

## LECTURE III.

As I am standing here before you, the spirit of Hahnemann overshadows the flitting hour. He is gone, and what is left us of him, is the echo of his fame, and the written record of his earlier labors.

As soon as Hahnemann had published a systematic exposition of his doctrines in the *Organon*, he set about creating a new *Materia Medica* in harmony with them. Already in the year 1805, Hahnemann had published a number of provings under the title: *Fragmenta de viribus medicaminum positives*, or fragments concerning the positive powers of drugs. This work contains a number of the characteristic symptoms of several of our more important drugs, obtained with massive doses of the strongest known preparation. The Aconites symptoms were obtained from the watery extract inspissated by exposure to the sun. These drug-effects were afterwards incorporated in the *Materia Medica Pura*, the first edition of which appeared in the year 1811, one year after the publication of the *Organon*. This work was originally published in four volumes, and contains the provings of sixty-six drugs, most of which constitute to this day the staple of our therapeutic agents. All these provings bear the impress of reliability. They are the results of careful labor. A number of enthusiastic and conscientious observers concurred in developing these drug-effects in their own persons by means of large doses of the strongest preparations then in use.

In 1828, Hahnemann published his remarkable theory of the chronic miasms. In the course of my lectures this theory will be explained and accounted for. I here allude to it simply for the purpose of introducing to your acquaintance a vast addition to the *Materia Medica*.

Among the chronic miasms, of which Hahnemann admits three, viz.: *Psora*, *Syphilis* and *Sycosis*, the psoric miasm is the most widespread and inveterate; most of the chronic diseases which now afflict humanity, arise from the insidious operations of psora. In the exposition which Hahnemann furnishes of his theory, he states the reasons which impelled his mind to seek for more thorough and reliable means of combating the disorders to which the human family is subject from infancy to old age. The drugs which had been proved so far, and which were used by the homoeopathic physicians in the treatment of diseases, were found insufficient by Hahnemann and his disciples to effectually remove the numerous chronic ailments that have desolated this fair world of ours for thousands of years. Hahnemann set his genius to work, and searched for, and

discovered a series of agents which he thought had been designed by the Creator for the great purpose of healing the chronic diseases that had so far baffled all the resources of art. Inasmuch as most of these diseases were supposed to originate in the psoric miasm, most of these newly discovered remedies were therefore directed against it, and designated by Hahnemann as *antipsorics*. We do not propose, at this stage of our course, to inquire into the validity of Hahnemann's theories; we simply wish to advert to the fact that the large number of drugs, the provings of which are recorded in the five volumes known under the title of the "Chronic Diseases, and their Homoeopathic Treatment," were supposed by Hahnemann to be possessed of specific powers to heal, and gradually to exterminate all chronic maladies. Several drugs which had already been proved at former periods, and the provings of which had been incorporated in the four volumes of the *Materia Medica Pura*, such as *Sulphur*, *Phosphoric acid*, and others, were reprovved in different ways; new symptoms were obtained, and the whole of them, old as well as new provings, were transferred to the "*Chronic Diseases*" as an integral portion of the great anti-psoric *Materia Medica*. The volumes entitled "Chronic Diseases," embrace about a hundred drugs, more or less, all of which are distinguished by an almost interminable array of symptoms.

Gentlemen, on contrasting the provings contained in the five volumes entitled "Chronic Diseases," with the provings of the four volumes of the original *Materia Medica Pura*, we discover remarkable differences as regards clearness and characteristic positiveness of delineation. In the original *Materia Medica Pura*, every symptom bears upon some well marked disease; with a little tact, and a previous knowledge of existing diseases, the practitioner has very little difficulty to discover among the head-symptoms of those drugs, the various forms of headache, congestive, bilious, nervous, rheumatic, and so forth, to which the respective drugs are homoeopathic. The same may be said of the alvine and thoracic symptoms, of the symptoms of the special senses, of the general nervous symptoms; the very expression of all these symptoms bears intrinsic evidence of their reliability and perfect truthfulness, and indicates in unmistakable language the pathological lesions with which they correspond as specific curative agents.

Would that the same confidence could be had in the provings of the drugs to which Hahnemann has applied the term "*anti-psorics*." Most of these provings were instituted during Hahnemann's declining years by his professional followers, and by their uneducated lay friends, in a manner which provoked Hahnemann's own condemnation. In a note appended to the provings of one of the anti-psorics, he declares in substance that he has had to reject a number of the symptoms furnished by some of the provers, and he moreover expresses his surprise that the business of proving drugs should be conducted with so much levity, as he inferred from the unreliable character of the symptoms, it must have been. In spite of Hahnemann's precautions, and a great deal of clipping and

pruning, a large number of insignificant symptoms, according to Hahnemann's own admission, have been left standing, producing unnecessary complications, obscuring the true therapeutic character of drugs and occasioning merriment and avoidable misrepresentations on the part of our opponents.

The doctrine of potencies, concerning which I shall offer all proper and useful suggestions in the course of my lectures, had engaged Hahnemann's attention from the very beginning of his great discovery. Towards the latter part of his practice, Hahnemann used almost exclusively the higher attenuations both in his own case as well as when treating his patients. And the opinion became prevalent among a number of homoeopathic physicians that, because the attenuations proved efficient in the treatment of diseases, they must likewise prove efficient in developing symptoms. Thus it happened that most of the later provings, and more particularly the provings of the antipsoric medicines, were conducted with the attenuations. The result is before us. If we had no other testimony to offer in favor of Homoeopathy than the provings of the anti-psorics, our cause would not be worth the ink it required to print them. Such trifling sensations, pains, eruptions and the like, as we see put down to the credit of the anti-psoric remedies, seem to be a parody on the splendid symptomatology of the *Materia Medica Pura*; it seems incredible that such a mass of vague, childish, ill-defined symptoms as are recorded in the four volumes of the "Chronic Diseases," should have been accepted by earnest and sober-minded men as the pure effects of drugs. With the exception of the few substances that have been transferred from the *Materia Medica Pura* to the "Chronic Diseases," we may safely reject many of the symptoms that are supposed to have been elicited by means of the attenuations, as unworthy our attention. I do not mean to say that attenuated medicines generally are unfit to develop symptoms; we have abundant evidence that the sixth, twelfth and even higher potencies have affected the organism in health in their own characteristic and peculiar manner. My criticism bears upon the symptoms furnished by the provers of such of our drugs as are technically known as *antipsorics*. In reference to many of these symptoms I wish to express my unqualified condemnation, and to state in unequivocal language that, with a few honorable exceptions, I reject most of them as baseless fancy-sketches.

Entertaining as I do a philosophical belief in the efficacy of attenuated drugs, and in the doctrine of dynamisation as developed by Hahnemann; yet I cannot refrain, on the present occasion, from expressing a regret that the system of proving attenuated drugs should have been so extensively adopted in our school. Attenuations will undoubtedly affect the healthy organism in exceptional cases. But in no one instance has an attenuation ever developed a single symptom that had not been more characteristically and more intensely produced by a massive dose of the strongest preparation of this attenuated drug. As a

general rule, the attenuations only act after the same drug had been previously taken in massive doses; and in all such cases the attenuations invariably reproduce, but more feebly and obscurely, symptoms that had been elicited by the larger dose. If the attenuations are used first, without any previous saturation of the organism by the concentrated tincture or the original drug, perceptible symptoms are scarcely ever obtained beyond the third attenuation; nor are these symptoms, with scarcely an exception, ever as clearly marked as the pathogenetic effects obtained by means of massive doses.

Our Materia Medica is unfortunately flooded with a deluge of trilling, unmeaning, unreliable symptoms. A perfect symptomomania seemed at one time to have taken possession of our school. Such men as Hering, Boenninghausen, Gross, fanned this incipient aberration into a perfect fury of symptom-hunting. If I mention living names, you will do me the justice, gentlemen, to believe that my criticism is exclusively dictated by the exalted and sacred demands of science. Hering's provings in particular seem to me liable to the grave suspicion of superficiality and unreliability. Not one of the numerous provings with which this gentleman has over-loaded our Materia Medica, will stand the test of a rigorous critical analysis. Many of them are fancy-pictures which may seem interesting to a few partisans, but will never pass current with the great body of scientific and enlightened homoeopathic practitioners. This rage of parading interminable symptom-lists before the profession, is destructive even of the positive good that some of these inaccurately proved drugs might otherwise do. Disgusted with the quantity of chaff, we feel disposed to reject even the grain of wheat that is hidden amongst it. What need is there of this Babylonian confusion? *Millefolium*, or the common yarrow, has been used empirically for years past for well marked disorders of the circulatory apparatus, such as nose-bleed, hemorrhage from the lungs, stomach, womb. Although it is proper and necessary, and especially incumbent upon homoeopathic physicians, to ascertain by actual experiment the therapeutic range of drugs, yet there is no earthly use in conjuring up an array of several hundred vague and trivial symptoms, in order to secure for a drug of such limited therapeutic dimensions a respectable place in the Augean stable of our Materia Medica. Four hundred symptoms to a drug which no practitioner living or to live will probably ever think of using, I mean using philosophically, and in strict conformity with our great law, for any other disorder than hemorrhage from some internal organ or tissue.

*Apis mellifica*, or the poison of the honey-bee, is another interesting agent of a rather limited sphere of action, of which the American Provings furnish 1,350 symptoms. If we consider that Aconite, which has been proved and re-proved by Hahnemann and some twenty of the most distinguished observers of our school, and which has a therapeutic range that may be said to be bounded only by the limits of disease, has only between seven and eight hundred symptoms, we may fairly suspect the pathogenesis of Apis of the most extravagant exaggerations. Decker with the fascinating charms of antiquated lore, and with the positiveness

of pretentious science, these provings have been ushered in with sounds of harpsichord and cymbal as an achievement, an invaluable contribution to our *Materia Medica*. But independently of the suspicion, which, like a dark cloud, overshadows the ignis-fatuus brightness of this picture of provings: that the poison of the honey-bee develops its pernicious effects by its direct action upon the capillary current, and not so much through the primary agency of the nervous system, we shall find, at a later stage of our course, that the effects of this poison, as exhibited in the "American Provings," are tainted with all the defects which distinguish many of our modern provings generally, and that they betray a lack of accuracy of observation, correctness of delineation, and adaptability to the treatment of disease, which will render it necessary to reprove all such drugs.

In thus critically sifting the materials with which we have to work, we shall arrive at facts to which permanency and universal recognition are secured as an imperishable birth-right. I am not willing to examine in the crucible of analysis the cases which are reported in the "Provings" as having yielded to *Apis*. I will say, however, that they furnish additional evidence of the utter unsoundness of the testimony which has been offered as illustrative of the curative virtues of this drug. From among a number of cases, let me select one or two as specimens of the whole series.

"A man of 28 years, of sanguine-nervous-bilious temperament, had been suddenly attacked with paralysis of the right side, with violent delirium, which sometimes increased to rage. His wife told me that the attack had been preceded by whitish blotches on the head and occasionally breaking out on the nape of the neck; they appeared suddenly and itched violently. On this account I selected *Apis* as my first remedy. In less than an hour after taking *Apis*, the eruption reappeared in innumerable places on the head, and he became more quiet. Before morning the blotches disappeared again, and his rage became so violent that it took three men to keep him from rolling off the bed. I gave *Hepar sulphuris*, and in fifteen minutes after, *Apis*. He became more rational during the day, and his eruption appeared profusely on the calves. This kind of treatment was resorted to repeatedly, and always with success."

The case was managed and reported by Dr. de Bonneville, a sort of itinerant practitioner, who, I believe, emigrated to California some years ago. I hardly know which most to marvel at in this case, the doctor's utter ignorance of the nature of the case, or the childish naivete with which he attributes the periodical intermissions between the paroxysms of rage to the use of *Hepar* and *Apis*. We are left to guess whether the paralysis and the acute irritation of the cerebral nerves were cured; the probability is, that the ultimate result of the treatment was unsuccessful; but I would ask you, gentlemen, would any honest and careful observer parade such results before the world as the effect of his treatment? Can we wonder that the scientific practitioners among our opponents laugh at such clinical messes as de Bonneville has concocted for us with the honey-bee?

Let me relate another case, and then close the Apis chapter for the present.

"A girl of eight years had been sick for about a fortnight. In the day time she was drowsy, and seemed lazy and listless; at night she was constantly talking during her sleep; towards morning her sleep became very sound, so that she would not wake until she was taken out of bed, shaken and driven about the room. She was exceedingly languid, with loss of strength, pale face; scanty urine, bowels rather costive. The mother of the child told me, that eight years ago a daughter of the same age had exhibited similar symptoms of derangement, and had finally died of dropsy of the brain.

"The mother was frequently attacked with nettle-rash, showing itself here and there on the legs, painful, sensitive to contact, and always assuming as it ran its course, a bluish-red, livid hue. A few of these spots might be seen on the nape of the neck and on the forehead of the sick child; they were scarcely visible, not hard or raised.

"I gave her three doses of Apis, second attenuation, one at eleven o'clock in the forenoon, one at three o'clock in the afternoon, and the third dose at seven o'clock in the evening. For the first time since she had been sick, she slept quietly next night, she woke early next morning, was bright, disposed to play about the house, and she looked better than she had done for a fortnight past. There was a visible improvement after the second dose. Next day I gave the child three powders of Apis 3. The following night she was more restless than the night previous, but she awoke at an early hour, and, in the afternoon, played in the yard. The second or third day after taking the medicine, hard, bluish-red spots made their appearance upon the face, forehead, nape of the neck and lower extremities. They remained hard and painful for ten or twelve days, after which period they passed away. It took some time before the patient regained her former strength, but she gradually recovered perfect health."

The most superficial reading of this report which, by-the-by, is drawn up with a good deal of confusion, shows that Apis had as much to do with the gradual recovery of this little girl as the comet's tail. There certainly was no very threatening disorder impending; otherwise the child would not have been pulled out of her bed every morning and pushed about the room in order to be roused out of her sleep. The facts of the case were undoubtedly, that the child was sickly; the eruption which was an hereditary cutaneous disorder, had begun to develop itself before medical treatment was resorted to, and this development went on increasingly until the eruption was fully out. Apis had no effect whatsoever upon the eruption which disappeared of itself after it had run its natural course. Apis did not even benefit the general health of the child; for, according to the relator's own statement, the little patient remained feeble for a long time before her former strength returned.

Dr. Hering appends the following complimentary note to this case: "The selection of Apis which was at that time almost unknown, was a masterly inference, and such reports should be copied in all our newspapers." In other

words: Whatever may serve as grist on my mill, is of immense importance to all the *world* and the *rest of mankind*. The literature of our school must be sadly in need of supply, if such fancy sketches have to be resorted to in order to fill its pages.

The cheerless task of criticizing the labors of my cotemporaries is not to my taste; but this duty has to be performed by every public teacher. If he wishes to inseminate new and higher truths, he must first pull out the rankling weeds that might obstruct their growth. Our *Materia Medica* is so filled with useless material, that our first business must necessarily be, to subject it to a most rigorous sifting process. Many of our drugs have obtained a reputation and a name, not because their provings can at all be relied upon as therapeutic indications, but because an empirical use has secured for them a sort of prescription-right. *Lachesis* is one of them. Perhaps no drug in our *Materia Medica* has enjoyed a more factitious *eclat* than this agent. But the halo of glory which has surrounded this secretion, proves, upon closer examination, to emanate from the smoke of fancy as much as from the light of truth.

All toxicologists incline to the opinion that the poison of serpents manifests its pernicious effects by destroying the vitality of the blood. The celebrated *Fontana* who made nearly six thousand experiments with the bite of the viper, concluded that among a number of other facts the following may be considered as established:

1. The viper's venom, when applied upon the nerves, does not produce any effect, nor does it accelerate the death of the animal; it is as innocent for the nerves as pure water, or simple gum Arabic.

2. The symptoms which it produces, depend upon its absorption, its being carried into the circulation, and on the action it exerts on the blood, which it partly coagulates, and on the nervous irritability, which it destroys by conveying into the fluids a principle of putrefaction."

Orfila, in his "system of General Toxicology," which is one of the most classical works on this subject in our possession, quotes *Fontana* as an authority, and accepts his inference as conclusive.

Flandin, in his recent work on Toxicology, which was published in Paris in the year 1858, likewise states that "the poison of serpents only produces its toxical effects after it penetrates the organism by a wound, and that it is absolutely powerless when introduced into the stomach." He adds: "The experiments of *Redi*, *Mead*, *Fontana*, *Breschet* and others, leave no doubt in this respect. Even the ancients were acquainted with this important fact; *Galen* and *Celsus* make mention of it. *Lucian*, in his epic poem entitled *Pharsalus*, causes *Cato* to say to his soldiers who are afraid of quenching their thirst in a spring full of serpents:

Noxia serpntum est admixto sanguine pestis;  
Morsu vires habent et tatum dentc minantur;  
Pocula morte carent.

Or in plain English: the poison of serpents is hurtful when mixed with the blood; their bite is poisonous, and may even cause death; but when the poison is drank, it is harmless."

A few years ago, Dumeril, distinguished in the scientific world of Paris, was bitten by a poisonous viper in the forest of Fontainebleau; his son sucked the poison from the father's wound without the least untoward accident to himself.

In spite of these grave facts substantiated by the most careful observation of able and conscientious experimenters, provings have been instituted with the poison of the *Trigonocephalus Lachesis* as though Fontana and his co-laborers had been, Don Quixote fashion, fighting mere windmills. Taking advantage of the doctrine of potentization which, although a vital principle of our School, may yet be made the source of much fallacious reasoning by fanatical or superficial dogmatists, a few physicians undertook to potentize the poison of this reptile by resorting to the usual processes of trituration and succession, and to institute provings with this potentized poison, which were to upset the experience of previous experimenters. Favored by plausibility, they succeeded in making these provings of the *Lachesis*-poison pass current for genuine drug-effects, and they professed to use *Lachesis* with success in the diseases to which they supposed it to be homoeopathic. The most distinguished and most philosophical writers of our School have repudiated the article as an unreliable intruder, and there is not, at this late day, a single case on record, where *Lachesis* can be shown to have effected a cure as clearly and unmistakably as we can prove the curative effects of *Aconite*, *Belladonna*, *Nux*, *Pulsatilla* and other polychrests; with the exception of the poisonous symptoms which have been incorporated in the provings of *Lachesis*, the remainder are unworthy the serious attention of thinking minds. The remaining symptoms are evidently the result of fancy and do not seem to be in homoeopathic rapport with any known and well-defined pathological condition. It is true a few cases of cure with *Lachesis* have been reported in the *Homoeopathic Archives*, one of the earlier homoeopathic publications; but these cases are reported in such a slovenly manner; the employment of *Lachesis* is mixed up with so many other drugs, and there is so much left uncured in most of these cases, that it is far more probable the patients derived what benefit they seem to have experienced, from the use of general hygienic means, and the discontinuance of the nauseating and prostrating doses of their alloepathic physicians.

If we wish to prove the poison of serpents, we should follow the example of nature, and proceed as we do with the vaccine virus; we should inoculate the poison through the capillary system; this, as far as we know, is the only reliable mode of ascertaining the physiological effects of this class of agents. At all events, the symptoms which are obtained by introducing *Lachesis* into the stomach, should be so perfectly certain that they cannot possibly be repudiated even by skeptics. This cannot be said of the *Lachesis* provings published in Jahr's

Symptomen-Codex; they are unreliable, indefinite, and, at best, without much practical value.

The object in proving a drug, is not to elicit symptoms, but to discover the mode in which a drug affects the living tissues, with a view of ascertaining its therapeutic uses. The difference between these two modes of investigation is very great. If the object is to elicit symptoms, we risk to lose ourselves in an inextricable maze of unmeaning and useless details which obscure the true character of a drug instead of establishing it upon the positive and acknowledged basis of fact. It is this mania of symptom-hunting that has introduced into our *Materia Medica* the tens of thousands of puerile and utterly useless trivialities which have excited the derision of both friend and foe. If, on the contrary, our object is to determine the therapeutic range of a drug with scientific precision, we shall necessarily use the most rigorous discrimination in distinguishing between actual drug-effects and purely accidental sensations, such as we experience more or less at all times in consequence of the abnormal influences which the mind, the nervous system and the tissues generally are exposed to.

The mere symptom-hunter is infatuated with the idea that symptoms may be obtained from the smallest as well as from a large quantity of a drug; he will employ the sixth, eighteenth, thirtieth or even two hundredth potency for his experiments with the same unconcern as the more massive preparations. And he will moreover commit another egregious mistake, which is: to note down as drug-effect every sensation which he may experience after taking the first dose; hence it is that our *Materia Medica* is filled with so many trivial symptoms, jerkings and twistings, itchings and stingings, spots and pimples; none of them symptoms that are in marked and characteristic rapport with well-known and accurately-described pathological conditions, but mere evanescent sensations with which any man might fill a page of foolscap in the course of a single day, without being under any medicinal influences whatsoever.

How different are the provings of the truly scientific observers of our School. Among the seven hundred Aconite-symptoms which we find recorded in Hahnemann's *Materia Medica Pura*, and in the re-provings of the Vienna Trovers' Union, there is not one that does not bear the test of a most critical scrutiny. The same may-be said of most other drugs proved by Hahnemann during the earlier period of his labors. All the re-provings of the Vienna Provers' Union, some of our English and a few of our American Provings are characterized by correctness and adaptability; they point of themselves, without any resort to sophistical cunning and hypothetical combinations., to the pathological disorders for the cure of which these therapeutic agents were designed. Some of our French provings and more particularly the Brazilian provings of Dr. Mure, a wild and fanciful propagator of Homoeopathy, are utterly worthless and a perfect caricature of the sacred business of determining the therapeutic character of drugs by positive experimentation upon the healthy.

Think of a diseased potato, or of a piece of charred deer-hide, or, *horrendum dictu!* a louse potentized to the thirtieth attenuation, one globule of which is swallowed and permitted to act for three, four and even six weeks, developing symptoms all the time, which symptoms are gravely arrayed under their respective heads as head, face, eye, ear, chest-symptoms, and so forth, and published to the world as the actual effects of those substances. Such and many other absurdities may be found in Mure's Brazilian Pathogenesis.

The business of proving drugs is at this period engaged in by all who desire to obtain a correct and reliable knowledge of their therapeutic properties. The old-fashioned empirical method of obtaining this knowledge *ab usu in morbis* or by clinical experience, has been abandoned by all progressive inquirers on the field of Medicine. Clinical experience only serves, as it should do, to confirm the therapeutic properties, a knowledge of which had been obtained by pure experimentation upon the healthy. Pereira who is one of the great authorities in alloepathic therapeutics, says in his great work on *Materia Medica* : "The homoeopaths assert, and with truth, that the study of the effects of medicines in the healthy state is the only way of ascertaining the pure or pathogenetic effects of medicines," and he fully concurs with Hahnemann in opinion that, if we administer our remedies to invalids, "the symptoms of the natural disease then existing, mingling with those which the medicinal agents are capable of producing, the latter can rarely be distinguished with any clearness or precision." Trousseau and Pidoux, in their *Treatise of Materia Medica and Therapeutics*, which has been elevated to the rank of a classical text-book in France, make honorable mention of the German Provers' Societies in the following language: "Under the lead of Homoeopathy, German Societies have been formed for the revision of the *Materia Medica*. All drugs have been proved upon the healthy by physicians who, it is true, have not always known how to avoid systematic illusions, but who, endowed with a good deal of patience and attentive observation, and always instituting their experiments with simple substances, have constituted a *Materia Medica Pura*, whence have emanated many very precious notions concerning the special properties of drugs, and concerning a variety of characteristic peculiarities of their action, with which we are too little acquainted in France. Owing to this ignorance we are only acquainted with the grossest general properties of our therapeutic agents, and, in the presence of diseases which exhibit so many varied shades of therapeutic indications, we very often lack the modifying agents adapted to these shades."

Fleming has enriched the literature of Aconite with some of the most splendid provings of this agent.

Joerg, late Professor of *Materia Medica* and Therapeutics in the University of Leipzig, gathered around him a band of enthusiastic and devoted disciples, aided by whom he instituted provings with a number of our most important therapeutic agents, with a view of determining their exact opposites in disease.

Frank's Physiological Magazine is filled with a number of highly important provings instituted by alloepathic practitioners with large doses.

All these provings help to perfect our knowledge of drugs, and to effect a proportionate increase of our means of cure.

Most earnestly do I invite you, gentlemen, to institute provings with new, and re-provings with old drugs. If every one of you would make it his business, within the first five or ten years of his practice, to furnish a complete monograph of some drug, exhibiting the whole therapeutic range of the agent, and its applicability to corresponding diseases, we should soon succeed in reducing our system of therapeutics to the forms of a fixed science, which every Medical College would teach as orthodox doctrine. The business of proving drugs is not near as laborious and painful as it may seem to the uninitiated. In order to institute successful provings, it is not necessary to torture one's self by pain and privations. While engaged in proving, you pursue your avocations as usual, you eat your usual meals, avoiding only such substances as might taint the organism or set up a counteraction in the nervous system. Smoking, chewing or taking snuff, the use of coffee, beer, and alcoholic stimulants, hygienic and dietetic irregularities of any kind, are incompatible with a thorough and successful investigation of the therapeutic properties of drugs. Nor is it sufficient to institute provings with attenuations. Repeated trials with massive doses are absolutely indispensable in order to obtain a correct and reliable knowledge of a drug. If the attenuations should develop symptoms similar to those obtained with massive doses, or if symptoms thus obtained should be accompanied by other symptoms, we may accept them as reliable, provided these symptoms were never experienced by us when not under medicinal influence. The desire of contributing our mite to a perfect and truly scientific *Materia Medica*, enables us to undergo a good deal of labor, yea, to suffer pain for a good cause. Nothing is more delightful to a conscientious and energetic prover, than to trace the action of a drug, as manifested by clear and unmistakable symptoms. Commence your proving with a small quantity, two or three drops of the tincture to be taken once a day, and increase the dose every morning or evening by a few drops, of course within conservative limits, until the drug seems to be unable to yield any new symptoms. Keep an exact record of the effects of each dose, and a picture of drug-effects thus obtained, will shadow forth the outlines of the pathological series of which it may constitute a curative neutralizer. In order to determine the therapeutic range of a drug, it is not necessary that the physiological series, or series of drug-effects, and the pathological series, or series of morbid phenomena, should correspond in all their details. In order to determine the curative adaptation of Phosphorus to pneumonia, or of Arsenic to lepra or malignant impetigo, it is not necessary that we should previously develop these diseases artificially. We know that Aconite is in curative rapport with an acute inflammation of the testicles, and yet among the pathogenetic symptoms of Aconite, orchitis is wanting. The homoeopathicity of drugs to diseases is not

determined by a mere mechanical juxtaposition of symptomatic similarities. We know that an acute inflammation arises primarily from torpor of the arterial capillaries, which, by a process of organic reaction, super induces engorgement and all the characteristic signs of inflammation. It makes no difference what organ or tissue is invaded; every where an acute inflammation is determined by the same cause: torpor of the capillaries. This being known, we require to possess a drug capable of affecting the capillaries in the same manner primarily, and of developing a similar organic reaction. We know by careful and reliable experiment that Aconite is this drug. Hence it is our great homoeopathic specific to acute phlegmonous inflammation characterized by a full, hard and bounding pulse, hot and dry skin, preceded by chilly creepings, thirst, flushed face, headache and dizziness, coated tongue, nervous restlessness, and other symptoms, all of which will yield to one or more doses of Aconite, except where the specific character of the disease renders the use of some other drug likewise necessary.

Let us then not forget that Homoeopathy should not be to us simply a fat cow that yields us plenty of milk and butter, but a Divine Goddess whose name is Truth, and whose form is Beauty; he who wishes to be a genuine high-priest in her temple, should aid in building it up.