

LECTURE II.

WE have met, gentlemen, to study both facts and principles. Among the facts, a correct knowledge of the therapeutic properties of our drugs occupies a deservedly high, if not the highest, rank. The principles embrace every statement or inference, every generalization, which bears upon, illustrates the meaning or facilitates the application of our law of cure.

I shall devote this hour to a development of some of the general principles of our school, including a philosophical definition of our law of cure, a clear perception of which is absolutely necessary to a successful study and an intelligent application of the therapeutic properties of our drugs, and their *modus operandi* in disease.

Before, however, entering upon a description of the external and internal properties of our drugs, it will be advisable to spend a few hours in explaining the various technical definitions which frequently occur in our school, and in acquainting those among you, who have not as yet had an opportunity of looking into our method of treatment, with the necessary details regarding the mode of making homoeopathic preparations, the utensils and manipulations which are resorted to for that purpose, an explanation of various technical expressions, such as trituration, attenuation, potency, dilution, and so forth. It is likewise desirable that you should have a knowledge of the non-medicinal vehicles which we use in preparing our attenuations, such as sugar of milk, alcohol, globules, etc.: in one word, it behooves every homoeopathic physician to possess a general knowledge of the manner in which a crude drug is changed into a remedial agent.

Many among you, being already fully acquainted with these details, may feel disposed to deem their recital superfluous. To all second course students, young practitioners, or young gentlemen who have had the advantage of studying with older practitioners, these preliminary details must undoubtedly seem tedious; but let us not forget that there are those among us who come here for the first time, and who have not yet had an opportunity of seeing or hearing much in the way of homoeopathic technicalities. For their sakes I shall be obliged to tire some of you with a few repetitions.

It is your interest, gentlemen, that I should not take anything for granted. You may perhaps recollect one of Moliere's immortal comedies, where a gentleman who had risen to fortune and to a position in society, engaged a professor of

philosophy to give him a private course of lectures on metaphysics. The professor said to him, "I suppose you understand Latin, sir?" To which the gentleman replied, "Oh, yes, sir, but you had better talk to me as if I knew nothing about it." This student chose the true mode of learning.

Keep it constantly before your mind's eye that a professor of medicine is not an infallible mortal, were that mortal even Hahnemann. I trust that I shall never permit myself to lay before you facts which only exist in my own imagination and are not substantiated by experience. Nevertheless, I shall at times offer inferences and suggestions; I shall lead your minds into the higher regions of thought, and endeavor to explain the law under which the facts of homoeopathic therapeutics are grouped in harmonious relations. At such times I trust that you will ever find my mind as free from partizan dogmatism as I desire your minds to be. "Prove all things and hold fast that which is good!" Let this be your maxim in all your studies. Genuine faith is the acknowledgment of a truth that shines as such in the interiors of the mind. This should be the faith of a student of Homoeopathy. If a statement does not seem clear and convincing, examine, interrogate, discuss; you will always find me and my colleagues willing to mete out to you the full measure of justice.

My duty to you, gentlemen, does not consist in making a display of learning; it is of a far more elevated and useful nature. You have come here to obtain a knowledge of Medicine generally, and more particularly of the manner in which diseases are treated in accordance with the homoeopathic law. Our system of Therapeutics is exceedingly democratic. If you look into Hahnemann's *Materia Medica Pura*, you will there find scarcely a single word of Latin or Greek. The action of every drug is described in the simple language of the people. These drugs were proved by Hahnemann's disciples and their friends. By proving, we mean that persons in health swallow a portion of the drug, in order to ascertain how it will affect them. The effects of the drugs were collected and recorded in the words of the prover; hence, in the original language, you will find many expressions among these provings which are not at all received as classical, and might mislead one who is not thoroughly acquainted with the idiomatic singularities of the German people. Among the provings of Chamomile, for example, we frequently meet with this expression: "sensation as if the heart should be squeezed off." By heart, the common people in Germany mean the pit of the stomach; and by this symptom the prover simply meant to convey the idea that he experienced a very hard and painful pressure in the praecordial region, such as is generally accompanied by anxiety and shortness of breath. That this is the meaning of the distress thus announced as a pressure as though the heart should be squeezed off", results from the accompanying expressions immediately preceding or succeeding this symptom.

Physicians have long since found out that diseases may be named, but cannot be treated, much less cured, with Latin or Greek. In order to treat diseases successfully, you have to be correct diagnosticians, in other words you have to know what the matter is; but next to this knowledge, it is likewise of the utmost importance that you should have an accurate knowledge of the true action of drugs upon the organism in health, not only of their toxicological effects as we find them recorded in old-school works on toxicology; but of the more delicate shades of action which may be observed throughout all the ramifications of the sentient nervous system. You will find the action of our drugs delineated with remarkable accuracy and completeness in Hahnemann's *Materia Medica*. But their study would require more toil and time than you can afford, in the beginning of your professional career, to bestow upon a careful and thoughtful perusal of this laborious work; moreover, the multitude and apparent sameness of the symptoms might puzzle you. It is my duty to present this subject to you in a more digested and practical form.

I would not have you understand that one or two courses of lectures will enable you to dispense with all further study on your part. All I can do, in the short period which is allotted to our lectures, is to give you such a knowledge of the curative properties of our drugs as shall enable you to step to the bedside of your patients, with the confidence of men who need not be afraid of the enemy they have to encounter. Nevertheless, a case may turn up, even at the commencement of your professional career, where, instead of prescribing for your patient upon the spot, you may deem it expedient to first consult your records. If you improve your opportunities for study, as all young gentlemen who mean to devote their lives to the service of suffering humanity ought, such a difficulty will never occur in an acute case, requiring the immediate interference of the physician; but in a chronic case, in a functional or organic disorder of long standing, you may have to fall back upon a Manual or Repertory, before making a prescription.

A perusal of our *Materia Medica* will confirm to you my statement that in style and manner it is as simple as it is rich and vast in its therapeutic aspect. It shall be my endeavor, and it will be my pleasure to show to you the perfect applicability of this *Materia Medica* to the successful treatment of all curable diseases. You will find that the characteristics, or, as we term them, the pathognomonic symptoms of all known diseases are contained among the results of our provings with sufficient accuracy and fulness to admit of the application of our great law "*similia similibus curantur*," to all curable cases of disease. Gentlemen, let us pause here for a few moments, and look at the practical character of the homoeopathic system of treatment. You are aware that our literature abounds in popular works on Practice. There is hardly a family of ordinary intelligence and education, where the mother, an elder sister, or some

other member of the flock, is not more or less acquainted with the use of some of our drugs in all ordinary cases. Hahnemann was the most democratic practitioner of Medicine that ever shook the old oligarchy of medical dogmatism to its foundations. The popular literature of our school is the logical and inevitable consequence of his mode of criticizing the old abuses and of treating the new truths. Some of our popular treatises on Homoeopathy, most of which are published under the title of "Domestic Physicians," have reached as many as six and even more editions. Hering's Domestic has gone through eleven editions in Germany.

In the 25th number of the North-American Homoeopathic Journal, the mention of this work is accompanied by the following remarks signed by T. F. Pomeroy: "In the last number of the journal, I perceive that Dr. Peters handles quack and secret medicines without gloves, as they justly deserve. I could not but wish, while reading his article, that he or some other one competent to do justice to the subject, would take up the matter of the domestic practice of Homoeopathy, as taught in the thousand and one treatises called 'Domestic Physicians,' and the practice necessarily growing out of the publication of such works, of furnishing families with 'domestic cases of medicines.' My own observation has satisfied me that this system, *on the whole*, has been productive of vastly more injury than good, both to the public and to the profession, and it is high time that it should be discountenanced and discontinued. In my opinion, the use of pellets or globules, and the attempt to popularize and *domesticate* Homoeopathy, have done more to degrade and injure our system, than any or all other influences combined. The introduction of the homoeopathic system and its zealous propagation, would naturally and necessarily excite both prejudice and opposition, because the interests of others were jeopardized thereby; hut the shafts of ridicule and contempt that have incessantly assailed its onward progress, have been invited by the folly that has begotten a progeny of medical literature, noted particularly for its crudity and rapid increase.

"I hope that the time is not far distant, when more attention shall be paid to the publication of books for the profession, and the talents and time of our brethren no longer wasted upon ' Domestic Practices' which seem chiefly to level us and our system to the position of quacks and quackery. So soon as its adherents and exponents shall learn to treat it with the respect to which it is entitled, our system of medicine will command even from its opponents both recognition and respect, although it may not secure their adhesion to its precepts or principles."

The physician who penned this paragraph is just one century behind this age of democratic progress. Let your motto be the beautiful verse of the old poet Terentius: "*Xullius humani a me alienum puto.*" I feel interested in everything that concerns man! With this feeling in your hearts, you will always desire to render the beauties of art and the majestic movements of science accessible to the masses of our people. "Let your light shine on the housetops, do not hide it under the bushel!" This great precept is emphatically applicable to the teaching and

practice of medicine. The man who would keep the light of medical truth shut out from the popular mind, ignores the spirit of our institutions, and is utterly regardless of the portentous signs of the times. The gloomy shadows of the old dogmatism are fast flitting out of sight before the rising sun of truth. Shall we again bow to the mystic conclaves of bewigged and bepowdered pedants, or shall it be our endeavor to cause the star of Homoeopathy to shine into the palaces of the great and the cottages of the poor and the lowly?

Dr. Adam Smith has called universities the "dull repositories of exploded opinions." Let our university be a beacon-light of truth to every honest inquirer. I regard the propagation of our doctrines among the people as one of the first duties of a homoeopathic physician, young or old. Use all honorable means to accomplish this purpose. Be always ready to relieve the sick, and do it successfully if possible. Enlist the editors of journals in your favor. Get them to publish, every now and then, an editorial paragraph making favorable mention of Homoeopathy. Publish popular tracts, and I every few weeks scatter them broadcast throughout the length and breadth of the community where you happen to practice. As often as your time and means will allow, give a lecture to the people possible, publish some popular periodical on Homeopathy, and tell your friends to share the expense by liberal contributions. Never mind the croaking of your opponents about quackery; this is nothing but the silly twaddle of impotent fools, who resort to abuse in the place of argument. All the great and liberal minds among medical practitioners have constantly endeavored to popularize the practice of their art. Listen to the words of one of the noblest and most gifted among them, I mean Benjamin Rush. In his lecture on "the causes which have retarded the progress of medicine," he gives this soul-stirring advice to the young gentlemen who enjoyed the privilege of listening to this great teacher:

"Let us strip our profession of everything that looks like mystery and imposture, and clothe medical knowledge in a dress so simple and intelligible, that it may become a part of academics education in all our seminaries of learning. Truth is simple upon all subjects, but upon those which are essential to the general happiness of mankind, it is obvious to the meanest capacities. There is no man so simple, that cannot be taught to cultivate grain, and no woman so devoid of understanding as to be incapable of learning the art of making that grain into bread. And shall the means of preserving our health, by the culture and preparation of aliment, be so intelligible, and yet the means of restoring it, when lost, be so abstruse as to require years of study to discover and apply them? To suppose this, is to call in question the goodness of the Supreme Being, and to believe that he acts without unity and system in all His works. In no one of the acts of man do we behold more weakness and error than in our present modes of education. We teach our sons words at the expense of things. We teach them what was done two thousand years ago, and conceal from them what is doing every day. We instruct them in the heathen mythology, but neglect to

teach them the principles of the religion of their country. We teach them to predict eclipses and the return of comets, from which no physical advantages worth naming have ever been derived; but we give them no instruction in the signs which precede general and individual diseases. How long shall the human mind bend beneath the usages of ancient and barbarous times? When shall we cease to be mere scholars, and become wise philosophers, well informed citizens and useful men?

"The essential principles of medicine are very few. They are moreover plain. There is not a graduate in the arts, in any of our colleges, who does not learn things of more difficulty than a system of just principles in medicine.

"All the morbid effects of heat and cold, of intemperance in eating and drinking, and in the exercises of the body and mind, might be taught with as much ease as the multiplication table.

"All the knowledge which is attainable of diseases by the pulse, might be acquired at a less expense of time and labor than is spent in committing the contents of a Latin grammar to memory.

"The operation of bleeding might be taught with less trouble than is taken to teach boys to draw, upon paper or slate, the figures in Euclid.

"A knowledge of the virtues and doses of the most active and useful medicines, might be acquired with greater facility, and much more pleasure, than the rules for composing syllogisms laid down in our system of logic.

In support of the truth of the opinions I am now advancing, let us take a view of the effects of simplicity, which has been introduced into the art of war by one of the nations of Europe. A few obvious principles have supplied the place of volumes upon tactics; and private citizens have become greater generals, and peasants more irresistible soldiers, in a few weeks, than their predecessors in war were after the instruction and experience of fifteen or twenty years. Could changes equally simple and general be introduced by means of our schools into the practice of medicine, no arithmetic could calculate its advantages. Millions of lives would be saved by it.

"In thus recommending the general diffusion of medical knowledge, by making it a part of an academical education, let it not be supposed that I wish to see the exercise of medicine abolished as a regular profession. Casualties which render operations in surgery necessary, and such diseases as occur rarely, will always require professional aid; but the knowledge that is necessary for these purposes may be soon acquired; and two or three persons, separated from other pursuits, would be sufficient to apply it to a city consisting of forty thousand people."

These are the opinions of a great and good teacher of our profession. The healing art, as such, is a very simple thing; and this beau ideal of it, as foreshadowed by the illustrious Rush, finds its realization in the homoeopathic practice.

The study of the therapeutic properties of our drugs may be reduced to the simplest formulas. There does not seem to be any immediate necessity for a

knowledge of all the intricacies of physiology or pathological anatomy, in order to become a successful practitioner. A physician should undoubtedly know all that which is practically useful to him as a restorer of health; but pathological anatomy, as Rokitsansky studies it, pursuing the material disorders of disease in the dead body with as much tenacity as Columbus went in search of a new continent, or Le Verrier hunts up a new star, is something comparatively distinct from, or independent of, the plain and practical wants of the sick-room.

Gentlemen, a man may be the leading pathological anatomist of the age, and yet he may be a poor physician; a man may be a great physiological chemist, and yet a most unsuccessful practitioner; a man may be a second Cruveilhier, and yet lose more patients than his unlearned colleague who only has a general knowledge of the main facts of anatomy: a man may even be a most learned pathologist, and yet make exceedingly inadequate prescriptions. Why is all this? Why may a practitioner treat diseases, and treat them successfully, without wading through the almost bottomless pathological learning of the Vienna School? It is undoubtedly true that therapeutics should not be, and indeed cannot be, separated from physiology and pathology, but, in the present state of these sciences, they can only inform us in a very general way, how far, and in what specific manner, the healthy functions of the organism have been invaded by disease. It has taken years of hard labor and bitter disappointments to reach this point; but now when it has been reached; now, when the organic functions, the nature of the secretions, the mission of the nervous system and the mutual relations of organs are tolerably well known, we find that the pathology of disease is not only cleared up, but simplified by the flood of light which the patient toil of our cotemporaries has shed upon it. Any intelligent person may be taught whether a headache is of a congestive, bilious or nervous character; any person may learn to diagnose pleurisy, pneumonia, typhus or any other disease of common occurrence, and may be made acquainted with the course and natural terminations of these disorders. Why should a knowledge of the therapeutic properties of our drugs, and of what constitutes their homoeopathicity to certain diseases, be more difficult?

It is not a knowledge of the ten thousand minutiae of disease, that secures success in practice; but the possession of that intuitive power of vision, that inborn faculty to appreciate the meaning and relation of phenomena, as indicating the degree or character of an existing disturbance of the vital forces; added to this must be a corresponding tact to determine what remedy is adapted to the case. This tact may be *sharpened*, it can never be wholly *acquired*, by experience. Common sense, backed by an appropriate amount of technical information, is a far more valuable gift to a practitioner than whole volumes of abstract science. I would not discourage you for the world from penetrating as deeply as you please into the marvelous intricacies of the medical sciences; I would simply have you understand, that, in order to diagnose and successfully

treat a case of pulmonary tuberculosis, it is not necessary that you should have investigated the inmost nature of a tubercle as a physiological product. If a physician's taste and genius lead him to make such minute investigations, he may become one of the few who lead generations onward on the path of science; but in a practical course of lectures, where, in the brief space of five months, the vast field of therapeutics has to be traveled over, it is of the utmost importance to the student, that the prominent traits of every drug disease, and consequently of every corresponding pathological disturbance should be presented, to the exclusion of a multitude of details which only serve to embarrass the memory and to tarnish the brightness of the genuine fabric.

Physiologism, by which I mean the abuse of physiology in its applications to the treatment of disease, has led to the most contradictory results. All the different ramifications of the physiological school are either guilty of the most frightful excesses or of the most lamentable omissions. The human organism is a compound of organs each of which is endowed with certain physiological properties or forces. The doctrine is that the play of the functions is determined by the structure of the organ; that the liver, for instance, secretes bile by virtue of its peculiar organization. What else can a man in his senses understand by this pompous nonsense than that the liver secretes bile, because it is the liver, and the urine trickles into the bladder, because it is the bladder and not the brain? What horrible abuses does this physiological organicism lead to in practice!

If the secretion of bile slackens, the liver must be whipped up by calomel; if the glands in the mouth secrete too much saliva, they are tied up by an astringent; abdominal torpor is removed by stirring up the intestinal mucous lining with a dose of salts or castor-oil; the heart is hushed by Digitalis, the brain by Morphine. It is the organ itself that is held accountable for its functional derangements. Theoretically the existence of diseases or morbid essences is denied; in their places we have abnormal physiological functions.

Gentlemen, it is of importance that you should have a perception of the teachings of the Physiological school; a logical comprehension of our own doctrines hinges upon it. The Physiological school does not distinguish between the organism in health and the organism in disease, between vital and morbid forces, between drugs and aliments. Muriatic acid is food for a dyspeptic stomach; Mercury for the absorbents when they require stimulation; blood-letting will relieve the brain from pressure, and will lessen the heart's labor of propelling the column of blood through the organism. "Physiological "and "therapeutic "have become convertible terms; in the crucible of subversive physiologism the normal functions of life, and the abnormal functions of disease are amalgamated without distinction under the cover of *seeming* principles which make chaos look like order, and death-harboring confusion like life-saving harmony.

The Homoeopathic School DOES distinguish between the *harmonic* forces of life, and the *subversive* forces of disease; between aliments which *support* and *develop* the organism in health, and drugs which tend to *disturb* the functions and gradually to *undermine* and *destroy* the organism. What would become of the human organism, if the inmost essence of vitality, the life-force of an organ, could be altered by disease? "If the salt has lost its savor, wherewith will it be salted?" Not only would the individual man perish, but the race, the very idea of humanity would become extinct. The vital sphere, or force, of which the individuals of our race are individualized manifestations, is just, as essential to the preservation of humanity in its present form, as the heat and light of the sun are essential to the preservation of the varied individualities of material nature. The vital sphere which emanates from this sun, is not sufficient for the preservation and development of organized life. There must be a vitalizing sphere back of the sun's heat, or within it, or round about it, I do not care where you locate this fountain-spring of life, —from which the sun itself derives the power to animate material nature; the moment an organized life-form is cut off from the influence of this supreme life-sphere, the sun, so far from preserving the form, destroys it. This life-sphere, which constitutes the inmost principle of every human form, can never be tainted by disease, any more than the sun's rays are altered in their essential constitution, if they engender poisonous exhalations from stagnant waters and decayed vegetable substances. These pernicious results are owing to the medium upon which the sun operates. As long as the sun shines upon pure flowing water, the limpid fluid will not be rendered turbid by his rays; but if they should fall for any length of time upon a stagnant pool filled with decaying animal matter, you will soon see this turbid liquid teem with myriads of living bodies hardly perceptible to the naked eye.

The vital rays act similarly to the rays of the material sun. As long as they act upon an organism existing in normal conditions of nutrition, exercise, atmospheric stimuli, and mental and passional influences: they not only preserve, but develop, strengthen and beautify the human form; but if these normal conditions are disturbed by exposure to dampness, to keen winds, to a draught of air, to excessive heat or cold, or by privations of food or drink, by excessive fatigue, by depressing or exciting mental or moral causes; the vital rays no longer acting upon an harmonious medium, cannot possibly develop harmonious results.

In the analysis of health and disease, the Physiological school does not seem to ascend beyond the circumstances which, in the eyes of the philosophical physician, simply furnish suitable opportunities for the invasion of the organism by morbid principles. To the adherents of the Physiological school, these abnormal circumstances which the philosophical physicians of all nations and ages have simply regarded as the exciting causes of disease, the *cansae*

occasionales as they are termed, sufficiently account for the functional derangements of the organism. According to some they excite an undue degree of vital reaction; according to others this reaction is depressed beyond the normal standard. Broussais was haunted by the ghost of inflammation; Brown knew of but one disease, *diathesis*, a sort of general susceptibility to physiological derangements, the intensity of which he measured numerically as it were, by the degree of excitability manifested by the tissues. The treatment corresponded with these contradictory hypotheses. The School of Broussais, upon whose banner was inscribed "Irritation and Inflammation," bled, froze and purged patients to death; Brown who proclaimed "Instability" as his beacon-light, sought to stimulate the prostrated organism by food, alcohol and opium. "By their fruits ye shall know them." Doctrines which led to such monstrous aberrations in practice, must have been radically wrong. The Physiological school ignored the very existence of diseases; pathological lesions which are simply the effect or result of those morbid essences which really and truly constitute the disturbing causes in derangements of the functions, were mistaken for, or confounded with these essential morbid forces; hence the wild and abusive stimulation in practice, hence an absurd and inhuman butchery in the place of rational treatment.

Can a thing be essentially good and bad at the same time? If the inmost vitality of the organism can be vitiated, how is this vitiated vitality to be restored to a condition of harmony? If the core is corrupt, how is it to be repaired? For the sake of truth, let us adhere to common sense. Is it not evident that there must be some restorative energy left, which the blighting hand of disease could not touch? What is this energy but the essence of life in man, the very principle that never perishes and therefore can never be tainted by disease? This inmost vitality, this living essence is not a reasoning or discriminating power; it feeds the tubercle and the polypus as well as the healthy muscle and nerve. It is the business of the vital force to assimilate food to the tissues and to repair their waste; but it behooves man's reason to determine, out of what materials the thread of life shall be spun. What a folly ever to accuse the vital essence in man! Diseases are adventitious principles or forces, super-induced or eliminated in the surrounding spheres by man's deviation from the laws of divine harmony. Look around you, gentlemen, at the mechanism of social life! Is it possible that the disorders which taint society, should not have led to the development of morbid forces which, although primarily resulting from man's transgressions, in their turn fan the tire of disease in man? This process is constantly taking place on a limited scale and in a more specific form. We know that puerperal peritonitis, typhus, yellow fever, may not be epidemic; but we likewise know that, if such patients are huddled together in badly ventilated hospitals, or crowded districts, deprived of proper attendance, pure air and water, clean linen and the comforts of sweet and gentle love, an epidemic principle may very speedily be eliminated which may spread the havoc of disease far and near.

This humanity is an organism, the harmony of which is depending upon laws that cannot be violated with impunity. It is idle to suppose that God's providence should not have designed rules and regulations for the government of his creatures. He governs brute nature by laws; how much more a world of rational souls! "And why take ye thought for raiment! Behold the lilies of the field, how they grow! They toil not, neither do they spin, yet I say unto you that even Solomon, in all his glory, was not arrayed like one of these." "Behold the fowls of the air; for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they?" "Therefore I say unto you, take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment?" "Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, oh ye of little faith!" "Therefore take no thought, saying, – what shall we eat? or what shall we drink? or, wherewithal shall we be clothed? For your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things." "But seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you!"

We say then that Humanity is an organism for which the Divine love and wisdom designed a code of laws. If these laws are obeyed, the evolutions of this great organism will be performed with a matchless harmony; if these laws are not obeyed, the opposite results must ensue. War, pestilence and famine desolate our globe, and the furies of hell lacerate the hearts of men. Hence we infer that the divine laws are not obeyed.

Among the atmospheric disorders, the subterranean convulsions and the electrical perturbations which visit us at more or less regular periods, the existence of diseases constitutes another characteristic sign of man's deviation from the laws of divine order. As I stated in my introductory, the biblical account of the original sin is all sufficient for therapeutic purposes. Man yielded to the first temptation, and this transgression opened the flood-gate of evil. The organism became tainted with morbid predispositions or tendencies to disease, and morbid principles were gradually excited in the spheres from which man derives vitalizing support for his bodily organs. This now constitutes the course of disease; in certain abnormal conditions of the system, such as exposure, privation, mental depression, some morbid force is enabled to excite a corresponding morbid tendency into an active disturbance of the physiological functions. The morbid force acts as a cause, an active, inseminating principle; the morbid predisposition is the germinal seed that is acted upon, and is kindled into a pathological lesion which constitutes the offspring, as it were, of this subversive insemination.

This is the theological view of the origin of disease from the standing point of our school. You may take an historico-natural view of the same subject. Practically, the results are the same. Take the existence of diseases for granted, and you have the same trinary series of facts: a morbid tendency as the basis; a morbific force as the inseminating principle, and a pathological lesion as the result of its action upon the former.

Therapeutically, both the theologico-spiritual and the philosophico-natural view of the origin of diseases, lead to the same results. Pathological lesions are acted upon by means of drugs. Theologically we are led to believe that drugs are the representatives or products of sin in material nature, the embodiments of evil principles; philosophically we arrive at a similar knowledge by the slow process of experimentation. By swallowing portions of a drug, suitably prepared and in perfectly normal conditions of the system, we develop groups of symptoms that are found to be essentially similar to the disturbances resulting from the action of morbific forces upon the morbid predispositions of the organism. From this similarity we infer that drugs are the products of the same forces which produce pathological lesions in the human organism. Now, a pathological lesion being given, what is a therapist to do in order to remove or neutralize it? Why, he acts upon it by means of the drug which is the product of the same cause that developed the pathological lesion. A previous knowledge of this drug must of course have been attained by experiments upon the healthy. As soon as the drug-power is made to act upon the morbific force which seeks to destroy the organic tissues, this force will turn to the drug as naturally as the needle turns to the pole. The drug-power is its twin sister, an union with which is sanctioned by the laws of God's Order. In proportion as the morbific force and the drug-force become united or amalgamated as it were, in the molecules of the drugs, the vital power of the organism begins to react and a process of cure is inaugurated, which, if adequately maintained, will inevitably lead to recovery. It is by the very terms of our law that this process of cure takes place. The similarity between the morbific force and the drug-force is greater than that between the morbific force and the morbid predisposition of the organism. It is by virtue of this superior attractive affinity existing between the morbific force and the drug-force, that the organism is ultimately freed from disease. It would be interesting, but it is not material to know what these forces are in their inmost essence. Whether they are electric, magnetic, aromal or odic forces; a comprehension of the general idea of Homoeopathy is neither obscured by the absence, nor would it be materially sharpened by the possession of this knowledge. Hahnemann looks upon the morbific essence as a *dynamic* principle which, as embodied in a drug, assumes a semi-spiritual and semi-material character. The morbific essence is certainly inferior to the vital force, for it is only exceptionally that it succeeds in destroying the living organism.

The question may be asked: if the drug-force and the morbid force are identical, how happens it that the drug-force does not kindle the same pathological lesion that characterizes the action of the morbid force? This seeming anomaly can easily be accounted for.

The morbid force acts upon the morbid predisposition, and subverts the organism from first principles to ultimates. The drug force, on the contrary, does not act upon the morbid predisposition, which it leaves passive, in a state of potency; it simply impresses the external tissues as it were, setting up a purely external disturbance of the functions, of limited duration, though sufficiently characteristic to reveal the therapeutic range of the drug. In a case of natural disease, the morbid force acts internally, directly or immediately upon the morbid predisposition; in a case of artificial or drug disease, the morbid force acts externally, indirectly or mediately through the material molecules of the drug. Hahnemann has applied the term "disease" to both the natural and the artificial disturbances, although there is this difference between the two, that the natural disease is an internal, and the artificial disease a purely external disorder, Hence we might say that a cure consists in *externalizing* an internal disease, or, in other words, in reducing it to the limited and harmless dimensions of the homoeopathic remedial agent.

Gentlemen, you may find it necessary to spend years in elaborating the principles of our science to your own minds with clearness and logical consistency. Ho who would enjoy a rational conception of the homoeopathic doctrine, must not be afraid of elevating his mind into the very highest regions of thought. The study of first principles is eminently useful to a homoeopathic practitioner. It consolidates his faith, and yields weapons wherewith he may repel the assaults of open enemies and unmask the treason of deceitful friends. The writings of some of our authors tend to bias the minds of unsuspecting students. In a review of Dr. Headland's treatise "On the Action of Medicines," Dr. Peters, for instance, uses the following language in the last May number of the North American Homoeopathic Journal:

"Poor Headland, he cannot see that similarity in a hybrid, or compound; that it consists of a certain amount of *difference* as well as of *resemblance*; that a similar thing differs as well as resembles; that a similar action exerts, not an identical, but a somewhat alterative influence; that similar or homoeopathic remedies exert a changing or altering action, which differs only in degree, not in kind, from simple alterative or true alloepathic remedies, or even antagonistic or true antipathic remedies; for antagonism is merely an extreme degree of difference, while similarity is a lesser degree of difference. The two laws (*contraria contrariis* and *similia similibus curantur*) are the complements of each other; they are not

diametrically opposed to each other; there is a bond of union and similarity between them. Identity and antagonism are the opposites of each other; similarity is not the opposite of antagonism, but is merely a lesser degree of difference, while antagonism is the greatest."

The essential distinction between Homoeopathy and the old systems of Medicine is done away with in this paragraph. Antagonism and similarity only differ in degree. The very soul of Homoeopathy is killed outright by the sophistry embodied in these few lines. Even the most superficial student of Homoeopathy knows that the spirit of this science, in Hahnemann's mind, was opposed to the common method of treatment, and that the formula "similia similibus" was promulgated by the discoverer of Homoeopathy as a means of determining the remedial agent which, in a given case, would operate in a manner absolutely the reverse of the established practices. A physician who overlooks this cardinal distinction, is neither prepared to accept nor to practice the homoeopathic doctrine. He does not understand its purport, and he crowds into his practice any thing and every thing that the most unprincipled eclecticism may flaunt upon its banner. This may be perfectly legitimate practice from an empirical point of view, but it is not homoeopathy, and I protest most solemnly against such teachings being put forth under her sacred aegis.

It is a sad thing to see homoeopathic physicians treating diseases as though the great law which, if properly understood and carried out, might save the world from physical and mental misery, recklessly disregarded by those who profess to believe in it. The truth is they do not believe in it, or else, which amounts to the same thing, they suffer themselves by the glistening infatuations of strange gods—an appearance of alloepathic learning—to be beguiled into the pernicious fallacies of our opponents. It may be flattering to one's vanity, to make an exhibition of false learning in the midst of an old-fashioned crowd; but how does this learning benefit the sacred cause of Truth? Is our watchword to be "onward" or shall we go back to the flesh-pots of Egypt? Shall we engraft our new Truth upon the old Fable, and dig an abyss of medical error, deeper and darker than before? Gentlemen, if we forsake principle; if we turn to empiricism and eclecticism as our "pillar of the cloud by day and our pillar of fire by night," the time will be when we shall be the meanest and most despised among the tribe of medical Israel.

Beware, gentlemen, of the deceitful glories of the Physiological school. Beware of its quicksands! Young physicians especially take a pride in confessing themselves the partisans of this school. "With microscope and crucible in hand, they expect to be led by physiology to the laboratory where the vital forces spin the thread of life, and to lend a helping hand, as they understand it, in case the functions should not be carried on to suit the judgment of the observing creature. If the stomach does not secrete as much gastric juice as it ought to do, they pour a little Muriatic acid into it to help it along, on the principle that Muriatic acid has

the same dissolving properties as gastric juice when out of the stomach; and yet they might know that there must be a vast difference between gastric juice and Muriatic acid; for gastric juice is an organized product of the vital forces, and, if no longer subservient to the supervisory action of these forces, soon decays and is radically altered in all its essential properties.

I have shown you how one branch of the Physiological school is led to the most frightful excesses in treatment. There is another branch which simply watches the natural course of pathological lesions, and rejoices in doing nothing to abbreviate it. Physiological physicians either bleed, burn or blister the poor patient, or else they shrug their shoulders, and, as Hirschel in his excellent work on Homoeopathy tauntingly remarks, "hide their impotence or ignorance behind an embarrassed skepticism, or a dangerous indifference which leaves the patient to his fate. Yes, the greatest lights of the allopathic school, have given over Medicine to Nature. Alas, what shall we say of Medicine, if the learned pathologist, armed with the whole apparatus of modern science, applies his stethoscope or his compasses to the patient's chest, and points out to the astonished layman the spot where the bloody infiltration, the bronchial dilatation, the emphysematous cell may be found; if, guided by the sounds of the heart, he furnishes an exact description of the valvular disease; if he demonstrates to the patient the size of the liver, or the quantity of fatty matter it contains; if he gives the anatomical history of pneumonia, and if, in spite of this tremendous array of medical science, he is finally compelled to confess to his utter ignorance of positive and infallible means of relief; if, for instance, a distinguished auscultator, like Skoda or Bock, after delighting his class with a lucid and correct description of the physical signs of pneumonia, has to tell them, that it is immaterial whether they bleed the patient, or give him Opium, or Tartar emetic, or Nitre, or nothing at all? Or, in a case of edema glottidis, after describing the characteristic difference between this disease and bronchitis, if the physiological physician has to prescribe gum-water, as if anxious not to dispute the palm with Nature? If Nature is sufficient to a cure, of what use is all this array of science? If the science of *healing* is useless, why not likewise throw overboard pathology?" Is it the business of the physician solely to *track* Nature with an observing eye, and to *admire* her multitudinous manifestations of life? Is it not his duty to learn from her the art of imitating her, and helping her along, without interfering in her operations? Alas, the greatest masters of our art are reduced to the miserable shift of the expectant school, which consists in looking on and doing nothing.

The so-called Expectant Method, as this system of treatment is termed, may be more agreeable to the patient than the old-fashioned bleeding, blistering, and salivating methods, but it is not always very successful. According to Dietl, for instance, who is physician in chief to one of the Vienna Hospitals, fourteen out of one hundred and eighty-nine patients who were treated expectantly for pneumonia, died; this is one in about thirteen; whereas under homoeopathic

treatment, only one in twenty-eight died in Fleischmann's Hospital, and out of seventy-two patients not one died in the Petersburg Hospital. The difference is considerable, although the partisans of the expectant method claim the results of homoeopathic treatment as showing the superiority of their own method. Not believing in the efficacy of small doses, they feel justified in claiming the brilliant results of our treatment for themselves.

Gentlemen, you have a vast field before you. The development of therapeutic medicine as a Science and an Art is the great problem of the future. It is your privilege to engage in its solution. May God speed the day when your efforts shall be crowned with success.