

Sequel to homeopathy unmasked : being a farther exposure of Hahnemann and his doctrines in reply to recent anonymous pamphleteers / by Alexander Wood.

Contributors

Wood, Alexander.

Publication/Creation

Edinburgh : John Menzies, 1844.

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/b5dzquc6>

License and attribution

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

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



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

76

SEQUEL
TO
HOMOEOPATHY UNMASKED;
BEING A FARTHER EXPOSURE OF
HAHNEMANN, AND HIS DOCTRINES,
IN A REPLY TO
RECENT ANONYMOUS PAMPHLETEERS.

BY
ALEXANDER WOOD, M.D.,
FELLOW OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS, EDINBURGH; EMERITUS
PRESIDENT OF THE ROYAL MEDICAL SOCIETY; LECTURER ON THE
PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE OF MEDICINE, ETC. ETC.

“Mark, now, how plain a tale shall put you down.”—PRINCE HENRY.

EDINBURGH:
JOHN MENZIES, 61, PRINCES STREET;
D. BOGUE, LONDON; AND S. J. MACHEN, DUBLIN.

1844.



EDINBURGH :

T. CONSTABLE, PRINTER TO HER MAJESTY.

P R E F A C E.

THE public have been eagerly informed that a second edition of the “Defence of Hahnemann” is demanded; and the Authors take the opportunity to assure us—“their *confidence* makes them rather indifferent to the Reply.” That they need not fear *anything*, appears from the mighty powers they arrogate, in a passage we believe to be unparalleled either for effrontery or bombast: “He thoughtlessly raised his pointed shaft of ridicule at the threatening cloud, not dreaming that lightning might lurk in its murky bosom, waiting only such a conductor to kindle a conflagration.”—(*Preface*, p. 4.)

“Assumes the God,
Affects to nod,
And seems to shake the spheres.”

What! can these “true interpreters of nature” not distinguish between Heaven’s bolts and their own rush-light and rosin flashes? Why all this commotion about a “flimsy tirade,” so despised, and so exposed? (as we shall see,)—overwhelmed with German literature; blasted with “withering sarcasm;” and, in mercy, at last annihilated by Jupiter Tonans! Why such a waste of “brute force,”—such a turmoil of the elements? All this—

“Resembles ocean into tempest toss’d,
To waft a feather or to drown a fly!”

The Defenders, however, have certain compunctious

feelings; and to prevent our utter destruction, urge upon us their kind advice how to escape. But let anonymous libellers know, that fellows with crape over their faces, and "shirts outside," are the last we should take directions from as to the safest way home in a dark night, supposing even we were so hopelessly lost, as their fond imagination suggests. With such we may be compelled to company for a little for the ends of justice, but they never can be our associates—far less our advisers.

As they seem entirely ignorant of our true position, we have no objection to have small things compared with great; but it must have been mere schoolboy recollections, and no heroic sympathies, that could have made them "dream of battles," or prompted the allusion to Pharsalia or Cannae.

"Departed spirits of the mighty dead!
Ye that at Marathon and Leuctra bled!"

How like ye such companionship? Perhaps, after all, it may turn out that *accident* has done for us what consummate skill did for Hannibal, and the boasted victory of the "Defenders" may prove only the headlong rush of contemptuous superiority ending in their pitiable defeat.

They are willing to believe that the alleged rapid sale of their first edition,* is a proof that the voice of

* "Some such treatises as those described," (the works of empirics,) "by the common manœuvres of publishers, may have *anticipated* a fifth or sixth edition, and gained a tolerable harvest of temporary rewards; but they lead astray, like the *ignis fatuus*, and their fame is as the mist of the hill."—*Character of Quacks*. PERCIVAL'S *Medical Ethics*. Ed. 1827, p. 290.

the public is on their side. So thought Cornelius, the father of Scriblerus, whose confidence in his lyre knew no bounds, and who pompously making the experiment, soon drew around him a tumultuous crowd, laughing and hooting; while he, mistaking their eagerness to see such an unwonted exhibition, for the resistless powers of his own strains, withdrew "with the greatest air of triumph in the world."

But, to be more serious.—The public are told, that they have a deep interest in this question. And assuredly it is so. For if we are to accept the invitation of the "Defenders," and test their discovery by experiment, it is upon the public that such experiments must be tried. Let them look, then, at the absurdities of the system, as we have shown them in the very words of its admirers. Let them study the fallacy of their arguments—the weakness of their analogies—the unsubstantial character of their proofs. Let them look at the opinions we have cited from those by whom Homoeopathy has been studied, and who are eminent as scientific men and practical physicians. Let them weigh well the testimony of Hufeland, "Hahnemann's best and earliest friend," who tells us that, in cases where "any thing positive requires to be done," we may expect Homoeopathic treatment to be "followed by fatal consequences."* When they have done all this, let them

* Venner, writing two hundred years ago, says :—"Vain, and very absurd is the conceit, which many have in favour of empirics—'*that if they do no good, they will do no harm.*' Admit that sometimes, by their trivial petty medicines, they do no harm; yet, nevertheless for that, I must tell you that they do much harm; for the sick body, re-

say whether they choose to be made the subjects of such experiments.

It is very easy to make a plausible story out of Hahnemann's history, and to picture him forth as a man persecuted for his adherence to the truth, and maintaining it in spite of want and indigence. We take a different view of it. We find him, at first obscure and unknown, struggling with poverty ; and again, after a time, drawing around him, at the great "centre of frivolity," the willing dupes of imposture, and reaping from them golden rewards. This was achieved by the means usual in such cases. He began by violent abuse of the Profession. Dr. Russell, indeed, gives a different account ; and from it we may learn how little reliance is to be placed on the Homoeopathic historians of Hahnemann. "Let it never be said," he exclaims, "that Hahnemann began his career by *denouncing the Profession*. It was not until mild words had failed, that harsh ones were used ; and if extravagance have sullied Homoeopathy, who is to blame ?" * But let the voice of truth be heard ! In 1792, Leopold II. of Austria died ; and Hahnemann, the profound philosopher, then evolving his great discovery,†

lying on their skill, and they not being able to direct and execute such courses, as shall be fitting and effectual to impugn the disease, while there is time fitting for the same, the sickness gets the mastery, and then, perhaps, when the strengths are too much weakened, and the disease becomes incurable, they seek help of the physician."—*Via Recta ad Vitam Longam*. Bath, 1660.

* Dr. J. P. Russell, *On the Origin and Progress of Homoeopathy*, pp. 5-6 ; *Br. Journ. of Hom.*, No. I., p. 6.

† Dr. Russell tells us, that Hahnemann's discovery struck him in

and anxious to conciliate the Profession, (!) drew attention to himself by denouncing the King's Physicians, and publicly called upon them to justify themselves for having had recourse to blood-letting.† Thus he made himself notorious.

Again, we find him imagining that he had discovered a specific and preventive for Scarlet-Fever. Did this benefactor of his species make it public? On the contrary, it is recorded of him, that he kept it secret; though, after Jany and Sulzer had thrown doubts upon its efficacy, it was disclosed. "Reflect for a moment," says Moore, (speaking of like conduct in others,) "what kind of man that must be, who is base enough to conceal a medicine, endowed with a power of curing any of the deplorable distempers that afflict mankind. If such a discovery were actually made and kept secret, the discoverer must be a villain for concealing what would save thousands from misery and death."‡

But enough of Hahnemann. Let us now turn to our British Homoeopaths; and we need not go farther than our own city.

In 1842, "A Treatise on the Principles and Practice of Homoeopathy," was published by Dr. Black, and though ostensibly of a professional character, was widely circulated among the public. This was soon after followed by a Pamphlet, entitled, "Re-

1790. Neither he nor Dr. Black inform us when he first announced it; but his second paper was not published until 1796, four years after the death of Leopold.

† Sprengel, *Etat de la Med.* en 1792.

‡ Reply to Anti-Vaccinists.

port of the Edinburgh Homoeopathic Dispensary," bearing upon its title-page the names and residences of the Medical Officers, and containing loose and inaccurate reports of the cases said to have been treated. This, too, was widely distributed. Both these publications abound in abuse of the regular Practitioner; verifying another of old Venner's characteristics of the quack.

A "Journal" next appeared, containing numerous characteristic advertisements—"promises of freedom from the sufferings of Child-bearing"—Homoeopathic cocoa—and offers of contracts for *professional* attendance, as inviting and varied as those of "Doudney" for wearing apparel.

A *year after* the last publication, "Homoeopathy Unmasked" came out, and yet the authors of the "Defence of Hahnemann" maintain that *by us* the question was *first* brought under the notice of the public. Now it *is* before the public, and we ask them to view the *system* calmly and dispassionately.

But the *animus* of the "Defence" requires us to do more.

Bound by their advertisements to prove against us "Elementary Ignorance, Illogical Inferences, and Gross Mis-statements," what have been the means resorted to for the fulfilment of this pledge? Let these, (as fully laid bare in the following pages)—their perversions and misrepresentations of "Homoeopathy Unmasked," and their misquotations from their own authorities, shew.

We require that the evidence for this, which we give in the Appendix, be deliberately and impartially consi-

dered. If there be any doubt, or if it can be supposed that the repeated occurrence of this was accidental, by all means let the writers of the "Defence" have the benefit of the doubt or supposition. But if our readers, even with the utmost exercise of charity, must come to the conclusion that these misrepresentations are intentional, then we ask them what must be the nature of a system, and what the character of its "Defenders," when they are compelled to resort to such expedients?

Well may Liebig say, "Homoeopathy treats truth with scorn, and bids defiance to common sense."

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
Wellcome Library

HAHNEMANN

AND HIS DEFENDERS, &c.

SOME men are "great" though "unknown." Some assume to be great because unknown,—but ever since "We, the People of England," turned out to be "three Tooley-street Tailors," self-exaltation has been guardedly admitted.

The "Defenders of Hahnemann" say:—"In conclusion, we have but to observe, that the fact of this pamphlet being anonymous should not impair its authority, as the original sources, from which the statements are derived, are cited; and that our only reason for withholding our name is, that we would not have it coupled, even in the way of opposition, with that of the author of "Homoeopathy Unmasked." (*Defence*, p. 86.) "*Our only reason!*" What array of names could make any one believe this? "Omne ignotum pro magnifico," indeed! If the position of the authors give them any claim to such lofty assumption, never were the characteristics of gentlemen so thoroughly disguised. We *can* conceive of authorship where the want of a name would not *necessarily* render the work worthless; but this cannot be the case, when such unmanly subterfuge is resorted to for the purpose of gross personal abuse, reckless perversions, and misrepresentations almost incredible.

Though a name could not have given value to such a "Defence," it would, at least, have indicated where to point the finger of scorn against those who could so daringly outrage all common decency in their violations of those principles by which honest men are guided.*

"The Defenders" find fault with us for not having read four hundred† volumes upon this great discovery, before presuming to allude to its "chief absurdities;"

* See Appendix for their false quotations from "Homoeopathy Unmasked," and other extraordinary perversions.

† We quote from the "Defence of Hahnemann."—"Our chief difficulty in encountering the author of this flimsy tirade, arises from the utter want of method which distinguishes his production—for he is systematic only in his misrepresentation, and consistent only in blundering. His knowledge of Homoeopathy is less than that of many well-educated gentlemen of the day; his whole stock in trade being derived from a careless perusal of a translation of Hahnemann's *Organon*; one volume of a translation of Hahnemann's *Materia Medica Pura*; the first number of the British Journal of Homoeopathy; a recent work, by Dr. Black of Edinburgh, on the 'Principles and Practice of Homoeopathy;' a translation of Jahr's Abridgement of Hahnemann's *Materia Medica*, and an article in the Quarterly Review. Of the multitude of able works which have appeared during the last twenty years, beginning with the writings of the renowned Hufeland," (for his opinion of Homoeopathy, see Appendix,) "amounting, according to a catalogue we have before us, to about three hundred and sixty works in German and Latin alone, with a small sprinkling of Italian, besides the writings of the French and American authors, and the various Homoeopathic Journals, he is utterly ignorant; so that we feel that an apology is due to our Homoeopathic readers for noticing the book at all; for there is not one among them but could at once detect the palpable fallacies of so impotent and illogical a writer."—*Defence*, p. 51.

When we give a specimen of the contents of such works, we think our readers will agree with us that we have done pretty well. The admirers of Hahnemann profess, that "as the *Organon* contains the general principles and the theoretical bases of Homoeopathy, so its practical application is to be found in the 'Treatise on Chronic Diseases.'" Dr. Black's work is written professedly to answer the question, "What is Homoeopathy?" so that, if after studying these, we have not obtained an exposition of the system, assuredly the fault is not ours.

but it is surely due to the professional public to show some *plausible* grounds, before exacting from them such Herculean labours. So far from this, the Homoeopaths place themselves in a very peculiar position ;— they demand our belief, and they, *singularly enough*, exclude the most common means of proof. They assert that it is “an error of *theorists* to pretend that the power of substances is diminished by dilution ;” and, when, as a matter of course, our minds turn to wine and ardent spirits, we find that *these* are *carefully* excluded from this “*general law*.” “These, the *most simple* of all the excitants, are the *only* ones of which the heating and irritating properties *diminish* when much diluted.”* Let them *say* then, whether porter, strong ale, tea, coffee, &c. &c., are also *exceptions* to this “*general law*.” We have found them so, and so has every one else. What do the Homoeopaths *say* ? Have they *not* ? Does adding water increase *their* heating or stimulating properties ? Here, then, we are prevented from *testing* their assertions, even with the “*most simple* of all the excitants,” and therefore, the best calculated to educe the real truth.

In like manner, they prevent our experimenting with their *globules*, the medicines they themselves employ. *These* are said to have no action on the *healthy* body, and *we* will not commit *disease* to their care. They cast us back upon the experiments of Hahnemann and his friends with *large* doses, from which *they* derive their confidence. But a loop-hole is here also left for escape ; for the quantity of each substance alleged to have been taken, in these *most minutely* recorded experiments, is never stated. So that when others repeat them, without obtaining the same result, they can be told, that they

* HAHNEMANN'S *Organon*, p. 294.

have not taken the *precise* quantity required ; and this method of evasion can be practised without limit.

But are the results, said to have been arrived at, of such a nature as to induce us to repeat the experiments ? Let us inquire. We quote their own words, from " Laurie's translation of Jahr's Manual," which is an abridgement of Hahnemann's " *Materia Medica Pura*."

" Common Salt " produces " awkwardness—incapacity for reflection—anguish, sometimes during a storm, but especially at night—numbness and insensibility on one side of the nose—repugnance to tobacco smoke—paralytic weakness of the legs—corns on the feet and warts on the hands—hatred to persons from whom offence has formerly been received," &c.

" Nutmeg " produces " bloody sweat and epilepsy."

" Agaricus " produces " an inclination to make verses and prophesy."

" Tea " produces " a sensation of hunger and a dislike to all food, and great relaxation of the stomach, which hangs down like an empty purse."

The " South Pole of the Magnet " produces " dislike to society and laughing faces," and " causes the toe nails to penetrate the flesh."

The " Sweet Violet " causes " one to lie on the back, while asleep at night, with the left hand passed under the head, and the knees bent ;" and also produces " great flow of unsettled and confused ideas," and " remarkable clearness and great activity of mind."

" Mephitis Putorius, the fetid juice of the polar polecat," renders " washing with cold water very agreeable."* And so with the rest.

* The propriety of this symptom will be obvious from the following description, from Cuvier's " *Animal Kingdom*."

" The intensity of their most nauseous suffocating stench, which has been described as resembling that of the Fitchet, mingled with

We find, too, that these men—some of whom attained a good old age, and were esteemed healthy and sane by their friends—experimented on themselves with substances, which are said to produce, when taken by a healthy person, “attacks of Tetanus and Lock-jaw,” “Caries and painful ulcers, which attack the bones and perforate them to the marrow;” as Angustura.

“Protrusion and incarceration of inguinal hernia;” as Alumina.

“Inflammation of the tendons;” as Antimony.

“Loss of memory, with diminution of the intellectual powers;” as Ammonium.

“An irresistible desire to blaspheme and to swear;” as Anacardium—The Casheu Nut.

Perhaps the “Defence of Hahnemann” was written under the influence of Granatum, which produces “arrogance;”—or Belladonna, which causes “a desire to bark and bite;”—or Ignatia, from which flows “effrontery;”—or Anacardium, which stimulates to “insults, invectives, and outrages;”—or perhaps the indecency which appears in some Homoeopathic works, arises from Belladonna, which produces “immodesty.” We presume it is for the purpose of *proving*, beyond a doubt, that the symptoms alleged to have been produced are actually the result of the remedies, that we are told that Cayenne Pepper causes “pain in the roots of the hair *after scratching*;” that Animal Charcoal produces “pain and blistering of the seat, *after riding*;” that Berberis produces “sensibility of the eyes to the brightness of

assafœtida, is scarcely credible.” “It will comfort Homoeopathic patients to find one of their eminent authors asserting, that ‘their remedies are in almost all cases destitute of sensible properties, such as colour, taste, or *smell*.’”—(*Homoeopathic Journal*, vol. i., p. 22.) The efficacy of trituration must indeed be wonderful!

the sun ;" that Nutmeg causes " shocks of pain in the teeth, after having drunk cold water ;" that Sulphuret of Lime causes " cough after drinking," &c.

When they tell us of their wonderful cures of physical diseases, of which the public know nothing, we refer our readers to their pretended power over moral disease, of which they can, in so far, judge. They will find that *Digitalis* is recommended as a Homoeopathic cure for Sadness ; that those suffering from " Anguish,"—if it occurs in the " open air," are to take " Bark ;"—if " in a carriage," " Borax." Should they be assailed " in the morning," let them take—" Arsenic ;" if " in the evening,"—" Ambra."

" Awkwardness" is *now* to be cured by " Anacardium," and " embarrassment in society," by " Ambra ;" while " a child who cannot bear to be looked at," is to be treated with " Antimonium."

Fear, too, has its appropriate remedies. Is it of " contagious diseases," it is to be cured by " Baryta ;" is it of " misfortunes," by " Calcareia ;" is it " of robbers,"—" Arsenic ;" is it " of spectres,"—" Aconite ;" is it " of solitude,"—" Lycopodium ;" is it " of dogs,"—" Bark ;" is it " at night,"—" Lamp-black ;" is it in " the evening,"—" Ivory Black."

But if fear becomes " despair," new remedies are at hand. Is it a " Despair of being cured," let the patient take " Bryonia ;" * " Hardness of heart " finds its appropriate remedy in " Anacardium," which is also recommended for " Impiety ;" while " Despair of one's eternal salvation " is to be treated by " Lycopodium."

* Bryony is a long-established favourite among charlatans. Miller says, " Mountebanks carry about fictitious images, shaped from the roots of bryony and other plants, cut into form, or forced to grow through moulds of earthen ware, as mandrake roots. These they sell to silly women under the pretext that by their potency," &c. &c.

A "Disposition to make mistakes" is to be remedied—if "when calculating," by "Ammonium Carbonicum;" if when "speaking," by "Alumina;" if "about weights and measures," by "Nux Vomica;" if "when writing," by "Bovista."

But enough of all this. If, as the Homoeopaths say, Anacardium cures fooleries, we wish they would oftener have recourse to it.

We have extended these quotations so, that, even if Laurie's translation be not good, it cannot affect the question in so full a specimen;—but Dr. Laurie is their own friend. The "blistering of the seat after riding," as a symptom produced by "Animal Charcoal," is omitted in the abridgement of Jahr, but will be found in the original work of Hahnemann.*

We have been accused of ridiculing Homoeopathy, and employing "buffoonery" against it. If there is ridicule in what we have stated, it is caused by reprinting their own words; and it will not do for the "Defenders" to deal in general assertions of misrepresentation. Let those who doubt our accuracy refer to "Jahr's Manual of Homoeopathic Medicine," and they will find the symptoms we have described under each individual remedy, and the moral diseases with their cures, in Part II., chap. 5.

Again, when we find 930 symptoms ascribed to a medicine which hitherto has been believed to be inert, we feel that this, to the professional inquirer, at once stamps the character of the system. For who is he, or who are they, who *can* assign so many effects to any substance? This destroys our confidence at the very outset. Suppose, however, this enumeration to be that of real feelings, we have still the true *discovery* to

* See Med. Gaz., xix. p. 243.

make—whether *any* of them, or *which*, be caused by the drug? In short, these are not experiments at all, but a mere record of every feeling which may occur in the living body, and can be expressed in words. We are told, indeed, that Hahnemann was so particular as to require the address of those who sent him such details. This might secure their respectability; but what has it to do as a credential of their fitness for such a delicate inquiry? Every physician knows, that one of the most difficult tasks assigned him is, to determine the effect of drugs, and that more particularly (for many reasons) when tried upon himself. To give some faint idea of this, and of the sources of fallacy, we will instance two cases of different kinds, both very illustrative, in addition to those already given in “Homoeopathy Unmasked.”

A gentleman, at his very outset in practice, was called to some distance to attend a lady of rank, which he of course considered a very happy beginning. The disease was pleurisy. After blood-letting, he mentioned that he was about to order a pill of hyoscyamus. The lady, who was fond of reading, hesitated, because she had seen it stated to have produced convulsions. Her scruples were with little difficulty removed, and the medicine was prescribed. In the middle of the night, the physician was roused by an express, calling him again to his patient, and on his arrival, he found she had been attacked with a convulsion fit. It may easily be supposed he considered his prospects blasted by this most unfortunate occurrence; but what was his relief to find the hyoscyamus had not been taken!! Yet if it had—this *accidental* attack might have ruined his professional character, and prematurely put a stop to a long career of useful and successful labour.

Innumerable instances of a similar nature might be

cited to shew the many sources of fallacy in ascertaining the effects of drugs.

Take a most instructive instance of this in another science. When the impetus of light was being inquired into, an experiment was devised with a very delicate balance, having a piece of metal leaf attached. It was anticipated, that if light had an impetus, then, by converging the sun's rays upon the leaf, the delicate balance would be affected—the balance dipped—and the experiment was declared to be conclusive! It was left for after years to explain, that this arose, not from the impetus of the light, but from a *change* having been *produced* on the *metal* itself.

Although to vindicate ourselves from the false and calumnious statements of these anonymous libellers is but a part of the object of the present publication, yet we cannot forbear shewing, in connexion with this subject, the means that are resorted to, to prove misstatements against us. The following is the way in which the "Defenders" introduce their charge:—

"We now come to speak of a subject which demands the exercise of the utmost charity. We can conceive how a very superficially educated person might, from a careless perusal of the Homoeopathic writings, have misapprehended, and therefore unwittingly misrepresented the doctrines of Hahnemann and his school; but it is difficult to conceive how any one, unless his aptitude for making convenient mistakes be quite unprecedented, could have accidentally contrived to make the extraordinary blunders about the 'Materia Medica' which we now come to expose. However, let us do Dr. A. Wood the justice to admit, that although the misrepresentations in this department are all of a kind to mislead the reader into an unfavourable idea of the Homoeopathic writings, yet, in many other parts of his work, he has blundered

for the pure pleasure of exposing his own ignorance ; so, in this case, we are willing to suppose that, even when he misstates facts of the plainest kind, it is his incompetence to perceive a truth, and a certain awkward habit that this incompetence gives rise to, and not a premeditated purpose of falsifying, which has betrayed him into this strange series of mistakes."—(*Defence of HAHNEMANN*, p. 63.) What foundation have they for this charge? First, That although we professed to take the remedies in alphabetical order, to show that we were not influenced by any peculiar absurdity, yet we omitted four medicines, which, in the book from which we quoted, occur between Alum and Angustura. To give a colour to this charge, they deliberately omit a restriction which we stated as follows:—"We shall avoid all reference to the more *powerful remedies*, and present a few specimens of the effects said to have been produced by the milder agents."—(*Homoeopathy Unmasked*, p. 46.) So that we, of course, omitted all those whose action we knew to be powerful, as well as those which we could not prove to be mild.

With so much to expose, it is scarcely worth while to notice, that, in order to give greater strength to their misrepresentation, in a pretended quotation from "*Homoeopathy Unmasked*," they change the comparative into the superlative degree, and read "*mildest*" for "*milder*," which alters the meaning of the passage.

Next, they deliberately accuse us of calling Alumina, Alum, although in the book our quotation is made from, (*the name and edition given in full*,) the Latin name "*Alumen*" is used, and is *translated* "*Alum.*"—(*LAURIE'S Jahr's Manual*, p. 13.) We are also accused of ascribing the symptoms produced by *Nitrate* of Silver to *Metallic* Silver, when, in the same work, these symptoms, including "*Epilepsy*," are ranged under a substance, call-

ed, in Latin, "Argentum," and which is translated by the English word "Silver."—(*Ibid.* p. 41.) Lastly, we are accused of confounding "Crude Antimony," their remedy, with "Metallic Antimony," although they must have been perfectly aware that the quotations which we gave to prove *its* inert character, had all reference to *Crude Antimony*, which, in obedience to *their* nomenclature, we called "Antimony." The following quotation, from Pereira's *Materia Medica*, will show at once our authority for the mild character of this substance, and will explain the chemical action by which, in the cases cited by the "Defenders," it became transformed into a powerful agent.

"In most cases it (Crude Antimony) produces no obvious effects, even when taken in very large doses. Rayer (*Dict. de Méd. et Chir. Pratiq.*) gave half an ounce of it in powder, for several days, without the slightest effect. Cullen, (*Treat. of Mat. Med.*, ii. 482,) however, has seen it cause nausea and vomiting in one or two instances in which it was largely employed. Rayer says that the decoction of the sesquisulphuret (Crude Antimony) is much more active than an equal quantity of the same preparation in powder. How are these facts to be explained? Rayer ascribes the activity of the decoction to arsenious acid, formed by boiling sulphuret of arsenicum (contained in the ordinary crude antimony) with water; for Guibourt obtained in this way $1\frac{44}{100}$ grs. of arsenious acid by boiling an ounce of crude antimony. But the presence of arsenic is not necessary to explain the greater activity of the decoction, since, by long-continued boiling with water, the sesquisulphuret of antimony yields hydrosulphuric acid and sesquioxide of antimony, (GEIGER, *Handb. Pharm.*). The occasional nausea and vomiting may arise from the decomposition of the sulphuret by the fluids in the alimentary canal."—(PEREIRA, vol. i., p. 399, 1st ed.)

And why did the Homoeopathists confine themselves to the three substances, the names of which they falsely assert that we misquoted? There were three others given in the text, and four, in addition, in the Appendix. Why did they not deal with these, instead of endeavouring to escape from our argument by *pretending* that we had falsified the names of three?

Of all the extraordinary specimens of argument which we have met with in the Homoeopathic writings, that by which the "Defenders" seek to reconcile us to the belief in the efficacy of their small doses, is conspicuous. We are first told to "*suppose* that the minute doses had been in practice from the age of Hippocrates to the present day;" and then asked, *if this were the case*, "how monstrous, murderous, and opposed to this sort of common sense," would the ordinary doses appear? This is very much as if the man, who, "proceeding gradually in his reductions," brought his horse's daily allowance "down to an exiguity before unheard of, and seemingly incredible," should have said to those who reproached him with the murder of his beast, "There is nothing cruel or absurd in a straw per day. If such had been the allowance of horses from their creation, how preposterously extravagant your whole stores of hay would appear!" The pith of the argument lies in the "*if*;" in the same way the corporation of "tinkers" would be done away, as has long ago been *proved*.

We are next told of the power of minute quantities of electricity; which has nothing more to do with the question than the dissertation on the divisibility of matter, which follows. We never disputed the infinite divisibility of matter—who would?—and we could even have furnished the "Defenders" with good examples. Among others, they do not tell us of St. Peter's brazen toe, which has been dissolved away in infinitesimal doses by the tender lips of melting devotees.

Prout is quoted, to tell us of animalcules so small, that a million of them does not exceed the bulk of a grain of sand. If their infinitesimal doses were intended for *such*, we might understand their efficacy, and would not then dispute the law, "like cures like."

In "Homoeopathy Unmasked," we shewed how the Homoeopaths themselves differed as to the amount of the dose of their medicines; "one party maintaining that the high dilutions, for example, 30, are the best in all cases; another party considering the lowest as only serviceable, and that the practice of the former was nothing better than a 'médecine expectante.'"—(Black, p. 146.) We stated, that this involved a gross absurdity, for that the proportion between these two doses, corresponds to that between 1 drop and 25;834,986;772,486;772,486;772,486;772,486;772,486;772,486;772,486 hogsheads! We are told in the "Defence," that "all this is downright fatuity in any man who has made science a study," p. 75. Yet it would appear that this fatuity is shared in by the Homoeopaths, as their "acrimonious disputes" on this subject prove. But the grand solution has been "expounded;" and Dr. Curie, its discoverer, announces that "every remedy is composed of two principles, one material, the other essential, or imponderable," (body and soul?) That "the lower dilutions place the organism under the influence of the 'material particles,'"—the higher under that of the imponderable.* This explains to us a passage in "Broacke's Practical Observations on Homoeopathy," which we did not before understand. The "Homoeopathic remedies are merely stripped of their bodies—of their *matter*, that the *spirit* only may be employed." This borders closely on another doctrine promulgated by a *German philo-*

* Introduction to Laurie's Translation of Jahr.

sopher, M. Von Martius,* who *proves* that there are in the essence of every plant a body and a soul. "All these things are doubtless strange to Dr. Wood," and Von Martius explains *how* they should be so, when he tells us, "that many scientific men, *to whom the power of comprehending the transcendental has been imparted in a lower degree*, will regard the consideration of such a subject as a digression;" and that it "can in no case be deduced from any proof derived from the nature of plants, but it *must be peculiarly the conception of the individual mind.*"

On the application of the physical sciences, especially chemistry, to medicine, Liebig is our highest authority. Would the Defenders like to know his opinion of Homoeopathy, and of the kind of reasoning which they themselves employ? Here it is:—"Can we wonder that men, wholly ignorant of physiology and chemistry, although in other respects rational, should adopt the absurd notions of Hahnemann—that his doctrines should prevail in Germany, and find disciples in all countries?† Reason alone will not prevent whole nations from falling into the most abject superstitions, whilst even a child, whose mind has been duly developed and instructed, will repudiate the fear of ghosts and hobgoblins.

"Can men who are totally incapable of apprehending

* See Reden und Beiträge über Gegenstände aus dem Gebiete der Naturforschung, Stuttgart und Tübingen; and Meyen's Report on the Progress of Vegetable Physiology, during the year 1837, translated by Francis.

† This surely was sufficient authority for our stating that the works of Hahnemann "gained some credit with the superficially informed, and those altogether unacquainted with medical science," which has so enraged the Defenders, at p. 56. Liebig, we presume, is "able to read the works of Hahnemann's German cotemporaries," and "has a sufficient amount of scientific knowledge to estimate their character." Dr. Russell styles Liebig "the great chemical Physiologist of the present day."—(*Br. Journ. of Hom.*, p. 7.)

that and the Homoeopathic absurdity, where the discrepancy between their doses (we are indebted to a practised arithmetician for the calculation) is as one grain to 578;703;703;703;703;703;703;703;703;703;703.70 $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{9}{7}$ lbs. ?

Nor is this all. In the apparent discrepancies in the regular school, the medicine was given for *different purposes*, and under *different* laws ; one using it as a sudorific, the other as a contro-stimulant, although given in the same disease. The Homoeopathic difference, on the other hand, is in the *same* remedy, given in the *same* disease, and to fulfil the *same* law !

Again, we are told that because "the iodide of potassium may be decomposed as effectually and completely by attenuated zinc and platina wires, the ends of which have been dipped in an acid mixture, as by the great galvanic battery of two thousand double plates belonging to the Royal Institution ;" or "an ounce measure can be filled either from the tun of Heidelberg or from a vessel of nine drachms." * Therefore, as we argued that, because the 30th dilution succeeded as well as the 3d, *neither* could have any effect at all ; so, say they, "if these simple wires succeeded as well as the battery of the Royal Institution, neither can have any effect at all." Another example of the absurdities into which men who reason by analogy are betrayed. If the experiment were tried in the *living body*, we suspect the battery of the Royal Institution would do a *little* more than merely decompose any solution in the stomach, so these "tremendously potent" medicines, given in doses 1,000,000; 000,000; 000,000; 000,000; 000,000; 000,000; 000,000; 000,000 times more powerful than are *necessary* to act in the disease, will not lie inert in the body, seeing that, by

* Defence, p. 76.

the very presence of that disease, it is, according to the Homoeopaths, "rendered specially susceptible to their action." These things, too, are "strange."

The question *here*, observe, is not, whether a small quantity will effect a certain purpose; but, granting this, whether will an immeasurably greater quantity do no more? A bottle of Rhenish will make a man merry; but will the fill of the tun of Heidelberg do no more? The "Defenders" say: "It may be, and probably is, as Professor Döppler has suggested, perfectly true, that an increase of volume gives an increase of power; but then while the power is increased, the quantity to be taken is diminished. If a whole grain were augmented in power a hundredfold, by triturating it with ninety-nine grains of sugar of milk, then one grain of the triturated mass would be equal to neither more nor less than a grain of the undiluted and undivided substance: so that it will be perceived, that while we increase the power we diminish the quantity, and until we have determined the ratio between the increase of power and decrease of substance, it will be impossible finally to settle the question of the dose."—(*Defence*, p. 78.) Here they surely forget that Hahnemann has stated, with all the apparent precision of algebraic formulae, that the power of the *greatest possible* dilution is still "very considerable," and he reduces the effect to almost positive certainty. "Suppose a drop contain the 10th part of a grain, producing an effect about = a , then a drop with $\frac{1}{100}$ th, will only produce an effect about = $\frac{a}{2}$. If it contain the ten-thousandth part of a grain, the effect will be = $\frac{a}{4}$," &c. &c.—(*Organon*, p. 292.)

The other statement we have alluded to, is intended to prove, that *we* have examples in our *Materia Medica* of inert substances made powerful by trituration. A passage is quoted from Pereira, to shew that metallic mercury has no effect on the living body, although in

the very next sentence, that author says, that under certain circumstances, it has a powerful effect; and he accounts for this by stating, that in these cases it becomes oxidated. The "Defenders" then allege, that in Blue Pill, Metallic Mercury exists in a state of minute division, and *thus* acquires power. This is calculated to impose on a non-professional reader, and requires to be explained. There is no proof whatever, that Blue Pill acts by containing minutely divided *Mercury*. Many eminent authorities, including Dr. Christison, believe that the *Metallic* Mercury becomes converted into an *oxide* in the trituration. This is confirmed by recent experiments by Dr. Wright of Birmingham, who found, that Metallic Mercury, introduced into the intestines of animals, in a *state of minute division*, had no effect unless oxygen gas was introduced along with it; when—becoming an *oxide*—it acted powerfully. But even were Blue Pill admitted to be simple *Metallic* Mercury, might it not, in the stomach, be converted into the *oxide*, as Pereira has proved was the case in those instances, in which pure Mercury was swallowed, and found to act powerfully?

It is a singular circumstance, that the only preparation of Mercury the Homoeopaths use, (excepting Corrosive Sublimate,) and which is called "Soluble Mercury," is neither soluble, nor is it *Mercury*. It has been shewn by Guibourt (*Joorna. de Pharm.*, vol. 6, p. 218,) and by Soubeiran, (*Ibid*, vol. 12, page 465,) to be changed into a *salt* of that metal by the process of preparation. But lest the Homoeopaths should say, that trituration *in every case* produces oxidation, and that their Medicines are thus made active, hear Dr. Black:—"Oxidation only takes place in a very few instances (if ever?) where trituration is employed." (Page 89. The parenthesis is his own.)

The other illustration from Mineral Waters, is an

awkward one for the Homoeopathists, and selected at an unfortunate time;—awkward, because from the variety of ingredients in these springs, any power they possess would argue in favour of *compound* prescriptions, which Homoeopathy so strongly condemns;—at an unfortunate time, because it is now asserted—in the language of the Homoeopathists *proved*—that all the virtues ascribed to Mineral Waters, and many in addition, can be obtained from the use of the *simple* element.

After reviewing the false analogies by which the small doses are supported, we turn to those which are employed to recommend the Homoeopathic law—“*Similia similibus curantur.*”

Homoeopathic medicines are said to cure diseases, because they possess the power of producing, in a healthy person, symptoms *analogous* to those of the disease. In “Homoeopathy Unmasked,” we shewed how little dependence was to be placed on such analogies. We took as examples Bark, Vaccination, and Lemon-juice, the three admitted specifics of the regular school. The *alleged* operation of the first, led Hahnemann to the discovery of the Homoeopathic law, and Vaccination is constantly quoted as a proof of it. We shewed that Bark possesses a curative power in all diseases, which recur at regular intervals, as ague, &c., and that it has no curative power in *fevers*, unless thus *periodical*. It is plain, then, that it cures ague,—not because it is a fever, but because it is a *periodical* fever; yet the Homoeopathists do not state, that, when taken by a healthy person, it produces symptoms marked by *periodicity*, which, however, is what alone it cures; but that it produces symptoms of *simple* fever, which it does *not* cure. How then is this argument met in the “Defence?” Wibmer, Wittmann, and Guersant, are quoted to prove that it produces

fever, which we never denied, and which it cannot cure; and Walther, they say, "mentions internal cold and *periodic* shivering, and shaking of the whole body, to have been produced by it."—(P. 56.) Even admitting these symptoms to be analogous to those of intermittent fever, can the isolated observation of one man set aside the numerous experiments of the "accurate Hahnemann" and his followers?

But Cullen, Hahnemann's authority, was ignorant that Bark cured Ague, in virtue of its *anti-periodic* properties; and Hahnemann "consequently looked upon its *anti-febrile* virtue as the important feature of its character."—(*Defence*, p. 55.) Hahnemann's experiments, then, if the Homoeopathic law be true, confirmed the popular error of its *simple anti-febrile* power. We confess we are at a loss to understand this; for no "preconceived notions" can affect the result of "accurate experiments." Hahnemann was "a true interpreter of nature. He made it a rule to set down *every* symptom that was observed, however trivial it might seem; for he judged that it was not for him to decide what was a trivial and what an important fact—all he had to do was to describe facts. It was better to have too many than too few."—(*Defence*, p. 10.) Had symptoms of *periodicity*, then, been observed, they must of necessity have been enumerated. As they did not manifest themselves, Bark must be an exception to the Homoeopathic law; for though it cures *periodic* diseases, it cannot produce them; and though it causes *febrile* diseases, it does not cure them. Do the Defenders mean to insinuate by their argument at page 56, that, had Hahnemann been aware at the time his experiments were made, that Bark had an anti-periodic power, these experiments would have had a different result?

Then as to Vaccination—it is said to *prevent* Small-Pox, because it produces symptoms similar to those of the disease. In “Homoeopathy Unmasked,” we shewed how these two diseases, though in one sense identical, because arising from the same Virus, were yet dissimilar in *symptoms*. The “Defenders” attempt to set our proof aside, in their usual style, as follows :—“ Now, in the whole course of our experience, we solemnly aver, that we never yet encountered a passage, penned by the sorriest dullard, containing, in so small a compass, so complete a revelation of downright, hopeless, ignorance as this. ‘ The one is a Pustular the other a Vesicular disease :’ he actually does not know that Small-Pox, in that period of its course in which the pocks have their only characteristic feature, is Vesicular, or that Cow-Pox becomes, after the eighth day, Pustular ! ‘ the one is a general, the other a local affection :’ he actually does not know, that the eruption of *inoculated* Small-Pox was often confined to the ‘ small point where the Virus was inserted ;’ or that Cow-Pox is apt to become so general an affection, as to cover the quadrupeds from horn to hoof, or that inoculation with Virus, from cases of this sort, has been known to produce a general eruption of Small-Pox on the human being !”

“ The one is attended with severe constitutional symptoms, the other exhibits none of these. ‘ The one is complicated,’ &c. He actually does not know that it was a distinctive character of inoculated Small-Pox in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, and that in casual Small-Pox it is common enough, to have no affection of the Mucous Membranes, and no severe constitutional symptoms ; or that inoculation, with new Cow-Pox matter, and in some cases with Cow-Pox matter transmitted, for several months, through a succession of persons, has produced internal and general disease of so

severe a nature, as to have proved fatal!"—(Defence, p. 41.)

A person scarcely acquainted with medicine could detect much of the sophistry of this. We were contrasting Vaccination with *Natural*, not with "*Inoculated*" Small-Pox, which latter is, like *Vaccination*, a *modified* disease, and therefore must not be adopted as a type. When attempting to shew the similarity between Cow-Pox and Small-Pox, they again speak of Cow-Pox, not in that form employed to *protect* from Small-Pox, but in a form so virulent "as to cover the quadruped from horn to hoof;" and they *do not* tell us that so far were such cases from protecting against Small-Pox, that one of the observers was so strongly impressed with the severity of the disease which it caused, "that he thought it would be better to take Human-Small-Pox, rather than Cow-Small-Pox for inoculation, when the latter assumes its dangerous and fatal forms."—(Report of Vaccination Sec. of Prov. Med. Association.)

For all such extreme cases, we had sufficiently provided, when we stated, that "however unlike the *symptoms* may be, (meaning of course in ordinary and characteristic cases,) the essence of the two diseases is, as Dr. Black observes, "identical."—(Homoeopathy Unmasked, p. 76.) Thus, it appears, that when the symptoms become very *similar*, its employment is in the one extreme, unnecessary, in the other injurious.

But we are accused of error in calling Cow-Pox a Vesicular, and Small-Pox a Pustular disease,—because Small-Pox is Vesicular in one stage, and Cow-Pox Pustular in another! Ought we then to have reversed our statement, and said, Small-Pox is a Vesicular—Cow-Pox a Pustular disease? Or should we say, neither is a Pustular, neither a Vesicular disease? What are they

then ? Both Papular ? Both are characterized by Papulae at *one* stage of their progress. This will not do either, for each afterwards passes through a Vesicular and a Pustular stage.

The style of arguing followed by the "Defenders," places them in a peculiar position. They cannot adopt the classification of Willan and Bateman, the highest British authorities on Diseases of the Skin, because, as Dr. A. Wood followed it, they styled it the error of the "Sorriest Dullard." Neither can they, with Rayer and the French School, consider both these diseases as Pustular, for both are Vesicular in one stage, and this, *in their opinion*, is sufficient to exclude them from that class. But they surely are aware, that "the Serum of almost all Vesicles becomes turbid, and occasionally even purulent at the time of their dessiation, while the fluid contained in several pustules is unquestionably Serous in the outset ;" so that by their argument there should be no distinction made between any Vesicular and any Pustular disease.

Those who have perused our argument in "Homoeopathy Unmasked," will see that the "Defenders," so far from shaking it by proving, that in extreme cases on both sides, the diseases are *identical*, have confirmed it ; for we contended, that Small-Pox and Cow-Pox, being in ordinary cases, identical in their origin, though not in their symptoms, the one gave protection from the other, because the disease very rarely attacks the same individual twice. On the other hand, the Homoeopathic law would require to prove, that the two diseases are not identical in their nature, but similar in their symptoms, which, we need scarcely say, they have utterly failed to do.

But, after all, what have the Homoeopaths to do with Vaccination ? It does not *cure* Small-Pox, but

prevents it,—though Dr. Black chooses to *assume* that it “*would* cure Small-Pox, if the intensity of the Small Pox did not predominate over it,” (p. 225.) Must there not be something “rotten” where constant recourse is had to vague analogies and bold presumptions?

The third specific we admit is Lemon-juice in Scurvy; and notwithstanding what the “Defenders” say, we again assert that its action is no more to be explained on Homoeopathic principles than that of Bark or Vaccination. They meet our statement thus: “Alluding (at p. 72,) to medicines which ‘long experience has retained out of the numerous class supposed to be specific,’ he adverts to Lemon-juice as a well known remedy for Scurvy, and says, with a triumphant sneer, “We have never heard even Homoeopathists pretend that Lemon-juice has the power of producing Scurvy in a healthy person. No, indeed, thou deeply-read Lecturer on the practice of Medicine! Never hear of Lemon-juice producing Scurvy in a healthy person! Has the modern practice of ‘teaching in order to learn’ helped you no nearer to the level of the ordinary student? We refer you to Stevens’ work on the Blood, where you will find an example of the monstrous absurdity which has not yet been dreamt of in your tiny philosophy.”—(*Defence*, p. 40.)

To all this we only reply, that no one who had studied Pathology would ever think of selecting “Stevens on the Blood” as an authority for medical *facts*. Hear Pereira:—

“Those only,” says Sir Gilbert Blane, (*Select Dissert.* p. 8, 1822; see also *Observ. on the Diseases incidental to Seamen*,) “who have made themselves acquainted with the early part of the naval history of this country, or those who have perused the interesting, popular, and eloquent narrative of Commodore Anson’s

voyage, can duly appreciate the value of this simple remedy. Yet, on hypothetical grounds, Dr. Stevens (*on the Blood*) ventures to assert that *Citric Acid induces Scurvy!*"—(PEREIRA, *Mat. Med.*, Part. ii., p. 1240.)

But another analogy is given, so characteristic of the system, that we must direct attention to it. Dr. Black had asserted, that in Neuralgia we never attempted to cure, but only palliated symptoms. To prove the contrary, we extracted a case from one of the Medical Journals, where a gentleman was cured of Tic by the use of Aconitine ointment. Straightway they exclaim—"This Sancho Panza has been kidnapped from the Homoeopathic camp," (p. 63;) and, to prove their claim by analogy, they attempt to show that the plant from which Aconitine is obtained, produces symptoms similar to those of Neuralgia.* The analogy is thus attempted:—Matthioli found it produce "convulsions of the eyes and mouth, and violent pain of the chin." Rödder put the juice into a wound in the thumb, and it produced "*violent pain* of the thumb and arm, with inflammatory swelling." Stoerk says, that a little of the dried plant laid on the tongue produced "continued *burning, piercing, dragging* pain, without swelling or redness;" and Reinhold found it produced "*burning and stinging* pain of the lips, gums, and root of the tongue."† Such are the symptoms analogous to those of Neuralgia! A very acrid substance introduced into a wound of the thumb causes *inflammatory* pain and swelling; or laid upon a delicate

* Aconite belongs to the family Ranunculaceae, in which are many hundred species, most of them possessed of very acrid, or corrosive properties; and several familiar to beggars, who employ them to produce sores. The kind of pain produced by the application of the juice of these plants to cuts, abrasions, or sensitive surfaces, is in no way analogous to that of Neuralgia.

† "Defence," pp. 62, 63.

tissue, irritates it, as Mustard, Cayenne Pepper, or any other irritant. But Elliotson states, that all that is distinctive in the pain of Neuralgia, is determined either by its taking the course of a nerve, "or from the character of the pain, *and the absence of such other circumstances as would be sufficient to occasion it.*" So that the pain the plant produced was not that of Neuralgia, and presented no greater similarity to it than any other pain produced by any other irritant might have done.

But there are many substances in their *Materia Medica* which produce symptoms as similar to Neuralgia, and, therefore, ought equally to cure it; and how would Mr. Skey have succeeded with them? *Æthusa* produces "tearing and shooting pains in the cheek bones," (JAHR'S *Manual*, p. 8.) *Agaricus*, "shooting or pulling pains in the jaws, the cheeks, and the chin, with tearing pain in the fingers," (*Ibid.* pp. 10, 11;) and it also affects the gums, (*Ibid.* p. 10.) *Anacardium* produces "burning sensation round the chin," (*Ibid.* p. 31.) *Calcarea* produces "acute pains in the face," (*Ibid.* p. 112,) &c. But, perhaps, all these, and many others which we might have quoted, *do*, according to the Homoeopaths, cure Neuralgia. Strange, then, that in the Edinburgh Homoeopathic Dispensary so large a proportion of their Neuralgic cases should have resisted such a choice of *specifics*!

But although such analogies, vague though they be, are discovered by the Homoeopaths, we must remind our readers, that other individuals, repeating the experiments without any view to the maintenance of a theory—that is, without "preconceived notions"—arrived at no such results. Thus, although *Belladonna* is said, not only to cure, but to prevent scarlet fever, because it produces symptoms similar to it, yet M. Stivenart gave it to 400 individuals without any such symptoms being ma-

nifested; and in 150 soldiers, who accidentally swallowed considerable quantities of the berry near Dresden, not a single symptom, bearing any real resemblance to scarlet fever, appeared; unless, indeed, a sensation of dryness of the throat and difficulty of swallowing is to be held as analogous to the sore throat of Scarlatina.

Our professional readers will think with astonishment of the number of substances that produce "dryness and constriction of the throat," and which, therefore, ought, *by analogy*, equally to cure the sore throat of Scarlatina! And, lest it should be imagined that positive evidence with regard to the alleged protective virtues of Belladonna in scarlet fever is calculated to outweigh negative, we quote Pereira, who, after giving a list of authorities in its favour, concludes:—

"But bearing in mind the well-known capriciousness evinced by scarlet fever, (as indeed by other contagious disorders,) in regard to the subjects of its attacks, and the large number of those who, though exposed to its influence, escape, the best evidence hitherto adduced in favour of the notion must be admitted to be inconclusive. While, therefore, the facts brought forward in favour of the existence of this prophylactic power are only negative, those which can be adduced against it are positive. For I conceive twenty cases of failure are more conclusive against the opinion here referred to, than one thousand of non-occurrence (of Scarlatina) are in favour of it. Now Lehman, (Bayle, *Bibl. Thérap.* t. ii. p. 417,) Barth, (*Ibid.*) Wendt, (Rust and Casper's *Krit. Repert.*, bd. xxii. s. 27,) Muhrbeck, (Rust's *Magaz.*, bd. xxiv. s. 495,) Hoffmann, (*Ibid.* bd. xxv. s. 115,) Bock, (*Ibid.* s. 580,) and many others that I could refer to, declare it has failed in their hands to evince its prophylactic powers. In this country we have no extended series of observations to quote; but the cases which I am ac-

quainted with are decidedly against the efficacy of the remedy.

A remarkable failure is mentioned by Dr. Sigmond, (*Lancet*, 1836-7, vol. ii., p. 78,) "of a family of eleven persons who took the supposed specific, yet every individual contracted the disease."—(PEREIRA, vol. ii., p. 859.)

Such the analogies, such the experiments, and such the proofs upon which Homoeopathy rests as a science ; and although we agree with the "Defenders," that neither reason nor common sense are *alone* competent to decide a scientific question, yet they discharge their right and fitting office in weighing and pronouncing sentence on the *evidence* submitted to us. Such was the office assigned to reason in "Homoeopathy Unmasked." We did not decide that doctrines were incredible because opposed to all previous knowledge and experience ; but we did say that the amount of evidence adduced in favour of Homoeopathy was altogether insufficient to determine its truth. For the amount of evidence required to warrant the reception of alleged facts should be great in proportion as these alleged facts seem to contradict the past experience of mankind.*

* Such duties are constantly assigned to reason ; and without its employment in this way the minds of men would be in a strange state. For example, in an influential Roman Catholic journal, (the "True Tablet,") so late as November 1842, there appeared the wonderful cure of the Countess Maistre, the daughter of the Governor of Nice. From a severe disorder, "one of her legs became contracted, bent back, and fixed in a state of ultra straining against the hip." The medical attendants proposed amputation ; but, as from the position of the limb, a double operation would have been necessary, it was not performed. She was cured *instantaneously*, by the application to the diseased knee, of a portrait of the venerable Canon, Del Bufato. The physicians examined the knee, and found it "straight, smooth, and perfectly healed." In such a case as this, Reason immediately decides that, whatever was the agent of the cure, assuredly the picture of the venerable Canon had no title to the credit. Why should not *we*, then, pronounce a similar decision, when we find Hahnemann gravely

Such is the law which is proclaimed by Hahnemann to be "universal." In "Homoeopathy Unmasked," we shewed that the law was not universal; although this was not, as the "Defenders" allege, our "grand argument." But it seems that this law for the treatment of disease, (to which, at least, two-thirds of known diseases are exceptions) is to be styled *universal*, because "no harm has yet accrued to science from calling *gravitation* a universal law!"—(*Defence*, p. 57.) The exceptions to the "universal law" are, chronic diseases, which could not be treated until the Itch-hypothesis, which we have *proved** to be opposed to the "universal law," was invented. We shall not dwell on these exceptions, in which the "Defenders" say we have been misled by the ambiguous language of Dr. Black;† but shall discuss the explanation given of the departure from the Homoeopathic System in those "urgent cases where life is almost extinct."

The "Defenders" say, that "in all those cases in which we administer Stimuli, it is not done to cure, but to keep alive; and while the patient is kept alive by stimulation, the curative machinery is also put in operation, in accordance with the general therapeutic law."—(*Defence*, p. 58.) We presume that there are cases in which the *threatened death* is the only *symptom* of deviation from health present, and the exhibition of Stimuli in such cases, is surely

assuring us that he cured a maniac, "in whom a disgust of life had led almost to suicide," by holding under his nose a phial, containing the *quadrillionth* of a grain of gold, and conclude that the gold had no share in the cure? What security have we, as all their experiments, and all their alleged *cures* rest on personal testimony, that they were not all of a similar description. The Countess and her attendants vouch the efficacy of the picture of the venerable Canon; why should not Homoeopathic patients make affidavits as to the powers of the globules?

* Homoeopathy Unmasked, p. 70.

† See Appendix.

opposed to the Homoeopathic law of "like is cured by like." But we are told, that "when there is no life, but only 'aptitude à vivre,' as in Asphyxia, we must excite the sleeping organism to live, before we can modify the kind of life," (p. 58.) Are we then, "while the patient is kept alive by stimulation," to put in operation "the curative machinery also," in accordance with the Homoeopathic law? That is—are we to stimulate the patient to keep him alive, and at the same time to give Homoeopathic remedies, the assumed power of which is to produce the symptoms under which he labours; namely, threatened death? And did not Hahnemann strongly condemn prescriptions, containing two substances which we believe to be analogous in action? How then can they defend compound, or consentaneous prescriptions of this kind, where remedies producing different effects are given at the same time? In short, where are we to stop in such a system? Cases where life is *almost* exhausted, involve a question of degree. Are we to stimulate in *all* cases where the vital powers are below the natural standard? If so, the exceptions to the law are even more numerous than we represented them to be in "Homoeopathy Unmasked."

It must be received as a compliment from the "Defenders," when they submit to receive from the profession, the means of recalling or sustaining life, that they may afterwards have the boast of "modifying it." In short, what could the Homoeopathic "helm" do, were it not for the "breeze?"—(*Defence*, p. 58.) The simile of the vessel and *rudder* are prettily enough described, but they forget the *dead calm* which is the matter in question.

To complete our sketch of the system, we should now discuss the Pathological doctrines advocated in the "Defence." This, however, from the line of argument the "Defenders" have adopted, would

lead us into the endless controversy respecting the *vital principle* ; and we need not enter upon it, as it does not affect the argument in the third chapter of "Homoeopathy Unmasked." It is very easy, in a pamphlet where proof is seldom given, to accuse us of "regarding Morbid Anatomy as synonymous with Pathology," and to assert that we advocate the system of "referring symptoms to a cause that is altogether hypothetical," which we never did ; and then to quote Dr. Abercrombie, to shew the absurdity of *this*. Equally easy is it for them to shut their eyes to the fact, that the question in Pathology on which they pronounce so authoritatively, is one on which the opinions of the highest authorities are divided. They adopt one side, and because we, to a limited extent, advocate the other, we are, according to their usual practice, stigmatized as ignorant and uninformed.

Having learned that tubercles are a secretion, and not a tissue, they are amazed because we "actually speak of them as a structural change." We consider a lung studded with tubercles, as a tolerable example of a "structural change." We would ask what is a structural and what a functional disease ; and to which Tubercular Phthisis belongs ? Our language is, at least, more precise than that of Hahnemann, who—if the Commentary of his admirers be correct—terms insensible and inscrutable conditions of the system, "Morbid alterations of the invisible *substance*." Does the Dynamic theory of life admit the vital principle to be "substantial ?"

But enough of such play upon words.

The Itch-hypothesis is a Pathological peculiarity of the Hahnemannian school. We confess ourselves of the number who are "incapable of perceiving in that doctrine, one of the deepest suggestions of a profound thinker and practical Physician." Hippocrates had explained what Hahnemann seemed to think was left for

him to discover, how there were individual idiosyncrasies, which made "the same disease, attacking two different persons, liable to run a very different course." He had also taught, that certain conversions take place in diseases—a subject which has since been well illustrated by Rodericus à Castro, in his treatise, "*Quae ex Quibus*," and has also employed the pen of Lorry.

Professor Schönlein, we are told, "entertains no doubt of the existence of secondary diseases *after* the Itch;" but it was left for the genius of Hahnemann to propound that the Itch need not always precede the diseases by which he asserts it is followed! Without this *theory*, he tells us that he could not successfully treat chronic diseases: the "Defenders" reiterate the same, and yet of that "hypothesis" they say, "Premature perhaps—it may be quite erroneous."—(P. 80.)

Is there yet a hope that, like Dr. Simpson, the London *Homoeopathist*, they may have discovered "that Homoeopathy, as it has recently been taught and practised by its great discoverer, is little better than a mere chimera?" Like him, too, they may declare that they "hold the hypotheses of Hahnemann as altogether unsatisfactory—his practical rules from them, as contrary to experience, and his theory of chronic diseases as devoid of all proof." Like him, too, believing all this, they may still continue to practise Homoeopathy, and even to publish books upon it; now, however, they are deprived of his excuse, and cannot say that—"out of a laudable regard for the feelings of their venerable Teacher, now in his 82d year, they hesitate to pronounce their recantation of the errors into which he has unnecessarily led them by his too hasty deductions."*

* A Practical View of Homoeopathy, by Stephen Simpson, M.D. After this avowal, the Author, out of delicacy to Hahnemann we presume, still continued to practise Homoeopathically; and the book

Notwithstanding the assistance they derive, in the treatment of disease, from these additional hypotheses, which they allow to be doubtful, perhaps erroneous, there is undoubtedly still some feeling of deficiency and an anxious "whistling" for an Allopathic "*breeze*;" that *their* "*rudder*" may guide them out of the *shallows*—. Abroad, at least, they do resort to blood-letting, though Hahnemann decidedly interdicted it. And under such circumstances, what would be the "plea of a convert," who, from experience in the old school, should stipulate for such an indulgence, as the condition of his adherence?

Having thus given some illustrations of what we meant, when we spoke of the "principal absurdities and contradictions" of Homoeopathy; and having shewn, that the "Defenders of Hahnemann and his doctrines," have, in their recent publication, increased, not diminished their force; we now proceed to the consideration of those charges against "Homoeopathy Unmasked," which have not been incidentally referred to in the preceding pages.

The first is thus stated by the "Defenders:"—"What is to be thought of the man who, witnessing the increasing success of those to whose medical creed he is adverse, and casting about for means of checking their advance, has at last bethought himself of aspersion on their moral character, in that point on which the public opinion of our country is peculiarly and honourably sensitive? Knowing, as he must, that there is no limit to the measure in which the investigation of the structure and functions of the sexual organization may become the duty of the physician, the surgeon, and the accoucheur; knowing that the proved effect of such studies on the

from which we have quoted, actually contains narratives of alleged Homoeopathic cures! "*ex uno disce omnes.*"

medical character is to blunt the mind to all impressions connected with them but such as are purely scientific ; knowing, or at least bound to know, that the facts of this nature had no where been stated in a more cold, abstract, and merely philosophical manner, than in the writings of Hahnemann and his followers, Dr. Wood has dared to ascribe the growing popularity of the Homoeopathic doctrine to a prurient imagination, delighting in obscene details, and to charge its professional representatives with pandering to this. If an imputation, so disgraceful to its author, shall take effect in the smallest degree, never had man such cause to blush for his success. But let not our readers,—let not Dr. Wood, imagine that we are engaged in self-defence. We will not stoop for one moment to repel such a charge from such a quarter. There is no shadow of ground for an imputation against us. We need not pause to affirm our assurance, that not a single Homoeopathist has derived one atom of pain or pleasure from the associations that so haunt the sensitive Dr. Wood. We are here the prosecutors. We arrest this unmasker, and exhibit him in his true character at the public bar, that men may know henceforward what his accusations are worth ; as we have seen an overforward witness committed for future trial and condemnation, on account of the unrighteous evidence he had given.”—

“ Some men are so dishonest, that without any peculiar impurity of mind they might have advanced this flagrant charge ; while others, and only a very few, are so impure that they could have done it without dishonesty. Dr. Wood may choose.”—(*Defence*, pp. 10 and 11.)

In the first place, we have to observe, that so far were we from stating that the abominable indecencies of the Homoeopathic writings had any effect in increasing their circulation in *this* country, that we expressly

said, "prudence had forced" the Edinburgh Author to "suppress the grosser indecencies; although, even from these his book was not altogether free," (*Homoeopathy Unmasked*, p. 18,); and that there might be no mistake, we referred to the particular passage. Nor did we, as is falsely alleged, "charge its professional representatives" with "pandering" to a depraved taste. Our words were, "*On the Continent* their circulation received an additional stimulus from the immorality with which some of them abound, and which *enable the licentious to pander* to their degrading tastes, and indulge their prurient curiosity, under the *guise of scientific investigation*," (p. 17.) The "Defenders" must either admit themselves to be "*the licentious*," or confess that they have perverted our meaning. If any one doubt that the characteristics to which we have alluded do afford a stimulus to the circulation of books "*on the Continent*," we refer them to the recently expressed opinions of one of the leading Literary Journals, on the standard of morality which obtains in the writings of the modern French authors.

We cannot introduce into this pamphlet *quotations* from the Homoeopathic works, which would at once bring home the charge. None but an anonymous writer, of the lowest character, would have dared to evade it, by the base insinuation which their *pretended* alternative makes. Neither shall we discuss such subjects with men who acknowledge no limit to the measure in which indelicate investigations may be pursued, and whose minds, "blunted" in the way they have described, are incapable of seeing the grossness of such revelations. In Dens' Theology questions are suggested which aroused an indignant nation—he gives the *questions* only—the Homoeopathic Experimenters furnish suitable *replies*.

To show that *we* are not *peculiarly* “sensitive,” we shall quote the opinion of other authors on this subject. In the *Medico-Chirurgical Review*, edited by Dr. Johnson, (a veteran practitioner, whose mind, according to the “Defenders,” ought to be “blunted,”) we find the following :—“We drop the curtain on the two philosophers,” (one Gersdorff, an experimenter of Hahnemann, and a *female* whose name is not given. Their revelations are given in Hahnemann’s “*Materia Medica, pura.*”) “We are told, indeed, of various” * * * * * “but as the Allopaths (ordinary practitioners) have not arrived at the happy pitch of disregarding common decency and common sense, we must, in deference to such prejudices, quit the subject.”—(*Med.-Chir. Review*, No. li. p. 144.)

The *Medical Gazette*, a well-established and influential London journal, says :—“We have quoted their beastly descriptions, given in the *ipsissima verba* in which they express their pruriency, their flatulency, and their filth.”—(Vol. xix. p. 244.) Again, at p. 305,—“We quote Hahnemann’s *pure* *Materia Medica*, (so called, we presume, from its astounding *impurity*, *lucus a non.*”)

And in the *London and Edinburgh Monthly Journal*, p. 226, occurs the following passage :—“These rules (p. 130 of Dr. Black’s *Principles*) exhibit a disgusting pruriency, in perfect keeping with the general want of delicacy of continental nations, and the imitation of which will be one of the blessings we shall owe to Homoeopathy and its followers.”

They again attack us, because, to illustrate some of the *errors in practice* to which the *doctrines* of Homoeopathy lead, we gave an account of certain cases in which, under Homoeopathic treatment, the disease had been allowed to go on until it became aggravated, and in some cases even death ensued. On this subject the “De-

fenders" remark—"Had the author really been convinced that the system was overthrown by his arguments and statements, he might have spared himself the questionable occupation of acting domestic spy on the patients of others, and publishing, without seeking explanation from the physicians, whatever scandal, ignorance, disappointment, or cupidity poured into the ear of the delighted listener. We doubt whether the amount of fruit he has gathered be recompense enough for a task so unworthy of a physician, and so revolting to the mind of a gentleman."—(*Defence*, p. 85.) Is this sentence written by one of the *inventors* of the famous "wrist-joint case?" That case, which told us of the "eminent surgeon who blistered the part at least twenty times, but with no benefit?" Of the treatment pursued in the Edinburgh Infirmary, from which he was salivated? of the "amputation which was advised," so cruel and so unnecessary? Did *they* seek explanation of the "eminent surgeon" who attended Heslop, both in and out of the Infirmary? Had they done so, they would have been prevented from publishing that case, justly styled by its exposé, "a tissue of the most reckless mis-statements, being in many minor, and in all essential points, at variance with truth."*—See *Monthly Jour. of Med. Science*, No. xxvii. p. 224, and *Appendix to Homoeopathy Unmasked*.

* Observe—this case is not simply a *mistake* in being entered "cured," which may happen easily enough in Dispensary Reports: and, in common circumstances, might have been of little moment. But Heslop was held up as a proof of the failure of the Old School, and to contrast all its horrors with the simplicity and success of the New; yet this most *valuable* case is reported "*cured*" upon the authority of their porter: and their account of his former treatment in the hospital, and his cure from their remedies, turn out to be equally untrue. The "Defenders" boldly say, that the charges founded on this case were refuted. In the Appendix to "*Homoeopathy Unmasked*," (that our readers might judge for themselves,) we published both the

When did this *new* respect for the "conventional decencies of society" spring up, which has led the "Defenders" to forget their "Dispensary Report," once so liberally distributed, and to pretend that we were the *first* to bring the subject of Homoeopathy under the notice of the Edinburgh public?—(See *Defence*, p. 4.) But the "Defenders" congratulate the friends of Homoeopathy "that, after all this degrading espionage—extended over so large a field, exercised by so unscrupulous an observer—he must take up the complaint of Bacon, and say, 'Spe fallente, progressu haud prospero, fructu parco et exiguo, cum *contemnendo* aut plane nullo, successu.'" The "Defenders" must not imagine that we exhausted our list. The cases were only published in illustration of the statements in the body of the work; and, instead of being selected from the "large field" which we *know* we might have enjoyed, had we added the experience of our brother practitioners, were, with two exceptions, met with in the ordinary routine of practice.

Having thus disposed of the only two, among the many, charges of a *general* kind that we deem worthy of notice, we now proceed to the specific charges of "elementary ignorance, illogical inferences, and mis-statements," by blazoning which in the newspapers for weeks before they published, the "Defenders" sought to reap the fruits of a triumph without achieving the labours of a victory.

We are accused of ignorance of the history of Medicine, because we stated that "there is no new discovery

charges and their so-called refutation; but truth compelled us to term the latter a "*confession*." It is easy to see why the journal, which directed attention to this case, is so virulently abused at p. 70

It has been well observed, "a man may be forgiven for *opposing*, but never for *exposing*."

which promises to be beneficial—no new science which promises, however remotely, to advance the healing art—that we do not eagerly investigate, and practically submit to the most calm and searching inquiry.” For the truth of this we might appeal to the numerous Medical Journals, the object of which is to concentrate, so to speak, on the individual practitioner the labours of his brethren, both at home and abroad.

But it seems we were in error, or rather guilty of “elementary ignorance,” because the reception of Vaccination and Auscultation, it is alleged, were opposed, just like Homoeopathy, by the great bulk of the profession.

What are the facts? When the discovery of Jenner was first announced, medical men demanded confirmation of it. That they were right in so doing, will be allowed by all who reflect on the fearful mortality of Natural Small-Pox, and the limit which Inoculation set to it. It behoved them, then, to exercise caution before any new discovery was permitted to supersede Inoculation, which had been proved to exercise an effect so beneficial; and we cannot but make allowance for that most salutary dread they felt, of exposing the nation again, even to a limited return of a scourge which might *well* appal the boldest and most sanguine. We find then, that, although “Dr. Jenner’s first publication excited, in *a remarkable degree*, public attention,” yet, owing to the distrust to which we have alluded, it was three months before a person could be procured in London on whom to exhibit the disease. But what was the consequence of the success of that experiment? “A general rush in favour of Vaccination succeeded.”* That the discovery was opposed, and with the utmost virulence, there

* See Gregory’s History of Vaccination.

can be no doubt ; but not by the medical profession, as a body. " A few, but happily a very few," says our historian, " opposed it." Dr. Moseley was the first, and his book was " republished three times, in different forms, before it attracted any general notice." And who was it that came forward to allay the prejudices against Vaccination ? Not Royalty and Nobility, but the heads of the medical profession, who published an advertisement, " strongly recommending it as safe in itself, and affording perfect security from the Small-Pox." This was signed by thirty-six physicians and surgeons of the first reputation in the metropolis, among whom we find the honoured names of Baillie, Lettsom, and Willan ; Cline, Abernethy, and Cooper. The only controversies of any consequence which, after this, occurred on the subject, were produced by some accidents which took place at the Small-Pox Hospital, owing to the precipitate haste with which the new discovery was carried out—and with respect to the *perfect* security which it afforded—a point which is now decided against Jenner.

The slanders against the medical profession here quoted (by the " Defenders,") from a man evidently of strong passions, and writing in the heat of a violent controversy, require no other answer than the following opinion of Willan's, as decided a *partisan* of Vaccination, though possessing a cooler judgment :—" Jenner's discovery was a touchstone to detect what proportion of selfishness alloyed the human heart. It was calculated to make known whether the scenes of misery which medical men are compelled to witness blunt their feelings. The result has certainly reflected distinguished honour on the Faculty, for the plan to exterminate the Small-Pox has been zealously adopted by the medical men of every part of the world which it has reached. There are, however, and I acknowledge it with reluctance, a

few Practitioners who must be excluded from participating in the praise thus acquired by the majority."* To allege that the part which the Nobility took in favour of it had any influence on the medical profession, is a libel, as absurd in itself as it is easily refuted. Did the Faculty follow Perkins, or St. John Long, or Morrison, because the Nobility attested the efficacy of each of *their* modes of cure? Or do they become the victims of any form of quackery, because, to quote Moore, (the "Defenders'" own authority,) "Clergymen, Judges, and Peers are daily swearing that they have been cured of incurable diseases?" "But," adds Moore, "the meanest apothecary smiles with contempt, when he reads their splendid testimonials."†

It is almost impossible to conceive men more unfortunate than the "Defenders" in the selection of their proofs. At page 23, they attempt to prove that the practice at first met with little encouragement in Edinburgh, when their own authority, Moore, expressly states—"It was received with heartfelt joy in Scotland. The Professors of Edinburgh, in conformity with the brilliant reputation which the University has long maintained as a Medical School, were impatient to investigate the properties of the newly-discovered lymph, which they soon procured from Dr. Jenner. Experiments were made, the preventive power was proved, and Vaccination established."‡ And yet, strange to say, one of these very Professors is selected as a proof of ignorance, and the very man who used to boast, in his Lectures, that his *own child* was the *first* vaccinated in

* Willan on Vaccine Inoculation, p. 4.

† Reply to the Anti-Vaccinists.

‡ Moore, History of Vaccination, p. 26.

Edinburgh. And, lest any of our non-professional readers should wonder why the Vaccine lymph was not at once transmitted to Edinburgh, we refer them to Baron's Life of Jenner, where they will find that, almost immediately after the successful experiments in London, the disease disappeared from the dairies, and it was some time before a fresh supply could be procured.

Associated with their discoveries in the History of Vaccination is a passage, which, taken in connexion with the violent and personally abusive character of the whole Pamphlet, will do more to "unmask" the men than any thing we could write. It attempts to account for the opposition of the Medical Profession to Homoeopathy, by ascribing to them the most unworthy motives, because it (Homoeopathy) "cannot fail to make deep inroads into Professional incomes, and to lessen very much the number of Practitioners that shall be needed to meet the altered circumstances of the Public."—(P. 22.) The only means which the "Defenders" possess of thus judging of the motives by which the Profession is actuated, is by expressing what their own were before they left it to adopt this new scheme. If such motives then actuated *them*, it is not difficult to see how, if emolument were their sole object of ambition, the rapid success of empiricism should attract such men to share in its humiliating though lucrative bribes!

The Stethoscope, too, was opposed. How?—Where? By whom? "About the year 1820," say the "Defenders," "Laennec gave to the world an account of his discoveries in Auscultation." But, strange to say, so eager as the Profession seem to have been, not only to investigate, but even to *anticipate* the discovery, that, in 1818, two years previous to the time "about which," according to the Homoeopaths, it was announced,

we find the Edinburgh Medical Journal—the leading periodical of the day—directing attention to it. It is absurd to speak of any active opposition being offered to it;—that it did not immediately become general was owing to the difficulty of its application, requiring the ear to be early and assiduously tutored to detect the sounds—and the best proof of the correctness of our assertion is, that the paper of Dr. Gregory, from which our opponents quote, had for its chief object to encourage its use, by showing, “that the difficulty of acquiring an accurate knowledge of its details had been much exaggerated.” And even in the very paper to which they refer, he says: “There are few public hospitals in this country in which Auscultation and percussion are not more or less employed; and I believe I may say, that there are very few among the intelligent students frequenting our hospitals, who do not seek to make themselves acquainted with the principal indications which they afford,” (p. 27.)

Hahnemann's invention *preceded* the discovery of Laennec by many years. What is their relative position now?

With regard to Harvey.—His discovery was made too soon after the exposition of the Baconian philosophy to derive any advantage, in its reception, from the methods of arriving at truth there explained, so that it cannot be cited as a case in point.

Our elementary ignorance next displays itself, by our “claiming for medicine a place among the sciences, very near mathematics and the science of numbers,” and then “dropping to the admission that medicine is, and must necessarily be, an imperfect science.” The object of the assertion seems to be to afford the “Defenders” an opportunity of comparing us with Icarus. But as

we never took the ambitious flight they allege—having merely drawn illustrations from the sciences of mathematics and numbers—so we have escaped the “sea of contradictions” into which they would fain have plunged us.

We are next charged with confounding the *science* with the *art* of medicine, because we state that it is “a fundamental principle in Homoeopathy, that if *it* be true, medicine must necessarily be false.” If we have been led into the “extravagant folly” of conceiving this, it is by believing that the Homoeopaths were serious in their abuse, not only of the art, but of the science of the regular practitioner. That some confusion prevails in the minds of the “Defenders” is evident. It has this practical advantage, that it enables them, when it suits their purpose, to run down the established system in all its branches; and when we attempt to meet them on the wide field for discussion which they thus open up, to restrict themselves to much narrower limits. When they have reconciled the contradiction of the following passages, it will be time enough for us to prove that we do know the branches into which medicine is divided. At p. 27 we find the following:—“There is, then, but one department (the theory of Therapeutics) 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 the 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. Nay, the field of contest is not so broad as even this,” &c.—(*Defence*, p. 27.) Let us turn now to p. 23, where we find the following:—“The latter (Homoeopathy) does not aim at the introduction of a new practice into a solitary branch of the

medical art, but demands for the field of its sweeping reformation the whole territory of practical medicine, joins issue with the old system on every inch of its possessions, and has to beat it from its fastnesses among the morasses of false experience, and the jungles of crude hypotheses."—(*Defence*, p. 23.) Surely these two passages must have been penned by different individuals—the one familiar with the "Blunderbuss," the other with the "Rifle;" or are they the production of the brain of a true scion of the "Double-head?"*

We are next accused of "ignorance," because, according to the Homoeopaths, we asserted that there was a unity of experience in medicine. They should first have inquired to what kind of experience we referred. We did think that the experience of most medical men would lead them to belong to that class of "theorists," who, according to Hahnemann, erroneously believe that the more water you add to any agent, the more you diminish its active power. We did think, that the experience of medical men led them to agree with Dr. Alison, that the introduction of quinine into practice, was "one of the most important additions which

* It seems as if the very jokes—poor though they may be—of "Homoeopathy Unmasked," require to be seriously refuted; for at page 59 of the "*Defence*," a very learned and lengthy paragraph occurs to prove, that we were guilty of employing "the unscrupulous device of garbling the quotation, and perverting the meaning of an Author"—we presume "Doppel-Koff," which is, we understand, a word of Richter's invention, is as well translated by Dr. Black, (p. 20,) and by Dr. Russell, (*Jour. of Hom.*, No. 1, p. 4,) "Double-head," as by the Defenders "Combination;" and we ventured to use this freedom with "Doppel-Koff," in return for Richter's flattering appellation of "vulgar Receipt-heads," as applied to the Profession. (See *Black*, p. 20.)

Of a similar kind is the grave offence of calling Hahnemann's "*Organon*," a "*Novum Organon*."

Chemistry has given to Medicine during the present century," just because it has enabled us to give the active principle of Bark in *large* doses, by freeing it from the non-medicinal vegetable matter, in combination with which it naturally existed.

The utility of Burnt Sponge in Goitre, Scrofula, and some other diseases, has been acknowledged, for many years back, by a part of the profession—its effects not being so apparent as to command universal assent. All doubt as to its utility was dispelled by the subsequent discovery of the good effects of Iodine in those diseases, and of its existence in Burnt Sponge; it is therefore manifest that the limited utility of Burnt Sponge, as compared to the acknowledged power of Iodine, even in moderate doses, arose from the minute proportion of Iodine contained in it—*i. e.* from the extreme *dilution* of the efficacious part of the remedy, and its admixture with a non-medicinal substance.

It is, therefore, because we are just congratulating ourselves on the improvement in practice which Chemistry has conferred, by enabling us to give these powerful substances in *large* doses—that we feel it to be contrary to *experience* to believe in the efficacy of *infinitesimal* ones; more especially when, as in some of the above instances, the remedy is used by the Homoeopaths in the very same diseases in which we have been in the habit of employing it.

Again, the Homoeopathic *law* is opposed to our every-day experience. The examples of this are numerous. Iodine cures Goitre, and, given in health, so far from producing it, causes absorption of the gland.

Engot of Rye induces labour, and excites uterine action. What would be its effect given in threatened miscarriage? Epsom salts, and other purgatives, will purge a healthy man; but will they arrest a diarrhœa,

unless when it depends on the presence of some irritant, which by their action they remove?

Such are a few specimens of the *experience* of the Regular School, to which we still believe that of Homoeopathy to be opposed. This subject has given the "Defenders" occasion to speak of what they call our opposing experience, in reference to the treatment of disease. To make out a case, they deliberately resort to two of the most extraordinary expedients, to give them no harsher name, which any controversialist was ever driven to employ. To obtain "the more weighty testimony of Cabanis, a distinguished philosopher, and a Member of the Parisian School of Medicine," they actually quote a proposition from him, which he states only for the *purpose of refuting*, and make it appear that *this* is his own opinion of the "Art of Medicine!" We are quite aware that there is a loophole through which an *anonymous* controversialist may escape from this charge. The "Defenders" may say that they only quoted Cabanis, to have his opinion of what was said by *some* men of the "Art of Medicine;" but we ask any honest man to read the passage as it occurs at pages 30 and 31 of the "Defence," and say what is the impression produced by it. Let them observe that Cabanis is spoken of as a "distinguished philosopher;" that his testimony is said to be "weighty!" that this is the reason given for quoting it; but surely these could never give *authority* to opinions which he quotes for the special purpose of refuting. Again, at page 31, he is spoken of as bearing testimony to the melancholy state of the Allopathic system. We shall immediately give Cabanis' opinion of those who argue like the "Defenders." Surely, after the compliments they have lavished on him, they cannot decline receiving it!

Cabanis also wrote a book on the "Degree of Certainty of Medicine," which would have afforded the "Defenders" greater scope for their new way of stating the opinions of an author, because in it he refuted a greater number of *objections*, in which they might have quoted *his own* views.

Nor is this all. To give an example of the variety of ways in which *one* disease is treated by regular Physicians, the "Defenders" select Fever. Can they mean to assert, that Fever is really the *one* disease which they profess to consider it? Do they not know that every epidemic presents a different character, and requires to be treated in a different way? The very quotation which they make from Dr. Alison, (p. 36), must have taught them this, for he condemns bloodletting—not in fever, but only in "most epidemics" of fever; and a little further acquaintance with the writings of that eminent and practical Pathologist would have made them aware, that, in the epidemic with which we were visited last autumn, he recommended bloodletting, and that in his "admirable History of Medicine," as Dr. Black justly styles it, he explains the apparent discrepancy as follows:

"The present writer can say with confidence, from his own observation, that the fevers which were prevalent in Edinburgh from 1815 till 1820 were materially different in character from those which have prevailed since 1825; that at the former time the pulse generally preserved a greater degree of firmness throughout the disease; that when death occurred, it could be more distinctly ascribed to the inflammatory complications; that bloodletting was better borne, and seemed much more decidedly useful; and that the indications for the use of wine, and the benefit from it, were much less frequently seen. When the statements of Dr. Welsh

on the fever of 1817-18 in Edinburgh are compared with those of other practical observers, either of former or later epidemics in Scotland, it will probably be admitted that the observation now made is in conformity with the experience of others. About the former period, several of the best observers—Dr. Duncan in Edinburgh, Dr. Bateman in London, and many of the military and naval practitioners—exerted themselves to shew the safety and efficacy of bloodletting in fevers, even of the typhoid type; but in many of the fevers prevalent since that time, caution has appeared equally necessary in regard to bloodletting, and wine has seemed equally useful and important as in the days of Huxham or of Gilchrist. And it is only by such observations that we can be duly impressed with the importance of the practical cautions given by Sydenham, by Cullen, and others of the older authors, as to the importance of attention to *the nature of the prevailing epidemic*, in regulating our practice in fevers.”*

After this, it is scarcely worth while to reply to what the “Defenders” have written on this subject.

They refer to the “more weighty testimony of Cabanis.” To this we can have no objection.

Thus, by anticipation, he states their argument—and thus he refutes it; not giving them much credit, as will be seen, for profound acquaintance with the ancient writings, or an attentive examination of different modes of practice:—

“*Objection.*—If medicine was well-founded, the theory would at all times be the same; the practice, too, would not differ in one age from another; ancient and modern physicians, men of all schools and all countries, would agree at least upon some important points;

* Hist. of Med., p. 101.

whereas, in running over the history of medical opinions, what a difference in their views—how contrary their methods of treatment !”

“ *Reply.*—This is more within the comprehension of every body ; it makes a great impression in general ; and it is easy to see how this comes to pass. Medical writers are divided in their principles ; practitioners are divided in their plans of treatment. Systems rise up and fall in quick succession, and the methods of cure undergo the like variation. If there is such diversity of opinion, that where Hippocrates says yes, Galen almost always says no, it is reasonable to conclude, that their rules of judging must be vague and vain. But a profound acquaintance with the ancient writings, an attentive examination of different modes of practice, and an accurate survey of the operations of nature, will enable us to obviate these objections, and to reconcile the apparent contradictions. With regard to the theoretical opinions, founded not upon the facts themselves, but upon the manner in which they are produced, it signifies very little how they disagree, provided that the practice is regulated by facts, and never forsakes the indications furnished by them. The mathematical, the humoral, the chemical, and the spasmodic physicians, all agreed in their practical inferences, and only employed their doctrine to connect their ideas together. From the time of Hippocrates to the present day, intelligent observers have seen what he so ably pointed out ; the practice has not changed so completely as has been alleged, and the same means have always been employed to bring about the same effects in every age ; subject, indeed, to such modifications as the changing circumstances must suggest to enlightened observers.”
—CABANIS, “ *Du Degré de Certitude de la Méd.*,” pp.

23 and 105. *From Abridgement in Ed. Med. and Surg. Journal.*

Let them cry now, "Most rightful Judge! Most learned Judge! A Daniel come to judgment! Yea, a Daniel!"—(p. 31.)

With regard to Broussais and Rostan, the inventors of new systems themselves, it was their interest, as it was that of "Hahnemann and his Defenders," to abuse as much as possible that system which they were attempting to overthrow; and the "accurate Louis," as the "Defenders" ought to have known, retired from practice in order to prosecute investigations into a branch of medicine, which, by their own shewing, belongs, with all its imperfections, to them as much as to us.

We are accused, at p. 43, of confounding "Positive Sciences" with "Abstract;" and of such importance is this deemed by the "Defenders," that they again repeat it at page 57. "Positive Science" is not a term often made use of; and although we cannot perhaps ascribe the honour of its "discovery" to Dr. Black, yet we deemed it our duty to ascertain in what sense the Homoeopaths employ it. It is plain, from what they say at page 53, where Chemistry is spoken of as one of the "Exact Sciences," that a confusion exists in their own minds, and that we were right in supposing Dr. Black regarded "Positive" as synonymous with "Exact;" and therefore, when he claimed for Homoeopathy a place among the "Positive Sciences," we were entitled to require him to show that its truths were either self-evident or demonstrative.

There are two specimens of alleged "illogical reasoning," upon which we have not yet had an opportunity of touching. The one occurs in a foot-note to page 42 of the "Defence." The "Defenders" there, *pretending to*

quote us, say—"The object of all research is the discovery of truth; the result of all successful *result* must therefore be true; but to determine the truth of any proposition, it is necessary to *determine* how far it is in conformity with the nature and reality of things," &c. This is what they *make* us say; and nonsensical enough it truly is! Unfortunately for them, however—that they may have an opportunity of ridiculing it—the word *result* is substituted for "*research*," the word we employed; and the word, *translated* by them "*determine*" in the last clause, is "*ascertain*" in "*Homoeopathy Unmasked*." By these alterations they *make* the sentence unintelligible, and then ridicule it for being so. It was necessary to introduce the subject of the different kinds of evidence required to prove different kinds of truth.

The other example of alleged "illogical reasoning" occurs at page 70, and is stated as follows:—"Dr. Wood, affecting to quote from Dr. Black's book, says—'Medicines can only cure disease in virtue of the power they possess of modifying the state of health, (Dr. Black;) the peculiarity of the Homoeopathic remedies is, not to operate upon the healthy, (Dr. Black;) therefore they cannot cure disease.'

"Is it worth while to expose it? Does not every reader perceive that the reason a medicine is given in a disease is, because it has displayed a power of affecting those in health? Do we forget the terrible symptoms which Dr. Wood's *Alum and Antimony* were represented as producing? Do we forget that he has all along attempted to ridicule *the provings* of medicines, and that no medicine is used by us which is not so proved; and that these provings are nothing but a detail of the way in which the medicines operate upon the healthy."—(*Defence*, p. 70.)

Now this whole question rests on the *presumed* identity of the power of the particular *drug itself*, and that inestimably small portion of it said to be contained in the *Homoeopathic* globules. Let this be kept in view. The Globules, alleged to *cure disease*, cannot be the same matter as the drug used in the large doses to experiment with on the healthy body ; for, if we judge them by their declared effects, these are diametrically opposite—the drug *increasing* the disease ; the globules removing it.

They will, indeed, still assert that the globules *must* contain a portion of the drug itself ; but, though matter *may be* infinitely divisible, they must not deny what Dr. Drysdale says, that they are destitute of “ chemical and physical qualities ;” and having lost these in the process of trituration, why not their “ *spiritual*” powers also ? (See p. 13.) Nor can their contrariety of effect, in health and in disease, be accounted for by the Homoeopathic law ; for this very contrariety is what they establish the law upon—a kind of “ reasoning in a circle,” not to be admitted.

Amidst all the abuse which has been so liberally heaped upon us, it is refreshing to find the candour of the “ Defenders ” so ready to acknowledge that we have made one discovery. “ Might they not be,” say they, “ those lately ‘ unmasked ’ monsters, surnamed by their enterprising discoverer, ‘ Psychological facts, involving the idea of life,’ ‘ ever varying and uncontrollable ’—a sort of hybrid between a Proteus and a Leviathan, which no man can enchain in a system, or ‘ subject to rigid experimentalism.’ ”—(*Defence*, p. 63.)

It has been remarked “ that ignorance of what has been written, affords a dangerous facility in making discoveries !” This ignorance, it would appear, also affords a facility in ascribing discoveries to other than the rightful party.

Did it never occur to the “ Defenders,” that one of

the "Educated gentlemen,"—a reader of the four hundred Homoeopathic volumes, might also have perused one of the few books in our language which treats of evidence as a science; and found there this sentence?—"A *psychological fact*, is a fact considered to have its seat in some animate being; and that by virtue of the qualities by which it is constituted animate."—BENTHAM, *Judicial Evidence*, B. i., C. ii.

The most triumphant part of the "Defence of Hahnemann" is, where the "Defenders" grapple, right bravely, with the slip of the pen, which substituted *final* for *proximate*. We make them welcome to it. It has afforded the groundwork for a passage more amusing, if not more argumentative, than the rest of the Pamphlet.

It is now time to deal with the accusations made against us of "garbling" the history of Hahnemann. Agreeing fully, as we have already professed to do, in the statement of Dr. Russel, that, "in Homoeopathy, it is especially true, that the origin and progress of a science is to be best traced in the mind of him to whom the science owes its birth," we can have no possible objection to the fullest inquiry into the "mental biography of Hahnemann."

We remarked that Hahnemann's practice must have been limited, to prove that he abandoned the old system before he had had an opportunity of becoming practically familiar with it; as a large proportion of his followers have since done. The Defenders contradicted us in this, attempting to prove that he enjoyed considerable practice;—1st, because Eble, his historian, distinctly states, that "he was brought into close practical contact with disease." 2d, Because "the situation of District Physician which he held at Gommern, insures considerable practice." 3d, Because "he was obliged to treat his own children."—To the two first objections we have only to reply, that we find from Dr.

Russel, he "*settled as a married physician at Gommern,*" (*Homoeopathic Journal*, vol. i., p. 2,) while Hahnemann, in a letter to Hufeland, says, "that, in the *first years after his marriage*, he entirely gave up practice, and treated almost no one medically;" so that, whatever advantages he might have had at Gommern, it is plain he did not enjoy them long.

With regard to the 3d objection—"In the *first years after his marriage*," his *domestic* practice was not likely to be very extensive; so that any experience derived from it would do little to increase his acquaintance with Medicine.

The fact of his translating "numerous Italian, French, and English works, and contributing largely to the Journals," does shew, that his practice was limited; for this is a very different occupation from that of recording, "in moments snatched from overwhelming occupations," the results of observations and reflections, by which the mind of the practical Physician must be ever occupied. Why is the study of Animal Magnetism not included in the list they give of his occupations? It was a favourite pursuit with him, and the results are seen in the Homoeopathic system.

The next statement of the "Defenders" is another direct misrepresentation of our words. We said that Hahnemann abandoned his profession, because it afforded him no directing principle; they *make* us say, because his course of *speculative* study did not afford him any directing principle. On this misrepresentation their whole argument is based.

The next paragraph, too, is equally curious. We had shown that the man who was accustomed to experiment on the physical sciences was not the best qualified to experiment in medicine—because, in the one case, having perfect control over the subjects of his experiments, he can ensure accuracy in the results: in the other, so

many hidden influences are at work that we never can be sure that what we observe is actually the *result* of what we do ; and any one who peruses Hahnemann's experiments ! will be at no loss to see that he, by considering their results to be as certain as those of *chemistry*, constantly confounds the "post hoc" with the "propter hoc."

The argument in "Homoeopathy Unmasked," commented on in p. 53 of the "Defence," is attempted to be overthrown by a strange piece of legerdemain. Quoting from us at the top of the page, that Hahnemann was "prone, from his earliest years, to abstract speculation,"* they, twelve lines further down, change "speculation" into "*observation*," and add, on their own authority, "*in medicine*," and thus, having changed our words, and completely perverted our meaning, they rear up, at this sacrifice of honesty, a man of straw, upon which to make their valorous attack.

Having exposed this, we shall not argue any longer with those who refuse to see that each science has its "own genius ;" and that just as one man may be fitted to elaborate the demonstrations of the exact sciences, (we do not mean Chemistry, which is styled an exact science by the Defenders,) and yet be very unfit for observation in the experimental sciences ; so another, accustomed to the precision of experiment in physical research, may, on that account, be all the less qualified to conduct investigations in a science, where both the phenomena and results are of a different kind.

* The "Defenders" thus *prove* the practical character of his mind. "The Hahnemann of ordinary writers, so far from being prone to abstract observation in medicine," (our word was *speculation*, and we never spoke of medicine) "wrote a little work called the "Medicine of Experience."—(*Defence*, p. 53.) Books do not always bear out their titles—self-exposures are occasionally styled "Defences ;" and when we find that this "Medicine of Experience" is "an epitome of the Organon," (*Russel*, op. cit., p. 17.) we must conclude it to have been speculative enough.

But, to return to Hahnemann. In reading, (*not observing*,) he learned that Bark was a febrifuge. This is now found to be erroneous. "He was then," according to Dr. Black, "*struck* with the fact that the same substance given to a healthy person produces symptoms analogous to Intermittent Fever," (BLACK, p. 18.) This we have also shown to be untrue, (p. 20.) Having, then, put these two *erroneous facts* together, "truth began to dawn upon him."—(BLACK, p. 18.)!!

What was to be expected from such a beginning? He had now got a "*preconceived notion*," which we are told he *confirmed by experiment*; but it turns out that there was a fallacy in the experiment, of which he was not aware, and which not only vitiates the result, but makes his experiment an argument against himself. Herschell says, "A law of nature has not that degree of generality which fits it for a stepping-stone to greater inductions, unless it be *universal** in its application. We cannot rely on its enabling us to extend our views beyond the circle of instances from which it was obtained, unless we have already had experience of its power to do so; unless it actually *has* enabled us, before trial, to say what will take place in cases analogous to those originally contemplated; unless, in short, *we have studiously placed ourselves in the situation of its* ANTAGONISTS, *and even perversely endeavoured to find exceptions to it without success.*"†

Was such a course pursued by Hahnemann? On the contrary, his next step was to search among the records of ancient and modern medicine, for *confirmation* of his *supposed law*, and to conduct a course of experiments *for its establishment*!

* They call a law *universal* when they say *they* have discovered no exceptions to it.

† Preliminary Discourse, p. 167.

The influence of "preconceived notions" in modifying even what we observe, was long ago pointed out by Bacon;* and has since been often repeated. Dr. Latham tells us "how apt some little favourite theory is to get early possession of the student's imagination, rendering him dishonest (perhaps unconsciously) in the simple reception of facts."—(*Lectures*, p. 120.) Dr. Cowan, the philosophical translator of Louis, speaking of the experiments of that "accurate observer," remarks—"With *no preconceived* views of his own *to establish*, (and we believe no one who has, will observe seven years†), all results from such researches cannot fail to address themselves to our confidence."

But it *was with* "*preconceived*" notions that Hahnemann began to experiment; the nature of his experiments are *therefore* not surprising, and their result in the Homoeopathic System, not inexplicable; for as the "accurate Louis" inquires, "What results can be obtained from the consideration of facts which are *doubtful, incomplete, or false?*"—(*Preface to Researches on Phthisis.*)

At this time the efficacy of the *infinitesimal* doses had not been discovered; and the first-fruits of this new curative law were "painful and dangerous aggravations, in no case necessary to cure," which "led Hahnemann to employ minute doses."‡

* We are sorry to be obliged to quote such names as Bacon and Herschell, after the severe censure we have got, (*Defence*, p. 43.) When we give our *own* opinions they laugh. When we quote the highest authorities, they sneer at our familiarity with great names—and we find ourselves in the predicament of the compassionate drummer, who, attempting to vary his lashes in every possible way, to satisfy the wishes of an imploring culprit, at length, in despair, cried out—"Strike low, strike high, there is no pleasing you!"

† Germans are certainly exceptions to this law.

‡ "Large doses are only opposed to the peculiarities of Hahnemann; with them patients may be treated Homoeopathically, but then we may frequently expect a positive increase of the disease,

It must be difficult to regulate the precise power of such substances; they have no action on the healthy, and their presumed efficacy in disease, must alter with the severity of the existing affection. But Hahnemann was in search of facts as definite and certain as those of chemistry; and, accordingly, we find in the "*Organon*," a law to regulate the progression, according to the dilution of the medicines; and algebraic formulae, by which the power of each drop is determined!—(*Organon*, p. 292, and *antea*, p. 17.)

Disease, however, still proved rebellious; "chronic diseases, treated homoeopathically, even in the best manner, re-appeared, after having been frequently seemingly cured:" "they appeared always under a form more or less modified, and with new symptoms, and *each year* with a *perceptible increase in their intensity*."—(BLACK, p. 109.)

A *new law* must be devised to meet them; and it too must, of course, be *definite and certain*.

Therefore, in the progress of this original discovery, we are told that Itch can be transformed into "warts,"—"enlargement of the bones," "caries,"—"gout," "obstinate constipation,"—"convulsions," "in a word," into "the thousand chronic affections to which Pathology

or even death. The experience of such painful and dangerous aggravations—in no cases necessary to cure—led Hahnemann to employ minute doses."—(BLACK, p. 81.) On this we remarked as follows:—"That is to say, that Hahnemann, practising Homoeopathically with medicines, which are admitted to be capable of producing some effect on the human body, caused a 'positive increase of the disease of his patients, and in some cases even death;' and, therefore, was driven to the employment of *doses which the chosen advocates of Homoeopathy admit are inert*."—(*Homoeopathy Unmasked*, p. 100.) In consequence of which, the "Defenders" say, "though it is quite untrue he ever produced death, as is falsely stated in "*Homoeopathy Unmasked*."—(*Defence*, p. 7.) We leave our readers to judge of the evasion.

assigns different names," (BLACK, p. 111.) "Hippocrates," remarks Professor Alquié, "has taught us, it is true, that *morbid affections* manifest themselves under very various forms; but he has not confounded, like Hahnemann and the Homoeopaths, the *form*, with the *essence*."

It may appear strange to those unacquainted with the "mental biography" of the German, that Hahnemann should have supported his system by the mass of "laborious trifling" which so many of his works display. But every thing in that country must be reduced to system; and no system can succeed without a literature of its own.

Still less is there cause to be staggered by the argument of its spread. Everywhere it happens, and nowhere more than in Germany, that a system springs up, is almost universally adopted, and then disappears.

The Journal of Hufeland acquired its first celebrity by its opposition to the Brunonian Theory, and was very instrumental in its overthrow. Against this theory Hahnemann himself wrote; and though now almost extinct, yet history has recorded that Brown "having announced his hypothesis *with the utmost confidence*, it produced a prodigious effect, both on the theory and practice of medicine. It was received with avidity by *all the younger part of the profession*, for it held out to them the most compendious road to knowledge, by which *the application of a few simple principles might accomplish more than all the accumulated knowledge of schools and colleges*. Its fame soon spread beyond its native country; it met with zealous defenders in various parts of the Continent, and *especially in Germany, where it was almost* UNIVERSALLY adopted, *with a degree of blind devotion*. It overthrew the Boerhaavian System; nearly superseded that of Cullen; and, for some time, almost

put an entire stop to research, by the persuasion that, truth having now been certainly discovered, farther inquiry was become unnecessary."*

Yet is it now overthrown, and Hahnemann was one of its destroyers! A lesson to those who rest the claims of science on a foundation so unstable.

Still less would we listen to any argument founded on the mere authority of names. The greatest and the wisest men have believed the veriest absurdities; and every error, which has attained any notoriety, has numbered some such among its advocates.

The anxiety which the Homoeopaths evince to entrap into a support of their views every name which, from position, or any other adventitious circumstance, can give weight to their claims, shows that, however numerous their list of adherents, most of them have still their fame to achieve.

Hufeland, who was decidedly opposed to their system, is, in almost every English Homoeopathic work that we have seen, vaunted as its supporter. The "Defenders," at p. 51, class his writings among those in defence of Homoeopathy. At page 7, they tell us that he "recognized in this new system the germ of a great improvement in the art of healing;" but that, when opposition sprang up, "like another Erasmus, he shrank from having his high reputation as a man of science sullied by the imputations which the leader of a great movement must always endure." "He assumed," they add, "the cautious position of a looker-on." What right have they to claim *him* among their adherents, or even among those who remained *neutral* in the controversy? In his "Enchiridion Medicum," the depository into which, he himself says, "I cast the *final result* of my long experience," he thus

* Art. Hist. of Med., Edin. Encyc.]

speaks of Homoeopathy, and condemns it practically, for the same reason that we condemned it in "Homoeopathy Unmasked." The following are his own words:—"Two errors hence may originate, which the physician must carefully avoid. The first is, doing too little—the negative treatment, which leaves *all* to nature. To this fault especially is the new (Homoeopathic) school liable—a fault which may be followed by *fatal* consequences in those cases where there is really something positive to be done. Such a course is proper only when there is no definite indication for action, where time and patience are necessary for a cure, or where nature takes upon herself (her powers being well balanced) to carry disease through a certain space of time, and wear it out; *e. g. mild Small-Pox, Measles, and the like.*"*—(*American edition*, p. 23.)

At Montpelier, too, a Professor of Pathology has joined their ranks—actually a Professor! Before allowing much weight to his testimony, we would require to know whether there was no mental peculiarity, no vacillating disposition, to account for the change. Perhaps he is a convert of the Hufeland school; but the adulation he will now receive from the Homoeopaths will be a poor recompense for being classed under Liebig's catalogue of "men who are totally incapable of apprehending the nature of philosophical investigations." (See p. 15.)

There are other Professors at Montpelier, better known than this new convert. One of them expresses his opinion of Homoeopathy as follows:—"This doctrine is a *true deception*. In its methods of treatment, it rests on a principle opposed to the doctrine of Hip-

* This subject was fully enlarged upon in "Homoeopathy Unmasked," pp. 115 to 119.

pocrates." "Its fundamental principle is one which *Nature disowns*—which *reason* had condemned, even before *experience had demonstrated* its vain and illusory character. So far from its being able to prevent or cure diseases—it can only, on the one hand, increase the tendency to contract them, and on the other, abandon them entirely to themselves when they appear. If it does not kill the patient, *it suffers him to die*; and when disease disappears under this plan of treatment, to nature and *moral* influences alone belongs the honour of the cure."—(*Golfin, Mem. sur l'Opportunité*, p. 74.)

Another Professor in the same school, contrasting the doctrines of Hahnemann with those of Hippocrates, (he ought to have apologized for "*coupling their names, even in opposition*,") thus expresses himself:—"The school of Cos, combats Pathological affections by that which is opposed to their nature, and the German author, by agents which introduce into the interior of the economy, changes similar to those which they are intended to cure. Hippocrates and his disciples exhibited their remedies in doses capable of overcoming the disease with more or less rapidity; but Hahnemann employs substances in quantities so infinitesimal, *that reason refuses to concede to them any power at all*."—(*Alquie Précis de la Doct. Med.*)

But even on the question of *authority*, we need not fear to contest the point. "In any disputable point of law or medicine," observes Lord Jeffrey, "most people would be pretty well satisfied with an opinion adhered to by nine-tenths of the profession; and, imputing the dissentient of a small minority to caprice or ignorance, would probably never think it worth while to make any farther inquiry." *

* Ed. Rev., vol. ix., p. 40.

Now, not to speak of the *active* opposition of such men as Liebig, Joerg, Vedekind, Heinroth, Hufeland, Froelich, Lichtenstaedt, Schimke, Albrecht, Titmann, Golfin, and Alquie,—what are we to say to the *passive* opposition of the great body of the profession? It will of course be alleged, that they are utterly ignorant of the subject. This is not the case. Its leading doctrines are now thoroughly understood, and thoroughly *appreciated* by the profession. What single new doctrine have the “Defenders,” with their literature of 400 volumes, added to those commented on in “Homoeopathy Unmasked.” A splendid opportunity was afforded them of shewing, that the new system was misrepresented, because misunderstood—that the works usually consulted on it in this country, were meagre and unsatisfactory;—Have they *shewn* this?

What *new* facts have they added? What *new* doctrines illustrated?

“But testimonies,” it may be said, “should be weighed, and not numbered; and a few judicious voices should outweigh ‘a whole theatre’ of others.” Here, again, we claim for the Profession a “splendid and indisputable triumph.” The string of German names, alleged to favour Homoeopathy, may *sound* formidably enough; but how many of them would never have been heard of, had it not been for Homoeopathy itself? Contrast with these Liebig, and Heinroth, and Hufeland, and others among their opponents, whose names are now of European fame. A string of our British Homoeopathists might sound formidable enough *abroad*; but what weight and authority do we attach to their names *at home*? The large proportion, to be sure, have still youth on their side, and may yet “achieve greatness for themselves;” but until that is done, it must be allowed, that their mere *opinions* are anything but for-

midable. Nor are Government inquiries any security against the sources of fallacy to which allusion has been made. The history of the purchase of secret remedies affords ample proof of this.

It may be said, that absurd and ridiculous as the *doctrines* of the system are, in *practice* it does succeed. This argument we fully discussed in "Homoeopathy Unmasked," chap. v.

This chapter the "Defenders" pretend to consider "hardly worth their while to notice," (p. 83.) although they take up one part of it, and assert that, because, having a direct interest in it, we held them to be disqualified as witnesses in their own cause, therefore *we* are equally disqualified from bearing testimony on behalf of our opinions. (P. 83.) Undoubtedly, *did* we rest the claims of our Science, or our opposition to Homoeopathy, on testimony *alone*. But we had before shewn, that Homoeopathy had *nothing* better to support it; and we then proceeded to root it out of this last refuge of every false system.

To what we have already said, we shall add two testimonies; and as one is that of a witness, whom the "Defenders" have already summoned to give evidence for them, they, of course, cannot object to him. Mr. Moore, the historian of Vaccination, thus speaks of such alleged cures:—

"The evidence that is requisite to prove or disprove any proposition in the science of medicine, is of a peculiar kind. It differs entirely from that species of proof which satisfies a court of law. Both direct and circumstantial evidence, which would leave no doubt in the breasts of judges and juries, have often not the slightest tendency to render a medical fact even probable. The declarations, and even the oaths, of the most conscientious, disinterested, and able men, are all insufficient.

“The reason of this is, that few men, even those of considerable capacity, distinguish accurately between opinion and fact.

“When a man asserts he has been cured of a particular disease by a certain drug, he is apt to think he is declaring a fact which he knows to be true; whereas this assertion includes two opinions, in both of which he may be completely mistaken. The first is an opinion of his having had the disease specified; the second, that the medicine employed removed the disease. Most people are convinced that they are acquainted with the malady they are afflicted with; they consider it as a mere matter of fact: and when they are cured, they have as little doubt of the remedy that accomplished it. This belief is often strengthened by the confident declarations, and specious behaviour of the person who exhibits the remedy: and if the patient possesses gratitude, this also heightens the delusion. He is thus easily prevailed upon to swear positively, both to the disease and the remedy, as if they were plain facts obvious to the senses: whereas, both the one and the other are frequently beyond the reach of human knowledge. Such cases, to the truth of which the parents will often take their oath, form no stronger presumption of these facts, than the affidavits that are daily sworn to of consumption, gout, or cancer being cured, prove, that a specific for these distempers has been discovered. This species of unintentional perjury has been very common during the last century in every part of Europe; and the more improbable the fact is, the more numerous are the affidavits, and the more respectable the signatures. Clergymen, judges, and peers, are daily swearing, that they have been cured of incurable diseases: but the meanest apothecary smiles with contempt, when he reads their splendid testimonials.

* * * * *

“ It is not with medicine alone that the cunning empiric performs his cures. He sometimes operates more successfully by an unusual incomprehensible legerdemain trick. Mesmer convinced thousands of the nobility, and even some men of science in Paris, that he could cure diseases without either medicine or change of diet. He placed his patients round a box full of broken glass, and made them pinch each other's thumbs, while he waved a rod of steel in the air. By employing a mysterious jargon, he even made many believe that they were capable of doing the same ; and they paid him large sums for being taught this valuable art. De Mainaduc and Miss Prescott have improved upon this plan. By moving their hands, they could extract any disease out of a sick man's body ; swallow it themselves, and then puff it into the air. Distance did not hinder them from operating with success. They could cure a man in India. And, though the knave de Mainaduc, with this wonderful power, died young, the art continues to be practised and paid for magnificently, and the cures are attested by coronets and mitres.”

“ After these instances, it is superfluous to speak of Perkins, though he had a better trick than either. The other quacks commonly took the trouble of seeing their patients, hearing their cases, and talking to them. Perkins saved himself all this embarrassment. He soldered bits of brass and iron together, which, he said, could cure gout, rheumatism, sprains, inflammations, and twenty other diseases, and sold them for six guineas a pair. He quickly printed, with most respectable attestations, many more cures than are now published of the failure of Vaccination. He established a Perkinian society of gentlemen of consideration, who zealously, to this day, extol the fame of the tractors. Several worthy clergymen purchased tractors, and most patiently and charitably ap-

plied them to their poor parishioners. For a time they performed surprising cures, and thought they rescued the afflicted from the extortion of the apothecary. These miracles are now at an end; the gout and rheumatism rage as formerly; but Perkins has made his fortune.

"It thus appears that lists of cases, however certified, rather deceive than enlighten. The regular physician who adopts this method of proving a medical fact, takes the very path he ought most sedulously to shun. Yet if any one should attempt, by investigating each particular case, to refute it, he would soon discover the impossibility of succeeding. I have been requested, on various occasions, to make such researches, and generally found that the patients were completely convinced of the truth of the attestation, whether the remedy was physic, magnetism, or a tractor. In short, they were ready to take the most solemn oath to what was quite impossible to be true."—(MOORE, *Reply*, &c. &c.)

And lest *professional* testimony should be thought *liable to a bias*, we add that of a Literary Journal:—

"We shall be told that marvellous as such things seem, they are nevertheless true;—that experiments have been multiplied, that cures have been verified by competent witnesses, and that to doubt is to sink into the lowest abyss of Pyrrhonism. To this invincible argument, from which it is insinuated that there is no appeal, we have only to reply, that the same sort of facts, and the same sort of cures, have been boasted, in hundreds of instances, in behalf of every possible medical system, and of every drug that has been vaunted, in turn, by regular and by irregular practitioners, and then have 'died and been forgot.' Animal Magnetism, Hohenlohe-ism, Metallic Tractors, the Royal Touch, Sympathetic Salves, and innumerable other exploded nostrums, and refuted humbugs, have been advanced

on the strength of the same vouchers, backed by the same irrecusable authorities. Against such proofs nothing can prevail but—common sense, and the old truth-teller Time, who, in the long run, never fails to do ample justice by all such pretensions.”*

Such is the “Defence” which is to set aside the arguments of “Homoeopathy Unmasked,” and reconcile us to a belief in this most extravagant of modern delusions.

We entreat our readers to observe, that every argument they employ is fallacious, every analogy vague, every illustration inapplicable. Reason is surely sufficient to decide this.

They tell us to try their remedies in *disease*, while, at the same time, they admit, “that neither private nor dispensary practice can furnish definite results.” (See “*Homoeopathy Unmasked*,” p. 114.) Is there no duty we owe to those who place their lives in our hands, which should prevent us from *experimenting* on their health, until we have *reasonable* ground to expect success? Dispensaries! Are the poor, whose health is to them their most valuable possession—are they to be trifled with in their diseases, that others may have some excuse for amusing themselves with “sugar of milk?”

We are told that Dr. Black’s book is the one we have chiefly noticed; why then have the “Defenders” not met us on this ground? Our objections to his arguments remain unanswered; our exceptions against his similes unremoved. Let him congratulate himself that *he* has not been “*defended*” by those, who, after burying Hahnemann under the weight of their ponderous

* *Athenæum*, 1836, page 172.

eulogistic effort, appropriately conclude by proposing to raise a monument to his memory. (See 2d Edition.)

If after reading this Reply, any one shall feel that we have not stigmatized the "Defenders" in language sufficiently severe, we entreat such to remember what a mass of abuse we have been compelled to work through, and that, in consequence, even the *more legitimate* epithets of condemnation, are, for the present, associated in our mind, with every thing that is mean, low, and scurrilous, dishonouring and dishonest. We have ever wished to draw as broad a line as possible between ourselves and the "Defenders," and trust the zeal of the controversialist has not led us to forget the courtesy of the gentleman.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX, A.

EXPLANATIONS OF THE "SPECIMENS OF MISQUOTATIONS
AND MISSTATEMENTS IN 'HOMOEOPATHY UNMASKED,'"
AS GIVEN IN THE APPENDIX OF THE "DEFENCE OF
HAHNEMANN AND HIS DOCTRINES."

CHARGE FIRST. (P. 87.)

"P. 28. 'But this which is essential,' &c. In this passage Dr. Wood charges Dr. Black with an attempt to prejudice the public against the use of Allopathic remedies, in cases where they have been found to be in a measure successful, on the ground, that the largeness of the dose makes them unpleasant; leading the reader to suppose this to be the grand objection to them. Though affecting to quote the author's words, he wisely [?] omits reference to the page; for his readers would have found, on turning to it (p. 8), that Dr. Wood had omitted, in his *quotation*, the most weighty reasons assigned for setting aside the Allopathic procedure, viz., the indirectness of the old method, the danger resulting from its massive doses, and formidable appliances; and, more than all, the inferiority of its results."

REPLY.

Our answer to this is simple. In the previous pages we had been considering the "most weighty reasons," and then alluded to the last, it being too absurd to need a reply.

CHARGE SECOND. (P. 87.)

" P. 30. Dr. Wood is speaking of the treatment of habitual constipation, and quotes, as exhibiting the manner of dealing with it, adopted by Homoeopaths, a passage which has reference to a totally different circumstance, viz., the presence of offending matters in the stomach or bowels. He also refers to a passage (p. 164, twice misprinted 64) which does speak of the treatment of chronic constipation, and refers to the temporary inefficacy of Homoeopathic means; but here again the quotation is garbled, 1st, by the omission of the words, 'aggravated by the use of purgatives,' thereby leaving out of view the chief reason for the resort to enemata; and, 2d, by the substitution of '*often*' for '*sometimes*;' thereby conveying an exaggerated notion of the frequency of the occurrence."

REPLY.

In the passage referred to, we expressly say "where offending matter exists in the stomach or intestinal canal." "The aggravation by purgatives" is a *matter of opinion*, (particularly doubtful with their "preconceived notions,") and was therefore omitted. That the mistake by which "often" is substituted for "sometimes" was not intentional, is evident, from the occurrence immediately after of the word "*occasionally*," showing that we had no wish "to convey an exaggerated notion of the frequency of the occurrence."

CHARGE THIRD. (P. 88.)

" P. 31. In a note, Dr. Wood charges Homoeopaths with employing severe remedies, under mild names. This is said *à propos* to Hering's treatment of the bite of rabid animals. One gathers from Dr. W.'s words, that this author employs the actual cautery, but gives it the gentle name of 'heat.' Now, on turning to 'Jahr's Manual, vol. ii., p. 651,' the reader will find that Hering recommends the use of 'heat at a distance;' and Jahr

has been careful to print the words, 'at a distance,' in capitals, to prevent any such mistake as Dr. Wood has [wittingly?] fallen into."

REPLY.

It is scarcely possible to conceive a more flagrant attempt at deception than this. It is evidently intended to convey to those who may not have an opportunity of referring to "*Homoeopathy Unmasked*," the impression that *we* had accused Hering of employing the Actual Cautery, when he only used heat at a distance; that we had done this wittingly; whereas our statement *is taken from Dr. Black's book, and quoted in Dr. Black's very words*. Does "heat applied to the wound, mean heat at a distance? Is "heat at a distance" *repulsive*? What connexion is there between Dr. Black's caustic rubbed *into* the sore, and Hering's "heat at a distance," to justify Dr. Black in quoting Dr. Hering's example as an apology for his use of the Cautery? We had only Dr. Black's authority for Hering's practice; and for believing him and *quoting from him*, we are accused of misrepresentation.

CHARGES FOURTH AND FIFTH. (P. 83.)

These have been already noticed at pages 11 and 45 respectively.

CHARGE SIXTH. (P. 88.)

"P. 39. Quoting Dr. Black (p. 56) Dr. Wood changes 'the basis of all our knowledge is the accurate observation of *actual* phenomena,' *i. e.* *real* facts, into 'the basis of all our knowledge is the accurate observation of *natural* phenomena.' An alteration which renders the meaning of the author obscure, or even absurd. It is curious that Dr. Wood should have chosen this place, for stating (see his note on this passage, p. 40,) that he 'thinks it better to give such quotations in the *ipsissima verba* of the author;' and it will scarcely be believed, by those who have not read '*Homoeopathy Unmasked*,' that Dr. Wood *refers to this very passage*,

transferred in this garbled form, to his own pages, for proof of the obscurity and inaccuracy of the author he is opposing.

REPLY.

It is *not* this trivial error which makes the passage obscure. We shall print it and the other passage to which the same note was appended in full, and ask our readers to explain their grammatical construction, and the meaning of the author. They occur as complete sentences in Dr. Black's book.

"The Homoeopathic principle widely differs from many dogmas of the Allopathic school, in that it was *discovered*, not *invented*—discovered in conformity to that fundamental principle,—that the basis of all our knowledge is the accurate observation of actual phenomena ; and the correct generalization of these phenomena should be the sole foundation of all our reasoning."—(BLACK'S *Principles*, p. 55, 56.)

"Commingle the symptoms of the various experimenters, without noticing what doses were employed, what symptoms were primarily manifested, in what groups or order of succession they were observed by different individuals, and the slight regard paid to the objective symptoms, render it impracticable to know the organ primarily affected, the genetic relation of many individual symptoms, or, what is most important, the character, the total operation of the medicine ; so that it may be viewed as a difficult task, for one who refers to these records of symptoms, to select the right remedy."—*Ibid.* p. 59.

CHARGE SEVENTH. (P. 88.)

"P. 47. 'Angustura. Used largely by the Allopathic school, as an aromatic bitter, in doses from 10 to 30 grains,' &c. This passage conveys to the mind of non-professional readers, for whom the work is written, that this substance possesses but feeble powers of affecting the system ; and thus the statements made by Homoeopaths of its powerful effects will be discredited.

On referring, however, to Hahnemann's *Materia Medica*, vol. i., p. 352, it will be seen that we have Allopathic authority for stating, that angustura is poisonous, when taken in large doses, and that several of the symptoms which Dr. Wood selects as too violent to be credible (cramp in the chest, trismus, and tetanus,) were observed by Emmert, an Allopathic author, who even gives a fatal case of poisoning by this 'aromatic bitter.'

REPLY.

Angustura is used by ordinary practitioners in doses of from 10 to 30 grains. Merat, a very high authority on such subjects, alluding to alleged bad effects that had followed its use, states, that "when the specimen is undoubtedly pure, more than six drachms (360 grains) may be taken without any bad effect."—*Dict. de Mat. Med.*, i. p. 303.) A much larger quantity could scarcely be borne by the stomach.

The "Defenders" take care not to tell the "non-professional public" that it was *not* Angustura which Emmert, "the Allopathic author," spoke of, but another plant altogether, to which the name of *false* Angustura is given, and which is a violent poison. *Of this they could not be ignorant, for Emmert's Memoir is entitled, "On the Poisonous Effects of the FALSE Angustura."* Nor is there any confusion between these two substances in their *Materia Medica*, for, at page 34 of Laurie's "Jahr's Manual," we find "Angustura" expressly termed "*Angustura vera*," and at page 95–97 we have the symptoms produced by the "*False Angustura*," which they properly regard as an entirely different plant, calling it by its old name of "*Brucea Anti-Dyssenterica*," which, to prevent the possibility of a mistake, is translated "*False Angustura*." Can any thing possibly surpass this? Yes! Let us proceed.

CHARGE EIGHTH. (P. 89.)

"P. 47. Argentum. From 'attacks of epilepsy'

being printed in capitals in 'Homoeopathy Unmasked,' one would be led to suppose this was a prominent symptom of silver in the *Materia Medica Pura*. It will be found, however, on turning to that work, which Dr. Wood 'confesses to have read,' that epilepsy is not to be found enumerated among the effects of metallic silver at all, but among those of the nitrate, (lunar caustic,) which even Dr. Alexander Wood knows to be an extremely active substance. Besides, Hahnemann was far from being satisfied that epilepsy could be produced by any salt of silver; and in his anxiety to avoid ascribing to any substance other than its real effects, he marks this symptom as doubtful, both in the list of the effects of nitrate of silver, and in his preface to the article *Argentum*.—(*Mat. Med. Pure*, traduit par JOURDAN, vol. i., p. 352.)"

REPLY.

All the symptoms we ascribe to "*Argentum*," and a great many more, will be found in Laurie's translation of Jahr's Manual, *the book from which we expressly stated that we quoted*, at pages 41 and 42, where they are said to be produced by a substance called "*Argentum*," which is translated "*Silver*." If this does not mean silver, it is not *our* fault. We have certainly learned, in the study of Homoeopathy, that "all is not gold that glitters."

CHARGE NINTH. (P. 89.)

"P. 49. The passage said to be quoted from p. 61 of Dr. Black's work, is not to be found there; supposing it, however, to be quite correct, we are at a loss to understand the grounds of Dr. Wood's astonishment at so many substances having been proved in half a century. Does he affect to believe that Hahnemann claimed to have felt, in his own person, all the symptoms detailed in the *Materia Medica Pura*? A glance at that work is sufficient to overturn such an idea. Thus, to instance

two of the medicines selected by Dr. Wood, Angustura and Argentum, the whole number of effects (some of them repetitions) noted by Hahnemann, as experienced by himself, or observed by him in persons under his own eye, is 152, whereas the *total* number of symptoms set down to these two agents is upwards of 500. Again, the number of medicines whose effects were more or less investigated by Hahnemann, is not 200, but about 90."

REPLY.

The passage quoted by mistake from page 61 of Dr. Black's book will be found, as the "Defenders" must have very well known, at page 66. We still profess our astonishment at the number of substances, the effects of which are said to have been ascertained since the commencement of the experiments. Let us remember how often these experiments *should* have been repeated, if an approximation to accuracy in their results was sought for. Let us remember the formidable symptoms said to have been produced by many of them, and the length of time which must therefore have elapsed before the experimenter was again in a fit state to resume them. Let us remember that there is scarcely a single substance tried which is not said to produce some form of insanity, and we shall continue to wonder that fifty years procured *satisfactory* evidence of the effects of even ninety of these substances.

CHARGE TENTH. (P. 89.)

"P. 52. 'And having finished his labours with his usual allowance of wine, which we have reason to suppose was not out of proportion to the food,' &c. All the ingenious speculations, built up at such an expense of laboured wit in this and the following pages, fall to the ground, on turning up to p. 205 of the Organon (2d French edition.) By the note the reader will see what was Hahnemann's 'usual allowance of wine;' he drank none.

REPLY.

We have nothing to do with *Hahnemann's* abstinence from wine; we quoted the confessions of one of his *Experimenters* (expressly); and he *himself* (*Hahnemann*, *Malad. Chron.*, vol. ii. p. 317,) tells us what effect *wine* had upon him, while under the supposed influence of the *drug*. How he knew this without taking it, it may not be difficult for the "*Defenders*" to explain!

CHARGE ELEVENTH. (P. 90.)

"Pp. 65, 66. 'It is evident that, to prove this law, the Homoeopaths must either show *why* it *must* be true, or exhibit such an extensive series of facts, *explicable on no other principle*, as shall clearly show that it is so. After summarily dismissing the first method of proof, he goes on: 'In discussing the second, we shall do all possible justice to the Homoeopaths, and shall not demand from them any higher proof than Hahnemann himself professes to regard as essential, viz. "that it (*i. e.* the Homoeopathic law) should clearly manifest itself in every accurate experiment and research.—Nov. Org. Aph. 23." This is a fine specimen of Dr. Wood's accuracy and ingenuousness. With the exception of the words, 'every accurate experiment and research,' there is no similitude between the original passage and Dr. Wood's *translation* of it. The paragraph in question does not even refer to Homoeopathy at all, but is a stricture on the antipathic or palliative method of treating disease; so that, in this instance, our author has not contented himself with garbling the passage, but must needs misapply it, as the reader may satisfy himself, by comparing the following words of Hahnemann:—

" 'Or, toutes les expériences pures, tous les essais faits avec soin, nous apprennent, que des symptômes morbides continus, loin de pouvoir être effacés et anéantis par des symptômes médicaux opposés, comme ceux qu'excite la méthode antipathique, énantipathique, ou palliative, reparaissent, au contraire, plus intenses qu'ils n'avaient jamais été, et aggravés d'une manière bien manifeste après avoir semblé, pendant quelque temps, se calmer.'—*Exposit. de la Mat. Méd. Hom.*, 2d ed. Paris, 1834, p. 122.

"Of this passage we beg leave to present the reader with two forms of translation; the one that in common use, the other on the original and improved plan of the discoverer of '*Hahnemann Novus*.'

"OLD STYLE OF TRANSLATION.

"Now, every accurate experiment, and every trial made with care, teach us, that continued morbid symptoms, far from being capable of being extinguished and destroyed by the opposite medicinal symptoms, such as are excited by the antipathic, enantiopathic, or palliative method, reappear, on the contrary, with a greater intensity than before, and aggravated in a sensible degree, after having seemed to be appeased."—*Organon, de l'Art de Guérir*, p. 122.

"DR. WOOD'S IMPROVED METHOD.

"That it (*i. e.* the Homoeopathic law) should clearly manifest itself in every accurate experiment and research."—BLACK, p. 48.

REPLY.

We question if the annals of controversy afford any parallel to this most disgraceful falsification. We are accused of quoting erroneously, the 23d paragraph of Hahnemann's *Organon*, and to prove this 'another passage altogether' from another part of the *Organon*, is printed in full, *and said to be the 23d paragraph, which it is not*. We now give the 23d paragraph as it is found in Hahnemann's book, and a translation of the passage, which, to prevent all suspicion, we shall take from Dr. Black's *Principles*, page 48 :—

"Comme cette loi thérapeutique de la nature se manifeste hautement dans tous les essais purs et dans toutes les expériences sur les résultats desquelles on peut compter, que par conséquent le fait est positif, peu nous importe la théorie scientifique de la manière dont il a lieu. Je n'attache aucun prix aux explications que l'on pourrait essayer d'en donner. Cependant celle qui suit me semble être la plus vraisemblable, parce qu'elle repose uniquement sur des données fournies par l'expérience."

"As this therapeutic law of nature *clearly manifests itself in every accurate experiment and research*, it consequently becomes an established fact, however unsatisfactory may be the scientific theory of the manner in which it takes place. I attach no value whatever to any explanation that could be given on this head; yet the following view of the subject appears to me the most reasonable."—(Sec. 23.)

Now if this is a mistake, what are we to think of those who could prefer such a grave charge against an opponent, without carefully satisfying themselves that they have grounds for it? *And if it is a mistake*, never perhaps were a stranger series of blunders made

to give colour to an accusation *absolutely and utterly false*. We cannot command the powers of Victorious Analysis, to present them in all their naked deformity, but we shall do our best to enable our readers to judge of them. 1st, The "Defenders" must have misquoted the passage. 2d, Although we gave a full reference to the part of Hahnemann's work where we found it, and where any one who *chose* might have found it also, they have substituted for it a totally different passage from a part of the book treating of a different subject, and, strange to say, have *stumbled* upon one, which contains the three principal words of our quotation, and therefore gives a colour to their accusation. 3d, Even if we had given a mistaken reference, they ought to be sufficiently familiar with Hahnemann's doctrines, as to know that the statement was substantially correct. It is not an unimportant one, for it is the only proof upon which he rests for the accuracy of his great law. It is impossible to believe that they could be ignorant of it. 4th, They must have shut their eyes to the chapter of Dr. Black's book which we were reviewing in the passage they complain of, for that chapter commences with a translation of that very paragraph of Hahnemann's book, which we are said to have quoted erroneously!!! 5th, They prevent those unacquainted with Hahnemann's works, from detecting them, by misquoting the name of his book, calling it "Exposit. de la Mat. Med. Hom. 2d Edit.," although they themselves give us in their 5th charge the *real* title of the French translation.

CHARGE TWELFTH. (P. 90.)

"P. 67. Dr. Wood having discovered that many Homoeopaths think it preferable to cauterize a chancre, when seen at the outset, than to treat it by remedies administered internally, exults in what he regards as a triumph of Allopathy over Homoeopathy. But does he not see that this opinion, if correct, merely amounts to a confession that Homoeopathy, as well as the older and rival system, is unable to prevent the constitution being tainted, and that, therefore, recourse must be

had to surgical means. A case is made out against *medicine*, but not more against Homoeopathic than Allopathic *medicine*. Where, then, is the ground of triumph? Was it a lurking consciousness of this that led Dr. W. to garble the quotation from Dr. Black's work, by substituting "Allopathic remedies" for "the cautery." What can be thought of the integrity of an opponent, or the strength of his cause, who resorts to such *devices* as we have here, to support his views?"

REPLY.

No case is made out against Allopathic medicine. The Caustic and Cautery are Allopathic remedies which destroy the disease. If they be Homoeopathic remedies also, why are the Defenders so anxious to disown them in their third charge, and to assure us that Hering only permitted heat to be applied *at a distance from*, not *to* the wound? Will heat at a distance destroy the poison of Syphilis; or is the Cautery applied *to* a wound, a Homoeopathic remedy?

CHARGE THIRTEENTH. (P. 91.)

"Pp. 67-70. This whole passage, treating of the treatment of chronic diseases, is disingenuous in the extreme, as the writer sedulously leaves out of view that the deficiency experienced by Homoeopaths, in subduing chronic diseases, was in great measure removed by the introduction of the antipsoric or eucrastic remedies, the *application of which is made strictly in accordance with the Homoeopathic law*. It is therefore altogether false to say, that 'to treat this large class of diseases, a new law, altogether different from the Homoeopathic one, has been invented.'"

REPLY.

Disingenuous, indeed! For the "Defenders" do *not* mention, that in the very pages to which they refer, our

whole object was to shew that the Antipsoric remedies are *not* strictly in accordance with the Homoeopathic law. "It is therefore altogether false to say," that we "*sedulously*" left this out of view.

CHARGE FOURTEENTH. (P. 91.)

"P. 70. 'In epidemic diseases, does the law manifest itself? No! because "the entire extent of an affection of this nature, together with the totality of the symptoms (a knowledge of which is necessary to form a complete image of the morbid state, and to choose according to that, the Homoeopathic remedy most in harmony with the *ensemble* of the symptoms), cannot be observed in the case of a single patient.'—Hahnemann, quoted by Black, p. 135. The word 'single,' in the foregoing quotation, is ambiguous. It might mean, that not one of such cases could be treated Homoeopathically (and in this case Dr. Wood would have some grounds for his assertion;) or it might mean that *one* case is not enough to gather the symptoms of the epidemic from, on which symptoms the choice of the remedy proceeds. That the latter is the real meaning, is rendered evident by the words which follow:—'In order to arrive at these, it will be requisite to abstract them from a view of the symptoms of several patients of different constitutions.'—(Hahnemann, quoted by Dr. Black, p. 135.) Dr. Wood, it seems, thought it justifiable to leave the meaning ambiguous, by the omission of these words, that he might make the mutilated passage serve his end. The resource is worthy of him."

REPLY.

We gave the *whole* sentence as it occurs in Dr. Black's book. And as we never took the absurd view of the word "single" which the "Defenders" suggest, we did not think it necessary to add the following sentence also. To treat a disease according to the totality

of the symptoms "of several patients of different constitutions," is certainly not to treat the individual according to the totality of the symptoms of his case. How do they treat the first cases of an epidemic, before they have had an opportunity of observing patients of different constitutions?

CHARGE FIFTEENTH. (P. 91.)

"P. 80, note. 'Let them (Homoeopaths) remember, that more than one of their number consider spitting of blood as unconnected with consumption.'—(Black, p. 147.) Ignorance, for which the merest tyro in medicine would blush. It will be seen, on turning to p. 147 of Dr. Black's work, what this allegation is worth. The author is speaking of the effects occasionally observed to result from the action of the medicines. As an example, hæmoptysis is mentioned as having ensued in several cases from the use of phosphorus, in phthisical patients; and to meet the objection, that this occurrence might have happened from the disease alone, he is careful to mention that the use of other medicines was not followed by that symptom."

REPLY.

Spitting of blood is a very common symptom of Consumption; and yet, when it appears in that disease, it is ascribed to the *remedy*, rather than the *disease*; just as the man who had taken charcoal, and found his "seat blistered after riding," ascribed it to the medicine, rather than the saddle.

CHARGE SIXTEENTH. (P. 92.)

"P. 95. 'Nay, as if determined to contradict every thing he ever writes, Dr. Black illustrates his principle of simple formula, by such a report and prescription as the following:—August 25. A great deal better. Piles have almost disappeared. Ant. Crud.,

followed by Laches., Sepia. Sulph. Nux. v. Disp. Rep., p. 17. *Five different substances!!* And this, notwithstanding Hahnemann has declared, that 'to prescribe compound prescriptions, is the height of empiricism!!'—Dr. Wood here deliberately confounds *compound prescriptions* with *succession of different remedies*; while Hahnemann condemns the first as irrational, on grounds which Dr. W. has not attempted to confute, he devotes many paragraphs to instructions as to the manner in which different substances should be used in succession. Dr. Wood, in short, pretends to consider "followed by," as equivalent to "combined with." Perhaps it was to a wish to convict Hahnemann of sometimes using compound prescriptions, that we are indebted for the exquisite translation of a passage of Hahnemann's writings. (*Organon*, p. 339), contained in the note to p. 102. We will not stop to notice how, under Dr. Wood's magic wand, *two* is transmuted into *twelve*, and the present tense into the past—these are trifles; but we must confess our admiration of the legerdemain, which could change 'a globule of sugar the size of a poppy-seed, which is to be soaked with the medicine,' into 'a grain of poppy!'"

—'tandisque quand on a donné deux secousses seulement à chaque flacon, il suffit d'une dragée de la grosseur d'une graine de pavot qu'on en imbibe, pour procurer une guérison prompte et facile.'

“ OLD STYLE OF TRANSLATION.

“ Since, when each phial has received only *two* shocks, a globule *the size of a poppy seed*, which has been saturated with it, (the solution,) is sufficient to insure a prompt and easy recovery.”

“ DR. WOOD'S IMPROVED METHOD.

“ Whilst one to which only *twelve* shakes had been given at each was sufficient, *with a grain of poppy with which it was combined*, to produce a prompt and easy cure.”—HAHN., *Nov. Org.* p. 306.

REPLY.

We did not confound compound prescriptions with succession of different remedies, and as we gave the passage *entire*, we did not allow our readers to do so either. But Hahnemann condemns compound prescriptions, because two or more active substances operating upon the body at one time, it is impossible to say what may be their effect. On August 28th, Dr. Black pre-

scribed five different substances. But supposing that the putting down of all these substances under August 28, was mere carelessness, and allowing the 28th of August to represent a whole week, even then we shall prove that Dr. Black's method of treating this case is open to the objections urged against the compound prescriptions of the ordinary school. The first substance given was Ant. Crud. the duration of the effect of this is said in Jahr's Manual, to be "as long as four weeks, and even longer in Chronic diseases."—(JAHR'S *Manual*, p. 37.) The second, Lachesis, is said, by the same authority, to have a "duration of effect of several weeks in some cases of Chronic disease,"—(p. 283.) The next "Sepia," has its duration of effect from seven to eight weeks in Chronic affections," (p. 496.) The next Sulphur, has its "duration of effect from 35 to 40 days in Chronic diseases, and even for a longer time," (p. 537.) The next, Nux V., which to be sure is an *antidote* to the last, has its "duration of effect 15 or 20 days, or even longer," (p. 379.)

With regard to the mistranslation appended to this, it occurs in a footnote, and was added while the Journal was going through the press. The fault was, being accidentally obliged, on this occasion, to trust to another what the Author would otherwise have done himself, he, perhaps carelessly, did not compare the translation with the original. It is a great satisfaction to him to know, that had the passage been properly translated, it would have strengthened his position much more than it does. So far from not "attempting" to confute Hahnemann's argument against compound prescriptions, we actually devoted four pages to a quotation from Dr. Paris in reply to it.

APPENDIX B.

SPECIMENS OF MIS-STATEMENTS AND MISQUOTATIONS IN
THE "DEFENCE OF HAHNEMANN AND HIS DOCTRINES."

P. 4. The "Defenders" attempt to gain an undue advantage by placing themselves in the position of the party first attacked; whereas "Homoeopathy Unmasked" was written in reply to several attacks made by them on the regular practitioners.

P. 7. An attempt is made to make Hufeland's name give support to the system; whereas he, in a book which he bequeathed as "a legacy" to the medical profession, expressly condemned it.

P. 28. An attempt is made by an isolated sentence from a work of Hippocrates, of very doubtful authority, to make it appear that he recognised the Homoeopathic law. Every one in the slightest degree acquainted with the writings of Hippocrates, is aware, that his law, "contraria contrariis opponenda," is the basis of all his Therapeutic proceedings, and is of course directly opposed to the Homoeopathic law.

P. 30. An artful attempt is here made to represent Cabanis, a "distinguished philosopher and a Member of the Parisian School of Medicine," as giving a "scurvy opinion" of the art of medicine. Objections have been made at all times against medicine, and these are quoted by Cabanis *for the express purpose of refuting them*. These the "Defenders" quote; and because they occur in a book written by Cabanis, they are represented as bearing the impress of his authority. But so far from this, in the very next page he refers to another work, in which he says, he flatters himself that he has suc-

ceeded in removing the doubts and difficulties which the "Defenders" would have us believe that he entertained.

P. 42. At page 35 of "Homoeopathy Unmasked," the following passage occurs, "The object of all research is the discovery of truth ; the results of all successful *research* must, therefore, be true, but to determine the truth of any proposition it is necessary to *ascertain* how far it is in conformity with the nature and reality of things." This introduces the subject of the different kinds of evidence by which different kinds of truth are established. The "Defenders" make the sentence absurd by changing *research* into *result*, and *ascertain* into *determine*, and then ridicule their own sentence as if it were fabricating our words.

P. 52. We stated on the authority of Dr. Russel, that Hahnemann abandoned his profession because he thought it afforded him no directing principle by which to guide his course ; the "Defenders" represent us as saying that he abandoned it because his course of *speculative* study afforded him no great principle by which to guide his course.

P. 53. Because we said that Hahnemann was "prone from his earliest years to abstract speculation," the "Defenders" represent us as saying, that he was "prone to abstract *observation in medicine*."

P. 56. We are accused of "unfairness" in stating that Hahnemann's discoveries "gained some credit with the superficially informed, and those altogether unacquainted with science," when Leibig, who is, according to Dr. Russel, "the great chemical physiologist of the present day," represents those who embrace Homoeopathy as "men wholly ignorant of physiology and chemistry, although in other respects rational ;" and again, as "men who are totally incapable of apprehending the nature of philosophical investigation, who altogether miss

its true spirit in their attempts to learn—who cannot, therefore, read the language of phenomena themselves.”

P. 57. It is stated that the “grand argument contained in “Homoeopathy Unmasked” is the non-universality of the Homoeopathic law. It is no such thing. We considered all the varieties of evidence by which the doctrines of Homoeopathy could be proved, and showed that its supporters had not fulfilled the requirements of any of these.

P. 61. A quotation is introduced from Dr. Fletcher, whom, without disrespect, we may term a thorough Theorist, to show that the action of revulsives is explicable on Homoeopathic principles. The doctrines on which Fletcher founded this statement are now exploded, and none but his resuscitators would ever have thought of bringing them forward by way of proof.

Pp. 64, 65. We are accused of giving false names to certain Homoeopathic remedies, although we referred to the book from which we quoted, so that even if the “Defenders” had been ignorant, they might have informed themselves that we had quoted correctly; and yet they accuse us of trying “to mislead the reader into an unfavourable idea of the Homoeopathic writings.”

P. 68. They accuse us of giving the symptoms produced by the “Metal Antimony” instead of the “Salt of Antimony,” which is called “Crude Antimony,” although as they referred to some of the quotations we gave, they must have been very well aware, that the authorities we quoted all spoke of “Crude Antimony”—the sulphuret, which is called Antimony in common parlance.

P. 77. They speak of the efficacy of the “Carbonate of Iron” in mineral waters, and contrast it with that of, what they are pleased to call, the same substance in powder. The Defenders must be perfectly aware that the carbonate of iron could not be swallowed in ounces

without producing marked effects; and that the substance to which they allude is the red oxide of iron, which is often sold under the name of carbonate, and which is a very inert preparation.

P. 81. The "Defenders," alluding to the death of Canizzaro, who died from the effects of Arsenic prescribed by one of their body, accuse us of calling their medicines "poisons in disguise." We quoted the case, merely to shew that Practitioners, calling themselves Homoeopathists, did not confine their prescriptions to the infinitesimal doses, but prescribed more potent remedies.

We would now refer to Appendix A, and particularly to our refutation of charges 3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13. After the perusal of these, the reader will probably be at no loss to discover *additional reasons* for the "*Defence*" being anonymous, besides the "*only one*" of the first edition, and the "*chief*" ones, of the second; for although they tell us that they "cannot retract one word of their Defence without a compromise of truth," yet between the publication of their first and second edition they discovered other reasons for wearing a disguise, of which a second chief one is, that they wished "the work to be judged by its intrinsic merits alone, unaffected by any personal considerations about the Author."* We trust we have afforded our readers an opportunity of gratifying this harmless desire.†

* These gentlemen say with Falstaff, when wishing to conceal his cowardice, "Would that my name were not so terrible to the enemy as it is."

† A case, illustrating the effects of Homoeopathy, lately occurred here, which we feel sure will interest our *Edinburgh Readers*:—"A robust young Journal, which, under the old school had prospered amazingly, (as indicated by an occasional bulletin declaring its *circulation* to be in a most excellent state), was throwing its green boughs out in all directions, and overspreading the land; when, in an unlucky hour, 'being well, it wished to be better.' Turning from its former friends, it was *persuaded* to place itself under Homoeopathic treatment. But, no sooner was their first dose swallowed, (supposed to have been gold in some one of its

many forms), than followed 'Black Vomit' of most offensive contents—Dukes, Rats, Serpents, Quacks, dilemmas, withering sarcasm, gad-flies, &c. &c. This was accounted for by the patient occasionally eating his own words. These disgusting ejections were handed about on the 15th June, *in waste paper*, among the adherents, and considered the very triumph of the art; and while all tasted with relish, some devoured! But, alas! on the 21st, the exhausted patient declared himself moribund, and actually expired on the 29th, just 14 days from the violent action!!

"We draw a veil over the progress of the mortal symptoms, and for the last articulate accents of the mumbling martyr, addressed to the friends he left behind, as also a testimony to his gifts and merits, evidently coming from a quarter of which there can be no suspicion, we refer to the '*Scottish Episcopal Times*,' 29th June 1844."