

Blair A POPULAR TREATISE  
(Geo. H.)

CONCERNING

# H O M Œ O P A T H Y :

TO WHICH IS PREFIXED

A BRIEF GLANCE AT THE FALLACIES

OF THE

OLD SCHOOL OF MEDICINE.

BY GEO. H. BLAIR, M. D.

28138

---

COLUMBUS, O.:  
OSGOOD & PEARCE, PRINTERS.  
1857.



## P R E F A C E .

---

“The greatest study of mankind is man.”—POPE.

“Throw physic to the dogs.”—SHAKESPEARE.

IN this age of the world, with its vast improvements in all that pertains to Science, Philosophy, and the Arts—with its gigantic strides in Literature and Politics—it is a lamentable fact that so few of mankind should turn their attention to the great laws which govern Life and Health. While each annual revolution witnesses new discoveries and inventions in all the collateral branches of learning, and a corresponding recognition and acceptance of their advantages, the subject of Medicine is left comparatively alone. A blind reliance upon the dogmas of two thousand years ago, or the equally culpable disposition of encouraging quacks and charlatans, have prevented, in some degree, the advancement of a specific, and therefore only *true* method of cure.

It is with a view of arresting this negligence, and of calling attention to the great importance of a proper understanding of the laws which govern disease and the administration of remedies, and at the same time of furnishing some practical facts and arguments in support of the doctrine which the author advocates, adapted to the comprehension of the non-medical public, that this little treatise is undertaken.

It has been thought proper, previous to entering upon an explanation of the beautiful simplicity which characterizes the Homœopathic System of Practice, to glance briefly at some of the more prominent theories which have from time to time been advanced by the advocates of the Old School, so called, with their ridiculous absurdities and graver effects; none of which, however, are more absurd or prejudicial than many of the errors taught and promulgated at the present day.

A few facts are also added, relative to the *present condition of Homœopathy*, from which the friends of the system may judge of

the veracity of those who are constantly asserting that it is "*dying out*." Is not their *desire* substituted for the *reality*?

It may be proper, in order to disarm criticism, that the author should disclaim any effort at originality, either in composition or matter;\* and to reiterate the assertion, that the enlightenment of his immediate friends and patrons in regard to a system which they have adopted, together with a desire to supply food for reflection to those who are earnestly inquiring after light on the subject, have been the only inducements to engage in the pleasant task.

And to those who would attribute selfish or mercenary views as the motives for publication, he would apply the celebrated French motto :

"*Honi soit qui mal y pense!*"

---

\* To "Paris' Pharmacologia" I am greatly indebted for many of the strictly historical facts contained herein.

# HOMŒOPATHY.

---

## RETROSPECTIVE.

As far back as History gives us any information, we are able to find traces of a rudimental Healing Art. Indeed, we cannot imagine to ourselves a condition of society in which the ills of human life were prevalent, without associating with it a corresponding remedial element of alleviation. In the story of the Good Samaritan we have an approximation to a true physician; and the Bible furnishes us with numerous instances of disease, and of the simple remedies then in vogue. Even several hundred years before the Christian era, we can trace rude and fragmentary signs of the art, but of so vague and unsatisfactory a nature as to give us no settled views regarding its application. It was not until the establishment of the Temple of Esculapius, in Greece, that records of diseases and their remedies were resorted to, and the confused elements of Physic obtained something like a system. But of the precise nature of their remedial means we are left in ignorance; and not until the days of Hippocrates do we find any satisfactory data from which to trace our history. From him were derived many of the doctrines which prevail even now; and notwithstanding the changes which may have occasionally occurred, or the innovations made, he may with truth be styled the "Father of Medicine;" and he and his immediate disciples be looked to as the founders of the system, as generally practiced at the present day. True, their notions of pathology were different in some respects, and from the very nature of things they were unable to employ the many and useless drugs of the present; yet many, if not most, of the precepts they inculcated, in modified forms, are adhered to even now.

It would be superfluous here to enumerate all the various theories which have from time to time been advanced by the more prominent lights of the medical firmament—Paracelsus, Sydenham, Stahl and others. Suffice it, that they were a tissue of incongruous absurdities, each flourishing in its day, and each disappearing to give rise to

another equally absurd. But from the mass of experience thus thrown together, much really useful information, and many valuable hints have been derived, and to this extent should their value be acknowledged.

#### ACTION OF REMEDIES.

In regard to the action of remedies, the most conflicting theories have prevailed. Galen supposed that the elementary properties of bodies—heat, cold, moisture and dryness—constituted their useful indications. Consequently, in disease characterized by coldness, it was thought necessary that heat should be applied, or rather remedies containing the properties of heat; in those conditions in which dryness was a predominant condition, moisture was supposed to be indicated; and in reverse cases, the same rule should govern.

The *Methodic* physicians attributed disease either to one or the other of two causes only—*relaxation* or *over-action* of the system; and, as a consequence, but two conditions were to be accomplished—tonic measures in one instance and depletion in the other.

The *Mechanical* theory attributed all derangements to obstructions in the blood; and its remedies were those supposed to exert a mechanical force upon the cause of disease. Upon this hypothesis the action of Mercury and Iron was supposed to depend; that is, by their properties of gravitation.

The *Chemists* believed that the presence of disease was occasioned by some chemical change in the fluids or solids—that there must be a predominance of an acid or an alkali; and their practice was based thereon.

The most superficial observer cannot fail to perceive that the practice of the present day partakes more or less of each of these various theories; that, in fact, it is a medley of the whole, without the merit they possessed of being systematic. According to the whim of the individual physician, one or the other theory is adopted; and it is no difficult matter to perceive the immense bad results which must follow such a condition. As a single instance of the confusion which must necessarily arise from this want of systematic arrangement and application, let us glance for a moment at the treatment of cholera, as practiced by physicians influenced by

different views of the pathology of the disease. One advises cold water externally and internally ; another hot applications and sweating. One maintains that oxygen reddens the blood, and should therefore be given ; another, that because of the loss of heat, carbonic acid is the remedy. In consequence of the absence of bile in the stools, mercury should be prescribed ; and yet, as diarrhœa is the great evil, opium, which checks the flow of bile, can alone save the patient. One maintains that it is a stage of intermittent, and therefore quinine is the only hope ; while still another, disposed to go the full length, orders freely of arsenic. One advises extremely small doses of mercury or opium ; while another positively insists that the most enormous quantities can alone avail. Others again, in order the more certainly to "hit the mark," prescribe a combination of the whole, determined that nothing shall be wanting to constitute a *scientific treatment* !

Any individual who has been at all observant of the course usually pursued by physicians of the ancient school will bear witness to the correctness of these assertions ; and yet these same men have the effrontery and coolness to style themselves "*Regulars* !" Their *regularity* must consist in the united and dogged opposition they manifest toward any suggested improvement over their time-honored dogmas.

It is not denied that Anatomy, Chemistry, Physiology, Surgery, and the collateral branches of a physician's education, have made rapid progress, indeed, are almost perfected ; but it must be borne in mind that these adjuvants belong no more to one form of *practice* than another. Yet, as a natural result, their application is modified, in part, by the peculiar tenets one holds in reference to the theory of disease and cure, but their general practical truths and uses are common to all, of whatever profession. Let it be understood, therefore, that in maintaining the general proposition that the science of *medicine* has progressed but little, if at all, for centuries, among those who profess all the learning and all the skill pertaining thereto, we do not include the accessory branches, which are considered necessary to the accomplished physician.

## REMEDIAL MEASURES.

Among the remedial measures which have, at times, attained to popularity, and which have been recognized as standard prescriptions—some of them occupying a place even in the Pharmacies of but a few years since—it is proposed to mention a few of the more superstitious and absurd, and to demonstrate if there be not in our own day and generation a course of practice partaking more or less of the same fallacies, and equally ridiculous, considering the relative opportunities which existed in ancient and modern times for enlightenment and observation.

Josephus, the Jewish historian, tells us that Solomon employed charms and incantations to promote the effectual action of remedies. Pericles, one of the wisest of Athenian statesmen, wore an amulet about his neck to prevent sickness. Music was also a popular means, in ancient times, of soothing and allaying disorders. Even Democritus assures us that many ills may be cured by the tones of a flute. Celsus mentions as a sure cure for epilepsy the warm blood of a recently slain gladiator, or human or horse flesh; and as late as the time of Boerhave, these and similar offensive measures were adopted in the treatment of that affection. Homer says that the bleeding of Ulysses was stopped by a charm; and Lord Bacon, the greatest of philosophers, had implicit faith in the efficacy of this measure. Sir Theodore Mayerne, physician to three successive English Sovereigns, was in the habit of prescribing, among other equally disgusting appliances, the entrails of a mole *cut open alive*, and even the lungs of individuals who had died violent deaths!

Another remarkable instance which prevailed as an almost universal superstition, was the belief that scrofula could be cured by the touch of royal hands; and hence is derived the appellation of "king's evil," which is even now given to this disease. It was not until the accession of the House of Hanover to the English throne that this opinion was discountenanced; and to this day, among the vulgar, it is not entirely eradicated.

Not only were the remedies employed themselves absurd, but very frequently the observances to be performed in obtaining and administering them were of the same nature. Thus the stars and

planets and their relative positions were to be studied and consulted, as they were supposed to exercise a mysterious influence in the selection of a drug. Pliny tells us that vervain should be gathered at the rising of the dog-star, when neither sun nor moon shines, and *with the left hand only*, if we would secure its virtues. Hundreds of similar examples might be adduced, showing the prevailing ignorance and belief in the marvelous.

The same superstitious tendency was manifested in their attributing the causes of disease to the changes in the planetary system, and to the influence of witch-craft and other kindred sources. We are even told that to secure ourselves against the evil influences of sorcery, three scruples of the ashes of a witch, *well and carefully burnt*, may be relied on!

A system of medical practice, founded on such errors and superstitions, may well be supposed to have undergone an entire change as the world advanced in reason and wisdom. But is such the case? Are there not various popular beliefs existing now which are full as delusive, and which rival in absurdity those just mentioned?

How many mothers consult the signs of the zodiac in weaning their children, with firm faith in the benefit resulting therefrom. Who has not been profoundly impressed, in his younger days, with a belief in the virtues of a *red string* in arresting hemorrhage from the nose.\* The use of coral as an article from which to manufacture beads was induced from its supposed efficacy in this complaint. The natives of the West Indies extol its virtues highly. Many otherwise sensible people, have unlimited confidence in the common "buckeye," when simply carried about the person, as a preventive of hemorrhoidal affections. The importance attached to the changes of the moon, are too well known to require notice. Indeed, we might enumerate scores of simple conceits and fancies, showing that

---

\* The writer was once called upon to visit a patient suffering from this cause; and found him *with each finger and toe* firmly bound round with cords, at the instance of a prominent physician of this city! True, there is a slight semblance of reason in thus attempting to prevent the return of venous blood in some degree, and thereby lessening the intensity of the circulation; but in view of the sufficiency of *proper means*, it certainly appeared childish and silly.

the common mind, even in our own day, is greatly influenced by mysterious and unaccountable phenomena, and frequently by minor occurrences.

But by far the most stupendous humbug of modern days is the so-called *Spiritualism*. It would be foreign to our purpose to attempt here an analysis of many of the conditions to which it is said to give rise; nor is it necessary to discuss the question of its truth or falsity, except to that degree in which it legitimately relates to medicine. Consequently, the pretensions of the alleged "*Healing Mediums*" will only be noticed. And in doing this, let it be understood that no direct fraud or collusion is charged upon any individual, although a recent ludicrous exposure of pretended "*manifestations*" of "*harmonious spirits*" in this city, would seemingly justify the course; but, on the contrary, it is charitably supposed that many of those who participate in these things delude themselves into the belief that they are actually capable of becoming the means through whom spiritual agencies may operate. It is purposed only to explain some points, and to demonstrate the folly of others, which seem so marvelous.

That which seems most unaccountable, and which these wondering fanatics parade as conclusive evidence of the truth of Spiritualism, is the seeming power which the "medium" possesses of describing an affection, without inquiry or previous knowledge of the patient. Now, we undertake to say that, so far as this is really accomplished, it requires but very little ingenuity. Any shrewd individual can accomplish the same thing. Nearly all those cases of disease which present themselves to the Spiritualist, are of long standing. Now, in all chronic diseases, there are certain groups of symptoms which are almost invariably present; and it may be safely said, that, with a little reflection, nine in ten of them could be repeated, in a general manner, by any observant person. Thus, for instance, headache, lassitude, aching of the back and limbs, occasional nausea, bad taste, variable appetite, pain under the shoulder-blade, fullness and heaviness at the pit of the stomach, deranged digestion, flushes of heat about the face, giddiness, disturbed sleep, cold extremities, &c., are common to every one whose health is impaired. Yet, if these should be enumerated by the "medium," with the accompaniment

of a little mummery in the way of jerks and contortions, with the addition of some unfounded assertions in regard to the state or condition of the internal organs, it would be regarded as little short of miraculous. There are other points, perhaps more pertinent to the case, which cunning management can always develop. Besides, to persons unacquainted with Anatomy and Physiology, and the technical terms therein employed—and of such are those who generally consult “mediums”—it is the easiest matter imaginable to impress them with an idea that their cases are understood. Even those who make no pretensions to more than flesh and blood, are not always guiltless of resorting to this, either to impress their own importance, or to silence prying inquisitiveness.

If, as is claimed, these “mediums” are capable of seeing and describing the internal arrangement of the human organism, why cannot they as well describe the contents of one’s pocket or trunk? This would convince the most skeptical that something more than any known physical law was employed. But this means could too easily be proved either true or false; whereas, the assertions made as to the state of the internal organs, cannot very readily be disproved.

But suppose, for the sake of argument, we should grant that spirits did take possession of the medium. In every instance which has come under the writer’s knowledge, the “spiritual physician” was generally one who lived upon the earth many years since, and professed to treat disease upon the same principles which then actuated him. Now, we moderns are very apt to think we know full as much as our fore-fathers, and claim even a little more skill than they, in the treatment of diseased humanity.

But we have noticed this “*ism*” further than its merits deserve; and have been betrayed into it more at length from the fact that many persons who in other respects claim our regard, are dabbling in its dirty pool.

#### COMPOUNDING OF REMEDIES.

In relation to the compounding of remedies, the greatest ignorance and disregard of scientific principles have been and are now evinced. Remedies supposed to exert a good effect upon certain diseases

have been thrown promiscuously together, without consulting the nature of their properties or their chemical affinities. Hence various antidotal drugs, acids and alkalis, stimulants and depletives, cathartics and opiates, have been combined in one mass. Such a compound, having once obtained a place in the pharmacoporias of the day, is looked upon as a "fixed fact," the merits of which no one has the temerity to call in question. In the Codex Medicamentarius, or *Materia Medica*, of Paris, may yet be found the celebrated catholicon of Mithridates, containing *seventy-two* ingredients; the original having been only modified by discarding the former component part of *vipers!* In the same work, in treating of the manner in which a certain extract of opium should be prepared, it is directed that the preparation be boiled for *six months incessantly*, the waste of water to be constantly supplied during the time! This, however, is really no more absurd than many modern formulas, and is quite as harmless. It simply shows the tenacity with which the "authorities" adhere to old notions, and the difficulty of overcoming established prejudices.

Few people are aware of the antiquity of many of the practices now in vogue. Physicians themselves are lamentably deficient in a knowledge of the history of their own art. Many, nay most, of the discoveries of recent times, find remarkable coincidences in the works of the ancients. There are those no doubt, who, ignorant of what has preceded them, discover anew certain principles or facts, and are thus really *bona fide* originators; others again, and by far the greater part, plagiarize from the works of their almost forgotten brethren, and parade as a new principle in medicine that which was taught centuries since, but which had become obsolete.

Take as an example the apparently new and almost universally prevalent practice of *inhalation*. Galen, who flourished but a few years after Hippocrates, was in the habit of using the fumes of opiment; and Rhazes, one of his disciples, gave it, combined with myrrh, galbanum, &c., for the *cure of consumption*. Sir A. Crichton, in later years, advocated its employment; and Dr. Mudge, in the year 1782, invented an "*inhaler*" for administering the fumes of *tar* in pulmonary complaints. He expressed it as his opinion that "much of the benefit derived by consumptive patients

from a sea voyage, arises from the tar vapor constantly present on board a ship." A mania for using "*tar vapor*" is at present prevailing all over the Southern States; and this *new* discovery is to prove specific in lung disease!

The use of *water*, too, has been in vogue since the days when Rome was in her glory. The disciples of Preissnitz will perhaps be astonished to learn that the Emperor Augustus was an adherent of their system; yet, it is related that he was cured of a dangerous illness by the use of the *cold bath*, under the direction of Antonio Musa. Unfortunately, however, for the reputation of the means employed, he was afterwards *killed by the same means!*

Calomel, Opium, and the Lancet are nearly as old as the practice of medicine itself. Indeed, it may be safely said that they constitute a *Materia Medica* within themselves, inasmuch as with them may be produced almost any required result arising from Old School views of pathology and practice. And this assertions brings us to the consideration of Allopathy proper.

#### ALLOPATHY.

Notwithstanding the various and conflicting notions which have been and are now entertained respecting the *cause* of disease, and the *remedies* to be used, the same governing theory of cure is adopted by all those who range themselves under the banner of Allopathy. "*Contraria, contrariis, curantur,*" say they; that is, *Diseases are cured by remedies which set up a contrary disease in a different part of the organism.* We shall briefly examine whether their practice coincides with their profession, and in those instances where it does, with what effect.

As a natural result of the Allopathic law, its remedies are divided into classes corresponding with the object which they are supposed to accomplish. Hence we have cathartics, emetics, diaphoretics, astringents, &c., according to their virtue in producing purging, vomiting, sweating, &c. And although there are scores of remedies, perhaps, under each of these divisions, whose lesser qualities are widely different, the physician is left to his own judgment in selecting *which* of the number he may legitimately use. It requires no great

degree of perception to see where such a doctrine must lead. For instance, in order to allay pain, it is only necessary to resort to a sedative, or an opiate; and chloroform, æther, or opium, may be used at the option of the practitioner, irrespective of the other properties which it may contain. So of inflammation or fever: bleeding, purging, the use of emetics—anything which will lessen or allay excitability—may be resorted to with the assurance of finding one's self sustained by *authority*.

But to illustrate the confusion into which this law of contraries, with the system of therapeutics based upon it, leads us, perhaps we cannot do better than relate a little incident in the experience of Prof. McLeod, of Edinburgh. He says: "Formerly there were several fever wards in the Edinburgh Royal Infirmary, of which three fellows of the Royal College of Physicians had the charge. One had the top ward, another the middle ward, and the third the low ward. It happened that on the same day three young persons of nearly the same age, ill of typhus fever, were admitted to the hospital. The disease was of equal severity in each, and the stage of complaint the same in all. What was the treatment, think you, pursued in the three cases, by the three fellows of the college? It should have been the same, at least if the system be correct; for the physicians in question would choose the best. But, sir, it was not the same. He in the top ward *bled his patient with lancet and with leeches*. He in the middle ward *physicked his patient with drastic purgatives*, and if he saw a large, comfortable effect, he gave praise and was content. He in the low ward, again, *gave whisky, wine and opiates*. What was the result of such deplorable freaks? I refer you to the statistic book; I have no doubt you will find it there!"

Dr. McLeod's experience is a fair illustration of the practice pursued by the "fellows" of our American colleges, as well as that of our trans-Atlantic neighbors; and it is not strange that he should have exclaimed: "No wonder that Sir James Macintosh forsook the study of medicine!" Every one of the methods resorted to in the foregoing instances has high Allopathic authority to sustain it. He of the lancet was lessening the force of the circulation and releasing the capillaries of their engorgement. He of the

purgatives was removing intestinal irritation or obstruction ; while the wine and opium advocate was quieting excitability, and at the same time giving strength to the system. And yet, conflicting as these cases of treatment are, they are no more so than those of the same number of any given disease. Indeed, if we except the use of calomel and opium, we can scarcely find two prescriptions *exactly* alike, notwithstanding the group of symptoms for which they are made may be precisely similar. Yet, in regard to the exceptions mentioned, there seems to be a wonderful unanimity of sentiment, as they are given almost universally. In Eberlie's Practice of Medicine—a standard Allopathic work—we find that in the one hundred and thirty-nine diseases spoken of, mercury and opium, in some form, are recommended in *one hundred and twenty-nine!* The frightful effects of mercury are well known ; and when we consider the immense number of those who are continually drugged with it—many of them willingly—it is not at all singular. In reference to the alarming control which this remedy exercises over the system, Prof. Chapman may well ask : “ *Who is it that can stop the career of mercury at will, when it has taken the reins in its own destructive and ungovernable hands?* ” Who has not seen, or needs to be told of the awful results of this pet monster of the “Regular” School ? What has caused the trembling limbs, the racking pains, or the carious bones which meet us at every turn ? The experienced physician, even of that class who most employ the drug itself, will not hesitate to answer *mercury!* And yet, actuated by the same motive which induced Massaria to assert that he “would rather err with Galen than be in the right with any other physician,” they continue to use this poison indiscriminately rather than deviate from established precedent.

Dr. Paley says “we are more the creatures of habit than reflection ;” and the aphorism is eminently applicable to professors of medicine. There has been but a slight deviation from the prescribed rule of practice for centuries. True, there have been many earnest inquirers, who, not satisfied with an *ipse dixit*, which experience did not verify, attempted to base their acts upon reason and observation. But no sooner had the fact become public than they were denounced as apostates—as being unworthy of former associations ;

and thus through fear of their more “*regular*,” but less enlightened brethren, were induced to forego the improvement they had entertained. Many, again, after long practice, have retired in disgust from the field of their labors, painfully impressed with the uncertainty and blindness of their system; and have not hesitated to express themselves accordingly. Of such was the eminent Dr. Baillie, who, losing all confidence in the usual routine of practice, exclaimed: “Tell me what will cure my patients, and I will give it to them!”

A true knowledge of the effects which drugs produce upon the human system, is unknown to Allopathy, from the fact that the *seeming* symptoms to which they give rise are usually obtained from their administration *in sickness*; and who can distinguish with any degree of certainty between the proper drug symptoms and those consequent upon the disease itself? Moreover, what two diseases are precisely similar in all their manifestations? And herein we have the clue to that difficulty which besets the adherents of the Old School, in making up a proper diagnosis or picture of any particular morbid condition. Take as an instance a case of inflammation of the lungs. The physician has resorted to blood-letting, antimony and opium. Is it possible for him, on visiting the patient a second time, to tell with certainty whether the drowsiness and stupor which may have intervened, be consequent upon a diseased action of the brain, or whether it be a medicinal effect?—whether the decreased arterial excitement and easier expectoration be temporary or permanent?

Again, it is not often that drugs are administered singly. Very frequently they are combined with an utter disregard of all natural affinities. It is sufficient that Dr. A. has found this remedy useful, and Dr. B. that, in order to combine the two, to make them doubly effective. But who can comprehend the important changes which may be generated by a combination of their particles? A candid writer in Hufeland’s Journal exposes this uncertainty, when he says: “Our knowledge of the affinities which drugs enter into when mixed up together, is too limited for us to be able to say, with any degree of certainty, what will be the mode or degree of action of a subject, even the most insignificant in appearance, when introduced into the human system.” This is the inward conviction of all observant

practitioners ; but how few are willing to publicly acknowledge the fact !

The *size* of the dose seems to be of little moment among our Allopathic friends, provided it stops short of fatal poisoning. How common the advice—"Give as much as the system will bear ;" or, "Dose from two to twenty !" Certainly this is not very definite, and one would suppose it did not matter much, provided they were made to *feel sensibly* the effect of a dose. But is this the case ? Experience teaches us that different amounts of the same medicine very often produce quite different results. Thus, calomel is alternately an alterative, purgative, sialagogue, diuretic, or diaphoretic, according to the amount given. But who is able to define distinctly where one action supersedes the other ? Dr. Pereira may well say, in speaking of this *oldest* and most commonly used drug : "*We confess we have very imperfect information respecting the nature of its action.*" Dr. Pereira is probably the highest authority which Old School physicians delight to honor, yet if *he* acknowledges an ignorance of mercury, what may we not think of the obscurity which must necessarily attach itself to newer remedies in the hands of less able men !

The fact is, the entire medley of Allopathy is made up of false reasoning and equivocal results. From the very nature of things, it cannot be otherwise. The best and ablest of its disciples have been reluctantly compelled to admit the fact. Even empiricism has been more successful in practice ; and Dr. Forbes, the great leader of British medicine, admits that, "in most diseases, non-medication is preferable ; Nature alone will cure !"

It is a relief to turn from the contemplation of such a jumbled mass of confusion, to the consideration of a rational system of medicine—to a doctrine of *Specifics* ; one based upon immutable truths, and which we propose to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the plainest understanding.

#### HOMŒOPATHY.

Homœopathy is a theory of cure, having for its guide the maxim: "*Similia, similibus curantur,*" or, that all may understand: *Medicines tend to cure diseases similar to those which they tend*

*to produce.* If a drug develops upon a *healthy* individual a certain train of symptoms, we hold that it is capable of *curing* similar symptoms produced by disease. It is a well attested fact, that no two similar diseases can exist in the same organ at the same time. One must give way to the other. As a familiar illustration, take the case of small-pox and measles. It frequently happens that during an attack of the one, it is superseded by the other, and disappears until the intruder runs its course, when it again appears. Both cannot manifest themselves simultaneously. So of many other diseases.

Even as early as the year 1738, the eminent Danish physician, Stahl, expressed his conviction of the Homœopathic law. He wrote thus: "The received method in medicine of treating diseases by opposite remedies—that is to say, by medicines which are opposed to the effects they produce—is completely false and absurd. I am convinced, on the contrary, 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, &c."

Many others, before and since his time, have approximated to a true idea; but they did not push their investigations and experiments far enough into the field of science to arrange and classify their observations into anything like a system. They suffered themselves to hesitate, occasionally a ray of light breaking in upon them, yet they lacked originality and perseverance, and finally relapsed into former errors. Or, it may have been, they were fearful of the sneers and raillery which, as at the present day, would have followed an expression of their convictions, and were thus deterred from giving their opinions publicity. However, be this as it may, it was reserved to a German physician to give to the world a treatise concerning the merits of this system, and to establish, by an immense array of facts, its truth and superiority.

Samuel Hahnemann, the father of Homœopathy, was born in Meissen, in Germany, in the year 1755. He received his medical education at the celebrated University at Leipsic, and stood deservedly high in the estimation of his colleagues as a ripe scholar and accomplished physician. He devoted much of his time in translating

foreign medical works into German, and it was while engaged thus upon Cullen's *Materia Medica*, in 1790, that it occurred to him to inquire why Peruvian bark should cure ague. No theory with which he was acquainted seemed to give a satisfactory explanation, and he therefore determined to investigate the matter for himself. With this view he commenced testing the drug upon his own person, and at the same time administered it to others. The result was, he found to his astonishment that in each instance it produced chills and fever—a condition which it was known to cure, with so much certainty! Here, then, was the secret of its success; and the question very naturally followed: "If this be the cause of the virtue which bark possesses, may not the same rule of action apply to *all* drugs?" Resolved to sift the subject thoroughly, he called to his aid many of the intelligent and enthusiastic students of the University, and commenced upon them a system of experimentation regarding the effects of medicines upon individuals, when taken in health. From the results obtained, he became fully convinced that the suspicions which he had entertained as to the curative process were correct; and in accordance with this opinion he at once proceeded to put them into practice.

#### MATERIA MEDICA.

The immense success attending his efforts soon drew around him a host of eager inquirers—many of them the most brilliant minds of Europe—who, becoming convinced from actual observation of the truth of the new doctrine, entered earnestly into a combination for its more perfect development. The method adopted was this: Several perfectly healthy individuals were selected, who were free from any pernicious habits, and placed upon a strictly temperate diet, with proper exercise for both body and mind. The drug to be "proved" was then administered to each at the same time, the quantity being augmented, if necessary, until the system was brought thoroughly under its influence. A close and careful record was kept of every symptom which developed itself, mental and physical; the time of action; at what period of the day the effect was most marked; indeed, nothing was omitted to form a *perfect* under-

standing of the qualities it possessed. The symptoms of each case were then diligently compared, one with another ; and if in each instance the results corresponded, they were noted as positive effects ; the isolated symptoms always being discarded, or qualified as such. For the *post mortem* appearance, or pathological condition produced, cases of accidental and criminal poisoning furnished the means of information. From this source, too, many symptoms of the more virulent drugs have been grouped ; but always with great care and in such instances as have been repeatedly observed.

The drugs, having been thus proved, were again tested in their curative action ; that is, by actual experiment upon diseased subjects, in administering for symptoms similar to those produced by the remedy, it was found whether they yielded readily and promptly.\*

This, then, forms the Homœopathic Materia Medica. Every one will concede that such an one, based upon so thorough and perfect an organization, and so minutely corrected in all its details, must be vastly superior to the confused mass of uncertain deductions, brought together from dissimilar sources, and oft times contradictory, to which our Allopathic brethren look as to the “law and the prophets.”

#### ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE TRUTH OF THE LAW.

And now let us inquire if the theory to which this plan of experimentation gave rise *be true*—whether, after a knowledge of the relations of a drug be understood, its application, under the law of “*similia*,” be correct. It has already been remarked that physicians, before the time of Hahnemann, suspected and imperfectly suggested the theory. It is now proposed to demonstrate that every well defined, specific cure, known positively to be consequent upon the power of the remedy, is performed in accordance with the Homœopathic law. Take the following prominent examples :

1. Mercury has from time immemorial been looked to as the

---

\* The reader will please mark the distinction between the terms “*similar*” and “*same*,” and not fall into the common error of supposing that the remedy cures its own symptoms ; or, in vulgar phrase, that “the hair of the dog cures the bite.”

“*sine qua non*” in the treatment of syphilis. The frightful ravages of this disease are too well known to require mention. According to all authority, the *effects* of mercury are so precisely similar as to defy the skill of the most eminent diagnostician to distinguish between them.

Again, this remedy is known to be the best means in the treatment of dysentery, yet all dispensaries agree in attributing to its use, griping, tenesmus, bloody and mucous stools, ulceration of the bowels, &c.; a very picture of the disease for which it is so highly extolled.

2. Nux vomica is the sheet anchor of Allopathy in the treatment of paralysis, notwithstanding the veriest tyro in medicine knows full well that it produces the same condition in a greater degree than any other drug with which we are acquainted.

3. Opium is the specific in delirium tremens, while, at the same time, it is capable of producing the same horrible condition.

4. Ipecac is relied upon as one of the most active emetics, yet modern writers on Practice all admit that in *minute doses* it is frequently prompt in allaying nausea and vomiting.

5. Rhubarb, the most common laxative, or cathartic, is equally common in the treatment of diarrhœa.

6. Nitrate of silver or caustic potash, either of which burn the flesh of an individual like living coals, are very generally used in the treatment of the so-called local inflammations.

7. Cantharides and copaiba produce specific effects upon the kidneys, bladder, &c., creating heat, irritation and burning. In inflammation of those organs, what remedies exercise more power in allaying similar symptoms?

These few instances are noted at random as they happened to suggest themselves. The list might be extended indefinitely. Indeed, the same analogy may be found in all those remedies which are known to be *specific*. And yet, the Homœopathist is scoffed at and ridiculed for adopting this method of cure upon a more perfect and extensive plan.

That patients very often recover under dissimilar forms of treatment, is readily admitted. In fact they get well *in spite of the Doctor*; but in all cases where the good effect is invariably apparent,

following the exhibition of a remedy, it will be found in consequence of its Homœopathic relations. The recoveries frequently in defiance of the most barbarous treatment, only serve to lend additional sarcasm to the remark of a celebrated medical writer : "Physic is the art of amusing a patient, while Nature performs the cure !"

#### POWER OF INFINITESIMAL DOSES.

We come now to the consideration of a subject which has been the more immediate cause of the sneers and taunts of which our Old School brethren are so profuse, namely : the **SIZE OF THE DOSE**. And here, before proceeding to discuss the power of infinitesimal doses, we wish to state distinctly and unequivocally that the quantity of a remedy to be administered, *has nothing whatever to do with Homœopathy proper*. The physician may, if he sees proper, give crude drugs in any quantity not inconsistent with safety, and yet be a strict Homœopathist. Indeed, many of the oldest and best physicians of our school invariably prescribe palpable doses. *The magnitude of the dose has not NECESSARILY anything in common with the LAW OF CURE*. Let this be firmly impressed. And yet, as a logical deduction from the nature of the law, it is apparent that very small doses will suffice for the purpose of establishing the desired medicinal action. Thus, if, for instance, we have a case of inflammation of the stomach in which arsenic is the appropriate remedy, it can easily be conceived how minute must be the amount which the highly irritated mucous membrane would not reject. Or, in congestion or inflammation of the brain, how much belladonna, a powerful irritant of that organ and the spinal marrow, could with safety be administered.

*The medicines we prescribe have a direct and specific effect upon the diseased parts ; and it is only requisite that we produce a medicinal action of a similar kind, in the same organ, of greater intensity, in order to expel that already existing ; and this medicinal disease having subsided by its own limited duration of action, leaves the parts free.* Hence it will not be difficult to understand that, in order to avoid greatly aggravating the original affection, it is enough that we give only a sufficient quantity of a drug to overcome the intensity of the existing morbid condition.

As a farther and plainer illustration of the susceptibility of organs to influences which ordinarily have no effect over them, take the human eye. We all know that light, so far from being generally injurious, is absolutely necessary to its perfect development and strength; yet when its delicate coats become inflamed, even moderate light is sometimes entirely insupportable. Cases are on record where the rays of a candle produced the most excruciating pain, even through seven or eight folds of linen.

After all, the size of a thing is only relative. What seems to us as exceedingly minute, is, in comparison with other objects, of immense proportions. The microscope reveals to the eye animalculæ so extremely minute as to require millions upon millions of them to make up enough in bulk to be appreciated by the naked eye; yet these possess all the intricate organs of life—breathing, digestive, and circulating apparatus. Light, heat, and electricity are probably all composed of particles of matter, but what human agency can detect them? Who can appreciate the quantity of atoms contained in an amount of hydrogen or carbonic acid gas sufficient to destroy life? or who has ever seen or handled the particles of noxious matter arising from decayed vegetable formations, which lay prostrate a whole community with some virulent disease?

A single grain of musk will give off its particles for years, sufficient to scent a room during the whole period, yet not perceptibly diminish in weight.

Kane, in his Chemistry, tells us that "gold may be divided into particles of at least 1-1,400,000,000 of a square inch in diameter, and yet possess the color and all other characteristics of the largest mass." Also, "that a single drop of a strong solution of indigo colors 1,000 cubic inches of water; and as this mass of water contains 500,000 times the bulk of the drop of the indigo solution, the particles must be smaller than 1-2,500,000,000 of a cubic inch."

A person of sensitive taste can distinguish the bitterness of quinine very distinctly, when but one grain of the substance has been dissolved in a barrel of water.

Every one is familiar with the fact that the most minute quantity of the vaccine virus is capable of producing a powerful, and some times dangerous effect upon those who resort to its protecting in-

fluence ; and this, too, when it is inserted by the merest prick of the lancet.

These examples of the divisibility of matter might be multiplied to any extent, but they are sufficient to lead reflecting minds to the conclusion that it is not always necessary that a substance should contain *appreciable* weight and bulk to be effective, nay, powerful, in its results.

The Homœopathist uses none but the purest of drugs, free from every thing which could possibly interfere with their properties. The active principle contained therein is thoroughly developed by breaking up the cohesion of particles, either by trituration with sugar of milk or by succussion with alcohol or distilled water. And inasmuch as the properties of remedies are only manifested from their surface, it must follow that this method of *increasing the amount of surface* diminishes the need of *quantity*. The Allopathist must be aware, if he reflects at all, that the curative action of a drug is produced only by absorption ; but he forgets that only the *most minute* quantities can be taken up by the delicate mouths of the absorbent vessels, and only from the surface exposed to them, while the bulk of the dose passes off in the grosser secretions.

Again, if the chemical theory of La Place be true, in reference to one molecule transmitting motion to others with which it comes in contact, in the same manner in which the decay of a tooth is imparted to those with which it is associated, the property of a drug may be infused into the medium that contains it. Thus the *surface* of which we have spoken becomes greatly enlarged, and the effective virtue correspondingly increased.

The salivation so often attending the exhibition of calomel is in all probability due to the absorption of particles of mercury ; yet they are so exceedingly small as to defy the detection of the ablest chemist. That this excitement of the salivary glands is due to *sympathy*, as the sapient Allopathist would have us believe, is simply absurd. They tell us that mercury cannot be absorbed in this manner ; and yet their records show us hundreds of cases of salivation produced by the *fumes of mercury*, arising even during an ordinary temperature ! If these "fumes" are not absorbed, pray tell us in what mysterious manner they do operate !

From these considerations, Hahnemann and his disciples were led to adopt the system of small doses, gradually lessening them as positive experience proved their utility. Nor should it be matter of astonishment if the founder of Homœopathy, dazzled by the magnitude and sublimity of the doctrines he had discovered, should in a measure have carried his notions to an extreme length. We have only to adopt his facts, however, not his fancies. We adhere to the truths he advanced and discard the errors. Consequently, it is not to be supposed that because we advocate the great law of cure which he so ably presented, we must necessarily indorse whatever else he may have written.

#### ALLOPATHIC AND HOMŒOPATHIC STATISTICS COMPARED.

But the most convincing argument in favor of Homœopathy—one which comes home to the understanding of every man who views surrounding circumstances with an unbiased judgment—is the overwhelming success evinced in its statistical facts. It is a self-evident truth, that whatever system of medicine is capable of performing the greatest number of cures in the shortest time, with the least detriment to the patient, is the *best*. We propose, therefore, to give some figures, showing the relative proportion of cures and deaths resulting from either form of practice, in the ordinary diseases of human life. It may be proper to mention, moreover, that these statistics are taken from government institutions, and are, consequently, as reliable as human testimony can make them. This remark is made because our Allopathic brethren, startled by the success as exhibited in the figures, may charge us with unfairness in presenting them.

Among the diseases most generally known, is inflammation of the lungs. And in giving the results of Allopathic treatment in this affection, we confine ourselves to the statistics of eminent French physicians, who are confessedly the most learned as well as the most successful of medical men. Lest, however, there may be any misunderstanding, it may be distinctly stated that the mortality in other countries is much greater than is here exhibited.

Barthez, Relliet and Leroux, in presenting what they considered successful results, show a mortality of 1 in 12.

Louis, Trousseau, Grisolle, Laennec and Bouillaud record 531 cases, with 81 deaths, or one in  $6\frac{2}{3}$ .

Dr. Chomel, physician to the Hotel Dieu, lost 1 in 8. These, being the very highest authorities in the medical world, and the mortality being comparatively slight as compared with the results obtained by less skillful practitioners, are considered sufficient for the purpose.

On the Homœopathic side, we have Dr. Fleischmann's earlier tables, showing 300 cases, and 19 deaths, or about 1 in 16. In the Homœopathic Hospital of the Sisters of Charity, at Linz, the average mortality is 1 in 20. In the Hospital at Gumpendorf, the whole number admitted was 1058, with 58 deaths, or about 1 in 18. The records of the Hospitals in Vienna, Marseilles and London show about the same average result.

In our country, Dr. Jackson, Secretary of the Massachusetts Homœopathic Medical Society, gives the reports of twenty six of its members, showing a mortality of 1 in 20. The statistics of the Mississippi State Hospital, of the Chicago Hospital, and of the New York Half-Orphan Asylum, are still more gratifying.

In the treatment of *epidemic* diseases, the vast superiority of Homœopathic practice is most distinctly seen. In yellow fever, that scourge of the South, the remarkable success of Homœopathic physicians attracted very general attention and was acknowledged every where. It was through the good results following their treatment of this disease, that the Legislature of Mississippi gave them the Hospital at Natchez. In this Hospital, as well as in that at Rio, the mortality in yellow fever was from 6 to 10 per cent. while the mortality in the Allopathic Charity Hospital at New Orleans reached a per centage of 66 !

The statistics of private practice in New Orleans, Charleston, Norfolk and Portsmouth, show about the same comparative results.

Of the astonishing good effects of Homœopathic treatment in Asiatic cholera, the public have had abundant opportunity to convince themselves ; and were it not that Old School physicians, with an utter disregard of all truth or courtesy, charge us with falsifying the records, it would be unnecessary to allude to it here.

In 1849, Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann, of Cincinnati, treated 1,116 cases of genuine Asiatic cholera, with a total loss of only *thirty-*

*five.* This extraordinary success so exasperated the adherents of the Old School that they publicly denounced these gentlemen as having reported imaginary cases to the Board of Health. This malicious charge was promptly met by a statement of the names and places of residence of each case; and the truth of their report was substantiated by the affidavits of the relatives, clergymen and friends who visited the patients.

In New Orleans, St. Louis, Sandusky and elsewhere that it raged most violently, the reports of Homœopathic practice compare favorably with the foregoing.

The following brief tabular view of the mortality of the most common diseases met with, has been prepared with great care, and is believed to be as near correct as it is possible to arrive. The average per centage of deaths is given as occurring in the *Hotel Dieu* and *Hospital des Invalides*, of Paris; St. Thomas' Hospital, London; Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston; Bellevue Hospital, New York, and Charity Hospital, New Orleans, on the Allopathic side; and the Hospitals at Gyongyos, Vienna, Gumpendorf, Leipsic, Marseilles, and London, in Europe; and the Hospital at Natchez, and New York Half-Orphan Asylum, in America, on the side of Homœopathy.

ALLOPATHIC MORTALITY.		HOMŒOPATHIC MORTALITY.	
	PER CENT.		PER CENT.
Apoplexy .....	65	Apoplexy .....	20
Dysentery.....	30	Dysentery.....	3
Dropsy.....	55	Dropsy.....	19
Small-Pox.....	25	Small-Pox.....	7
Scarlet Fever.....	33	Scarlet Fever.....	8
Typhus.....	30	Typhus.....	10
Pneumonia.....	15	Pneumonia.....	5
Inflammation brain.....	70	Inflammation brain.....	12
"    bowels.....	42	"    bowels.....	20
Paralysis.....	10	Paralysis.....	2
Croup.....	18	Croup.....	2
Erysipelas.....	15	Erysipelas.....	1

The average mortality in *all* diseases under Old School treatment is above 8 per cent., while under Homœopathic treatment it only reaches about  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.

These facts and figures certainly ought to furnish food for reflection to every unprejudiced mind. If they be true—and the inference is that one side is as fairly represented as the other—there certainly must be virtue in the infinitesimal doses of Homœopathy, and positive harm in the massive doses administered under the law of Allopathy. Nature, if left to herself, does not show as favorable a representation as the former, nor as deplorable a one as the latter, as the experiments of Biett and Magendie most conclusively demonstrate. And that the statistics given have not been perverted, can be relatively tested by any common observer. It is only necessary to look around upon the circle of one's own immediate acquaintance. Satisfy yourselves of the number who employ either form of practice, and then inquire as to the comparative number of deaths occurring under them. Ask the sexton or the undertaker *who they derive their business from!* And from such practical inquiries draw your own conclusions.

Nor is this all. We claim that the average duration of treatment is much less under the specific treatment than under any other. And a still more important fact is, that upon the disappearance of the original malady, the patient is not left with a worse drug-disease entailed upon him. It may be safely stated that more than one-half the number of chronic diseases which come under the observation of the physician, originate in the inhuman system of *drugging*. This is even partially admitted by the very men who uphold the practice; yet is looked upon as a "necessary evil." Under the auspices of Homœopathy, on the contrary, when the affection which has prostrated the patient subsides, he regains his usual health rapidly and perfectly, and expresses himself "as good as new." It is within the province of any individual to convince himself of this assertion before trusting himself to its care.

And yet, with this array of facts presented to the senses of our Old School cotemporaries, we are stigmatized as "quacks" and "imposters," and with like opprobrious epithets. We leave an intelligent public to decide who most justly merit such imputations.

#### THE CLAIMS OF HOMŒOPATHY.

Homœopathy is not ashamed of her professions, nor does she seek to hide them. There is no mystery, no pretensions, no rash

assumptions unsupported by facts, in connection with her claim to public attention. What we desire is, that her claims may be closely scrutinized; that her errors, if any, be fully met and publicly denounced. Let the two systems be tested, side by side, with impartiality, and we are willing to abide the issue.

But we are denied the common courtesies due to gentlemen. No matter that our acquirements may be as varied, our talents as great or our morals as good, because we happen to differ honestly as to the best method of alleviating the ills of suffering humanity, we must be banished without the pale of society, and are not recognized by these "*Regulars*" as medical men. Our discoveries in science and our remedies in disease, are stolen with the utmost coolness, and without the least credit, are paraded as something *new*. As pertinent to this assertion, let us inquire where they learned that belladonna would cure hooping-cough and scarlet fever; that nuxvomica would cure paralysis; that aconite would allay rheumatic pains, and that arnica was such a sovereign remedy for bruises? And pray, why is it, that your doses are "growing small by degrees and beautifully less" each succeeding year? And why is it, that the lancet, instead of thirsting for and rioting upon human blood, as of yore, is quietly rusting in its case? You have learned something, at least, and we strongly suspect you will live to learn more. Like Rip Van Winkle, you will awaken ere long to find that your sleep has been more lengthy than refreshing.

Fortunately for the advancement of truth, the intelligent masses of the people think for themselves. They are not to be controlled in matters pertaining to the welfare of their own lives and health, by the simple assertions, devoid of proof, which emanate from the mouths of these self-constituted medical oracles. This age is eminently progressive; and it were strange indeed, if, while every other department of human science is so rapidly advancing, that of medicine should remain stationary. No matter how preposterous a subject may at first seem, or how conflicting it may be with preconceived notions—if it emanate from a respectable source and presents an array of facts and arguments in its support, it should receive a fair and impartial investigation. And a non-compliance with this course is, we apprehend, in part the secret of the violent opposition which

Homœopathy has experienced. Because of the entire *newness* of its precepts, of its direct contradiction of the received opinion, it has been scouted without even the formality of an examination. That it is a "humbug" is assumed *a priori*; and instead of an investigation of its claims, and a candid argument based thereon against its fallacie, we have the vulgar denunciation, without reason, of a body of men who would have themselves considered respectable and liberal.

The truth of the matter is, the propositions laid down in Homœopathy cannot be successfully controverted. The attempts of Prof. Simpson and Dr. Hooker served only to show their utter ignorance of even the commonest knowledge of its principles. The able replies of Prof. Henderson to the former, and of Dr. Marcy to the latter, most conclusively show this fact.

Hundreds of other physicians have gone into an investigation of the system thoroughly, with the express purpose of exposing its errors; but upon testing the matter honestly, these same men have become its warmest adherents. Conviction is almost certain to follow candid examination.

In pleasing contrast with the narrow and selfish course pursued by the physicians of the Old School, we are proud to point to the position taken by the friends of Homœopathy. Were we disposed to advance our own selfish interests, it would certainly inure to our advantage to prevent as many medical men as possible from embracing our doctrines. In proportion to our number, no one will pretend to deny that the circle of our practice is not by far the largest; and that, in a still greater degree, it embracethe in telligence and wealth of the people. But instead of discouraging investigation, and thus monopolizing the field, we openly court it. It would afford us the greatest satisfaction to show the practical merits of the system at the bed-side of the patient to any truthful inquirer; or in any way lend our aid and assistance in testing it to its fullest extent. We hold ourselves in readiness at all times to discuss the question, publicly or privately, or in any manner to give its truths or its falsities the utmost publicity. Surely, this does not savor of "*quackery!*"

But we do not apprehend a discussion. The advantages are all

on one side; for, whereas it is essential to a knowledge of our system that we should at the same time be conversant with Allopathic medicine, they, on the contrary, endeavor to prevent by every possible means an examination of our doctrines. Consequently, we *know* whereof we speak, while any attempt at controversy with us, except by ridicule, is a blow in the dark.

#### HOMŒOPATHY IN 1857.

It is extremely amusing to witness the energetic attempts of these "regular" gentlemen, to convince their patrons that Homœopathy is an exploded idea; that, like many of their own evanescent theories, it is dying away, to be thought of only as one of the follies of the past. *Our* friends remember this same story, as having an existence ever since they have known anything of the system. Assuredly, it is a long time in "going down." Like the leaning tower of Pisa, its readiness to fall must be much more seeming than real. And, unfortunately for the veracity of these gentlemen, some things are susceptible of a mathematical demonstration. Let us examine the true present position of this "dying humbug."

About half a century since, Homœopathy was scarcely known beyond the immediate circle of its founder and his few friends. For several years following its discovery, the government forbid its being put into practice, and even Hahnemann himself was banished from the country. Twenty-five years ago, there was scarcely an advocate of the system in America; and less than fifteen years since, there were less than half a dozen west of the Alleghanies.

*Now*, in the city of Leipsic, the former home of Hahnemann and scene of his earlier persecutions, a monument is erected in his honor under the patronage of the authorities; and the centennial anniversary of his birth day was celebrated there with great pomp and ceremony.

Homœopathic Hospitals and Dispensaries are scattered all over Europe. Emperors, princes and the nobility, as well as the most distinguished literary and scientific men, are its warmest patrons. And lest it may be suspected that the facts are exaggerated, we trust we may be pardoned in giving the *names* of a few of the most widely known. It is not pretended that *because* of their patronage

the system is any the more true ; but the fact of their encouragement does go a great way in disproving the malignant assertions of its opponents, to the effect that in Europe it scarcely has existence. These names are taken from a work published in London, entitled, "Homœopathy in Europe."

In addition to the Emperors of Russia and France, the Queen of Spain and numerous lesser potentates on the Continent, we have the well-known English names of the Earl of Wilton, the Earl of Airlie, the Earl of Roden, the Earl of Erne, Lord Gray, Lord Kinnaird, Lord Lindsay, Lord Colville, Lord Robert Grosvenor, Lord Newport, Mr. Elliott Lockhart, Archbishop Whately, the Bishop of Down, the Archbishop of Dublin, the Dean of Dublin, Major-General Farquharson, the Chevalier Bunsen, beside some two hundred eminent English clergymen, upwards of one hundred military and naval officers, &c.

In our own country, the progress of Homœopathy has been still more rapid. At present we have four Hospitals, twelve Dispensaries, two Colleges, twenty-four organized Societies, and upwards of two thousand regularly educated physicians. Our literature is rapidly multiplying, and for the great research displayed therein and vast accumulation of new facts, is far in advance of contemporaneous Allopathic publications.

A strong argument in favor of our system, is the character of those who generally employ it. Instead of the credulous and ignorant, we have the refined, the intelligent and the liberal-minded in the community. And a still stronger item in its favor is the fact, that having once adopted the practice, *they adhere to it*. Certainly but few men would persist in employing a practice which did not readily and satisfactorily relieve their sufferings.

#### OBJECTIONS EXPLAINED.

In explanation of the success which attends our efforts, it is asserted that our patients do not *get as sick* as those of other practitioners. We grant the correctness of the remark, as a rule ; but beg leave to inquire *why* disease treats our friends so leniently? The answer is very simple, and certainly avails nothing against us, for while nature in the one case has to contend with the disease as it

originally exists, in the other she has a double enemy in the addition of the *drug-disease*. Upon no other theory can an explanation be given, and we feel confident that our patrons do not desire a prostration at death's door, for the purpose of having the subsequent satisfaction of knowing that they have barely escaped its entrance !

Among the minor and more foolish objections urged against Homœopathy, the fact of the comparative inertness of the small doses, is dwelt upon with great gusto. "Why," says the Allopathist, "I can take a vial full of their globules with impunity !" and, *therefore*, it is assumed that they possess no virtue. With them such reasoning may be considered logic ; with us, it is *gammon*, Our object is not to make sick, but to cure ; not to tear down in order to build up. With as much propriety might they say that because a man's daily ration of pork and beans produces no deleterious consequences when taken *in health*, the same would prove harmless in sickness. Or because the rattle of the drum and the piercing whistle of the fife may be rather pleasant than otherwise to an individual under ordinary circumstances, they would remain so if one was suffering with an acute attack of headache. Our medicines are designed for the sick, not for the healthy ; and to those who have attentively read the preceding pages, it will not be requisite to notice this simple objection any farther.

But the objection which we most frequently meet with is, that we do not usually resort to cathartics. The received opinion is, that in nearly every form of disease there must exist some obstruction in the alimentary canal which ought to be removed. No matter what the cause, or what the symptoms may be, the bowels must be attacked as the first and main consideration in producing a cure. And here let us say, that no greater curse to health ever befell mankind, than this same opinion.

Nature has provided to a great extent many of the means of alleviating the ordinary ills of life. In a usual state of health, many ounces of the food taken into the stomach pass through the skin in the form of insensible perspiration, and very frequently, when, from any cause, the daily secretions from the bowels are prevented or delayed, this perspiration is greatly increased. Again, in sickness, Nature very wisely diminishes the desire for food, and

very generally to an extent commensurate with her ability to dispose of it in this manner. Yet, without regarding this fact, it is foolishly supposed that the alvine evacuations must be *increased* during illness; and this, too, when perhaps not a mouthful of solid food had been taken meantime! The only sensible method of overcoming constipation, is to *correct the condition on which it depends*, and, as a natural consequence, they will be restored to their normal condition. The simple removal of the contents of the bowels, by the use of cathartics, will never effect this. The relief which follows their administration, is only temporary; and the action produced by the medicine having subsided, the tone and strength of the organ are diminished in a degree corresponding to the stimulus produced. The consequence is, as may be daily witnessed, that the repetition of the dose is more frequently demanded, and, at the same time, larger quantities are required, until finally it is almost impossible to produce the desired result, except at the hazard of great physical derangement. Every experienced Homœopathic physician can point to hundreds of such cases, where the poor patients were dragging out a miserable existence, having to resort to almost incredible doses in order to produce an effect; and suffering with the invariable consequences resulting therefrom—dyspepsia, hemorrhoids, &c.

And in order to show that frequent evacuations are not always necessary, the writer of this may be pardoned for stating that, in spite of the assertions of Old School physicians that he was pursuing a course of mal-treatment, he persisted in letting a patient with typhus fever remain *twenty-eight days* without a movement of the bowels. At the end of that period, the secretion occurred as naturally as in health; and a rapid recovery, such as could not have taken place under a depleting course of cathartics, was the result. Usually, the bowels do not ~~remain~~ inactive so long as in this instance; but it is no uncommon thing to see our patients remain ten or fifteen days in this condition. Nor does any bad result follow therefrom. On the contrary, the strength of the patient is preserved, and, of course, convalescence and health more speedily re-established.

In *mechanical obstructions* of the bowels, or in cases of *poisoning*, of course a resort to emetics or cathartics is indispensable; but

the means, under such circumstances, do not belong to any *school* of medicine. Common sense dictates such a course, as much so in the removal of a foreign substance from the stomach and bowels, as from any other part of the human body.

As another explanation of the good results of our practice, it is said that *imagination* effects the cure. Suppose this were so, does not the assertion reflect more severely upon the advocates of Allopathy than upon ourselves? In the name of humanity, if the simple impression made upon the mind can exercise a controlling curative power over disease, why not resort to it, instead of submitting the patient to a nauseating system of drugging? But the charge is too silly to require a discussion. We must have extraordinarily precocious infants to administer to, if they are capable of fancying an impression is being made, either for good or evil! Besides, we suspect the massive doses of the Old School would be full as likely to impress the imaginative powers, as the simple remedies of Homœopathy!

Again, for lack of any other objection, a resort is had to the *diet* we allow our patients, as an explanation of their recovery. It is charged that ours is a "*starvation plan*" of treatment. And although we confess that vigorous abstinence from food is very often productive of great good, in derangements of the animal economy, especially of the digestive functions, yet a perusal of the following "Diet Card," which is appended for the sake of convenient reference, will show that we are sufficiently liberal. It is not the *quantity* of food we object to, but the *quality*.

Thus we believe we have very briefly met all the common objections against the adoption of Homœopathy; and have demonstrated, in language suited to a popular understanding, the superior merits which it claims. If we have been the means of correcting erroneous impressions and of satisfying popular inquiry in regard to the subjects of which we have treated, our aim will have been accomplished.

# APPENDIX.

---

## DIRECTIONS FOR THE REGIMEN OF THE SICK DURING HOMŒOPATHIC TREATMENT.

The needful dietetic observances during Homœopathic treatment are comprehended under the following general rule, viz:—The patient should abstain from every thing of a medicinal nature, and should partake of light, digestible food to satisfy hunger, and of such drink as nature requires to allay thirst. Agreeably to this rule, the aliment may be classified under the following subdivisions :

### ALIMENT ALLOWED.

In ACUTE DISEASES, Nature herself generally dictates the needful abstinence, and the patient is permitted—

Pure water in preference to all other drinks, or water with the addition of sugar, raspberry or strawberry syrup. Barley-water, rice-water, oatmeal gruel, farrina, panada, gumarabic water, whey, milk and water, preparations of sago, tapioca and arrow root, without any seasoning other than a little salt or loaf sugar, or one of the syrups mentioned.

Beef-tea, veal or chicken broth, thickened with rice, macaroni, or sago, and seasoned merely with a little salt, are allowable.

After the more violent symptoms have subsided and the appetite calls for more substantial food, a wider range may be taken, and the diet allowed in chronic diseases may be resorted to.

In CHRONIC DISEASES, the following articles, in addition to those already enumerated, may be allowed, viz:—

All kinds of light bread or biscuits not containing potash, soda or other similar ingredients, and not too fresh; cakes made of meal, eggs, sugar and a little butter; buckwheat cakes; light puddings of wheat, Indian meal, rice, oatmeal or bread, without wines, spices or rich sauces; hominy, Indian mush, rye mush, pearl barley.

Potatoes, turnips, carrots, cabbage, cauliflower, asparagus, green or dried peas and beans; (but these vegetables should not be used in colic or diarrhœa.)

Milk not too recent from the cow; butter-milk, boiled milk, unsalted chocolate or cocoa and weak black tea.

Sweet butter, cream, new cheese, curds and other preparations of milk, plain custards, raw or soft-boiled eggs, (except in diarrhœa.)

Animal and vegetable soups seasoned with salt only; beef-tea, to which may be added bread or toast; well boiled vermicelli, macaroni, rice, &c., together with a few wholesome vegetables, according to taste.

Beef, mutton, lamb, not boiled too young, venison, hares and rabbits; chickens, pigeons, turkeys, partridges, quails, woodcocks, snipes and larks.

All fresh fish, having scales.

Salt, sugar, ice-cream, with the addition of strawberry syrup, or that of other allowed fruits, and not flavored with aromatic substances, in moderation.

## ALIMENT STRICTLY FORBIDDEN.

Apples, peaches, pears, apricots, plums, cherries, currants, blackberries, strawberries, raspberries, &c., (except in diarrhœa.)

Old smoked salt meat, salted fish, veal, geese, ducks, ham, bacon, pork (salted or fresh) and sausages.

Rancid butter, old cheese, lard, hard-boiled eggs, omelets, fish without scales, as cat-fish and eels; lobsters, crabs, clams and soups made from them.

All kinds of nuts. Coffee and green tea.

The flesh of all young animals. Highly seasoned soups and sauces.

Cakes prepared with much fat, or aromatics.

All kinds of colored confectionery, pastry and honey.

Cider, vinegar, salads or cucumbers prepared with it; sauerkraut, pickles, catsup, garlic, onions, sage, mint, parsley, thyme, lemon and orange peel, celery, horse-radish, allspice, mace, nutmegs, cinnamon, cloves, ginger, saffron, vanilla, coriander, fennel, all kinds of pepper, tomatoes, beets, radishes, green corn, boiled or roasted.

All kinds of fermented and distilled liquors, wine and lemonade, and drinks made from acids. All natural and artificial mineral waters, &c.

NOTE.—Should any of the articles allowed disagree with the patient, of course they should be abstained from.

During the treatment of a nursing child, the mother should abstain from eating any of the articles of food which are prohibited.

Perfumeries, camphor and tooth powders must be avoided.

All medicines or baths not prescribed by the physician, should be carefully rejected.

Tobacco should not be used, except in small quantities, and at long intervals.

Exercise in the open air and thorough ventilation are necessary.

The medicines should not be taken for at least half an hour before or after eating. They may be kept in a cool dry place, free from odors.

