WBK
H491L
1869

Surgeon General's Office
LIBRARY.
ANNEX
Section, Homeopathy
No. 38056

205

A

LETTER

TO

PROFESSOR A. B. PALMER, A. M., M. D.

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,

BEING

A REPLY TO HIS FOUR LECTURES ON HOMŒOPATHY.

BY CHARLES J. HEMPEL, M. D.

Surgeon Genl's Office
LIBRARY.
38056
Washington, D.C.

DETROIT, MICHIGAN:
PUBLISHED AT THE OFFICE OF THE "AMERICAN HOMŒOPATHIC OBSERVER,"
51 WAYNE STREET.
1869.

WBK
H491L
1869

Film No. 5055, no. 3

LETTER.

My Dear Professor:—

You have taken the trouble to deliver four lectures on the subject of Homœopathy. Having been published, they have been read by the friends of this science, and have excited a feeling of sorrow and amazement in their minds, that the Professor of Pathology in the University of Michigan should have so far forgotten his personal dignity, as to present such a tissue of garbled extracts and unfair denunciations, as a fair criticism on the doctrines and practices of the Homœopathic School. You seem to have been aware in your own mind, that you have made yourself obnoxious to the charge of dealing unfairly by your opponents, and misrepresenting their doctrines. Otherwise why should you have penned a paragraph like the following, in advance of all accusations from the other side: "The quotations from Rau, Marcy, Henriques, Hempel, Hale, etc., were from their works that were before me. Some of those from Hahnemann's Organon, were from the second American edition, while others were from his various works as quoted by Sir James Simpson and others of the highest authority, and for the correctness of every quotation I hold myself responsible. Not only have I used the very words of the authors or their translators, but *so far as was consistent* have given the context; have always endeavored to present fairly the meaning of the author. The pains I have taken in this respect, enable me to repel in advance any possible accusations ot garbling and unfairness. That I have presented in their true light the leading doctrines of Hahnemannic Homœopathy, no honest man, acquainted with the subject, will, I feel confident, deny."

I have taken the liberty of reviewing, and replying to your Lectures, and embodying my remarks in the form of a letter to yourself.

It will be my endeavor to show you and your readers, my dear Professor, that you have made yourself liable to the most serious "accusations of garbling and unfairness." To be sure, you have kept a back-door open for escape from such charges. You say "as far as was consistent, I have given the context." Consistent with what? Ay! with your settled determination to ruin Homœopathy by fair means or foul. This has been the leading thought in your mind; the leading motive which prompted you to deliver these Lectures. Of course you have utterly annihilated Homœopathy; you have crushed the Homœopaths, "these enemies to true science,"—page 91 of your Lectures. Henceforth, Homœopathy will no longer "appeal to the popular ignorance on the subject of Medicine, nor to popular credulity and prejudice for support;"—page 8.

You say that "this system has been rejected by all the great lights of our Profession." At the very moment when you penned these lines, two of the most distinguished physicians of Aberdeen, Scotland, connected with the University and Royal Infirmary of Aberdeen, went over to the Homœopaths with flying colors. Their names are Reith and D. Dyce Brown; If you read Braithwaite's Retrospect, you must have read the splendid contributions of these gentlemen on various subjects of the Materia Medica. You will find their conversion to Homœopathy related in a recent publication, entitled:

"HOMŒOPATHY, ITS NATURE AND RELATIVE VALUE. By Archibald Reith, M. D., Physician to the Royal Infirmary of Aberdeen. With an Appendix by D. Dyce Brown, M. A,. M. D., Fell. of the Obstet. Soc. of London, Med. officer to the General Dispensary, etc. Aberdeen: D. Wyllie & Son. 1868.

Dr. Reith did not derive his knowledge of Homœopathy from the writings of Hahnemann nor of any of his disciples; he stumbled upon it, as it were, while studying the physiological writings of Trousseau, Claude Bernard and Brown-Séquard. From their experiments he deduced certain therapeutic conclusions which, without his knowing it, brought him face to face with Homœopathy. When informed that he was treading on the domain of Homœopathy, he honestly studied it in the works of Hahne-

mann and his disciples, and, although repelled by some of Hahnemann's original teachings, yet he had brains and heart enough to sift the wheat from the chaff, and became an open and most honored and distinguished convert to our cause. Strange to say, like Molière's "Bourgeois Gentilhomme" who had spoken prose all his life-time without knowing it, Doctor Reith had practiced Homœopathy in the Royal Infirmary for two years without being conscious of his abominable infringement of orthodox and ligitimate medicine. During these two years, Doctor Reith enjoyed the support of his colleagues and the Managers of the Institution; they were pleased with his great success and with the improvements he had introduced in the treatment of his patients. Homœopathy had not been mentioned. The doctor had given them the substance without the name. When calling for certain medicines which are exclusively used by Homœopathic physicians, the Faculty all at once opened their eyes; they all at once discovered that the damnable heresy, Homœopathy, had crept in amongst them; that Doctor Reith's small doses were not in accordance with the British Pharmacopœia. He was summoned before the Hospital Managers on a charge of heterodoxy, and was dismissed for no other reason under Heavens than because he cured his patients better, more speedily and more successfully than he had ever done before. It is proper to add, that some of the best members of the Medical Board denounced this proceeding as an act of high-handed impropriety.

Dr. Wilks, Lecturer on Medicine at Guy's Hospital, has lately been making experiments with Aconite in several inflammatory diseases, such as pneumonia, acute rheumatism, bronchitis, cough, chronic catarrh. He gave rather larger doses than are generally given by homœopathic practitioners. Says the London Homœopathic Review: These cases proved to Doctor Wilks two very important points, viz., 1st, that "it is only at the onset of an inflammatory process that Aconite is likely to prove useful," and 2nd, that the dose must be small; indeed, in one of his cases, even two drops at a dose caused very uncomfortable symptoms, about which Dr. Wilks remarks: "I had no hesitation in attributing the new symptoms to the

effect of the remedy." But the good doctor had great hesitation to be suspected tainted with Homœopathy; he begged his class not to believe that, because he used Aconite, he was on that account a believer in Homœopathy. On the contrary he denies it, as Peter did his Lord and Master. Says Doctor Wilks: "As regards Aconite, I am acquainted with two medical men who, in the course of a long practice, have been in the habit of daily using it, but have not cared to speak of it too openly for fear of having their names associated with members of an eminently quack system; and it may be remembered that the late Mr. Liston brought no little odium upon himself, on account of his advocacy of the use of this drug in erysipelas."

Of course Dr. Wilks alludes to homœopathic physicians in this paragraph. "We could not have conceived the possibility," says the British Journal of Homœopathy "of such a display of meanness of spirit on the part of men pretending to the position of men of science and of gentlemen, as is shown by Dr. Wilks and his two friends, did we not remember the sad example of Bacon, 'the greatest, wisest, and meanest of mankind'."

The late Doctor Liston was favorable to Homœopathy. Doctor Quin, an intimate friend of the great surgeon, communicates a number of interesting facts on this subject in the 6th volume of the British Journal of Homœopathy, page 138. At the suggestion of Doctor Quin, Liston, who had been lamenting to the former over the fatality attending his treatment of the great majority of cases admitted into his hospital, with erysipelas of the head, a fatality that was much the same in the physicians' wards, treated a number of cases with small doses of Aconite and Belladonna. Mr. Liston pronounced one of the cases "the most satisfactory and successful one he had ever seen." He said: "The Belladonna, the students might be aware, was given on the homœopathic principle, the doses only being somewhat increased. They had all probably seen the good effects of Aconite and some of the other remedies employed by the advocates of Homœopathy"

I must beg the privilege of quoting the following extract from Dr. Quin's report; it will show you what the great surgeon

thought of our practice: "In the course of some clinical remarks delivered by Mr. Liston in April, 1836, *apropos* of the case of a man admitted on the 17 of December, with erysipelas of the upper extremities, that eminent surgeon, in the most unequivocal manner, bears evidence in favor of the principle of Homœopathy, and also gives testimony to the efficacy of the Homœopathic remedies, even when administered in infinitesimal doses. I can not do better than quote his own words, as used by him in the Clinical Lecture alluded to above. '*Erysipelas occurring in the upper extremity.*—Since I last spoke on the subject of erysipelas, we have succeeded in subduing the action of the vascular system, without either the use of the lancet or tartarized antimony, by giving small doses of the Aconitum napellus and afterwards of Belladonna. Two cases in which this treatment has been most successfully employed, have been accurately detailed in some late numbers of the Lancet. You have no doubt read them, as well as watched the cases themselves in the Hospital. The first case was that of a woman who, the first time she was in the Hospital, was treated for erysipelas by antimony, punctures and fomentations. It was some time before she recovered, and her convalescence was exceedingly tedious. (She came into the hospital on the 30th of October, 1834, and was discharged, quite well, on the 22nd of January, 1835. Under allopathic remedies she was between eleven and twelve weeks recovering). "In the second attack, after subduing the inflammatory fever in some measure by antimonials, we administered extract of Belladonna in very minute doses, and in two or three days she was quite well. The second case was that of a woman who had been much subject to the affection, having had successive attacks of it at intervals, seldom recovering from them under a fortnight; small doses of the Aconite, followed by Belladonna, were given her, and in the course of three days she was also convalescent. There has been another case lately here, of a man with small ulcerations of the leg, from the toes up to the knee, aggravated by a scald, and who walked about until the leg became exceedingly swollen and red. He suffered besides considerably from the fever. In this state he

was admitted. We subdued the fever and then administered to him the extract of Belladonna, and in twenty-four hours, the disease had quite disappeared. Of course, we cannot pretend to say positively in what way this effect is produced, but it seems to almost act by magic; however, so long as we benefit our patients by the treatment we pursue, we have no right to condemn the principles upon which this treatment is recommended and pursued. You know that this remedy is recommended by the Homœopathists in this affection, because it produces upon the skin a fiery eruption or efflorescence, accompanied by inflammatory fever. *Similia Similibus curantur*, say they....I believe in the homœopathic doctrines to a certain extent, but I can not as yet, from inexperience on the subject, go the length its advocates would wish, in as far as regards the very minute doses of some of their medicines. The medicines in the above cases were certainly given in much smaller doses than have hitherto ever been prescribed. The beneficial effects, as you witnessed, are unquestionable. I have, however, seen similar good effects of the Belladonna prepared according to the Homœopathic pharmacopœia, in a case of very severe erysipelas of the head and face, under the care of my friend, Dr. Quin. The inflammatory symptoms and local signs disappeared with very great rapidity. Without adopting the theory of this medical sect, you ought not to reject its doctrines without due examination and inquiry.".....

"Mr. Liston," writes Dr. Quin, "was most struck with the action of Aconite, in subduing inflammation and reducing vascular excitement; and he often expressed his regret to me that the power of Aconite to abate vascular over-action, and supercede the necessity for abstraction of blood in many diseases, was not known to him earlier; because he was convinced that it would have prolonged the life of his father, whose death had been hastened, in his opinion, by ill-judged, copious venesection."

"In numerous cases," writes Dr. Quin further, "demanding surgical assistance to which I had called him in, in consultation, he invariably left the whole constitutional treatment to me, after his professional services were no longer required; he continued

his visits merely from the interest he took in watching the effects of the homœopathic medicines prescribed by me."

What a contrast between a great man like Liston, and Allopaths of the present day, including even yourself. You would not consult with a Homœopathic physician, not you. Perhaps you may never be called upon to do so. In his Elements of Surgery, second edition, page 61, Liston has perpetuated the homœopathic treatment of erysipelas in the following passage: "The exhibition of the extract of Aconite, in this and other inflammatory affections, is often followed by great abatement of vascular excitement, so that the necessity for the abstraction of blood is done away with. The medicine may be given in substance, or dissolved in pure water, and repeated every third and fourth hour. The sensible effect is relaxation of the surface, and frequently profuse perspiration; the arterial pulsations are diminished in frequency and force. The extract of Belladonna, in doses of one-sixteenth of a grain, may then be substituted with great advantage, and often with the most extraordinary effect upon the disease."

Professor Brera (see British Journal of Homœopathy, Vol. VI, page 278,) and Combe, (see his life, page 456,) speak kind and respectful words of Homœopathy. I will call to your mind the late Doctor Tessier, one of the really great physicians of Paris, and Doctor Henderson, Professor of Pathology in the University of Edinburg. As physicians and pathologists they are, to say the least of them, the equals of any men either in France or the British Empire.

Instead of deriving your information from the recognized works of our School, you seem to have principally depended for your garbled extracts and misrepresentations upon Simpson's silly caricature of Homœopathy, and the platitudes of the renegade Peters who never was a homœopath, never understood the a b c of Homœopathy, was constantly engaged in controversies with his colleagues, and manifested his antagonism to Homœopathy as soon as he began to obtain a practice and a position under her banner.

I do not believe, my dear Professor, that it is given you to

understand the nature, conscience and aspirations of a great Reformer like Hahnemann. Hahnemann had a keen perception of the uncertainties and absurdities of old Physic when he first graduated in Erlangen, and he became so disgusted with Medicine, the more so, the more he became acquainted with its practical workings, that he bent the whole energies of his mind upon discovering the science of Therapeutics such as he felt it must have been interwoven in the plan of Nature by God's eternal Providence. In a letter to his friend Hufeland, on the "Great Necessity of a Regeneration of Medicine," he unbosoms himself in this noble and sublime language: "For eighteen years I have departed from the beaten track in Medicine. It was painful to me to grope in the dark, guided only by our books in the treatment of the sick; to prescribe, according to this or that fanciful view of the nature of diseases, substances that only owed to mere opinion their place in the Materia Medica; I had conscientious scruples about treating unknown morbid states in my suffering fellow-creatures with unknown medicines which, being powerful substances, may, if they were not EXACTLY suitable (and how could the physician know whether they were suitable or not, seeing that their peculiar, special actions were not yet elucidated), easily change life into death, or produce new affections and chronic ailments, which are often much more difficult to remove than the original disease. To become in this way a murderer, or aggravator of the sufferings of my brethren of mankind, was to me a fearful thought,—so fearful and distressing was it, that shortly after my marriage I completely abandoned practice and scarcely treated any one for fear of doing him harm, and—as you know—occupied myself solely with Chemistry and literary labors.

"But children were born to me, several children, and in course of time serious diseases occurred, which, because they afflicted and endangered the lives of my children—my flesh and blood—caused my conscience to reproach me more loudly, that I had no means on which I could rely for affording them relief."

"Where shall I look for aid, SURE aid?" sighed the disconsolate father on hearing the moaning of his dear, inexpressibly dear, sick children. The darkness of night and the dreariness

of a desert all around me; no prospect of relief for my oppressed, paternal heart!

"But perhaps it is in the very nature of this art, as great men have asserted, that it is incapable of attaining any great certainty.

"Shameful, blasphemous thoughts, I entertained. What, shall it be said that the Infinite Wisdom of the Eternal Spirit that animates the Universe could not produce remedies to allay the sufferings of the diseases it allows to arise? The all-loving paternal Goodness of Him whom no name worthily designates, who richly supplies all wants, even the scarcely conceivable ones of the insect in the dust, imperceptible by reason of its minuteness to the keenest mortal eye, and who dispenses throughout all Creation, life and happiness in rich abundance; shall it be said that He was capable of the tyranny of not permitting that man, made in His own image, should, even by the effects of his penetrating mind, that has been breathed into him from above, find out the way to discover remedies in the stupendous kingdom of created things, which should be able to deliver his brethren of mankind from their sufferings often worse than death itself? Shall He, the Father of all, behold with indifference the martyrdom of his best-loved creatures by disease, and yet have rendered it impossible to the genius of man, to which all else is possible, to find any method, any EASY, SURE, TRUSTWORTHY method, whereby they may see diseases in their proper point of view, and whereby they may interrogate medicines as to their special uses, as to what they are REALLY, SURELY, POSITIVELY serviceable for?

"Sooner than admit this blasphemous thought, I would have abjured all the medical systems in the world!

"No! there is a God, a good God, who is all goodness and wisdom! and as surely as this is the case, must there be a way of his creation, whereby diseases may be seen in the right point of view, and be cured with certainty, a way not hidden in endless abstractions and fantastic speculations!"....

Here you have the reason clearly stated why Hahnemann abandoned the practice of Medicine for a time. While he was

supporting his family by translating the medical works of foreign authors, his teeming brain was in search of the law of cure, which he felt must be one of the laws of Divine Order. He discovered this law, practiced medicine again in accordance with its behests, saved the life of a French lady who had been traveling all over Europe in search of some one who could restore her health, married her—his first wife having died long since—,and went with her to Paris where he lived and practiced for a number of years, and died at an advanced age, surrounded by a host of friends, of grateful patients and devoted disciples whose legions are now spreading his name and fame, and the glory of his discovery, all over the inhabited globe.

He was the first to promulgate the doctrine that "Like cures Like" is the true foundation of the Science of Therapeutics. You would fain rob him of the immortality with which this great discovery will invest his name. Page 11 of your first Lecture you write: "He and his followers have ever claimed that the law 'like cures like' expressed in Hahnemann's formula, 'SIMILIA SIMILIBUS CURANTUR,' was an original discovery of this Sage of Cœthen. But the fanciful Stahl before him wrote: "I am persuaded....that diseases are subdued by agents which produce a similar affection—burns, by the heat of a fire to which the parts are exposed; the frost-bite by snow or icy-cold water, and inflammations or contusions by spirituous applications." Having copied this statement from Hahnemann's Organon you must have seen that he relates a large number of cases from page 45 to 75 of that celebrated work, extracted from leading allopathic authors, who effected these cures as brilliantly as they did simply because the treatment in those cases was, unconsciously to the physician, conducted in accordance with the principle of homœopathic similarity.

Hahnemann mentions a number of authors who had a partial glimpse of the law, "Similia Similibus," among others Hippocrates in "De locis" where this author writes: "Vomiting is best cured by an emetic;" and "by prescribing similarly acting agents, similar diseases arecured."

Stahl is likewise mentioned by Hahnemann; you quote Stahl

from Hahnemann, but instead of quoting Stahl's passage entire, you garble because the passage contains an emphatic condemnation of the only principle of cure that Old Physic can boast of. Here is the passage as quoted by Hahnemann from the original author: "The Danish physician Stahl has, above all other writers, expressed his conviction on this head most unequivocally. He speaks in the following terms: "The received method in medicine, of treating diseases by opposite remedies, that is to say, by medicines which are opposed to the effects the diseases produce, (CONTRARIA CONTRARIIS,)—is completely false and absurd. I am convinced, on the contrary, that diseases are subdued by agents which produce a similar affection, (SIMILIA SIMILIBUS);—burns, by the heat of a fire to which the parts are exposed; the frost-bite, by snow or icy-cold water, and inflammations and contusions by spirituous applications. It is by these means I have succeeded in curing a disposition to acidity of the stomach, by using very small doses of sulphuric acid in cases where a quantity of absorbing powders had been administered to no purpose." You had not even the manliness to add this last paragraph, undoubtedly because it illustrates the inefficiency of Old Physic, at the same time that it corroborates the truth of the homœopathic law. After quoting all these illustrations of the law of "SIMILARS" in Old-School practice, Hahnemann modestly adds: "Thus far the great truth has more than once been approached by physicians. But a transitory idea was all that presented itself to them; consequently, the indispensible reform which ought to have taken place in the old School of Therapeutics to make room for the true curative method and a system of medicine at once simple and certain, has, till the present day, not been effected."

An evanescent and partial perception of the law does not constitute a discovery. The discovery and application of the therapeutic law "Similia Similibus" are entirely due to the genius of Hahnemann. Millions had seen an apple fall to the ground; but it took the eyes of Newton to see the great law of the attraction of gravitation illustrated by such a common event.

"Long before Stahl," say you, "three general methods of cure had received recognition, the antipathic, allopathic and homœopathic." This is true in regard to the former two, but where do you see the homœopathic method alluded to? We do not speak of such isolated cases of homœopathic treatment as Hahnemann mentions in his Organon, and which were simply the accidental results of a fortunate empiricism. Where do you see Homœopathy alluded to as a consistent, coherent, scientific system of Therapeutics? Trousseau, who speaks of the labors of the Homœopathic School with great respect, employs the term 'HOMŒOPATHIC' throughout his Materia Medica as synonymous with substitutive treatment; but I am not aware of any author who has made use of this term previous to Hahnemann; no author certainly has ever used it, in spite of Phillipps and his lost Arts, as designating a compact Science of Therapeutics.

You, Professor, do not practice under any of these names. As to Homœopathy you have displayed your ignorance of it so broadly, in these Lectures, that you will not take any offence at being denied all knowledge of it But if you are neither an Allopath, nor an Antipath, nor a Homœopath, under which banner are you enlisted? "Instead of professing to be Allopathists and Antipathists," you write, page 88, "we repudiate these appellations given to us by these men (the homœopaths); and ignoring all terms indicating the belief in exclusive systems, we call ourselves simply physicians, and strive to administer medicines only after the methods which science, reason, common sense and experience may dictate. Although we have the boast of antiquity, and pay due respect to Hippocrates and Galen, but few of the principles upon which we now proceed, are obtained from them; and as to disdaining innovations, we seek for, and embrace them, often with imprudent haste; and discoveries and improvements are our special claim and our highest glory." I shall show you, in a subsequent part of my letter, that the authors of all great discoveries and improvements in Surgery and Medicine, were the victims of the foulest and basest persecutions at the hands of their professional contemporaries, and that so far from these improvements being accepted readily and joyfully, they had to be forced upon an unwilling and rebellious Profession. If you do not recognize

any general principle of Therapeutics; if, as Hudson affirms in his Lectures on Fevers, page 209, Medicine is no exact Science, what then is it but an empirical system depending upon the fitful caprice, and the taste and judgment of the individual practitioner? He may have a more or less perfect knowledge of pathology, a more or less extensive acquaintance with the nature and operations of remedial agents; but if the relation between remedial agents and diseases is not clearly defined and governed by a positive, fixed and unchanging law, what chances has even SUCH a physician of practising any thing else than an enlightened empiricism? And if we reflect that a vast majority of our physicians do not occupy a higher position in their Profession than a majority of our mechanics, tradesmen and gentlemen of other Professions respectively in theirs, must we not come to the legitimate conclusion that mankind are at the mercy of medical ignorance, mercenary egotism and ruthless brutality? The thousands of allopathic nostrums now afflicting humanity, and the removal of such invaluable agents as Tartar emetic and Calomel from the supply-tables of the Army by the late Surgeon-General Hammond, are evidences of this lamentable fact.

How much progress had the science of Therapeutics made from the time of Hippocrates to the time of Sydenham? In Sydenham's time, Raleigh's Cordial was still a fashionable medicine: "A blending of pearl, musk, hartshorn, bezoar-stone, mint, borrage, gentian, mace, red rose, aloes, sugar, sassafras, spirits of wine, with twenty other things. Digby proposed to increase its strength by adding viper's heart and flesh. Lefèbre, the French physician, wrote a treatise, by the King's command, on its sovereign virtues. Charles II would take no other medicine, and even now the great Cordial finds a place in our accepted Medical Schools. So says William Hepworth Dixon, the charming author of "HER MAJESTY'S TOWER." The Codex of the Medical Faculty of Paris retains even to this day the ancient Theriaca which Andromachus of Crete had to prepare by the orders of Nero, and which consisted of a farrago of sixty one ingredients possessing the most opposite properties. The Electuarium

Opiatum Polypharmacum of this codex contains 72 ingredients, one of these the flesh of the viper.

We have had madmen in our own School who have sought to engraft upon our Materia Medica all sorts of absurdities and abominations. But they were quickly and universally repudiated by the critical taste and good sense of the profession; I allude more particularly to the Brazilian provings of Dr. Mure, a wild and fanciful propagator of Homœopathy, whose contributions I condemn in the following language, in the third Lecture of my Materia Medica: "Such provings are utterly worthless and a perfect caricature of the sacred business of determining the therapeutic character of drugs by positive experimentation upon the healthy. Think of a diseased potato, or a piece of charred deer-hide, or, HORRENDUM DICTU! a louse, potentized to the thirtieth attenuation, one globule of which is swallowed and permitted to act for three, four and even six weeks, developing symptoms all the time, which symptoms are gravely arrayed under their respective heads as eye, ear, face and chest-symptoms, and so forth, and published to the world as the actual effect of these substances. Such, and many other absurdities may be found in Mure's Brazilian pathogenesis."

But who can read the history of allopathic Materia Medica without a feeling of shame, derision and disgust? The great Hoffmann, of whom John Thompson M. D., Professor of Medicine and Pathology in the University of Edinburg, writes in his Life of Cullen: "The ideas with regard to the nervous origin of diseases, which pervade the numerous writings of Hoffmann, and which he has explained and illustrated in a very distinct and luminous manner in the fourth and fifth chapters of his Therapeutics, where he treats of the geneology of diseases, and of the sympathies existing between the different parts of the nervous system, form the great basis of the pathology AT PRESENT taught in the Schools of Medicine" (see Henderson's Homœopathy fairly represented, page 191), availed himself of a Materia Medica recommending such delicacies as: water from the dung of animals; oil of excrements; hen-dung for colic; swallow's-dung for epilepsy; peacock-dung for diseases of the head, giddiness, epilepsy; poultices made of human or cow-dung; human excrements for constipation; extract of mummies, precipitate of human blood and of the human skull, of

frogs, vipers, worms, gems, and pearls, and the oil of human fat; not to mention fifty other things equally absurd and abominable, for which I refer you to Henderson *loco cit.*, to Marcy's Allopathy and Homœopathy, and Professor Helmuth's article in the November number of the North American Journal of Homœopathy 1865, page 224.

When Hahnemann entered upon his career as a medical Reformer and as the Creator of the Science of Therapeutics, Materia Medica was still a chaos, and a compilation of empirical statements and formulas. He soon gathered a band of disciples around him, who helped him bravely in the good work of building up the Materia Medica of the future. Hahnemann's Materia Medica Pura in four volumes, the first fruit of his patient and penetrating genius, will always be regarded as a monument of devotion to therapeutic Science. Some of the later provings are not reliable; in a foot-note Hahnemann complains bitterly of having symptoms sent to him as the effects of drugs that are evidently unreliable and which on that account were rejected by Hahnemann. Very few physicians of our School place any confidence in the bulk of the symptoms embodied in the Chronic Diseases; they were obtained with high attenuations and are either doubted or rejected by homœopathic physicians of sense and experience. Let me inform you, my good Professor, that Homœopaths are not in the habit of compromising with errors in Science; a great deal that is published as a contribution to the homœopathic Materia Medica, is condemned, a great deal is sifted and cleansed in the fire of experience, a great deal is hailed as a splendid addition to the edifice of which Hahnemann had laid the corner-stone. The labors of our German Colleagues, of our English brethren and the efforts made in our own country, testify to the perseverance with which Homœopathy is investigated, stripped of mere tinsel and presented to the world as the God-like Science.

It is unfair that you should have availed yourself of our own manly criticisms as something derogatory to Homœopathy. Our aim is Truth; we seek Truth, and to establish Therapeutics upon a basis of Truth; we do not hesitate to winnow from

our Materia Medica the chaff that a few superficial, fanciful and speculative pretenders seek to mix up with pure, life-giving, undisputed and indisputable facts.

In trying to endeavor to correct the mis-statements with which your Lectures abound, I hardly know where to commence. In attacking Homœopathy you have proceeded with such a merciless and systematic cunning, that an honest-hearted critic like myself, who would not have touched your Lectures but for the sacredness of the Cause which you have sought to injure, hardly knows where to make his first bow to your misrepresentations. Even those venomous opponents of Homœopathy Simpson and Hooker, admitted that great good might arise from the homœopathic law if it could be carried out in practice; but to you, Homœopathy is a blasphemous absurdity, a thing to be hated, put down, ostracised, persecuted even as christianity was by Saul before the Lord had taken the scales from his eyes.

You extend your unkind feelings even to the men who believe in, and practice Homœopathy as honestly as you ever believed in Galen or yourself.

"What then," you write on page 92 of your fourth Lecture, "what then, you naturally inquire, is left of this system? As a system of medical doctrines, if not already extinct, it seems rapidly tending to dissolution. There is however, a sect and an organization existing, constantly in the field, pretending to an improved method of practice, opposing with vigor the Regular School of physicians, yet seeking on occasions to obtrude themselves into association with them; and without stating to the public their distinctive doctrines—generally concealing, if not denying their infinitesimal absurdities,—they are constantly pushing their claims to recognition, and appealing to that public for patronage and support, availing themselves of the ignorance prevailing on these subjects, and of the existing prejudices which they use every means to increase."

This is generous. You do not mean to excite any prejudice against the Homœopaths. These four Lectures were not designed for any such purpose. These Lectures were simply intended as a rough hint that Homœopaths have no business to intrude upon the Faculty at Ann Arbor. We are content to have this

question decided by the Authorities to whom a decision of this kind is intrusted by the Constitution of the State. If you knew the Homœopaths a little more intimately, you would find that, although they are inspired with zeal for their cause, yet as men, as colleagues, as social acquaintances, they are as meek and kind-hearted as lambs.

Now, my dear Professor, let me attend a little more closely to the burthen of your Lectures. The success which crowned the homœopathic treatment of Cholera during its first invasion, seems to have been selected by you as one of your main points of attack. Let me attend to this subject in the first place, commencing with your manner of presenting the case of Doctor Chargé of Marseilles.

As regards this gentleman's case, I think a simple perusal of his statement made at the Congress of the Gallican Homœopathic Society, in September, 1857, will show that the Doctor was made the victim of a base conspiracy by the allopathic physicians connected with the hospital, one of the wards of which had been entrusted to Dr. Chargé's care. I transcribe the following brief résumé from the British Journal of Homœopathy.

In 1854, the Cholera was committing frightful ravages among the population of Marseilles, and all the resources of the allopathic School, seemed to be fruitless to stay its progress or cure the patients when once attacked. Now in a previous epidemic the success of the homœopathic practitioners had greatly exceeded that of the allopathists, and as the facts were pretty generally known, public opinion compelled the authorities to apply to the homœopathic practitioners for their aid in the public hospital against a disease that seemed to defy all the powers of the established system. Dr. Chargé as being the practitioner most distinguished on the former occasion for his success (in acknowledgment of which he was decorated with the Cross of the Legion of Honor,) was applied to by the Mayor to take charge of a couple of wards in the Hôtel Dieu hospital. To this appeal, which thus made could scarcely be resisted, Dr. Chargé responded by undertaking the duty im-

posed on him, stipulating of course, that he was to have an abundant supply of nurses, dressers, flannels, and other necessaries, all of which were readily promised to him. All the patients brought to the hospital were to be sent on alternate days to the homœopathic and allopathic wards. The Mayor's request was dated the 31st of August, and on the 2nd of September, Dr. Chargê commenced his labors. It is true that Dr. Chargé resigned his trust after three reception-days; it is also true that during those three days, twenty-six patients were received and twenty-one died, as Dr. Bouquet, his allopathic opponent, stated in his letter to the allopathic Journals, but this letter gave no explanation of the reason of Dr. Chargé's retirement nor of the cause of the excessive mortality in his wards. According to Dr. Chargé's account, the promises given by the administration of the hospital in reference to nurses and necessaries were not fulfilled. In the male ward there was but one attendant allowed, and he was soon laid up and useless, so that the homœopathic physicians had to do the duty of nurses as well as doctors, which of course they could not long coutinue to do. There was a great want ot bed-clothing. flannels, etc.; only one pupil was provided to assist the medical men, and he was soon laid up by sickness. The admission of the patients on alternate days to the homœopathic wards, which seemed to remove all possibility of a selection by either party, had not that effect, for as patients in the other wards, when they took cholera, as they often did were transferred to the cholera-wards, and as this process of transfer was entirely in the hands of the allopathic medical officers, an opportunity was thereby afforded them of retaining in their own wards, patients attacked by cholera on the day of the allopathic admission until the following day, when they might be thrust in a dying state into the homœopathic wards. This was frequently done; which will account, in great measure, for the extreme mortality in Dr. Chargé's wards. In the face of all these unfavorable circumstances it would have been madness to continue the trust confided to him, all the conditions of which had been so faithfully performed by himself and homœopathic colleagues, and so vexatiously evaded by the opposite party. Without assistants, without the requisite

bed-furniture, with the control of the admission of patients in the hands of adversaries eager to damage the reputation of Homœopathy, Dr. Chargé was forced to retire from the unequal contest.

You say that Dr. Gerstel declined serving under the orders of a bitter allopathic opponent who would have used every means, fair or foul, to ruin the Doctor's reputation and bring discredit upon Homœopathy. Dr. Gerstel had treated nearly 300 cases of cholera in different villages in Bohemia, in which it had shown itself of a most inveterate character. Most of these cases were officially certified. He had 32 deaths. He petitioned the authorities of Prague, that a portion of the hospital should be allotted for cases of cholera. This was refused, and instead of granting his petition, he was requested to serve under the orders of a deadly enemy. If he had accepted such a proposal would not he have deserved the contempt of all men of sense for making such an egregious fool of himself? The doctor understood the trick perfectly; "be innocent as doves, but wise as serpents."

At that time the successful treatment of cholera by Doctor Fleischmann, physician-in-chief to the homœopathic Hospital of the Grey Sisters at Gumpendorf in Vienna, excited such great attention that, as he himself relates in the Hygea, vol. 8, page 316, "he was commissioned to lay before the court a report upon the cholera, and the best mode of treatment in accordance with his experience. The immediate result obtained was the removal of the prohibition to practice Homœopathy in Austria, in February, 1837." The practice of Homœopathy had been prohibited in Austria by a decree of the Chancellor's Court of the 2nd of October, 1819. When the cholera broke out, special permission was granted to try the homœopathic treatment against this terrible plague. During this epidemic, Fleischmann received 1202 cholera patients in his Hospital, of whom 793 were cured and 409 died. Under allopathic treatment, the percentage was more than double. "In the treatment of this disease," writes Fleischmann, in his report, "at least as we have it in an hospital, even for us homœopathists,

much remains to wish for. Every medicine which has been recommended, has been tried and tried again by me, but I have little to say in praise of any of them. According to my experience *Veratrum album* still keeps its place as the best medicine, while for the cramps, Secale is most useful, and for restoring the secretion of urine, Nux vomica."

What a trouble you put me to, my dear Professor, in correcting your garbled extracts. As you quote Fleischmann, you would have him understood as saying that homœopathic remedies had no effect in the treatment of cholera; whereas the reverse is the case. On looking at the cholera-statistics of the General Hospital of Vienna at that period, you will find that two-thirds of all the patients received died, whereas, Fleischmann only lost one-third, and the success of his treatment was so striking that the Emperor removed the interdict which had been launched against Homœopathy fifteen years previous, and not only permitted homœopathic physicians to practice their Art in perfect freedom, but likewise to dispense their own dilutions and triturations, which was a great triumph over another class of deadly enemies, the apothecaries.

I am compelled to refer to another extract, where you have shamefully garbled. You quote Doctor Russell, one of the editors of the British Journal of Homœopathy, as saying: "we cannot help deprecating the boastful tone we so often hear assumed by Homœopathists on the treatment of cholera." "It would argue a singular callousness of feeling not to be penetrated with a profound sense of the comparative impotence of our Art in arresting or even greatly modifying this terrible plague." Doctor Russell writes as follows: "We cannot help deprecating the boastful tone we so often hear assumed by Homœopathists on the treatment of cholera. THAT OUR SUCCESS IS GREATER, MUCH GREATER THAN THAT OF OUR ALLOPATHIC COLLEAGUES, WE HAVE NO DOUBT WHATEVER, AND THIS STATEMENT IS CONFIRMED BY OUR STATISTICAL RETURNS. Still that is saying very little and it would argue etc." Why were these four lines left out in your quotation? Is it because they hurt you? And this is what you call fairness. "Not a single passage," say you to your ignorant audience, like a blind leader of the blind, "not a single passage has been misquoted, design-

edly garbled, or in the least degree misrepresented." My dear Sir, the whole aim and object of your Lectures has been to garble and misrepresent Homœopathy. Doctor Russell reported to the General Board of Health of the city of Edinburgh, 346 cases of cholera that were treated in the homœopathic cholera-hospital, of whom 57 died, or about 17 per cent. In reply to his report, the Secretary of the Board of Health sent the following acknowledgement : "I am directed by the General Board of Health to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 22nd inst. (February, 1849), with the reports of cases of cholera forwarded therewith ; and I am to convey the thanks of the Board to the Physicians of the Edinburgh Homœopathic Dispensary, for the valuable information contained in those Reports."

Signed : ALEX. BAIN.

Say what you will, squirm as you may, Homœopaths can and do beat you at treating cholera ; they beat you at treating any kind of disease, and certainly at treating Asiatic Cholera. We do not claim these favorable results as the results of superior skill, but as the logical and inevitable results of superior therapeutic maxims. You seem to have such an intense aversion to Homœopathy that you forget yourself so far as to imagine figures where nobody else would see them. Speaking of Cholera, which seems to be a thorn in your side, you say that Dr. Tessier of Paris, in charge of an excellent hospital, Sainte-Marguérite, admits a loss of forty eight or forty nine per cent., and you refer to the British Journal of Homœopathy, vol. XI, page 693, as your authority for this statement. Here is what is said of Dr. Tessier in that passage : "We (the members of the First Congress of the reconstituted Gallican Homœopathic Society, who were then assembled in Paris from the 5th to the 10th of September, 1851, from all parts of France and other countries,) paid a visit to Doctor Tessier's hospital. He has 100 beds which are generally all occupied, and the arrangements of the hospital pleased us very much. The wards are airy and high, and the hospital is well situated and well served. Two English practitioners were attending regularly the practice of Dr. Tessier whilst we were there, and we doubt not this will become a seminary for the education and instruction of enquirers. Dr. Tessier is a man of the greatest talent, courteous and communicative, and thoroughly skilled in all the learning of the Old School, a first-rate pathologist, an admirable speaker, and

with an engaging simplicity of manner. He informed us that he had never met with anything but uniform kindness and respect from the central bureau of Hospitals, although at various periods there have been medical men among them, and such is the case at present ; not the slightest opposition has been offered to him in the change that he has carried out in the medical treatment of his patients." Unless you have private information, not accessible to outside parties, the wish must have been father to the thought, and to this statement of the thought, in this instance, at any rate. There is nothing said of 48 or 49 per cent. in this paragraph ; it is true that Tessier was afterwards transferred to the hospital Beaujon, which is one of the finest hospitals in Paris. The passage to which you refer, British Journal of Homœopathy, vol. XII, page 698, says : "We are sorry to learn that the cholera, in his wards, as well as in the other hospitals in Paris, showed so malignant a type. One great cause for the increased mortality in all the hospitals, as compared with the last epidemic, is the decidedly contagious character the disease has manifested. It thus spreads from bed to bed, and attacks patients already suffering from serious diseases."

Now, Doctor, next time you quote cholera against the Homœopaths, quote correctly, and in a spirit of fairness ; otherwise you will be found out a second time ; in matters of Homœopathy some of us are a great deal better posted than you are.

Speaking of Dr. Tessier, I may as well here communicate to you what his Allopathic Colleagues and Superiors thought of his practice as a Homœopath ; I copy from the American Homœopathic Review, vol. XII, page 142 ; to which publication the information was conveyed by Doctor Dunham, of New York, who was in Paris at the time when the Executive Committee of Hospital Physicians were convened to consider the question of expelling Tessier from the hospital staff. "The discussion of the Committee, as briefly reported in the *Gazette des Hôpitaux*, was stormy, and as to the denunciations of Homœopathy, was sufficiently unanimous to indicate the orthodoxy of the Committee. But when it came to the practical question of expelling a physician from the hospital-staff, because of an innovation in practice, there arose a practical difficulty. Such

a precedent in Paris would involve too sweeping a train of sequences. The discussion was ended by the argument attributed to Chomel, substantially as follows : Physicians are not appointed on the hospital-staff until they have proved their fitness for the post, and we cannot deny our Colleague's fitness. They cannot be dismissed except for bad behaviour. If we decide the adoption of a novel mode of treatment to be bad behaviour, we do not only implicate ourselves, for we all have introduced novelties into our treatment of diseases, but we erect a barrier to all progress in medicine, and destroy the freedom of the practitioner. We cannot, then, without establishing a dangerous precedent, expel a physician unless we can show that his new method has clearly and unquestionably increased the mortality of his patients beyond that of any other physician. Unfortunately, Colleagues,—for, of course, I detest and despise Homœopathy—THE RECORDS OF DOCTOR TESSIER'S PRACTICE SHOW A MORE FAVORABLE RESULT THAN THOSE OF ANY OTHER HOSPITAL. We cannot, therefore, interfere with him."

How strikingly does this conduct contrast with the conduct of the Managers of the Edinburgh Infirmary against Professor Henderson of the University of Edinburgh, and with that of the Managers of the Aberdeen Infirmary against Doctor Reith, a distinguished member of the Hospital-Staff. You, my dear Professor, may have read his contributions to the Science of Pharmaco-dynamics in the last numbers of Braithwaite's Retrospect. They were extolled by his colleagues and commanded the admiration of the English Profession generally ; but when it was found that they were the very doctrines that are professed by the Homœopaths, he was dismissed from the Hospital-Staff. Since then, Doctor Reith and his Colleague, Doctor Brown Dyce, late Assistant-Professor of Materia Medica in the University of Aberdeen, have published their conversion to Homœopathy in an admirable pamphlet that puts their defamers to shame.

On the Continent of Europe, Homœopathy, has finally triumphed over all governmental as well as professional opposition. No student is ever rejected because of a leaning towards Homœopathy, and we are informed in a recent letter from Doctor Marenzeller, President of the Vienna Society of homœopathic physicians now numbering over sixty members, that the inter-

course between homœopathic and allopathic practitioners is marked by the utmost cordiality, and by mutual confidence and esteem. They consult together in doubtful cases, leaving the treatment to the regularly attending physician.

Why not pursue the same course of conduct in our own country? An eminent allopathic practitioner in New York, Doctor Gardiner, consents, from motives of humanity, to consult with a homœopathic practitioner of honorable standing in the Profession, and for doing this act of kindness to a neighbor, he is expelled from the Academy of Medicine. Shame upon such conduct! Men capable of such an act of brutality, ought to have the mark of Cain set upon their brows as violators of the first and highest law of Christian morality; "these three, Faith, Hope and Charity, but the greatest of all is Charity."

If you, my dear Professor, were animated by a spirit of Christian Charity towards the Homœopaths, would you have presented the tissue of garbled extracts and misrepresentations of which your lectures are composed, as the result of an honest inquiry into the merits of Homœopathy as a science and a system of medical practice? Never, Sir!

"Thus," you exclaim, "do these extraordinary claims of success, when properly stated, come to naught."

I believe I have shown to the satisfaction of every unprejudiced reader, that you have not made even the shadow of an attempt to test the claims of Homœopathy, but that your constant effort has been to distort both the facts and the principles of this great Science.

As a further proof of this, let me quote your remark concerning the virtue of Belladonna in scarlatina. You say: "Belladonna in homœopathic doses has been greatly vaunted as a specific in scarlatina, the most wonderful success being among the standing references; but the highest homœopathic authorities now admit its total inefficiency in the severer forms of the disease."

What forms of scarlatina do you mean by these severer forms? Do you mean those forms of scarlatina which are generally

designated as malignant scarlatina? Let me inform you that Homœopaths have never claimed Belladonna as a specific for malignant scarlatina; Homœopaths have never claimed that they would promise to cure more than five or six out of a dozen cases of malignant scarlatina, which almost uniformly die under allopathic treatment. Homœopaths claim Belladonna as a specific for the simple, uncomplicated, although severe, smooth Sydenhamian scarlatina; no remedy surpasses the curative virtues of Belladonna in this disease. Between the years 1835 to 1855, Fleischmann had treated in his hospital 91 cases of scarlatina, seven of which died. Several severe epidemics had occurred during this period. He certainly must have had a number of severe cases to treat, and a per-centage of 7½ of deaths would undoubtedly be considered by yourself and any other allopathic physician as a splendid success.

Fleischmann treated 1058 cases of pneumonia, cured 1004; 48 died, 6 cases remained; percentage of deaths a little over 4½; his cases contained a good many cases of complicated and typhoid pneumonia.

Of erysipelas, 504 cases were treated, and 510 cured; four died of gangrene.

Of diarrhœa, 323 cases were treated, 319 cured, 3 died.

Ophthalmia of different kinds: 130 cases, 129 cured, 1 remained uncured.

Inflammation of joints: 888 cases treated, 877 cured, 7 died of miliaria.

Angina faucium: 920 cases received, 919 cured, one died of gangrene.

Cardiac inflammations: 57 cases received, cured 56, one died.

Gastric fever: 1181 cases received, cured 1173, died 7.

Rheumatic fever: 1417, cured 1416, one remaining.

Typhus: 3165 cases received, cured 2779, died 368, a little more than one case in 9.

Pleuritis: cases received 146, cured 142, died 4.

Rheumatism, acute and chronic : cases received 759, cured 756, two died.

Peritonitis : cases received 215, cured 204, died 11,

Jaundice : cases admitted 87, cured 87.

Measles : cases admitted 109, cured 107, died 2.

Dysentery : admitted 103, cured 100, died 3.

Effusion into pleura : admitted 63, cured 54, died 5.

Can you obtain any better results than these, under allopathic management ? If you can, homœopathic physicians will be delighted to acknowledge your success ; but you can not do it. And then, you must remember that these successes are obtained without blistering, bleeding, physicing, scarifying and puking the poor patients to death ; no moxas are used, no setons, no issues, no cauteries, no red-hot rods of iron ; only a few little pleasantly-tasting powders, or a few drops of a liquid attenuated medicine in half a goblet of water, or a few small globules of starch and sugar impregnated with the medicine ; this is all.

You make the bold statement that Andral, after experimenting with some homœopathic remedies, reported to the Academy that after a fair trial he had not witnessed the slightest beneficial effects from the infinitesimals used. If you have examined the records of Homœopathy as you profess to have done, what is the reason that you have overlooked, systematically, and as it were with malice prepense the ten thousand evidences in favor of Homœopathy, and among these, the ample and reiterated refutations of Andral's pretended trials, which were not only unfair, but likewise conducted with an utter ignorance of the principles and therapeutic resources of the science ?

In your desperate attempts to put down Homœopathy, you rehash to your audience the slanderous lie that the Russian Government had prohibited the practice of Homœopathy in the Empire. This vile hoax was first published in an allopathic sheet, the *Courier Médical.* The hoax was republished in some of the English morning-papers and likewise in the *Lancet.* As soon as the news reached here, Doctor Verdi, an

esteemed homœopathic physician of Washington City, D. C., and Mr. Seward's family-physician, at once applied to the Russian Embassy for information, and was told that there was not a word of truth in the whole story. The statement likewise received an authoritative contradiction in the Standard and Morning Star; and the *Lancet* of the 24th of October last, acknowledged the falsity of the statement and expressed its PLEASURE that the statement was false. Every Professor of Pathology reads the Lancet ; how is it that you have overlooked this correction of a vile hoax? Homœopaths are not afraid of fair and manly discussion, they invite it ; but this system of hounding Homœopathy is unbecoming.

Homœopathy is doing well in Russia. By a recent ukase, the formation of a medical Society, by the homœopathic physicians of St. Petersburg, was officially sanctioned in spite of the active opposition of the Medical Council of the Empire. There are now about one hundred homœopathic physicians practicing in Russia. The November number of the London Monthly Homœopathic Review, 1868, contains the following : "The official reports upon the cholera-epidemic of 1866, we are informed by the *Bibliothèque Homœopathique*, assert that whilst the physicians of the large hospitals in St. Petersburg admit a mortality of 33 per-cent., Dr. Hering, a homœopathic physician, who, in his capacity of medical officer of police, was in charge of a temporary hospital containing ten beds constantly occupied with cholera-patients for eight weeks, lost not a single case. And further, the chief of police, Général Trephoff, has certified that attacks of cholera were infinitely less common among the police in Dr Hering's district who, under his directions, used homœopathic prophylactics, than among those in other parts of the town who, not less carefully provided for, only adopted such hygienic precautions as were recommended by their allopathic medical officers. At the conclusion of the epidemic, Dr. Hering's services were acknowledged, and his success attested, by an imperial decoration."

Let me now take up the next statement, that referring to the number of homœopathic practitioners in Europe. You say

that the last authentic statistics within your reach are brought down to 1855. Great Britain at that time had 206 homœopathic physicians. It has now 258 legally qualified practitioners, 107 of whom reside in London. It has, moreover, 6 hospitals including the London Hospital which was established in 1849, and, up to December 1866, had received 59,138 patients. I refer you to the Homœopathic Directory for Great Britain and Ireland, of the year 1868, for further information. How many homœopathic physicians there are now practising on the Continent of Europe I am unable to say, the latest data not having yet reached me; but I know that there are about 100 homœopathic practitioners in Paris alone, whereas you give 78 as the whole number practising in France. According to your statement there are 65 homœopathic physicians in the whole of Austria, whereas there are about 70 in the city of Vienna alone; Hungary has a large number of homœopathic practitioners; so has Bohemia. Prussia and the States of the North-German Confederation have several hundred. Their patients are among the highest ranks of Society, members of Royal families, Magnates of the Empire, Generals commanding armies, literary men. A great many of the homœopathic physicians of Europe have been decorated by their respective governments for devotion and contributions to science; the late Doctor Fleischmann had eight decorations from as many different governments.

How is it in our own country? Thirty years ago there was only one homœopathic physician in the State of Michigan, now there are over three hundred, a great many of whom being in the enjoyment of very large professional incomes. Thirty years ago there were only half-a-dozen homœopathic physicians in the city of New York, none in Brooklyn or Williamsburg; now there are over three hundred. In the United States there are about 5,000 homœopathic physicians. The richest and most intelligent families in the city of New York, employ homœopathic practitioners. The Editors of the New York Evening Post, the New York Tribune, the Sun and some of the most influential weeklies are ardent advocates of Homœopathy. William Cullen Bryant, is one of the foremost advocates

of this science. So are Parke Godwin, Charles A. Dana, Horace Greeley, John A. Bigelow our late Ambassador to France, in fact all the first men in the City and State of New York. The same is true in regard to Philadelphia. Several of the Regents of the University employ homœopathic physicians. We accept your simile of the "the cricket in the meadow, making more noise than a whole herd of oxen quietly feeding, or reposing upon its verdure. But should that herd be aroused, its powers would be felt. That cricket might be silenced." Is it by the brute force of oxen that you mean to silence this cricket? It will not be silenced by brute force. It will chirp on more briskly than ever and drive the oxen out of sight. The community, and especially the enlightened community of Michigan, is getting tired of being doctored by oxen. The comparison is your own.

Thank God, the spirit of hatred and persecution which you manifest in your Lectures, is not participated in by all scientific men. At the late Homœopathic Congress at Brussels, the President of the Belgian Academy of Medicine, Dr. Fallot thanked the Congress for the invitation that had been forwarded to the office of that Corporation. "All our Colleagues," he added, "will endeavour, to respond to the appeal made to them by the Congress; for, Gentlemen, whatever differences of doctrines and of practice separate us, we all pursue the same object, the search after truth; we have but one common desire, to do the greatest possible amount of good. For these reasons we shall applaud your labors." How beautifully does this language contrast with the following ribald denunciation in Doctor J. H. Jerome's annual address before a recent meeting of your State-Society. "Yet when the University as a whole, demands enlargement for the better accommodation of its growing patronage and the maintainance of its prestige, requiring aid beyond the limits of its original endowment, and an application is made to the State Legislature for such purpose, they are met at the threshold with the seducer's proposition, if it will doff its chastity, prostitute its virtue; lay aside its distinctive characteristics and cohabit with the merest tissue of fanciful speculation that ever

issued from the brain of a pretended philosopher, and give tone and character to a more than half extinct dogma, the sugar plum of her debasement shall be meted out—a proposition more monstrous who can conceive."

And does it not equally, nobly, contrast with the following impertinent sneer at the Board of Regents : "Having been set at defiance by guardians of this honored Institution, and the attention hitherto given it by the profession, canceled by their own deliberate act, no alternative remains but the simple exercise of a wholesome self-respect. And if we may not cherish, we are not forbidden to let it alone."

The sentiments embodied in these extracts have been dictated by a regular Trades'-Union spirit. "Rule or ruin!" A beautiful device for men who profess to love the truth of science and to have the welfare of their fellowmen at heart. Socrates was satisfied that he knew nothing, and the great Newton, after having discovered the law of attraction, was conscious that he had only picked up a small pebble on the shores of the boundless ocean of science ; but to these men the domain of Therapeutics is bounded by a blister, a puke, a purge, a putrefying salivation, a venesection, a dose of opium and a red-hot rod of iron.

"I have not come to bring you peace, but the sword." These words of the Saviour have been emphatically exemplified in the manner in which Hahnemann's great discovery was received by the Medical Profession at large. In the city of Leipsic, where he first resided, and which has been regarded as a sort of Emporium of Science, he was ridiculed, jeered, pelted, caricatured and persecuted not only by the rabble whom the high-priests of medicine set up to it, but by the Medical Faculty and the Authorities themselves, until he was driven out of the city and found an asylum in the dominions of the Duke of Anhalt Cœthen, who had befriended Hahnemann and his discovery. It is true the citizens of Leipsic have atoned for their brutal conduct by erecting public statues in his honor; but at the onset of his career Hahnemann had to obey the law of all great reformers, the law of hatred and unrelenting persecution.

It would seem as though the Medical Profession ought to be a liberal profession, encouraging inquiry and extending a generous hand to those who devote their mental energies to simplifying the practice of Medicine and transforming its arbitrary rules and hypothetical theories into positive and reliable generalizations. Although therapeutic science has now been constructed, reconstructed, and tinkered for the last two thousand years in every conceivable manner, yet it is acknowledged by all the best writers of the dominant School of Medicine that the real Science of Therapeutics is yet to be discovered. The distinguished Sir Thomas Watson, in his recent Address on the occasion of the inauguration of the new Clinical Society of London, uttered this remarkable language: "Certainly the greatest gap in the science of Medicine is to be found in its final and supreme stage of Therapeutics. The anatomy of the human body is sufficiently well known. Its material pathology, also, has been, I will not say completely, yet very amply and fruitfully ransacked. I say its *material* pathology; for the condition of doctrinal pathology must necessarily partake of whatever imperfections may be found in the correlative science of physiology. Again we have attained to a great degree of certainty in the detection and discrimination of disease in the living body. We know tolerably well what it is that we have to deal with; but we do not know so well—nor any thing like so well—*how* to deal with it. We want to learn distinctly and clearly *what is the action of drugs*, and of other outward influences upon the bodily organs and functions. To me it has been a life-long wonder how vaguely, how ignorantly, how rashly, drugs are often prescribed. We try this; and not succeeding, we try that; and baffled again, we try something else; and it is fortunate if we do no harm in these, our tryings. Now this random and hap-hazard practice, whenever, and by whomsoever adopted, is both dangerous in itself, and discreditable to medicine as a science. Our profession is continually fluctuating on a sea of doubts about questions of the greatest importance. Of this the evidence is plentiful and constant. I say this uncertainty, this unseemly variation and instability

of opinions, is a standing reproach to the calling we profess. *Of Therapeutics, as a trustworthy science, it is certain that we have, as yet, only the expectation.*"

By whom, Professor, are these memorable words spoken? Who is it that utters this cry of distress in the wilderness of old-school Therapeutics? Is he a young man without name or experience? Why, it is Sir Thomas Watson, a man who has grown gray in the practice of medicine; a man who has enriched medical literature with some of our most brilliant standard works; a man who stands at the head of his profession in the British empire. Ought the men to whom these words are spoken, these blind leaders of the blind, to indulge in intolerant and egotistical fanaticism instead of cultivating an honest love of truth and boundless charity towards those among their brethren who conscientiously and intelligently differ from the big crowd of doctors in the perception of what constitutes therapeutic wisdom, and what is the shortest, most pleasant and safest road to the restoration of disturbed health? This certainly must seem so to any common sense man who is not a doctor; but the infatuated pride and the unreasoning dogmatism of the medical profession are absolutely boundless. At all times the rulers in this kingdom have been opposed to new facts and principles, and have entrenched themselves behind a wall of egotistical jealousy and the spirit of persecuting legitimacy and caste. Hear what Gross, in his system of surgery, relates of the immmortal Ambrose Paré: "The discovery of the use of the ligature is due to Ambrose Paré, in the sixteenth century, prior to whose time surgeons were in the habit of staunching hæmorrhage with the actual cautery, hot pitch, and all sorts of styptics, of the most cruel and barbarous nature." "For the good of mankind," says this great man, "and the honor of surgery, I was inspired by God with this good thought." "Paré himself fully appreciated the utility of his invention, but his contemporaries spared no pains to undervalue it, and to revile and persecute its author, subjecting him to the humiliating office of searching the writings of the ancient fathers of medicine for traces of the use of the ligature

as a justification of his practice. Gourmalin, the jealous and malignant President of the College of Physicians of Paris, made himself particularly conspicuous on the occasion, and thus earned an infamous reputation ; for the only act by which he is now remembered, is his bitter and unrelenting persecution of Paré, rendered immortal by his great achievements."

How fared Jenner, the discoverer of vaccination. Hear what is said of him in Appleton's Encyclopedia: "In 1798 Jenner went to London to communicate the process of vaccination to the profession, and to endeavor to procure its general adoption. His reception was disheartening in the extreme. Not only did the doctors refuse to make trial of the process, but the discoverer was accused of an attempt to 'bestialize' his species by introducing into their system diseased matter from a cow's udder; vaccination was denounced from the pulpit as 'diabolical'; and the most monstrous statements respecting its effects upon the human system were disseminated and believed."

Even Harvey, the discoverer of the circulation of the blood, had to contend against all sorts of misrepresentations and disappointments. We read in Appleton's Encyclopedia: "Harvey discovered the circulation of the blood in 1619. For many years he experienced the treatment with which all innovators or discoverers are familiar, and complained that his practice declined considerably after the publication of his treatise on the circulation of the blood, a result which he had predicted. His discovery raised bitter and powerful enemies, more particularly the French Academy of Medicine, and Riolanus, its Professor of Anatomy, whose motto was: Malo cum Galeno errare quam circulator esse cum Harveyo;—I would rather be mistaken with Galen than circulate with Harvey."

Among modern victims of old-school fanaticism and persecutions, Hahnemann, the discoverer of Homœopathy, whom Jean Paul Richter designated as a "double-head of philosophy and erudition," occupies the most prominent rank. Why was he thus persecuted? and why are his followers, who are numbered by tens of thousands, and count regular professors of

medicine in European universities among their adherents, and philosophers, professsional men, statesmen high in office, and the leaders of fashion and intelligence the world over, among their patrons, still treated as professional outcasts by their old-school opponents? These call themselves the "regular" and "legitimate" doctors; they claim that when a man is taken sick he ought to be restored to health by the hands of a regular and legitimate prescriber, bled, puked, purged, blistered, and half flayed alive in the good old fashion of Old Physic. In the case of these regular and legitimate prescribers, it cannot even be said that there is method in their madness. Some years ago, when the celebrated Doctor Kearney Rogers was taken ill, the biggest guns among the regulars were in attendance on the unfortunate man. He died. Their lancets and their colomel could not save him. The death of this truly great surgeon created a terrible excitement in the allopathic camp. Why did you let him die? was the question asked by outsiders. Doctor Hosack killed him, said one of the attendants; Hosack retorted: You killed him; and articles were published and pamphlets flew about thick and fast from opposite pens, each trying to show in the most ungentlemanly language that the other was a fool and a jackass. It was generally conceded at that time that both parties succeeded in this task.

There prevails a glorious uncertainty in old-school practices. Old-school doctors repudiate principles, as Sir Thomas Watson justly observes; for them the science of Therapeutics exists only in expectation. What is the consequence of this utter absence of principle in old-school Therapeutics? The consequence is, that it moves in a vicious circle, repudiating all active treatment to-day in order to resume it so much more fiercely tomorrow. Even the horrible mercurial practice is not yet abandoned by the regular and legitimate branch of the profession. "The horrid spectacles," writes Dr. Heustis of Alabama, in the second volume of the American Journal of the Medical Sciences, "the horrid spectacles frequently to be seen as the consequence of mercurial treatment are shocking to humanity

and disgraceful to the profession. Even were mercury the only alternative, that life is dearly purchased which is bought at the sacrifice of everything that renders life desirable, the constitution broken and destroyed, the person maimed and disfigured, so that it is scarcely recognized by the unfortunate sufferer himself, who is an object of pity and horror to his friends. Deprived of their teeth, perhaps of their jaws, we sometimes see these pitiable objects with distorted features, the cheeks and palate partly destroyed by mortification, and the remaining portion cicatrized into an unsightly knot, with the mouth twisted from its natural position, drawn obliquely to the ear, and the lips and cheeks consolidated with the gums."

In the 19th volume of the same journal the same writer observes: "I have known an artificial disease produced and kept up by the daily exhibition of calomel; and because a flow of saliva was not excited it was concluded that the medicine had not exerted its specific effect, or had not been given in sufficient quantity. It was therefore pushed further, and sloughing and mortification of the gums, cheeks and fauces, and death itself following in the train."

It would seem as though the progressive enlightenment of the age ought to have put a stop to these barbarous proceedings and consigned King Calomel to a dishonored grave. For a time it indeed seemed as though the horrid consequences of mercurial poisoning had intimidated the physicians and frightened their patients into an unwillingness to be butchered in this manner any longer. But the vicious circle in which old-school thearpeutics is revolving, brought back the frightful abuses of this wretched empiricism with redoubled violence. Velpeau, late surgeon-in-chief to the Hôtel Dieu, was in the habit of prescribing the mercurial ointment in quantities of one to two ounces, in order to produce a speedy salivation. Trousseau, late Professor of Clinical Medicine, in the University of Paris, did not hesitate to employ three to five ounces for a similar purpose, in the space of twenty-four hours; and Paul Dubois, the most celebrated obstetrician of France, car-

ries this dose to the enormous quantity of one pound, and even one pound and a half. Think of it, one pound and a half of mercurial ointment rubbed into the human body for the purpose of producing salivation which common experience informs us may lead to the most murderous mutilations of the human frame. It is well known to you, my dear Professor, that the late Surgeon-General Hammond banished tartar emetic and calomel from the supply-tables of our army on account of the horrid manner in which these drugs were abused in the military hospitals. Yet these heroic agents, which the ignorance and brutality of allopathic army surgeons made a curse to the sick, become a blessing, when administered by homœopathic practitioners, in obedience to their law of cure.

In the presence of such facts what becomes of your statement, page 89, that "nothing can be more absurd than the charge that the regular profession opposes discoveries and improvements"? Even Professor Simpson's recent invention of acupressure has been denounced by high surgical authorities. Professor Syme displayed his contempt for it by publicly tossing his colleague's pamphlet, expounding it, into a box of sawdust. He knew nothing about this improvement, and refused to learn anything about it.

It is with this reckless and ignorant intolerance that homœopathic physicians are treated by the so-called regular profession. The regulars know nothing about Homœopathy, and denounce it because they are ignorant of its principles and practical rules. Years ago a homœopath was on trial before Judge Edmunds, an ardent homœopath, for mal-practice. The late Doctor Cheeseman was called by the prosecuting party, as a witness. "What is your opinion of homœopathic physicians?" He was asked by the counsel for the prosecution. His answer was very concise: "I think they are either knaves, fools or imbeciles." Whereupon the judge asked him: "Have you ever read any of their works?" "No, sir," was his answer, "I should feel disgraced if I had ever looked into any of them." Whereupon he was admonished by the judge to first acquaint himself with their doctrines and practices before

coming into court and testifying against them in such a reckless manner.

This is the extent of the knowledge which allopathic physicians generally have of Homœopathy. To be honest with you, my dear Professor, I do not believe that you know much more about it than your allopathic colleagues. Your lectures lead me to infer that you have carelessly glanced over the first five chapters of my Materia Medica, the lecture on Sulphur, Hahnemann's and Rau's organon, a few scattering pages in Marcy and Hunt's treatise, a page here and there in the British Journal of Homœopathy, and Hale's New Remedies; but of our Materia Medica, of the practical application of our principles and provings to the treatment of diseases you evidently know nothing. I do not believe you would dare to undertake the treatment of a simple bilious-rheumatic fever in accordance with the principles of Homœopathy. If you had treated one such case correctly, you would want to treat another one like it, and a third case, and you would glide into Homœopathy just as naturally as a tired horse walks through the gate of a richly laden meadow or a well-stocked barn yard.

And again, Doctor, in the presence of the enormous doses that are prescribed, even to this day, by the regulars, as you style yourselves, what becomes of your statement regarding Rau's objections to the plan of large doses, which you say "any of us would condemn," page 72 of your pamphlet? The success of homœopathic treatment with small doses was so striking that it gave rise to an entirely new method of treatment in the allopathic ranks, the so-called expectant plan. Dietl, one of the hospital staff of Vienna, treated several hundred pneumonia patients on the expectant plan, without bleeding, tartar emetic or any kind of active treatment, and lost only seven patients in a hundred. Fleischmann's loss amounted to about four cases in a hundred, and Reissinger, another homœopathic physician, lost one case in a hundred. Dietl professes to have made the discovery that the small per-centage of his losses shows very plainly that the homœopathic method is simply the expectant plan in disguise; he does not believe in the

small doses of homœopaths, and he attributes the success of their treatment to the fact that they give no medicine.

The allopathic treatment of pneumonia shows as well as the treatment of any other disease, the uncertainties of that practice. From Rasori's treatment with hundreds of grains of tartar emetic, and Bouillaud's coup-sur-coup butchery, down to Bennett's restorative method and Dietl's expectant plan, what a confusion, what a baseless and speculative system of experimentation. Nothing but the crudest and most shocking empiricism, until finally a side-ray from the sun of homœopathy gave you allopathic gropers in the dark a glimpse of a better path to the cure of pneumonia than shedding of torrents of blood and crowding ounces of tartar emetic into the stomach. How truly does Sir Thomas Watson exclaim that the science of therapeutics as yet only exists in expectation.

Now, my dear professor, we homœopaths assert that Hahnemann has discovered the fundamental principle upon which this sciencs rests. We profess to believe that Hahnemann has discovered the law which constitutes the ground-work of that science in the eternal series of nature's facts.

What is this law of cure? Is it a mere fanciful theory? The creation of a passing hour? A dazzling bubble, a subjective imagination, a mere system born of the moment to vanish again into naught, when some other system shall be born?

Hahnemann's discovery of the true science of therapeutics which he has seen fit to promulgate under the name of homœopathy, would not have stirred up so much bitter strife and persecution in the ranks of his opponents it this great discovery did not involve a principle of eternal truth. Botanic and eclectic physicians are not persecuted as Hahnemann and his followers have been. Why? Because their practice is simply a variety of old-school physic. Homœopathy is not a variety of old-school physic. Homœopathy is the great science which reduces the treatment of diseases to simple and intelligible methods. Its fundamental principle is expressed in the terse formula of "like cures like," or, in the words of Hahnemann, "similia similibus curantur," which is intended to convey the

doctrine that natural diseases, such as inflammation of the brain, lungs, bowels and other organs; rheumatism, gout, bilious fever, typhus and the like, are cured by means of drugs capable of producing similar diseases on persons in perfect health. In other words, if a man is taken sick, or, if you please, if a man, woman or child is taken sick, we cure them by administering to them a medicine which, among the various drug-substances in any of the kingdoms of nature, is capable of affecting the tissues of the organism in health in a manner similar to the pathological condition before us. Hence we have two great series of morbid phenomena, one, the series of natural morbid phenomena, known and described in pathological treatises as the various diseases to which human flesh is heir to; the other, the series of artificial morbid phenomena or drug-diseases of which the various drug substances in the three kingdoms of nature, such as aconite, or monk's-hood; stramonium or the thorn-apple; strychnine, arsenic, the various mercurial preparations and hundreds of others constitute the material substrata, the visible forms or embodiments. If you chew and swallow a sufficient quantity of the root, or a sufficient quantity of the alcoholic tincture of aconite to affect the tissues of the healthy organism in a manner that aconite is capable of affecting them, you obtain a series of symptoms or phenomena which I should designate as the aconite-disease. A sufficient quantity of the aconite-poison may be allowed to affect the tissues fatally or to develope effects which, but for the antidoting action of other substances, would result in the destruction of life; on the other hand, quantities of the poison may be swallowed deliberately and systematically, *within conservative limits*, without any permanent injury to the organism, for the express purpose of determining with positive and almost mathematical certainty in what various ways the different tissues and systems of the organism may be affected by this drug. Toxicological treatises record the massive outlines of the effects of the poison upon the human organism; systematic experimental poisonings, such as I have alluded to, acquaint us with the shade of action of the poison, a knowledge of which

is absolutely necessary, if we wish to employ a drug as a remedial agent with a full knowledge of its curative powers and the highest attainable degreee of certainty that it will achieve certain definite therapeutic results. These systematic experiments or provings, as homœopathic physicians term them, and the toxical effects gathered from the toxicological works of Orfila, Christison, Flandin, Wibmer, and from cases of poisoning recorded in our medical journals, have shown us that aconite, in its action upon the tissues in health, is capable of producing a counterpart or fac-simile, as it were, of some of the most distressing and dangerous maladies that befal this woe-stricken humanity. Among these maladies we notice in prominent outlines inflammatory rheumatism of the joints, acute inflammation of the lungs, bronchial tubes, pleura, heart, abdominal viscera, muscular tissue, the various neuralgic affections, gout, acute diarrhœa, jaundice, enuresis, scrofulous ophthalmia, paralysis, dyspepsia, venous congestion, palpitation of the heart, spinal irritation, croup, etc. If we are called upon to treat one of these affections as a natural disease, we do not travel the round-about, complicated, debilitating ways of old-school treatment; we meet the enemy directly, by the shortest possible road, and conquer him without an effort, pleasantly, gently, safely and radically, with a very small, yea, an infinitesimal dose of the very drug that produces a similar disease, namely, aconite. We say that because aconite produces the fac-simile of the disease, or, in other words, is homœopathic to it, a small dose of the drug will cure it specifically and wipe it out as it were, without leaving any of the distressing consecutive ailments which the round-about, revulsive and counter-irritant treatment of old-school physic almost invariably entails upon the patient.

It is in this manner, by instituting systematic experiments within conservative limits, upon a variety of human organisms of various sexes and ages, that homœopathic physicians have become acquainted with the specific curative virtues of hundreds of drugs, and are constructing a Materia Medica that will not only be a monument of devotion to the cause of hu-

manity, but become the basis of that glorious therapeutic edifice which, up to the advent of Hahnemann, had only been a dream of old-physic poetry and imagination.

My dear Professor, I have endeavored to give you a brief definition of Homœopathy. I cannot try to unravel the workings of genius; how the solemn presence of the law that drugs typify diseases; that each drug typifies, or, in the language of Hahnemann, is homœopathic to some specific disease, and will therefore cure it, gently, safely and radically, flashed upon his penetrating reason. The law is discovered; abundant means for its application are accumulated in the works of Hahnemann and his disciples, and a grateful posterity will complete the structure which they have so gloriously begun.

Can a law be more universal? It includes every drug in nature, and every pathological disease. The work is not yet completed. No great discovery starts into life, as Minerva did out of Jupiter's brain, fully armed and equipped. The curative range of drugs is being investigated with more and more zeal and perseverance. The labors of the homœopathic school begin to be appreciated even by old-school practitioners. Schroff, Professor of Pharmacology in the University of Vienna, is constantly investigating the therapeutic virtues of drugs by experimenting upon himself, his colleagues, pupils, and numbers of lay persons.

"Under the lead of Homœopathy," writes the late Professor Trousseau, who stood at the head of his profession in Paris, "German societies have been formed for the revision of the Materia Medica. All drugs have been proved upon the healthy by physicians who, it is true, have not always known how to avoid systematic illusions, but who, endowed with a good deal of patience and attentive observation, and always instituting their experiments with simple substances, have constituted a Materia Medica Pura, whence have emanated very many precious notions concerning the special properties of drugs, and concerning a variety of characteristic peculiarities of their action, with which we are too little acquainted in France. Owing to this ignorance we are only acquainted with the grossest general properties of our therapeutic agents, and, in the presence

of diseases which exhibit so many varied shades of therapeutic indications, we often lack the modifying agents adapted to these shades."

Trousseau was not a homœopath, but he was a man of too much brains not to do justice to the labors of homœopaths as far as he was acquainted with them. We do not expect to see men like youself, who have attained to fortune and glory by the old-fashioned way of practicing medicine, to become open converts to our doctrines. This would suppose a devotion to truth that but few men are capable of. We do make such converts every now and then even among the foremost leaders of Old Physic. The most recent converts of eminence in Great Britain are Dr. Reith, physician-in-chief to the Royal Aberdeen Infirmary, and Dr. Dyce Brown, late Assistant Professor of Materia Medica and Medical Jurisprudence in the University of that city.

If it be proper to claim the attribute of rational and legitimate for any system of medicine, it is for the great law discovered by Hahnemann. This law does not claim the legitimacy of usage and the rationality of human cunning, but its legitimacy and rationality are derived from the very foundations of nature, from the constitution of the human mind and the providence of God. If Hahnemann has imparted to it a name it is not because his discovery is a mere system, evanescent like other systems, but because even universal truths have to be presented to finite minds in the finite form of a name. The Infinite Himself, when manifesting Himself among men, had to adopt a finite form and finite language. If the practices of this discovery are simple, this simplicity is not deliberately sought but suggested as a spontaneous and logical result. You, Professor, know better than I do how membranous croup is treated in the regular and legitimate style of Old Physic. Bleeding an infant even to the amount of five ounces, puking it half to death with tartarized antimony or the sulphate of copper, suspending three or four murderous leeches from its throat and crowding a dose of calomel into its stomach, is the general routine treatment of this disease. Now look at the

homœopathic method of treating croup: We assert, and our statistical tables bear us out in this assertion, that ninety-nine cases of croup out of every hundred recover by the use of a few small doses of aconite, the sulphuret of lime and roast sponge. A few little globules moistened with the highly attenuated medicine are dissolved in a few tablespoonfuls of water, of which solution a teaspoonful is given to the little patient every half hour, or every hour or two hours, according as the violence of the symptoms may require.

Or, take pneumonia. Here again, we have bleeding, tartarized antimony, cupping, blistering, big doses of opium, saline mixtures, and other delicacies, and the result is that one out of five or eight patients dies, and those who convalesce generally require two or three weeks longer to get rid of a catarrhal cough. How is it under homœopathic treatment? Doctor Tessier, physician-in-chief to the Hospital Sainte Marguerite, in Paris, can tell you. He treated forty-three pneumonia patients in the presence of a number of young physicians who attended his clinical lectures in the hospital; the patients were examined twice a day in accordance with all the requirements of art, and a report of the cases published. Two of these cases died, the balance recovered in five to ten and fifteen days, and left the hospital without consecutive cough, stitch or pain. Of the two who died, one was brought to the hospital moribund, and the other was in the last stage of tubercular phthisis. The medicines used were small, or rather infinitesimal doses of aconite, bryonia, phosphorus and tartar emetic. No bleeding, blistering or saline mixtures. Doctor Tessier had become a convert to Homœopathy.

Your spirit seems to be in a state of great tribulation regarding the universality which Homœopaths claim for their law of cure. Your spirit is troubled to such an extent that it will not even allow the Homœopaths the benefit of Rau's remark that "many diseases disappear simply by removing the morbific influence." "This," you observe, "is a simple dictate of common sense and common observation, but disproves the dogma of similia similibus as the only law for cure." Now, if a man is attacked

with fever and ague from living in a miasmatic district and is no longer attacked with the fever after moving into a non-miasmatic region of country, what has such a fact to do with therapeutics? Or, if a person takes cold from sitting in a draught of air, or getting his feet wet, and no longer takes cold by avoiding currents of air or keeping his feet dry, what has this to do with therapeutics? Hahnemann's formula legitimately applies to diseases for the cure of which drugs are generally used and recommended by physicians of every school. And in the drug-world it applies to all the natural or chemical products which, presenting themselves to the senses under definite, specific and permanent forms, are capable of morbidly disturbing the normal organism in a definite, positive and unvarying manner. Such natural products are, for instance, the poison of cantharides, aconite, belladonna, nux vomica, ipecacuanha, pulsatilla nigricans, chamomile, rhubarb, etc., or among mineral substances, arsenic, mercury, iron, etc., or among chemical products, the salts of gold, lead, silver, etc., the iodide of mercury, the iodide of potassium, the sulphuret of lime, etc. I am astonished that a man of your standing should require an explanation of this kind; you must have resorted to the quibble that these substances are not simple substances, but chemically analyzable into a number of constituent elements, for the purpose of justifying the nauseous compounds of allopathic drug-shops; these compounds are certainly not simple substances.

Page seventy-nine you use this language: "We thus see that homœopathic professions and practices by no means correspond. It may be claimed that this system, like others, is progressive, but when it is claimed that any dogma in a system is essential, infallible and universal, any progressing, any change from it is abandonment." In raising this objection you evidently confound the principle or law with its practical aplication. The law is ever true, ever the same. Drugs correspond to diseases; special drugs correspond to, or are homœopathic to special diseases. But when we avail ourselves of this law or generalization as a therapeutic guide, it is evident that

the practical application of the general principle may be progressively improved in proportion as we become acquainted with more drugs, and as our knowledge of the curative range of each special drug becomes more perfect. "ARS LUNGA, VITA BREVIS." You must not forget that Hahnemann published his Organon in 1810, and that since then we have perfected our means of diagnosing disease by the invention of new instruments and new modes of exploration, and have likewise increased our means of curing by a more careful analysis and re-proving of our drugs, and by the addition of a large number of new and valuable articles to our Materia Medica, to such an extent that we are in a much more favorable position than Hahnemann was, to do justice to the therapeutic law. The principle upon which vessels are propelled by steam now, is the same as it was at the time of Fulton; yet how differently and how much more successfully is this principle applied now than it was by the original inventor of steam-navigation. The principle or law is one thing, its practical application quite another.

This explanation may serve as an answer to the following statement in your pamphlet, page 56. "Hahnemann wrote before the itch-mite was generally regarded as the cause of this disease, and as the principle or MATERIES MORBI (not materia morbi, as you have it) of its contagion. He thought the suppression from the surface dangerous, leading to all these bad results, (the consequences of the suppression of the itch enumerated by Hahnemann). It was to be cured by potentized sulphur.

In his Physiological Commentaries, Professor Martyn Payne of the University of New York, protests to this day against the acarus being the cause of the itch. Hahnemann ascribed to the suppression of the itch, the consequences which are really due to a suppression of prurigo by ointments or washes. Hebra first showed the professional world the real difference between prurigo and the itch, and demonstrated the fact by actual experimentation upon himself and others, that the SARCOPTES HOMINIS causes the itch, and that to cure the itch all that is

required to be done is to destroy this animalcule. This destruction can be accomplished by various means ; acetic acid, lavender-oil, a solution of the sulphuret of potash ; but the most reliable and most effective means to accomplish this purpose is the sulphur-ointment. Where no acarus is found, the eruption is not the itch, and if it is not the itch it is prurigo, the suppression of which by ointments or washes would entail upon the patient all the disastrous consequences which Hahnemann attributes to a violent suppression of the itch. Hence, your paragraph, page 86 : "If any thing is certain in Therapeutics, if there are any specifics in Medicine, they are to be found in Quinine for ague, in Sulphur for scabies, in lemon-juice and succulent vegetables for scurvy, in Iodine for goïtre, and in Colchicum, at least as a palliative, for gout," does not apply to Hahnemann. The acarus is not a disease : hence, Sulphur cannot be said to be homœopathic to the itch ; it simply destroys the itch-mite, as other substances may do, that is all.

Nor is Quinine a specific for fever and ague in this sense, that it cures every case of this disease. If you teach this doctrine you simply mislead your students and contribute to the fearful abuse that is made of this agent by your allopathic army-surgeons. I suppose that almost any case of fever and ague can be temporarily suppressed by a large dose of Quinine, but the fearful havoc which such treatment entails upon the nervous system, the viscera and the blood (I have known it to cause incurable and fatal leucæmia as demonstrated by the microscope) is not a cure. Thousands of cases of fever and ague are cured by Arsenic, Ipecacuanha, Nux vomica and other drugs, even by raw cider. Boudin, in his Treatise on Intermittent and Contagious Fevers of marsh-districts, informs us that out of 266 fever and ague patients in the military hospital of Marseilles, whom he treated in 1842, 118 were cured with Arsenic alone ; 57 were cured with Arsenic after having previously taken Quinine without effect ; 13 were cured with Quinine, upon whom Arsenic had no effect, and 8 remained uncured both under Quinine and Arsenic. The number of fever and ague patients whom Boudin has treated with Arsenic

in the hospitals of Marseilles, Versailles and Paris, where he was successively stationed, amounts to four thousand. He affirms in his pamphlet, 1856, that since 1843 he has never given a single dose of Quinine for fever and ague. What now becomes of your specific? I have treated a soldier who was in hospital for nine months and had fever and ague more or less during all this time, for which he took any amount of Quinine. After the war he came North from Nashville, where he had been stationed, and applied to me for treatment. He had been living in this city for nearly a year without being able to get rid of his fever. He stopped it for a while with Quinine, but it broke out again. I cured him at once and radically with a few small doses of Nux vomica. Upon investigation I found that the man was a great drinker and that after every debauch he had an attack of fever. This circumstance being an indication for Nux vomica in homœopathic practice, I gave him Nux and cured him.

In selecting a remedy for fever and ague, Homœopathic physicians are not guided by the nature of the paroxysm alone, but likewise and principally by the symptoms which characterize the apyrexia, or which immediately precede or accompany the paroxysm. The disturbances in the circulation, the nervous phenomena, the gastric derangements constitute important indications. In experimenting with the pulverized bark upon himself, Hahnemann found that it caused a "PECULIAR FEVER" flushings of the cheek, palpitation of the heart, general heat and dryness of the skin, and that this "peculiar fever" was reproduced whenever he swallowed the bark. Hahnemann does not say that it caused intermittent fever; and, in perusing the article, Cinchona, in his Materia Medica, you will find that his indications for the employment of Cinchona in intermittent fever, do not so much refer to the paroxysm composed of a chill, fever and subsequent perspiration, as to the accessory symptoms which characterize the whole attack.

Yet I assert Quinine may cause an actual paroxysm of fever and ague. I have known a lady in this city who could not

swallow a grain of Quinine without experiencing a decided chill, followed by burning fever and subsequent drenching perspiration.

When you write, page 14, that "in ague, for instance, the remedy is not chosen in reference to its effects in removing the poison which is its cause, nor indeed, in reference to its more essential internal conditions, but simply in reference to its conditions which are perceptible to the senses, either of the patient or the physician," you mean to smite the Homœopaths upon both cheeks I suppose. But remember, Doctor, that your lectures are printed, and that you can not impose upon professional readers as you may have succeeded in doing upon credulous medical students. Do you mean to convey the idea that you know something of the nature of the fever-and-ague poison, and that you know something more of its operations than the perceptible changes it developes in the circulation, the nervous system, the digestive apparatus and the secretions generally? If you do, all I can say to you is that "much learning hath made thee mad."

Now for your next annihilator of Homœopathy, the cure of Scurvy by lemon-juice and succulent vegetables. Aitken, in his Science and Practice of Medicine, defines Scurvy: "A morbid state ushered in by debility, lassitude, lowness of spirits, attended by fetor of the breath, sponginess of the gums, which swell by irritation, till they overhang the teeth in palmated excrescences. Livid subcutaneous patches and spots appear upon the skin, especially on the lower extremities among the roots of the hair. Spontaneous hæmorrhages may take place from the numerous canals; contractions of the muscles and tendons of the limbs occur, with pains, and sometimes superficial ulcerations. An altered state of the albumen of the blood is associated with this condition, *and the phenomena are brought about by a deficient supply of the organic vegetable acids, of the salts of fresh vegetables.*"

We infer from this definition, and experience has abundantly confirmed, that the free use of lemon-juice and an abundant supply of succulent vegetables are generally sufficient to cure

scurvy. But this definition likewise shows that scurvy is not a disease in the same sense as pneumonia or inflammatory rheumatism. It simply results from the deprivation of certain constituents which are indispensable to the integrity of the organism. Hence the cure of scurvy by lemon-juice and succulent vegetables can not be adduced as a proof against the universality of the homœopathic law. Nevertheless if you want to have evidence that lemon-juice is homœopathic to scurvy, I refer you to Pereira's remarks on the action of mineral and VEGETABLE ACIDS upon the blood. "The diluted mineral and vegetable acids," says Pereira, "when swallowed in moderate doses, at first allay thirst, sharpen the appetite, and promote digestion. They check preternatural heat, reduce the frequency and force of the pulse, lessen cutaneous perspiration, allay the troublesome itching of prurigo, sometimes prove diuretic, and occasionally render the urine unusually acid. Under this use, the milk often acquires a griping quality, and the bowels become slightly relaxed. By their long-continued employment, the tongue becomes coated with a whitish but moist fur, the appetite and digestion are impaired; while griping and relaxation of the bowels, with febrile disorder, frequently occur. If their use be still persevered in, they more deeply injure the assimilative processes, AND A KIND OF SCORBUTIC CACHEXY IS ESTABLISHED."

Now I come to your last specific, iodine for goïtre. Do you mean to assert that iodine will cure every CURABLE case of goïtre? That it is a certain, positive, infallible specific for every curable case of this disease? If so, you cannot have treated many cases of goïtre. Goïtres that have resisted the action of iodine in large and small doses, have yielded quite readily to small quantities of the iodide of mercury ointment rubbed upon the goïtre. Other goïtres have been cured by roast sponge taken inwardly and applied externally in the shape of an ointment.

You say that you are not acquainted with a single case of goïtre produced by iodine. If you are not you have not read Dr. Wilcox's paper entitled: Observations on the Curative and Noxious Effects of Iodine, illustrated by cases, and published

in the first volume of the Annals of the British Homœopathic Society. A case is described in this paper, in which goïtre was produced *ab initio* by the administration of ten grains of iodide of potassium daily for a week. That the action of iodine upon goïtre is of an irritant character, is testified to by Dr. Wood in his Materia Medica, Vol. II, page 334. "Sometimes," says Dr. Wood, "the bronchocele, instead of yielding immediately, seems to be stimulated into inflammation, swelling and becoming somewhat painful." Coindet, who first discovered the use of iodine in goïtre, Græffe of Berlin, Peschier in Hufeland's Journal, and others likewise inform us that under the action of iodine the size and hardness of the tumors first increase before a decrease takes place. That iodine exerts an irritant action upon the liver, and causes an enlargement of this viscus and of the agminated glands, as in typhus, is shown in Dr. Cogswell's (Edinburgh, 1837) Prize Essay upon iodine and its compounds. Strangers after residing in this community for some time and drinking our lime water, are sometimes attacked with enlargement of the thyroid, others with enlargement of the submaxillary and parotid glands; I cure them of this trouble by advising them to acidulate the water they drink with a little vinegar or lemon juice. Goïtre seems to be a specific anomaly, originating in some specific influence with the true nature of which we are as yet unacquainted. If this be so, it may not be in the power of any drug to reproduce a full representation of goïtre as a permanent and unvarying effect of the drug, although a case is on record, where goïtre was caused by the iodide of potassium; at any rate, your statement, page 37, that "iodine has never, so far as I know or believe, produced anything resembling goïtre," is shown to be false.

Your reference to Colchicum has nothing to do here. Its action in gout is simply palliative; it is a derivative action, obtained by physicking the bowels.

You must have felt very ill-natured towards Hahnemann when you penned the following lines in your second lecture, page 43.

"The remedy most frequently used by most Homœopaths in

acute diseases, is aconite. They pretend to have established by their provings that it is homœopathic to fevers and inflammations; and is used in infinitesimal doses to counteract these conditions. But the fact is, aconite never caused a fever nor an inflammation. It acts much like veratrum viride, tartar emetic, and other depressing agents when given in perceptible doses. In infinitesimal doses, of course, it has no effect. When given in free doses, as it is by many Homœopaths, it is an antipathic remedy in inflammation."

Or when you penned the following words in your fourth lecture: "The Homœopaths declare that pleurisy will be cured in twenty-four hours by aconite. Will that agent cause pleurisy or anything like it? Who could have the hardihood to pretend that such is the fact?"

You say that aconite does not cause inflammatory fever. Now, my dear Professor, what is the use of making such reckless assertions? Instead of picking out a few passages here and there from my Materia Medica, Hahnemann's Organon and a few other works of our school, and stringing them together into four rambling, incoherent and illogical lectures, why not investigate the facts as they are, and admit them like a man? I have devoted a number of pages to a full exposition of the therapeutic range of aconite, and have shown by the incontrovertible testimony of facts that aconite causes inflammatory fever and that its action upon the capillary system develops a series of phenomena which is typical of what we have been in the habit of terming ACUTE CONGESTION, and in a higher degree, INFLAMMATION.

Here is what I say of pleurisy which seems to be especially obnoxious to you, no doubt because the allopathic bleeding, leeching, blistering, purging and narcotizing processes consume at least a couple of weeks to cure such a disease. "And why should we not look upon Aconite as a sovereign remedy in acute pleurisy?—stiches of various degrees of intensity in the chest and sides of the chest, especially during inspiration and when coughing, frequently accompanied with a plaintive and whining mood, anguish and ill-humor, or with oppression of breathing; if these symptoms are accompanied by inflammatory fever,

bloody cough, headache, have we not a well-defined group of symptoms of pleuritis? Aconite will effect a speedy change in these symptoms." To illustrate the wonderful curative power of aconite in this disease, I relate the following case: "In the case of a powerful man, but sensitive to the action of medicine, I effected a cure of acute pleurisy in three days, by means of the 30th potency. I saw him in the evening and found him in great distress. His pulse was up to 140, full and hard; he complained of distressing headache, especially in the frontal region, vomiting of bile, acute stitches in the left side, near the apex of the heart, and rendering it impossible for him to expand his chest; he had a racking cough and expectorated blood and mucus. I put the patient on Aconite 30th, and on the third day after this treatment commenced, he was out attending to his business, without the least cough, pain, or difficulty of any kind remaining. Such an extraordinary result is undoubtedly of rare occurrence, but it shows the power of reasonably high potencies of Aconite to effect a speedy cure in acute inflammations of the pleura." I do not suppose, my dear Professor, *that you would be uncivil enough* to say that this report is not true; but if it is true, what right have you to say that aconite in infinitesimal doses does not act?

"Small doses," you say, page 18, "are a necessary part of the homœopathic system; and whenever the larger doses of medicine are given, they are not selected in accordance with the sole universal law of cure."

Where is this stated? Hahnemann, at the beginning of his homœopathic career, gave large doses; to a woman who complained of a shooting stitch in her epigastrium whenever she brought her foot down too firmly, he administered a whole drop of the crude tincture of Bryonia alba, and cured her at once, after she had been suffering for weeks. He soon found that when administering the usual doses of medicine in accordance with homœopathic similarity, the medicine often produced an aggravation of the symptoms, which, although temporary, nevertheless was very annoying. Then he gradually came to divide the dose more and more either

by triturating the drug with sugar of milk, or attenuating it with alcohol. To carry out the process of progressive division, all he required was thirty small vials, not oceans of alcohol and mountains of sugar of milk. Here, then, we have two facts essentially distinct, a law, and the method of applying it in practice. The perception of the law was a DISCOVERY, the method of applying it, an INVENTION, both due to the genius of Hahnemann. The law is unchangeable, because a law of Nature; the invention is changeable because peculiar to Hahnemann as an individual, and therefore bounded and characterized by his individual taste, judgment and experience. This invention is liable to modifications, and has been, and will be still further modified as our knowledge of the pharmacodynamic properties of drugs and of the best mode of developing their therapeutic virtues progresses. If you understand this process of reasoning, you will admit that your statement regarding larger doses not being homœopathic, or selected in accordance with the law of Homœopathy, is essentially erroneous. Dose has nothing to do with the law, it has only to do with the application of the law, and I repeat to you what I have said in my lecture before the last Legislature: "There is no such a thing as a homœopathic dose; the term homœopathic expresses the doctrine that a drug, in order to cure a disease quickly, safely and radically, must be capable of developing in healthy persons an artificial medicinal disease similar to the natural malady. A dose of ten grains of quinine might be administered in strict accordance with the homœopathic law, whereas in other cases an infinitesimal globule might be without any sort of homœopathic relationship to the disease. It is not the quantity of the dose, but the nature of the remedial agent which constitutes the homœopathicity of the drug to the disease. And it must be apparent to my hearers that if allopathic physicians tell their patients: we practice homœothy, we give very little medicine, or no medicine at all, a few bread pills, perhaps, they tell them, either wittingly or unwittingly a falsehood. No physician prescribes a medicine homœopathically, in accordance with the law *similia similibus curan-*

tur, unless the medicine is capable of eliciting in healthy persons the counterpart of the disease for which it is prescribed as a remedy."

In dividing the dose by means of the process of trituration and succussion, Hahnemann did not believe that a new power was added to the medicine, but that its inherent power was developed, set free as it were, and grafted for the time being upon the sugar of milk or the alcohol as its vehicles. Hahnemann's idea was that the more the inherent drug force is disembarrassed from its material substratum, the more active it becomes, but that this increase of activity is in a great measure modified by the breaking up of the material substratum. I intend to show on some future occasion that this opinion of the discoverer of Homœopathy embodies a principle of high philosophy, contains the germs of a grand cosmogonical edifice; for the present it may suffice to state that the doctrine of dynamization or potentization as propounded by Hahnemann, does not enjoy the concurrence of all Homœopathic practitioners, and that some of the best men among us reject it as unfounded and unphilosophical. But, as I said before, this doctrine is part of a changeable invention, it is not part of the unchangeable law.

Small, not infinitesimal doses, however, necessarily and logically result from the operations of the unchangeable and eternal law. Begin the practice of Homœopathy with large doses, and experience will at once demonstrate to you the fact that small doses are necessary to the successful operation of medicines administered in accordance with the homœopathic law. This is not a matter of opinion or theory, it is a matter of experimental fact. Experience shows that pneumonia, pleuritis, typhus, and other acute diseases are more successfully treated with attenuated medicines than with crude tinctures; but no physician is bound to definite, unchanging rules in this respect. His own judgment, knowledge, and the circumstances of the case, the constitutional idiosyncrasies of the patient guide him in determining what dose he ought to prescribe, and how often he ought to repeat the medicine. Hahnemann's

teachings in this respect are based upon his own individual experience; the experience of his followers has confirmed some, but not all of these teachings, and they do not hesitate to proclaim this fact broadly and unreservedly; and in this respect they differ greatly from their allopathic opponents who seem to be afraid of every ray of light that might reveal to an abused Humanity the cruel practices of Old Physic.

Nature is a permanent revelation of the effects of infinitesimal quantities. The small doses of Homœopathy are no longer an object of satire to the truly distinguished opponents of this science. "We do not belong to the party of those," write Trousseau and Pidoux, "who fancy they have done with Hahnemann, after invoking Arago's authority to prove that the decillionth part of a grain is proportioned to a whole grain, as an atom which is invisible to the naked eye is to the bulk of the sun. Assuredly, the quantity of the pestilential or small-pox miasm which is required to kill a man is exceedingly small, and we are not aware whether Arago has ever endeavored to find out the relative weight or volume of this fractional miasm."

Arago never dreamed of solving a problem which seems to have been solved by the Professor of Pathology in the University of Michigan. Here is your own announcement of this interesting and unparalleled feat:

Page 68 you write: "The infectious or contagious poison is germinal, as has already been stated, is a living cell or molecule, capable of multiplication in the system. It must and does multiply before it produces its effects. The smallest particle of this germinal matter introduced into the system by inhalation in the air, or by inoculation into the skin, thus reaching the blood, after a week or two, the period of incubation, as it is called, so increases in the body, taking nutrient materials to itself, as to manifest the most decided effects, the phenomena of the disease; and PRODUCING THE MOST SENSIBLE AMOUNT, EVEN OUNCES, AND PERHAPS POUNDS OF THE SAME KIND OF MATTER, IN SMALLPOX, passing off in effluvia, or accumula-

ting in the pustules which are so abundant. But no one pretends that medicines are living germinal matters, thus multiplying in the system. Thus the analogy and the illustration entirely fail, and common sense and common sanity so strongly protest against the possibility of such effects that I need say no more."

I hope, my dear Professor, that you will bequeath to the University the scales upon which you have weighed ounces or pounds of the smallpox contagium; they will immortalize your fame either for better or for worse, as Horace has it: "*Monumentum ære perennius.*"

Speaking of contagium and infinitesimal doses, I may as well allude to another passage in your lectures, second lecture, page 32, where you evidently labor under some misapprehension. You say: "The method of contagion is by particles of morbid *germinal* matter passing from a person affected with a particular specific disease, as smallpox, to another person, through the air, or by contact of the persons; and this living, morbid, germinal matter, multiplying in the blood and other parts of the body into which it is received, at length comes to exist in sufficient amount to produce the same disease. Thus a simple germ however small, by multiplication, receiving nourishment and the elements of growth from the body in which it is operating, becomes sufficient in quantity to produce effects. But medicines, particles of dead matter, incapable of growth and multiplication, can have no likeness to contagion in communicating their properties from one man to another, or to the living body. It will thus be seen that the operation of very small particles of vaccine, or other kinds of virus, cannot, with any propriety, be used to illustrate the supposed effects of imponderable quantities of medicines."

You talk very glibly in this passage about a contagium being living, morbid germinal matter, passing from a person affected with a peculiar specific disease, as smallpox, to another person, etc. Now, if I chose to be very pointed, I might ask you: Do you consider smallpox, the plague, cholera, yellow fever and the like, co-existing with the creation

of man? How did the first smallpox, plague or yellow-fever patients catch the disease? I should like to know how you will prove that the contagious effluvia passing from a smallpox patient are any more living than his urine or excrements. What leaves the living body ceases to be living; life is communicated to the things which it assimilates to the living tissues. How will you prove that the contagium floating about the atmosphere, is any more living than the extract I obtain from the living drug-plant? Is the carbonic acid which the growing cabbage-plant absorbs while attached to its stalk in the soil, a living body? After the carbon is assimilated to the tissue of the plant, it acquires the living properties of the latter, and the oxygen is returned to the atmosphere to be assimilated by the living human organism. Sever the cabbage-head from its stalk, and it becomes as dead as any human head after decapitation. But the dead cabbage-head may be converted into living brain. Organization is not life; you seem to consider organization and life convertible terms. Besides no microscopist has ever yet beheld any morbific miasm disconnected from the living organism. It does not become amenable to observation until it has invaded at least one primitive cell, fibril. Hence it is the poisoned cell, not the miasm, which he sees. The doctrine of the fungoid origin of diseases is as yet very shaky. For a brilliant refutation of your doctrine of "animate contagion" I refer you to an article by Professor Horatio C. Wood, in the University of Pennsylvania, entitled: "An examination into the truth of the asserted production of General Diseases by Organized Entities," in the October number, 1868, of the American Journal of the Medical Sciences. The article concludes as follows: "In conclusion perhaps it is allowable to state that some two or three years since, the writer of this paper was strongly inclined to believe in the doctrine of animate contagion, having imbibed it during his student life, and that this essay has not been the result solely of studies especially undertaken for the purpose; but that during the progress of other microscopic investigations, the evidence so gathered itself in his mind as to lead him into

this by-path, and to leave with him no doubt that general diseases are not caused by organic entities. There is a vast accumulation of negative evidence which repudiates the doctrine of animate contagion, either as taught by Linnæus or by more recent authorities. There are no known facts establishing the doctrine; there are many such which strongly support the negtive proposition." Upon the whole, Professor, you had better let your living-cell contagium depart in peace.

You say, page 38 : "The Homœopaths insist that these homœopathic medicines affect the system at the very point where the disease affects it, and in a similar manner, but yet so as to overcome the morbid action. But these are theoretical assumptions, unsustained by proofs ; and, as we believe, contrary to both facts and reason."

Is your doctrine of a living contagium, and its operations in the organism any less a theoretical assumption than the doctrine that the disease and the action of the homœopathic remedial agent enter the organism by the same door as it were ? I think not. I believe, and I shall endeavour to explain this more fully in some future publication, that the drug-force in its essence is identical with the morbific force which produces the disease to which the drug is said to be homœopathic. My doctrine is that "Similarity, in a therapeutic point of view, is determined by identity of essence ; and that the drug-disease is said to be similar to, not identical with, the natural malady for the reason that the drug-disease is developed in the organism INDIRECTLY, through the medium of the drug; whereas the natural malady is the result of a DIRECT action of the morbific force upon corresponding parts of the organism ; hence, the drug-force being essentially the same as the disease-producing principle, must necessarily meet the latter at the very point where it first invades the organism. Here it is where the struggle between the remedial force and the morbific element commences ; this struggle may sometimes be very short, and sometimes it may have to be continued through a whole series of developments, and its management may require skill and patience. The natural law which governs the course of many

diseases ; the circumstances, constitution and antecedents of the patient, necessarily come in for a large share in determining the duration of the struggle. Another important element of success is the physician's knowledge of the requisite amount of remedial force, neither more nor less, which he ought to bring to bear upon the enemy. Be this as it may, I can see very well how the remedial force, starting from the same point as the disease, and exerting its curative action from that beginning, may be enabled, if properly sustained by a repetition and perhaps a more suitable adaptation of the dose, to gradually follow up the morbific element in its course through the tissues, and ultimately control it, even as you suppose your contagium gradually poisons the organism.

It is well known that Hahnemann explained the operation of a homœopathic remedial agent in his own way; but he likewise says, section 28 of his Organon: "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." Hahnemann, I believe, is entitled to an opinion as well as anybody, but his opinions do not constitute an integral part of the science of Homœopathy, and you have no right, as you frequently do, to represent them as such.

Before dropping this subject, I must correct one more of the many misrepresentations and garbled quotations, with which your lectures abound. Page 60, in your third lecture, you quote me as saying:

"We hear of physicians using four and even six medicines, not only in the same case, but at the same time, alternating them in regular order; and Lutz, he says, in a late publication, has proposed to mix the remedies instead of attenuating them." And then you exclaim: "Thus we have the consistency and universality of homœopathic teachings as a doctrine of life, a heavenly truth illustrated."

Instead of resorting to this sneer, and applying my expres-

sions concerning Homœopathy as "a doctrine of life and heavenly truth," to the foregoing statement, would it not have been more becoming the dignity of a Professor of Pathology, if you had quoted the whole passage, adding the words: "This is undoubtedly a strange abuse of which no intelligent practitioner who comprehends our law of cure, and is fully conversant with our therapeutic resources, will ever render himself guilty." I mention this abuse reprovingly, not in a spirit of approval or commendation. Your frequent protestations that in delivering these lectures you were animated by the love of truth, and never meant to be designedly unjust, as page 57, where you say: "I have now presented all the essential principles of Hahnemann's Homœopathy, and in the language of its author and supporters. Not a single passage has been misquoted, designedly garbled, or in the least degree misrepresented, and I challenge contradiction as to a single statement made;" or, page 92, where you say: "Speaking, as it seems to me, without prejudice, and certainly without passion, and with an earnest desire to present the exact truth, this is what I believe to be the present Homœopathy which surrounds us," have an ugly look about them. A man who is conscious of his integrity of purpose and of the rectitude of his intentions does not resort to such gratuitous justifications and excuses before he is attacked; but I am not the keeper of your own conscience; you may be one of those unfortunate men who fancy that seeking to revile a scientific or philosophical truth is no crime because not so defined by the Revised Statutes; nevertheless it is a crime, a great crime, both against God and Humanity.

When Dr. Marcy taunts your allopathic colleagues on their pretensions, you get mad, and give vent to your wrath in these words, page 88: "Gentlemen you know how utterly and intensely untrue all this is. The man that could write such a paragraph as this, is capable of anything in the way of reckless statement and outrageous misrepresentation. No confidence can be placed in anything he could affirm." Evidently it does make a difference whose ox is gored.

I am reaching the end, my dear Professor, of which I am right glad both for your sake and mine. Before concluding I will correct a misstatement like the following, page 14: "In all the works of Hahnemann and his followers, remedies are placed in opposition to symptoms, ignoring everything else." Or page 16: "Remedies cannot on this plan, (the homœopathic plan) be directed to causes; it is impossible; they can only be directed to effects, to the symptoms." And then, by way of illustration, I suppose, you pick out from Jahr, in your usual manner, not for the purpose of exhibiting, but misrepresenting the truth, a few detached symptoms. Page 14, you say: "We find looking at different parts at random, the following directions: For absence of mind, irresoluteness (mere external manifestations, your own addition)—remedy: Alum. Absence of mind with confusion of thought: Cuprum. Making mistakes in writing: Natrum carbonicum. Frequent vanishing of thought: Oleum animale. Fear of death: Digitalis."

Where are you DIRECTED to prescribe the remedies you mention for these symptoms? These symptoms are presented by Jahr as parts of a whole series of drug-effects elicited by experimenting with these drugs upon persons in health. If one of the symptoms you have quoted, should occur as a prominent indication among the various symptoms the patient complains of, that more or most prominent indication might, perhaps, decide the choice of the remedy. Take, for instance, the symptom "fear of death." If a woman in confinement, or a young lady subject to paroxysms of hysteria or mental alienation, should complain of a group of symptoms, of which "fear of death" constitutes a most prominent part, this symptom, all the other symptoms corresponding, might decide the choice of the remedial agent. Thus in one case this symptom might point to Aconite, in another to Digitalis, in another to Aurum, in a fourth to Arsenic. And in thus prescribing for a symptom, the homœopathic physician would, at the same time, and necessarily, act upon the pathological condition, whether it be anæmia, nervous depression, amenorrhœa, or any other disorder.

You cannot help noticing, Professor, that by pursuing this course, the homœopathic practitioner enjoys a great advantage over an old-school physician. He not only takes cognizance of the perceptible symptoms, including both the subjective and objective phenomena of the disease, but he likewise inquires into the chronological order of their progressive manifestation, he determines their logical dependence upon each other by the light afforded by Physiology and Pathology, and traces them to the primary condition whence they emanate and which they reflect to the senses and to the reason of the observing physician. Every enlightened allopathic practitioner pursues the same course, but the Homœopath has this advantage over his allopathic colleague, that the former prescribes a remedy affecting the organism similarly to the disease and thus wipes it out in a DIRECT manner, not in the round-about manner of Old-Physic, by the uncertain methods of derivation, alteration, counter-irritation.

Nor is it necessary that the symptoms of the drug-series should correspond with the symptoms of the pathological series, link for link, from beginning to end. Homœopathy does not require any such servile symptom-treatment. Dropsy, for instance, is the ultimate terminal disorganization of a pathological series. To cure dropsy homœopathically we need not prescribe a medicine that has actually produced dropsy. To cure dropsy we prescribe a remedy which develops a series of subjective symptoms or sensations and objective changes starting from the same initial point as the pathological series, and which, if carried to its ultimate extreme, would result in similar disorganizations. Let me state an example by way of illustration: I was once called upon to prescribe for a Parisian lady who had an attack of ascites. She told me that she had had three similar attacks in Paris, for which she was tapped by the celebrated Dupuytreu. Her first attack was the result of a sudden fright. On attempting to cross the street during the revolution of July, a man was shot down in front of her. The shock to her nerves caused ascites. She had been in this country for several years when the effusion returned again. I

prescribed for her in accordance with the exciting cause which was the "shock to the nerves by fright." The remedy was Aconite. Every Homœopathic physician having a proper knowledge of the science and practice of Homœopathy would have made the same prescription. Aconite does not cause dropsy, but it has the same effect upon the nerves as a sudden fright. A few days after beginning to use the Aconite (I gave her the German tincture prepared of the fresh plant, leaves and root included) she commenced discharging a sanguinolent liquid from the vagina. Occasionally large black looking coagula were mixed with the liquid. Very soon the discharge amounted to several quarts a day until the effused fluid had all disappeared. Whether the dropsy returned again at a later period I am unable to say, for the lady left the city and I have not heard from her since. Aconite is not, generally speaking, a remedy for dropsy, but in this case the dropsy was merely symptomatic of a general state of nervous depression and irritation, resulting in a corresponding decomposition of the circulatory fluid.

My therapeutic proceeding in this case was strictly in accordance with Hahnemann's fundamental doctrine as expressed in the fifth paragraph of the Organon, where he says: "When a cure is to be performed, the physician must avail himself of all the particulars he can learn, both respecting the probable origin of the acute malady and the most significant points in the history of the chronic disease, to aid him in the discovery of their FUNDAMENTAL CAUSE, which is commonly due to some chronic miasm. In all researches of this nature, he must take into consideration the apparent state of the physical constitution of the patient, (particularly when the affection is chronic,) the disposition, occupation, mode of life, habits, social relations, age, sexual functions, etc., etc."

With what grace can you, in the presence of such teachings, tell your class, page 70: "You have been taught that it is more important to change pathological conditions, and to remove morbid causes, than to aim your treatment at the mere

palliation or removal of symptoms. But the homœopathic method, based upon the alleged similarity of drug-effects to the symptoms of disease, cannot act on this principle."

Evidently, my dear Professor, you know a great deal of Homœopathy. This knowledge is likewise displayed in a very brilliant manner in the following paragraph, page 38: "The symptom stupor, for which opium would be given, because in large doses it produces stupor, may arise from a variety of proximate causes, from the state of the brain existing in concussion, from compression of that organ, from blood poisoning, from arrested nutrition of the brain in a great variety of diseases, from nervous exhaustion, etc. But in prescribing for symptoms alone, as Hahnemann taught, these various circumstances are disregarded, etc."

These various circumstances are disregarded, are they? Indeed, let us see. In the paragraph from the Organon which I have quoted, Hahnemann makes it a fundamental rule of practice that the cause of the disease must be investigated and the treatment conducted accordingly. Let us apply this rule to the symptom "stupor." If, in the course of exanthematic typhus, stupor occurs, it becomes an indication for Belladonna, Opium, perhaps Hyoscyamus; this would depend upon the other co-existing symptoms of the disease. A comatose condition of the brain may occur in consequence of a severe mortification of one's feelings. An elderly gentleman had his feelings terribly hurt by an insult, in consequence of which he very soon sank into a comatose condition, with a heavy and slow pulse, and the pupils contracted to the size of a pin's head. His tongue was thickly coated white. I gave him a few powders of sugar of milk moistened with the 18th potency of Opium, a powder every fifteen minutes. After the second powder the pulse rallied, some perspiration set in, the pupils resumed their natural size, the patient talked with perfect ease and consciousness, and fell into a sound sleep from which he awoke quite well. Another illustration: A boy fell from our railroad bridge into the river. He was taken out in a state of stupor and unconsciousness. Concussion of the brain, and consequent hyper-

æmia were diagnosed. Veratrum viride was prescribed and the boy got well. Again: An old farmer fell from the top of a hay-stack directly on his head. For a fortnight after this accident he was not very lively, when I was suddenly sent for by the family. I found the old gentleman comatose, and pus discharging from his ear on the side of his head on which he fell. The coma had set in with a violent chill. Diagnosis: Compression of the brain from the effusion of pus. Prognosis: Death in the course of the next twenty-four hours. The result was as predicted. I have cured attacks of syncope with stupor resulting from an anæmic condition of the brain, by means of small quantities of wine, iron and quinine. I have cured a man who had been bled eight times for pneumonia, and was constantly lapsing into a state of drowsiness, amounting to stupor, by means of a few small doses of homœopathic attenuations of Aconite and Cinchona. Where is your Opium in all these cases? Where is your disregard of the etiological and pathological circumstances of the case? What right have you, Professor, to represent Homœopaths like a pack of silly fools, whereas the silliness and folly are all on the other side?

How much pathological wisdom is there in the following passage, page 16? "Now, according to the principles you have been taught, a fever caused by suppression of the secretion of the skin, is properly treated by endeavoring to restore that secretion, thus attempting to remove the cause, to eliminate by the skin morbid materials in the blood causing the fever."

If a fever of this kind is sufficiently severe to require the interference of art, the cutaneous secretion is very readily restored under homœopathic treatment. The selection of the most suitable remedy for this purpose would depend upon the totality of the existing indications. If the patient complains of headache, the cheeks are flushed, the skin is hot and dry, the tongue somewhat coated, the pulse is full, hard and bounding, and the patient complains of the heat of the room, we remove all these symptoms and restore the normal action of the skin and the natural temperature of the system by means of a very small dose of Aconite, say a drop of the second or third atten-

uation. If the patient complains of feeling chilly, wants to be in a warm room, near the stove, the palms of the hands are dry and warm, he looks rather pale, the tongue is slightly coated, he has some headache, dizziness, feels thirsty, is a little sick at the stomach, the pulse is slightly accelerated, a few doses of the fourth to sixth trituration of Mercury will soon restore the disturbed equilibrium. I have known families where the mildest catarrhal fever would at once assume a typhoid character, and where a few doses of Belladonna had to be given at the outset.

But you know as well as I do; at any rate, being a Professor of Pathology, you ought to know, that a suppression of the perspiration may, and frequently does result in something much more serious than a simple catarrhal fever. It may give rise to inflammatory fever with local inflammations, pneumonia, pleurisy, meningitis, etc., to remittent fevers of various forms and degrees of intensity; it may open the door for the invasion of zymotic diseases; all this may depend upon the prevailing type of the disease, upon hygienic and dietetic conditions, upon constitutional peculiarities, idisynocrasies, etc. How does your therapeutic rule of restoring the secretion of the skin apply in such cases? If you made this statement for the purpose of having a fling at the Homœopaths, I can excuse it; as a lesson of therapeutics it is unmeaning nonsense.

I cannot help thinking that a good sound course of lectures to your students on the subject of Homœopathy would result in great good to your class. Old-Physic is evidently revolving in a vicious circle. Sir Thomas Watson is right when he says that the science of therapeutics only exists in expectation. So was Sir John Forbes when he writes in his work entitled: "Homœopathy and Young Physic," that "Old Physic cannot be worse, and that it must either mend or end." What other conclusions can you arrive at on reading the following final passage of Dr. Hudson's 14th Lecture on Fevers: "In suffocative bronchitis the patient's life will often depend upon the energy and watchfulness of the physician. Decoction of Senega with Carbonate of Ammonia; boluses of Camphor and

Carbonate of Ammonia; oil of Turpentine in doses of half a drachm or a drachm; and, in desperate cases, tincture of Cantharides, in 30 or 40 drop doses in combination with the Turpentine, have been the remedies most successful in my experience. With these should be conjoined the most liberal allowance of brandy or whisky, in the form of punch; and the use of every possible mode of external stimulation, as sinapisms, turpentine epithems, and blisters, more especially flying blisters, as recommended by Dr. Graves. I recollect a patient whose life was saved by my pouring boiling water upon his legs, after all the above mentioned means had failed. He was fast sinking into the fatal coma in which these cases terminate, and could not be aroused by any measures which had been previously employed. The pain produced by the scalding water, however, did so most effectually, and under the use of the Turpentine and Cantharides mixture he eventually recovered; the only bad consequence being a large superficial sore on the calf of each leg, which, however, healed rapidly."

Is not this mode of treatment the grossest empiricism? I have read of a yellow-fever patient who, in a fit of delirium, jumped from the third-story window into the Mississippi and was taken out of the water perfectly sane; he recovered from that moment. Quite recently I read of a man who, in a fit of delirium tremens, jumped out of the third story window upon the pavement. The fall was broken by an awning. The man did not hurt himself much and was rational from that instant. No humane teacher of medicine would recommend such proceedings, including the scalding process, as rational treatment. Old-Physic dignifies them by the name of heroic measures.

I apply to you and the men of your school, the very words you address to Homœopaths, page 90 of your Lectures: Men who believe, or even pretend to believe, in such practices, will never create the science of therapeutics, never. On the other hand, I agree with the writer in the United States Medical and Surgical Journal for January, 1867, page 212, when he extols the great men of Old Physic. But I am sorry to say that even in this matter you have sought to benefit your side very unjustly

and improperly by garbling the honorably frank and just commendations and admissions of the Journal's correspondent. In order to correct your misstatements I shall have to quote your own passage, page 90, of your fourth Lecture, and the passage you quote from in the Journal, entire. You write: "In the Homœopathic United States Medical and Surgical Journal, for January, 1867, page 212, we find the following lamentation: 'A leaden apathy has for a long time past been upon our Homœopathic physicians East. We want solid acquirements everywhere; we want in our schools more pathologists and learned physicians—as Bennett, Watson and a score of others. Writers, for instance, upon female diseases, and their surgical and mechanical treament; and writers on obstetrics, such as Bennett of London, Sims, Simpson and Barnes. When will issue from our ranks writers of such worth as Roger, Cazenave, or Wilson on diseases of the skin? Louis, Andral and Skoda on diseases of the chest? West, on diseases of children? Or such pathologists as Rokitansky, Virchow, or Bock? Homœopathy is here a *humiliated beggar* to Allopathy. Produce! produce! were it but the pitifullest infinitesimal fraction of a produce, produce it, in God's name!'"

This is your quotation, literally. Now I do not agree with the writer if he means to extol these great men as against the Homœopaths. The works of these men belong to the domain of Medicine generally, which is our domain as well as that of any other class of physicians. We do not profess to have a homœopathic Surgery, a homœopathic Pathology, a homœopathic Obstetrics; to be sure, wherever medical treatment is required, we differ from our medical brethren of the other side even in these collateral Sciences. Our great claim is to have filled the gap which Sir Thomas Watson so keenly perceived and pointed out; we have DISCOVERED AND CREATED THE SCIENCE OF THERAPEUTICS.

But now let us see how far the Journal's article bears you out in the inferences which you evidently designed your hearers should draw from your garbled quotation.

The Journal's article is a letter written by its New York

correspondent. The passage you have garbled, originally reads as follows: "A leaden apathy has for a long time past been upon our homœopathic physicians East, *at least as compared with what is being done by our brethren West, both as regards medical literature and medical investigations. Our best literature in this country has of late come principally from the pens of Western writers. Our Colleges should all be replete with life and learning.*" This passage which I have italicised, is left out by you purposely, and evidently for no other reason than because it speaks a kind word in favor of the homœopathic physicians of the West. Here you begin to quote, and stop where you ought to have continued. The article goes on: "westward, you are working; and I hope we shall see some day here, a league of workers, masterly exponents of medical science. We want too, here, men who are *authorities* in specialties. While we have, for example, men of as great ability in Obstetrics, we have none of such generally recognized ability as is conceded to several old-school practitioners, and the same is true of Surgery. Homœopathy is *sometimes* here a humiliated beggar to Allopathy" (you leave out the word sometimes, by which the writer evidently meant to indicate the necessity in which homœopathic practitioners are sometimes placed to call an allopathic brethren in council), "and the reason is", as the writer further states, "because our physicians are not sufficiently leagued together to give their united support to any member of their School in any thing, no matter how great talent he may possess; and let a homœopathic physician here be never so skilled in diseases of the chest, the uterus, skin, or any thing else, he would receive but a limited amount of aid from his brethren. Is it more politic to conceal these facts, or is it wiser to face them?

"Our Institutions, too, should be filled by scholars eminent in theoretical and practical medicine, and the value of our medical societies should be enhanced by contributions of papers —the fruit, not of compilations, but of months of study, and which should embody the results of extended observations in the sick-room. Our physicians, if they cannot find in their private practice material enough to give them new or important

ideas upon a particular class of diseases, should seek them in tenement houses, if necessary, or in dispensaries. We ought all of us obey the injunction of Herr Tenfelsdrœckh—"Produce, produce!—were it but the pitifullest infinitesimal fraction of a product, produce it, in God's name! 'Tis the utmost thou hast in thee; out with it, then. Up! up! whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy whole might. Work while it is called to-day, for the night cometh, wherein no man can work."

This passage as originally written by the Journal's correspondent, reads far differently from what you would have it read in your garbled extract. Moreover Herr Tenfelsdrœckh's invitation in Carlyle's Sartor resartus was not intended for Homœopaths, but for all men; every one of us should be a worker on the broad field of Hamanity and contribute his might to the universal Good. It is in obedience to this duty, I suppose, that I have undertaken the task of setting you right on the subject of Homœopathy.

Among other things, I trust I have shown you that the size of the dose does not constitute Homœopathy, and that comparatively large doses may be given in perfect accord with the homœopathic law. Comparatively large doses are often necessary. If you want to expel tænia by means of Kousso or Filix mas, you have to give large doses of these drugs to accomplish this result. A free dose of Santonine may be required to expel lumbrici. The bite of a rattle-snake or a mad dog is not a disease like pneumonia, and requires the most active antidotal means for the prevention of its disastrous consequences. Various means are proposed, such as whisky, liquid ammonia, exsection of the parts, cauterization, the continued use of belladonna and bromide of potassium. Would you have a homœopathic physician undertake to neutralize the hydrophobic virus by an infinitesimal globule of Belladonna? How would you remove a quantity of cherry-pits from the bowels except by means of a gentle cathartic, say a dose of castor-oil? or a mass of indigestible material from the stomach except by an emetic, say a dose of ipecacuanha? I once was called to a little girl who had swallowed half a pound of dry raisins; the consequence was that she was thrown into convulsions. I gave

her an emetic which brought up all the noxious material, leaving her with a fever and symptoms of gastric irritation which were readily subdued by a few infinitesimal doses of Aconite and Nux vomica. What had this emetic to do either with Homœopathy or Allopathy? Here was a foreign substance, a noxa as it is called, to be removed; could this removal be accomplished more readily than by an emetic? If impacted scybala should give rise to incipient symptoms of enteritis or typhloënteritis, would you not remove this mass by means of a good dose of castor-oil? This fæcal mass acts like a foreign irritant which must come away before any medical treatment can be instituted for the beginning inflammation. I once was called to a lady in confinement who had not voided any urine for twenty-four hours. The bladder was enormously distended, the urea was coursing through the vessels, giving rise to a high fever and intense restlessness. The atony of the bladder had been caused by the pressure of the head upon this viscus during the act of parturition. I applied a cold-water compress to the bladder, at once this organ contracted and the urine rushed out like a perfect torrent. In order to please your absurd interpretation of the homœopathic law, I suppose I ought to have administered a globule of the thirtieth potency of aconite. Enough of all this nonsense.

You say, page 75, "It is stated by those in the best possible position to know, that the condition of Homœopathy is far better in America than in any other country and they attribute their greater success of the American so-called homœopathic physicians, to their departing more from Homœopathy, and adopting more from the Regular School here than any where else."

I am in a much better position to know than your informant. That information was conveyed to you by somebody who loves Homœopathy no better than you do. American homœopaths are generally men of liberal and generous tendencies, and they despise the narrow-minded bigotry and Trades'-Union spirit of their allopathic opponents. They believe that man was neither

created for a medical caste nor a medical doctrine, but that Medicine exists for the sake of man, and that it is the solemn duty of every physician to acquaint himself with, and to use in practice every therapeutic means that may promote the recovery of his patient and the welfare of Society. If American physicians practice Homœopathy, it is because they have became satisfied, upon careful investigation and after abundant trials, that Homœopathy is the most humane, most beneficent and safest system of practice which will conquer the minds of the Profession as surely as universal recognition awaits every known law of Nature.

It seems to me a blessed thing that Homœopathy should have been revealed to the world to rescue it from the brutalizing materialism into which modern Chemistry, Physiology and the Physical Sciences generally are fast plunging this poor and misguided Humanity. Every thing is reduced to matter by modern investigators. If Professor Huxley's late Lecture may be considered as a criterium, life is but the result of organization ; vital manifestations are but the properties of matter, and, by a legitimate process of deductive reasoning, the Eternal Spirit is but the property of a material Universe, and the result of a combination of material molecules. Old Physic goes hand in hand with this debasing Physicism. Disease is something grossly material that must be salivated, sweated, purged, puked out of the Organism. The chemical formulas of the normal tissues have to be reconstructed by eliminating or adding chemical ingredients. Liebig and Lehmann have become the masters of Therapeutics. Homœopaths are sweeping their chemical cobwebs into the dust. HINC ILLÆ LACHRYMÆ!