillionth of a grain of *nux vomica*, or one or two grains, which is the ordinary dose?" It is difficult to read this narrative without coming to the conclusion, that it was not by inadvertence, but by design, that these essentially distinct questions were thus confused, else why, in violation of all usage, should the judgment of the faculty upon the ordinary examinations of the candidate have been withheld, until the extraordinary meeting should put them in a position to give judgment also upon the extraordinary question, which has now for the first time, so far as is known to the public, been made a subject of discussion. It is no fault of mine, or of Mr Pope's (if his statement be true), that the faculty have thus exposed themselves to the suspicion of having acted unfairly; and, for my own part, I shall be exceedingly glad to see the good name of the University cleared from all the breathings of just reproaches which may have sullied it. In so far as the candidate's rejection was *bonâ fide* on the ground of deficient attainments, of course it cannot be objected to. No wise friend of the Homœopathic, or of any other system of medical practice, will censure the attempt to raise the standard of medical education. It is to be observed, however, that the systems do not come into conflict on either of the fields which Mr Pope has to re-tread. Surgery and medical jurisprudence have little to do with therapeutical pharmacy; and, as Mr Pope had already passed his examinations upon *materia medica* and the *practice of physic* to the satisfaction of the examiners, the questions put to him on the subject of Homœopathy and the administration of medicines cannot be understood as at all supplementary to his examinations upon

those heads, but relate to an entirely distinct question, which I now propose to consider.

It is not a little remarkable, that, simultaneously with a very serious and general movement towards the abolition of religious tests in the University, there should be an attempt, on the part of the Faculty of Medicine, to introduce a medical creed or confession of faith, a profession of adherence to which is to be required of candidates, as a preliminary condition of obtaining degrees. The two certainly stand remarkably contrasted. Of religious tests, it may be said that they have the sanction of ancient and very extensive usage; that (however ineffectual they may now be judged for the ends contemplated) they have, at least, this rational foundation that they are connected with an established church and a determinate faith; that they aim at the expression of that which we are generally agreed is, in substance, if not in form, abiding, and even eternal; that they are neither arbitrarily framed nor arbitrarily imposed, being formal, well-considered documents, an assent to which is known to all the world as the legal condition of office. In all these respects, how different is the other! This new test in medicine—an imposed abjuration of all intention to inquire into the merits of a system of practice advocated as the best by an influential and increasing body of our countrymen, lay and medical—is altogether an innovation; it has no rational foundation, there being no *established system* of medicine, and no substantial agreement even among the so-called orthodox of its practitioners—no permanency, its whole history being a narrative of revolutions, so momentous that, even within the memory of living men, it has been so greatly changed, that it would be rash for any one to foretell that, fifty years hence, there will be anything like one-tenth of the present usual modes of treatment still in observance. Hence, it has no written, formal creed or confession, to be set before the eyes of the matriculating student, and

to attend him along his course, as the recognised condition of graduation; on the contrary, these examiners of the Faculty of Medicine have improvised this test; and it is still unwritten and indefinite. Let them attempt to put it in writing, with the necessary definitions, and they will be the first possibly to laugh, if they do not blush for shame, at the absurdity of the result. Let them exhibit in detail, define the prohibited practice, assign a *minimum* dose of each known or unknown drug, and fix on the *similar* law as the only one according to which remedies shall *not* be given. Let them do this, and exhibit the result, if they can and dare. At present, all we can learn in detail from this unwonted examination is, that the *minimum* dose of *nux vomica* which can be given, without loss of character, is one or two grains. For us laymen, whose bodies are the subjects, this is not a very comforting rule. We should rather have had the *maximum* stated; and, since it appears (on the evidence of Dr Christison) that three grains of the alcoholic extract, or (on the evidence of Dr Trail*) that fifteen grains of the powder of this common poison have caused death, we may look with some anxiety to so liberal a *minimum* quantity. How near a poison-dose will the *maximum* be?

It is very singular, that the examining professors should have fallen into the blunder of supposing that any one system of medical practice is either sanctioned or condemned by the University. According to Mr Pope's statement, Mr Syme observed, "that he could not see how any honest man could practise Homœopathy, and call himself a doctor of medicine of a university which repudiates him;" and the resolutions of the College of Physicians contain language to the like effect. Mr Syme seems to think the University is like a Pennsylvanian debtor thus addressing his creditor—"How on earth can you have the

* Taylor's Medical Jurisprudence. *Poisons, Nux Vomica.*

face to claim anything from me, sir? I repudiate the debt!" Happily for the credit of our Alma Mater, she does not thus disown her lawful children. Her graduates, whatever system of practice they may follow, are her acknowledged graduates still, and quite entitled to wear all the hard-won honours she has crowned them with. Of course, Mr Syme may repudiate the Homœopathists and all their remedies; refusing, to his patients' great detriment, to prescribe aconite for fever, and arnica for wounds, because they both own a Homœopathic source. We are told that Mr Syme asked Mr Pope if he would burn or return his diploma (by which, we suppose, the certificate of graduation or the degree was meant) if he became convinced of the truth of Homœopathy? Indeed! Why so? Would it then cease to be true that Mr Pope had made good studies in botany, anatomy, pathology, physiology, and all the other prescribed subjects, even in materia medica and the practice of physic, so as to pass the usual examinations upon each of them? and if all this was true, on what intelligible ground should his degree be cancelled?

Mr Pope appears to have had a much juster notion than his teachers of the nature and import of a degree in medicine, and, consequently, of what the preceding examinations ought to be; and it is worth noting how very nearly his extempore remark, "that the degree was merely an attestation of the amount of medical knowledge to which" he "had attained," coincides with the more deliberate statement on that point of Dr Christison's distinguished predecessor in the chair of materia medica. When examined before the University commissioners (A.D. 1826), Dr Duncan, jun., said:—

"With regard to the medical degree, I would say that the medical degree of Edinburgh is purely professional, and it is in high estimation both in this empire and in its colonies, as is proved by the great number of individuals who come here to graduate. It is likewise in es-

timation on the Continent. *It is merely a designation by which the public know that the individual has had a certain amount of professional and general education, and has been able to pass through a certain course of examination.* The doctors of medicine in this University acquire thereby, however, no monopoly in the practice of medicine. There appears to me great danger in altering the character of this degree; but little danger would arise from increasing the *professional acquirements of those* who obtain it, because it is *for these that it is valuable for the public;* and, if these were raised, it would become more valuable: 'but there would be great danger in rendering it more literary or scientific.'"—Minutes of Evidence, p. 235.

It will be observed, that Mr Pope did not, in this examination, commit himself to the pursuit of Homœopathy; he only expressed a resolute intention to investigate its claims. He was quite entitled to do more. The questions he was asked being irrelevant, his pertinent answers to them ought to have been held as irrelevant to the examination. Personal practice in the giving of drugs is no legitimate subject of examination. As a mere student, he had no more lawful right to practise than any other "unqualified" amateur. In the prospect of soon receiving a degree, he was quite entitled to say (nor could the answer be objected to), that he did not know what doses he would give. It was time enough for him to make up his mind on that point when his advice was required; and physicians would be wiser, and their practice more successful, if, in determining quantities, as well as in other respects, they paid more regard to the peculiarities of each case, and less to apothecaries' recipes. But what if he did not intend to practise at all—at least, not in the meantime? There is no improbability in the supposition of such a case, which would occur oftener than at present, were practitioners of medicine more anxiously conscientious in the matter of giving drugs. So far from its

being improbable, it is a case of usual occurrence. Speaking with reference to the age required of graduates (21 years), Dr Alison says :—"In regard to the age, I may mention, that it cannot be supposed that a man of twenty-one will enter at once into practice as a physician. *If he enters at all upon practice at that age*, he enters as a general practitioner, and is an assistant almost always to an elder man."* Or, again, what if he be resolved not to copy, but to outdo the Homœopathists, by giving even less medicine than they do, after the lauded example of a distinguished physician in Edinburgh (Dr John Thomson, we believe), referred to by the accomplished Dr John Forbes, lately Editor of the "British and Foreign Medical Review!"† If giving infinitesimal doses be bad, is the giving of *none* worse, in the eyes of the learned examiners? To save his credit, must a physician give a dose in every case? Or how often may he omit doing so with impunity? Or is it only insisted for, that, if he does give a dose, it shall be a stirring one?

But, putting out of sight all such puerilities, let us look for a little at the bare principle contended for (implicitly, for it is not distinctly avowed) on the part of the Faculty of Medicine. It claims the right of authoritatively regulating, not the study only, but the practice of medicine, and that even in the matter of the quantities of each to be given. Now, can anything be more absurd? Our readers have been already reminded (few of them need to be informed) that the history of the practice of medicine exhibits incessant change. Is that to its discredit? Not so. It can only claim to be regarded as a science, or even as a living art, by showing progress; and how can there be progress without change? The reproach which has

---

* University Commission, Evidence, p. 491.

† See No. xli., p. 254.

been thrown upon the body of practitioners by the most eminent among themselves has been, that it has always resisted progress; that it has been too slow to receive improvements; that it has been inert and stationary, scowling upon the more ardent and advancing of its members; and that thus nearly all the great benefactors of mankind in that department of action are remembered as having been stoned by their fellows, whose descendants build their sepulchres. Each reformer is an innovator. In this respect, Homœopathy has no cause to complain of unusual treatment. It is in truth honoured by being thus put in the category of modes of practice prohibited or proscribed. If it be true, like every great truth, it will have to fight its rough way into recognition and acceptance; but, whether true or not, it falls not within the authority of the Faculty of Medicine so summarily to put it down. Before we pronounce anathemas, we ought at least to have a creed; for how shall we know the False, but by the possession of the True? No advance has ever been made in this world, in any region of thought or action, by mere *negatives*; which are only valuable so far as they point to, or prepare for, what is *positive*. We live all of us, not by refusing errors, but by accepting truths. If the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Edinburgh be prepared with a creed on which they can agree, for the detailed regulation of practice, by all means let us see it; and then, having accepted it, they will have some rule by which to reject what is contrary and heretical. Till then, there is no orthodoxy and no heterodoxy in medicine. Each educated practitioner shall do that which seems good in his own eyes.

When such novel agreement comes among them, one of the very last parts of practice which it will reach, we may safely affirm, will be the *quantities* of medicine. There is no ancient recognised creed to fall back upon in present doubts or disagreements; and there are no natural limits

in the matter, except the causing death on one side, and utter inactivity on the other. Between these extremes, there is room for infinite variety. If the Homœopathists be supposed to approach the latter limit, some other practitioners go dangerously near the former. Will the Faculty of Medicine undertake to lay down practical limits on either side, within those we have indicated, the transgression of which shall incur forfeiture of character? I think not. But even could they now make such a rule, it would be too late for the adjudication of Mr Pope's case. It will not do to try a man first, and then justify the condemnation by an *ex post facto* law. There was no law of the Senatus *(and did not the examinators know it?)* by which they had right to reject a candidate, on the ground that he had resolved to investigate, nay, that he had even embraced, with all his young strength, the Homœopathic system. So far as their "remission" rested on that ground, they stand convicted of glaring injustice. What protection is there to modest, ingenuous, devoted students against such tyranny? If the Faculty of Medicine have rejected Mr Pope yesterday, because he has a leaning towards Homœopathy, they may reject Mr Pagan to-morrow, because he confesses an intention to use chloroform, or *not* to use it; or has no faith in the virtues of cod-liver oil; or believes in mesmerism, or *disbelieves* it. Is Homœopathy more distinctly an innovation than the use of chloroform, or than mesmerism? Does Dr Simpson practise precisely as Dr Hamilton did? Or does Dr Christison teach only what he was taught at college? If there be no law, there can be no transgression; and, if the examiners are bound by nothing but their own particular notions of what is the best practice, there can be no security that the student, who was passed with *eclat* by one set of examiners, would not, just for that very reason, have been instantly "remitted" by another. If such doings are to be allowed, the ancient credit of our University will soon be lost. It will have

set itself against the advancement of learning, the progress of science, the improved practice of medicine. If, on the other hand, it be said for the examiners, that there is a law of the University which justifies their proceedings, let them point to it. We state emphatically, that they are condemned equally by law and by uniform established practice. It appears that the University commissioners had under consideration to recommend the appointment of other examiners in medicine, in order to relieve the professors from that onerous duty. One or two more such examinations might prove that the step was a necessary one, for different reasons.

Before the authorities of the University (the Patrons or the *Senatus*, as may be, one or both) are prepared to pass any statutes for the exclusion of students who are favourably inclined, or indifferent, towards Homœopathy, a good many things will have to be considered. We can only notice a few of these. The general results of medical practice will have to be examined, that these may be compared with the results of Homœopathic treatment, in order to arrive at a just judgment on their respective merits; and this will be a very serious, and possibly not a very satisfactory, inquiry for the colleges. It can hardly be entered into without the inquirers (if they be at all unprejudiced and competent) coming to the conclusion, that the present state of the practice of medicine is such as to admit of much improvement; and that the duty of all practitioners is to look out anxiously in any quarter where there may be promise of aid. It will have to be considered that the fact is undeniable, that a large proportion, including many of the most scientific practitioners, have sadly lost confidence in the virtues of medicines, as usually administered; and that the recorded testimony of such a man as Dr John Forbes—late editor of the leading English medical journal—is to the following effect:—

"1. That in a large proportion of the cases treated by

Allopathic physicians, the disease is cured by nature, and not by them.

"2. That in a lesser, but still not a small proportion, the disease is cured by nature in spite of them; in other words, their interference opposing, instead of assisting the cure.

"3. That, consequently, in a considerable proportion of diseases, it would fare as well, or better, with patients, in the actual condition of the medical art, as more generally practised, if all remedies, at least all active remedies, especially drugs, were abandoned."*

Such a judgment is fully corroborated by that of our late much respected Dr Andrew Combe, in a letter to the writer of that article [25th January 1846].† Although certainly no Homœopathist, he writes as follows:—

"A few words now on Homœopathy in particular. I am very glad that you have brought the question of its truth and merits seriously before your readers; for, of all methods of advancing the interests of science, that which consists in the supercilious neglect of alleged new discoveries, merely on the ground that they differ from what is already known, is assuredly the worst. * * But surely we are bound not to be too rash in rejecting, without examination, facts and principles which come before us, attested by men of experience, skill, and integrity, and who can have no motive for deceiving us. Judged of by the standard of our own opinions, these facts and principles may seem at first sight to be altogether absurd; but, if so, the question then comes to be, is our standard itself undoubtedly a correct one? Or may it not be that ignorance has misled us to adopt it as infallible, and that it would be wiser in us to compare both it and the alleged discoveries with nature, before assuming either to be demonstrably true.

Again, "*as a matter of theory*, supported only by argu-

* British and Foreign Medical Review. January, 1846. P. 257.

† See ante, p. 83.

ment, Homœopathy produces no conviction whatever on my mind of its truth, or even of its probability; but, *as a question of fact*, claiming to rest 'on the irresistible ground of its superior power of curing diseases, and preserving human life,' and on the alleged experience of able and honest men, as competent to judge as most of those who oppose them, I cannot venture to denounce it as untrue, because I have no experience bearing especially upon it to bring forward, and we are still too ignorant to be able to predicate *a priori* what may or may not be true in the great field of nature. But, after the presumptive evidence which you yourself have produced, *if I were now in practice, I should hold myself bound, without further delay, to test its truth by careful and extensive experiments*, because, where truth is really our aim, the shortest and least encumbered approach to it is always the best; and even a few well-defined and carefully-observed facts would carry far more weight, as *items* of evidence, than volumes of general or controversial reasoning. * * View the question as we may, *one of three things must be:* either Homœopathy is true, or it is false, or it is a mixture of truth and error. Let us suppose the worst, and hold it to be false in its foundation, and false in its superstructure—what harm can result from putting it to the test, and ascertaining the fact demonstrably? None whatever, but, on the contrary, much good. *We shall at least have gained the power of giving a direct and authoritative negative to its allegations*, which we shall then prove to be fallacious, and which have been suffered to reign and diffuse themselves for thirty years, from the absence of *direct* counter-evidence by which to rebut them. We shall thus be able also *to put the profession and the public on their guard with some chance of being listened to*, and shall have obtained the inestimable advantage of keeping our own minds open to the admission of new truths, and of showing that, in our estimate of evidence, and in our conclusions, we are actuated not by any

mean jealousy or dogmatic assumption of authority, but by the single and simple desire of advancing the interests of science and humanity to the best of our ability."

You will observe this to be a very different conclusion from that to which the conduct of the College of Physicians and of the Faculty of Medicine points. But Dr Combe had calmly considered the subject; we have no reason to believe that the members of either of these bodies had done so. They rather, on the other hand, remind one of the proceedings of a jury not remarkable for impartiality towards the accused: of whom the first said, "I see clearly that this man is a heretic;" the second, "Away with such a fellow from the earth;" the third, "I hate the very look of him;" the fourth, "I never could endure him;" a fifth, "Hang him, hang him;" yet another, "A sorry scrub;" "He is a rogue," said Mr Liar.

In regard to such a statute as would exclude practitioners of Homœopathy from any of the benefits connected with a degree in medicine, one of the first questions to be answered is, *Cui bono?* Whom would it advantage? for, of course, neither the Senatus nor the Patrons would be accessory to such a step in order to gratify the *odium medicum* of the faculty. It would not benefit the University, for the students thus excluded would *pro tanto* diminish the total number attending the University, whose character also for liberality, and free inquiry in science, would inevitably suffer damage. It would not advantage the public; for, if (putting out of view all baser considerations) it be quite certain, according to the law of probabilities, that, so long as there is a large and influential body of lay adherents of Homœopathy in this country, there will also be practitioners, it is clearly for the gain of the public that the practitioners shall be well instructed in medical science, so as to be more likely to come to a better mind, if now under a delusion. Another advantage is, that the professors of the heretical system are likely to be less secta-

rian if, during their college-days, they receive instruction and pursue their studies in the company of their orthodox coevals. I do not imagine even the most bigoted opponents of Homœopathy to be so blinded, as to suppose that any possible system of exclusion or persecution will exterminate all medical practitioners of a system which claims among its lay adherents in England such a class of men as is indicated by those who have been already named. If, then, practitioners of Homœopathy there must be, surely the more they are under a liberal system of medical education the better for all parties, except those (not to be spoken of here) whose base aim it is to depress their professional rivals, that they may thus gain for themselves an apparent elevation.

Of the evil effects likely to follow from the conduct of the Medical Faculty, one of the gravest remains to be noticed—I mean, the corruption of the students. Were an enemy bent on devising a snare by which weak consciences might be entrapped, a more crafty and ruinous one could hardly be invented. A student, whose whole prospects in life are dependent upon his obtaining a degree, appears for examination before a tribunal which has declared that any intention of practising or investigating Homœopathy is an insuperable bar. His conscience tells him emphatically that duty demands that he shall examine the proscribed system, perhaps confess himself already a believer in it. He is asked, "Have you any intention to practise Homœopathy, or to study it?" What shall he answer—Yes! or No? On the side of *falsehood,* is professional reputation, success, emolument; on the side of *truth,* dishonour, disappointment, possibly starvation; and it will, perhaps, be hinted to him that really there can be no duty in the matter; that he may do very well with the lessons he has already learned. If his teachers thus become the tempters, shall we wonder if he falls? and how shall we expect truth, moral courage, elevation of sentiment, in a profession which is thus entered with shame?

In concluding this subject, I shall only add, that it seems to me that no right-minded man can read Mr Pope's narrative without deeming it to call for either a specific denial or an explanation on the part of the Medical Faculty. At present, they lie exposed to very grave charges; and, if I may trust altogether in the reporter's accuracy, there were things said by members of the faculty, the moral nature of which I will not trust myself to characterise. Any denial or explanation from them will, of course, be as specific as the charges are; and I shall be exceedingly glad if they are able to clear themselves from all just blame. We shall learn, at least, on their own authority, what were the real grounds of Mr Pope's "remission." Unless they deny the statement *in toto* (which I cannot suppose), they will have to explain how Homœopathy came to be mentioned at all on the occasion referred to. In the meantime, any satisfactory explanation on this point seeming to me impossible, I cannot avoid the conclusion that their conduct in this matter was eminently illegal, cruel, and unjust.

I now come to the third act.

I have already considered the insolent attempt of the College of Physicians to discredit the practitioners of Homœopathy, and to dictate to the public their own arbitrary terms; thus combining to defraud us of medical services to which we are justly entitled. Next, I have disclosed the plot by which it was proposed to exclude from University honours in medicine every candidate who should show any partiality towards that system. I have now, lastly, to bring under your notice the recent movement of the same Medical Faculty in the University, with the aim of expelling a professor who was appointed to the Chair of Medicine and General Pathology, on very high recommendations, and who has, during some nine years, discharged his duties ably and faithfully, to the credit of the University, and to the satisfaction of the public. Re-

solute in their determination to extirpate the growing heresy, our medical friends have left no means untried, but those of experiment and conclusive refutation. First, they resolved to disown those who had already graduated; next, to allow no more graduates; and, lastly, to oust one of the medical professors, whose honest conversion to the heresy has been intolerably mortifying to them.

That Dr Henderson is a man of high professional reputation and of acknowledged ability, there can be no doubt; and it can as little be questioned, that he particularly excels in the diagnosis and description of disease, which renders his testimony as to the effects of Homœopathic remedies peculiarly valuable. The Medical Faculty no doubt felt that, while one of the professors of medicine was a Homœopathist, with whatever loudness and frequency they might repeat their cry, that the practitioners of Homœopathy were not scientific or "regular" physicians, but mere quacks; even those of the public who knew nothing personally of their merits, would ascribe such language to the want of manners and good feeling, and merely add such expressions to the already crowding instances of "God's great gift of speech abused;" that, to quote from Dr Ransford's Reasons, "to call Hahnemann and his followers quacks, is merely to say that which is false." It was, therefore, of extreme importance to the play that Dr Henderson should be got rid of. Fortunately, our University is not so constituted that the other members of any one of the faculties can degrade a professor whose teaching happens to be obnoxious to them; else it would be a curious jumble. In the Medical Faculty, one would hardly be well in, before they began to speak of putting him out. Dr Simpson would have been expelled long ago for his chloroform; Dr Gregory for his mesmerism.*

---

* It would be unfair to Dr Simpson not here to connect his name with Dr Gregory's, although he has recently called by a different

Well aware of this, the Faculty of Medicine has not attempted a direct vote of expulsion against Dr Henderson. Its course has been a little more circuitous. At a recent meeting (24th June, 1851), resolutions to the following effect were carried unanimously:—*

"1. That the public profession of Homœopathy by the Professor of General Pathology is inconsistent with the efficient discharge of the various duties which belong to that chair, and is calculated to injure the University as a Medical School.

"2. That the Senatus Academicus be requested to transmit a copy of this resolution to the Patrons of the University, together with the expression of a hope, on the part of the Medical Faculty, that some step may be taken to avert the danger which is thus threatened to the University."

Although the latter resolution modestly suggests "some step" merely, I can have no doubt that what is aimed at is Dr Henderson's removal; for the terms of the first resolution exclude every other reading. Had the *teaching* of Homœopathy within the College been the alleged grievance, it is intelligible that a less formidable visitation might have been effectual; if irregular, he might have been solemnly censured by the Senatus. But the ground of offence is "the public profession" of it. For this, besides expulsion, there seem only two conceivable remedies. Either, *continuing to believe* the Homœopathic system to be the best, Dr Henderson may be urged to *cease to profess* it; but I am sure the members of the faculty cannot intend to propose to those whom I am now addressing the execution of a function so dishonourable: or it may be supposed that the powers of persuasion which belong to the members of council will be adequate to

---

name, and proposed to explain by a different theory, the phenomena of animal magnetism to which he bears witness.

* See Dr Henderson's Letter to the Patrons of the University, on these resolutions. Edinburgh: W. P. Kennedy.

achieve Dr Henderson's re-conversion to orthodoxy, where the eloquence of his brothers of the Medical Faculty have failed in doing so. It would be a singular disputation, no doubt. However credible such a meaning might be, if the proposition come from another quarter, I can hardly suppose it to be the meaning of the faculty. Thus, the only probable reading of these resolutions which remains to me, is that which regards them as expressive of a desire, on the part of the Medical Faculty, that the patrons will take steps for Dr Henderson's degradation from the chair he now occupies.

And so that resolution was carried *unanimously* by the members of the Faculty of Medicine within the University of Edinburgh, during the latter half of the nineteenth century. Thus, on some future day, may the historian of science record his astonishment that until so late a period there was no freedom of inquiry and practice, even in medicine, within the metropolitan University of Scotland. For my own part, I wish to say very little about it; I am heartily ashamed for our city and Alma Mater. Unanimously! Was there not *one*, among so many, liberal and bold enough to utter an indignant manly dissent? Among the medical professors of Edinburgh, is there not one remaining of the good old stock?

I am not fond of unanimous resolutions, because very seldom (unless when they are merely superfluous) they seem to me to express a true unanimity. There is often a dangerous cowardly gregariousness which leads public bodies to avoid division. A majority, perhaps even a resolute minority, thus appears as the whole. Had the flock but been divided, one cannot tell on which side the most would have been found; and I have observed of gregarious animals, that, when one of the flying herd has got heart to turn and stand at bay, he is not left to stand alone.

Having with one voice, if not with one mind, adopted this resolution, the next step was to bring it up to the Senatus,

to be by them accepted and transmitted to the Patrons. Its authors seem to have thought that there was to be no difficulty with the Senatus; that any reputed heresy in medicine, although admittedly not taught within the University, which had thus received final sentence from the Faculty of Medicine in solemn conclave, could not but be instantly condemned by the members of the Faculties of the Arts, Law, and Theology. Especially by the last; "for was there not an obvious analogy—a clear identity of principle in the two cases?" Is it possible that any member of the Senate can have really argued so? It is averred, but can it be true? I believe it; and the argument I think a very logical one. There is wanting only an admitted premiss, and the conclusion cannot be questioned. *Given* an authenticated medical "Confession of Faith," required by statute and usage to be signed by all the professors of medicine, and it will follow that they must teach accordingly within the College. But alas! for the conclusion of the matter. They had come without their bond; and so forfeited not only the pound of flesh, but what more will have to be paid by way of public penance for so grave a crime. No medical creed had ever been heard of in the Senate; and the Faculty of Medicine were in such haste to bring up their resolution, that they had neglected to prepare one. And so the matter ended; not one member of any of the other faculties, as I understand, showing any inclination for the business. The motion is stated to have been withdrawn, as having been irregular by defect of due notice. The next notice of such a proceeding will, no doubt, contain a distinct reference to the new creed, which we shall all be curious to see. Even then, I cannot imagine how they propose to get over the difficulty, that the alleged heresy is not taught within the University. We shall wait with much interest to learn what their next step is to be. In the meantime, I claim their thanks for thus directly communicating to the Patrons their benevolent, liberal inten-

tions in the matter, which it was their purpose to make known through the Senatus.*

So, for the present, ends the third act of this conspiracy. I have been informed that in other quarters steps are being taken with a view to its farther development; but I shall not detain in my hands what I have already written until the completion of the fifth act. Should it appear necessary, I may have something more to say on the subject. In the meantime, I am anxious that what has already taken place should be publicly known; thus, what is to come will be the better attended to.

Hitherto I have assumed the position of stern, unequivocal opposition to the various proceedings on which I have found it my duty to comment. At the same time, I believe myself to have in no instance transgressed the right limits of such controversy. I have made no personal attacks, and have imputed no unworthy motives. The questions of this nature which appear on the face of Mr Pope's statement are not of my suggestion. I shall be the first to regret if I have misrepresented any of these transactions; but, as I have founded my judgment and my arguments upon the authentic records, by embodying these in this letter, I have put my readers in a position to correct for themselves any errors into which I may have fallen.

I am very unwilling to end this letter without adding a few words of earnest friendly remonstrance. Did I feel less than I do the high dignity of the physician's vocation, and remember less how many great and true men have laboured in it, painfully and magnanimously, for the good of mankind, I should be less affected than I now am by the conduct to which I have had to refer. If I had little faith

---

* Mr Syme, the mover of the resolutions, afterwards brought the matter before the Patrons, in a memorial signed by himself alone. See Town Council Proceedings, December 16, 1851. See also Dr Henderson's Letter thereon to the Patrons. W. P. Kennedy.

in the past achievements or future possibilities of medicine as a science or as an art, any discredit which might be attached to it would hardly move me. I confess it is far otherwise. Believing that there are great conquests in reserve for it, I cannot regard with indifference the erection of ill-considered barricades which will inevitably retard its progress. Their builders, no doubt, intend that its progress in one direction only shall thus be impeded; but the introduction and culture of such a spirit in science tends necessarily to its stagnation. Science advances by growth, not by mere accretion; and to obstruct its free expansion in any part is to dwarf it. If I *think it probable*, judging from its history, that the Homœopathic system is destined to exert much influence on the healing art, I *have no doubt at all* that the attempt to repress it, or any other practical system honestly pursued, by means of insults and penal measures, will only degrade medicine; for, observe that here, as in higher things, such means of repression have no necessary, no natural relation to Truth; for once that they are used on her side, they will be at least ten times employed against her.

It may be thought that Hahnemann and his disciples have not contributed much as yet towards medical science; but will any candid and well-informed observer refuse to admit that they have contributed something? Is it nothing to have insisted on the exact observation and detailed recording of the action of medicines? Are there not new and valuable remedies now coming into common use, which they introduced? Has not the general practice of the profession, as regards the use of drugs, been, during late years, sensibly affected by the infinitesimal doses? Let them be quite sure that they have assimilated into the body of medical science all the nutriment to be derived from this source, before they contemptuously and permanently sever themselves from it.

Again, if belief in the efficacy of infinitesimal doses be a

delusion, is it so very hurtful? In the present state of the art of healing, when so many of its distinguished practitioners have to record a decrease of faith in drugs, with increased experience of disease, is it not greatly safer to give too little medicine than too much? And if it be a mischievous delusion, to be discountenanced, and, if possible, dispelled, are obloquy, persecution, contempt, insult, directed against its sincere and earnest votaries, the means which duty or wisdom urges for its defeat or extinction? On the contrary, does not all history teach us, that, instead of dissipating any vaporous form of belief, the uniform effect of persecution is to crystallise it into permanency? Let the practitioners of Homœopathy continue mixed with the general body of physicians, and, if the system be false, the stronger truth which the others hold will ere long supplant and exterminate it. Let them be put out of communion, and, by external pressure, condensed into a distinct sect, having no intercourse with the rest of the profession; then, *true or false,* it may be safely predicted of the system, that it has a long life in prospect. From that time forward, its young *alumni* will seldom come into close contact with the other forms of medical belief; they will be nursed in separate institutions; in which, during their whole course of instruction, it will be instilled into their receptive minds, that the Homœopathic is the one all-inclusive, all-sufficient system of knowledge and practice in that department of the profession; and he will, indeed, be zealous for orthodoxy who has much hope of reclaiming them after such training. Even now, in consequence of the proceedings of the Colleges and the Medical Faculty, some of the adherents of the persecuted faith have begun to agitate for such exclusive institutions.

Let the persecution advance, and certainly it will result in their establishment. That such a consequence would be highly injurious to our universities, and to the general education of the students of medicine, I have no doubt.

If the Homœopathists get into their own hands the power of granting degrees in medicine (which will obviously be necessary if the University degrees are denied to them), they will be enabled to affect the general body of practitioners far more widely than they now can; and, like all young licensing bodies, they will be tempted to lower the standard of education. At any rate, they will thus come into distinct competition with the old-established colleges. I cannot suppose those who are now engaged in the crusade against Homœopathy to be indifferent to this result; and I might wonder at their present tactics, were I not aware that an insolent contempt of their advancing opponents conceals from them the serious nature of the contest.

The course of Homœopathy exhibited in its history might correct their judgment. So might familiarity with its literature, or, still more, personal intercourse with the more distinguished of its professors. It is singular, that the President, and the other members of the College of Physicians, who had recently an opportunity of meeting with Dr Arneth, of Vienna, as a specimen of the Continental Homœopathists, should not have formed a juster estimate of the system and its adherents, than their resolutions express. There are those, too, living among us, whose ability, acquirements, and disinterestedness, daily teach the same lesson. If we *will* shut our ears against the truth, it is true we can do it; and the truth in her advance will then pass us by; nay, but if we will not go out to seek her, prepared to do her homage, although she appear in meanest clothing and in lowliest places, we shall hardly find her. If we make up our minds beforehand, in what form, from what quarter, with what accompaniments her approach is to be, our pre-judgments will be our only conclusions.

Finally, I adjure our medical friends, as they regard the dignity of their profession, as they desire the advance of science, as they value sincerity and ingenuousness, as they

confess allegiance to the laws of nature, which will receive no dictation from man; above all, as they would not be found doing injustice and cruelly oppressing the innocent; in short, as they feel the claims of highest Duty, I adjure them to pause ere it be too late, and willingly to retrace their steps, lest ignominiously they may afterwards be compelled to retreat from their present false and discreditable position.

I have the honour to be,
My Lord Provost and Gentlemen,
Your obedient servant,
AN ALUMNUS OF THE UNIVERSITY.

P. S.—The following resolutions were subsequently adopted unanimously by the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh:—

"1. The College having considered a series of resolutions transmitted by the Royal College of Physicians, in regard to Homœopathy, feel called upon to express their opinion that the system so designated being entirely inconsistent with the principles professed by candidates for the diploma of the College of Surgeons, any fellow or licentiate who practises it, or countenances others in doing so, by meeting them in consultation, will justly incur the disapprobation of the College.

"2. That a copy of the above resolution be transmitted to the Royal College of Physicians."

We cannot desire a better reproof of the narrow bigotry of our Scottish College than the following resolution of the Council of the Royal College of Surgeons of England:—

"That the Council have attentively and repeatedly considered the various communications which they have received on the subject of Homœopathy; and, after mature deliberation, have resolved, that it is not expedient for this College to interfere in the matter."

REASONS

FOR

EMBRACING HOMŒOPATHY.*

HAVING been known until within a comparatively short time since (especially while holding office in the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh) as a determined opponent of Homœopathy and its disciples, and now coming forward to avow my conviction of its truths, and my desire to assist by every legitimate means in their dissemination, I think it a duty to give my reasons for thus changing my opinions and practice.

In common with many of my professional brethren in Edinburgh, I questioned the possibility of the Homœopathic preparations containing any medicinal properties whatever; because, in the first place, the most carefully conducted chemical analysis failed to detect their presence, except, perhaps, in some few of the tinctures; and,

---

* By Charles Ransford, M.D., Edin., Fellow of and lately one of the Examiners in the Royal College of Physicians, Licentiate of the Royal College of Surgeons, formerly one of the Medical Officers of the Royal and Western Dispensaries, Secretary of the Anatomical and Obstetrical Societies, Member of the Medico-Chirurgical, Extraordinary Member and President of the Royal Medical and Harveian Societies of Edinburgh, Physician to the York Homœopathic Dispensary. Extracted from the "British Journal of Homœopathy." No. 37.

secondly, because, even if they did exist, so material and palpable did we erroneously suppose disease to be, it was impossible (so we argued) that substances so attenuated could exert any influence upon the human organism. Still, with all the apparent difficulties and absurdities (as we styled their doctrines), our patients resorted to these heretical practitioners—and generally assured us, to our ill-concealed mortification, that they received benefit at their hands. Notwithstanding our prognostications of the ephemeral nature of the system, it continued to increase in favour, and its disciples were to be found amongst the most intellectual and calm thinking members of society. We said one to another, what do these men give to their patients? One physician informed me that tartarised antimony in small doses, would act as a sufficient aperient, and doubtless that this was the preparation exhibited for the purpose in cases of constipated bowels. Ashamed am I to confess, that I and others utterly ignorant of the subject, and refusing to inform ourselves by actual experience, not merely suspected but asserted, that men of unimpeachable integrity gave ordinary drugs, under a feigned name, for the purpose of producing certain effects. In whatever else we differed, we cordially agreed in denouncing the entire system as quackery, delusion, and imposture, and, as a necessary consequence, excluded its professional advocates from our societies, whether scientific or social. We did not stop to ask, whether there was or was not *truth* in Hahnemann's proposition; if there existed a *law* for the administration of medicines; but our vials of wrath and contempt were poured upon the devoted heads of his followers, for the unpardonable innovation of administering drugs in inconceivably minute doses. We probably should not have evinced such an amount of irritation at the simple announcement *similia similibus curantur;* but to attempt to cure acute disease by such unheard of means was so ab-

surd (thus we in our ignorance spoke and wrote), that none but fools or knaves would trouble themselves with the brief investigation necessary to prove the falsity of Hahnemann's notions. We never could separate Hahnemann's law from infinitesimal doses, although we might have been informed by a tyro in Homœopathy, that Hahnemann practised according to his promulgated law, for years ere he adopted the practice of minute doses. Without trying the effects of remedies upon this principle, we publicly declared the entire band of Homœopathic practitioners (most of whom held legal diplomas, many of them from our Alma Mater) as unworthy of our society; by these acts we virtually, if not really, asserted that they were banded together to propagate a delusion and a fraud. What a proof this was of our own extreme credulity! and of the "characteristic obstinacy of the medical profession."

The conscientious, highly educated, and accomplished follower of Hahnemann, whose only object was to substitute in therapeutics, certainty for uncertainty, order for confusion; this man, I repeat, was treated as a Pariah, an outcast. Homœopathy was always pronounced to be on the wane; nevertheless, we found to our cost that it took from us our best patients; we fondly hoped that these misguided people would after a little time return to their former orthodox creed and practice: but, no, they not only deserted us, our cathartics, sudorifics, alteratives, derivatives, blisterings, bleedings, *et hoc genus omne;* but, charmed with the superiority of their new favourite, in the most unkind manner, they persuaded others to follow their example. The Homœopathists were bold enough to open a dispensary, and, strange to behold, the *poor* flocked to it; we had comforted ourselves in the belief that, whatever whim the aristocracy might choose to pursue, the *poor* would certainly not become converts.

The young and talented members of our school of me-

dicine embraced and enthusiastically advocated the principles and practices of Homœopathy, and asked us to explain how it was that the proportional recoveries of cases of Asiatic cholera and pneumonia (*proved* to be such, not merely by the advocates, but likewise by the *opponents* of Homœopathy), in Dr Fleischmann's hospital, at Vienna, so far outnumbered those of the Allopathic or old school practitioners. These figures were extremely awkward, *we* were comparatively powerless in the treatment of Asiatic cholera, at least in its advanced stages; whilst the Homœopathists were often successful. The Vienna hospital was a public institution; any physician might visit it, and not only ascertain the truth or falsehood of the statistical returns, but also see the effects of the infinitesimal doses. We *would not* be convinced. Not being able to *deny* the recoveries, we attributed them to the more healthy site of the hospital, the more abundant supply of attentive nurses and of comforts to the sick, and with these so-called reasons we dismissed the statistics of cholera. Those of pneumonia remain to be accounted for: we satisfied ourselves with asserting that Fleischmann was not skilled in auscultation, that slight cases of bronchitis would be set down as pneumonia and be classed amongst its cures. Mr Wilde, a surgeon, editor of the "Dublin Quarterly Journal," and author of the work, "Austria and its Institutions," who is not a Homœopathist, states that he witnessed the treatment of cases of pneumonia in Fleischmann's hospital, and that these cases were as acute and virulent, as those which had come under his observation elsewhere; that whilst the mortality for 1838 was not more than five or six per cent., three similar institutions on the Allopathic plan showed a mortality as high as from eight to ten per cent.

In answer to this, and the testimony of Dr Balfour, as published in the "British and Foreign Quarterly Review," we comforted ourselves that pneumonia was curable with-

out drugs, that this was the secret of the cure, and not the administration of Homœopathic preparations. A little reflection would have convinced us that this was a somewhat dangerous argument to broach, by men ordering calomel, opium, tartar emetic, leeches, venesection, blistering, &c., &c., for, however disposed we were to talk thus amongst ourselves, we never adopted the *laissez-faire* mode of practice when our patients required our professional assistance. And it cannot be denied that such arguments (if they be worthy of the name), were they sound ones, tell more against Allopathy and its advocates, than against Hahnemann and his followers, inasmuch as the former used violent means which they consider to be unnecessary. Such a mode of reasoning has been not unaptly likened to a man passing a sword through his own vitals, in order to injure his adversary. But *any* testimony, however strong, however clear, was unavailing to us: the mists of prejudice—deep-rooted, inveterate prejudice—shrouded our mental vision as with Egyptian darkness; every misrepresentation was had recourse to, and satisfied us; we despised Homœopathy, called Hahnemann a cheat and a nostrum vender, clutching a non-authenticated piece of gossip, and delivering upon this a verdict, the evidence for which would have been deemed insufficient by any twelve intelligent and unprejudiced persons, and which, even if it had been true, could not have tested the merits or demerits of the Homœopathic law. Had we really been desirous of knowing Hahnemann's character, in its moral as well as its professional relation, we could have been sufficiently informed by men of reputation, his contemporaries —yet not Homœopathists.

Marmaduke Sampson, Esq., in his very able essay entitled, "Truths and their Reception, considered in relation to the Doctrine of Homœopathy" (a work as well as others of the same talented writer, by which my impressions upon the subject were greatly strengthened), has col-

lected a number of testimonials from well-known persons in various parts of Europe.

The venerable Hufeland acknowledged the highest personal respect for Hahnemann. Valentine Mott, the eminent American surgeon, says—"Hahnemann is one of the most accomplished and *scientific* physicians of the present age." Dr Uwins and Mr Kingdon, of London, considered that Hahnemann was worthy of the thanks of the profession, for his unwearied industry in ascertaining the properties of medicines.

Dr Sigmond speaks of him as a man of high intellectual attainments, of great sagacity, of inflexible courage, and of unwearied industry.

Dr Forbes bears a similar testimony, and we are inclined to think that the evidence of these gentlemen is sufficient for the purpose.

My suspicions that Homœopathic medicines had really some action, were first awakened in 1844, by one of my patients, an Oxford student, calling upon me during the long vacation. This young gentleman had been for several years under my care for a heart affection, which had caused himself and his family considerable anxiety. Consultations had been held with practitioners of high standing in Edinburgh, and he had been actively treated *secundum artem*, by depletions, digitalis, counter-irritants, &c. &c. He told me that, since he had last seen me, he had been under the care of a Homœopathic physician. "Well," was his but ill-pleased doctor's reply, "you did not experience any effects from his sugar-plums!" "Pardon me, doctor, the effects were very perceptible." This answer appeared somewhat strange: is it possible that a decillionth of aconite can produce any sensible effect? He passed away to Oxford, his physician remaining unconvinced, attributing the consequences of the remedies to something given clandestinely: a refuge to which I and those like minded with

me invariably betook ourselves; and I remained obstinate, notwithstanding that my patients continued to desert me for the Homœopathic practitioner. Occasionally we heard of a death occurring in the practice of our rivals. This furnished ample scope for our eloquence. The man has been murdered! a case of inflammation has terminated in death! of course, what could be expected?—the man was not bled; we spoke and wrote as though a fatal termination was a *novelty* amongst us Solons of the Allopathic school. Then one of our brethren exulted over a performance of his own, which we all maintained satisfactorily settled the question of the action of infinitesimal doses. This worthy doctor actually did a Homœopathic physician the honour of sitting at the same table with him, at the house of a mutual friend; their worthy host's hospitality had the effect of somewhat dispelling the frigidity of the sapient Allopath, who, after dinner, accosted his erring brother, and asked him for an inspection of his pocket medicine case. It was immediately handed to him. Selecting the tube labelled *nux vomica*, he had the hardihood to pour the contents into his palm, and swallowed them, looking for the approving smiles of the assembled guests. This was too good an incident to be lost; we, in our absolute wisdom, proclaimed it far and wide. Do you *still* persist in believing that these globules contain what they profess to do? If they really consisted of *nux vomica*, do you not suppose that some visible result would have followed the swallowing of so many? These were the queries put to our Homœopathic unprofessional friends; *unprofessional*, observe, for otherwise the solution of the apparent difficulty would have been very easy. For it is only under certain *morbid* conditions that these medicines act by their peculiar affinities. A child, at the time not susceptible of the disease, may be exposed to the contagion of scarlatina, small-pox, or other of the exanthemata, without contracting the disease; yet a similar exposure, a

month afterwards, may be followed by the development of the malady; or three men might be bitten by the same rabid dog, and but one of them sicken with hydrophobia; would any one from this deny the malignity of the virus? Besides, it is a well ascertained fact that small doses of medicinal substances will frequently produce more powerful effects than larger quantities of them. To test the action of infinitesimal doses, is purely a matter of experience, and it is in the power of any one to satisfy himself on the subject. We also attributed the so-called cures to the effect of imagination; although many cases of recovery from acute diseases, in children, could not with any fairness be attributed either to mental or moral causes; but the fact was, we *would* not allow that Homœopathy could cure, and it was therefore settled by us that it *should* not. All cures were attributed to any cause but the right one, although recoveries under Allopathic remedies were readily enough allowed to be the effect of the remedies employed, nor, in spite of our assertions that diet alone would cure disease, did we ever trust to it exclusively in severe maladies. The press now began vigorously to send forth its productions upon the subject; but, although a reader of the surprising effects narrated, scepticism was yet in the ascendant. In the summer of 1848, I was led by circumstances to join a highly respectable practitioner in Alnwick, and I with great regret left Edinburgh. In the quiet locality to which I now removed, I ceased to think of Homœopathy, and hoped to pursue my vocation unmolested by that pestilent heresy; although, occasionally meeting with it amongst the higher classes of society, nothing else in the town or neighbourhood induced me to pay any greater attention to its claims; nor, indeed, to trouble myself about it at all, further than to lend to the few who advocated its principles certain publications opposed to them. But I could not avoid reading of the opening of hospitals

for the reception of patients labouring under acute disease, and of the invitation to the medical profession to witness their treatment. This course of proceeding seemed to be a somewhat unusual one for quacks to pursue, and, besides this, ever and anon I received communications from friends and former patients, many of whom I knew to have been once opposed to Homœopathy, but who now informed me of the benefit which they had received from it. I also observed that the number of well-educated medical practitioners practising upon the Homœopathic principle was yearly on the increase. I remembered that when a student at the *Ecole de Medicine* in 1831, there was but *one* Homœopathic practitioner in Paris, Dr Quin, and that he removed to London. Contrasting that state of things with the present (1849), I remarked that in London there were upwards of thirty Homœopathic practitioners; in Paris a considerable number; throughout Germany, its birth-place, and under the sanction of the reigning powers, it was rapidly increasing; that in America they were to be counted by hundreds. That amongst these practitioners were men of unquestionable character and reputation, many of whom had for many years successfully practised according to the old system; and many others who determined to try whether there was any, and how much truth existed in it, had their doubts removed so far as to there being action in the infinitesimal doses. Space will not allow of my giving a list of them; I will mention the names of some in Britain:—Dr Uwins, Mr Kingdon, Dr Millingen, and Professor Liston, in London; Professor Henderson, in Edinburgh; Mr Ramsbotham, Mr Smith, and Dr Wright, in Huddersfield—the three latter adopting its practice exclusively. Dr Uwins and Mr Kingdon brought the subject before the London Medical Society, the latter detailing several cases in which the Homœopathic remedies were of signal service. The thanks which these gentlemen received for

their attempt to diffuse information upon this subject amongst their brethren in a legitimate manner, were rudeness and reprobation. Dr Uwins was assailed as a madman, and when Mr Kingdon had concluded his interesting paper, one member said, that "he thought that all Homœopathised patients were cured by nature"—another, that he did not believe in it—and a third, that "it was all humbug;" and, as an appropriate finale to the proceedings of this meeting of philosophers, a tacit understanding was come to, that the subject *should never again be mooted in that assembly*. I found that the profession in Edinburgh and London resembled each other in the opposition which it offered to a proposed improvement in therapeutics. I acknowledge that, so far as I am concerned, I was as much to blame as any of them; and the only reparation which I have it in my power to make, is this confession of the melancholy fact. These circumstances, coupled with the increasing want of confidence in the ordinary practice, led me to the determination of *secretly* testing the monster, and of publishing the results of my trials. I believed that by so doing, I should be convinced of the fallacies of Homœopathy, and that any doubts of their existence would be speedily dispelled, and my mind set at rest. My determination to test it was strengthened by attentively considering the letter of my late ever to be lamented friend, Dr Andrew Combe, whose writings are so widely known and so justly appreciated in Europe and America. Dr Combe had no cause to serve but that of truth. Truthfulness was his characteristic. I knew but too well, that, so far as the uncertainty of medicine was concerned, I could scarcely be worse off, for professional intercourse (and this was considerable) with many eminent practitioners had not tended to increase my confidence in drugs nor in medicine generally; nor did Dr Forbes give me comfort, when he issued his celebrated number of the "British and

Foreign Review, containing the well-known article entitled "Homœopathy, Allopathy, and Young Physic." In order to take my first step with every precaution, I acquainted my friend Dr Russell of Edinburgh with my difficulties, and received from that gentleman every direction for the proper investigation of the Homœopathic practice; I likewise went to Newcastle, and introduced myself to Dr Hayle, who received me with his wonted urbanity, and advised me, if I wished to be speedily convinced of the *power* and efficacy of Homœopathic preparations, to select for trial *acute* cases of disease. I returned and commenced my investigations, carrying them on in such a manner, that, with scarce an exception, my patients were ignorant of my proceedings, and did not suspect any deviation from ordinary practice, save that they were agreeably surprised to find themselves cured and relieved by medicines tasteless and colourless. The result of my first trials utterly confounded me. Acute inflammatory cases, of such a description as are by consent of all authorities in medicine ordered or recommended to be treated by bleeding, either general or local, and other debilitating measures, yielded much sooner to the Homœopathic remedies appropriate to each case.

So soon as I was convinced that the Homœopathic preparations, administered according to the Homœopathic law, were more efficacious in curing acute cases of disease than the old method of practice, I corresponded with several of my medical friends of the Allopathic school, mentioned my experience on the subject, and requested their opinions. *Not one met the case on its merits;* one ridiculed the idea that such effects could possibly result from a decillionth of aconite, &c.; another dismissed the subject very summarily by saying, "that he knew nothing whatever of Homœopathy, but that he considered the administering of such small doses in really dangerous cases to be a trifling with human life;" another's response was to this

effect—"I have seen some narrow escapes from Homœopathic treatment." One friend, whilst opposing Homœopathy, made this somewhat remarkable admission—"I have no doubt but that patients will get well sooner under the Homœopathic treatment;" a fourth saw no objections to my continuing the investigation secretly, believing that a return to my "first love" would be the result of a more extended experience.

Several of my patients of the higher ranks asked me whether I was practising Homœopathically. I replied in the affirmative, but added, that as yet my mind was not sufficiently decided upon the matter; they did not care how I treated them, providing I did so conscientiously; and all my medical correspondents urged me not to proclaim my "perversion" (so they termed it) until a few months longer should have passed away.

Numerous cases, each one treated by myself alone, convinced me that all my preconceived opinions upon Homœopathy were erroneous, for it was to the *action* of the remedies administered that the results were due.

The *diet* was not altered in the case of children at the breast, nor in the cases of those adults unconscious of my treatment could *imagination* have exerted the slightest influence.

But even if these powerful auxiliaries have assigned to them an undue share of influence, I would ask my Allopathic brethren, whether they believe that *imagination* will cure cases of acute disease, the rapid subsidence of which under Homœopathic remedies is astonishing, and can be attested by thousands. Or will diet, however restricted and well regulated, be effectual for the same desirable end (and let it be observed, that cases of infantile bronchitis have come under my practice where no alteration of diet could have been made), and the disease only began to yield (and then did so) upon the administration of the Homœopathic medicines. But if this line of argument be

persisted in by our brethren, or the assertion that the *vis medicatrix naturæ* is the cause of recovery, we reply—be consistent, then, do not continue to administer the nauseous and hurtful compounds to your unhappy patients, if you think that the disease can be removed by the combined influences of diet, imagination, and nature; do not injure their stomachs by calomel, jalap, and other potent drugs; nor resort to bleeding, blistering, nor such like violent measures. Surely, those who in sincerity advance such arguments, would do well to ponder whether they may not easily be turned against themselves, and the subjects of such unpleasant experiments may with reason say, gentlemen, leave us to the more agreeable remedies of imagination, diet, and nature.

But I have been not a little surprised of late, to find that the once oft reiterated objection to the employment of Homœopathic remedies in acute and dangerous cases, has been succeeded by attempts to frighten my patients, by telling them, that although the seat of disease may be, and is, reached by Homœopathic remedies (for the evidence of this is beyond dispute), yet that this is effected at the expense of the constitution. Some of my patients informed me, that medical men told them by way of warning that the Homœopathic medicines were virulent poisons, and that although they removed disease, they undermined the patient's system, and shortened his life! One lady assured me so, and another was told that if she persisted in taking the remedies which I prescribed for her, she would die suddenly. Happily these ladies (who were both my patients) were women possessed of ability and will to exercise their reasoning powers, and therefore they disregarded such ridiculous modes of setting aside the question. I told them that if the remedies *were* poisons, doctors of the old school administered the same in much larger quantities: also, that Hahnemann, who proved so many medicines upon himself, lived to the age of eighty-nine.

A lady, the sister of a friend of mine, a highly respectable Homœopathic physician, was gravely told by a gentleman in large practice, that a pain in the region of the heart, with which a lady is troubled, has been caused by the belladonna given to her by this physician; at another time this same practitioner asserted that this very belladonna was "nothing."

Strange, indeed, it is that such contradictory assertions should be made, but we must leave the task of reconciling their discrepancies to the authors themselves.

But another objection is also started, viz., that the majority of the profession is opposed to it; so were the London College of Physicians to Harvey's doctrine of the circulation of the blood. Vaccination likewise was received with distrust, and was opposed. Mr Sampson, in the work before quoted, has shown how those of authority in various departments—such as banking, the post office, the law—have ever been the active opponents of measures of undoubted reform, affecting their own vocation, and that, therefore, it cannot be a matter of surprise that (for reasons easily divined) Homœopathy should meet with a similar reception from members of the medical profession.

It is not to the credit of our island, that, while the doctrines of Homœopathy have arrested the attention and become the study of many learned and experienced medical men in Europe and America, Great Britain is the only country where it has been noticed only to draw forth the most opprobrious invectives. It will not be satisfactory to assert that Hahnemann's theory is absurd and novel. Dr Millingen (not a Homœopathist) asserts, in his "Curiosities of Medical Experience," "that Hippocrates laid down in his aphorisms the incontrovertible fact, *duobus doloribus simal obortis, non tandem eâdem in parte, vehementur alterum obscurat*," *A.* 46. To a certain degree it was upon this assertion, which the experience of ages has confirmed, that Hahnemann founded the principal and most import-

ant point of his doctrine; but, going much farther than the Father of Medicine, he affirms that similar diseases effectually remove each other. For centuries practitioners have been acting Homœopathically; the exhibition of specifics, in fact, being nothing else. Specifics are known to produce symptoms similar to the diseases they cure. To increase the number of these specifics, has been the laborious and singular study of Hahnemann and his disciples, a study of which Haller had first given the example; and the same author justly states, "that our safest, perhaps our sole, guide in the study of disease, is the group of symptoms, that become more and more perceptible during the course of our investigations." Even were we to discard the theory, we cannot so deal with facts. Let us not care so much about the correctness of his theory (for the history of medicine affords the almost constant substitution of one theory for another), as the *success* of the practice. I ask the unprejudiced medical inquirer to read attentively the "Essay on the Homœopathic Treatment of the Asiatic Cholera," and the "Narrative of a Mission to Ireland during the Famine and Pestilence of 1847," by Joseph Kidd, surgeon.

Those essays will be found in a volume published under the superintendence of the British Homœopathic Association, by Samuel Highley, 32 Fleet Street, London.

What were Mr Kidd's auxiliaries for treating the malignant typhus, and yet how marked was his success, as proved by the convincing testimony of clergymen and others who had no interest whatever in supporting the Homœopathic practice?

My own experience for nearly eighteen months, the irresistible evidence brought under my notice in my researches made alike in the writings of those opposed as well as of those favourable to Homœopathy, furnished facts upon facts, until an overwhelming array presented themselves. I felt that, although there was nothing to prevent my continuing to practise now and in what manner

I chose, I was fully convinced that the Homœopathic principle was the correct one, and that my own success in practice upon that principle was the most marked in the history of my professional life; I felt that the only honest course to adopt was the avowal of my belief. I knew that, by so doing, I should draw down upon myself the anger of my former professional friends, that would, for a time at least, endanger my professional reputation, and separate me from all existing professional ties. On the other hand, I dared not relinquish those remedies, or the mode of administering them, which I had found so efficacious in curing rapidly and safely so many forms of disorders. I was told that, to avow myself a Homœopathist, would be to take a step fatal to my reputation as a scientific physician, but the words of Dr Baillie (as truly a scientific man as any of his successors) were strongly impressed upon my mind, "Tell me what will do my patients good, and I will give it to them." Estimating so highly as I do the Homœopathic practice, it will not be considered a matter for surprise that I should consider it my duty resolutely to defend it, and diligently to propagate it, and this I am determined to do, uninfluenced by the frowns or even threats of those with whom I was not long since on terms of intimate friendship. My only wish is the removal of the prejudice which prevents their investigating the subject; an investigation which, if pursued with a determination to arrive at the truth, I am convinced must result in a firm belief of the greater certainty, and therefore incalculable superiority, of the Homœopathic practice in the removal of disease; or, if this be not practicable, at least, of the more effective relief of suffering.

To call Hahnemann and his followers quacks, is merely to say that which is false. A system of therapeutics which is based upon observation and experience, which has been tested by various persons in different parts of the globe; these persons publishing to the world the results of their

investigations, these results agreeing remarkably with one another, can this with justice be called quackery? It pretends not to possess a universal remedy for the various ills that flesh is heir to; it does not conceal its remedies; on the contrary, it publishes them without reserve, and invites all the members of the medical profession to test its truth or its falsehood for themselves. Take aconite, for example, in infinitesimal doses, administer it as we have frequently done to an infant at the breast, so as to exclude any supposed effect of the imagination, it will be found to be an indisputable fact that this medicine, in this very minute dose, will subdue inflammatory action more effectually, more quickly, more safely, than any other known means. Every practitioner may convince himself of the truth of this assertion. It was the testimony of so many enlightened and honest men, professional and unprofessional, that first led me to investigate the subject, and others I believe will from similar reasons be led to adopt a like course; what the result will be, it does not require to be told. Truth will prevail.

FULMINATIONS AGAINST HOMŒOPATHY.*

THERE must be some truth in the Homœopathic doctrine of the efficacy of minute doses. In Edinburgh, the favourite haunt of medicine and medical practitioners, there are only five Homœopathic doctors—a number scarcely to be detected by microscopic inspection among the swarms of licentiates who jostle each other in the streets; and yet, it appears from a batch of pamphlets recently sent to us from the modern Athens, their presence has excited a consternation among the orthodox medicos, the effects of which might supply worthy matter for the pen of a Swift, or a Molière, or a Rabelais—who was himself a physician.

The first fulmination against the Homœopathic heresy in Edinburgh emanated from the College of Physicians. These learned Thebans, in full divan assembled, passed a series of resolutions, in language such as has rarely been adopted by an anteprandial meeting. After premising that no person could be ignorant of the light in which the College regards Homœopathy, they declared that all fellows who became Homœopathic practitioners "endanger the reputation of the College;" that they become "merely nominal fellows," "and hold a false position and spurious credit." They further protested, that all such renegades from the true medical faith "must necessarily be alien to the other fellows and to the profession at large," inasmuch

* From the "Spectator."

as "no fellow of his College, or any other physician, can by any possibility, without derogating from his own honour and the honour of the profession, meet professors of Homœopathy in consultation, or co-operate with them in the other common duties of professional life." The practical application of these dogmas was a broad hint to the black sheep against whom they were levelled, that they ought forthwith to resign their fellowships. The Council of the College were directed to transmit copies of the resolutions to all known offenders; and their secretary, catching the peculiar spirit of courtesy that inspired them, subjoined to the name of Dr Henderson, in the copy transmitted to that gentleman, not his legitimate title of "Professor of Pathology in the University of Edinburgh," but the designation "Practitioner of Homœopathy"—which the doctor, without any desire to disclaim it, might warrantably object to, on the ground of the *animus* which dictated its selection.

Fielding's Colonel, mad on the point of honour, with his favourite phrase of "the immortal dignity of man," is thrown into the shade by the more than Castilian punctilio of the Edinburgh physicians. These gentlemen, it appears, would hold it degrading to assist a fellow-being struck down by apoplexy, if a Homœopathist held him in his arms. And Fielding's Mrs Slipslop could not have emphasised the words "low creatures" more felicitously than the secretary to the College did the title "practitioner of Homœopathy." Judging by their anti-Homœopathic resolutions, and forgetting for the moment their many real claims to respect, one might fancy the Edinburgh physicians to be a cross-breed between a Brahmin, with all his pride of caste, and a lady's-maid, with all her airs and *minauderie*.

But the Faculty of Medicine in the University of Edinburgh were resolved to outdo their neighbours of the College of Physicians. Soon after the latter had promulgated their resolutions, a student of medicine, suspected of Ho-

mœopathic leanings, underwent the examinations preliminary to the obtaining of a diploma. The professors expressed themselves satisfied with his answers, till it occurred to one of them to ask him whether it was true that he intended to practise Homœopathically? The candidate for medical honours replied that he could not give a decisive answer till he had studied the subject; which, he added, he had determined to do. He was then asked whether, in the event of his becoming convinced of the truth of Homœopathy, he would burn or return his diploma. He replied, that, considering the diploma a mere attestation to the amount of medical knowledge he had attained, he saw no necessity for doing so. He was then given to understand that the faculty would not pass him until he became convinced of the fallacy of infinitesimal doses. Habit has reconciled men to the practice of exacting from licentiates of theology solemn declarations, not merely that they believe, but that they will always continue to believe, certain doctrines; but the Edinburgh Faculty of Medicine is, we imagine, the first that has exacted from a candidate for a diploma a vow always to believe in a certain medical theory, and adhere to a certain mode of medical practice. The professor could afford to smile at the impertinence of a college who had no power to remove him from his chair; but the luckless student was deprived by the faculty of that diploma which he had fairly earned by industrious and intelligent study. The College could only show their teeth—the Faculty could bite.

The position assumed by the medical Canutes of Edinburgh is ludicrous. They are endeavouring by a new test act to arrest the arising tide of medical inquiry and experiment. They would deserve to be laughed down—the only treatment adapted to their case—even if their proceedings affected Homœopathists only. For, whatever those gentlemen may think, Homœopathists are quite as much entitled to fair play, and the common courtesies

which gentlemen of education practise in their intercourse with each other, as Allopathists or any other pathists. But the mock-heroics and oppression of the Edinburgh doctors have a wider range of application. The artillery they have been playing off against Homœopathy might be turned upon any other doctrine or practice against which they happen to be prepossessed. The progress of medical science can be retarded, if not arrested, by allowing corporate bodies to exact promissory vows against entertaining any new opinions. But *cui bono*, even to the obstructors? In our parallel theological experience, enforcement of tests has best served to thin the Established churches.

HOMŒOPATHY AND ALLOPATHY.*

POPERY is not confined to Rome or to Oxford, it being, in fact, an apotheosis of self, and self possessing, in this great free kingdom of ours, a *copiosa felicitas* of putting on as many dresses as there are characters in the mighty masquerade of human life, it pervades all the departments of social existence. In our senate, it represents a patriot bowing his neck with graceful reluctance to the patronage and emoluments of office; in the church, it sighs "*nolo episcopari;*" even in the various spheres of philanthropy, it sometimes surreptitiously presides over those orbits in which revolve other interests besides "refuges" and soup tickets; while in the severer and higher regions, such as those which this empire boasts, of physic and of law, it assumes the shape of public spirit, and enters its indignant protest against the unreasonable demands of those who think that, in the one, justice concerns itself exclusively with securing the rights of the community; or, in the other, that a patient can presume to recover by any treatment, or any scale of doses, except those prescribed by the London and Edinburgh Pharmacopœia. Such is self—ever constant, and yet ever Protean. It flourishes now in units, and, anon, these units, multiplying and reproducing themselves, grow into the thriving corporation of a many-headed *ego*; but, whatever or whoever is its exponent, it is always true to the description of

* From the "Christian Times."

it in sacred writ: "There is one, and there is not a second."

But our readers will naturally ask, What has all this to do with Homœopathy or Allopathy? We will tell them. Everybody knows that, within the last dozen years, a medical practice has been creeping into notice, asserting the pretensions of a legitimate science, but undertaking that department commonly called "therapeutics," in a manner so entirely different from what has been regarded as appertaining to the ordinary privileges of prescriptive authority, that many of the affiliated and dependent allies of the old system have taken just alarm, lest the hereditary consumption of drugs should be abridged, and thus the craft by which many rise to wealth should be endangered. The heavy shot of the prerogative battalions have been found, in various critical skirmishes, to be no match for the quiet, unpretending, and yet matchless skill with which their guns have been answered and silenced by the pigmy pieces of the new school. The Cowes Yacht Club have done "*koutou*" to the lines of the "saucy" America, and Messrs Bramah have honourably, though under protest, paid forfeit to the great Yankee picklock. In these cases, the vanquished were foolish enough to let our cousins from the United States have English fair play—that is, a fair stage on which to beat them if they could; and this they did, incontinently, unmistakeably, much to their credit; and we, for ourselves, congratulate them on their laurels, only wishing they may challenge us again, and be as manfully met again. But *verbum sapienti*—the old medical school are not thus prepared to put on a green livery; they know better; and, accordingly, instead of taking up the gauntlet thrown down by the followers of Hahnemann, and choosing umpires to decide on the merits of their respective systems, they have, with a proper pride, which is refreshing, and entitles them to the gratitude of every dispensary in the kingdom, from "Savory and Moore" down

to the "Galen's Head" at the *Ultima Thule* of the land, not only ignored their pretensions, but have determined to cut the whole community dead, and absolutely to scout even their personal acquaintance—

> "Now this is noble, and bespeaks a people proud
> And jealous of their honour"—

yes, the Medical Faculty of the Universities of St Andrews and Edinburgh, backed by the Royal College of Physicians, have resolved to refuse the degree of doctor of medicine to all students who will not pledge themselves not to practise Homœopathy, and the Provincial Medical and Surgical Association of Brighton, assembled for the purpose of promoting the interests and advancing the science of their profession, deliberately issue a manifesto, which is declared to have been adopted unanimously, wherein they state, "that Homœopathy, as propounded by Hahnemann, and practised by his followers, is so utterly opposed to science and common sense, as well as so completely at variance with the experience of the medical profession, that it ought to be in no way or degree practised or countenanced by any regularly educated medical practitioner;" that "it is derogatory to the honour of the members of this association to hold any kind of professional intercourse with Homœopathic practitioners;" and wind up by declaring that, "in proposing these resolutions, they are actuated by a strong sense of the importance of the subject in its relation both to humanity and morals." How people dare to be cured of long-standing maladies by such a set of empirics, is for them to settle with the old doctors; nevertheless, the new school are not altogether satisfied with this proceeding, and, indeed, we ourselves cannot help thinking, perhaps simply enough, that it would have been more generally acceptable, and more in accordance with the idle prejudices of the English character, if the M.D.s had done what the Yacht Club and Messrs Bramah did—that is,

summoned their rivals to a fair trial, and let the public see who were right. However, this they have not done, and we think that the pretenders have got up a case of which at present we cannot foresee the end; but we somewhat surmise that, after all, this heresy may succeed, for that it is making formidable progress is notorious; and it is within our own knowledge that a family recently at Brighton, wishing to consult one of the misguided leaders of the proscribed sect, was told that his hands were so full that he could not make an appointment without a day's notice. This is disheartening to the cause of the "real old original XXX" Esculapian College. Moreover, the Homœopathists are arrogant enough to say that they will have a charter of their own, and are daring enough to put their pretensions into a plausible shape as follows:—

"Medicine, as a science, includes the anatomy and physiology of health—the chemistry, natural history, and botany of the materia medica—the anatomy and physiology of disease, and the theory of therapeutics, or the operation of remedies; and, as an art, it consists of rules for distinguishing diseases, and for the selection of remedies appropriate to each. Now, of this category, the first *seven* contain facts and doctrines quite as valuable, in the eyes of the Homœopathist, as in those of the common practitioner. There is, then, but one department of the *science* of medicine, in which the two systems can be at variance. And, in the *art*, of the two sections into which it is divided, the distinguishing of diseases and adaptation of remedies, the former is common, in all its details, to the two systems—the latter alone can be the subject of any controversy."

With such specious arguments as these, we may well tremble lest Homœopathy may be palmed upon society, just as vaccination and gas-lighting have been, notwithstanding, from historical recollections which we published in a former number of our journal, we showed that *they* also were proved by *most respectable* authority to be—what

the same kind of authority has predicted of Homœopathy —"utterly opposed to science and common sense."

But we must stop. We hope our readers will excuse this trifling on our part; but we really have no heart to treat the subject in any other light than as one that is to be laughed at for its effrontery; while at the same time we feel convinced that this senseless crusade is calculated to do immense good to the cause which it designs to crush. The earth *would* go round in spite of the pope; and we may be sure that, if pain and human woe are relieved by Homœopathy, the emancipated sufferers will persist in preferring heretical ease to orthodox anguish. The successful system *will* circulate round the centre of truth, whether it be in physic or in physics.

THE

ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS

AND THE

HOMŒOPATHISTS.*

TO THE BRITISH PEOPLE.

The essential principle of Popery, up to the present hour, to a most woeful extent prevails in the high places of Medicine. Our corporate medical bodies are the inveterate foes of the grand principle of Protestantism—the right of private judgment. An ignorant and infatuated world has been, time immemorial, deeply in love with art and mystery, of which it has had its fill; and most dearly has it paid for the luxury. It has been unwittingly amused with sounding names and dazzled by splendid pretensions. It has had the science, art, and mystery of government,—of divinity, of law, and of medicine; and the professors of these several sciences, arts, and mysteries have, as their indefeasible right, laid claim to the privilege of acting wholly without any consultation with, or control by, the parties interested in their respective operations. They have, to a vast extent, drank deep into the cup of Popery; they have demanded implicit confidence from mankind. To doubt, was to be condemned as contumacious, and subjected to appointed penalties. Thus the interests and the concerns of liberty, property, physical health, and eternal

---

* From the "British Banner."

life, were to be left to the sole and exclusive care of those various corporations! Such was the ancient state of things; and such, to a large extent, it is now, in our "most enlightened age." There is, upon the whole, but little abatement either on the side of the privileged or of the multitude. The arrogant and outrageous pretensions of the potentates are but little lowered, and the great majority of a foolish world are well pleased to have it so. Hitherto, but a small portion of mankind have understood the right and duty of exercising private judgment in this matter; they much prefer taking everything upon trust. There are, nevertheless, specialities; the position of the various objects to which we have referred is not everywhere alike. In various countries, but more especially in our own, there is a considerable measure of emancipation as to the science of government; men, in large numbers, think and speak with tolerable freedom concerning the character and the conduct both of the legislature and the executive powers. In regard to the "science of religion," it is the same, especially in the portion of society called Nonconformist, or dissenting. As to "law," it is not so; things there stand much the same as they did generations back; the bulk of men are wholly ignorant of the necessity, the value, beauty, and glory of just law, and the wrongs and miseries to which a portion of them have from time to time been subjected by unjust, oppressive, and cruel enactments, and by the iniquities which have blended with the administration of them. But it is worst of all in the matter of "physic." There, system gives place to system, and school to school; and yet the advocates of each system, and the professors of each school, for the time being, lay claim to a monopoly of medical wisdom, and treat with summary vengeance, to the extent of their ability, all those who attempt innovation!

On a former occasion, we were induced to take up the subject of Homœopathy, as coming legitimately within the province of humanity—a chief department of our official

labours. We were then prevented from completing what we had to say, on behalf of the public, by the papal invasion and the commencement of Parliament, which absorbed both our space and our thoughts, and we have now been led to return to it sooner than we intended, by the extraordinary course pursued by the Scotch Universities, which have commenced a deadly war against the Homœopathic practitioners. The Royal College of Physicians, of Edinburgh, has determined to give diplomas to no man, whatever his talents or acquirements, who has the slightest sympathy with the Homœopathic system, and to withdraw such diplomas from all its fellows who may fall into the heresy. Now, it will be allowed that this is a very extraordinary measure, and such as the public cannot witness altogether unconcerned. The doctors exist for the public, not the public for the doctors; and therefore this is a matter in which the public, having the chief, if not the sole stake, are entitled and required to exercise a judgment. This right, for them and ourselves, we now assert, and act upon it as the great principle of Protestantism, which applies not less to medicine than to theology. It may be that these Scottish Universities are acting a part which entitles them to the universal thanks of the nation, or it may be that they are acting a part which ought to subject them to universal condemnation; we hold, therefore, that this is a point which ought to be determined. Now, we are not going to enter into the matter medically; this is not our business; but the great question is one with which we hold ourselves competent to deal.

Is it demonstrated by experience that Homœopathy cures, at the very least, *one-third* more patients than the old school? So say the Homœopathists. Is it true that the Government of Vienna, probably impelled by the Allopathists, at first denounced the introduction and practice of Homœopathy, and that they were subsequently prevailed upon by one of the Austrian nobility to permit

the establishment of an hospital—by way of experiment—and that, in the said hospital, which was opened about the time of the cholera invasion, for cholera patients, and that the Government medical officers, themselves the opponents of Homœopathy, reported that, while *two-thirds* of those treated Homœopathically recovered, *two-thirds* of those treated by the ordinary methods in the other hospitals perished? Is this true? Is it true that the Government reports of this extraordinary result led Count Kolowrath, Minister of the Interior, to repeal the law interdicting the practice of Homœopathy? Is it true that Dr Wilde says, the Government reporter, and opponent of the Homœopathic principle, reported to the Government that "the statistics show that the mortality is much less there (in the Homœopathic Hospital) than in the other hospitals of the city." Is it true that Knolz, the Austrian Proto-Medicus, published reports in 1838 which exhibited a mortality of but *five or six per cent.* in the Homœopathic Hospital, while three similar institutions, on the Allopathic plan, show a mortality as high as from *eight to ten per cent.*

It is stated by the advocates of the Allopathic system, and the opponents of Homœopathy, that the latter system may succeed in concealing its imposture in the sluggish stream of chronic maladies, but that in acute diseases, which demand immediate remedies, it is impotent. Now is it so? It is just, if report may be credited, the very reverse! From tables before us, prepared by Professor Henderson, of the Edinburgh University, it is shown that in 909 cases of inflammation of the lungs, treated upon the established system, no fewer than 212 died—that is, nearly *one* out of every *four*—whereas, in 299 cases treated on the Homœopathic system, only 19 died, or *one* out of every *fifteen* cases. In 111 cases of pleuritis, treated upon the established plan, 14 deaths ensued, or about *one* in *eight;* whereas, out of 224 cases of the same malady, treated Homœopathically, there were but *three* deaths, or little more

than *one* in *a hundred* cases! Again, in 21 cases actually occurring in the Edinburgh Infirmary, upon the established plan, there were *six* deaths, or more than *one* in *four;* whereas, in 105 cases of the same malady treated Homœopathically, there were but *five* deaths, or *one* in *twenty-five* cases!

Now, we ask the Royal College of Physicians if these things are so? It will surely be allowed that there is at least a case made out here for inquiry. These statistics are facts, or they are falsehoods. If falsehoods, let their falsehood be arrived at; if facts, let the Royal College of Physicians explain, and vindicate the course they have pursued.

We now proceed with a case in point.

We inserted a paragraph last week to the effect, that the Senatus of the University of St Andrews had threatened to withdraw a diploma from Dr Hale, of Norwich, because he had avowedly adopted Homœopathic principles, and expressed our disbelief in the allegation. We now, however, begin to entertain fears that it may, after all, have been true; for, from a letter which we have since received, we find that a like course has been adopted by the Royal College of Physicians, Edinburgh. This letter originated in the issuing of a series of resolutions by that distinguished body relative to all practitioners of Homœopathy, constituting fellows of their college. These resolutions were passed May 9, 1851, at a meeting expressly convened for that purpose, and with entire unanimity.

The manifesto was left to exercise its own effect on the minds of the fellows of the college; they are to understand this as a significant hint either to recant or withdraw, and that, failing of this, they will be expelled. Such fellows, then, may do one of three things—they may renounce their Homœopathic principles, or, at least, desist from acting on them; or they may wait in silence their expulsion; or they may defend themselves by protest or otherwise. Dr Macleod

has preferred the last course, and to crown his reasons for so doing, is the object of this very able, copious, and temperate pamphlet. The doctor lost no time in doing what he has done, although he apologises that it was not done earlier. The resolutions were passed on the 9th of May, and the pamphlet bears date the 28th of June, and is addressed to Professor Simpson, President of the Royal College of Physicians. A copy of the resolutions, it seems, was sent to Dr Macleod, among the other gentlemen who had fallen into the Homœopathic heresy. At first, he was disposed to disregard the denunciation, and to deny the authority of the requisition; but it seems such a use has been made of the resolutions, as to compel him to speak out; in consequence of that document, "disreputable imputations" regarding every one who has embraced a new theory have been recklessly made. The author, in proceeding with his defence, gives the history of his own studies, which is certainly such as few can boast; at any rate, not many have had more extensive opportunities of study. He commenced his career in Edinburgh, where for years he devoted six hours a-day mainly to the business of the dissecting-room for nine months in the year, and laboured with zeal in the Royal Infirmary for upwards of three years, performing nearly all the weights and measures made there during that period. He went the round of the hospitals, when the physicians were not there regularly, for several years, watching and examining for himself every case of interest; he assisted in the examination of almost all the bodies of those who died in the hospital. In a word, he did all that was deemed necessary or practicable thoroughly to master the science of medicine as it is taught in that far-famed school; yet so unsatisfactory was it, in many respects, that he determined to renounce drug or Allopathic practice, and to devote his energies to the study and teaching of anatomy and physiology. Circumstances arose to call his attention to Homœopathic practice: hav-

ing, nevertheless, his doubts about its law, he determined to proceed to Vienna, that he might examine the subject at the Homœopathic Hospital in that capital, and this he did for four months, studying at the same time the negative practice pursued by Dr Skoda and the Allopathists under one of his colleagues; and, after carefully comparing the results during that time of these several modes of treatment, he was forced to the belief, that the Homœopathic was the most efficient, the negative or do-nothing the next, and the Allopathic not only the least so, but the most dangerous, and that even in the most skilful hands. While at Vienna, the doctor, full of zeal and insatiable in his thirst after knowledge, met with some persons who called his attention to the subject of Hydropathy, from which they had received personal benefit. Determined to sift this matter to the bottom, he set off to Grafenberg, and spent the autumn and the winter with the renowned Preznitz. Having thus extended his views of men and things, he returned again to Scotland, a believer in the efficacy of minute doses, when properly administered, in the cure of many diseases, and also satisfied that water, for divers maladies, was a powerful medical agent. Declining several situations which offered, he accepted the office of physician to the establishment of Benrhydding, where, he says, "I have spent some five happy years in discharge of the duties of my office, and have enjoyed the privilege of treating no fewer than 6000 cases." Dr Macleod goes on to complain of those men in the profession, who have chosen to take part in this controversy; insinuations of the most unworthy descriptions have been, and still are being, lavishly scattered, with a view to damage, at all hazards, the repute and authority of the objects of their displeasure. He then proceeds with an elaborate argument, into the character and merits of which we cannot enter, since it lies beyond the scope of our present article. It is, moreover, of a nature somewhat technical. Passing over this, then, we proceed to that which con-

cerns us, and with us all mankind. Our present object is to remark on the closing, and, as they may be designated, the practical portions of the pamphlet. The author tells the president that he considers such a display on the part of the College, as eminently hazardous to its future reputation, unjustifiable in its present position, and by no means calculated to exert any beneficial influence in furtherance of the public safety. Dr Macleod has shown that whatever unanimity there may be among the physicians, and as to the truth of Homœopathy and its practitioners, there is very little as to their own medical practice. Not satisfied with defending himself and his brethren, he becomes, in his turn, assailant, and he here displays a capability, if he chooses to exert it, of carrying on the war with no feeble hand. The Royal College issued a ukase, stamped with authority; Dr Macleod meets it by the calm statement of a few facts—facts of a nature the most damaging to anything like science or consistency. The following will speak for itself:—

"No man, no society at least, seems to me entitled to interfere authoritatively with the honest efforts of others to attain some object of public importance, unless it can be shown either that the same end has already been attained, or that, through some better process, success is at hand. It ought to be held as a canon that, until science has reached its ultimate laws, it is essentially free; so long as the knowledge of these laws is in the distance, no hand of authority ought to be laid on the inquirer who is struggling to attain it. Now, sir, of that empirical system which in this country we find pitted against our rational therapeutics, I mean to say little more. I have already shown its extraordinary looseness as an empirical scheme; and I have asserted that it is losing ground yearly; I have called attention to the fact, that the use made of it in practice is so various, that, apart from the books in which its formulæ are written, no one can say with certainty what it is. Let me narrate merely one or two circumstances that came

under my cognisance years ago, as illustrations; and then I shall ask again, what is really the value of the system, in virtual defence of which our college has felt it necessary to put on at present so hot an antagonism, and to send forth these denunciations? Formerly—I do not know if it is so now—there were several fever wards in the Edinburgh Royal Infirmary, of which three fellows of the Royal College of Physicians had the charge. One physician had the top ward, another the middle ward, and a third the low ward. It happened that, on the same day, three young persons of nearly the same age, ill of typhus fever, were admitted into the hospital. The disease was of equal severity in each, and the stage of complaint the same in all. What was the treatment, think you, pursued in those three cases, by the three fellows of the college? Of course it should have been the same, at least if the system be correct; for the physicians in question would choose the best. But, sir, it was not the same. He in the top ward *bled his patient with lancet and with leeches.* He in the middle ward *physicked his patient with drastic purgatives;* and if he saw a large, comfortable effect, he gave praise, and was content. He in the low ward, again, *gave whisky, wine, and opiates.* What was the result of such deplorable freaks? I refer you to the Statistic-book; I have no doubt you will find it there!"

Such was the practice in what long claimed to be the first medical school in Europe! Such is the system which demands the homage of mankind, and which pours the bitterest scorn upon men who venture to think it unsatisfactory, and long for something better! But we must leave the three physicians, and turn to the doctor's account of the two professors, which runs thus:—

"In the University, formerly, two professors used to lecture, on alternate days, on clinical medicine. It happened once that each had at the same time under his care an acute case of *pericarditis.* The professor, who lectured upon his

case on Monday night, said, in substance, as follows:—'Gentlemen,—As to the treatment of this disease, it has been the practice to give large doses of mercury, so as to bring the constitution under its action; and, to effect this as rapidly as possible, small quantities of opium are usually combined with it. This practice I, however, believe to be erroneous; for I have observed the progress of the disease unchecked, even during profuse salivation. The most efficient remedy—in fact our sheet-anchor—in this disease is tartar emetic. You will have noticed the large doses I have given of this remedy, and yet the patient seems not to suffer from it. In fact, the constitution of this disease, as in some others, has a remarkable tolerance for tartar emetic. When the lecture was finished, I left the hall, fancying I had learned some great truth, and knew better than an hour before how to save life. On Wednesday evening during the same week, in the same hall, and to the students, the other professor lectured. The lecture was devoted to the acute case of pericarditis under his care in the hospital. After describing the case, and giving a sketch of the character and progress of disease, he spoke in substance as follows:—'Gentlemen,—It is a remarkable thing that there should be any difference in regard to the mode of treatment to be pursued in a disease such as this. I believe it is the Italian and French schools which advocate so very strongly the employment of tartar emetic; but I would strongly urge you to put no confidence in this remedy; for, if you do so, you will lean on a broken reed. Our sheet-anchor in this disease is mercury; under the action of which you must bring the patient as soon and as freely as you possibly can—even bleeding is of little importance in comparison with the use of mercury. The two combined—*i.e.*, mercury and blood-letting—is of course best, but at all events use mercury, and never trust to tartar emetic.' What effect was produced on the minds of the students by such opposite teachings, I cannot say. I can,

however, speak for one. He walked down into the noble quadrangle in bitterness, and gave involuntary utterance to the words, 'No wonder that Sir James Mackintosh forsook the study of medicine!'"

Now, it is to be remembered that such was the teaching of the college in the experience of Dr Macleod. Is it marvellous, therefore, if the effect was what he represents it to have been? and is it strange that he should resent the conduct of the Royal College towards himself and his Homœopathic brethren? Was it possible that such teaching could command the respect of young men of intelligence and reflection, who were anxious to ascertain what is the truth—who were averse to walking in the dark, while performing deeds connected with death and life, and whose honourable spirits revolted at the thought of practising on the credulity of mankind? Dr Macleod next inquires of the President of the Royal College of Physicians, What is likely to be the effect of the ukase on the country? and on this point he sets forth a series of thoughts which are worthy the attention of all whom the matter concerns:—

"In the first place, what effect can follow from the resolutions, on minds already favourably disposed towards the denounced doctrines? Let us notice how Homœopathy now stands, and the nature of its hold on opinion. Has it been accepted only by the ignorant? Is it professed only by quacks and impostors? Let not the college be deceived. Our leaders should not shut their eyes to the fact, that the system in question is assented to by thinkers as enlightened and acute as any in this age, and that its disciples are not of the multitude. Is a man like Bunsen, for instance, or Archbishop Whately, or, indeed, any one who can probe more than skin-deep, likely to be deceived by the superficial but meaningless unanimity of that ballot-box? The list of its professional cultivators, too, notoriously contains the names of as reputable and instructed physicians as

any in Europe. Not one solitary practitioner, I believe, will that unhappy decree turn from his course; nor will it shake the faith of a single patient who has tested the system by experience. Then, again, as to the general public. Is it not the most probable result of a simple authoritative decree like the one we are considering, that it will rather rouse prejudice against it? Those tales of futile and frequent exactions of this sort, in former times, are rife enough to reach and fill the general ear; and, on the face of present circumstances, there is nothing peculiar, nothing to satisfy any one that the old blunder has not been repeated. The decree, I have said, is simple and unattended. It is an utterance from authority regarding certain matters still under inquiry; and it is nothing more. It is unaccompanied by any effort at persuasion, or by the faintest promise of service in the way of clearing up existing difficulties. One great, one inestimable service, the College might have rendered; nor is it yet too late. It is a service, likewise, in perfect harmony with our English idiosyncrasy, which, as I have said, is averse to generalisation. I refer to the establishment of a great hospital, wherein the operations of the new system of cure might be seen and examined by all; furnishing alike to the student and advanced practitioner the only true means of reaching correct judgment on a matter of paramount professional as well as public concern."

Here it comes out—the facts were known before—that his excellency Chevalier Bunsen and Archbishop Whately have embraced the Homœopathic doctrine, and in them we have two of the most enlightened men of the age—the one of the church, the other of the world—the avowed disciples of the system which has been denounced by the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh.

Nor is this all; there can be adduced the names of 3000 practitioners, very many of them of the first mark in Europe, and not a few chief professors of the universities,

and physicians in the courts of kings. But a Bunsen and a Whately in our own country are but types of a numerous class of educated men who entertain similar views. Amongst that class will be found, the Duke of Hamilton, the Earl of Wilton, Lord Robert Grosvenor, Principal Scott, of Owen's College, Manchester, the Marquis of Anglesea, and Richard Cobden. What Dr Macleod calls the "decree" is, in our judgment, not simply idle—it is foolish. No men of sense would think the less of the system, and the multitude will think of it all the more. Persecution is always patronage amongst Englishmen. We reiterate our oft-repeated suggestion—a point to which we are happy to find Dr Macleod referring—that the question is not to be settled by mere authority. The professors of the new system appeal to facts, and on the ground of facts they must be met. We have said we laugh at the globule, but we are rendered serious by the contemplation of the facts, numerous and well-attested, which are from time to time coming before us. On this point, we have been alike amused and pleased to find that most able man and distinguished physician, the late Dr Combe, as quoted, using the very words used by ourselves, in former articles: his high science and our mere common sense conducted us respectively to the same conclusion. The Homœopathists are in earnest; they clearly believe their own doctrine, and they are rapidly placing themselves in a position which will bring matters to an issue. They have already, in London, two hospitals, both in full operation, which are open to the visitation of the general public and the whole Medical Faculty; while, from period to period, the results are being published to the wide world. It is, we contend, but just to give them a fair hearing. In the face of England they stand forth in the capital, and say, "Send us patients labouring under every malady known to human nature, and we undertake to deal with them on Homœopathic principles, and to produce effects more satisfactory,

and, for mankind, far more beneficial, than have hitherto been realised from Allopathic practice." Can anything be more rational, more candid, more decisive? But we must give the closing paragraph of the letter, which constitutes a personal appeal to the President of the College of Physicians, who appears to have been one of Dr Macleod's college companions and early friends:—

"Concerning your own action in these recent deliberations, I know positively nothing; but I shall not question the sympathy of one who has never been blamed for resisting novelties himself; who has perhaps introduced more serious and startling courses of practice than any other contemporary British physician; who is certainly not bound by formulæ of colleges, but, on the contrary, who has ventured, on the strength of his own will and resources, to walk all but singly along a most perilous path. Recollections of former times also re-assure me. Were I to arrange and compute the value of their influences, I know not—if I have erred—how far I might not plead in palliation *Te Duce*. You have not forgotten that small room, approached by the long passage, where our lamented friend, Dr John Reid, once lived and studied. Free speech was there, free thoughts, and criticism unchecked. Youth passes, and with it many dreams and impulses. We think, when we begin, that we are to storm the world, but, alas! the world too often storms us. Many find it safest to capitulate, and permit themselves to be sold. Still, all these early impulses are not foolish. For myself, I would cherish, as before, fair hopes of success and auspicious fortune; but, foremost, that old and firm resolve, to remain, whatever betide, by honesty and intellectual independence."

These solemn words form a meet conclusion to this very able epistle, by which the College of Physicians, of the orthodox system, have gained nothing—Dr Macleod and the Homœopaths a great deal. The pamphlet will prove

a valuable advertisement to both; and we vouch for it, no man, with a fair portion of intelligence, can read the letter with care and candour, without forming a favourable opinion both of the writer and of his subject, and without concluding that he has made out a sufficient case for further inquiry. Let this be granted, and we ask no more; for we repeat, in conclusion, that all we ask is justice, and that we, the British people, have the deepest interest in the question; and we have every reason to be dissatisfied by the conduct of the established practitioners in attempting by mere authority to suppress the new system. We shall return to the subject.

THE BRIGHTON PROTEST ANALYSED.

Resolutions passed by the Provincial Medical and Surgical Association, at a meeting held at Brighton on 14*th August*, 1851.

"1. That it is the opinion of this association, that Homœopathy, as propounded by Hahnemann and practised by his followers, is so utterly opposed to science and common sense, as well as so completely at variance with the experience of the medical profession, that it ought to be in no way or degree practised or countenanced by any regularly-educated medical practitioner.

"2. That Homœopathic practitioners, through the press, the platform, and the pulpit, have endeavoured to heap contempt upon the practice of medicine and surgery, as followed by members of this association, and by the profession at large.

"3. That, for these reasons, it is derogatory to the honour of members of this association to hold any kind of professional intercourse with Homœopathic practitioners.

"4. That there are three classes of practitioners who ought not to be members of this association, namely: first, real Homœopathic practitioners; second, those who practise Homœopathy in combination with other systems of treatment; and third, those who, under various pretences, meet in consultation, or hold professional intercourse with those who practise Homœopathy.

"5. That a committee of seven be appointed to frame laws in accordance with these resolutions, to be submitted to the next annual meeting of the association.

"6. That the thanks of the association are eminently due, and are hereby given, to the Presidents and Fellows of the Royal Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons of Edinburgh, for their determined stand against Homœopathic delusions and impostures.

"7. That the thanks of the association are also due, and are hereby given, to the Universities of Edinburgh and St Andrews for their resolution to refuse their diplomas to practitioners of Homœopathy; but the association feels imperatively called on to express its disapproval of any school of medicine which retains among its teachers any one who holds Homœopathic opinions.

"8. That these resolutions be printed, and transmitted to all the medical licensing bodies and medical schools in the United Kingdom; and that they likewise be inserted in the "Times" newspaper, the "Morning Post," the "North British Advertiser," "Saunders's News Letter," all the British and Irish medical periodicals, and in such other journals as the council may sanction, upon the recommendation of the branch associations."

The prefixed resolutions, embodying the collective wisdom, we are told, of 300 medical practitioners, and much praised by the medical journals, seem to require few comments from us. At the same time, we might be blamed for arrogance, were we merely to proclaim dissent, without stating the grounds of it, from the deliberate judgment and conclusions of so large a number of our professional brethren. We are the rather called on for reasons of dissent that reasons of affirmation are offered by these resolutionists, who in this respect differ from some other bodies which have spoken on the subject. We are aware, too, that we should be doing great injustice to so numerous and influential a society, were we not to take it for granted that the

reasons thus publicly alleged for the position its members have resolved to assume in future towards ourselves, and all others of the medical profession who adopt to any extent the Homœopathic system, are in truth the best reasons that can be alleged. Taking this view, we feel it our duty in a few sentences to propose, *seriatim*, with all becoming modesty, for the consideration of our readers, what remarks occur to us on these resolutions.

And generally we observe, that in these, as in all the other recent fulminations against Homœopathy (so far as they have come under our notice), we have to complain of the want of due precision. Homœopathy is *eo nomine* condemned, and its practitioners are denounced; but what conception the word Homœopathy represents in the minds of those who have been accustomed to use it as a stigma, and not as a definition, we have no means of discovering. That they regard it as something to be abhorred and avoided, is plain enough; but that they have any distinct notion of the peculiarities and characteristics which distinguish it from all other doctrines and practices in medicine which are likewise to be abhorred and avoided, does not appear in these resolutions, which imply no knowledge of Homœopathy, except that the system so named was propounded by Hahnemann. Accordingly, no attempt is made to distinguish between things so widely apart as the *similar* law and the infinitesimal doses, even with a view to their separate condemnation. With every anxiety to do full justice to all our opponents, even to the most virulent and unreasonable of them, we must observe, that these indefinite denunciations expose those who make use of them to this remark, that they appear far more anxious to burn their brothers and rivals the heretics, than for the sake of truth to extinguish the heresy. Had this been their pure object and motive, they would, no doubt, have felt it necessary to be much more explicit; to show in what precise respects the system was untrue which they were condemn-

ing; thus using means to reclaim those whom now they only persecute. In popular journals such indefiniteness might be pardoned, but not in the solemn resolutions of a medical and surgical association, and we must request our readers to keep in view throughout the following remarks this radical pervading vice.

I. If Homœopathy be "utterly opposed to science and common sense," its vitality is very inexplicable. One or other it might be and yet live; but not both. Popular beliefs may be opposed to scientific truth; the discoveries of science may seem opposed to common sense, and yet be largely received and credited; but here we are told is a doctrine equally opposed to both, and yet, as we know, and as these resolutions imply, widely believed, practised, and rested on. Our next remark is, that, in stating Homœopathy to be opposed to "common sense," the resolutionists appeal to the popular judgment on the matter; a tribunal of which the medical journals have lately affected to speak with great contempt. Having already with us so many persons distinguished for scientific attainments, and for the possession of an uncommon measure of common sense, we shall wait, with hope and patience, for the mature popular verdict.

We are further told that Homœopathy is "completely at variance with the experience of the medical profession." This reminds us of Hume's argument against miracles: he said they were contrary to general experience, the truth being that they are beyond it; general experience not embracing the conditions under which they profess to appear. So of the curative effects of infinitesimal quantities of medicine given in accordance with the similar law, it may be truly said, that they are *beyond* the general experience of the medical profession; it cannot be truly said that they are in any respect *contrary* to it. There is no doubt a very general experience of the effects of medicinal agents, given neither according to the Homœopathic law, nor in minute

quantities; there is a more limited experience of their effects when administered in accordance with the Homœopathic law, but in large quantities; there may be some experience of the impotency of infinitesimal quantities given otherwise than according to the Homœopathic law; but with what show of truth can it be said that there is any general experience of the effects of minute quantities, given in accordance with the Homœopathic law, unfavourable to such administration? On this point we refer our readers to Hahnemann's "Medicine of Experience."

In conclusion, on the first resolution we remark, that there are no tenable grounds for alleging Homœopathy to be opposed to science, or to common sense, or to medical experience; and that the contrary opinion of the Provincial Association is the unhappy consequence of prevailing ignorance on the subject thus rashly pronounced upon.

II. To the statement in the second resolution, we give a deliberate and explicit denial. It may be quite true that Homœopathic as well as other practitioners have spoken with disrespect of the existing general practice of medicine; and some of them may have done so indiscreetly and immoderately—following too closely the example of those who have aimed at overwhelming Homœopathy and its practitioners with obloquy; but that in extent or intensity the vituperative language retorted by the disciples of Hahnemann at all nearly equals that which the other members of the profession have directed against him and them, is obviously and ludicrously untrue. It is too plainly the wolf accusing the lamb. We cannot imagine which of our fellow practitioners are referred to as denouncing medicine from "the pulpit." Should any of them have been allowed to practise so irregularly, it is a matter for the bishops. That the most intemperate of Homœopathists has ever extended his condemnation to "surgery," we cannot believe, at any rate it is beyond all our experience; nor can we conceive any empirical rule for the administration of

drugs which can greatly affect the reduction of a dislocation, or the amputation of a limb, or any other of the principal operations of surgery.

On the other hand, we could quote examples without number from the writings of Homœopathists, evincing their high respect for medicine, which they have done so much to advance in some of its branches; but at present we must confine ourselves to one extract, and it shall be from a work which appeared some years ago under the hands of the editors of this journal; and on the testimony there borne to the great benefits of medicine, and the veneration due to the long line of its promoters, we still heartily concur.

"It has been asked, in the second place, If Homœopathy be true, how can the cures effected in the Allopathic system be accounted for? The very nature of the objection would have prevented our noticing it at all, did we not gladly embrace the opportunity of entering here a protestation: that we advocate Homœopathy as the best system of therapeutics we know of, but by no means as peremptorily exclusive and condemnatory of all others. That it is destined in the long run to work into methodical arrangement and harmonious simplicity the whole mass of facts and complex multitude of doctrines, which enrich and at the same time encumber the paths of medical science, must be the best cherished hope of all such as believe Homœopathy to be founded in nature and borne out by experience; but there is more than an objector's ingeniousness in this roundabout way of representing Homœopathists as laying a claim to the absurd character of healing monopolists; or it requires more than a child's simplicity really to suppose that, should Hahnemann's system be true, the cures of Allopathy become a sphynx's riddle, past Œdipus's finding out. The glories of medicine, of Allopathic medicine, stand recorded in Time's book, whose leaves are centuries, whose characters are the

doings and sufferings of mankind; universal conscience and universal gratitude bear witness to its beneficial working from the remotest ages down to the present generation. With feelings of reverence do we look to the past; tradition and authority are both venerable, though neither infallible in our eyes. We defend our cause, and only turn aggressors, in so far as self-defence renders it necessary; we demand the liberty of opinion and the right of choice that we respect in others; we put in a claim for admission into the academical pale, in behalf of a system which professes to court whatever severest ordeal and scrutiny may be imposed upon it, as the condition of its right of citizenship; we long to inscribe a new glory in the annals of the science, whose humble but conscientious votaries we are, and to add a new boon—a new blessing—to those that medicine, through every succeeding generation, has bestowed upon suffering humanity. But who ever presumed to mark out the boundaries of medical industry and success? Is there not an infinitude of possible lines between two points, although the shortest be but one? Or did our objector never bethink himself that something analogous possibly attaches to the Allopathic system, wherein notorious differences of speculative and practical views in eminent men are far from being constantly attended by a corresponding disproportion in the ultimate results? There is as much ground for being sore puzzled at sailing vessels having crossed, and crossing, the Atlantic, because steamers now do so at an increased rate of velocity."—"Introduction to the Study of Homœopathy."—(Pp. 15-17.)

III. This resolution professes to be based on the preceding ones, stating the conclusion to which they have led. We have already shown, we believe to the satisfaction of all candid readers, how utterly groundless are the statements in the former resolutions; and with these foundations must also perish this superstructure. But even were

it otherwise, could it have been alleged with any truth that the Homœopathic practice is unscientific and senseless, and that its adherents are distinguished even in their profession for speaking with contempt of other modes of practice than their own; still even these grave faults will not justify such a schism as the resolutions propose to enforce. It is quite plain that any blame justly attaching to the disciples of Hahnemann, upon such grounds, rests also upon many of their opponents, and the disastrous effect of carrying out to its logical consequences such a system of excomunication will be to split up the body of medical practitioners into a congeries of isolated individual atoms.

IV. The next resolution needs no answer. It exhibits the extremity of professional hostility against Homœopathy; for it excludes not only those who are themselves tinged with the heresy, but all who, even from charity and large-heartedness, have any intercourse with the heretics.

VI. We beg leave to concur in a vote of thanks to any who shall appear to have made a "determined stand against Homœopathic delusions and impostures," which none can be more anxious to put an end to than ourselves; but we are at a loss to discover in what respects either of the Edinburgh Colleges has merited such an honourable distinction.

VII. It will surely be time enough for the Provincial Association to tender its thanks "to the Universities of Edinburgh and St Andrews for their resolution to refuse their diplomas to practitioners of Homœopathy," when they shall have so resolved respectively. Hitherto the governing body of the University of Edinburgh has shown no inclination whatever to countenance the late irregular proceedings of its Faculty of Medicine; and of St Andrews, we do not yet know that the recent doings there, with reference to Homœopathy, have any authority but what is derived from the autocratic fiat of the professor of all medicine in that remarkable school.

Having now laid before our readers these resolutions, with our comments upon them, we leave the matter to their judgment; confidently expecting their concurrence in this conclusion, That we have great reason to congratulate ourselves that the most pleadable reasons which can be alleged in justification of the recent proceedings against us are so illogical, insignificant, and untenable.

A LETTER

ADDRESSED TO

DR ROSE CORMACK.*

"Not all the coronets and mitres in England can give dignity to an error, or transform a lie into a truth; and, layman though I be, I hesitate not to proclaim in this public Christian assembly that the sermon (Mr Everest's) from which I have quoted is replete with quackery, heresy, and impious doctrine."... (Dr Cormack's Speech at the Brighton Anti-Homœopathic Congress.)

Sir,—A friend has just placed in my hands the "Medical Times" of Saturday, August 16, containing a report of a speech made by you at Brighton last week to the Medical and Surgical Association, in which you refer to a sermon published by me some months ago. I beg to return you my most cordial thanks for it. I can assure you very sincerely that I take it as a very kind thing of you to do. That sermon was falling into what I am to suppose you agree with me in thinking to be most unmerited oblivion. You have generously advertised it for me all over the world without putting me to any expense; and I must be allowed to say, I think this is very handsome conduct on the part of one who differs decidedly from my views. I was in some perplexity to make my sentiments known, and you descend, the *Deus ex machinâ,* and relieve me.

The great satisfaction I feel at having my sermon thus resuscitated and brought under the notice of so respectable a meeting, is certainly somewhat qualified by the language you apply to me and it. Not that I object to being abused

---

* By the Rev. Thomas R. Everest, Rector of Wickwar. London: William Headland.

—quite the contrary—by an Allopathic doctor; but there is a melancholy reflection connected with you, sir, and that is that you are the son of a clergyman! Naughty words must have been very cheap where you came from, sir, for you have laid in an elegant assortment of them, and I presume there are "plenty more to be had at the same shop: country orders executed with diligence and despatch." But where can you possibly have learned such naughty words? "Blasphemy," "impiety," "lie," "heresy," "quackery"—in what filthy pool did you find all this mud? I am not much in the habit of seeing your medical journals, and so perhaps it may be only my innocence that causes me to wonder at it, for it may possibly be all normal and correct there; but I do know something of the "interior" of clergymen's families; and indeed I must confess not to have, as yet, heard any such words there. Alas! sir, it is another of the charges against the dreadful art in which you have been initiated, that the education necessary for it and the studies preliminary to it harden the heart and petrify the feelings. How sad it is to reflect that perhaps there was a time when you, sir, were an ingenuous youth, who, educated by a pious father and gentle mother in the faith and fear of God, were accustomed to hear of that blessed charity which thinketh no evil, and taught to restrain thy tongue from speaking it. Alas! alas! sir, the atmosphere of Allopathy does not suit these soft plants. Anatomy, dissection, and their kindred studies have changed many an amiable man into—something that I decline to characterise, and will not imitate. I will practise towards you, sir, that which I see in those sons of clergymen who are brought up as clergymen, and which has not been quenched in me by learning Homœopathy. I pity and forgive you.

I have, however, a few words to say to you. Permit me to begin them by telling you a short story. Once upon a time, it is said, there lived in Dorsetshire an eccentric old

farmer whose name was Cawse. The rooks used to give the old man a great deal of annoyance, alighting on his wheat-fields and committing great havoc there; but he was rather indolent, and bore the annoyance as patiently as he could for some time. At last, one morning the rooks had gone what the Irish call "beyand the beyant," and Farmer Cawse could stand it no longer; so he seized an old gun, crept slily along the hedge, and fired, not at any individual among them, for he was a humane man, but "promiscuously into the lot," as he said. The rooks rose as one bird, cawing very loudly, on which the farmer was heard to say with great exultation, "Ah! Cawse! Cawse! indeed. Thee mayst call me what names thee do plaze, thee mischievous rascals, it do do my heart good to hear thee, vor I do learn vrom thy chattering as I have peppered zum on ye, and vrightened all the rest."

You will say, perhaps, sir, that the story is a stupid one, and quite out of place here. It may be so; I will not defend it. You say I am everything that is base and bad and vile and shocking. I am very sorry for it, and hope I may mend by and by. You say the Homœopathic doctors are quacks and impostors. Let it be granted. And you say that all the archbishops, bishops, peers, members of parliament, clergy, and, in short, all those who believe in Homœopathy—who you tell us are many in number—are knaves and fools. Very well, sir. I will concede to you, if you like, that all those children born into the world who may be suspected by their mothers' vigilant obstetric attendants of any leaning to Homœopathy in the *paulo post futurum* state, should have their necks twisted in infancy, so that Allopathy may have a chance of being left at peace. But we cannot bring about this same desirable wringing of necks. And there is a great public, which cares neither for you nor me, and merely says, when it reads your well-flavoured philippic, "Pooh! it's only another case of 'Farmer Cawse!' the doctors abusing those who have

been peppering and frightening them." Don't you think, sir, you would produce more effect on this great inert public, if, instead of calling me names, you were to do that which you have been taunted, provoked, and dared to do, over and over again for forty years past, and which I now again dare you to do; that is, publish an account of the experiments you have made with Homœopathic medicines on Homœopathic principles?

You have delivered yourself of a very bitter invective against Homœopathy and me. I think it is but fair play that I in my turn should be allowed to deliver myself of a few pages of common sense against your art and you. It is not a fair match, it is true; for mere idle abuse goes for little, as the case of Goliath of Gath shows—a history which you, sir, being the son of a clergyman, have no doubt read, though without being much edified by it as it would seem. But I did not provoke the match. If Allopathy receives any damage, you are responsible, sir; I wash my hands of it altogether.

Suppose I am taken suddenly ill in London, far away from our "medical man;" if the art you profess has any certainty in it, there ought to be one normal mode of treatment, one correct mode, and one only—and all who deviate from that must be wrong. Is there such a normal mode of treatment, sir? You know the contrary. You know that the treatment I get depends on mere chance. Dr This will put me into cold water, Dr That into hot; Dr Somebody will prescribe bleeding, Dr Otherbody orders calomel. The Green Door is for mild aperients, the Yellow Door for tonics and bracing. This side of the way compounds forty medicines into one dose; the other side of the way says all medicine is humbug, and gives you bread pills. Dr East says you must be lowered; Dr West says you must have "good sound sherry, sir, and mutton chops." In short, take the twenty "medical fellows" that live nearest you, and you shall find twenty professors of the same art

all professing different views, urging each of them a different practice, founded on opposing hypotheses and irreconcilable theories. Every doctor has a pet system of his own, and is, in the eyes of himself and his whole circle, infallible; and the law covers the whole set of contradictory systems with its broad ægis. Once give a man a DEGREE, and the law then canonises all he does: if he bleeds, pronounces it to be right to bleed; if he forbears to bleed, says that bleeding was not necessary; protects him if he gives calomel; protects him if he eschews and abhors it; protects him if he burns your skin off, or scalds it off, or blisters it off, or leaves it on; protects him if he gives tonics; protects him if he gives aperients; protects him if he gives drastic purges; protects him if he gives "good old sherry, you understand, and mutton chops;" protects senna infusion, castor oil, strychnine or bark, taraxacum, cod-liver oil. Caprice rules the destiny of the sick. Chance is your only certainty. You know nothing of what treatment you are to meet with if you consult a doctor, save only that it depends entirely on the individual into whose hands you may fall, and that the law will protect him whatever he may do! Doctors differ; and if so, common sense says, "some of them must be wrong;" but the law says, No! all are right. Whether it be Dr A, who holds one set of opinions, or Dr B, who holds the diametrically opposite ones, or Dr C, who has nothing in common with either of them—no matter! What each does is right. Whatever great man is called in, and whatever great system he follows when he is called in, he acts exactly as nature intended he should act.

Now, sir, you can hardly expect us much longer to put up patiently with this sort of confusion. A sick man does not want theories, neither does he much interest himself to hear Dr Pshaw call Dr Pooh an ignorant man. Your patient wants certainty. He wants this—that, go where he will, apply to whom he will, when he is ill he shall get,

for the same symptoms, the same remedy. And has he not a right to expect it at your hands, sir? And has he not a right to be dissatisfied if Dr Greendoor orders him one system, Dr Yellowdoor another system, and Dr Bluedoor a third system? May he not reply, "Gentlemen, gentlemen, I want that medicine which is a specific, or the nearest to it, for my pains and aches; spare me your theories."

Permit me now, sir, to reason a little further with you.

Whoever will turn an attentive and inquiring eye to the ways and works of that Almighty Creator in whom we live and move and have our being, as far as he in his great wisdom and mercy has permitted us poor blind mortals to see of them, cannot fail to be struck very early in the study by this fact—that in all his dealings with his creation he operates by general fixed laws, equally applicable, when the circumstances are similar, to all times, climes, and cases. Matter tends to matter, for instance, so far as we know, all over the universe, by a law, the expression of which is the same everywhere; that is, that the force varies inversely as the square of the distance. The laws of motion, as discovered by Newton, atomic attraction, chemical combinations, the expansion of steam, electrical phenomena, all reveal to us the same fact—all show us the mighty "I am that I am," developing his glorious works on harmonious and fixed principles, acting according to certain definite and fixed laws, and laying down, for the governance of his vast works, certain positive and settled rules: so settled are they, that we call them laws of nature. Not that we suppose the Almighty to be bound by laws, but that the tendency to order in the Divine operations is so strong, that when once a principle has been adopted it is not departed from; indeed this would seem to belong to that all-truthfulness which is an attribute of the Deity. Ignorant human nature might err as to the advisability of certain principles, and suppose one to be better to-day, another to-morrow. Not so the All-seeing, All-truthful

Deity! Seeing at one glance all possible combinations and events, the Deity has decided at once on that principle which, *for* them all and *in* them all, is the wisest and the best! He does not operate as the blind Pagan supposed his lubberly Jupiter to act, by fits and starts, now in a rage, now in a hurry, now in a jest—locally, partially, fortuitously, irregularly. No! the Christian's God, as revealed in the Bible and as read in his works, acts ever on one gigantic uniform plan, by means of serious, permanent, universal, abiding wisdom: unerring, unchanging, developing its acts and workings in general laws generally diffused over the whole universe. Particular and isolated phenomena are, then, in reality comprehensible under, and the result of, one of those laws, and derivable from it if we possessed the general expression or formula of it. And every art, moreover, which man has discovered and practises is founded on this assumption; for they all depend on certain laws of nature, and on the certainty that those laws of nature, once discovered, remain invariable as long as the circumstances and conditions of them remain invariable. Your dyer mixes his colours in their fixed and due proportion; unless some new term has been introduced into the equation, the resulting hue is the same to a shade that it was a century ago. Your steam-boat crosses the Atlantic to an hour, your engine bites its way along your rail to a second, your rifle-ball falls truly within the bull's-eye at a hundred yards, your shell with a given charge strikes the flagstaff at a mile—because the laws that regulate the expansion of steam and powder, and the falling of bodies, vary not. Your sailor sets his fortunes and his life on the steadiness of the needle, and is not deceived; your merchant trusts to the electric telegraph a message, which, if wrongly sent, might ruin him: in short, turn where you like, you find God's laws sure and from everlasting to everlasting, and man never deceived when he trusts to them. Heaven and earth may pass away, but his Word

and his laws will never pass away!—no, nor vary, nor alter, nor swerve, nor fail, nor diminish, nor increase, nor decay, nor deceive! And let us clearly understand this fact, that every one of our necessaries, comforts, luxuries, appliances, appurtenances, or usages—all we enjoy, admire, employ, use, do, or have—is owing to our having, by more or less labour, investigated certain of the laws which God has ordained, and placed ourselves in the condition to benefit by their operation. Some of these laws are obvious, and have been investigated and applied in the very early ages of the world; others during the career of the generations of man; others more lately; thousands more remain no doubt to be discovered, and each, as it is discovered, to be applied so as to advance the happiness of man, and speed the march of civilisation. For man, in the rudest state of society, makes but few of these laws subservient to his purpose; in the most advanced state, many. And whenever and wherever man wishes for certainty, improvement, social or industrial progress, or indeed physical amelioration of any sort, he can find it (out of God's revealed Word) nowhere, and by no means other than by applying his mind to collect *facts* in sufficient quantity to furnish him with indications from which to deduce the general expression of the law, that is, the general formula which embraces and applies to the case in question.

In one branch of human knowledge alone, amidst all those to which these observations apply, is this plan not followed. I repeat that there is but one single branch of human learning, in any way connected with the laws of God, in any way referring to, or relating practically to, or bearing on man's comfort, in which this plan is not followed, and never has been followed, and there, of course, everything is dark, pathless, unintelligible, and uncertain. I speak, of course, of the *law of cure of disease.* What is the law of cure? What is the formula for it? What is

the general expression for it? Is there no such thing? From the highest point to which balloon ever reached, fling forth a stone into space, and I will give you an expression by which you may find its place to a foot at any moment of its fall. $S=m\ T^2$. So the Almighty does his work! Now, Dr Rose Cormack, how do you do yours? Produce your rule!

All the winds of heaven once careered across the Atlantic Ocean in confusion and lawlessness; cross gusts, opposing currents, conflicting storms—there never was such a scene of wild and inextricable disorder as was presented by a West India hurricane. There were calms and the most destructive storms within a few miles of each other. Here, beyond the power of language to convey, the tempest raged and roared, and tore to pieces the noblest vessels that by misfortune fell within its sphere, while, within an easy distance, old tubs of colliers lay like logs on the waveless sea, and spread all their flying kites in vain to catch a breeze. Since the day when Æolus hurled his spear against the prison of the winds, and let out at once all the breezes, there never was more confusion; and many generations of stolid captains of merchantmen, and smart men-of-war's men, too, tied on their sou'-westers, in the full conviction that God had made no way for escape out of all this wilderness of winds. At last there came a man! and he began to collect facts and compare them. He learned the direction in which trees fell during the coming and during the passing typhoon; he got ships' logs in numbers; he traced their courses on his maps; he found the contemporaneous position of many; he found how the wind took them, and how it left them; and, after years of patient exploration, he enunciated the expression of the law of storms which God had laid down:—"Storms advance turning on their axes as they go." And now the heaviest captain among them knows how to trim his sails so as not only to escape destruction, but even

to convert the once-dreaded hurricane into a favourable breeze.

So works the Almighty; and so can genius, from the very midst of chaos and confusion, get the clue to it all. And then we find that all that we "fools and blind" thought was interminable and inextricable disturbance, is in reality fixed order, which cannot be disturbed, and is so certain, that it may be expressed in a general formula applicable to all cases.

And now, Dr Rose Cormack, where is your formula? We have got it for every art but yours. Produce it. I challenge you to do so. Is it blister everybody? Certainly not; you burn some, and scald others. Is it salivate the universe with calomel? No, sir, that was once almost your law in the good old Abernethian days, and it may be so still in the country; but it is assuredly given up wherever the light of knowledge has dawned. Is it, "Always purge everybody?" Purgamus agros purgamus agrestes? Not quite; though the practice (which has nothing to recommend it but its antiquity and facility of application) is in many places pretty general. Is it "Bleed all mankind?" Those days, too, are passed. The patients died under their cure so often that the practice could not be maintained, and only lingers now amongst plethoric oxen, farmers, labourers, and fatting calves.

What, have you no law of cure, then? no general formula to embrace all cases? nothing to enunciate at all? What! have all the years since Hermes Trismegistus not availed to communicate to you the general expression for the law which the Lord has laid down to regulate the application of medicine to malady? Do you really and truly suppose that *here*, and *here only*, man is sent to sea without a compass? Shall a body projected near the earth always describe a parabola? Shall comets pass away into outward darkness and measureless space, and yet return, like a playful child gambolling round its parent? Shall the

falling meteor's path be laid down on a line of iron from which it may not swerve by one hair's-breadth? Through all the mazes of the moon's devious track, shall the very moment of the greatest obscuration during an eclipse be predicted a thousand years beforehand—yes, and the people to whom it shall be visible? Shall the very eccentricities of the wild whirlwind be found to follow a definite method in their capricious perverseness? Shall, in one word, the eye of God find wherever it rests *adorable order and unswerving harmony,* excepting only in one place—and there *cure be left to chance-medley?*

Rest assured, sir, that God hath not forgotten to be gracious. There is laid down by Infinite Goodness for man's use a clear, positive, distinct, and definite formula for the administration of medicines. That the professors of the art have not found it, is quite true; that the madge owlet knows as much of the quadrature of the circle as they do of that law, is quite true; they missed it as the cuckoo missed the nightingale's song, that is, because he went on saying, "Cuckoo! cuckoo! did you ever hear such a clever cuckoo, cuckoo?" for ever, and drowned all other notes in his own foolish noise.

But a man has lately died, sir, whose profound wisdom has discovered this law of which we have been speaking, and has enunciated it in such a general expression as includes, when the necessary corrections are applied, all possible cases of disease, so as to render the cure of them simple and easy. You and your friends abuse that man as much and as often as you can; but I can assure you, that if you or they had been acquainted with him you would speak otherwise of him. You never spoke to him or heard him or saw him probably. I lived on terms of the greatest intimacy and friendship with him for several years. Reserved to most people, to me he was communicative; and I believe very few people indeed have ever enjoyed so many opportunities of knowing Hahnemann

thoroughly as I have. Well, sir, I who did know him well tell you, who did not know him at all, that he was perhaps the most amiable, virtuous, conscientious, high-principled man that ever lived. I speak not of his vast genius, his wonderful stores of reading, his prodigious memory: his writings will best say what he was in these respects; and if you will condescend to read them you may judge for yourself. But I know him, besides, to have been the most honourable, noble, benevolent, and truth-loving man, perhaps, that ever lived. And having thus borne my testimony to his character, I will next, with your permission, proceed to tell you how he happened to discover this law of cure. His father, sir, had, as he himself often told me, brought him up to love the truth above all things in this world, and was continually inculcating on him this maxim, "Never take anything for granted, nor receive anything in any science as a truth, until you have investigated it for yourself." I have no doubt, from my own knowledge of Hahnemann, that he readily enough imbibed the maxim. After having passed through the usual studies with great credit to himself, he took his degree, and began to practise as a medical man. "It soon struck me," he has said to me, "that I was called on to admit, in the practice of medicine, a great deal that was not proved. If I was called to attend a patient, I was to collect his symptoms, and next to infer from those symptoms that a certain internal condition of the organs existed, and then to select such a remedy as the medical authorities asserted would be useful under such circumstances. But it is very evident that the argument is most inconclusive, and that room was thus left for many serious errors, and so I determined to investigate the whole matter for myself from the very beginning." It was in the midst of poverty, in one little room which contained his whole family, in a corner, separated from the rest of them by a curtain, under every discouragement, and with a hungry family to maintain by

hard drudgery in the intervals of his own investigations, that he set himself to his task. It may perhaps give you a better idea of the man himself, if I mention that, when I once asked him why he smoked, he replied, "Oh! it's an idle habit, contracted when I had to sit up every other night in order to get bread for my children, while I was pursuing my own investigations by day." I then learned, on farther inquiry, that, having resigned his practice as a medical man, he was compelled to earn a living by translating for the booksellers, and had, to enable him to continue his investigations, adopted the plan of sitting up the whole of every other night. I think, sir, you will say that he will find admirers, perhaps, but few imitators. And now, sir, will you permit me to discuss awhile those investigations, so cautiously undertaken, so anxiously pursued through so many laborious years, uncheered by one single mark of approval from any one of the thousands of his profession. They cried then, as you and your meeting cry now, "Delusion! delusion!" Ay, sir, the delusion of yesterday is becoming the faith of to-day, and that which your predecessors mocked at, and you storm at, is become to millions as necessary as the air they breathe.

Now do you know at all, sir, the manner in which this most able and cautious man set himself to work to investigate the general expression for the law of cure? Why, he studied the severe philosophy of Bacon, and from it he learned to accumulate facts and discard theories. He found the art of cure entangled in all kinds of hypotheses —hypotheses of which each age saw many rise, become fashionable, and die, to give place to new ones. He found there was no basis of certainty for any theory or opinion, so he rejected the whole useless mass, and determined to have no theory at all.

The world has been so often informed of the manner in which he began his discoveries, that I presume it has

reached even yourself; yet suffer me to refer to it once more; it may not be altogether without profit,

Dr Cullen had just published some accounts of the extraordinary cures of various kinds of ague by cinchona. The man whom you despise so much was employed in translating his work into German for the booksellers, for, having given up a profession which he could not conscientiously practise, he was very poor, and his thoughts one day fell on the subjects he had been reading. He thought, "Why does this substance cure these maladies?" Alas! he could get no answer to the question; all was as dark before him as it must be to you, sir, at present. The question was dismissed from his mind, but in vain; it returned with renewed force. He procured some of the substance in question. He examined it, tasted it, weighed it; but there was still no answer. "The depth said, it is not in me to say; and the sea said, it is not in me." He took his hat, wandered forth alone, and meditated on the subject alone for hours, and all in vain. At length he thought, "A certain quantity of this inert-looking powder will make strong a man who is attacked with a certain sort of weakness, and arrest his periodical shivering and concomitant sufferings; will it make me stronger, I wonder, if I take it?" He began a course of it, and one evening, after having taken a quantity of it for several successive days, he was attacked with shivering and other symptoms of intermittent fever, attended with much weakness and loss of appetite. He stopped his daily doses; his fever went away, and health returned. He tried it many times, and invariably with the same or similar results.

Now, sir, observe, if you please, "fact the first." Cinchona gives a healthy man an intermittent fever, and cinchona cures intermittent fever in the sick. Do you think the mode of investigation adopted by Hahnemann was unphilosophical, incautious, untruthful? Then, sir, that is Homœopathy; and whenever you give quinine to the weak,

you go back to the very elements of the science, and adopt that very system which you abuse. And there is not one of you all who does not in this manner every day imitate the very man whose discoveries you ignore while you employ them. You are, one and all of you, Homœopathists, and you one and all practise Homœopathy, wherever you can; and nothing but your ignorance of the properties of those medicines which the law has empowered you to distribute prevents you all from practising pure Homœopathy in every instance where you are called in.

But the wise man whom you abuse did not stop here. He was not one to generalise too soon. He exhausted the powers of cinchona on the human frame by repeated experiments on himself and his family, and then set to work to repeat the same experiments with various other substances in succession. Do you think that in these laborious inquiries, in which his whole business was confined to collecting facts, he was acting like a charlatan or like a wise and cautious philosopher? You call him a charlatan —so do they all; and you and yours are no doubt all honourable men, if not very wise ones. But would not Bacon, if he were alive, say that he had chosen the only true path to discovery?

The result of all experiments made with all kinds of medicines in succession was simply this, that whatever irregularities of action (or symptoms) any substance whatever introduced in the healthy, those same symptoms it would invariably cure in the sick. The law of God comes out at once in bold relief.

LIKE SHOULD BE TREATED BY LIKE.

And is there not in the beautiful simplicity of the formula something that looks like truth? Is there not something truthful in the whole proceeding, from the first conception of the idea, through all the long and painful accumulation of facts, until the result of the whole is con-

densed into one expressive, comprehensive formula tersely enunciated, but embracing the whole range of medical science, and including every possible case? Sir, I appeal to you. Can you understand nature's language? Can you doubt whose hand it was that stamped creation with the indelible words, "Like cures like?"

Sir, there are two paths—two possible paths—but two possible, and no more, by which the application of remedies to disorders may be followed out. You have followed one of those paths; Hahnemann chose the other. His path was Facts, your path is Theory. He was a great philosopher, you are, I fear, a very small one. He was a wise man, a profound scholar in every branch of human learning, a very deep thinker, a most unwearied reader, and a most benevolent man. It is your misfortune, perhaps, sir, and not your fault, that you are none of these things. Permit me then to explain to you, and others like you, the difference between your system of medicine and his.

A medicine is merely a substance which, when received into the system, disturbs its working. A medicine is merely any agent which possesses the property of making a healthy man ill; and if advantage be taken of its disturbing powers, and they be rightly applied and directed, changes illness to health as it changes health to illness. You and your school proceed as follows to find out how those powers of disturbance are to be applied so as to produce order:—You visit a patient, you examine and inquire, and then you proceed to diagnosis; that is, to pronounce that certain internal changes, whether organic or functional, have occurred. This is theory the first; and it is open to all kinds of errors, and admits of the most grave objections. Having determined to your own satisfaction what nobody wants to know, that is, the nature of the change that has taken place, you proceed to give to that changed state a name. Herein is contained theory the second. Your attempt to name diseases is utter nonsense, for unless all the symptoms

are identical, two cases of disease cannot be identical. This theory also leads you all into interminable errors. And having got the name, you choose that remedy, or those remedies, which your respected predecessors in the art have said or taught should be given to such a name of disease. This is theory the third; and it is full of all sorts of fallacies, and is of itself quite sufficient to account for the miserable results of your practice—the many deaths, the few cures, the lingering cases.

Such is your system, sir. It stands like a milking-stool, on three legs; each leg is a mere theory, and a mistake in any one of your theories upsets the poor patient. Hahnemann followed a different plan. He collected the changes of which a patient complained, and chose that agent which produced similar changes in the healthy. If the doctor knows what that is, and will apply it in right doses, he has done all that medicine can be made to do. You have no law of cure at all. Tom told Dick, who handed it over to Harry, that cod-liver oil was good in phthisis! Jenkins informed Robinson, who told it to Brown, that he had heard from the celebrated Stiggins, that dandelion was a fine thing in dyspepsia! How can you go to sleep, Dr Rose Cormack, with such a miserable assortment of rubbish in your head? Is it in such terms as these that nature's laws are enunciated?

The consequences of all these childish hypotheses are most terrible. Medicine, or treatment, which has reference to an imaginary state, and it is imagined will be serviceable in that imaginary state, is prescribed in sad reality. Symptoms caused by that treatment ensue; the patient gets an accession of suffering; he sees and knows nothing of that magic relief so often communicated instantaneously by dynamic remedies when properly selected. No one can distinguish between the symptoms caused by disease and the symptoms caused by the doctor's treatment; the patient dies, or recovers after a long convalescence. But the wors

part of the story is quite unknown, which is this, that a treatment which has no reference to the complaint always sows the seeds of future malady; and he who might have passed his life without any need of medical aid, if he had never called in a doctor, having once had the misfortune to do so, imbibes disease from those hands at which he sought cure, and must call in a doctor again at some future day.

You seem to imagine, sir, that it is a sufficient answer to all these things to abuse me and call me naughty names. I tell you of facts. Try them, if you like, and give us the results. But how are these facts altered by calling him who speaks of them a naughty name? Do you think, sir, that by pelting with mud him who is sowing good seed, you can prevent that seed from germinating?

You *dare* do it, I have no doubt; indeed, why should you not? nobody minds your naughty names; the humble individual who is now addressing you the least of all. But there is one thing you dare not do; that is, make experiments to disprove Hahnemann's facts and deductions, and publish the results. THAT you dare no more try than you dare try conclusions with a locomotive.

I propose, at some future day, should God spare me, to address to you a second letter respecting chronic diseases and infinitesimal doses. I am sorry to say I am far too busy to do so just now. Permit me, however, to tell you another little story. Two boys, Smith and Thomson, went out to bathe; Thomson was unfortunately drowned while bathing. On Smith's return to school, his master reprimanded him severely for not having tried to save poor Thomson; on which Smith said, in a tone of virtuous indignation (much like that of your late speech), "Please, sir, I might perhaps have saved poor Thomson; but, if I had, I *must have lost my gallipot*, and where was I to get another, I should like to know?"

Now, sir, the human race shall not die uncured because your gallipot is in danger.

A few words more, and I have done. You may wish to know, perhaps, why I mix myself up in these matters. Believe me, when I tell you most sincerely, that it is not because I am ignorant of what I am likely to gain by it. Honour and emolument, patronage and praise, do not grow by the side of THIS route. Truth is like a stone set rolling down a steep; it crushes all those who oppose it, and many of those who are cheering it on its progress. Abuse during their lives, and a small amount of posthumous mention, is all that man ever awards to those who labour for truth; equally indifferent to each of them, I desire no better fate than has ever been awarded to such as myself. But the fact is, that, after having spent several years near Hahnemann, in habits of great intimacy with him, when I took my last leave of him before he died, I asked him what I could do to repay in any way all the kindness I had received from him, to show my gratitude for all the instruction he had given me, the truths he had taught me, the delightful hours I had passed in his society. He put his arms round my neck, and said, "Do as much good as you can to those amongst whom you live."

He died shortly afterwards, sir, and then I lost the best friend that man ever had. The great solemn truth he discovered, like a stone thrown into a lake, is spreading its ripples all over the world; and with some little practical knowledge of it, and not forgetting his last words to me, I endeavour, according to my opportunities and ability, to lend it such weak aid as I can. Amongst the poor of my own parish I find it very useful. I can cure, and do daily cure with it, and have, for these some years past, cured with it, diseases for which, with all respect to you, your poor conjectural art can do nothing at all. I have had many opportunities, through many years, of witnessing its beautiful action in all kinds of suffering and disorder, and I am constantly curing with those medicines, administered on Homœopathic principles, which you, who know nothing

of the matter, say are inert—disorders for which your art may have invented a name, but has discovered no remedy. Yes, sir, while you are speaking washy speeches against Hahnemann and me, I am sending away cured cases of disorder which your authorities declare to be incurable. For indeed there are few disorders incurable, excepting only such—and these I meet with, sir, pretty often—as are induced or perpetuated by the injudicious and improper administration of Allopathic medicines; and believing, as I most sincerely do, what is usually called Allopathy—even extensively as it has of late been modified and amended by the slow introduction of some of Hahnemann's principles into it—to be a most pernicious error, and most fatal to the well-being of man, I am not disposed to object to your speech. On the contrary, sir, I deprecate nothing from you but your conversion and co-operation. What I do fear from you gentlemen is not open antagonism, but forced conversion, to a grand science which your previous education has totally disqualified you from comprehending; an advocacy, from compulsion, of that which you do not love, which you cannot manage, and which you may stifle by embracing it though you cannot destroy by abusing it. There were magicians, it is said, in olden times, who could not conquer Christian knights in fair open warfare, but by entertaining them, and breathing on them, they changed them for a time to apes, satyrs, owls, and swine. Entertain Homœopathy, sir, and beneath your breath the sweetest of sciences will be changed probably into something that its discoverer would not recognise—a compound nondescript, combining all the errors of one system with all the difficulties of the other; resembling the new art in name, and the old one in doing good to nobody but the doctor. Meet it with the open warfare of argument and experiment, and you fall powerless and prostrate before it. Pelt it with plenty of mud, refuse degrees to those who wish to examine it, persecute it well—and in ten years more your

profession will be extinct. For in whatever corner you lock up the wisdom you may have acquired in your passage through life, add to the stores there this one little piece, I beg of you—if you medical men do not practise Homœopathy, non-medical men will. And if once you let that practice begin, indeed, sir, it will take a great many speeches to stop it.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

THOMAS R. EVEREST.

Wickwar, August 27, 1851.

We doubt much if Mr Everest, when he put his hypothetical case, illustrating how prone doctors are to differ, was aware that the fact had received a kind of numerical certainty through the endeavour of a whimsical old gentleman, of whom the following anecdote is related, from personal knowledge, by Dr. Hering, of Philadelphia:—

"Whilst travelling in Germany," says the doctor, "I one day came to a village, the proprietor of which invited me to spend the night at his house, in place of putting up at the inn. He was a rich old gentleman, a great original, always an invalid, having ennui and good wine to a great extent. Learning that I was a young medical man, about to commence my travels, he told me he would sooner make his son a hangman than a doctor. On my expressing surprise at the observation, he produced a large book, saying that it was now twenty years since he first became ill in body, but not in mind; that two doctors of celebrity, whom he then consulted, had quarrelled about his disease, and that, consequently, he had employed neither of them nor their medicines, but that he had registered the affair in his book. Then, after finding that the disease did not get better, he set out on his travels, resolved, *if he could find three doctors who perfectly agreed upon his case without any hesitation*, to allow himself to be treated by them; but

never by any other. For this purpose, he had consulted at first all physicians of any reputation, and afterwards others whose names were less known, but having, in spite of all his sufferings, never abandoned his first resolution, and keeping an exact account of every consultation in a book for the purpose, he never succeeded in finding any who agreed respecting his case. Accordingly, not having followed the advice of any, he still remained an invalid, but he was still alive. As may be well supposed, the book cost him a pretty sum of money.

"This book had the appearance of a ledger in large folio, and was kept in the form of tables. In the first column were the names of the physicians, amounting to 477; in the second, those of the disease, with explanations concerning its nature; of these, there were 313 differing importantly from each other; in the third column were the remedies proposed—these consisted of 832 prescriptions; containing in all 1097 remedies. The sum total appeared at the end of each page.

"He took up a pen, and said, coolly, 'Wont you prescribe something for me?' But having no great inclination to do so, I only asked if Hahnemann was not in his list. With a smile, he turned to No. 301, name of the disease O, remedy prescribed, O. 'That was the wisest of the lot,' he cried, 'for he said that the *name* of the disease did not concern him, and that the name of the remedy did not concern me, but that the cure was the essential point.' 'But why,' I inquired, 'did you not allow him to treat you?' 'Because,' he replied, 'he was but one, and I must have three who agree.'

"I asked him if he were willing to sacrifice some hundred francs for an experiment, in which case I should be able to mention not *three* but *thirty-three* physicians living in the neighbourhood, and in countries and parts of the world widely separate, who should all be of one opinion. He expressed his doubts, but at the same time resolved to

undertake the trial. We then made out a description of his disease, and, when the copies were finished, we sent them to thirty-three Homœopathic practitioners. He inclosed a louis d'or in each letter, begging each physician to name the remedies which were capable of curing, or at least of alleviating, his disease.

"A short time since I received a cask of Rhenish, of the vintage of 1822. 'I send you wine of the year 1822,' he wrote, 'because twenty-two physicians agreed respecting my case. I thereby perceive that there is certainty in some things in this world. I have got various works on the subject, in order to gain information upon it. Out of about two hundred medicines, twenty-two physicians have fixed upon the same remedy. One could not expect more. The physician nearest me has got me under his care, and I send you the wine that I may not be tempted to drink too much from joy at seeing my health improving from day to day.'"

THE EAST *versus* THE WEST.*

We have lately had many communications addressed to us on the subject of Homœopathy, and the practice of globular medicines and infinitesimal dosing, as it is called, but we refrained from using them, as we could not well understand the drift of the senders, and thought they were either deluded enthusiasts or ignorant charlatans. We have, however, altered our opinion somewhat on the matter, though not Homœopathists either from conviction or practice as yet, and our reasons for listening to the new doctrines are as follow:—Firstly, we have had a series of pamphlets and periodicals handed to us for examination and perusal, which relate to this system of medical practice; and secondly, and more forcibly, we have watched attentively for a considerable time the system of persecution and downcry that has been organised at home against the practitioners engaged either as amateurs or as qualified medical men in its spread and dissemination. The perusal of the former has much amused and pleased us, and the consideration of the latter has gradually fixed our attention more and more, until at length it has engaged our sympathy and commanded inquiry. Wherever persecution begins, a sense of right ends on the part of its promoters and abettors, and the mind of an educated person is led to suspect that that person, or body of men, or science, which

---

* From the "Morning Chronicle" of Calcutta.

it is endeavoured to hunt down, is formidable by truth, a conscientious advocacy of right and reason, and a superiority over the worn-out deceptions of the pack who are hunting down their victim, and endeavouring to cover him with ignominy or annihilate him by falsehood, misrepresentation, and persecution. All these are now at work in England, and to what point? Not to protect the public from empirics, men of bad reputation or broken down in trade, trying to support themselves by delusion and chicanery, but against regularly educated men of the highest grade of qualification, universally respected, and for years distinguished in the medical profession, who, throwing aside the shackles of education and prejudice, have been bold enough to adopt and practise the Homœopathic system of medicine, giving up, in many instances, large practices and great emoluments, for what they conscientiously believe to be a better system of medicine, more suited to reason, truth, experience, and the human frame. There can be no doubt that there is a strong and valuable deposit of truth at the bottom of the system of persecution that has been adopted towards these men, conscientiously giving up what they have been educated to look upon as infallible and confirmed in its truth by the practice of ages, and still more conscientiously giving up the large emoluments and high position to which its practice had introduced them.

The perusal of the Homœopathic journals above alluded to has awakened in us a lively conviction of the great value of the system of medical practice of which they are the mouthpieces; if not to the extent its most sanguine admirers and practitioners would go, at least so far as to make us wish to see these matters calmly discussed, without abuse, prejudice, or violent language, which it strikes us have in the present instance been all on the side of the old-system gentlemen. People in the medical profession are, it seems, beginning to think, and the public at large

are beginning to feel and believe, that the old system, and the present system, of dosing human beings with enormous quantities of nauseous and noxious drugs, is a barbarous and a vicious one, and we agree with them, and are certain that, if the practice and study of Homœopathy should be productive of no other beneficial result, they will at any rate modify the disgusting, hurtful, and savage practice which, as we have said above, is most painful to the patient, sometimes utterly ruinous to the constitution, and not very creditable, even in the most successful cases, as they are called, to the medical practitioner. The expenditure of drugs to an enormous amount, both in value and quantity, has killed many, has very seldom saved any, and must as a system die out, giving way to partial Homœopathy, or an entire adoption of that system, if its enemies should persecute it well, and so cause a quicker appreciation of its value in the public mind, than would have been established for a long time had it been treated with the indulgence which is generally the fate of visionary schemes and theories, devoid of truth and built on a shaky foundation.

It will perhaps be said that the publications to which we have above alluded, are so many impositions, and full of false cases and reports. We don't think so. Their contents are apparently as true as the pages of their rivals and traducers, and they are temperate, calm, and devoid of abuse and ill words, which the others are not; and hence another reason for suspecting that the right is on the side of those who believe themselves best in the contest, and show that they can afford to be good humoured and calm.

It may be said that the Homœopathic system of medicine is not suited to this country and tropical diseases. This is nonsense. If a system of medicine be founded on truth and reason, it is suited to all climates, countries, and seasons; if not, it is suited to none, and cannot be upheld by its antiquity, wide prevalence, or its powers of persecu-

tion, and its readiness to have recourse to them. Certainly the fine old English system of medicine has been doing wonders for the undertakers in Calcutta of late, and has frightened many into an acquaintance with Homœopathy, which they never before thought of cultivating, and which has ended in their being entirely convinced of its truth and superiority.

PROPOSED INAUGURAL ADDRESS

FOR 1852,

TO BE DELIVERED TO THE MEDICAL GRADUATES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

BY THE

PROFESSOR OF MATERIA MEDICA PURA.

Gentlemen,—In offering you, according to usage, in the name of the Medical Faculty and of the Senate of this University, of which you have just become Graduates, a few words of congratulation, counsel, encouragement, perhaps, too, of warning, I shall say little as to the general considerations and influences which ought to have weight with you during your future life; and shall confine my remarks almost entirely to one topic, which appears to me, as it has appeared to the most distinguished of my colleagues and predecessors, of supreme importance. Still, I cannot even name this subject, without using the present opportunity to remind you of the high dignity of your vocation. As physicians, professing to be beyond other men in possession of the power of healing, your advice will be eagerly sought, often reverently followed, on the most critical occasions; you will be admitted into closest intercourse with those by whom you are thus put in trust of human lives; and you will often have to confess to yourselves, possibly with deep, hopeless anguish, how little is the help you can bring to those who are looking to you

with so full a faith. If any thoughts can compel you to ardent, devout, persevering study, to the acquisition of all that can add to your resources and make you better furnished physicians, surely they are such thoughts as these.

As his name implies, the physician is peculiarly brought into contact with Nature, and only by perfect fidelity and loyalty to her every lesson can he fulfil his duty. If there be anything which he loves more than truth—as, for instance, wealth, social importance, professional, literary, or scientific reputation—whatever else he may be, he never can be a good physician. Again, it continually happens, that, as the originating or modifying causes of disease, or as otherwise brought under his notice through personal intimacy, the most delicate and difficult moral questions call for his solution. Here, also, are high demands made; to answer them there must be high moral attainments. Lastly, his intercourse is with men in the most solemn moments of birth, illness, death; and what solace, help, blessing, may not the good physician bring!

The topic, gentlemen, to which I have now to call your attention, is one on which my predecessor in this office last year specially dwelt (in an Address which most of you, being then students, may have heard or read); in many of whose remarks I concur so entirely, that I shall repeat them to you; others of them seem to me partial and insufficient; and there are some from which I may find it necessary emphatically to dissent; I mean therapeutics and pathology, in so far as it is essential to therapeutics.

On the occasion referred to, my predecessor said, "There can be no physician without physic—no medicine without therapeutics. Pathology is a mere introduction to it. The only true end of medical knowledge is the cure of diseases. But there can be no cure without remedies. Neither can remedies be of any use unless you know them, and how to give them, and what effects to look for from them in health, and in disease, and in the thousand vary-

ing circumstances of disease, inherent as well as extraneous."*

Again, "It may perhaps appear at first view surprising that such a subject should need to be pressed on your attention at the present time. But I appeal to yourselves, whether it has hitherto received in the course of your studies that share of your consideration which its relative importance among the practical branches of medicine undoubtedly demands for it; or whether your ideas on the actions and uses of remedies are as precise as they ought to be, and as they are on other subjects. You know this is not the case. And why? Simply on account of the difficulty of therapeutics; and because, of all the medical sciences, it is the most unsettled and unsatisfactory in its present state, and the least advanced in its progress."†

Once more, after speaking of the great advances made during the last forty years in pathology, and of the comparative scantiness of the contributions made to therapeutics during the same period, there follows this pregnant sentence:—"And as for the theory of therapeutics, embracing a generalisation of the actions of remedies, an accurate description of the physiological effects of each, a just idea of their therapeutic influences, and a knowledge of the conditions for employing them, we are little in advance of our predecessors thirty years ago."‡

It is well, gentlemen, that you should ponder such statements. To those only entering upon medical practice, these humiliating confessions of one of our most experienced physicians may seem highly discouraging. Yet, if they tell no more than the truth—if they express the mature judgment, not of one only, but of the very many

---

* Address, &c., p. 294. ("Monthly Journal of Medical Science," September, 1851.)

† Address, pp. 294–5.

‡ Ibid, p. 295.

among those who have had the best opportunities of practically testing the present usual modes of medical treatment, I repeat, it is well that you should ponder them. So long as you are content that therapeutics shall remain in its present amorphous condition, and look for no greater change than the addition of an empirical remedy here and there, possibly to be soon subtracted again, proving on farther experience valueless, you will never bend your minds to the subject with the intense continuous effort which is quite essential to the discovery of a lasting foundation, on which, *gradatim et paulatim*, a true system of therapeutics may be raised; and high honours will he have deserved from his professional brethren and from mankind, who shall appear to have achieved and established such a discovery.

Assuming, then, that some of you, at least, are prepared resolutely to follow out this investigation, it is my present purpose to suggest for your consideration one or two general principles, which may prove of great value as guides in the inquiry; I shall not presume to force them upon your acceptance, but I ask your candid, independent, deliberate estimate of their worth. I have only farther to premise, that my remarks shall be confined to the action of remedies, known or unknown, which belong to the class of *specifics*, and that I shall leave out of view, at present, those other various means by which diseases may be arrested, mitigated, or otherwise beneficially modified. It is quite obvious, that, in so far as attainable, specifics are greatly preferable to all other medicines; they are the direct roads to cure, all others, at best, being circuitous. In reference to the importance of this department of inquiry, I shall here take leave to remind you of the words of my respected colleague, and your esteemed teacher, Dr Alison:—"Our hopes of the increasing efficacy and usefulness of our art must depend on the progress which may yet be expected in two lines of inquiry, in which our suc-

cess has as yet been only partial: *first*, on the *discovery of specifics*, which may counteract the different diseased actions of which the body is susceptible, as effectually as the *cinchona* counteracts the *intermittent fever*, citric acid the scurvy, or vaccination the small-pox; *secondly*, in the investigation of the causes of disease, whether external or internal." To the first of these, especially, will my present remarks apply; although, not impossibly, they may be found ultimately to throw light also on some at least of the causes of disease.

We are now to inquire, gentlemen, by what course of study or of experiment we may hope to increase the number of known specifics. Study, without some guiding principle, can do nothing, I fear, in this direction; experiments at random little more. During many centuries, the number of specifics which have been thus accidentally discovered are so few, that we can hardly hope, without better guidance, during our generation to add one or two more to their number. Thus driven to look out for some principle or rule which may direct our investigations and render them fruitful, let us now consider whether our general knowledge of Nature's operations, and the experience acquired in some of the branches of science, will not afford us the aid we so much need.

And *first*, I shall call your attention to the close resemblance observed between the effects produced on the human body by natural disease, and the effects produced by certain known foreign substances. On this point, it will be sufficient to refer you to the frequent cases in which it is extremely difficult to ascertain whether death has been caused by natural disease or by poison; a difficulty often only conclusively solved by the discovery, through chemical means or otherwise, of the actual material poison. This is quite in accordance with what might have been inferred by rational considerations; for, unless the action of medicinal substances were of a like kind, or, so to speak, within

the same sphere as natural morbid action, there would seem no possibility of direct curative power; the disease and the remedy, having altogether separate courses, would never come into contact. It may be here remarked, too, that there are good reasons for believing a great part of the diseases commonly ascribed to natural causes to have their origin in the poisonous influence of foreign matter.

Next, assuming it to be admitted on all hands that there are at least one or two known specifics, I observe to you that it seems extremely improbable that there are not many more unknown; that, inasmuch as a near resemblance of most forms of natural morbid action can be produced by one or more foreign substances, there is every reason to anticipate that some one of these will be capable of counteracting each simple, well-determined, diseased action, had we only the means of discovering the right one. From the complications of diseased action, from individual peculiarities of susceptibility to natural morbid action, or to the action of medicines, and from other causes, there may be much difficulty in this inquiry; but it appears to me, gentlemen, that any person capable of reflecting on the subject will come to the conclusion that there are treasured for us in Nature, in one form or other, specific remedies for many of the ills which flesh is heir to, could we but discover them!

Being then satisfied that the inquiry is not a hopeless one, and may be productive of invaluable results, let us next consider in what way it is to be made; whether there be any fundamental principle which may be assumed as the basis of our investigation.

Now, it seems to me that we have such a principle. I think all analogy leads to the belief that the relation between the pathogenetic and the curative effects of specific remedies is not casual and fluctuating, but essential and constant; that each has the power of curing some certain morbid action, just because it has the power of producing

on the healthy body some other certain morbid action, having a distinct recognisable relation to the natural morbid action. We are not entitled to anticipate what that relation may be; but, assuming that such a relation exists, let us now try to discover what it is, whether a relation of similarity, contrariety, or otherwise.

The *data* then being (1st) That many substances are known to produce on the healthy human body organic or functional disturbances of a like kind with those observed in natural morbid action; and (2d) That some one or more of such substances are known to be capable of curing, specifically, such natural morbid action; the *problem* is, *To discover the law of relation between the pathogenetic and the curative action of such substances.*

In order to solve this problem, we have obviously to find some one or more substances, of which the pathogenetic and the curative effects are both known, that we may have the means of comparing these. Let us take one for an instance; and let it be the one named first in the passage I have quoted from the writings of my valued colleague, Dr Alison; I mean *cinchona.* The *curative* effects of this drug we all know well; it is a specific remedy for intermittent fever. With its effects *on the healthy body* you are probably less familiar, such knowledge not being generally thought important; but, for the purpose of comparison, it is essential that we should be in possession of it. Pereira describes it thus: "A febrile state of the system is set up, manifested by the excitement of the vascular system and dry tongue, and the cerebro-spinal system becomes disordered, as is shown by the throbbing headache and giddiness."* For our present purpose, let us assume this description to be substantially correct, and let us further suppose that the symptoms thus produced resemble those observed to occur in intermittent fever as nearly as, making due allowance for accidental

* "Materia Medica," vol. ii., p. 1404.

disturbances, we should expect, were the relation we are in quest of a relation of *similarity*, and we have now obtained what we have been seeking: we have solved the problem. The *law of relation then between the pathogenetic and the curative action of specific remedies will thus appear to be a relation of similarity.* Proceeding upon this, as a valid hypothesis; at least, we might make further experiments, in order to see how far it was true in regard to other medicinal substances; as we found our induction confirmed, we might gain increased confidence in it, until, after large experience, we might feel assured of its truth, and announce it authoritatively as a *general law of specifics.*

Such, it appears to me, gentlemen, is the mode of inquiry dictated by sound philosophy, and therefore likely to be productive of valuable results: I recommend it to your earnest attention. In doing so, I have now to tell you that you will enter on a path not all untrodden. Of him who, so far as I know, was the first to tread it thoughtfully, and in whose footsteps many zealous and noble-minded votaries of medicine are even now following, I shall have a few words to say to you. Shame, indeed, it is to us, that at so late a day, and within the walls of a university, any words of mine should be necessary that you might remember with reverence the name of Samuel Hahnemann.

Born at Meissen, in Saxony, just one hundred years ago, of parents so poor, that, when yet a boy, he had to find for himself the means of learning; with a mind so bent upon it that nothing was impossible to him; teaching by day that, with the utmost frugality, he might live to study by night; with a true dutiful heart, he made conquest, one after another, of the sciences and literatures of early and later times, until he became a master in them all. To be a physician was what he aimed at—a true physician; no idle, prating pretender; and he must needs possess himself of all the various culture that could train or furnish his mind. Especially was it his duty, having

first learned the languages, to make profound studies in medicine, to become familiar with the thoughts and knowledges of her votaries from almost patriarchal to present times, a duty which he nobly fulfilled. As became him, too, he studied more particularly chemistry and the physiological and curative properties of herbs, and the other materials of medicine; and in both these provinces of inquiry he achieved important discoveries. Nor was he unfamiliar with the practice of his art. Like others of his time, and with equal success, he pursued it, but not with equal contentment. Genius had given him a light, by which he saw the darkness in which he and all his fellow-labourers were working, and thus he would work no longer. If the chaos of medicine was not anyhow to be reduced into order, at least he would not by his meddling increase the confusion. With such rare, earnest conscientiousness, he abandoned the nearest surest means of living, and gave himself to serious literature ; in no time or country a ready way to wealth. Yet, in all his studies, he never forgot his vocation, and lay in wait for what light or help patient, industrious, honest observation of Nature might yet bring. I have only to add, that such was the original depth, breadth, and texture of his intellectual being, that these acquirements never overpowered it—that he "wore all this weight of learning lightly, like a flower"—and then I ask you whether we have not here such stuff as great Discoverers are made of. Nor will it, I trust, affect your judgment, even greatly excite your surprise, that vulgar minds can see in all this no nobleness, nothing worthy of study, veneration, love; that many, even eminent, practitioners are found capable of publicly associating with the most contemptible of impostors the name of one of the bravest and best of men. Alas! in every age of this world's history the ardent followers of truth have been the calumniated few; and why should a different fate attend Hahnemann and his followers?

Gentlemen, it were premature now to ask you to accept as truth the discoveries of Hahnemann; but I may have satisfied some of you that he is a man worth listening to; and I shall only add on this head the testimony of one or two whose words are likely to have influence with you. Hufeland, in whose distinguished journal Hahnemann's earlier papers were published, in a note to one of these, a masterly criticism, entitled "Fragmentary Observations on Brown's Elements of Medicine," which appeared without the author's name, writes as follows:—"These observations are from the pen of one of the most distinguished of German physicians, &c., &c. * * * We have here the unprejudiced opinion on this subject of a practical physician of matured experience and reflection."* From Broussais and from Brera might be quoted observations to the same effect. Valentine North, the great American surgeon, who visited Hahnemann, writes, "Hahnemann is one of the most accomplished and scientific physicians of the present age." Dr Sigmond, in his lectures on Materia Medica and Therapeutics, says of Hahnemann, "I have to speak to you of a man of high intellectual attainments, of great sagacity, of inflexible courage, and of unwearied industry; who, amid difficulties of no common kind, has laid the foundation of a system which, whilst it cannot but create a few smiles at its singularity, is the work of great erudition, much toil, and striking ingenuity." Dr Forbes, so well known as a talented physician, and as a man possessing a highly cultivated mind, writes, with regard to Hahnemann, that "No careful observer of his actions or candid reader of his writings can hesitate for a moment to admit that he was a very extraordinary man. He was, undoubtedly, a man of genius and a scholar; a man of indefatigable industry, of undaunted energy; surpassed by

* Hahnemann's "Lesser Writings." Translated by Dr Dudgeon. Headland. 1851. P. 405.

few in the originality and ingenuity of his views, superior to most in having substantiated and carried out his doctrines into actual and most extensive practice. It is but an act of justice also to admit that there exists no grounds for doubting that he was sincere in the belief of the truth of his doctrines, and that many, at least, among his followers have been, and are, sincere, honest, and learned men."*

To quote more such attestations would be to trespass unduly on your patience; to many of you, even these may have seemed superfluous; for one who has left behind him so many volumes as Hahnemann, the fruits of his observations, study, and reflection, need not count much on other attestors of his true merits. When you come to read these works, gentlemen, as I have no doubt many will do, you will find in them the unquestionable indications of a mind highly gifted by nature, and variously enriched by cultivation. They seem to me to exhibit in a very rare degree the union of philosophical power with practical sagacity, and a spirit of unwavering truthfulness. In a literary view, they must be placed with our best classical writers on medical subjects. Yet these are but a small part of his claims to your earnest attention; it is the testimony of the living which will most move you. That Hahnemann is now revered by thousands of the educated and thoughtful, who are not ashamed to call themselves his disciples, and who regard him as one of the greatest discoverers in any region of investigation—among whom are hundreds the graduates of this University, or of other eminent schools of medicine in Germany, France, Italy, England, the United States of America—is a fact which will bear on your minds with more weight of conviction than any opinions of mine, or any other particular testimonials; and, when you reflect that this veneration rests chiefly on the expe-

* "British and Foreign Medical Review."

rienced practical results of Hahnemann's discovery, you will regard it as entitled to even greater consideration. Having already made some observations on the character of the discoverer, it is now time for me to say a few words on the nature of the discovery, and the circumstances in which it was made.

It was in the year 1790, while engaged in the translation of one of the works of our own Cullen, in which the fever-producing powers of cinchona are noticed, that Hahnemann first caught sight of the rational principle for which he had been so long waiting. Cinchona is known to cure ague; it is stated also to produce on healthy people febrile symptoms. May not this be the indication of the general law of specifics? So thought Hahnemann; and, like other wise men, he did not then and there announce the fact to be so, but patiently set himself to a laborious and careful examination of the morbific action of medicines on the healthy body. Among those he thus put to trial were cinchona, mercury, belladonna, digitalis, cocculus. Six years of the prime of his life had been thus spent before he felt justified in publicly announcing the law of specifics, which has earned for him so wide a fame—"*Similia similibus curantur.*" In 1796, in Hufeland's Journal,* under the title of "Essay on a new principle for ascertaining the curative powers of Drugs; with a glance at those hitherto employed,"† did Hahnemann first promulgate to the physicians of his age, through the medium of the medical journal of highest reputation in Germany, what is now known as the Homœopathic law. Neither then nor ever afterwards did he attempt by popular writings to gather disciples from among the unlearned. In this remarkable

---

* "Journal der Practischen Argniekunde," vol. ii., part 3.

† Hahnemann's "Lesser Writings." Translated by Dr Dudgeon. P. 295.

paper, after a very able criticism of the means of cure in general use, and an exhibition of the very unsatisfactory nature, both of the process and of its results, he writes, "The true physician, whose sole aim is to perfect his art, can avail himself of no other information respecting medicines than—

"First, *What is the pure action of each by itself on the healthy body?*

"Second, *What do observations of its action in this or that simple or complex disease teach us?*

"The last object is partly obtained in the practical writings of the best observers of all ages, but more especially of later times. Throughout these, the as yet only source of the real knowledge of the power of drugs in diseases is scattered; there we find it faithfully related how the simplest drugs were employed in accurately described cases, how far they proved serviceable, and how far they were hurtful or less beneficial. Would to God such relations were more numerous."

"But even among them contradictions so often occur, one condemning in a certain case what another found of use in a similar case, that one cannot but remark, that we still require some natural normal standard, whereby we may be enabled to judge of the value and degree of truth of their observations."

"This standard, methinks, can only be derived from the effects that a given medicinal substance has, by itself in this and that dose, developed in the healthy human body." Again. "We only require to know, on the one hand, the diseases of the human frame accurately in their essential characteristics, and their accidental complications; and, on the other hand, the pure effects of drugs, that is, the essential characteristics of the specific artificial disease they usually excite, together with the accidental symptoms caused by difference of dose, form, &c., and by choosing a remedy for a given natural disease, that is capable

of producing a very similar artificial disease, we shall be able to cure the most obstinate diseases."

You will have observed, gentlemen, that, in these sentences, Hahnemann strongly urged upon physicians the expediency of using all medicines singly; as thus only could their proper effects be determined with any approach to accuracy. In a later paper, he has some very witty remarks on the absurdity of the common compound prescriptions, which I cannot here quote;* but I may read to you its concluding sentences:—

"Know that two, not to speak of three or more, substances, when *mingled together*, do not produce the same result that might be expected from them if given *singly* and at different times, but a different dynamical intermediate action, whether you wish it or no. In that case, the systematic arrangement of your ingredients is of no avail, nor the part you allot to the *base* and *bases*, to the *adjuvant* and *adjuvants*, to your corrective *director*, and excipient. Nature acts according to eternal laws, without asking your leave; she loves simplicity, and effects *much* with one remedy, whilst you effect *little* with many. Seek to imitate nature."

"To write very composite recipes, and several of them in the course of the day, is the climax of parempericism; to administer quite simple remedies, and not to give a second before the action of the first has expired—this, and this alone, is the direct way into the inner holy place of art. Make your choice!"†

Hitherto, these pregnant remarks have received only partial attention. Something, indeed, has been already done in the way of simplifying prescriptions, but how much more is yet to be effected!

The publication, in 1796, of the paper first named (which related especially to chronic diseases), was fol-

---

* "Lesser Writings," *ut supra*, p. 400. † *Ibid*, p. 404.

lowed at intervals by other essays and treatises, the earlier of which appeared also in Hufeland's Journal, in which Hahnemann's views were more fully exhibited. Thus, not to mention others well deserving your notice, and contained in the volume of his "Lesser Writings," already so often referred to, there appeared in 1806 the "Medicine of Experience," in which he promulgated the general application of the Homœopathic law, and in 1800 the "Organon of Rational Medicine," in which he advocated its exclusive use. In the beginning of the year 1805, he published, in Latin, his experiments on himself and others with twenty-three different medicines. In 1811, he issued the first part of his "Materia Medica," and this elaborate work was completed in 1821.

Upon any detailed notice of these various writings, I cannot enter here; but, in justice to Hahnemann, I must not omit to mention, that, in publicly announcing this curative law, he failed not to point out how it was rooted in the Past; showing, from the writings of Hippocrates, Paracelsus, Stahl, &c., that, from ancient times, the truth had been foreshadowed; that the law, although never before thus clearly promulgated and proved, had, in fact, although unconsciously, been acted on throughout the long history of medicine. Gradually a small but earnest band of disciples gathered round him, with whose assistance he was able to produce the "Materia Medica;" a work, the very extent of which has been thoughtlessly alleged as a reason for discrediting his discoveries in the sphere of the action of medicines; as too great and various for even the most long-lived and indefatigable of mortal men to achieve.

What public and private oppositions, loss of friends, accession of enemies, contempt, calumny, persecution, Hahnemann encountered, before his great discovery met with reception or even public toleration, it is not for me to narrate. Suffice it to say, that in this respect his lot was the

lot of nearly all the great benefactors of mankind. And now, in Leipsic, from which the living Hahnemann was banished as an "irregular practitioner," publicly sits a bronze statue, *in perpetuam ejus memoriam*. Of the far nobler monument which has been raised to his name, in a host of devoted followers extended over the civilised world, I have already had occasion to remind you.

In now recalling your attention to the mode of inquiry for a general law of specifics, I would have you consider how nearly Hahnemann seems to have pursued the track which I ventured to suggest as a probable means of discovery. Through his preceding labours, an advance has so far been made, that the first question for you to examine is not, What is the law of specifics? but, Is the law of specifics truly Homœopathic? Is the relation between the pathogenetic and the curative effects of medicinal substances a relation of similarity? To this inquiry, then, gentlemen, devote yourselves in such a spirit as becomes the true votaries of science, the faithful cultivators of the art of healing. You will find much help at hand—Books, Hospitals, Dispensaries, Physicians. Those who have put the question to Nature, and found her answer "yes," will give you willing aid in your honest inquiries. I am not advising you to accept their conclusion without patient conscientious examination; only, not to refuse their assistance in putting it to the test. There is much help to be gotten from the experience of your forerunners in all such investigations; and of this help you may avail yourselves without becoming their pledged disciples.

It may hardly be necessary to remind you that the close attention with which, in this inquiry, you will have to study the phenomena of disease and the actions of remedies, cannot fail to be productive of valuable results to yourselves, even should you fail to find the pearl you are in search of.

I may forewarn you, that one part of their uniform experience is likely to deter many of you at the very threshold

—I mean the minuteness of their quantities of medicines. I will not conceal from you, that, in order to examine with any measure of candour the Homœopathic system as usually practised, you will have to divest yourselves of prejudices which often prove fatal to the ignorant or superficial. Were I addressing a mob, I might think it necessary to argue that Nature's instruments are not like brickbats, which, in order to be effective, must be hard and heavy; but, in addressing you, gentlemen, I am in a different position—being entitled to assume, on the part of my hearers, no inconsiderable acquaintance with the silent stupendous energies by which this order of things is maintained, and particularly some familiarity with the usual phenomena of disease. I don't need to remind *you* of the latent powers of the smallest seeds, of the virulence of animal poisons, of the infinitesimal quantity of vaccine matter which will affect the whole system, and of such other analogous instances; nor need I tell you that an athletic, robust man, after a few moments spent in an infected atmosphere, comes out with the germs of deadly disease; "so inconceivably minute (to quote the words employed by my distinguished predecessor to prove the necessary impotency of infinitesimal quantities of medicine), that no sense, no balance, no microscope, no chemical analysis, no human means whatever, can discover the slightest trace of them in what is administered—that you can never have any surety of their presence, or any well-grounded assurance of their absence—that they defy the finite faculties of man to form even a distinct conception of them, either with the aid of figures and the eye, or with the help of a vivid imagination." Nature is full of such analogies, and, as I cannot here enlarge on this topic, I refer you to a very interesting paper on this subject by a writer distinguished for eloquence and scientific attainments which appeared some years ago (with several others also well deserving your attention), in a little volume named "An Introduction to the study of

Homœopathy."* The paper referred to is one "On the theory of small doses," by Dr Samuel Brown.

Having already urged on your attention the near resemblance observable between the phenomena of natural diseases and the effects of drugs, I will now point out to you that, if it shall appear to be the fact that infinitesimal doses are curatively efficient, we shall have in this only a further extension of the same similarity; which will be even more apparent if the fact be, that quantities too small to produce generally any noticeable action upon healthy persons, are yet sufficient to cure some given disease—just as out of twelve healthy persons exposed to some given infection, one only receives the fatal morbific influence.

In relation to this matter, I trust you will never forget how great a hindrance to each of the sciences has been opposed by magisterial dogmatism; that in all such inquiries we have to ask, not what *can be*, but what *is;* and that to such questions nature answers often but in a whisper, which reaches only the most watchful and docile of her disciples. I will add, that the alleged curative powers of infinitesimal doses rests on *precisely the same kind of evidence which attests the curative power of larger quantities;* the amount and particular value of the evidence bearing on this point it is for you to examine. Plainly, the inquiry is altogether confined within the range of experience; of the powers of drugs we know absolutely nothing, *a priori;* only we are quite entitled to expect in disease an increased susceptibility to the action of any medicinal substance capable of producing on the healthy body similar symptoms. This entirely accords with the history of infinitesimal doses, which were introduced by Hahnemann, not in virtue of any ruling theory, but in consequence of his observing that as the quantities were diminished the cures were more certain.

---

* J. Leath, London.

Having now said all that your time will allow me on the subject of Homœopathy, as a general system of specifics, I shall conclude this address with a few observations on certain tests or criteria, proposed as the means of enabling inexperienced physicians to discover truth, and to avoid "the snares of imposture and byways of delusion," by the application of which my eminent colleague concluded the claims of Hahnemann and Homœopathy to be demonstrably unfounded.

In the first place, it was said to be "undeniable that all important discoveries in science at large are preceded by a period of incubation, as it were, during which the world is gradually prepared to receive them. There appears a fitness in the very time of discovery. Hence hints of the truth precede its development; hence, too, a brief interval of hesitation on the part of the public is quickly followed by universal belief. Hence, moreover, arise disputed claims of invention—a circumstance observed even in most minor discoveries."

On this criterion, I shall only observe, *first*, that, so far as it is justly applicable, it is of no practical value; and, *secondly*, that it has no proper application to Hahnemann's discovery. It is of no practical value, because to examine the tangible product is a much easier and less fallacious course, especially for the young, than to inquire into the period of incubation, and thence certainly determine the relation of the hypothetical discovery to all previous science. It is inapplicable to Hahnemann's discovery, inasmuch as he never stated it to be a novelty; on the contrary, his great work is the statement of a law of relation, and belongs to methodology: he is to be classed with Bacon and Newton—by no means with Watt and other inventors; and it was not in a spirit of thoughtless levity or insolent boasting that he termed it "The Organon of Medicine."

To me, I confess, it is very strange that any educated physician should imagine the history of medical science to

teach that the most remarkable discoveries in that region have, after a "brief interval of hesitation," "met with universal belief." My colleague, the Professor of Midwifery, in a recent paper on chloroform, to which I cannot do better than refer you, told a far other and much truer story.* Nor will it be doubted by those who have watched the progress of truth, that the falling in pieces of the old faith is the inauguration of the new; and thus the prevalent scepticism in medicine, among its most enlightened votaries, is the extreme darkness which precedes and points to the dawn of a better day. The next criterion is thus stated:—"In the second place, all the true discoveries have made way first among the votaries of the science most immediately concerned with them, and have become matters of faith and interest with the public at large only in the second instance. So has it been with therapeutics."

While this position appears to me, gentlemen, only very partially true, and while the two instances first named in support of it go far to refute it—I mean "the anti-variolous property of vaccination" (which, as you are aware, was established through means of inoculation, introduced into Europe by Lady Mary W. Montague), and "the prevention and cure of scurvy" (which we owe to the regulations and management adopted by Captain Cook, in his famous voyage in the Resolution, afterwards published in the "Transactions of the Royal Society," 1776)—it will be perfectly obvious to you, after the preceding narrative of the early progress of Homœopathy, that the system which I have felt it my duty to press on your attention has nothing to fear from the application of such a test. Its first adherents were all scientific physicians.

The third criterion hardly deserves serious notice. It is thus stated:—"No upright physician ever attained great

* "Etherization in Surgery." Part I. "Monthly Journal of Medical Science," September, 1847. See ante, p. 200 (in New Test Act.)

success in practice on a sudden or at an early age." I should be sorry, gentlemen, by giving in my adherence to so rash a statement, to libel those of my colleagues who at a comparatively early age attained eminence as practical teachers or as physicians. It would be invidious to name them; but you all know them, and know them to be among the most distinguished teachers in our University. At any rate, the criterion has no application to Hahnemann. It suggests, however, the familiar thought that the progress of improvements in all departments of practice has ever been chiefly among the young, for very obvious reasons. After middle age, the mind, like the body, is more rigid, and less apt to put itself into new postures and receive lessons in new processes. Again, it cannot but have occurred to you, that, without rare ingenuousness and mental activity, an experienced mature physician will hardly consent to be again put to school, acknowledging his juniors his superiors, that he may learn improved methods, and acquaint himself with a large field of strange knowledge. Whether, as is commonly said, the fact be, that almost no physician above forty years old believed in Harvey's new doctrine, I cannot tell; but of this I am sure, that the story, if a fable, bears on its front a most intelligible and instructive moral. Indeed, all such criteria, by which it is proposed to divert your attention from urgent scientific and practical questions, remind one of the old saying, "Out of Galilee ariseth no prophet;" the aim of which was, by a plausible but fallacious prejudgment, to exclude the impartial consideration of immediate, paramount, unanswerable claims. I object altogether to such arbitrary formulas, by which we are asked to decide upon the merits of new doctrines and practices in medicine. Even when applicable, they are indirect, cumbrous, unsatisfactory. Notoriously, they have been amongst the most serious impediments to the reception of truth, which is by their means evaded rather than repulsed. They are quite op-

posed to the spirit of the inductive philosophy, being a relic of scholasticism; and you will do well to be on your guard against all such entanglements. In the pursuit of truth dare everything—fear nothing but unfaithfulness; and be sure that the firmer the grasp with which you lay hold on the objects which from time to time demand examination, the less likely are you to be deceived as to their true character. Never be content to take an enemy's account; rather make it your rule to wrestle with each important doctrine in the persons of its ablest, if possible, of its living, expositors; until you have done so, you cannot know that you are its masters, and may only have been wasting your strength in idle contest with some of its feeble or even treacherous followers; making your own overthrow the more sudden and painful whenever one of its strong men happens to cross your path. And remember that we can do nothing against Truth: when she comes, however disguised, it is always as a conqueror; and unless we do her homage, and follow in her train, we shall either be trodden beneath her feet, or be cast aside, disarmed, helpless, contemptible. Gentlemen, make your choice.

TRIAL AND CONFESSIONS

OF

PROFESSORS SYME, CHRISTISON, AND SIMPSON.*

"Cessit immanis tibi blandienti
Janitor AULÆ
Cerberus, quamvis furiale centum
Muniant ANGUES caput ejus, atque
Spiritus teter saniesque manet
Ore trilingui."—*Hor. Carm.*

IN Edinburgh the combat deepens. The last fortnight has given birth to the pamphlets enumerated below; there being one from each member of the medical triumvirate at whose bidding the "regulars" have taken the field against the practitioners of Homœopathy, with no advantage and much dishonour. Professors Christison, Syme, and Simpson

* From the "British Journal of Homœopathy."

1. Correspondence between Professor Christison and Dr George E. Stewart, on Homœopathy.

2. The Memorial of James Syme, Regius Professor of Clinical Surgery unto the Honourable Patrons of the University of Edinburgh.

3. Speech at the Medico-Chirurgical Society relative to Homœopathy: with Notes on the peculiar theological opinions of some disciples of Hahnemann; &c. By James Y. Simpson, M.D., &c.

4. Letter to the President of the Medico-Chirurgical Society of Edinburgh, on the recent Speeches of Professors Syme and Simpson. By William Henderson, M.D., Professor of General Pathology.

5. A Letter to the President of the Royal College of Surgeons on the late proceedings of that body, regarding Homœopathic Practitioners. By James Russell, M.D., F.R.S.E., F.R.C.S.E., &c.

6. Letter to the Honourable the Patrons of the University of Edinburgh on the Memorial of Mr Syme. By William Henderson, M.D., Professor of General Pathology.

appear before the public, resolute to put down Homœopathy; by what means and with what success will be seen presently.

With some differential circumstances, it will be found that they stand substantially in one position. All tried and convicted on their own confession and otherwise of having given countenance to Homœopathy, compelled under the sting of the "Lancet" to make their palinode with what humiliating accompaniments it was thought expedient to impose, they now appear before the public in Edinburgh as the leaders of the medical conspiracy which is beginning to attract general notice. Very unfortunately for them, every step they have hitherto taken to purge themselves from this contamination has only added to it, or brought on them even more serious charges. If the council of the Royal College of Surgeons of England had any difficulty in coming to the resolution "that it is not expedient for the college to interfere in the matter," nothing will be more likely to satisfy them of its unquestionable prudence than the exhibition now made in Edinburgh by the three chief instigators of an opposite course of conduct.

On their own confession, they are all guilty of countenancing Homœopathy, for the resolution of the College of Surgeons, moved by Mr Syme, expressly states, that to meet Homœopathic practitioners in consultation is to do so; and certainly no less is implied by the previously adopted resolutions of the College of Physicians, over which Dr Simpson presides. Dr Christison, more judicious than the other two, has made no attempt to efface this brand, which the miserable struggles of the others have only affixed more indelibly.

It is quite true that the position thus assumed by the members of these colleges is altogether untenable; it is a violation of established professional usage and an outrage upon humanity: but they have sworn to it, and until it is abjured must consent to be tried by it. They have been

tried and found guilty. Well aware that if to meet in consultation any physician practising homœopathically be to countenance that system now, so it must have been a year, or two years, or ten years ago, they have been using desperate efforts, under the lash of their inexorable tyrant, the organ of the English medical mob, to make it appear that in point of fact they have not committed this offence, or have committed it only in a venial form, and are willing to do penance to any required amount. But we must consider their cases in succession.

I. Dr Christison. Not duly estimating the truth of the saying, that "if speech be silver, silence is golden," this well-known toxicologist has appeared before his students as the champion of orthodox medicine and the prompt slayer of its young rival. Experienced, yet not wise, in his antidotal lectures on Homœopathy, he allowed himself to make remarks on the conduct of those of the medical graduates of this year who were, at the time of their examinations, believers in Homœopathy; for which one of them called him to account—the result of which appears in the pamphlet first named. It is a result on which the Professor of Materia Medica has no reason to congratulate himself.

He has exposed his conduct, in thus referring to graduates of the University, to Dr Stewart's severe yet just rebuke, being told that it was "highly undignified and indiscreet, as well as unacademical." He has given Dr Stewart an opportunity to proclaim the fact, that, of the forty-five students who graduated this year, *five* were to his certain knowledge believers in Homœopathy, and as many more had a leaning to it, and he has "no doubt are now daily becoming more convinced of its superior efficacy;" and to announce, for the encouragement of other students and to the confusion of the Medical Faculty, as follows: "Indeed, so entirely satisfied am I that in such examinations any questions tending to elicit a confession of belief, or of

intentions in reference to practice, are entirely out of place and irregular, that I was quite prepared, had any such been put to me, to decline answering them upon that ground, and to abide the consequences, taking my appeal, in case of necessity, to the Senatus and Patrons of the University." This remedy was, however, unnecessary in Dr Stewart's case; for, although convinced "of the importance of the Homœopathic law and of the efficacy of infinitesimal doses *given in accordance* with it, on neither of these subjects was he directly or indirectly asked any questions."

These are but a few of the consequences of Dr Christison's indiscretion. He has given his young and able opponent a fair opportunity to review in detail his lecture on Homœopathy, and conclusively to expose its weakness, showing that by him, as by most of the other professors in the University, the subject is "as yet unknown or misunderstood." Upon any examination of Dr Stewart's effective criticism we cannot now enter, and, recommending it to our readers, must hasten on to the latter part, in which he proves Dr Christison to have been plainly, although unwittingly teaching the Homœopathic doctrine. But before doing so we must refer to one of Professor Christison's arguments, which may have weight with the ignorant, and is a very remarkable instance how possible it is even for a man of high scientific reputation to speak about Hahnemann's discovery, without having the remotest conception of its true character. The objection thus appears in the notes of the lecture on which Dr Stewart's remarks are founded: "It takes a long time to establish a remedy in regular practice." "Iodine has been known for thirty-one years, and its action is still obscure. But in Homœopathy we are called on to believe that one sagacious man did at once what many have been unable to accomplish in many years." In reply, Dr Stewart well remarks, "There is in this no argument against Homœopathy at all; although I confess there is in it great cause for admiration of Hahne-

mann." No argument, certainly, against Homœopathy; and the very statement of the contrary proves that Dr Christison had failed to see that, if Hahnemann's announcement was anything, it was the announcement of a law of discovery, by which the specific application of medicines to diseases can be known anterior to any such experience of their action. Nay more; that not only is the investigation simplified immensely by getting quit of the uncertain, varying, disturbing element of disease, but, by the discovery of this law of relation between their effects on healthy persons and in disease, the whole records of the past, which narrate cases of poisoning or medicinal aggravations, become at once available as a practical repertory. Thus, little as he may be thinking of favours in that quarter, Dr Christison's inquiries in the region of poisons become part of the handbook of Homœopathic practice; and were his experiments and observations conducted with a more painstaking, minute accuracy, he might yet confer serious obligations on the method of practice which it is his idle purpose to put down.

Nor will Dr Christison be counted blameless for giving publicity to the fact that the prophylactic powers of belladonna in scarlatina were discovered by Hahnemann—a discovery made by means of the general therapeutic law which it thus remarkably authenticates; and if Dr Christison would, on the ground of his medical doctrines, indignantly spurn the *living* Hahnemann as no fit associate for him, with what fairness can he take advantage of one of the valuable discoveries in medicine in which the great reformer still lives, while he insults the discoverer in the persons of his honest and able disciples. At any rate, is it not plain that, by recommending the use of this medicine, one of its many inestimable fruits, Dr Christison gives public countenance to the Homœopathic law?

We can refer to a few only of the passages in Dr Christison's writings, by which Dr Stewart has clearly proved

him to be guilty of teaching Homœopathy. They are quoted from his Dispensatory.

1. Tartar emetic.—"Internally (writes Dr Christison —p. 149) it produces *inflammation* of the alimentary mucous membrane, and also, it appears, *of the texture of the lungs;*" and *per contra* we find on the same page among the effects of this medicine in small doses, "*the cure of pneumonia*, pleurisy, and other acute inflammations."

2. Arsenic.—"A great multiplicity of secondary affections has further been observed, among which the most frequent and most remarkable are, partial palsy, *epileptic convulsions*, and *dyspepsia with emaciation*"—(p. 184); *per contra*—(p. 136) "it is one of the *standard remedies in epilepsy;*" and (p. 134) "*is in small doses a tonic.*"

3. Kreosotum.—(p. 376.)—"In the human subject its poisonous action has been sometimes manifested by *nausea, vomiting*," &c.; *per contra*—"it allays *vomiting* from functional disorder of the stomach;" is also "valuable in the chronic vomiting of pregnancy;" "and in the most obstinate of all kinds of vomiting—sea-sickness."

Of such examples of the Homœopathic action of remedies, Dr Stewart writes—the work referred to is full; and leaving the Professor of Materia Medica to make what terms of reconciliation may be possible with the English demagogue, we now turn to our next subject.

II. Mr Syme.—No one is more zealous in this business, or more indiscreet, than the Professor of Clinical Surgery. Not content with moving in the College of Surgeons the recent resolutions, by which he has condemned himself as a countenancer of Homœopathy, he was the mover in the Medico-Chirurgical Society of a resolution to the following effect:—"That the public profession of Homœopathy shall be held to disqualify for being admitted or remaining a member;" which came before the society on the 19th November last. From the discussion all strangers were excluded by a unanimous vote, and a report of the proceed-

ings was afterwards published by authority.* No doubt the society sadly wanted cleansing—it was deeply tainted with Homœopathy. We don't speak here of the conversions among its members to the system now proscribed, which might be thought inevitable, but of much more direct countenance given. So long ago as 1842, a paper was read to the society, the joint production of *two* well-known and perfectly inflexible Homœopathists, by one of them not then even a member of the society, but who was afterwards requested to join it, proposed, balloted for, and duly elected. The paper we refer to was "on the Pathology of Typhus," and was afterwards published by the request of the editor, Dr Rose Cormack, then a physician in Edinburgh, in the "Monthly Journal of Medical Science" for April, 1842. This will serve for one instance of the society's doings; the other we shall take is a very recent one. In the number for June last of the "Monthly Journal of Medical Science"—the sequel to that just referred to—"conducted by Professors Christison, Syme, Simpson, Goodsir," &c. &c.—we find the following:—"Article II. Evidence of puerperal fever depending upon the contagious inoculation of morbid matter. By Dr. F. H. Arneth, of Vienna." (Read before the Edinburgh Medico-Chirurgical Society, on April 16, 1851.) So our friend Dr Arneth has been among them!—we are glad to learn it; they could not have been instructed by a better Homœopathist. But what comes of the character of the society?—what of the consistency of the medical triumvirs of Edinburgh? All three were giving marked and public countenance to Homœopathy!

It will be admitted that this society had become of quite Augean foulness in the matter of Homœopathy; and, as it had no Hercules, the two biggest men there (or most zealous) set themselves to cleanse it, by turning into it

* "Monthly Journal of Medical Science." Dec. 1851. P. 581.

such a stream of vulgar nonsense, impertinence, and calumny as to make it no longer tolerable. It is quite true that they have been nearly drowned themselves, and that the mire of Homœopathy sticks all the faster to them. But what will not a man do for reputation?—and they have a merciless taskmaster.

It is remarkable that the very announcement of Mr Syme's motion, as indicative of a departure from the scientific purposes for which the society was instituted, led to the resignation of two members (sons of Mr Syme's distinguished predecessor in the chair of clinical surgery, to whose exertions its institution was in great part due); Dr Rutherfurd Russell, already referred to as having been solicited to join the society, although well known to be a Homœopathist; and Dr James Russell, a much older member of the profession, whose letter to the President of the College of Surgeons (the *fifth* on our list) has been one of the good results of the recent medical conspiracy. A surgical case in which Mr Goodsir, professor of anatomy, and another operating surgeon, had refused their services, except on the condition of the dismissal of the patient's usual medical attendant (who happened to be a Homœopathist), avowedly on the ground "that the College of Surgeons has in its corporate capacity interdicted its members from meeting Homœopathic practitioners," gave occasion to this calm, modest, effective protest against the present cruel and insolent attempt of the doctors, by means of combination, to dictate their own extravagant terms to the public. The following letter to the Editor of the "Edinburgh News" narrates the case referred to:—

"Sir,—The first example of the operation of the recent resolution of the College of Surgeons, that none of its fellows should co-operate with a certain class of physicians, has just come under my notice; and, as I consider it of importance that the case should be tried at the bar of public opinion by the principles of common sense and common

humanity, I beg of you to give it the benefit of publication in your widely-circulated paper.

"A few nights ago, about ten o'clock, a respectable physician was sent for in great haste to see a gentleman just come from the country. He found his patient suffering from hernia, in great pain and danger. He administered some Homœopathic medicine, and tried to reduce the tumour (as the return of the protruded intestines is technically called). He failed, and nothing seemed left but an operation. Not being himself an operating surgeon, he went for Professor Miller, who was out of town. He then went to another, comparatively unknown to the public, who said he could not go without first consulting Professor Goodsir; accordingly the physician and surgeon drove to the Professor of Anatomy. The surgeon went in, and talked for about half an hour with Mr Goodsir, and then the physician was told that they could only go on condition that he did not *remain even in the house* during the operation, but gave up the poor sick man entirely to them. To save his patient's life, the physician consented, and they drove to the house of the sufferer. On examining the tumour before proceeding to operate, it returned at once to its natural situation, showing that the medicine, more true to nature than the surgeons, had rendered their interference unnecessary.

"Now, sir, allow me to make a few remarks upon the principle of this surgical combination. The number of operating surgeons in any town is very small; there being not more than six in such a town as this, it is quite easy for them to combine to effect any purpose they have in view. If they have the right to extort, under penalty of death, such an ignominious condition from a patient as that he shall dismiss out of his house his medical attendant, and perhaps only friend in the place, they may extort anything else they please. If he must abandon his physician at the bidding of surgeons, may he not be compelled to

abjure his faith, or to dedicate his fortune to some pious surgical charity? If once medical mortmain be admitted, it will prove infinitely more dangerous than clerical. The surgeon holds present sufferings in his hand, the priest only threats of future punishment. If the principle of such a trade's-union be once admitted, the proud boast of medicine, that it is broad as humanity itself, and ignores all differences of creeds, nations, languages, is at an end; and, in some parts of Ireland, we may have Orange surgeons who refuse to save the lives of heretical Papists, while, in others, the Roman Catholic may recruit the ranks of his church by victims won by the dexterous use of the scalpel. As regards Homœopathy, it merely accelerates the period when, among the number of the many graduates of our University who are embracing the new faith, there shall be found some of more than average manual dexterity and anatomical knowledge, and less than average sensitiveness of feeling, who will devote themselves to pure surgery. As regards Professor Goodsir, we acquit him of any personal animosity towards Homœopathy, for some years ago he undertook to write pathological articles in the "British Journal of Homœopathy," and only desisted for fear of offending his less liberal brethren; but we cannot justify this outrage of humanity, by the plea of his fearing the consequences of breaking the college law, without admitting the same extenuation for almost all the cruel deeds under which this earth has groaned, for fear is the parent of cruelty.*—

I am, &c., J. Rutherfurd Russell."

Mr Syme's speech on his motion was chiefly about him-

* We are glad to say that, since this occurred, another similar case happened in the practice of a Homœopathic physician, and that one of the most experienced and skilful operating surgeons at once acceded to the physician's request, accompanied him to the patient's house, and was prepared to perform in his presence any operation which might be deemed necessary.

self and Homœopathic practitioners; there was nothing worth noticing about Homœopathy. He referred to Dr Henderson's statement of having met with him in consultation, in order to gainsay it, which he could not do effectually; and his unhappy attempt had the effect of giving Dr Henderson occasion in his letter to the president (No. IV. on our list) to establish his statement quite conclusively, and thus prove Mr Syme to be extremely inaccurate in matters of fact, and, on his own principles, guilty of giving countenance to Homœopathy.

Mr Syme's speech contains, however, some important admissions. He is acting under the sting of the "Lancet." Referring to the statement already noticed, he says, "This charge has been eagerly adopted by the London medical periodical press, which, from week to week, represented Mr Syme as guilty of the grossest inconsistency, in publicly opposing what he had privately countenanced."

Again, as to the examination of students, "As the member of a licensing board, he did not conceive himself entitled to reject any candidate, except on the ground of having failed in complying with the prescribed course of study, or acquiring the expected amount of information."

If we understand his meaning, Mr Syme has changed his mind since July last, when he took so remarkable a part in Mr Pope's examination; and, should his colleagues also have profited by their experience, such a scene is not likely to recur for some time in the University of Edinburgh.

Had we nothing of Mr Syme's to notice but his speech at the Medico-Chirurgical Society, we might think he was mending; but a perusal of his memorial to the Patrons of the University (No. II. of our list) must instantly dissipate any such delusion. We have already called the attention of our readers to the recent attempt of the Medical Faculty to persuade the Senatus of the University to concur with them in an application to the Patrons for Dr Hen-

derson's expulsion; to which modest proposal the Senatus would not listen.* Nothing daunted, this pugnacious Professor resolved to make his singular application, which he has accordingly done in the memorial of which the title is quoted. We regret that the document, containing fourteen theses, is too long for insertion here; but we shall give an abstract of it. Mr Syme humbly showeth, That he has a direct pecuniary interest in the prosperity of the Medical School of the Edinburgh University, in which degrees are conferred in accordance with certain regulations; enjoining attendance on a course of lectures on general pathology, which must be taken in Edinburgh, the only medical school in which such a chair exists; the utility of which has been matter of great doubt. V. "That the present Professor of General Pathology has, for some years past, publicly professed the practice of Homœopathy, which is entirely opposed to, and inconsistent with, the principles which he and his colleagues of the Medical Faculty have been appointed to teach." That, therefore, Dr Henderson has been expelled from the Medico-Chirurgical Society. That attendance upon such a course of lectures, conducted by such a Professor, must be a serious obstacle to medical graduation; and that the "existence of a Homœopathic Professor in the Medical Faculty" has been used to create distrust of the soundness of the medical instruction given at the University, &c. That Dr Henderson was appointed to hold his office *ad vitam aut culpam:* that there can be no greater fault than the profession of Homœopathy, and that, should this be doubted, the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons can at once remove doubt by the expression of their opinion. Finally, the memorialist humbly prays, that, therefore, the Patrons will "declare the chair of general pathology vacant."

The modesty of this is unsurpassed, unless by its logic.

---

* See "The New Test Act," ante, p. 196.

Even were there the gravest grounds for proceedings, to every one but Mr Syme it would seem highly indecorous that a colleague should institute them, and that under the influence of a personal difference: to propose that a chair in the University should be abolished, that Mr Syme may be avenged of his enemy. Then look at the logic of this "insolent" memorial. It might be a reasonable ground for such an application, could it be alleged that Dr Henderson's teaching was inefficient, because stupid, or inconsistent with established or generally received science; and a very important question, which we cannot here consider, would then be raised, as to the measure of liberty enjoyed by University Professors in Edinburgh or elsewhere. But the contrary is not denied, nay, has been expressly admitted in one of the recent numbers of Mr Syme's own journal (June, 1851); at least, there is not one word in this precious memorial on this, the only relevant point. The alleged ground of complaint is not the *teaching*, but the *practice* of Homœopathy. There is indeed one way in which Dr Henderson's practice may be unfavourable to his teaching of pathology, which we cannot pass over. It is the province of the professor of general pathology to teach the natural course of disease, organic and functional. No doubt his experience of these may be affected by his mode of practice. By giving poisonous doses he might, no doubt, have better opportunities of witnessing their morbid effects; but toxicology is out of his proper sphere. His business is to know and teach the natural course of diseases. If it be alleged that the practice of Homœopathy is unfavourable to such a study, we may admit it; but it can only be so because the course of diseases is effectually cut short by Homœopathic remedies, and their full development prevented. Mr Syme is welcome to this admission. If, on the other hand, as Mr Syme assures us, the Homœopathic medicines are altogether inoperative, Dr Henderson, in making use of them, is in the best possible

position for acquainting himself with the natural course of diseases, which it is his office to teach. By no possibility can any proposed remedies be more absolutely inoperative, unless in the way of exposing their author to merited contempt, than Mr Syme's ridiculous memorial. When the report of the College Committee, to whom this curious document has been remitted, comes to be considered by the Patrons, we have no doubt they will tell Mr Syme that they cannot interfere in the matter if they would, and would not if they could.*

III. Dr Simpson. Guiltiest of all in the matter of Homœopathy, and now at last confessedly so, is the Professor of Midwifery. Following Mr Syme, whose argument as well as motion he seconded, Dr Simpson tried to excuse himself before the Medico-Chirurgical Society; but Dr Henderson's letter convicted him, and Dr R. Russell's set the matter at rest. The reference to a joint opinion in his possession allowed of no evasion. When his meetings in consultation with Dr Russell had been thus brought into notice, Dr Simpson suddenly changed his tone, and made a full confession. In the letter to Dr R. Russell which is appended to his speech, Dr Simpson writes:—"And do not suppose, as your letter would seem to imply, that I am in the least degree ashamed to acknowledge having met

---

* The following judicious report of the College Committee, unanimously adopted by the Town Council, justifies our anticipations, and conveys a severe although just rebuke:—

"The College Committee having considered this memorial, in respect of the terms of Dr Henderson's appointment to the chair of medicine and general pathology, and that no allegation is made of his having failed to discharge his professorial duties in terms of his commission and of the royal warrant instituting the chair; and, farther, in respect that the soundness of all new opinions in regard to medical science can only be satisfactorily settled by the results of scientific investigation and experience, the Committee, without giving any opinion whatever on the subject of Homœopathy, beg leave to refuse the prayer of this memorial."

you at these cases in times past. * * * But that is entirely a different question from the question of meeting you or other Homœopathists for the future, now that the colleges have declared, in their corporate capacity, the impropriety of even seeming to admit in any degree the legitimacy of so-called Homœopathic medicine, by the members of our profession meeting at cases with practitioners of Homœopathy, for diagnostic or other purposes. In that opinion and in that step, I most heartily concur." Indeed, ashamed or not, he could not but confess that, acording to the foolish rule to which he so heartily accedes, he had given countenance to Homœopathy. Evidence was abundant. Dr Christison's indiscretion had brought to light one item, in Dr Stewart's words (Correspondence, &c., p. 19):—"Towards the close of last winter's session, when Dr Arneth of Vienna was in Edinburgh, he was in the habit of attending Dr Simpson's lectures. On one occasion, in Dr Arneth's presence, I recollect that Dr Simpson told his class of a case of vomiting during pregnancy then under his care. He had launched forth in succession all his Allopathic appliances—opium, naphtha, prussic acid, &c. (I forget if chloroform was also used), but without relieving the patient. He had either taken Dr Arneth to see it, or had told him about it, and the latter recommended him to try either a quarter or half a grain of ipecacuanha, I do not recollect which. He acted upon this suggestion, and with decided good results. Dr Simpson made a remark to the effect, that this, no doubt, looked very like Homœopathy, but yet he was bound to acknowledge the fact."

Aware that a confession extorted at the last hour affords no claim for mercy, Dr Simpson has made his recantation with abundant humiliating penance. For one of the most talented, experienced, instructed, and influential physicians in Edinburgh, one of the Professors in the University, to have been doomed to publish such a pamphlet as

Dr Simpson's, will surely be held degradation enough, even by the pitiless tyrant whose scourge urged on the pen. Looking only to its certain effect on Homœopathy, nothing could be more satisfactory than to see one of its greatest enemies writing such a book; but looking to the character of the medical profession, which we will not disown or slander even in present circumstances, we cannot regard this production otherwise than with painful regret. Untrue statements, feeble arguments, and base insinuations characterise it throughout; it shews not one sign of true manhood. To any detailed criticism of such a tract we will not stoop; but we shall notice very shortly a few of the more prominent points.

Two reasons for the publication of this speech are stated in the introductory note; one of them being Dr Henderson's letter, and the other Dr R. Russell's. In regard to Dr Henderson's, there needs no more be said than that he has conclusively established his statement, and forced Dr Simpson to take refuge in the plea of *non mi ricordo;* possible defect of memory not having been heard of in his speech, in which he was on that point quite positive. The correspondence with Dr R. Russell arose thus. On seeing in the "Monthly Journal" a report of Dr Simpson's speech, Dr Russell wrote the following note to Dr Simpson:

"Dear Sir,—I observe, in the speech you delivered at the recent meeting of the Medico-Chirurgical Society, you speak of having met Homœopathic practitioners only twice, and, on both of the occasions, it was Professor Henderson. You must have forgotten that you have met me several times, and that you signed a formal letter along with me, beginning, 'We met this day in consultation.' I take it for granted that you will use the first opportunity of correcting this inadvertence, as, of course, its correction will come with a much better grace from you than from me. May I request a reply to this."

On the 9th December, not having received any answer,

he again wrote, calling Dr Simpson's attention to his former note, and adding, that, *since sending it, he had again looked at the report of the speech, and found that it did not contain, as he had thought, the express statement that Dr Simpson had met Homœopathic practitioners only on the occasions particularly noticed*, but that he still understood the speech to imply as much.

We cannot quote the whole of Dr Simpson's letter, as it contains a special reference to the cases in which he had met Dr Russell in consultation; the publication of which was a breach of professional confidence, meriting grave censure; all the more that the fact being that Dr Simpson had visited patients with Dr Russell whenever he was asked to do so, the particular nature of the malady in any case was utterly irrelevant to the discussion. No one supposes that Dr Russell wanted Dr Simpson's opinion as to the best Homœopathic remedy, his utter ignorance of the subject being perfectly notorious even before the issue of this pamphlet. We shall now quote the first few sentences of this disingenuous letter, requesting our readers to observe particularly how the inuendo conveyed by the words in italics stand related to Dr Russell's *second* note, the substance of which has been stated.

"Dear Sir,—Since receiving your letter on Friday, I have really not had ten minutes of spare time to answer it. And, let me add (notwithstanding your second note of yesterday), I do not, after all, see how you could very well expect me to take the trouble of writing a reply. For you state, '*I observe that, in a speech you delivered at the recent meeting of the Medico-Chirurgical Society, you speak of having met Homœopathic practitioners only twice, and on both occasions referred to it was Professor Henderson.*'

"Now you must excuse me saying, *and I say it with pain, that you never did 'observe' any such statement in my speech;* for no such statement exists in it.

"You add,—'You must have forgotten that you have

met me upon several occasions.' Not at all; but the subject of meeting or not meeting with you was not in any way, I assure you, before the Medico-Chirurgical Society; and even the remarks about meeting Dr Henderson were only incidentally, perhaps improperly, introduced, when the real matter of consideration before the society was, in truth, a matter of principle, and not of persons; and when the question was, not what we had done with Homœopathists in times past, but what relations we should have with them for the future."

These passages, along with the one previously quoted, embrace a great part of Dr Simpson's letter. In the concluding sentences, he presumes to express his opinion of Homœopathy, which he designates as "a system of consummate charlatanry." This leads Dr Russell in reply, after noticing Dr Simpson's acknowledgment of the consultations referred to, to observe, "I shall be glad to have your opinion on Homœopathy after you have studied it, and when you shall have acquired the courtesy of style which is essential to conducting a correspondence in the manner to which I am used, and from which I cannot consent, even for your sake, to deviate." That Dr Russell's view of the import of the speech is the true one, we think, admits of no doubt, and there is just as little that so it was understood by the society; else what possible object was there in detailing to the society certain cases in which Dr Simpson had met Dr Henderson? When Dr Simpson writes that "the subject of meeting or not meeting with you was not in any way before the Medico-Chirurgical Society," he writes what is untrue, and what he could hardly have written had Mr Syme's speech been published here along with his own; for Mr Syme had enumerated the Homœopathic practitioners of whom he had any knowledge, saying of Dr Russell, "that he had had no communication with him whatever for at least seven years."

From these extracts, our readers will be able to form some notion of the character of this letter by the President of the Royal College of Physicians, which, in its tone, style, and objects, corresponds perfectly with the late notorious resolutions of that body. Of the other pages of this pamphlet, we would observe that they are even more remarkable. Their erudition may be in some measure estimated by an enumeration of all the authorities referred to, which we subjoin in a note.* It might be thought that the man who has travelled from Tartary to Brazil in pursuit of Homœopathy, visiting on his way the Mormon Model-Settlement, must be a very Humboldt. Alas! the perusal of this great work on Homœopathy by no means suggests the Cosmos: of high science, order, or beauty, it bears no trace. It is rather a Chaos than a Cosmos; yet, out of its most confounded confusions, we shall select for brief remarks a few points which project out of the general darkness.

And, first, we observe, that the illustrious writer makes no attack upon the essential principle of Homœopathy; he nowhere refers to it as being absurd or untrue. We accept this as an admission that even the adventurous Professor of Midwifery was not prepared to deny its truth. The authorities he quotes and the topics he touches do not by any means approach that high region. Lost in the con-

---

* The Mormons or Latter Day Saints. Bradshaw's Guide to the Continent. Ueber die Nichtigkeit der Homœopathie, Leipsic, 1840. The Medical Gazette. The Lancet. Confessions of a Homœopathist (an impudent, coarse lampoon, which some of our readers may remember). M. Huc's Travels in Tartary, Thibet, &c. Whatley's Logic. Dr Forbes' Review. Doctrine de l'Ecole de Rio, Paris, 1849. Dr Wood's Homœopathy Unmasked. Casper's Wochenschrift for March, 1845. Dr Schubert of Dramburg (no reference). Dr Cormack's Speech at the late Brighton Meeting. A Sermon, preached in the Church of St Augustin, Cheapside, by the Rev. Thomas Everest, rector of Wickwar, 1851. Hahnemann's Organon (with reference to Psora Theory). Mure's Pathogenesie. Pharmaceutical Journal for 1851.

templation of the inexplicable fact, to which he calls the attention of the society, of there being THREE Homœopapathic chemists' shops in Edinburgh, he never seems rightly to get out of that sphere of thought. In his view, a great mystery appears to involve the subject; for he cannot understand that the sale of these wonderful medicines should be regulated by the vulgar law of demand and supply.

The ignorance of Homœopathy apparent in this brochure is unaccountable. That a man should have lived so long among books, and read so many on all sorts of out-of-the-way subjects, as Dr Simpson is reputed to have done, and should never have read any one book treating seriously of Homœopathy, is worth considering. If the great readers at the head of the profession be thus, what will the underlings be? Knowing nothing of Homœopathic literature, or wilfully ignoring it, this ready writer takes his information from such sources as "Bradshaw's Continental Guide;" and having probably never read any one of Hahnemann's writings, he forms his judgment of the opinions and character of that remarkable man from what idle rumours chance to meet him. Thus he concludes with the author of the "Guide," that because the hospital at Leipsic contained few beds, therefore Homœopathy must be getting into disrepute in that quarter; both being alike ignorant that that institution is one of the few hospitals in Germany supported by voluntary contributions, and that the very fact of its existence proves much on the other side.* It would have been more to the purpose to tell

* The haste with which Dr Simpson has availed himself of every statement calculated to injure Homœopathy, without deeming it necessary to inquire how far it might be true, has led him to bring before the public a witness, whose character, when known, must seriously damage the cause he is called to support. In order to exhibit the *present* state of Homœopathy in Germany, he quotes some idle gossip (none of it apparently of later date than 1840) from "Brad-

his readers that this year, in one of the public gardens of the same city, with all due solemnity, a bronze statue was raised to Hahnemann's memory; or that, in London, two hospitals have beeen lately established, containing together nearly 80 beds. The public of this country, unlike Dr Simpson, naturally attach more importance to the state of medical belief at home than abroad. Yet abroad, too, Homœopathy has spread far and wide; from East to West, as Dr Simpson reminds us;—yes, embracing many climates and *creeds*. In these circumstances, it is hard to hold Homœopathy responsible for the *theological* opinions of all its votaries. Finding the authority of the Colleges laughed at by the public, he wants once more to call in the Church to stay the advance of science. Homœopathists, he says, are heretics in theology as well as in medicine; and adduces two examples to prove

---

shaw's Guide to the Continent." The chief authority given by the writer, a Mr Lee, for his statements that Homœopathy was decaying in Leipsic, is a work, as he states, published by the house physician of a dispensary there, containing "an exposition of the system pursued," entitled, "Ueber die Nichtigkeit der Homœopathie" —(on the Nothingness of Homœopathy.) There was published in Leipsic, in 1835, a work with the following title:—"Homœopathisches Heilverfahren in chirurgischen Krankheitsfällen, nebst der reinen Arzneiwirkungen eines neuen wichtigen Antipsoricum, von Dr Julius Theodor Hofbauer"—(Homœopathic experience in surgical cases, together with the pure action of a new powerful antipsoric, "Osmium," by Dr Julius Theodor Hofbauer.) The alleged proving and published cases were discovered and exposed by Drs Trinks and Noack as a scandalous fabrication, which proved to be the work of a man of the name of Karl Wilhelm Fickel, sufficiently notorious as the only renegade from Homœopathy; to which the apostacy of such a man could bring only honour. Such is the man on whose statements Mr Lee and Dr Simpson build their important conclusions. If Dr Simpson wishes to hear more of this friend of his cause, we recommend him to apply, not to the medical, but to the police authorities of Germany, for the last accounts left him imprisoned for swindling. But truly, as Dr Simpson has found, "Poverty," even in controversy, "makes us acquainted with strange bedfellows."

it. One of these is a recent French writer, of no authority with any one but Dr Simpson; the other a clergyman of the Church of England. The sermon referred to we have not read, and (even if otherwise competent) we can form no opinion of its theological character from the scraps Dr Simpson has quoted. We have, however, seen by the same author a letter to Dr Rose Cormack,* on his recent speech at Brighton, which Dr Simpson quotes with approval; and should Mr Everest think it worth while to visit Dr Simpson's attacks on his theology or calumnies on the subject of Hahnemann and Homœopathy with such a chastisement as he inflicted on poor Dr Rose Cormack, the Professor of Midwifery may have cause to repent having ever meddled with the Rector of Wickwar. At the same time, although the notion of making Hahnemann or Homœopathy responsible for all the theological vagaries of his disciples, is too absurd to be treated seriously, we have no objection that it be so, if only Allopathy have the same measure. Thus Dr Simpson will get the credit of having on his side Joe Smith and the Mormons (whom, presuming too largely upon public credulity, he elaborately likens to Hahnemann and his disciples); and those gentlemen, about whose theology we don't know much, but whose doctrines regarding property are seriously objectionable, whom we see now and then referred to in the "Times" as committing robbery by means of chloroform. Could not Dr Simpson use his influence with these followers?

Of this same public credulity Dr Simpson speaks much, and with unquestionable sincerity, else he never could have hoped, by blindly endorsing them, to put into respectable circulation here old calumnies long since silenced by exposure elsewhere. To this class belong the wonderful, almost romantic, stories of the poisoning of dukes and other notabilities, with dreadfully powerful globules. If

---

* See ante, p. 294.

he believes the public to be in serious danger of this, he is a remarkable instance of the credulity we are speaking of; if he does not believe it, he is guilty of the basest falsehood.

For the educated non-medical public, Dr Simpson seems to have a supreme contempt. They are quite unfit, he says, to judge properly of such doctrines as Homœopathy and Mormonism; on the one they ought to accept the opinion of the doctors, on the other of the clergy. Yet, after all, as we shall see presently, his final appeal is to "common sense." He thinks it necessary to tell them "that men labouring under disease, even the most acute, and, consequently, much more so when suffering under slighter ailments, do not, as a general rule, die even when untreated." With this truth the public have been long familiar; nay, they know more—that, even *when treated*, people do not generally die, although Dr Forbes's opinion is becoming a very common one, that the benefit of average medical treatment is extremely problematical. We are agreed that if people *die* under infinitesimal doses they die by nature, not by medicine; under much other treatment the cause of death is doubtful.

Again, he says, "We have a confession of faith, and a standard by which we can judge such men, namely, THE STANDARD OF COMMON SENSE." We are delighted to see this; it is what we have always contended for; only let it be the "common sense" of the thoughtful, the informed, the candid, and we have everything to hope: we fear Dr Simpson's appeal is to the common sense of the most vulgar. Witness a specimen of the logic of one who parades Whatley's name (p. 13). "If a grown-up man were gravely and seriously to assert to the world that two and two make five, the world would be inclined to look upon him as doubtfully rational, inasmuch as he defied the principles of common sense. And when other grown-up men now tell the world that they can cure this or that dis-

ease with a billionth or decillionth of a grain of this or that common and probably even inert drug, they express an opinion perhaps even more intensely and directly absurd than the doctrine of two and two making five." To argue on any subject with one who does not distinguish between the certain truths of the Reason, and the acquired empirical knowledge of natural agents, the powers of which we cannot tell *a priori*, could serve no good purpose. What the necessary healing quantity of any drug may be is a matter of experimental investigation, not of abstract reasoning; and long lines of figures or other more popular illustrations, are altogether irrelevant to the inquiry. The stars shine on us, although we can form no conception of distances so great that billions are the units with which the astronomer measures; and strong men, after a few minutes spent in an infected chamber, come out with the seeds of a mortal disease, "so inconceivably minute, that no sense, no balance, no microscope, no chemical analysis, no human means whatever, can discover the slightest trace of them in what is administered."*

It is certainly remarkable that Dr Simpson should find the action of infinitesimal doses more incredible than the phenomena of animal magnetism.

It was to be expected that a man with Dr Simpson's gross views of the nature of medicinal action, should scoff at Hahnemann's profound (though, perhaps, erroneous) speculations on the origin and transmission of disease. No doubt Dr Simpson knows all about this hidden matter; teaches perhaps as historical fact the pretty myth of Pandora's box.

Although well knowing that "regular" medicine has plenty to tell of offensive nauseous remedies; that such things as viper broth, snail soup, and spider ointment

---

* Professor Christison's Inaugural Address against Homœopathy, quoted by Dr Simpson.

(much recommended by Anthony and Cleopatra's physician, Dioscorides), had been held in veneration before Hahnemann was born, Dr Simpson has yet thought it worth while to notice with minute detail some not very nice insect remedies which have been proposed (preparations of the *acarus scabiei*, &c.), but which we have neither given nor taken; Dr Simpson may like the subject, we do not—and shall here part with him.

Having now taken such a glance as our time has allowed at each in succession, we shall make a remark or two on the absurd position in which they all stand, and into which they have misled their too thoughtless followers, by the adoption of the recent resolutions. From our preceding remarks, it is quite plain that physicians using the most approved remedies cannot help countenancing Homœopathy; and it is obviously unjust, and will not be tolerated, that equal privileges should be denied to members of the profession whose discoveries are making valuable additions to medical science. When it is said that members of the colleges will have nothing to do with practitioners of Homœopathy, the public will insist upon knowing what that means. Throughout the discussion in the colleges, indeed, the way in which the interests of humanity are left out of sight, as altogether too insignificant a matter to be thought of, has not failed to attract notice; and in some form an early reckoning will be held. Within closed doors, it may be sufficient to brand with a nickname the practitioners of a more than usually successful and popular system of cure, and to doom them to expulsion from common professional intercourse; but when the public are asked to countenance the persecution, they will require something more definite than a name. What then do the resolutioners mean? Are they prepared to abjure all remedies that shall be found to fall under the Homœopathic law? Will Dr Simpson never again cure chronic vomiting with half a grain of ipecacuanha, or Dr Christison treat

pneumonia with small doses of tartar emetic, or Mr Syme dare to use arnica? Is that their meaning? Or is it that the small doses are the only ground of quarrel? In that case a *minimum* must be assigned, the transgression of which shall infer expulsion. At present, in the mere matter of quantity, there is more difference between the high and the low Homœopathic dilutions, than between the last of these and the small doses frequently prescribed by Drs Christison and Simpson. If half a grain be too much, may not Dr Simpson give $^1/_4$th of a grain, or $^1/_{10}$th, or $^1/_{100}$th, or even $^1/_{1000}$th, without incurring banishment? Of all possible spectacles, a grand schism in the medical profession, on the sole ground of the quantities of the drugs prescribed, is about the most melancholy; and when such a disastrous course is violently urged by those who, on their own confession, have made no experiments with a view to ascertain in how small quantities medicines are efficacious remedies, and against those who have had large experience on the subject, leading to the conviction that minute quantities are best, the measure can only be regarded as the attempt of a dominant sect to crush their advancing rivals by force of authority. When the matter is pushed to such an extremity, that the patient may die while the operating surgeon is requiring the physician to repeat the articles of his faith, it is surely time that the creed should be known, and the shorter it is the better. Let it be "in certis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus charitas!"

P.S.—Since these pages were written, Dr Simpson has published a second edition of his pamphlet, on which we can here make but one or two remarks.

Our first is, that we congratulate Dr Simpson on the progress he has made in a fortnight; and, should he continue to press on with the same energy, he will soon be *in medias res* of this controversy. He has already come to the

rough statement of the Homœopathic law; the next time we meet him he will have learned something of its necessary limitations and conditions, for he has now taken to consulting the writings of credible Homœopathists, instead of judging of their opinions, as heretofore, from the statements of their most reckless calumniators. He has yet hardly touched the surface of the argument; when he goes deeper into it, we shall be glad to fight the battle once more. Before he can be entitled to such consideration, he must have learned to distinguish the Homœopathic system, the extension and success of which depends upon no secret remedies or local circumstances or personal influence, from the instances he quotes of *individuals* here and there having for a time achieved wide and yet very unenviable reputation as administrators of some one treatment. He must abandon his old vice, to which he still holds, of classing Homœopathy with the pretended infallible universal remedies. To a thoughtful mind, it will be quite apparent that nothing can in truth be more essentially unlike belief in *one universal specific* than faith in the prevalence of a law of relation, according to which the remedies must be *as indefinitely various* as are the phenomena of disease. Dr Simpson's own practice approaches much nearer to that referred to than does the Homœopathic; for he applies the same remedy to many dissimilar states of body, which any good Homœopathist would consider malpractice.

Dr Simpson has yet to learn that, although the Homœopathic law be universally true, its application to practice must yet be extremely difficult; and that thus occasional or frequent failure no more proves it fallacious, than the failure of ninety-nine out of a hundred arrows to pierce the bull's-eye disproves the law of projectiles. Homœopathy is not more than fifty years old, and has much to learn; yet the strength of its youth gives promise of a supremely victorious manhood.

Audacious as ever, Dr Simpson not only denies the efficacy of small doses, but disputes the alleged provings. Not only are the alleged cures by infinitesimals ascribed by him to imagination, but the alleged effects of large doses, taken for the purpose of ascertaining their action. If Dr Simpson knew anything of the evidence on this subject, even he would hardly hazard such a line of argument.

Into the details on which he enters we cannot now follow him; but, rejoicing in the improved tone of his treatment of the subject, we must here part with him—leaving to other hands, or another opportunity, the particular exposure of his many errors and fallacies. Before he can be ripe for the discussion of this vital question, he will have to spend more hours than he seems yet to have spent minutes on its examination. Aware that it is the great medical question of the day, he seems resolved to prosecute it; and we hope to meet him again.

DR RUSSELL'S ADDRESS

AT THE

SECOND CONGRESS OF HOMŒOPATHIC PRACTITIONERS.

HELD AT LONDON ON THE 23D AND 24TH JULY, 1851.*

GENTLEMEN,—It is now nearly a century since the birth of the great man to whom we owe the reformation which gives us our distinctive appellation and task; and a bare recital of the leading events which have been more or less caused or affected by the idea he first embodied and taught, would more than occupy the space allotted to this address. But it would be more profitable could we discover the spirit which shaped itself in these outward effects, for it is only by so doing that history becomes an oracle, directing us how to act, and telling what we may anticipate.

The career of Hahnemann is too familiar to us all to require narration here. The features of his character most important to bear in mind, when we attempt to estimate the results of his life, are those which he derived from the country of his birth, and those which he shared in common with all great actors in this world's drama.

Germany, that land of promise, of promise unfulfilled—that land which has so often given us a prince for our throne and a monarch in the realms of thought—was em-

---

* From the "British Journal of Homœopathy," Vol. ix.

phatically his fatherland. There he acquired that width of culture and experience corresponding to his future elevation; thence he derived that simplicity, a frequent attendant if not essential attribute of high genius—a simplicity blended with lofty imagination, which delights to recognise a symbolic significance in things of everyday life. Thus, upon one occasion being visited in his retreat at Cœthen by a disciple who had often heard of the garden attached to his house which afforded him his only exercise, being at the time unable from the hostility of his persecutors to venture beyond his own threshold, in reply to the natural observation of "How small this much talked-of garden of yours is, Hofrath," he observed, "Yes, it is narrow, but (pointing to the sky) of infinite height." His enemies could not interdict his ascent, however much they circumscribed his rambles. And thus he became a

> "Type of the wise, who soar but never roam,
> True to the kindred points of heaven and home."

From the too great inclination of his countrymen to exalt the ideal over the practical, what might be called a tendency to run to ghost, he was saved by an intense desire, inherent in all reformers, to give substantial reality to the truth he had won from "the void and formless infinite." To the critical element so excessive in his time and country, and which now threatens all creeds and systems with destruction, he united a faith firm as that of a former and greater age and the zeal of a prophet, which, even in the act of consuming the old and false, quickens into being a higher and more enduring form of life. To this combination of opposite qualities, to the profound abstract thinker, the scientific inquirer united with the vehement preacher, and the sagacious man of the world, do we owe one of the greatest achievements recorded in the annals of science.

As Hahnemann's character, like that of all men whose lives have told directly upon the human race, was essen-

tially national, so the development of his system in the various lands where it took root presents distinctions equally characteristic of their inhabitants. In Germany, great in men and ideas, and little addicted to spontaneous organisation, no sooner was the doctrine promulgated, than it was partially accepted, exposed to the keen critical acumen of its subtilising intellect, commented on with the easy candour of philosophical scepticism, and when practically espoused it encountered the risk of being lost in absurd extremes; for, while the Hochpotenzers waged war with the Specifikers, both were warned from the camp of the thirtieth regiment of regulars. And now we may even descry in the distance the Homœopathic sceptic, which seems to me the strangest of all anomalies. In short, in Germany men prefer taking the watch to pieces to trying whether it will go. Hence, notwithstanding the number, ability, and industry of its adherents, the system has not made the impression on its native land which it ought to have done, and which it would have done, had the Germans been a more practical nation. Let us at the same time frankly acknowledge our immense obligation to them, for they seem destined to grow seed-corn which they may not eat. *Vos non vobis* is painfully applicable to this noble race. Alas, that in the land which gave to us the art of printing, the press should be gagged!

Although we are now in possession of a Homœopathic map, by that zealous apostle of the cause who gave such volcanic life to it in Sicily, yet we shall not venture upon the "grand tour," but content ourselves by applying the principles we have indicated to the progress of the reformation in Britain and America. We unite these two countries, for they are of one tongue and lineage. In fact, America is the extreme development of Britain in one direction; more than rivalling its parent in energy and enterprise, and presenting almost in caricature those features in which both they and we differ from Germany.

We may venture without offence to say, that this country, chosen by all the earth to rear the palace for the coronation of commerce, is pre-eminent among the nations. But great as it is nationally, we look in vain for individuals who hold a corresponding pre-eminence among those of other lands. The greatest state seems to have only small statesmen.

The same holds even more emphatically true of America. There as here, the excellence consists in the application rather than the conception of ideas. Hence, as we might have expected, Homœopathy was imported ready-made into these countries, and put to use. The first to give it a firm footing here was Dr Quin, who, with other rare qualifications for the task, was eminently a man of the world—sagacious, practical, adroit, and bold. The very man for England. Soon others rose, all more or less distinguished by this vigorous, practical character, and whose success in every case corresponded to the amount of those qualities they possessed. Over the country in all directions there sprung up practitioners, who with true English instinct organised institutions, such as dispensaries with a committee of management, which now serve as so many centres of independent growth and development, and are spreading like a ganglionic system over the whole island. So that, whereas ten years ago there was but one or two such institutions in the kingdom, there are now above forty, almost all of which have a regular board of management, generally comprising persons of great social influence, and are so far independent, that in the event of the removal of the practitioner to whom they owe their origin, means would be immediately taken to secure another. Like all British institutions, they have so much stability and plasticity, that individual losses can no longer affect their permanence. The number of patients who have been treated at the various dispensaries is now very great, certainly not less than 100,000. In America, too, there exist associations of all

kinds for the promotion of Homœopathy, some of which have even been sanctioned by the state and incorporated by charter, and obtained the right of granting college degrees, as in Pennsylvania.

To the mere historian this is a pleasant sight, for it assures us that Homœopathy *of a kind* has laid so firm a hold of the practical English and American mind, that nothing can now check its steady and rapid advance. It has twice proved its power to combat the most deadly of modern plagues, with an amount of success unparalleled by any other method. The result of the Homœopathic treatment both of cholera and yellow fever has greatly increased the public confidence in the system, and won adherents from the old school of physic.

There are now no less than three hospitals in full operation, all ably equipped with efficient medical officers, and presided over by men of more than British lustre and renown. So that, if there be any truth in history, we may predict for our reformation a future more abundantly triumphant than its brief past. For every day as it adds to the bulk increases the momentum of the body.

But to us to whom the internal development of this great truth is committed, there is much ground of anxiety. It is by no means flattering to our vanity, that while it has done so much for us we have done so little for it. We can scarcely point to one original idea suggested, and to but one important medicine added by us, nothwithstanding the multitude of books which have been written both here and in America. And it well becomes us to be modest in the height of our success, seeing we owe it so entirely to the ill-requited labours of others, many of whom are scarcely known even by name. Far be it from me to presume to say this in the way of reproof; I merely indicate it as the natural consequence of importing a scientific discovery into this intensely practical and unideal country. Probably the numerous practitioners who have done so much to establish

and extend this truth, have been of more benefit than had their time been spent in proving new medicines, or re-investigating the properties of those already proved.

But we are now entering upon a most critical period of our history, and we shall require in the prosperity we confidently anticipate more wisdom to guide our course than when we were insignificant in numbers and reputation. The opposition we are experiencing from the practitioners of Allopathy is quite out of proportion to any mischief they conceive our system calculated to produce; and they seem to be acting under the convulsive apprehension of speedy personal extinction. Indeed their recent doings display an amount of folly approaching to the state of the "quem Deus vult perdere," and it requires no great prophetic power to foretell the result. It would certainly have been more congenial to the better part of our natures, had the inevitable process of the absorption and extinction of the antiquated and feeble by the fresh and vigorous proceeded more gradually, and with a less mortifying exhibition of the mean passions which lie dormant in every heart, and display themselves when provoked by selfish fear and cupidity. But this was not to be: and, in the age which boasts so loudly of its enlightenment, liberality, and toleration, we have seen the most celebrated medical University of Europe stoop to an act of as base and cowardly persecution as any which roused the eloquence of Luther against the perfidy of the Vatican.

It is with profound regret we contemplate the ruinous course adopted by these venerable institutions. Cato's famous sentence, "Delenda est Carthago," proved bad advice: for with the fall of Carthage began the decline of Rome. And we should gain infinitely more by a generous rivalry, than by this bitter hostility between the two opposing schools of medicine. But we fear that to expect this would be to confound the ancient St Andrew's Knight of the Lance with the modern St Andrew's Day of the

Lancet.* One thing, however, is certain, that as the Red Indian, in spite of his tomahawk and scalping-knife, disappears more rapidly before the ploughshare than the rifle, so the overthrow, or, what would be far better, the conversion of our antagonists will be more accelerated by our peaceful development than by any aggressive measures.

True, it is not easy to bear with the "silent magnanimity of nature" the furious assaults of the incessant scribblers in the medical press, to say nothing of the torrent of gibes and taunts to which we are daily exposed. But now that "Punch," that London Puck, has volunteered his services to command the Joke-corps in this forlorn hope, we may expect to be relieved from the wearisome repetition of attempts at witticism by those whose silly laugh is only now tolerated in society on account of their obvious want of knowledge and good breeding. By the by, "Punch" should clearly be on our side, for he must claim descent from the Laughing Philosopher, and Democritus was the first to announce the Homœopathic doctrine, in his famous answer to Hippocrates, who was sent by his foolish townsfolk to cure of insanity the sanest man of his day.

The rapid progress of our system, involving as it must do the gradual reversing of our relation with the old school, will endanger the loss of that wholesome stimulus which makes each of us feel that he is at present working in the field of a microscope, with the eye of anything but charity fixed upon his actions. If this be withdrawn, there will be considerable risk of the distance between the physician and his patients being too much diminished, and that not so much by the elevation of the latter as the depression of the former.

So long as our whole strength is expended in diffusing

---

* The Medical Faculty of St Andrews, which has suddenly become so very sensitive of its reputation, consists of—one Dr Day.

rather than augmenting truth, we are tending to equalise the amount of knowledge whose difference distinguishes the professional and non-professional public. When we read a popular treatise on Astronomy, by Herschel, we are conscious that in his capacious mind there lie vaults of wealth beyond what he has thought proper to produce for our instruction, and the light he gives, though enough for our unpractised eye, only confirms our previous estimate of his unattainable elevation. But it is far otherwise with popular works, written by those who have not yet obtained the medal of the Legion of Science. The amateur, when he has mastered his manual, imagines more or less foolishly that he is equal to its author, and expresses his confident opinion upon all matters contained therein. This is the natural consequence of the arithmetical aspect of our books of reference. Once admit the principle that the selection of a remedy depends upon the mere number of the symptoms it has in common with a disease, and it requires a far less complex machine than that of Babbage to supersede the necessity of calling in a doctor. It is not easy for those just entering upon domestic practice, with plenary powers derived from Jahr and Company, to understand how we can admit in its fullest extent the value of the simple rule as an unerring guide to the choice of the right remedy, and yet maintain that its application is so difficult that even Hahnemann, in the full maturity of his experience, exclaims: that he should feel inclined to worship as a God the man who was thoroughly acquainted with all the virtues that lie in belladonna alone. So that the complaint of the Father of Medicine: *Ars longa vita brevis, experientia fallax,* holds as true now as it did two thousand years ago. Without wishing to wrap ourselves in a cloak of mystery, or to assume the *odi-profanum-vulgus* air, it is quite obvious that every art has its multitude of technical peculiarities, which require the apprenticeship of a life thoroughly to master, besides its simple laws, which may be under-

stood by any person who takes the pains to reflect upon them.

The obvious remedy for this awkward approximation of the two classes, is to set before ourselves a higher standard of attainment, such as Hahnemann had. It is by working in his spirit and towards his ideal that we are his disciples, and not by servile copying of his written directions, much less by implicit faith in the traditionary legends about his miraculous cures. And, perhaps, I may take the liberty of pressing on your attention the claims of the Journal with which several of us are connected. It has been the anxious wish of the editors that it should represent the growth of our system; and, among the testimonies to the recognition of its value, we have one more flattering than agreeable in the fact of a reprint to the amount of a thousand copies having been made in America. I should hardly have thought myself entitled to advert to this, had there been an active scientific spirit manifesting itself in other directions, but I fear we are content with what we have attained to, and perhaps nothing but a sharp reverse will teach us that the end of growth is the beginning of decay; that not to go forward is to go back; and whenever we cease to gain we begin to lose. In the words of Goethe—

> "Stumbleth he who runneth fast,
> Dieth he who standeth still;
> Nor by haste nor rest can ever
> Man his destiny fulfil."

Now that, backed by so powerful and distinguished a body of supporters, we have given a challenge to all other schools by the opening of public hospitals, it is of the utmost consequence that, excelling them in our special method of treatment, we should equal them in our general attainmeuts.

We cannot over-estimate the value of our hospitals; not only nor indeed mainly on account of the statistical evidence they are calculated to afford, but as presenting a field of observation to inquirers. For medical statistics

are generally very fallacious. It is a common error to transfer the certainty of numbers to the things they indicate but do not represent. Numerals are simple unchangeable substantives, and never vary in their material relations. Two is, and always must be, equal to two. But when they become adjective, then this no longer holds true. Two men are not necessarily equal to two men. It is a common error to suppose that, because calculation is so valuable in ascertaining the probable duration of life, some similar process may be applicable to questions regarding the treatment of disease. This essential difference is overlooked, that in the former case the elements of the calculations are extremely simple, and in the latter just the reverse. We know that within a given space of time all now alive shall be dead. It is no very difficult problem to find the probable term of each life; although all we can even here determine is the aggregate, not the individual period of death. But it is altogether different with disease. Disease is not a thing, it is an abstract term for a combination and series of changes occurring in a living person. And if two men are not equal to two men, much less are two sick persons equal to two other sick persons, though all are ill of the same disease. When we speak of two cases of brain-fever, we mean two individuals differently organised originally, subjected from their birth to different influences which have modified and increased their primary dissimilarity, and who have into the bargain a morbid action going on in an important organ, and which probably still more exaggerates their natural unlikeness.

Thus they may differ in every other respect and agree only in this, that their brain is inflamed. And yet all these enormous differences are overlooked, and they are secured as so many equal atoms to be subjected to an endless process of multiplication and addition, and from data thus imperfect are drawn algebraical formulæ which we are told are as certain as the propositions of Euclid.

I do not wish to undervalue statistics, but merely to suggest the propriety of carefully limiting them to their legitimate sphere of application, which seems to me to have been transgressed by some of our ablest physicians.

There are few of our reasonings for practical purposes founded upon mathematics; but there is another kind of evidence, far more accessible and equally cogent—the direct appeal to the senses. We do not recognise a thing by enumerating its properties, but by a much more rapid and subtle process. As no sane man can doubt, after a certain number of times, that he can be mistaken in the appearance of a simple, obvious, and well-marked disease, so may the same certainty attend the observation of manifest effects of remedies when their operation is watched. Hospital reports, especially tabular ones, are open to a thousand objections; but seeing is believing, and any one who is familiar with disease, and sees its course modified or arrested under our treatment in a way he never saw before, cannot resist the conclusion that the result is due to the means employed. Besides the conviction obtained by those who observe for themselves, we cannot doubt but that the fact of cultivated and trustworthy physicians attesting their belief in the system from personal observation, has an invaluable effect in inducing others to pursue a similar course. Nor is the advantage to the student entering the profession to be overlooked. It becomes us to afford all facilities to those who venture to oppose the tyrannical decrees of universities and colleges, and to give them every encouragement in the prosecution of those studies for which they have to encounter the risk of degradation and insult. Every hospital is a school, and while we should deeply regret to see candidates for the Homœopathic diploma separating themselves before the termination of their curriculum from their academic fellows, yet, whether the degree is to supersede or to be superadded to that of the old school, it is quite obvious that before long some examination into the quali-

fications of those who profess to practise Homœopathy will be demanded by the public and granted by the state. And I trust that the claims of Edinburgh may not be forgotten. We have already one Professor there, who is now doing us valiant service; and I feel assured that the recent futile and malignant attempt to deprive him of his well-earned position will more clearly demonstrate the fact, that, so far from a profession of Homœopathy disqualifying a teacher from giving instruction in the preliminary branches of study, the greater nicety of its therapeutics demands a more intimate acquaintance with all the varieties of morbid action, the laws of which constitute pathology. For if the system we have devoted our lives to advance and improve be something more than a cabalistic spell muttered over fantastic globules, if it be indeed one of the greatest thoughts of the day, then it must assimilate to itself all true knowledge and learning. If the sciences were ever necessary to medicine, they are more so now. Truth fulfils, never supplants truth. The value of the past is enhanced by the present, as the revelations of the Old Testament could not be fully understood till the promulgation of the New.

Indeed, it is one of the most gratifying reflections how naturally all the cognate sciences and curative methods arrange themselves round the central truth of Homœopathy. Thus we welcome all the contributions of the chemist and pathologist, as well as the instructions of those who have studied the application of water in its various relations to disease, and all practical investigations on that most mysterious of curative agencies—mesmerism —which even in the cradle rouses such undue fears in the timid, and excites equally exorbitant hopes in the credulous. In short, we give a hearty welcome to all appliances which promise to eradicate the distempers or alleviate the sufferings and prolong the life of the family of mankind. We do not even fanatically refuse the measures employed by our Allopathic brethren. (For though the Jews do not

study the New Testament, that is no reason the Christians should not study the Old.) We find in the dietetic medicines, such as cod-liver oil, a valuable auxiliary to our specific treatment. Much less do we reject the improved methods of diagnosis, so elaborately and successfully cultivated by many Allopathic physicians, and one of the most recent innovations in an important department of practice has been largely tested and warmly advocated by one of our most energetic and distinguished practitioners.

Indeed, we confidently anticipate the day when Homœopathy and Allopathy, and all such discordant sectarian names, shall merge in one general system, and when there shall be but one art of healing as there is but one Hope, one Faith, one Life, and one true Physician. To hasten the advance of this glorious consummation, requires higher attributes than any that science affords. It demands of us to forget the petty jealousies which have done so much to retard our progress, and that we should act with more mutual toleration and larger charity.

Let us then unite in a higher sense than we have yet done, helping and cheering one another in the arduous task committed to our care, and above all things keeping each his own honour unsullied; that thus we

> May bear without abuse,
> The grand old name of Gentleman,
> Defamed by every Charlatan,
> And soiled by most ignoble use.

A TRIP TO LEIPSIC.

THE HAHNEMANN JUBILEE.*

After having done duty, like other provincials, for two days at the Royal Bazaar in Hyde Park, we started for Dover, to make the most of our brief holiday. Arriving there at half-past eleven o'clock at night, we encountered a scene of indescribable confusion. A multitude of porters contended fiercely for the luggage, and the victorious party having piled a cartload on a large barrow, set off, with a speed and noise of a fire-engine, to the quay. The event showed we had need of all our speed, for the boat was already off: we hailed it, and seeing what a multitude we were, it put back to within a trunk throw of the edge; the porters pitched the luggage on board, and we followed in its wake, and in a few minutes we were on our voyage. Being midnight, we asked for beds, and were directed to the cabin. On descending, we found it filled by successive layers of human beings, quite a model for a slaver. Perceiving an unoccupied crevice above the third tier, we picked our steps, amid a polyglot of execrations from the half-awakened mass of sleepers, to the edge of a sofa where, in a profound sleep, lay an exhausted Sclav or Teuton, and, making a pedestal of his chest, we reached our dormitory.

---

* From the "Edinburgh News," and "British Journal of Homœopathy."

Passing through Belgium, by way of Ostend and Liege, we hastened on to Cologne, and were soon upon the berhymed river. It is always a pleasant variety floating on the Rhine, not so much on account of the scenery, which has always appeared to us much overrated, but for the abundance of amusing scenes the steamers afford. The dinner on deck is a great treat. The sharper with his large moustache, his low brow, keen eye, wide trousers, and polished boots, brushing his hair, before the engagement, with his pocket-brush, and adjusting his whiskers at the looking-glass on the back of it; then the resolute German, pleased at the prospect of a good long uninterrupted *edification;* next the London party—the pursy old gentleman, out of all patience at the sour wine, weak soups, and endless succession of anonymous and unintelligible fractions of fish, fowl, and flesh, while his interesting daughter does her best to keep him in good humour, and tries to speak German, learned specially for the occasion, to the *garçon*, who, supposing it English, pertinaciously replies in the Rhine dialect of that tongue. But we forget that most of our readers are probably familiar with such scenes. Our objection to the Rhine is its want of a background; you see at once all that is to be seen, pretty headlands and picturesque ruins, but nothing grand. The Danube is far finer. There we have always to the picture a frame of snowy-peaked hills, which are delightful to the eye from the contrast of light, and are a sort of stepping-stone to the imagination into the remote unknown they bound and barrier.

We left the Rhine a little way from Frankfort, and proceeded next day to Baden-Baden, *en route* for Switzerland. But it was otherwise determined. The evening of our arrival was calm and beautiful, but soon we felt the deadening sensation of an approaching storm. The clouds lay like large slates upon the sky, and for some hours vivid flashes of lightning leapt from edge to edge, without any

thunder. As night closed in, we returned to our hotel, and had scarcely reached it when the rain came down like a tropical waterspout; it continued, along with thunder and lightning, all night, and in the morning the roads were impassable. A small brook, a mere "burn" on the yesterday, was to-day a tumbling, roaring river like the Rhone. The kitchen of the hotel was filled with water, tables and chairs were floated away, trees soon began to come down, and heaps of firewood. One hotel (the English) was surrounded with water—its inmates had to be removed in carts; streets had become canals, and invalids were carried on men's shoulders to the higher parts of the town. What were the inhabitants about all this time? Most of them, wrapped in huge cloaks, with umbrellas over their heads and pipes in their mouths, were contemplating the work of havoc, and perhaps speculating on the laws of hydraulics, only doing nothing. It was a strange contrast to such a scene at home, exhibiting so strongly the little power of self-help in the German character, and it might well suggest an anxious thought of how this great people were to work out their freedom. What can be done for a nation without a history and without a faith? Is it not regeneration it needs; it has never been born. The German nation is an agglomeration of atoms bound together by pressure from without, not a constellation arranged by forces acting from within; and yet great even in its present chaos! a huge leviathan unconscious of its might, on which two-headed vultures strut, guzzle, and flap their regal or imperial wings.

So much for Baden, the most agreeable lounge and most dangerous hell-trap in Europe, where gambling goes on from night to morning; and under the gayest and most fascinating surface there trickles incessantly a black rill of crime and misery.

Our Swiss tramp being knocked on the head by this unsought water-cure process, for the roads and railways were

destroyed, we had nothing for it but to make for Leipsic with all the expedition in our power. In our way thither, we spent a night at Cassel, lately so famous for its bold assertion of constitutional freedom. It has suffered much by the quartering of so many troops upon it, and it tells us the sad lesson that a little state cannot be free unless isolated by sea or mountains—a lesson which we fear Hungary likewise teaches. We spent the following night at Halle, with one of the most distinguished theologians in Europe, and one of the most popular professors in Germany. He corroborated the observation we had long ago made, that Protestant Germany was probably the most irreligious country in the world. And it is in some respects the worst kind of irreligion, as it presents nothing offensive to the taste of the moralist. Sentiment, morality, and mesmerism are equivalent to religion there; they neither believe nor disbelieve anything beyond the teaching of Goethe, "that noble dome lighted from beneath."

On our arrival at the Blumenberg Hotel at Leipsic, on the morning of the 8th of August, we found some of our English friends already there, who had come for the same object as ourselves. The day was spent in visiting old acquaintances whom we had known some ten years ago when studying here; and in the evening we had our preliminary meeting. The following day was the chief diet of this strange general assembly. The hall of meeting was spacious, and tastefully ornamented with trees and garlands; and the company assembled, to the number of about one hundred and thirty, presented a curious appearance to an English eye. They had come from all parts of Europe. To begin with the most remote, there was Dr Nunez from Madrid, physician to the Queen of Spain, decorated with a broad blue ribbon, besides many orders —quite the courtier in air and figure. Then we saw an ardent disciple from Copenhagen, who looked rough and

tough, and fit for service in the hard north. From Rome had come a German by birth, who had won a large reputation in the Eternal City. Our neighbour Hanover had sent a polished deputy—physician to the Crown Prince. Besides the representatives of the large cities, who formed the bulk of the assembly, there were also men with huge beards from the inland provinces of Hungary and Bohemia; and seated beside some pale and studious Northern German, might be seen a gay and debonnaire inhabitant of the south, whose dark moustache and easy carriage would hardly have squared with our idea of professional decorum. This motley multitude were all attentively listening to an interesting paper which was being delivered from the reading-desk, when a sudden explosion was heard. The speaker stopped; most of the assembly rose. Another louder than the first, and again another, and another! The president thundered with his hammer, and entreated them to remain; to no effect. A rush was made to the door, and those who staid anxiously speculated on the cause. Some said it was a new revolution; others, that it was a gunpowder plot to blow all Homœopathists into "sparables" in the twinkling of an eye. At length the tide rolled back again, and it turned out to have been the igniting of some powder canisters and fireworks in the next house. After the *sederunt* terminated, the meeting broke up into little groups, to give and get reciprocal intelligence of the good cause. This was highly encouraging and satisfactory. In some places, as Madrid, it is almost the prevalent method. The court physician is a Homœopathist; many professors are so; there is a regular Homœopathic clinique, and students may take their choice as to the system they wish to pursue. In Vienna it is also very strong. There are two or three Homœopathic hospitals, and a thoroughly equipped school for teaching it. The Homœopathic practitioners in Vienna are probably the most highly cultivated physicians in Europe.

The physician to the King of Bavaria, too, we understand, is a disciple of Hahnemann's; but he was not at the meeting. In short, in many parts of the Continent the Homœopathic practitioners are so numerous, that, in announcing the arrival of a physician in a hotel, for example, if he is not a Homœopathist, he is called an Allopathic doctor. This we have seen in a newspaper. It was fixed that we should meet on the following day at ten o'clock. The ceremony was to be at noon.

Accordingly at 12 o'clock the burgomaster and town council of Leipsic, and the adherents of Homœopathy, marched in procession to the site of the statue, which is excellently situated on the beautiful promenade that surrounds this charming town. The sun shone brilliantly, and the good Leipsic burghers, with their fair wives and daughters, had mustered in immense numbers to witness the imposing ceremony. As far as the eye could reach was a dense crowd of citizens, and every window that commanded a view of the spot was thronged with ladies and gentlemen. The police formed a way for the procession, which was very long, consisting of about 300 or 400 individuals, to the enclosed space where the statue stood, enshrouded in its long canvass veil. When those who formed the procession had arranged themselves around the statue, where they were joined by many elegantly attired ladies, whose brilliant dresses contributed, along with the garlands of flowers that were hung around, to impart liveliness to the otherwise sombre group of black coats and white waistcoats. A *Te Deum* was excellently performed by a band and chorus. After this, Dr Melicher stepped forward, and delivered the following impressive oration:—

"Gentlemen,—If it should appear presumptuous that I should this day, in this place, amid such a numerous audience, be the spokesman, I am indebted to several concomitant circumstances for this honour, but chiefly to the confidence of my fellow-practitioners and the friends of

Homœopathy, who, at the meeting of the Central Society last year at Liegnitz, did me the honour to elect me director for this year, and confided to me all the business of promoting its original object.

"But the object of this society, founded at Cöthen in the presence of the master, on the 10th of August, 1829, the fiftieth anniversary of the day when Hahnemann received his degree, is "the promotion and advancement of Homœopathy," for which end a meeting of Homœopathic practitioners and non-medical persons is appointed to take place every year in a different part of Germany, and under a different presidency.

"This arrangement had been faithfully carried out until the year 1848, when it became impossible; but in the year 1849 it was resumed, and has been continued until the present day, which is the twenty-second meeting during the twenty-three years of its existence.

"After having, as we believe, fulfilled all the conditions of our statutes, there still remained for us a duty to perform of a peculiar character, namely, to dedicate to our master, Samuel Hahnemann, the discoverer and founder of Homœopathy, a monument, in order that posterity might make pilgrimages to it, and be enabled to look upon his likeness.

"Athough this year the 10th of August occurs upon a Sunday, yet the authorities of this city have given us leave to celebrate our Sabbath *this* day, and on the spot which they have politely given us for the monument of Hahnemann. If thereby we have justified our project and the unusual character of our action on this day, yet perhaps some one might ask us, 'Who was Hahnemann? what did he do? what great deed did he perform? and how is he made the recipient of such great honours?'

"Samuel Hahnemann, the son of a poor painter on porcelain, of Meissen, studied in this town of Leipsic, and first publicly enunciated his new method of treatment at the

world-renowned university of this city, which has already educated so many heroes of science. At an early period he discovered remedies which would alone have served to transmit his name to posterity. Though there may not be anything very extraordinary in the fact of nature's high-priests searching for and finding out medicinal agents for the cure of the sick, yet Hahnemann peculiarly deserves the gratitude of science and of all humanity, which none of his predecessors can share with him, and which is and will remain in all ages his own property. He discovered what had long been sought for in vain, the general fundamental therapeutic rule, and expressed it in three words, '*similia similibus curantur*'—like cures like. Conscious of the greatness of his discovery, well might he say with Gellert:—

'Die Wahrheit, die wir alle nöthig haben
Die uns als Menschen glücklich macht,
Ward von der weisen Hand, die sie uns zugedacht,
Nur leicht verdeckt, nicht tief vergraben.'

The revelation of this truth was the occasion of much annoyance to him, for hitherto *hatred (contraria contrariis)* had been the chief rule in medicine. He was abused, he was persecuted; Germany became intolerable to him, a German, so that, in place of his earthly remains, we could only deposit his works in the foundation stone of his monument. And yet it was he who shook and destroyed the foundation of the old school of medicine, so that it is now compelled to construct a new building; and yet it was he who at length led men to a system of diet and regimen consistent with nature; and yet it was he who taught us how to bring up a new race that should have a healthy frame and a healthy mind. Thus he is not only a reformer of medicine, but rather a reformer of all human society: his doctrine a religion, and its practice a cultus.

"Thus Hahnemann, by the power of his doctrine, which is founded on natural laws, has obtained for Homœopathy

the rare distinction that it is not the exclusive property of his fatherland, Germany—not the exclusive property of Europe; but that it belongs to the whole world; for all languages name him—from the north to the south, from the west to the east, all nations acknowledge the master, Hahnemann.

"What doctrine can boast of such an extensive, such a blessed, such a magnificent and lasting success? These are the reasons for his obtaining a monument, to which all nations, but especially the German people, have contributed the requisite funds, in order to give him a feeble testimony of their fidelity, gratitude, and veneration.

"Because Hahnemann was a citizen of Leipsic, because it was here he discovered Homœopathy, and the first Homœopathic institution was founded in this city, which was chiefly supported by the generosity of its citizens; for these reasons is his monument erected here.

"That monument is completed: it stands before you; a veil alone conceals it from your sight. Remove the veil!"

At these words, the veil in which the statue was enshrouded fell to the ground, and the metal likeness of Hahnemann stood forth to view, amid a joyous flourish of trumpets and the cheers of the assembled multitude. The vocal chorus sung an ode composed for the occasion, after which Dr Melicher resumed:—

"There are, no doubt, many among you, my esteemed hearers, who knew Hahnemann personally. Is this not a striking likeness of him? Is this not he, on whose thoughtful brow Pallas Hygieia has stamped the revelation of Homœopathy? It is he; and the artist has represented him sitting after the ancient style, as though he were engaged in writing his motto, 'Aude sapere!'

"So let his statue stand in honour of his services to science and art; let it testify to posterity, that these services were recognised in his own time; let it stand as an incitement to all who tread the toilsome but remunerating

J. RAMAGE LITHO

way of truth; and let it be commended to the attention of all who derive pleasure from the works of plastic art.

"To you, esteemed fathers of this beautiful city, who so kindly granted all our requests, I am commissioned by the founders to deliver to your protection this simple monument, which I do by this deed. May it be till the remotest times an ornament to these walks, a source of joy to your citizens."

Thereupon Dr Haubold stepped forward and read aloud the deed, conveying the statue over to the authorities of Leipsic, which was beautifully written in the highest style of the caligraphic art, and ran as follows:—

SAMUEL HAHNEMANN,
born the 10th April, 1755, at Meissen,
died the 2d July, 1843, at Paris,
Doctor of Medicine:
To Him,
the Founder of Homœopathy,
the Central Society of Homœopathic Practitioners
erected at Leipsic,
the centre of Germany, the birth-place of his Discovery,
on the 10th of August, 1851,
this bronze Monument,
in grateful recognition of his immortal doctrines,
and his invaluable services to medicine.

This was accomplished in the following manner:—

1. By means of a committee consisting of Dr C. Haubold, Dr F. X. Melicher, and Dr Fr. Rummel, who chose as their artistic adviser Mr Augustus Stüler of Berlin, architect to the King of Prussia.

2. By means of the artists, Mr Charles Steinhaüsser, who modelled the statue, and Dr Emilius Braun, who cast it in copper by the galvano-plastic process—both of Rome.

3. The pedestal is of Silesian marble—after the design of the architect, Mr A. Stüler—from the atelier for statuary of Hiller and Einsiedel of Leipsic and Dresden.

4. The erection of the monument was conducted by Mr

Geutebrück, architect to the university, and executed by Mr Purfürst (as master-mason), and Mr Bach (as master-carpenter).

The foundation stone of the monument was laid in solemn silence on the 23d of May by the under-mentioned directors, and the monument was unveiled, and publicly delivered up by means of this deed to the worshipful magistracy of Leipsic on the 10th August, 1851.

Done on Sunday (the 8th after Trinity), the 10th of August, 1851.

(Signed) { Dr F. X. Melicher, Dr C. Haubold, / Dr Fr. Rummel, A. Stüler.

The deed was accepted by the chief magistrate, who returned thanks, in the name of the town of Leipsic, for the beautiful ornament to the town, and, addressing the assembled citizens, he commended the statue to their care.

Hereupon the aged Dr Stapf, the oldest and dearest friend of Hahnemann, and the oldest living representative of Homœopathy, stepped forward, and deposited at the foot of the statue a wreath of laurel. It was touching to see the feeble old man, who seemed to be deeply moved by the part he had to perform in the ceremony, as he tottered forward with uncertain steps to bestow the emblem of immortality on the effigy of the dear friend of his youth and manhood, with whom he had borne the scorn and persecution of an illiberal world, and whom he would ere long rejoin.

With the unveiling of this statue the object of our visit ended, although once more we re-assembled at a grand banquet, where toasts were proposed between the courses, so that it lasted for four hours, enlivened by brilliant music and songs, in the choruses of which the whole company, not less than one hundred and fifty, joined. We may give

one Latin song, which was very popular with the students—

Gaudeamus igitur,
Dum conjuncti sumus:
Hahnemanni hospites!
Bibere ut veteres
Ecce! Nostrum munus.

Ubi sunt, qui itidem
Fortunati erunt?
Abeas ad humiles,
Ipsi certo principes
Nobis invidebunt!

Vita brevis, longa ars!
Cous senex docet:
Procul sit hæc regula,
Regnent hodie pocula,
Vinum nunquam nocet.

Vivat artis conditor,
Et defunctus vivat!
Cujus stat memoria,
Immortalis gloria,
In æternum vivat!

Vivant ei similes
Simili curantes:
Vivant artis vindices!
Vivant almi principes,
Artem honorantes!

Vivant et contrarii
Contrariis curantes!
Facultates medicæ
Omnes scholæ clinicæ!
Deus providebit.

Apage compositum!
Adjuvans in basi,
Corrigens, Excipiens,
Medicinas dirigens,
Requiescant pace.

Floreant Specifica,
Sulphur et Sabina,
Aconitum, Phosphorus.
Floreat in omnibus
Homœopathia!

The next morning witnessed the dispersion of most of those who had come to Leipsic in order to be present on this interesting occasion.

Among the Homœopathists present at Leipsic, and who assisted at the meeting of the society, and the ceremonial of the unveiling of Hahnemann's statue, we may mention the following:—

Germany was represented by—

Dr Stapf, Dr Bönninghausen, Dr Rummel, Dr Haubold, Dr Melicher, Dr Schmieder, Dr Würzler, Dr Schneider, Dr Weber, Dr Rückert, Dr V. Meyer, Dr. Cl. Müller, Dr Leder, Dr Rentsch, Dr Rath, Dr Gerster, Dr Hartlaub, Dr Davidson, Dr Kiesselbach, Dr Hirsch, Dr Trinks, Dr Wolf, Dr Tietzer, Dr Altmüller, Dr Fielitz, Dr Patza, Dr Bamberg, Dr Schubert, Dr Bolle, Dr Reil, Dr Baumgarten, Dr Link, Dr Schwarze, Dr Gross, &c. &c.

England was represented by—
Dr Drysdale, Dr Russell, Dr Dudgeon, and Mr Hering.

Spain by—
Dr Nunez, physician to her most Catholic Majesty, and Knight of the Order of Charles III.

Austria sent—
Dr Wurstl, Dr Caspar, Dr Schreter.

Bohemia—
Dr Hofrichter of Prague.

Italy—
Dr Wahle, of Rome.

Denmark—
Dr Pabst of Copenhagen.

It was a matter of considerable astonishment that France, which is in such immediate connection with Germany by means of railways, had furnished no representative from among her hundreds of Homœopathic practitioners.

And now let us say a few words on the monument which has just been consecrated to the memory of Hahnemann. The height of the figure as it sits is six feet; it is formed of pure copper made by the galvano-plastic process by Dr Braun of Rome, from the model by Steinhaüsser of the same city. The pedestal is of grey marble, highly polished, and standing on three granite steps; the whole is surrounded by an elegant railing, on the larger pillars of which Aconite and Arnica are represented. The monument stands in a large open space in front of the Hotel Blumenberg, and with the Stadt Theatre on its right; on its left is a beautiful shrubbery, and the space in front is clear to the distance of several hundred yards. Between it and the theatre, runs the road which leads from the town to the favourite resort of the worthy Leipsicers, the Rosenthal. The same road also leads to the large Allopathic Hospital, and to the Ophthalmic Hospital, so that students

frequenting these must pass the statue. The pedestal of the statue bears the following inscription:

TO

THE FOUNDER OF HOMŒOPATHY,

SAMUEL HAHNEMANN,

BORN APRIL 10, 1755,

DIED JULY 2, 1843,

BY

HIS GRATEFUL DISCIPLES AND ADMIRERS.

Judged as a likeness of Hahnemann, the statue is universally acknowledged to be excellent, but as a work of art we cannot bestow on it unqualified admiration.

So terminated this memorable festival—memorable on any hypothesis of Hahnemann's character. There has lived no man in this century who could attract from so great a distance such a band of mourners round his tomb —men of every nation in Europe, of every variety of mental development. The spirit of Hahnemann is likely to prove more than a match for our medical bodies. "For *thought* is more powerful than parks of artillery; and were it yesterday, or were it a thousand years ago, writes and unwrites Acts of Parliament, moulds the world like soft clay." The thought of Hahnemann will outweigh the deeds of his opponents. It will run the same course here as in Germany—be neglected, patronised, opposed, reviled, partially accepted, and, after this generation has passed into silence and oblivion, universally adopted.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

TOWN COUNCIL OF EDINBURGH

IN REFERENCE TO HOMŒOPATHY.

On Tuesday, the 6th of January, 1852, the following Petition and Letter were laid before the meeting of the Town Council:—

Unto the Right Honourable the Lord Provost, Magistrates, and Council, Patrons of the University of Edinburgh, the

PETITION

of the undersigned, Graduates of the said University, and others,

Humbly sheweth,

That your Petitioners, deeply impressed with the importance of providing adequate instruction for those who are to become practitioners of medicine, and of securing that University degrees in medicine, which are public attestations of the studies and acquirements of those who receive them, shall be granted simply on the ground of such studies and acquirements; and feeling a deep interest in the progress of medical science, and in the prosperity of the University of Edinburgh, as one of the principal medical schools in Great Britain, desire earnestly and respectfully to direct your immediate attention, as Honourable Patrons, to a matter connected with the granting of degrees in medicine in the University of Edinburgh, which has been forced upon the

notice of your petitioners. The facts upon which your petitioners found the present application appear in the following document, with reference to the examination of one of the students of medicine, issued by the authority of the Medical Faculty of the said University, and published in the "Monthly Journal of Medical Science" (No. 128):—

"Mr Alfred Crosby Pope, having appeared before the second division of examiners of the Medical Faculty in the middle of June, underwent the usual written examination on the practical branches of medicine and surgery, and was afterwards subjected to an oral examination on the same subjects. He had satisfied several of the examiners; but his surgical knowledge was evidently defective. While under examination in midwifery, he was asked what doses of calomel, opium, tartar-emetic, and aloïn he would give in certain diseases. In reply, he stated correctly the doses usually given in medical practice; and when asked whether these were the doses which he would himself prescribe, he replied that they were. He then underwent an examination on materia medica, the professors of that branch and of clinical surgery being present. His replies were satisfactory enough; the only objection of any moment indeed being that his doses of medicines were somewhat large. The Faculty having been furnished with positive information that Mr Pope had avowed his purpose to become a Homœopathic practitioner after graduating, it was determined that he should have an opportunity of answering to the charge. The question was put to him by Dr Christison, and the following are the very words of the conversation that ensued:—'Well, Mr Pope, I am satisfied so far with your answers: but there is another point on which I wish to be informed: and, as it is best not to beat about the bush, I shall put to you a plain question, in order that I may get a downright answer. I am told by a colleague that he has been informed, on good

authority, that it is your intention to become a Homœopathic practitioner after you graduate; *after the answers you have this day given me*, I feel bound to say I do not believe it. Am I right?' To which Mr Pope replied, 'I am not now a Homœopathist; but, after graduation, I mean to inquire into the truth of it.' Professor Syme then remarked, 'Now, Mr Pope, suppose that this inquiry which you meditate were to confirm your belief in the truth of Homœopathy, what would you do with the diploma received from us? would you burn or return it?' 'No,' replied he, 'I would keep it.' 'For what purpose?' 'To show that I had regularly studied.' 'Studied what? Delusions! Fallacies! Nonsense! It would only show that you had misspent four or five years of your life in studying what could not possibly be of any service, according to your own view; and I am sure that, on reflection, you must see how inconsistent it would be with common honesty or common sense to use a diploma, after ceasing to entertain the principles which are professed in order to obtain it. But recollect, Mr Pope, I offer this remark to you as a friend, and not as a professor.' Mr Pope then withdrew, and in what remained of his examinations he made a satisfactory appearance, except in medical jurisprudence, in which, as in surgery, he was defective. The case being a new one, it was referred by the examiners to the whole Medical Faculty for decision. Of the thirteen members, eleven were present. After considering the whole circumstances, the faculty unanimously resolved —'That serious doubts are entertained as to the soundness of Mr Pope's principles of practice; and that on this account, as well as his insufficiency on some subjects of examination, he shall be remitted till the end of July, by which time he will have had ample opportunity of making the inquiry into the truth of Homœopathy which he says he contemplates.' This resolution, which admitted of his graduating this year, in the event of his satisfying the

Medical Faculty, was communicated to him in conversation by the dean. Mr Pope, however, withdrew at once from the list of candidates."

From the above statement it appears that, in requiring from any candidate an explicit pledge, limiting his future course of study and practice, the Medical Faculty have made a fundamental change in the conditions under which degrees in medicine have been heretofore granted; and the petitioners believe that this has been done arbitrarily, and without the authority, or even the knowledge, of the *Senatus* or of the Patrons of the University: That your petitioners are deeply convinced that this innovation, if adhered to, will be highly injurious to the progress of science and to the morality of the students, as well as greatly detrimental to the usefulness and to the reputation of the University of Edinburgh; and that those who find themselves thus debarred from pursuing their studies in whatever direction truth seems to call them, will be driven to other and possibly to foreign universities, or to separate and independent institutions: That this proceeding on the part of the examiners seems the more objectionable when they are also professors in the University, and have ample means, as teachers, of bringing under the notice of students any facts or reasons which they may think important in reference to medical doctrine or practice; and that the attempt to protect and perpetuate their own particular opinions, by the imposition of such a test, argues either doubt of the stability of their own position, or a most unworthy distrust of the judgment or integrity of the medical students of the University.

It may hardly be necessary for your petitioners to repeat, what must be quite familiar, that the art of medicine, inasmuch as it is progressive, and dependent to a great extent upon the advancement of the related sciences, is continually liable to change; so that the wisdom of one generation is the folly of the next; and that the endeavour

to prevent its free growth in any direction is unwise, and cannot but be injurious.

That, with particular reference to the mode of practice which the Medical Faculty is now attempting thus to obstruct, viz., that founded on the law of specifics announced by Hahnemann, and generally known as the Homœopathic law, for the selection and administration of medicines, your petitioners would respectfully represent to the Patrons of the University that the belief in it has been, during more than half a century, steadily and rapidly extending over the Continent of Europe, and in the United States of America, as well as in Great Britain, where, among the physicians now practising in accordance with it, are many of the graduates and one of the medical professors of the University of Edinburgh: That, in several of the most distinguished foreign schools of medicine, it has been distinctly recognised and taught: That there are public hospitals and dispensaries, both foreign and domestic, for the exclusive practice of it: And that, in the opinion of your petitioners, and in that of a large and influential body of her Majesty's subjects, this system is calculated to exercise a greatly beneficial influence on the art of healing.

Your petitioners, however, have no wish to obtain from the Patrons the expression of any explicit preference for, or approval of, the Homœopathic system; on the contrary, the object of the present application is to secure the intervention of the Honourable Patrons of the University, should such appear to be necessary, in order that any undue attempts to interfere with the full liberty of the students of medicine may be prevented in future; and that the honour, independence, and distinguished reputation of the University may be preserved.

In conclusion, your petitioners have to request that the Honourable Patrons will cause the irregularity complained of to be brought under the immediate notice of the *Senatus* of the University, or will act otherwise in the matter as to

their wisdom shall seem best.—And your petitioners will ever pray.

EDINBURGH, 75 QUEEN STREET, Jan. 12, 1852.

MY LORD,—The petition which I have the honour of delivering into your lordship's hands, for presentation to the Town Council, is probably, both in number and weight of names attached to it, without parallel in the records of the city.

It has been signed by *three thousand three hundred and thirty-seven* men, most of them heads of families. Among the most elevated classes have been noted, *nine* PEERS, viz., the Earl of Airlie, the Earl of Wilton, the Earl of Roden, Lord Gray, Lord Kinnaird, Lord Lindsay, Lord Colville of Culross, the Earl of Erne, and the Bishop of Down and Connor; *five* MEMBERS of PARLIAMENT, viz., Lord Robert Grosvenor, Lord Newport, Mr Elliott Lockhart, Mr John Ellis, and the Hon. C. P. Leslie; *one hundred and fourteen* PHYSICIANS and SURGEONS, *thirty-one* of the former Graduates of the University of Edinburgh; *two hundred* CLERGYMEN (one of them being the Rev. Alfred Pope, Leamington, the father of the aggrieved student); *forty-eight* MAGISTRATES; *seventy-one* MILITARY and NAVAL OFFICERS.*

Great as the numbers and important as many of the persons are, they form a mere fraction of those interested in the object. The agency employed to procure signatures to this petition was only occasional and gratuitous, and in many productive quarters no efforts whatever were made. Many friendly to the object refrained from signing; some because they thought the Town Council could do no good in the matter; others—and these the most influential—on the ground that the University having issued its manifesto

---

* Additional names having been sent after the petition was presented, the numbers of the different classes have been increased; but the total number who signed the petition has not been altered, so that this is somewhat short.

against all students intending to devote themselves to Homœopathic practice, our strength ought to be directed towards the establishment of a separate institution for their education, or at least of a board of examiners, with power to grant degrees in medicine.

Your petitioners assent to neither of these views. On the contrary, it seems to us that the Town Council, as representing the community and invested with large powers within the University, is the legitimate and appointed authority for the redress of any public wrong which may occur there, even should it be of such a nature that they can give redress only indirectly; and we are of opinion that any separate institutions will be premature, until all efforts to secure free use of those now existing have failed. At present the general impression on the minds of the medical profession, the students, and the public is, that our University has declared all who intend to practise according to the principles of Homœopathy inadmissible to graduation. This impression may be erroneous—I believe it is so; but it is yet inevitable, so long as there is no public disavowal of the obvious and just inference from the public statement of the Faculty of Medicine in regard to Mr Pope's examination, *embodied in the petition.* And equally inevitable will be the consequences; the honest and bold students will abandon a school from which they are warned, by hearing from the lips of the examiners that there is a trap between them and their diploma, although not more than one in ten may fall into it; while the timid and less scrupulous will avoid the pitfall by disguising their real sentiments. In either case, the University and the interests of medicine and the public will suffer serious damage.

Representing as we do so considerable and influential a portion of the community, we think ourselves entitled to obtain, in some form, through your honourable body, an explicit assurance as to the intentions of the University in

this matter, and to know whether or not this unprecedented Test Act is to be enforced against any students disposed to study or to practise Homœopathy; and we cannot for a moment entertain the thought that the rulers of the highest educational institution in the kingdom will hide their purposes in ambiguous phraseology.

To you, then, my lord, and the Town Council, we look for a definite reply. We are prepared for either alternative; and according to the response shall be our future line of conduct.—I have the honour to be, my lord, your most obedient servant,

J. Rutherfurd Russell.

To the Right Hon. the Lord Provost.

LIST OF THE GRADUATES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH,

Whose names have been noticed among the signatures to the petition.

C. B. Ker, M.D.
Richard Frith, M.D.
Henry R. Madden, M.D.
George Rogers, M.D.
William Wright, M.D.
John Stewart Sutherland, M.D.
C. Acworth, M.D.
D. Crawford Lawrie, M.D.
Neville Wood, M.D.
George Cochran, M.D.
Charles Ransford, M.D.
William Gully, M.D.
J. S. Marsden, M.D.
Samuel Brown, M.D.
D. Wielobycki, M.D.
James Russell, M.D.
George E. Stewart, M.D.
William Traill, M.D.
Francis Black, M.D.
Rob. Ellis Dudgeon, M.D.
James Davenport, M.D.
J. J. Drysdale, M.D.
John Blyth, M.D.
A. Lyschinski, M.D.
J. R. Russell, M.D.
Wilson Cryer, M.D.
*S. Wielobycki, M.D.
*Francis Irvine, M.D.
*R. D. Mackintosh, M.D.
*F. F. Quin, M.D.
*William Macleod, M.D.

The names marked * did not arrive in time to be included in the original list.

The petition having come under the consideration of the Council on 13th January,

The CLERK intimated that another communication had been received from Dr R. Russell, stating that fifty-four other names had been adhibited to the petition, six of whom were clergymen, four physicians and surgeons, three military officers, and two magistrates.

Bailie FYFE thought that all that could be done with these communications was to send them to the College Committee, in order that they might examine carefully into the matter, with power to communicate their opinion to the Senatus if they think fit.

Mr RIDPATH thought it was full time that the Council, as patrons, should take up the matter. What right had the Medical Faculty to ask a student whether he meant to follow the trade of a clothier, confectioner, grocer, or anything else. They had no right to ask any gentleman whether he meant to practise Homœopathy.

The LORD PROVOST said it was a matter of great delicacy and difficulty in the Council pledging itself to interfere in any way with examinations for medical degrees. There could be no doubt that it was on account of his Homœopathic principles that Mr Pope did not get his diploma. If the Medical Faculty had refused to give him his diploma without any reason, there would have been less difficulty in the case. It seemed to be a very awkward thing; but the awkwardness of the Council in interfering with it was not less marked.

The matter was then remitted to the College Committee.

END OF THE MATTER.

On the 27th of January, the petition of graduates of the University and others, complaining of an irregularity introduced by the Medical Faculty in granting degrees of

medicine, which at a previous meeting of Council had been remitted to the College Committee, was brought up by the reading of that Committee's report. They (Committee), without offering any opinion on the subject involved in the memorial, directed the same to be transmitted to the Principal of the University, for the information of the Senatus Academicus.

Councillor RIDPATH did not think it would be proper to pass over this subject in the way which he observed it was now proposed to do. The Council, as Patrons of the University, ought to take up the subject in earnest.

Bailie FYFE (College Bailie) could not agree with Mr Ridpath, and expressed a hope that the matter would never again come before them. The Committee thought the course which they had taken was the most judicious one in the whole circumstances; and it was, he believed, substantially in accordance with the wishes of the parties who got up the memorial. They fully hoped that no more complaints of this nature would come before the Council, and, therefore, they considered the best plan was simply to send the petition to the Senatus for their information.

Mr RIDPATH was satisfied with this explanation.

The LORD PROVOST said he had talked to some of the professors on the subject, and he believed it would not have been possible to have got even a small number to reject any student on account of his Homœopathic tendencies. HE BELIEVED THAT THAT WHICH CAUSED THE COMPLAINT HAD BEEN DONE SOMEWHAT INADVERTENTLY, AND HE WAS SATISFIED THAT EVERY STUDENT, WHATEVER HIS NOTIONS REGARDING HOMŒOPATHY MIGHT BE, WOULD HENCEFORTH FIND NO BARRIER TO HIS OBTAINING DEGREES.

FINIS CORONAT OPUS.

APPENDIX.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROTECTION OF HOMŒOPATHIC STUDENTS AND PRACTITIONERS.*

MEMBERS AND SUBSCRIBERS.

Ashurst, W. H., 6 Old Jewry, London.
Anderson, F. B., Surgeon, Richmond.
Atkin, Dr, Hull.
Allen, Wm., Shifferal, Salop.
Addicot, Rev. H., Taunton.
Apperley, David, London.
Accnes, Major, Cheltenham.
Aldons, Major, Bath.
Appleby, J., Manchester.
Allison, William, do.
Armstrong, E. J., Dublin.
Ashe, Rev. J., do.
Ashe, Henry, do.
Armstrong, Rev. Mr, do.
Allshorn, G. E., Edinburgh.
Anderson, Rev. Wm., do.
Borras, Robert, London.
Betts, Edward, Great George Street, London.
Bonser, Edward, Bristol.
Bohn, John, do.
Bright, John, do.
Buck, Henry, London.
Bollen, H., St Paul's Churchyard, London.
Bergman, A., 20 Amphill Square, London.
Bergman, Phil., 12 Coleman Street, London.
Browne, George, East India House.
Bright, Henry S., Hull.
Boddy, Dr, Windsor.
Back, Thomas E., Dover.
Blakiston, Sir Matthew, Landbrook Hall, Ashbourne, Derbyshire.
Butcher, F., 36 Conduit Street, London.
Barton, J., 107 Great Russell Street, Bloomsbury.
Burgess, Wilson, Worcester.
Brewin, Edward, do.
Burlingham, Samuel, do.
Bollen, Henry, Salop.
Blake, J. D., Taunton.

* All Subscriptions may be sent to the Honorary Secretary, Dr Dudgeon, 82 Gloucester Place, Portman Square, London.

Buck, Henry, St James' Cottages.
Boyde, Major-General, R.A.
Bourke, Peter, Jersey.
Black, Dr, Clifton.
Branoker, Rev. R., Oakfield, Clifton.
Baxter, George, Kingston.
Barnard, R., Kiniton.
Browne, John, York.
Boyle, Hon. Courtney A., Bath.
Benson, G. Manchester.
Bennett, W. R., do.
Bronley, R. W., do.
Boag, James, do.
Blyth, J. C., do.
Bennett, John, do.
Booth, George, do.
Banning, Joseph, do.
Bury, John, do.
Boyer, Mr, do.
Brydon, James, do.
Bagshaw, Rev. A. A., do.
Bodenham, Thomas, do.
Burgess. W. R., do.
Barnes, Mr, do.
Burchell, Rev. W. F., do.
Buckley, Geo., do.
Berry, H. do.
Baxter, Thomas, do.
Banks, Charles, Dublin.
Blest, Dr A. E., do.
Burns, Gilbert, do.
Bryers, Robert, do.
Blyth, Dr, do.
Bartee, Dr R., do.
Boyd, Rev. C., do.
Black, Rev. G. Macartney, Dublin.
Brown, James, Edinburgh.
Bonus, W., do.
Bower, Mr, Edinburgh.
Bruce, Rev. John, do.
Brown, John C., do.
Beckett, James T., do.
Burnett, Mr, do.
Brown, Rev. D., do.
Black, William, do.
Bell, Melville, do.
Chand, W., Bristol.
Collins, T. P., do.
Clarke, Dr John Say, Canonbury, Islington.
Copeman, J. D., Old-Fish-street Hill, London.
Carley, G., 27 Warton Street, London.
Cave, Mr, Maidstone.
Clarke, Major, Windsor.
Carley, George, 24 Warton Street, London.
Church, J., London.
Chandler, A. E., Hereford.
Colville, J., M.A., Worcester.
Church, Thomas, Salop.
Capper, John.
Capper, Jasper J.
Chapman, Dr, London.
Clamford, Captain R., R.A., Woolwich.
Compton, Edward H., Wolton-under-Edge.
Clarke, Thomas R., Russell Street, London.
Curoge, J. H., 17 Saldstury Place, Exeter.
Cuarell, Rev. R., Weston-super-Mare.
Curie, Dr, 17 Hanover Sq., London.
Clifford, George, York.
Chapman, A. G., Brighton.

Colvin, A. J., 64 Gloucester Square, London.
Calder, Lieutenant, R.N., Belfast.
Collingwood, John, Brighton.
Cheeseman, John, do.
Chatfoelo, Dr Robert, LL.D., Brighton.
Cheeltham, C.D., Manchester.
Clegg, G., do.
Clegg, William, do.
Crewdson, Robert, do.
Clayton, Joseph, do.
Champneys, Rev. H. S., do.
Challender, jun., W. R., do.
Crawford, Mr A., Dublin.
Cowper, Henry A., do.
Cowper, Joseph, do.
Chambers, John, do.
Cummin, Mr, do.
Coddrington, Rev. Latham, Dublin.
Coddrington, J. G., Dublin.
Clintook, Stanley, do.
Cochran, Dr G., Edinburgh.
Coventry, A., do.
Campbell, Rev. J. R., do.
Campbell, J., do.
Cooper, Thomas, do.
Campbell, Mr H., do.
Cruickshanks, E., do.
Diamond, Aar., Bristol.
Dublin, the Archbishop of, Palace, Dublin.
Dudgeon, Dr, London.
Dunn, T. P., Wooddreft.
Dunsmure, John.
Dale, Thomas, Emseote.
Darling, General Sir R., Brighton.
Dodson, J. W., Brighton.
Davies, Charles, Manchester.
Dixon, H., Manchester.
Doig, jun., D., do.
Dernford, Rev. R., do.
Day, Arthur, Dublin.
Doyne, Phil., do.
Dwyer, Francis, do.
Drysdale, Dr, Liverpool.
Drysdale, Matthew, Dublin.
D'Aubrey, George, do.
Dennistoun, J., Edinburgh.
Davidson, G. R., do.
Dodds, Thomas R., do.
Dalziel, D. B., do.
Dickie, H.D., do.
Edrasson, J., 12 Aldermanbury, London.
Edwett, Mr, Maidstone.
Evans, Thomas, Hereford.
Edwards, P. Norman, Hereford.
Everest, Rev. T. R., Wickwar.
Emerson, George, Belfast.
Eastwood, John, Manchester.
Edmondson, Richard, do.
Edge, Alexander, do.
Eastwood, Mr, do.
Edwards, Alexander, Dublin.
Erne, the Earl of, Dublin.
Edmondson, Rev. George, do.
Erskine, Wm., Edinburgh.
Edmonstone, Rev. J., Edinburgh.
Ferris, Joseph, Bristol.
Freese, Henry, 12 Coleman Street, London.
Friend, George, East India House.
Flashman, George, Dover.
Fowden, William, do.
Field, James R., 117 Fore Street, London.
Field, sen., Mr, do.

Fox, Henry, Taunton.
Fox, Charles, do.
Fletcher, Ar., R.N., Jersey.
Farquharson, Major-General, Oriental Club, London.
Frith, R., M.R.C.S., London.
Finlay, Mr, Cheltenham.
Finlay, Mr E., do.
Fearon, Dr, Birmingham.
Fawett, Major J., Brighton.
Fletcher, Mr, Bath.
Fletcher, Rev. R., Manchester.
Fetherston, Edward, Dublin.
Fetherston, Joseph, do.
Fetherston, H. R., do.
French, Arthur, do.
French, Rev. W. Le Poer, D.D., Dublin.
Finlay, John, Edinburgh.
Grosvenor, Lord Robert, London.
Grop, Henry, 12 Coleman Street, London.
Gillerd, William, M.R.C,S., Clifton.
Groat, William, Dartmouth Grove, Blackheath.
Gee, Rev. Robert, Brighton, Devon.
Giles, A., Exeter.
Guinness, A., M.R.C.S., Exeter.
Georgii, Professor.
Griffith, Charles, Weston-super-Mare.
Guest, Mr, Clifton.
Grant, Rev. J. H., Bideford, Devon.
Gillson, Rev. Edward, Bath.
Grimshaw, Joseph, Manchester.
Gleave, J. O., Manchester.
Gray, Thomas, do.
Gray, L., do.
Garner, J., do.
Getz, A., do.
Gorton, Thomas, do.
Guinness, Arthur, Dublin.
Guiness, Ben. Lee, do.
Guiness, Arthur Lee, do.
Guiness, jun., Benjamin Lee, Dublin.
Garnett, Samuel, Dublin.
Garnett, William, do.
Gordon, Rev. Mr, do.
Guiness, Rev. W., do.
Guiness, Arthur S., do.
Galwey, Robert, do.
Going, Robert, do.
Gage, Mr, Edinburgh.
Hook, Mr, Maidstone.
Heming, Mr, do.
Hackney, Nathan, Hull.
Hanson, Samuel, 15 Trinity Square, London.
Hill, John, Ashbourne Grove, Greenwich.
Hooper, William, Hereford.
Humfrys, William, Hereford.
Henderson, Rear-Admiral, Bath.
Hamilton, Dr, London.
Headland, 15 Princes Street, Hanover Square, London.
Harris, Dr H. B., St Heliers, Jersey.
Helleur, Philip, Jersey.
Hering, W., 38 Mortimer Street, Cavendish Square, London.
Hattersley, Richd., Wickwar.
Hawker, Lieut.-General Sir Thomas, K.C.H., Clifton.

Hands, F., M.R.C.S., 23 Duke Street, Grosvenor Square, London.
Huggins, William.
Harmen, Thomas H., Southampton.
Howarth, William, York.
Hope, George, York.
Hole, Admiral Lewis, Bath.
Hewitt, Dr, Bath.
Hay, Captain John, Brighton.
Harvey, Ch. T., Manchester.
Harvey, Alderman, do.
Heron, Wm., do.
Handley, W., do.
Hollis, George, do.
Handley, Joseph, do.
Harrison, W. P., do.
Huddlestone, Mr, do.
Hallam, Eph., do.
Harrison, jun., W. B., do.
Hards, R. R., Dartford,
Holland, E. C., Manchester.
Hardy, G., do.
Hill, Rev. R., do.
Houston, John, Dublin.
Henry, Lieut., R.N., Dublin.
Higginbotham, Charles C., Dublin.
Haig, Robert, Dublin.
Haig, John, do.
Hamilton, Alexander, do.
Hall, Rev. Richard, do.
Hume, Alex., Edinburgh.
Hague, R., do.
Hawkins, J., do.
Henderson, Dr William, do.
Hamilton, M., do.
Ireland, B. M., Hull.
Johnston, Thomas, do.
Jewen, R. F., K.W., Windsor.
Jackson, Al., Dusley.
Janson, J., Exeter.
Jones, Ed., Cheltenham.
James, Rhodes, York.
Jones, E. Leslie, Bath.
James, Horatio, do.
Johnson, J., do.
James, Lieut. Henry, R.N., Brighton.
Jones, Rev. R., Manchester.
Jones, Mr, do.
Johnson, W. R., do.
Jamieson, Rev. W., Dublin.
Jones, R. Talbot, do.
Johnston, George P., do.
Kingdon, B., Exeter.
Knott, Mr, Maidstone.
Kingdon, B., M.R.C.S., Exeter.
Kenway, E., Cardiff.
Kenrick, Rev. George, 26 Regent Square, London.
Ker, Dr C. B., Cheltenham
Knowles, Dr, Manchester.
King, Rev. A., Dublin.
Kent, Rev. Edward, do.
Laker, Thomas, Maidstone.
Laker, John, do.
Laker, Mr, do.
Laurie, Dr D. C., Brighton.
Leadam, Thomas, M.R.C.S., London.
Lyte, H. Maxwell, Jersey.
Laurie, Dr, Dunstable.
Laurie, Dr, 12 Lower Berkeley Street, Portman Square, London.
Luther, Dr Charles, Bath.
Lee, John, Manchester.
Lloyd, William, do.
Leonard, Mr, do.
Long, Mr, do.
Lindsay, W., do.

Litter, Rev. R., Manchester.
Longven, R., do.
Lessey, Rev. T., do.
Laurie, Mr, do.
Lindsay, G. H., Dublin.
Lindsay, Mr W. J. C., do.
Lindsay, Hon. Captain, do.
Leighlin, the Very Rev. the Dean of, Dublin.
Luther, Dr W., Dublin.
Lyle, Thomas, do.
Lyschinski, Dr A.
Lang, John, Edinburgh.
Laurie, Mr, Edinburgh.
Laurie, Dr James, do.
Lindsay, Colonel, do.
Molineux, F. More, Losely Park, Guildford.
Molligam, Wm., Bristol.
Matthiesson, Hen., 12 Coleman Street, London.
Matthiesson, W. E., do.
Marsden, Dr F. L., Gr. Malvern.
Madgnick, Mr, Canonbury Park, London.
Martin, Edward, Richmond.
Moore, Thomas A., Windsor.
Moore, Thos. Chas., do.
Millet, Mr E., B.L., do.
Markland, Thomas, Clifton.
Mackintosh, John, do.
Metcalf, William, Dover.
Mummery, R. B., do.
Metcalfe, Frederick, do.
Millard, J., M.R.C.S., 4 Lloyd Square, London.
Mason, Wm., George Street, Greenwich.
Millard, Wm., 9 Dane Road, Lee.
Massy, Dr R. F., Worcester.
Morgan, Joseph, Hereford.
Melton, Samuel J., do.
Morgan, Nathaniel Ross.
Manwairing, Admiral, Bath.
M'Carlty, Rev. J., Jersey.
Macdonald, Professor, St Andrews.
Mackintosh, Dr R. D., 11 Dixfields.
Morgan, Daniel, 9 Vere Street, Oxford Street, London.
Meriton, J. D., Southampton.
M'Gregor, J. B., M.R.C.S., Belfast.
M'Dearnan, John, do.
Madden, Dr H. R., Brighton.
Macfarlane, J., Manchester.
Mather, W. do.
M'Dowall, Dr, do.
Molineux, Mr, do.
Midwood, F., do.
Massey, Thomas, do.
Moore, Jas., V.S., do.
Matthews, Dr, do.
Moore, J. H., do.
Moore, Mr, do.
Miller, Robert, Dublin.
M'Gee, Rev. R., do.
Massey, Hon. J., do.
Murray, Robert, do.
Medlicott, Rev. J., do.
M'Laren, James, Edinburgh.
Mucurb, John, do.
Naisch, H., Bristol.
Newman, George, M.R.C.S., Glastonburg.
Newman, Thomas, Worcester.
Nelson, James, Emseote.
Neold, J., Manchester.
Norman, Conolly, Dublin.
Norman, Mr A., do.
Norton, Dr, Chester.

Nenagh, the Very Rev. the Dean of, Dublin.
Nisbet, R. R., Edinburgh.
Oxley, Richard, Windsor.
Ozanne, Dr, Guernsey.
Oulton, Rev. W. P., Dublin.
Owen, J. S., Edinburgh.
Poole, James H., Bristol.
Page, Rev. L. F., Woolpit Parsonage, Suffolk.
Pine, Mr, Maidstone.
Peck, M. C., Hull.
Parker, Rev. John, Danhill, Sussex.
Passurs, P. H., Dover.
Pamphrey, John, Worcester.
Pally, Captain J.
Palk, Lawrence, Haldon House, Exeter.
Pile, Rev. A., 9 Meridian Place, Clifton.
Page, Rev. Thomas, Rugby.
Peters, Edward, do.
Polford, Mr, Brighton.
Parker, Alderman, Manchester.
Pope, Mr, Halifax.
Phillips, Edward, Manchester.
Pope, A. C., do.
Paul, Mr, do.
Phippill, Robert, do.
Potter, John, do.
Patrick's, the Hon. and Very Rev. the Dean of St, 8 Christ Church, Dublin.
Pitcairn, Rev. David, do.
Porter, jun., William, do.
Parker, Mr, do.
Prior, Rev. John, do.
Prior, Rev. Hugh, do.
Paisley, John H., Edinburgh.
Rosenstein, Dr J. G., 3 Wintown Place, Greenwich.
Raikes, R., Hull.
Richardson, John D., Dover.
Ritchie, Alfred, 4 Diamond Terrace, Greenwich.
Roth, Dr, London.
Rowley, Mr, 173 Castle Street, Reading.
Rowley, Rev. W. W., Weston-super-Mare.
Rossiter, John, Weston-super-Mare.
Ralph, Mr Greenhow, Peechhill, Cork.
Reynolds, Thomas, Shorehampton, Bristol.
Ransford, Dr, York.
Robertson, Major L., Bath.
Reason, William, Brighton.
Rayner, T., Manchester.
Robinson, Geo., do.
Rogby, T., do.
Raolton, John, do.
Robertson, John, Dublin.
Robinson, Robert, do.
Richards, John, do.
Ratchiff, Rev. Rich., do.
Russell, Thomas, do.
Russell, Dr J. Rutherfurd, Edinburgh.
Russell, Dr James, do.
Rutherfurd, Oliver, of Edgerston.
Ramsden, James, do.
Russell, F., do.
Russell, Sir James, Ashestiel.
Sugden, Samuel, London.
Smith, F. J., 74 Old Broad Street, London.
Sandoz, F., East India House.
Selle, W. C., Richmond.

Smith, Robert, Richmond.
Simpson, Mr, Maidstone.
Sykes, David, Hull.
Stephenson, F. H., do.
Seaton, J., do.
Starr, Edward, do.
Stalkert, Henry S., Dover.
Stalkert, Hugh, Dover.
Sullivan, J., 34 Sussex Square, Brighton.
Sommer, E. V., Taunton.
Stokes, Dr A., Wickwar.
Stokes, A., Nailsworth.
Smith, Alfred, Dudbridge.
Sturge, Joseph, Weston-super-Mare.
Solly, Rev. H., Cheltenham.
Sutherland, Dr, Leamington.
Shaw, William, York.
Smyth, John, Belfast.
Sharp, William, M.R.C.S., F.R.S., Rugby.
Squire, R. D., Bath.
Sturdy, Thomas, Brighton.
Smith, Richard, do.
Spinks, Thomas, Manchester.
Stanley, R. do.
Scholefoeld, W., do.
Shaw, Mr, do.
Slade, Rev. Canon, do.
Smith, A. H., do.
St Georgio, John H., Dublin.
St Georgio, jun., John, do.
Scriven, Dr W. B. B., do.
Stratton, John, do.
Stratton, jun., John W., do.
Swanton, Thomas, do.
Saunders, Richard, do.
Saunders, Henry, do.
Skinner, Capt. A. M., R.N., do.
Stewart, Dr G. E., Edinburgh.
Scott, Robert, do.
Swan, W., Edinburgh.
Schmitz, Dr L., do.
Trotman, W. H., M.R.C.S., R.N., 27 Park Street, Bristol.
Taylor, Mr, Maidstone.
Thompson, Thomas, Hull.
Thompson, William, Windsor.
Thompson, William, Hull.
Tapp, John, do.
Thomson, Dr James, 16 Harper Street, Red Lion Square, London.
Tollie, J. W., 4 Robert Street, Adelphi, do.
Taylor, Captain M., R.A., Woolwich.
Tristram, Barrington, Park House, Clifton.
Taylor, John, York.
Traill, Dr William, A.B., F.C.D., Belfast.
Turner, H. Manchester.
Tuckey, Dr C. C., do.
Turner, H., do.
Thompson, W. G., do.
Taylor, Robert, do.
Turner, Alex., do.
Thompson, J., do.
Thompson, T. H. Dublin.
Todd, H. W., do.
Turner, Richard, do.
Thompson, George, do.
Taylor, William, do.
Thoms, John, Edinburgh.
Viccars, George, Hull.
Venn, J., M.A., Hereford.
Vigors, Richard, Dublin.
Wilkinson, J. G., Sussex Lodge, Finchland, London.
Wood, Dr., F.R.C.P.E., 10 Onslow Square, Brompton.

Welman, C. H., Taunton.
Webb, J. C., 5 Bedford Terrace, West Holloway, London.
Watson, W. D., Maidstone.
Waineswright, R. A., Islington.
Wright, W., M.A., Worcester.
Wheeler, David, do.
Wolkinson, Charles, Clapham Park.
Wilson, D., L.R.C.S.E.
Wilman, C. N., Taunton.
Wilkinson, R. C., Fore Street, Exeter.
Wilkinson, Alfred, 37 Park Crescent, Brighton.
Walker, H. T., Weston-super-Mare.
Whitmore, Major, Clifton.
Wheeler, Rev. M., Berkeley Rectory, Frome.
Wilmot, Dr P. M., Southampton.
Wilson, Rev. Dr. Wm., do.
Ward, Robert, York.
Wilks, J. P., do.
Wilson, William, Bath.
Wells, V. M., Brighton.
Woolcott, Mr, do.
Wilson, John, Manchester.
Walker, Dr Robert, do.
Waterhouse, H., do.
Walkden, Mr, Manchester.
Williams, James, do.
Wilson, Thomas, do.
Wildes, G., do.
Wolkinson, Richard, do.
Ward, William, do.
Walker, Mr, do.
Worthington, Beresford, Dublin.
Worthington, Thomas, do.
Warren, Latham C., do.
Warren, Robert A., do.
Warren, August. E., do.
Walters, Henry, do.
Wallace, Thomas, do.
Woolsley, Major, do.
Wray, George Atkinson, do.
Webb, Robert, do.
Worthington, Alex., do.
Wilson, George, do.
Walter, Dr William, do.
Wilson, Thomas C., do.
Wielobycki, Dr D., Edinburgh.
Watson, Rev. Dr, Edinburgh.
Wigham, tertius, John, do.
Wigham, Henry, do.
Wedderburn, John, do.
Yapp, William, Hereford.
Yeldam, Mr, London.
Young, Mr, Dublin.
Young, Samuel B., do.

It has been thought better to omit in the above list the names of all the ladies who have subscribed to the fund.

From the way in which the names here given have been copied from the original, it is feared that some appear incorrectly, while others may have been altogether omitted. The whole will be incorporated in a full list, which the Secretary is preparing, to accompany a report of all the proceedings of the Association and a statement of its finances, a copy of which will shortly be sent to every subscriber.