

CHARLES J. HEMPEL, M.D.

LECTURE I.

INTRODUCTORY.

GENTLEMEN:—In these halls which are consecrated to the solemn business of teaching the life-giving truths of Homoeopathy, we again welcome you as the future champions of this God-created science. Forty years ago her illustrious discoverer had to flee before her ruthless enemies, until he found a refuge within the boundaries of the humblest principality of Germany. Since then we have achieved a triumph which promises still more brilliant success. We have our own pharmacies; our numbers have swelled to many thousands; we are honored with the confidence and respect of the most intelligent and influential members of every civilized community; we boast of chartered institutions, dispensaries, hospitals, colleges. In our own glorious and imperishable Republic, Homoeopathy, like an infant Hercules, is advancing towards the period when strong, majestic, radiant with the sun-light splendor of a divine truth, she will go forth in the irresistible might of her manhood to do battle for the great good of humanity, and to combat the mischievous practices of the destructive therapeutics which the infatuated professors of antiquated systems have been permitted for centuries to proclaim *ex cathedra* as the orthodox tenets of medical science.

Ours is a noble and sacred position. We are not simply teachers and students of medicine; we are the professed advocates and promulgators of a medical doctrine which is to revolutionize to its very foundations a time-honored system of therapeutics. The old landmarks of medicine are to be forever removed by the new dispenser of healing powers; the horrible tortures which the deceitful genius of man has contrived for the relief of the sick, and to which the votaries at the shrine of an unregenerate AEsculapius still adhere, with all the unfeeling tenacity of incarnate fiends, are to be buried in the abyss of eternal oblivion; a whole empire of medical Pride, Superstition, Prejudice and Interest is to be overturned, and a new temple of the healing art is to be founded upon God's great law : that so far from a relation of antagonism existing between the disease and its remedial agent, this agent on the contrary unites itself with it, as ' it were, by some mysterious but inevitable process of attractive affinity, and gently hushes and removes the disturber, without leaving a trace of his painful presence. These are the objects of our endeavors ; *our* pride is not centered in a

creed; *our* interests are those of suffering man; *our* worship is the love of truth; *our* school is boundless nature; *our* teacher, Reason, fortified by observation and experience.

If our aim is elevated, our responsibility is correspondingly great. We owe it to the public, and above all to our own consciences, that we should be right. If we claim the privilege of an unsparing criticism towards our opponents, we certainly should exercise the strictest watchfulness over the developments which are going on in our own midst, and are presented to the world as integral portions of the homoeopathic fabric. A candid, fearless and impartial examination of our own doings and teachings can only result in good to the cause of medical truth and of the sick; moreover, we have become a power in the laud; we can afford to exhibit our weakness in broad daylight ; our strength will become the more apparent and formidable; and the sting of satire, which threatened to poison the very life-springs of homoeopathy, will seem as harmless as the prating of babes, or the vapid nonsense of learned sots.

Let us then devote a few moments to an examination of the past, the present and the future of our cherished science. I beg the privilege of presenting my remarks under the respective heads of "the FOSSIL, the TRANSITION, and the PROPHETIC PERIODS of Homoeopathy."

FOSSIL PERIOD.

THE old fable of Minerva starting out of Jupiter's brain a full-fledged goddess, armed and equipped for war, with spear, buckler and helmet, has never yet found, and is not likely to find, its realization in the sciences or arts. The law of gradual growth seems to be a necessity inherent in the organization of all finite existences and discoveries. Homoeopathy is subject to this law. To suppose that a finite mind could have perceived at a single glance all the facts of the new science of therapeutics, and could have arranged them into a faultless system of relations and applications for the use of succeeding generations, would be to suppose that God had delegated his infinite wisdom to mortal man, for the accomplishment of such a work. Homoeopathy, eternal in nature and reason, had to have a beginning and a development in time. In the midst of Cimerian darkness and chaotic confusion, the sun of medical truth shed his first rays over one of the small capitals of Germany. Fragmentary essays were the first fruit of the new light; gradually a compact system of the new doctrine was given to the world, and it was not until several years had elapsed after the publication of the Organon, that the *Materia Medica Pura* was completed.

In Hahnemann's case, theory preceded practice. He was a man of genius and the *discoverer* of a great law, interwoven in the very foundations of nature, and constituting an essential element in her infinite mechanism. Cullen might have seen it before Hahnemann, but although a fine thinker and an excellent physiologist who believed in the vitalizing forces of the nervous system, and was therefore far in advance of the massive humoralism which had been dispensing under Boerhaave's lead its dissolvant, its deobstruent, its discutient, its incrassant brews and decoctions: yet his was not the glorious destiny to interpret the specific curative relation which Peruvian bark holds to intermittent fever, as the result of an universal law which would prove applicable to the treatment of diseases generally, and would be universally followed by the same positive and life-saving results. It is the perception of this specific relation of the bark to intermittent fever which establishes the genius of Hahnemann; the readiness with which he generalized his discovery, shows the vastness of his grasping intellect.

The opponents of Homoeopathy deny that Peruvian bark is endowed with the specific power of producing a condition like fever and ague in the healthy organism. They affect to account for the effects of bark experienced by Hahnemann by the fact, that these effects resulted from a foregone conclusion in Hahnemann's mind. He had predetermined that the specific curative power of bark in fever and ague, was owing to the property it possesses of realizing a similar disturbance in the healthy organism; and therefore, when he experimented with bark in order to verify the correctness of his theory, the specific effects had to be such as he had decided in his own mind they should be. This is Professor Simpson's theory against Hahnemann. He too took the bark without experiencing any of its fever and ague symptoms, and therefore he concludes that, in the matter of Simpson versus Hahnemann, he, Simpson, being his own judge and jury, brings in a verdict in his favor without the least hesitation or compunction of conscience, and apparently satisfied that Hahnemann will go down to posterity, if he goes there at all, or does not go to a worse place, as a common impostor, covered with merited derision and contempt. But the Professor has failed to perceive that his argument against Hahnemann cuts both ways, for it certainly was a foregone conclusion in the Professor's mind that bark should not produce fever and ague; hence it did not produce it.

The discovery of Homoeopathy will be viewed in another, I should say more heavenly light, by those who religiously believe that God's providence rules the destinies of this humanity. God knew that in the course of time diseases would invade the human frame, and He certainly must have provided means of meeting the adversary in an adequate manner. And inasmuch as God's providence operates by universal laws, He must have arranged, in the very framework of nature, an universal principle of cure, which, in due course of time, would be discovered and applied for the relief of the sick. "We have a right to

suppose that, if love and wisdom be not mere abstractions, but living and efficient attributes of the Divine Creator, His infinite love would prompt His wisdom to devise such a law of cure, and, in order that it might become operative, to appoint some suitably-prepared mind as the discoverer and promulgator of this divine system of therapeutics.

Now, if these premises be correct (and I do not see how any religious physician can dispute their soundness,)-we have a perfect right to look upon Hahnemann as the vessel whom it pleased God to fill with the wisdom and energy required for the great work of medical regeneration. All that it is incumbent upon us to do, is to substantiate by reasoning and experience the incontrovertible validity of his great discovery.

Even our opponents must admit, that if, in the fullness of time, the God-appointed architect of a true system of therapeutics should make his appearance, he will prove to be a man peculiarly fitted for his work – endowed, not only with a high order of intellect, with indefatigable energy and the flash of genius, but with all those delicate, unerring physiological susceptibilities which we contend Hahnemann possessed. If he was a God-appointed reformer of the old system of medicine, we certainly cannot be charged with extravagance, if we claim for Hahnemann a keenness of sensibility to medicinal impressions which, for aught we know, may have exceeded those of any of his cotemporaries; at all events, they must have been adequate to the task he had to perform, of revolutionizing the *Materia Medica* and establishing the new system of therapeutics by means of successive provings of drugs upon himself and his disciples. No man can perform a great work unless his soul is inspired with the love of it. Hahnemann's enthusiasm may have fired all the energies of his noble intellect; it may have quickened all the sensibilities of his untainted organism; and why should not this have fitted him, in a most eminent degree, for the sublime business of determining the therapeutic properties of drugs by systematic provings upon himself and his faithful disciples? Why should these natural advantages of destiny and organization have transformed Hahnemann's mind into a laboratory of baseless hallucinations, fit only to delude an imbecile crowd? We cannot accept these inferences of his reckless defamers; nor can we accept the inference that, because Hahnemann's humanity was not immaculate, he must therefore have been a contemptible quack. We are told by his enemies that he permitted himself, during the earliest period of his professional career, to sell one or two medicines as specific remedies for certain diseases. I have been unable to ascertain how far these charges are founded; but supposing they were, would this conduct on the part of Hahnemann militate against his fitness to discover the true law of the healing art? He was poor, he had to procure bread for his family, and he may have momentarily yielded to the weakness of regarding the products of his genius as a marketable offset against the poverty which had fallen to his lot. The apostle, whom the Saviour addressed as the rock upon which he would build the foundations of his eternal church, perjured himself in the ante-chamber

of Cai'phas, by denying the Master in whose service he afterwards suffered an infamous and horrible death. Gentlemen, if there is a meanness on God's earth which I despise more than any other, it is the canting hypocrisy and the arrogant self-sufficiency of professional men. Behold by whom the ranks of the medical profession are filled! God be praised, we can boast of a few thoughtful, honest, liberal-minded men, who love truth more than a creed, and who would rather serve the sick than sordid interest or hollow-hearted ambition; but what, besides their parchments, entitles a majority of medical practitioners to their seats in the council-chambers of medicine? Where is the ever-active ambition for the good of man, the ever-aspiring love of progress, the comprehensive liberality of thought and feeling that distinguish the good Samaritan among us? To hear such a man as Hahnemann, the gifted son of Heaven, whom the wise and good Hufeland delighted to honor as a friend and brother, traduced by the brainless multitude of the common leechers and calomel-venders, or by the arrogant pedants who fill professors' chairs in allopathic colleges — men who, under cover of their parchments, and the semblance of ethical morality, permit themselves to practice the most cruel deceptions and extortions upon their patients — is enough to make an honest man's blood boil with indignation. May God have mercy upon their nameless frames, when the memory of Hahnemann shall be wreathed in the temple of Immortality with the homage of a redeemed humanity!

Homoeopathy was ushered into the world an infant giant, turgescient with the new life. At the very threshold of his discovery I request you to identify yourselves with the position and the mind of Hahnemann. What was it that flashed through his mind when he beheld the new truth? What was that one glimpse, that one inspiring thought, that inmost revelation of genius which was as yet unfettered by the chains of words, and emerged from the chambers of his mind like a shapeless consciousness, a vague aspiration, if you please, before the understanding had time to recover from its surprise and examine the quality of this instantaneous unfolding of thought? Gentlemen, it is because the followers of Hahnemann have failed to grasp the nature of that inmost perception, that the heavenly science which he was commissioned to announce to the world, has been misapprehended by some of her earliest apostles, and has been developed into channels that will require a thorough purification before the healing powers of their waters can be commended to the sick with uniform confidence in all curable diseases.

Behold Hahnemann in the presence of the new truth; its inmost, ethereal essence floating before his mental vision like a wavelet of transcendent light. What was it that this focus of revealing brightness conveyed to his startled reason? Why, it was simply this: that there is no essential difference between the principle of disease and the principle of the drug. Be disease what it may, a purely physiological disturbance as Broussais would have it, an effect without a cause as it were; or the result of some morbid agent acting upon the living tissues as a subverter of their functional equilibrium: the drug-action must not only be

analogous to it, but must meet it from beginning to end, must be its exact counterpart, a sort of framework into which the essential principle of disease will fit as its own home and orderly arrangement, and which it will most gladly accept in the place of an opposing organism, which is the legitimate sphere of harmonious and constructive, instead of discordant and destructive forces. It is this intellectual perception of the essential oneness of the morbid principle and the drug-force that quivered through Hahnemann's mind when he beheld the first rising of the new sun on the distant horizon of truth. In this one universal thought you grasp the very spirit of Homoeopathy; in this one thought she has her being; this relation of harmonious oneness between the drug and the disease is the absolute, the inevitable condition of every therapeutic cure.

Gentlemen, the letter killeth. It might have been well for Homoeopathy if the spiritual perception which had been enkindled in Hahnemann's mind, could have expanded into symbolic speech of a corresponding order. Would that we could have witnessed and understood the silent communing between the Master's soul and the holy presence that came to him in those inspiring moments. This has not been our privilege, and we have to gather our knowledge of the inmost workings of his mind from the printed record which he has left behind him. So soon as Hahnemann confided his inmost thoughts to words, he exposed them to the danger of being misapprehended by those whose intuitive vision of the truth was clogged by the coarse and clouded understanding. And who can tell how far, in Hahnemann's own case, the effort to analyze and to give definite shape and utterance to the new truth which shone into his mind from the bosom of the Infinite, may have diverted the quivering ray from its true course into a series of developments more or less tainted by the peculiarities of his mental constitution and the fallacies which, to a greater or less extent, are inherent in every finite mind? Hahnemann's position at the time when the great truth of Homoeopathy flashed upon his mind, was a very peculiar one. He was like a great chieftain marshaling his forces against an enemy, who has fortified his camp with all the contrivances that human cunning can suggest; an offensive as well as a defensive position. Hahnemann conducted this war of extermination with merciless energy. He engaged in the combat with the determination of crushing the enemy as a monster of wickedness and falsehood. What else could be expected of a spirit which, like his, loved truth and loathed the systems that had been playing foot-ball with suffering humanity for thousands of years? Medical science was utterly depraved; it had to be wiped out; baseless theories and gross materialism were its component parts; the little wheat contained in such an immense quantity of chaff, was hardly worth preserving; *Materia Medica*, *Therapeutics*, *Pathology* became a mass of ruins, and the flag *similia similibus* floated over the enemy's camp.

Similia similibus was the motto upon the escutcheon of the new truth. Hahnemann, I have no doubt, understood himself perfectly in thus formulating his great discovery. Having destroyed the enemy's fastnesses, he built up his

own works, cementing the whole fabric into a coherent system under the name of Homoeopathy. The principles of this system are explained in the Organon. This great synthesis constitutes the defensive works of Hahnemann's discovery. They have been assailed with all the weapons which sarcasm, sophistical cunning and material science could furnish. That these works must guard some precious treasure, is evident from the fact that no regulars ever assemble in convention without flinging a little of their dust at Hahnemann or his discovery. Even at the recent convention of apothecaries at Washington, Professor Guthrie of New York, in his address, alluded to Homoeopathy as an infinitesimal humbug, which must undoubtedly appear a great improvement on former insults of this kind, if we consider that Homoeopathy has always been represented as a humbug of monstrous proportions, and that infinitesimal, in the minds of her defamers, means infinitesimally small.

To us the formula *similia similibus* which embodied a luminous truth to Hahnemann's mind, presents itself more or less as a mystic symbol which, as paraphrased by its author, means, that diseases can only be cured by remedial agents which produce in the animal economy, while in a state of health, conditions resembling in all respects the natural disturbance. Hahnemann believed in diseases; but he likewise believed that the essence of diseases would ever be an inscrutable mystery to the infinite understanding and that all that we shall ever know of diseases, is the manner in which they appear to the senses as an aggregate of phenomena. The morbid force manifests itself to us by its effects on the living organism; these effects are our therapeutic indications, to remove which we have to operate with drugs that produce effects of an exactly similar order upon the tissues in health.

To an unsophisticated mind, this doctrine, thus expressed with a certain generous vagueness, would seem to embody a beautiful and saving truth, nor is it probable that it would ever have been assailed with one tithe of the fierce bitterness and venomous satire which have sought to crush the life out of it, if the practical developments which were given to it by Hahnemann and more particularly by his earlier disciples, had not been mixed up with a mass of unimportant, pedantic details that were not only shocking to the universal sense of the profession but threatened to hide the new light under a bushel. The influence which the irresistible weight of circumstances had upon Hahnemann's mind, was not appreciated by his disciples. If the great reformer denounced the absurdities of pathological theories and therapeutic methods with intelligence and power, his disciples, feeling secure under the wings of his genius, saw fit to despise the very idea of pathology; in the place of the luminous intuitions with which Hahnemann determined the character of a given disease, and the specific adaptation of this, that or the other drug to its essential nature, they had to content themselves with a sterile comparison of the symptoms of the disease with the symptoms of the then known drugs, in order to effect by such purely external juxtapositions of morbid phenomena the selection of a remedial agent

whose homoeopathicity to the existing case was determined by the numerical proportions of its symptomatic similarities.

The shape which the science of Homoeopathy took in these earlier periods of her existence, seemed so contrary to reason that even the good and wise Hufeland who had generously opened the columns of his influential journal to an exposition of Hahnemann's doctrines, saw fit to undertake a refutation of some of his positions.

Some of Hahnemann's illustrations of homoeopathic action which have been put forth as perfect clinchers in all popular discussions on Homoeopathy, evidence the beautiful delicacy of the physiological adjustments of the living organism, rather than the homoeopathic relation of such remedial measures to the functional disturbance. The cure of a burn by the application of heat, and the restoration of a frozen limb by means of cold, are physiological rather than therapeutic processes, essentially of the same order as the restoration of a man who is dying with hunger, by means of the smallest quantities of nourishment, or of the restoration of a man who is dying with thirst, by means of small quantities of liquid. To the eye that has been operated on for cataract, we measure out light very gradually; to the stomach that has been deprived of food until its vital energies are nearly exhausted, we administer food within restorative limits, commencing perhaps with a few drops of wine or a teaspoonful of broth. If we were to meet a pilgrim in the desert, dying with thirst, would we inundate his stomach with a bucketful of water? The mucous membranes being exhausted, would not the feeble flicker of vitality become extinct, if the prostrated brain were called upon to effect the absorption of such a disproportionate mass of liquid?

A similar physiological caution is required in the treatment of frozen limbs. LP we were to expose them to the ordinary heat of a stove, we should soon bring about decomposition of the injured parts; hence we administer caloric within conservative or rather restorative limits, first, as much of it as is contained in snow, ice or frozen sauerkraut, and gradually increasing the quantity as the vital action becomes strengthened.

In the case of burns the opposite process takes place. If we were to plunge a burnt limb into ice-water, we should soon destroy it; hence we abstract caloric very gradually, imperceptibly at first by applying heated alcohol, spirits of turpentine or similar agents which contain a sufficient amount of cooling principles to quicken the feeble reaction of the deeply-wounded vitality of the part.

Upon similar grounds we remove the pain of a simple burn by exposing the part to the heat of a stove or to the flame of a candle. It is not the hot stove or the burning candle that effects a cure in such cases; the excess of caloric is abstracted by the cooling influence of the surrounding atmosphere, which has to be tempered by the proximity of heat; else the pain would increase in consequence of the disproportionate amount of vital reaction which the decomposing

tendencies of the atmospheric oxygen might excite in the injured part. These, friends, are physiological processes, which Homoeopathy has no legitimate right to offer as illustrations of the law "*similia similibus curantur*."

False issues were raised in the bosom of the Homoeopathic School. Medicine is both a science and an art. The science was speedily overlooked in the midst of the multifarious claims, explanations, suggestions with which the homoeopathic artists filled their journals. By such writers as Hering and Boenninghausen, the most fanciful and baseless speculations were dignified with the term "law." The most childish verbiage about right, left and cross symptoms, upwards and downwards, vertical, horizontal and diagonal action of drugs, and a mass of kindred balderdash was put forth by these and other writers of the Homoeopathic School as the solemn dictate of Nature.

Moreover, every trifling sensation became a symptom. After Hahnemann had published his great work entitled "*Materia Medica Pura*," which history will revere as a monument of careful and reliable experimentation, a perfect symptomomania took possession of the self-constituted leaders of our School. At that time Hahnemann had already grown grey in the midst of his triumphant labors, and he cannot justly be held responsible for the theoretical extravagances of his disciples. The *Materia Medica* was flooded with a perfect deluge of symptoms which would have dishonored and destroyed any medical doctrine that was not founded upon the rock of eternal truth. And materials have been crowded into it that must seem disgusting to every pure-minded man. *Cimex lectularius* and *pediculus*, the bed-bug and the louse: Gentlemen, if we cannot cure diseases without such materials, my advice is, let us exterminate the materials, and leave the cure to nature.

Things could not well go on in this direction without exciting a powerful reaction against the theoretical assumptions of Boenninghausen, Gross and other writers of that time. We now enter upon the

TRANSITION PERIOD

of Homoeopathy. One of the first men who raised his voice against the then existing fancy-sketches of the homoeopathic symptom-fabric was the medical counsellor Dr. Rau, a man of the highest professional standing, and of consummate judgment, education and experience. In his *Organon*, of which I furnished an English translation some ten years ago, he vindicates medical science with a full knowledge of its legitimate claims. A band of noble minds soon united in upholding the great cause of medical truth. Griesselich published his *Hygea*, and the best thinkers of the Homoeopathic School became contributors to its pages. Pathology, therapeutics and medical common sense had again a representative in our midst. The symptom-doctors opened fire upon the impertinent intruders in isolated pamphlets as well as in their regular publications. Hering, who had virtually denied the specific character of diseases, and had taught as one of his self-styled laws, the childish absurdity, "that any

disease may be cured with any drug," conceived such a bitter hatred against Griesselich, that even after the death of the lamented reformer, he could not refrain, in a scurrilous publication entitled "*Hauhecheln*," from alluding to this noble-minded thinker in vulgar and unjust language.

The withering pages where Griesselich brushes away the flimsy cobwebs of his opponents, constitute some of the most brilliant and instructive chapters in the literature of our school. Thanks to the efforts of Griesselich and his friends, the student of Homoeopathy, whom the quicksands of an unmeaning symptomism had plunged into an abyss of doubt and uncertainties, again found himself placed upon solid ground, where he might cast the anchor of hope. Neither the nosological empiricism which Hahnemann had so justly rebuked, nor the fantastic and truth-destroying symptomism which the dictatorial triumvirate of Boenninghausen, Hering and Jahr sought to substitute in its place, found favor with the writers of the *Hygea*. With every proper feeling of reverence for the noble old man whose genius had awakened this new longing for truth in their souls, they subjected his doctrines to the most rigid examination; they repudiated the idolatrous man-worship, to which the triumvirate and their followers seemed addicted; they proclaimed the doctrine that diseases are essential modes or conditions of existence, which are just as immutable as the physiological functions of the organism, and of which the symptoms are manifestations full of meaning to the intelligent observer.

What a change in this dreary wilderness of symptoms, which the triumvirate had been in the habit of arranging into unstable and illogical groups, without any regard to their internal relationship and fitness, simply in accordance with certain arbitrary and ridiculous notions of up and down, right and left, backwards and forwards, crosswise and otherwise. Symptoms ceased to be hieroglyphic symbols; they became speaking witnesses of an abnormal, but essential condition of the organism, upon which their individual quality and their general relation to each other depended.

Granted that the inmost essence of diseases will forever remain an inscrutable mystery—although such a doctrine seems to me to imply an uncalled-for and utterly gratuitous interference with the rights of human reason—nevertheless, these abnormal conditions of the organism are just as accessible to the scalpel of inquiry and observation as the normal physiological status of our frame. We certainly may know as much of disease as is needful for us to know in order to effect a cure by therapeutic means, in accordance with some definite, consistent, uniformly-true method of treatment. Hence, whatever may tend to shed light on the causes, course and terminations of a disease, belongs to the domain of human thought and observation. Hence, again, the study and analysis of postmortem changes may become useful and even highly important means of diagnosis. And hence we derive the consoling conviction that the researches of our cotemporaries, in the departments of physiological chemistry and pathological

anatomy, have not been love's labor lost, but may be turned to excellent account by men who are in possession of an universal principle of cure.

Gentlemen, the writers of the specific school, which offers the only just and legitimate conception of Homoeopathy, have shown us the problem that we have to solve: A disease being given, to determine the character, the probable course and termination of the disease, and to select the remedial agent that shall meet it at all points, as its natural, direct or specific neutralize!1. We shall revert to this subject in our last division of this discourse.

If the fossil period of Homoeopathy had been distinguished by the most lamentable misconceptions and positive perversions of her spirit, the specific school became no less tainted with the most woeful absurdities. Griesselich had departed, and the Hygea had become defunct. The lucid and eminently philosophical teachings of this journal no longer stimulated the vital currents of scientific Homoeopathy. The symptom-school had repudiated the validity of pathological lesions as homoeopathic indications, with an unaccountable and utterly unreasonable stubbornness. In endeavoring to correct the errors of pathology, the adherents of this school expelled both truth and falsehood. They drove out one devil, but seven other devils took possession of the premises. They ostracised the names of diseases which had become household words among the people. Instead of calling a thing pneumonia or inflammation of the lungs, by which every honest-minded and unprejudiced physician understands a condition of the lungs characterized by morbid phenomena of a definite and more or less specific order, constituting an unitary complex of disturbed functions, subject to well-known, orderly changes and characteristic terminations, we were told that this gross nosologism is incompatible with the dignity of Homoeopathy. We were told to take a record of the symptoms, and to individualize, as it was termed, every case of disease, by filling a whole sheet of foolscap with the subjective sensations of the patient.

The whole past of pathology was flung in the dust. The Hippocratic school which had made the development, relations and terminations of morbid phenomena an object of the closest scrutiny and observation, was theoretically ignored as unavailable; the great page of Medicine was a blank which henceforth had to be filled with the ten thousand jerkings, twitchings, prickings, spots, pimples and insignificant nothings that our symptom-hunters have crowded and keep crowding into our Materia Medica without order, without any diagnostic acumen, without any reference to those fixed and immutable pathological conditions which have marked the pages of human history with the characters of one, uniform, identical language of woe.

If there be unity in Nature any where, it is to be found in pathology. Study disease in China or among the aborigines of our continent, under the bright sky of a southern sun, or among the snow-clad plains of the poles; you will find it every where exhibit the same characteristic phenomena and obey the same laws of development, save accidental differences which the modifying influences of

climate and mode of life may impress upon it, without in the least affecting its essential characteristics. A pneumonia in Greenland is the same disease as a pneumonia in Naples, and the syphilis of a Chinese requires the same treatment as the syphilis of the West Indies.

The consoling unity of the principle of disease, without which we could never expect to arrive at a true Science of Therapeutics, we are to fling to the winds; the fixedness and immutability which has characterized disease from the primeval ages of the world to the present day, we are to repudiate as a scholastic chimera; these grand divisions of disease which Infinite Wisdom has set up in the very frame-work of Nature in order to render the eternal Scourge amenable to the tribunal of human reason and subject to the control of those specific agents which the hand of Infinite Love has scattered along the path of suffering man: we are to ignore, and accept in their stead the baseless, planless, arbitrary, illogical, indefinite, incoherent, unreliable and ever-changing combinations which the symptom-school would fain have us consider as the consummation of therapeutic wisdom.

It would be well for humanity, if the professional sense and the common sense of an unsophisticated, non-professional man, remained essentially the same. Many of the theoretical absurdities which creep into the medical schools might then be avoided, and man might be spared untold suffering, to which the dangerous practices that false theories so frequently suggest, give rise. But by some sad fatality the study of a profession, and more particularly perhaps of the medical profession, instead of developing and fortifying common sense, seems to have a tendency to bias the judgment, to obscure the intuitions of reason, and to entangle the mind in a maze of sophisms which, by habit and interest, finally become a second nature.

If a layman of common sense, speaks of pleurisy as a disease, he does not mean that the pathological lesion of the pleura, the effusion into the pleural sac, the stitching pain and acute soreness in the side, the panting respiration, the tearing cough, the bloody expectoration, the fever, headache, flushed face, coated and inflamed tongue, and the various consensual symptoms are the disease, but simply the effect of disease. By an authorized abuse of language, and for the sake of abbreviating the matter, we designate these pathological changes and conditions as the disease. Such incorrect forms of speech may save a good many circumlocutions and fatiguing definitions, and they are perfectly harmless, as long as they are not mistaken for an expression of the truth.

There is no harm in saying, the sun rises or sets; these customary expressions, although implying a radical falsehood, are perfectly compatible with the most rigid calculations of astronomy. But, if we would build a theory of the starry heavens upon these illusory phenomena, the whole science of astronomy would become perverted. In medicine, a great many forms of speech are current among the people, which would do no harm, if they were not made the basis of a theory and corresponding practice.

The most popular error in medicine is, to speak of a pathological lesion as a disease. If the lungs are inflamed, the common man calls that inflammation a disease. The professional physician who ought to know better, has been beguiled into accepting these popular definitions as the genuine truth, and erecting upon such false theories a system of treatment fraught with danger, mischief and suffering.

In order to remove the effused serum from the pleural cavity, he applies a blister to the side, for the purpose of drawing the fluid out.

This is but too often the vulgar explanation of such a proceeding. Knowing that, in pleurisy, the capillaries are injected, he applies leeches to the side of the thorax, in order to remove the accumulated blood which he considers as the cause of the inflammation. It seems incredible that physicians should entertain, and act in accordance with, such absurd notions; but pathology has been full of such illusions.

Hahnemann repudiated the doctrine of pathological lesions as a fruitful source of deceptions. Yet, the study and analysis of pathological changes after death, seem to exercise a powerful attraction on the most gifted medical minds. Why is this? Why should a man like Rokitansky be willing to spend his life among cadavers, amid the ruins of the dissecting-room? Certainly not to act the part of an intellectual hod-carrier, but because he honestly fancies that these dissections and microscopical examinations of diseased organs may lead him to a more accurate and more intimate knowledge of the nature of disease. The method may be faulty, but the aim is noble, and the arduous labors of such a man are eminently deserving of the commendations of our school.

Only let us guard against repeating the mistakes of the old-fashioned empirical nosologism, and connecting mere names of diseases with remedial agents in the fatal bonds of an indissoluble union. If we say that Phosphorus is a remedy for pneumonia, or Bryonia for rheumatism, let us associate with these technical names, definite abnormal states, with which the Phosphorus and Bryonia action, corresponds both in essence and in form. If this course had been uniformly pursued by the specific school, the dangerous extravagance of regarding certain remedies as absolute specifics for certain general disorders, such as Arsenic for typhus abdominalis, Phosphorus for pneumonia, Pulsatilla for amenorrhoea, would have been avoided, and the specific homoeopathic relation of a drug to a disease, would have been understood to mean what it really does mean in nature: that a certain abnormal state of the organism can be directly met by only one remedy, in the same sense as that there is but one straight line from one point to another.

Thirty years after the publication of Hahnemann's Organon, the Homoeopathic School had undergone considerable modifications, owing to the persevering and eminently successful efforts of Griesselich, Schroen, Arnold, and a host of other writers and practitioners of this stamp, to elevate the scientific character of Homoeopathy, and to expound her principles as natural laws, independently of tradition and authority. One of the most brilliant and philosophical works of that period, where the connection of homoeopathic therapeutics with psychology, physiology and pathology, is shown with great force and originality of thought, was published by Dr. Koch, of Stuttgardt, who is now residing and practicing among us.

The adherents of a purely technical symptomism had dwindled down to a very small number. Homoeopathic physicians had discovered that, under the guidance of their therapeutic law, the facts of pathology might be converted into beacon-lights as it were, pointing out to the helmsman, to whose watchful care some patient had confided his frail bark, a safe entrance into the haven of convalescence. Broussais, who had defined a symptom as "the cry of a suffering organ," spoke an intelligible language to the physicians of our school. The symptom was no longer a sensation without quality, but a speaking witness of some peculiar, characteristic, or we might say, specific disease, an element of an unitary group, to all whose other elements it was related by virtue of an essential identity, and from which it only differed in appearance, in consequence of the functional and structural differences of the affected organ, tissue or system. The contempt which the regular physicians, as they self-complacently style themselves, had experienced for homoeopathic practitioners, gave place, in Germany at least, to considerate treatment. In the writings of the opposition press, they are frequently alluded to as "our respected colleagues." This change of tone was not the result of a compromise, but of actual conquest. Some of the most distinguished Professors of Medicine in Germany, admit that there is a good deal in Homoeopathy which may be made available; they admit that their poor patients have been physicked too much, and that their prescriptions are unreasonably complicated; they even go so far as to ransack our Materia Medica, and to appropriate some of our drugs, without it is true, being always very particular in regard to mentioning the source whence they are derived. Professor Schoenlein, of Berlin, recommends Pulsatilla for menstrual suppression in doses of one-sixteenth of a grain.

Previous to the thorough discussion which the doctrines of Hahnemann underwent in the columns of the Hygea, the infinitesimal globule had been considered as an indispensable accompaniment, a logical and inevitable result of the homoeopathic law. This opinion which, if allowed to prevail in an absolute sense, might have led to injurious and perhaps fatal mistakes in practice, was tempered, through the efforts of the Hygea, with a suitable admixture of belief in

the homoeopathicity and curative adaptation of larger doses of the remedial agent. Even the tinctures of such drugs as Pulsatilla, Aconite, Belladonna, Nux Vomica, and the lower triturations of Mercury, Sulphur, Arsenic and other agents, were not only used with signal advantage, but were found to be equal, if not superior, to the attenuations in a number of cases.

The bugbear of homoeopathic aggravations had likewise been stripped of its terrors. This doctrine was a logical consequence of Hahnemann's peculiar mode of explaining the operation of homoeopathic agents, and therefore liable to modifications just so far as these explanations might require to be modified. It was found that, in many cases, the natural development of the morbid phenomena had been mistaken for a medicinal aggravation, and that the subsequent relief was a natural subsidence of the pain, and by no means owing to an organic reaction against the primary action of the drug. Thus one stumbling-block after another was removed, which had been in the way of a calm examination of the tenets of our school; the number of sober-minded homoeopathic practitioners increased from year to year; every fact in therapeutics and pathology, of which homoeopathy could justly and usefully avail herself) was incorporated in her statute-book, and the day seemed to have dawned when the regenerating influence of the homoeopathic law would be felt in the whole domain of medical sciences.

Gentlemen, the time will come when the law *similia similibus* shall whisper accents of wisdom in every council-chamber of our opponents; but we should not attempt to obtain this influence by an abandonment of principle. It is strange that in our own country, where Homoeopathy is rushing onward like a mighty river in her triumphant course, her crystal purity should be contaminated by the mischievous folly of some of her pretended advocates.

Some of the writers in the North American Homoeopathic Journal promulgate doctrines which every philosophical thinker of our school must regard as perversions of the very principle which constitutes the corner-stone of homoeopathic therapeutics. The physiologism of Broussais, the iatro-chemism of Liebig, the humoralism of Boerhaave, the empiricism of Rademacher, all the medical absurdities of the present and past centuries, are mixed up by Dr. Peters with the facts of Homoeopathy, in that species of eclecticism which Trousseau and Pidoux condemn as " a source from which emanates the nothingness of chaos, and which, proscribing all unity of method, has led to the numerical system, the last cloak of skeptical weakness."

Is it proper for a homoeopathic practitioner to blow hot and cold in the same breath, and to swear by any kind of treatment that folly, pride and reckless

caprice may suggest? If the homoeopathic law of cure be not an universal principle, capable of being defined and applied with scientific precision, why affect the name of homoeopathic? Is not this trifling with the sacred things of God and humanity?

In an article on fatty diseases of the heart, Dr. Peters proposes to get rid of the fat by deluging the stomach with liquor potassa. A pint, says he, will dissolve several pounds of it. No more beautiful illustration of iatro-chemism could be found in the whole range of medical literature.

If you adopt physiologism in one instance, why not be consistent? Why not stimulate the liver with your calomel, or narcotise the brain with opium? We may feel disposed to excuse the illusions of this false system of physiological therapeutics for the sake of the consistency with which it was taught by the distinguished Professor at the Val de Grace, with an eloquence and a brilliancy of genius that fascinated the medical world of Paris, and unfortunately was backed by a power of specious logic, and a justness and depth of criticism, which swept the medical horizon like a meteor of dazzling splendor. But to see Hahnemann chained to the car of Broussais, must excite a feeling of pity and contempt in the heart of every clear-headed homoeopathic physician against these shallow attempts to fish pure pearls in muddy waters.

Who can read a paragraph like the following in a professedly homoeopathic journal without a feeling of bitter disappointment and disgust: "Acids prevent the digestion of, and remove fat; a Spanish general who was enormously corpulent, is said to have removed the fat so rapidly by drinking large quantities of vinegar, that he could wrap the loose skin around him like a cloak; another case was promptly cured by Nitric acid; yet when Nitric acid is made to act on fibrin apparently deprived of its fat, an oily substance is disengaged; and during the action of Nitric acid on starch, an oily matter is set free. The best time to take acids, to prevent fatness, is before and during meals. Alkalies, such as Soda and Potassa cure adiposis in a different way, they cause the fat to be re-absorbed from the fat cells, then combine with it to form a soap or emulsion, after which it is burnt up with oxygen, as a calorific element; the best time to take alkalies to remove corpulency, is from four to six hours after meals; if taken with, or shortly after food, they will solve or saponify all the oil and fat in the food, favor its absorption and appropriation." Liebig teaching Homoeopathy; as well might we appoint a rabid wolf the shepherd of a flock.

Dr. Peters seems to have a peculiar fondness for the iatro-chemical treatment of diseases. Speaking of the iodide of potassium, he says: "The most remarkable of its effects are a rapid and very considerable increase of the urine, and what is

quite remarkable is, that gradually the uric acid sediments entirely disappear, while those of the ammonia-phosphate of ammonia decidedly increase. This effect is still more apt to occur from large doses of the iodide of starch and iron. Here we would seem to have a truly homoeopathic remedy to the *Phimphatic Lithiasis*." Liebig again! This looks like science, but such teachings constitute a most woeful perversion of science. How does the iodide of potassium remove the uric acid crystals? By virtue of its dynamic action? But Lehmann tells us that most of the soluble alkaline salts, such as the nitrate of potash, the iodide of potassium, the alkaline carbonates, etc., are found unchanged in the urine. Hence, so far as therapeutic purposes are concerned, we might as well mix these substances with the urinary excretions in the bed-chamber instead of introducing them into the living organism.

The doctrines which I here repudiate, are not the result of a passing indiscretion; they are the offspring of false principles and of a misapprehension of the very spirit of Hahnemann's own teaching. And what is worse, they are engrafted upon the Code of Homoeopathy as genuine doctrines; they are recorded in, and therefore must be supposed to have the sanction of, a professedly homoeopathic journal distinguished for the ability, sound learning and devotion of its editors and contributors. Gentlemen, in defending truth, we must not mince matters; we must speak out plainly and manfully. Honesty and rigorous analysis are our sacred right and duty.

Let me show you to what lamentable and dangerous mistakes the hyper-materialism of Dr. Peters and his followers, if he have any, leads in practice. Speaking of *Aethusa Cynapium*, and Noack's recommendation of this drug for abdominal typhus, the doctor goes on to say: "But the most essential part in typhoid fever is the peculiar change in the blood, this consists in a diminution of the fibrin and an increase of the carbonated salts, especially of carbonate of soda. Numerous experiments have shown that in animals which have for a long time been submitted to the excessive use of alkalies, the blood becomes destitute of fibrin and rich in the carbonated alkalies; "hence the alkalies are homoeopathic to typhoid fever, and the acids, antipathic."

Now I ask, in the name of common sense, what have these phenomena to do with the homoeopathicity of the carbonate of soda to typhus? Is not this change in the constitution of the blood effected by an endosmotic process of absorption? Is there the remotest analogy between the cerebral symptoms accompanying this change of the blood, and the pathognomonic symptoms of typhus? How will you determine the homoeopathicity of the alkali to typhus in a given case? Will you first draw a pint of blood from the patient and then make a chemical analysis of it, in order to ascertain the relative amount of fibrin and the presence of the

carbonate of soda? How absurd, and what an uncertain basis for the selection of a drug! Lehmann tells us that " it appears, from the most recent analysis of Becquerel and Rodier, that the amount of fibrin may vary considerably in the same group of diseases, in one case rising above, and in another falling below, the mean number." Is it possible that Homoeopathy has to seek refuge in such miserable fallacies? Sulphuric acid is recommended for black vomit, because, in a case of poisoning with sulphuric acid, the acid corrodes and blackens the mucous coat of the stomach; these shreds of chemically blackened mucus are considered as homoeopathic to black vomit, and a clever practitioner like Dr. Holcombe, permits himself, on the recommendation of Dr. Peters, to use sulphuric acid in this stage of yellow fever.

Gentlemen, if I seem to you severe in my condemnation of these mischievous teachings and practices, it is because I am pained in my very soul, to see the divine truth of our doctrine sacrificed to vulgar and deceptive materialism. Alkalies are homoeopathic, acids are antipathic to typhus. What is the inexperienced student of Homoeopathy to understand by this disgusting twaddle? Is he to understand that alkalies will cure typhus and that acids will not? or that either may be used indiscriminately? If so, by what law is he to determine the curative fitness of these respective agents in determinate cases? What is left for him to fall back upon, but a baseless and most treacherous empiricism, unbecoming a rational mind, and utterly at variance with the divine prerogative of man to investigate the first principles of science, and to realize in his own humble sphere the order and living harmony, which constitute the matchless and imperishable beauty of God's nature.

We are standing on the threshold of the future. The

PROPHETIC PERIOD

of Homoeopathy has dawned upon us. A spirit of inquiry is abroad that will sweep out of existence both the hyper-symptomism of the past and the hyper-materialism of the present; a spirit of inquiry that will develop Homoeopathy into an art based upon the clearly comprehended and universally admitted facts of science. The medical age is traveling towards Homoeopathy, though with their seeing eyes they see not, and with their hearing ears they hear not. The spirit of God is hovering over the dark waters of Medical Chaos, creating order and harmony out of the confused elements which the struggling genius of physicians has scattered about on the vast plain of Therapeutics. Homoeopathy is fast reforming the old abuses and modifying the theories of the past. In the most classical work on Therapeutics in France, the sixth edition of which was published a few months ago, I mean the elaborate treatise of Trousseau and

Pidoux. the doctrines of the Organon are subjected to a most rigid, but very fair criticism. In an introductory chapter of some hundred pages, thirty are devoted to Hahnemann.

Even our globules have been adopted by alloepathic practitioners. In the late Convention of Apothecaries held in the city of Washington, Mr. Delluc, of New York, presented a report on what he terms saccharides and sugar-granules, which he recommends strongly as more suitable and agreeable vehicles for the administration of drugs. The report was referred to a committee, and the saccharides will no doubt be incorporated in the body of alloepathic pharmaceuticals.

" The wind bloweth whither it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof; but canst not tell whence it cometh, nor whither it goeth." Yes, the old wreck of Medicine is drifting towards Homoeopathy. The people are tired of being physicked to death, and physicians are compelled to treat human nature with respect. Satire is repudiated by the most distinguished opponents of Homoeopathy as an unworthy weapon. "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 destroy 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." They even admit that, if it "be true, as Hahnemann asserts, that disease is an alteration of the immaterial vital principle in us, and that the medicine which acts upon this immaterial vital principle, must do so by properties of the same order: the quantity of the dose may easily become infinitesimally small."

Why then, it may be asked, are these gentlemen opposed to Homoeopathy? Why do they reject or find fault with almost every existing medical doctrine, and yet continue the abuses of the old methods of treatment? Evidently for various reasons, the principal of which is, that they labor under an honest misapprehension of the teachings of Hahnemann, arising in a measure from their incompleteness and from Hahnemann's unqualified opposition to the medical theories and practices of the past. They designate their method as the *substitutive method*, by which they understand the process of effecting a cure, by substituting one disease for another. Theirs is not so much a new method, as a new mode of explaining the phenomena of counter-irritation. A cure of ophthalmia, by means of the application of a solution of the nitrate of silver to the inflamed eye, is the result of a substitution of an artificial inflammation for the natural disease.

This seems, in reality, Hahnemann's explanation of the operation of homoeopathic agents. The artificial disease substitutes itself for the natural malady, by virtue of its superior, more specific intensity. But strange to say, this

very simple explanation has been woefully misunderstood by Hahnemann's opponents, as well as by some of his leading disciples.

Every disease embodies a trinity of facts: 1. The cause which constitutes the essential principle of the disease; 2. The pathological lesion or derangement, and 3d, the symptomatic indications. Can you conceive of a single act which is not the result of a three-fold order of principles? Does not every act imply a moving cause, a thing moved, and a method or mode of motion? So does every disease imply the existence of a morbidic principle or force, a corresponding derangement of the physiological functions, and a series of phenomena by which this derangement manifests itself to the sentient understanding.

What now does Hahnemann, who never mistook a pathological lesion for the essential morbidic force, mean when he says that the homoeopathic remedial agent effects a cure by virtue of its superior intensity? Why, he simply means, that the relation existing between the remedial agent and the essential morbidic force, is of a more specific nature, and therefore more intense, than the relation existing between the morbidic force and the physiological organism, and that this force will therefore be induced; by a natural process of affinity, to relinquish the organism and unite itself with the remedial agent, which possesses the power to *externalize*, if I may use this expression, the internal disease, by amalgamating it as it were with its own molecules, and thus reducing it to such a condition of inferiority to the vital reaction as must result in the restoration of health. If Hahnemann had not meant this, he would have taught an absurdity, and Hahnemann was not the man to teach foolish things.

Professor Trousseau and the symptomists have done Hahnemann equal injustice in opposite directions; Trousseau by accusing Hahnemann of contenting himself with combating the essential, immaterial, dynamic, morbidic cause, and the symptomists by attributing to him the absurd doctrine, that symptoms may be treated as abstract and independent entities as it were, without referring them to a pathological lesion as their fountain-head. Hahnemann knew full well that in every disease the physiological functions of the organism are deranged in a peculiar, specific manner; but when he speaks of the substitutive action of homoeopathic remedial agents, he does not understand it in the same sense as the physiological school, of which Trousseau is one of the leading oracles, understands this doctrine. He certainly does not mean that in order to cure a natural inflammation, we must absorb it by exciting a more intense artificial inflammation, but he does teach that the character of the pathological lesion determines the meaning of the symptoms, and the choice of a remedial agent, and that a remedial agent, thus selected in accordance with the symptoms, and with specific reference to the pathological disorder, will act directly upon the morbidic force by virtue of an inmost and therefore superior affinity, without creating a perceptible artificial disturbance of the physiological organism.

Gentlemen, I look upon a proper comprehension of the homoeopathic law as the highest effort of reason. It can hardly be expected that an alloepathic physician,

whose mind is wedded to the fallacies of materialism, should be able to analyze the meaning of *similia similibus* with that nicety of perception without which any heavenly truth remains either inaccessible to the human mind, or hidden in the fog of skepticism and misapprehension. Trousseau who is a distinguished Professor in the Medical School of Paris, a good and honest man, of gifted intellect and not afraid of progressive ideas, does not comprehend Hahnemann. Hence his arguments against Homoeopathy leave the latter invulnerable and may be turned against his own position with terrible effect.

"Because an artificial morbid action seems to cure in many cases a natural morbid action by substituting itself in the place of the latter, after which the former rapidly disappears of itself, we must not conclude that this curative effect is due to the similarity of the artificial to the natural disease. Substitution does not mean homoeopathicity. The curative application of a topical irritant to a specifically inflamed part cannot be accounted for on the ground of *similia similibus*. In a phlegmasia of a bad character, topical irritants act most probably by causing the healthy or physiological element to prevail over the morbid element, or by extinguishing, so to say, the latter. This may be inferred from the injurious action which topical irritants exercise on healthy inflammation. A healthy or physiological inflammation, and an inflammation of a morbid, gangrenous, diphtheritic, syphilitic, scrofulous character, are in no wise similar. Pathologically considered, they are rather opposed to each other, since the one tends to a curative restoration, and the other to a decomposition and destruction of the parts. Hence by endeavoring to impress a restorative character upon an inflammatory process of a specifically morbid, disorganizing tendency, we do not act *homeopathically*, but *heteropathically*. If it were possible for the medicine to induce an artificial morbid action as nearly as possible similar to the natural morbid action, this one would be increased instead of being weakened. But an internal resemblance has been taken for granted on the ground of a few gross external analogies, and whereas the principle of *contraria* was more evidently demonstrated than ever, the principle of *similia* has been proclaimed."

This paragraph, which seems to embody a very specious and successful refutation of the homoeopathic law, shows how little even such men as Trousseau and Pidoux apprehend the true import of *similia similibus*. They will have it that a medicine, in order to act homeopathically to a disease, must actually set up a disturbance of the physiological functions similar in form and degree to the natural disease. This, they say, is the doctrine of the Organon, and it may indeed seem so to the superficial reader. But in spite of Trousseau's argument to the contrary, Mercury does cure syphilis homeopathically. Mercury is homoeopathic to the syphilitic element, and it is this element that Mercury neutralizes or extinguishes, if you please, thus converting the malignant sore into a healthy inflammation. And if the application of white precipitate or the nitrate of silver to a simple, or, as Trousseau terms it, physiological inflammation results in an increase of irritation of the inflamed part, it is because the action of the

topical irritant is not homoeopathic to the physiological action or element. No, my dear professor, homoeopathic physicians are not the fools you take them to be; Homoeopathy does not rest upon a mere gross resemblance of external symptoms, but upon a similarity of the internal morbid processes. It is the drug action in its essential principles that is homoeopathic to the essential morbid action, and, by virtue of this homoeopathic affinity, hushes up, extinguishes or, as you very energetically express it, *devours* this latter element.

The whole of Trousseau's brilliant argumentation against Homoeopathy rests upon this fatal misapprehension of the fundamental idea of homoeopathicity. Trousseau will have it that homoeopathicity means the actual production of a pathological disorder similar to, and more violent than the natural disease, whereas the true intent and meaning of Homoeopathy is the superior affinity of the drug principle to the essential principle of the disease or to the morbid force or *element*, as Trousseau terms it, which *generates* the specific, characteristic derangement of the physiological functions. We thank the learned Professor for having afforded us an opportunity of enlightening him on the subject of Homoeopathy; he is, so far as I know, the first writer of eminence who has undertaken the task of refuting the doctrines of Hahnemann by philosophical reasoning. "Would that all our opponents might imitate his example! If we cannot beat them in vulgar abuse, we certainly can beat them in argument.

Friends, we must not expect to conquer the world by a mere stroke of the pen. Nor will the numerical method be found a reliable means of securing the universal triumph of our cause. It is undoubtedly true that, under a properly conducted homoeopathic treatment, all other circumstances being equal, more patients will be cured, than under any other form of treatment. Nevertheless, the numerical method is the lowest order of argument that can be resorted to in favor of Homoeopathy. Numbers are not facts of the reason, but have to be credited upon the authority of individual observers. And then it is very doubtful whether the pneumonia or typhus of one region, and similar maladies of another region, are equally intense in character, and equally amenable to treatment. Moreover, observers may not be equally particular in ranging diseases under their proper categories, although I am confident that, in this respect, unfairness cannot be charged upon homoeopathic practitioners, who very often succeed in cutting short an acute disease, like Asiatic cholera, in its preliminary stage, which, under alloepathic treatment, will run its course onward towards a fatal termination.

If *similia similibus* is a natural law, it must be capable of demonstration. We cannot expect to convince our alloepathic brethren of the truth thereof, until we shall succeed in establishing this law as one of the immutable principles of nature, the perception of which constitutes an essential element, and therefore an inevitable result, in the progress of our mental growth. Yes, if *similia similibus* be an universal law, and if it be true, that Infinite Wisdom operates in things infinitely great as well as in things infinitely small, according to an unchanging

system of harmony, then every globule which a homoeopathic physician prescribes, should personate God's Providence to the suffering organism, and should minister relief just so far as relief is possible under the supreme laws of life.

The usefulness of the homoeopathic law is admitted even by those who denounce the doctrines of Hahnemann as a tissue of absurdities. Professor Simpson concedes, that "it would be a valuable general law, if it could be proved to be such." Even Hooker, in his diatribe against Homoeopathy and Hahnemann, believes in the possibility that "future observation may establish the homoeopathic law as one among the many laws of cure, which are employed in the removal of disease; "he simply asserts "that homoeopathic observation has not done it."

Is there such a law? Is an universal law of cure one of the principles of universal order? To say that it is not, is to doubt the wisdom and goodness of Providence. It matters not how disease came into the world. The biblical tradition of the original sin, whether it be understood in a literal or figurative sense, accounts for the introduction of disease in a manner sufficient for all practical purposes. We are told that the Creator was satisfied with his work. The design and working of the great machinery of creation were perfect. If there was no disease, the probability is that there were no drugs. If there were drugs, the Creator must have foreseen the eventual supervention of diseases; and if there were no drugs, he must have so fashioned the forces of nature that, with the introduction of diseases, drugs must have been produced. If drugs were intended as the natural neutralizers of diseases, I do not see how, with the belief in a Providence, whether the Providence of God, or the Providence of Nature, whose supervising and all-governing care extends to the minutest details of the Great Whole, the idea of a specific adaptation of drugs to diseases can be avoided. And if drugs are specifically curative under His infinite Providence, it can be shown that they cure homeopathically.

It matters not how we understand man's original transgression of the laws of Divine Order. The fact that such a transgression took place, is established by the evidence of the actual as well as by the traditions of the past. The moral transgression tainted the physical creation, and the forces of disease were the inevitable result. But God could not permit these morbid forces to pervade creation like wild and lawless furies seeking whom they might destroy. He subjected them to the laws of order, by compelling them to fix themselves as it were in definite, concrete forms. Thus it is, that medicinal agents embody or materialize, so to say, morbid forces, themselves resulting from man's original transgression, and perpetuating themselves, with the hereditary consequences of this transgression in man, from age to age and generation to generation. In what do these hereditary consequences consist in a pathological and therapeutical aspect? Why, they consist in the fact that man's organism is actually tainted with morbid tendencies, corresponding with those forces of disease which a wise and

merciful Creator compels to embody or substantialize themselves in our drugs for the use of suffering man. The Aconite-force is therefore within us, the Belladonna-force is within us, not actively, but in a state of potency, watching for an opportunity to break forth like a fury bent upon destroying the organism. Under the influence of some accidental cause, the slumbering Aconite-force becomes a rebellious disease, and then it is that the healing artist steps in with the Aconite-plant in order to imitate God's own process of salvation. He brings the Aconite principle as materialized in the plant, in contact with the Aconite disease, and obliges the latter, by virtue of its superior affinity to the former, to unite itself with the drug-molecules, and from an internal disease, to become converted into an external principle of limited and harmless dimensions. This it is what Hahnemann meant, when he seeks to explain a homoeopathic cure upon the ground that a drug acts more powerfully than the disease ; Hahnemann could never have been guilty of the silly nonsense, which his opponents impute to him.

To Homoeopathy is reserved the glorious mission of restoring order in the domain of Medicine. Order in Medicine implies a threefold hierarchy of facts: 1st. *Forces of disease* which are essences, essential principles or morbid causes, effecting corresponding derangements of the physiological functions and thereby producing,

2nd. *Pathological lesions* which manifest themselves to the sentient understanding,

3rd. By *abnormal sensations* and alterations of tissue.

This is the hierarchy of facts without which Medicine is a chaos and a nonsense, and which implies a threefold order of studies :

Pathogenesy, or the science of morbid causes;

Pathology, or the doctrine of abnormal changes in the physiological functions and the organic tissues; and lastly,

Semeiology, or the doctrine of symptomatic indications.

Who can foretell whether it will ever be given unto us to know the essences that perpetuate woe and pain among us? We may never be able to solve this mystery, but it will be reserved for Homoeopathy to show that these essences do not float through ethereal space in anarchical confusion; Homoeopathy will show that they are definite in number, subject to law and order, and admitting of a classification not depending upon the fitful caprice of fancy, but resting upon the incontrovertible and immutable dictates of Nature. Mere symptom-hunting will not accomplish this result, but a careful and unceasing comparison of drug-symptoms with pathological phenomena will be a preliminary step towards the grand Nosology of Nature.

And then, let us not despair of the chemist and the natural philosopher. Consider what has been done in the laboratory ! How the principles of matter have been hunted up in their hiding-places! May we never know the forces that float upon the sun-beam into the atmospheres of Nature, vitalizing the germinal principles

in the crust of our planet, and developing them into visible forms in harmonic relations with the constituent principles of man's own nature? The ancient philosophy which regarded man as a miniature-universe, is the very cornerstone of theosophic truth and a mine of practical usefulness to the Homoeopathic physician. Yes, the principles which originated the drug-world, emanate from, and are perpetuated by, man's sinful nature. He tasted of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil; he substituted the lusts of his own will in the place of God's law of love, and the fallacies of his foolish wisdom in the place of God's eternal truth. The consequence of this moral transgression was that man's physical organism became tainted with morbid tendencies or predispositions which reacting upon the spheres of life, engendered morbid forces corresponding with those morbid tendencies. Every now and then, under favorable circumstances, these morbid forces, existing as they do in the bosom of the vital spheres, invade the organism exciting its morbid predispositions into actual lesions.

But, under God's Supreme Providence, these forces of disease are subject to definite laws of order and means have been provided for their extinction. The forces which develop pathological lesions are the same forces that develop drugs in the crust of our planet. Drugs being the natural ultimations or material types of the forces of disease, will therefore manifest a tendency, and are indeed possessed of a power to absorb or attract these forces, to *externalize* them as it were with reference to the internal organism, and hence to hush up their disorderly workings amid the play of the physiological functions.

Thus it is that God himself sets us a supreme example of homoeopathic action. With the very forces which create pathological lesions, He creates the means for their extinction. And the human artist imitates the Divine example by using for the cure of a pathological lesion such drugs as are *homeopathic* to it; in other words, drugs that harbor within their inmost bosoms the very forces which had excited the lesion, and the quality of which he determines approximatively, according to Hahnemann's brilliant teaching, by experimentation upon the healthy as the only reliable basis of comparison between the physiological series of phenomena of drug action, and the pathological series or phenomena of disease.

Here you have a generalization of the facts which may be said to constitute the great Series of Homoeopathy: man's sin tainting the vital spheres which support his physiological organism, by the production of morbid principles that would utterly pervert God's fair creation, if, under His supreme Providence, they were not held in order by eternal laws. Under God's government they do not rove through the spheres of life like the unchained furies of hell, but they are ever tending downwards in obedience to an inevitable necessity until, in material nature, they become embodied in fixed forms, subject to the use of man, each typifying some specific morbid essence, which will not fail to unite itself with this its material type, if such a union be still possible in the prostrated organism.

Would that I could make you see it as clearly as I see it: that our drug-world is a fixed and permanent revelation, in material forms, of the diseases that afflict humanity ! To me, Homoeopathy is not a mere system of technicalities; it is a Christian science, a divine handmaid to the Christian atonement. Sin begetting disease which the laws of order compel to fix itself in definite material forms that become the agents for its own extinction. Is not this the Christian salvation enacted in the domain of therapeutics? God permitting sin to exist, and coming into the world to wipe out its terrible consequences!

It has been said that Homoeopathy is a system of atheism in disguise. Who are the atheists – practitioners who flagellate the poor organism with the rod and the scorpion, or the men who gently and sweetly minister remedial agents for the purpose of removing pain? "I came not to destroy, but to save." Nor was a drug created for the purpose of inflicting pain; its mission is to be a saviour unto suffering man.

It is the Physiological school, this medical Babylon of the day, that is guilty of atheistic materialism. Berard, the Professor of Physiology in the Medical School of Paris, teaches that life is the result of organization, a doctrine that can only be accounted for and excused in so far as it implies an acknowledgment of the magnificently-beautiful harmony of adaptation existing between man's spiritual and natural organisms.

Trousseau and Pidoux account for the phenomena of disease and of medicinal action by the supposition of vital properties inherent in the constitution of matter. Living matter! A self-sustaining, self-living organism!

And if the harmony of the machine is disturbed, they bleed, blister and burn it, as though the poor organism were at fault. They do not see that it is invaded by an enemy, from whose assaults it should be freed without having additional tortures inflicted upon it. "I came not to destroy, but to give life."

Gentlemen, we may not live to see the day when Homoeopathy shall be acknowledged as the great universal Christian science of medicine. But let us work for this noble end. The harvest is ripe, and God's blessing awaits every honest laborer in the vinyard of his suffering humanity.