

LECTURE
ON THE
HISTORY OF MEDICINE
AND THE
SCIENCE OF HOMEOPATHY.

BY R. J. SMITH, M. D.,
HOMEOPATHIC AND HYDRO-PATHIC PHYSICIAN AND SURGEON,
43 BAY STREET, TORONTO.

PUBLISHED BY SPECIAL REQUEST.—PRICE 7½d.

☞ See last page of Cover. ☞

TORONTO:
PRINTED BY J. CLELAND, 62 YONGE STREET.

1852.

517

LECTURE.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

The era in which we live is distinguished for its vast discoveries, and its astonishing development of knowledge. We constantly hear of the march of intellect, the progress of science, and the perfection of the arts. The light of science is pouring upon us a brightness, at times, which, for a season, we are incapable of comprehending.

The arts seem to grow out of the necessities of man, while the sciences appear to arise from his intellectual improvement, and follow the cultivation of the arts of civilization, or, as it has been beautifully observed, "the arts are the offspring of necessity, while the sciences are the fruits of ease and leisure."

Art has been defined as the power of doing something which is not taught by nature or instinct; it involves the idea of learning, or improvement in knowledge. While the term science implies a positive knowledge of the principles on which art is based, and the reasons of phenomena—the why and the wherefore; "certainty grounded on demonstration."

Man in the state of infancy, is the most helpless and defenceless of all created beings; he is not furnished by nature with covering to protect him from the inclemencies of the weather, without the means of attack or defence, destitute of the endowment of instinct to guide him in the selection of his food, and deprived of many of the qualifications granted to the inferior animals. But he is enriched with capacities of intellect, which far more than compensates him for the loss of those conveniences and securities of the earlier stages of his existence. This intellectual capacity prompted by the necessities of his situation, and accompanied by his natural desire to seek relief from ills, and to supply defects, enables him to rise above his wants, and draw around him comforts and enjoyments unknown to instinct, and far beyond the gratification of mere

animal existence. And above all, he is the special object of Divine favour, and enjoys the benefits arising out of the family relation.

Out of man's peculiar situation in the world, arises the necessity of the useful arts. His state of destitution in regard to covering and a place of shelter, naturally suggests the necessity of clothing and a dwelling to protect him from the vicissitudes of the weather, the change of seasons, the variations of climates, and the ravages of beasts of prey. The state of his organization, very significantly prompts him to seek expedients of converting the natural stores of animal and vegetable production into savoury food. The same disposition of mind, when assailed by disease, would prompt him to search for a remedy. And thus, step by step, does man's inventive genius carry him forward from the discovery of one useful art to another, until all his original wants are supplied, and a great degree of comfort and independence attained, and he characterized the lord of creation.

At what period in the history of the world the human frame became first subject to the incursions of bodily disease is unknown; as is also the nature of the first suffering induced. But we may safely infer, as man advanced in the arts of civilization, he became more and more exposed to morbid influences, and probably at a very early period of his existence became the subject of diseases from noxious food, accidental causes, &c. Be the time of incursion of disease in the human family when it may, and be the kind of suffering what it may, efforts to obtain relief, would be perfectly natural, and we may reasonably conjecture that the practice of medicine and surgery, is almost coeval with the existence of man. Judging from the circumstances which probably attended the early population of the world, and the simplicity of the mode of life of the inhabitants, we may conclude that the disease of the earliest times were mild and uncomplicated in their nature, and admitted of easy relief; corresponding in no small degree, to the inexperience of the times and the limited knowledge of remedial agents.

What is called the conjectural existence of medicine, or the time which elapsed from the period when disease made its first attack upon man, until the first record of its treatment by medicine is made, reaches down to the history of the Egyptians. Egypt has ever been considered by most writers of antiquity as the nursery of the arts and sciences. For many centuries after the cessation of fabulous history, and the beginning of trustworthy records of the times, do we find philosophers of other centuries resorting to Egypt, in order to gain access to her Priesthood, which was considered the principal depository of the mysteries of the age. It was in Egypt that medicine first became an object of study, but we are

still in doubt, how far it was the object of pursuit by a particular class of men. The supposition is highly probably that the cure of disease in those early periods of antiquity, was conjoined to the priestly office, and not yet erected into a separate calling, and made the special study and pursuit of a class of men, called physicians.

From all we can learn of the ancient Egyptian priesthood, we may conclude that a considerable portion of their learning consisted in a dexterous management of the arts of magic and incantations, and that a large share of their reputed success in the treatment of disease, may be set down to the superstition and gullability of their patients. These and similar means have more or less been used in all countries and all ages, by designing men, to gain influence over their victims; and the history of medicine furnishes abundant evidence of their success.

In the earliest accounts of the treatment of disease, we find it recorded that particular persons undertook to cure particular diseases only, and that some took charge of particular parts of the body. A course indicating either that especial attention was paid to the study of disease, and its treatment, or that their knowledge was limited, and their remedies few and empirically applied.

The accounts of the rise and progressive improvement of medicine in different countries, as given by historians, differ very little from each other. If we attempt to trace back its history to the remotest antiquity among the Egyptians, Assyrians, Babylonians, or Grecians, in either case we are led to the recital of fabulous stories about the deeds of some supernatural beings who are honored as the agents of introducing the divine art of healing from the gods themselves. Thus it is said of Æsculapius, that he was the son of Apollo, that he possessed the skill necessary to restore life to the dead, and that his death was brought about by a thunderbolt from Jupiter, which was provoked by his having deprived Pluto of his authority. Divine honors were paid to Æsculapius after his death, as the god of medicine. The profession of medicine became hereditary in the family, and his descendants for eight centuries were invested with the priestly office.

Very little improvement took place in medicine, so long as those who practiced the healing art acquired the right, by hereditary descent. About six hundred years before the Christian era, Pythagoras made his appearance in the world, and applied himself to the study of Anatomy and Physiology; and no doubt far exceeded his predecessors and contemporaries, in his knowledge of medicine. About this time medicine first emerged from the gloom of superstition and priestly domination, and took its position in the world, as an object of study for the common people.

A little more than four hundred years before the Christian era, Hippocrates was born. He applied himself to the study of medicine, and by introducing a new method of investigation, effected a total revolution in both opinions and practice, and maintained an unrivalled authority over the minds of his successors in medicine for six centuries. He is called the Father of Medicine. Many of his descriptions of disease, and the correctness of his diagnosis, and of his prognosis, give evidence of an extent of knowledge of symptom, their discrimination and termination, which has not been surpassed in more modern times. He left a number of works behind him, and many of them nearly in a perfect state. During the prevalence of his authority, writers chiefly occupied themselves in elucidating his doctrines and commenting upon his writings. The doctrine of crises and critical days in diseases, formed an important part of the pathology of Hippocrates. And many modern authors would have saved themselves much credit as correct observers of the phenomena of disease, and rendered much essential service to the profession, by following more closely the course indicated by this great master. He is the author of clinical medicine, and was the first writer to accurately note down the symptoms of diseases, so that they could be recognized by his description. The result of all his labours in the cause of humanity and medicine, was the establishment of a *rational empiricism* in the healing art. He aimed at nothing higher, and he accomplished nothing more. Medicine was practised as an *art*, without a sign of the principles of a *science*.

For several centuries after the death of Hippocrates, the study of medicine remained stationary, without advancement or improvement. His followers contented themselves with studying his precepts and reducing the doctrines which he taught to practice, in the treatment of disease. Although many illustrious men, eminent for learning and talents, arose within the first few centuries after the death of Hippocrates, and wrote voluminous works on medicine and other branches of philosophy, yet no one seems to have called in question the truthfulness of his doctrines, or made an attempt to disturb the calm which prevailed over the entire face of medicine for about six hundred years.

About the middle of the second century after the Christian era, *Galen*, a man of extraordinary powers of mind, arose, and in his turn challenged the supremacy of the doctrines of his predecessors, subdued all opposition to his dogmas, and retained the confidence of the medical world in triumph, for more than a thousand years. He wrote more than two hundred treatises on subjects connected with medicine. The weight of his influence and the extent of his writings, seemed to repress all

further attempt at improvement in either theory or practice, for the period just named. His successors, like those of Hippocrates, did not dare to look for truth beyond the limits which he prescribed for the domain of the healing art. Although his knowledge of Anatomy and Physiology far exceeded the knowledge of his predecessors and contemporaries, yet it is very questionable whether the practice deduced from his theories, was as successful in the treatment of disease as was that of Hippocrates. The doctrines of Galen are greatly mixed up with abstruse speculations about the cause of disease, and equally absurd hypotheses about the action of remedies. While Hippocrates seemed to apply himself more to the correct observation of phenomena, and to adopt such medical hypotheses as were deducible from facts, and thus endeavour to establish a method of cure, in which reasoning was always subordinate to experience.

Until the conclusion of the reign of these two great sovereigns in medicine, no matter what changes of opinion took place, dogmatism prevailed in all the schools, until, through the labors of Avicenna and his compeers of the twelfth century, the resources of chemistry were brought into exercise.

About this time a new era dawned upon the world, and henceforward medicine received great accessions from the collateral sciences. After the revival of letters and the discovery of the art of printing, the portals of science generally seem to have been thrown open to an inquiring world. The illiberality of ancient times, and the superstitions of the dark ages, were both checked by the light of truth which now dawned upon the common mind. All the natural sciences began to be studied anew, and the benefits of their knowledge applied to the good of society.

Connected with the reformation and advancement of the study of medicine, from the twelfth to the eighteenth century, we have the names of Avicenna, Paracelsus, Harvey, Brown, Sydenham (the English Hippocrates), Stahl, Børhaave, Hoffman, Van Helmont, Van Swieten, Haller and many others.

After awarding to these worthies all the honors due to their services and lives of toil, when we look for the practical result of all their labors upon the application of remedies to the cure of disease, we are astonished at the littleness of the progress made in the *practice of medicine*. The dogmatism of the ancients at last gave way, only to make room for the theoretical speculations of the moderns.

During the third great epoch in medicine, extending from the twelfth to the middle of the eighteenth century, systems rose and fell about as often as one celebrated teacher came on the stage, was buoyed up for a

while by some prominent school, and then died to make room for his successor. Change succeeded change, different theories gave rise to difference in practice, giving full proof of what I am endeavouring to bring prominently to view, namely: that medicine was still practised as an *art*. Although by virtue of its connection with Chemistry, Botany and other natural sciences, medicine was dignified with the name of science, yet there was no *known law* to serve as a basis upon which an enduring superstructure could be reared for the application of medicine to the cure of disease.

Continental Europe, England, Scotland and our own country, have each given rise to stars of genius and renown in medicine, which have glittered for a season, mounted to their zenith and gone out. In some instances the professor, who was father to some popular system of doctrines, has outlived his offspring theory, and been called to witness the ascendancy of a successful rival.

The frequent changes of theory and the consequent changes in practice, century after century, afford incontestible evidence of the truth of the remark just made, namely, that there was no *known natural law*, which was universally acknowledged in medicine. But if there are immutable laws or governing principles in every other branch of science with which we are acquainted, why should there not be in medicine, which is to man the most important of all sciences? For if it be true, that in the creation of every thing, use is intended, and the degree of importance of the thing created is to be estimated according to the greatness of the end to be accomplished, then, well may the subject of medicine and its collateral sciences command our utmost attention.

Man, the noblest work of creation, was made healthy, with sufficient duties and labors assigned him, to employ all the time, and exhaust all the energies of a healthy body and mind. He has many and important duties in this life to perform, but the great end of his existence here must be looked for in another state of being. In view of the high destiny to which he is called, he could not have been created to drag out a miserable existence of three score years and ten in this world, under the accumulated weight of hereditary and acquired disease of centuries, a burden to himself, and an incumbrance to his fellows, without hope of rescue, and then migrate to a state of annihilation! We now behold him subject to disease, yet surrounded by medicinal substances belonging to the animal, vegetable and mineral kingdoms, which if judiciously applied in the treatment of his disorders, are capable of restoring him to health.

As was said before, in every other department of science we recognize fixed laws. For example, see Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Botany, Mathematics, Astronomy, Music, &c. And it is not reasonable to suppose that in the application of medicine to the cure of disease, we are left without chart or compass to direct our way.

Thank Heaven, this long sought law in medicine is no longer a subject of inference. Within the three last quarters of a century it has been revealed to man, and the Homeopathic School of Medicine, with her thousands of physicians and millions of recipients, fully recognises the universality of its applicability to the cure of disease. Many men that richly deserve to be classed with the great and the good, labored and toiled through their lives long to perfect the practice of their beloved profession, but it was reserved for our illustrious founder, SAMUEL HAHNEMANN, to expound and publish to the world the law expressed in the words, "*similia similibus curantur*"—"like cures like." He was the honored instrument in the hands of Providence, of discovering this law, and instituting a system of cure, based upon it, at once mild and efficient in the treatment of disease.*

To Paracelsus of the 16th century, is due the credit of having first suggested the true therapeutical principle. He learned that medicines can cure only diseases analogous to those which they are capable of producing. The brilliant intellect of Stahl, also distinctly recognised the truth of *Similia, Similibus, Curantur*, and pointed out its advantages over the then universal law of cure, *Contraria, Contrarius, Opponenda*. Had he, or Paracelsus before him, adopted the course of Hahnemann, in experimenting with drugs, in *health* and in *disease*, and by this means accumu-

* Samuel Hahnemann was born at Meissen, in Saxony, on the 10th of April, 1755. At the age of twenty years, with twenty crowns in his pocket, he set out for Leipsic, to study Medicine. He maintained himself by giving private instruction in Greek and French, and by translating English works into German. After studying the elementary branches of medicine in the Leipsic school, he spent a year in the Hospital at Vienna, and afterwards another year at Erlangen, where he took his degree in 1779. Soon after entering upon his profession, he became dissatisfied with the prevalent mode of treating diseases, because of its uncertainty, and he left the beaten path in medicine. In 1790, he discovered the great Homeopathic Law, *similia similibus curantur*, and from this time forward, he labored assiduously to develop the principles of his new discovery, and reduce them to practice in the treatment of disease. He took medicine himself, and induced others to take it in a state of health, in order to ascertain their positive effects. The effects thus obtained, were his guide in the selection of the remedy for any given case. He had ascertained that medicines can cure only diseases analogous to those which they are themselves capable of producing. His fame is world-wide, and his success without a parallel. He died in his eighty-ninth year, full of professional honors.

lated a sufficiency of facts—the incontrovertible arguments in sustaining any theory—Homeopathy would long since have been the only system of medicine.

Both these reformers were possessed of gigantic intellects—genius indeed of the highest order—and the most exalted moral courage, which enabled them to disregard the ex-cathedra dogmas of antiquity; but they lacked that patient, and self-sacrificing devotion in pursuit of facts, and that unbounded benevolence and love of mankind, which so signally characterised the career of Hahnemann. To him therefore should be rendered all the honor of this mighty achievement in *medicine*.

The weight of great names, and the dogmas of schools, have always interposed difficulties in the way of improvement in medicine. Any man who had the genius to discern, and the courage to publish to the world, an important discovery, and the more important, the worse for him, was sure to call down the anathemas of these potent authorities upon his devoted head. Witness the persecution meted out to Harvey, for the discovery of the circulation of the blood; to Jenner, for his discovery of the protective power of vaccination against the loathsome, and destructive small pox. After reviewing the conduct of the profession in the past towards the real pillars of the healing art, we need not be surprised at the treatment which the immortal Hahnemann received at the hands of the dogmatists in medicine.

It was the labors of this greatest of medical philosophers of modern times, by the development of the great therapeutic law above mentioned, which elevated the practical application of remedies to the cure of disease, from a *mere art* to the character of a *true science*.

And the return made to him for this mighty achievement, and most important service to his race, by the body of the profession, has been obloquy and reproach; and to those who maintain his doctrines at the present, proscription and misrepresentation. Talent and the highest order of genius have, in too many instances, failed to exonerate some of the greatest benefactors of our race from the reproachful charge of imposture. In evidence of this, the course which the profession at large has pursued toward Hahnemann and Homeopathy, has added one more page of deep disgrace to the history of medical men. Although what has just been said is strictly true, when applied to the profession generally, yet there are found many honorable exceptions when the remark is applied to individual members of the profession.

We must not conclude, however, that all the opposition of medical men of the allœopathic school, for opinion's sake among themselves, is directed against homeopathy; for we find them equally as much embi-

tered against each other, when occasion occurs for the exhibition of the real state of feeling in their own rank, as they are against us.

Homeopathy has nothing to fear from its enemies of the old school; the appeal has been made unto Cæsar—the people. And who has a better right to decide a question of this kind, when doctors disagree, than the *people*, seeing that the profession is for the people, and not the people for the profession.

It is now too late in the history of the world to proscribe a man on account of his opinions, or even reject his opinions without investigation. We have a prolific and free press, through which every thing of general interest finds its way to the people, and now a days every body reads and thinks and talks. The favoured few, no longer have the privilege of manufacturing opinions for the many. There is an evident tendency of the common mind, to inquire into the nature of new discoveries, and if possible become acquainted with their principles and claims to confidence. On the subject of medicine, just at this point, nothing but sound experience and reason can guide us. For when the mind, with all the speculative force which belongs to it, is left to wander abroad without this guide, it is prone to fall into error. Knowing this to be the case, it is unsafe to seek, on subjects admitting of speculation, confirmation and support without experience. The principles which are to guide us in medicine, must be drawn from experience, and not from assumed hypotheses.

When we consider the expansion of knowledge generally, and the accession of science, which have taken place since, or a few years previous to the discovery of the great homeopathic law, it ceases to be a matter of surprise, that the subject of medicine should have shared so largely of the spirit of improvement, and undergone the revolution just alluded to, in consequence of the application of the great therapeutic law recognized by our school, to the cure of disease. Indeed, when we look back upon the history of medicine, we are struck with astonishment, that its practice should have resisted the spirit of improvement so long, a period of more than two thousand years.

The natural sciences, within a century past, have undergone almost a new creation, and medicine, notwithstanding the efforts of its antiquarian protectors, could not resist the flood of light poured in upon it from the collateral sciences. It has shared largely in the advancement made in almost every department of human knowledge, within the period just named. The Linnæan system of classification of the subjects of natural history, which has done so much towards the improvement of the various departments of science, has been instituted since. The doctrine of the

regular succession of the stratified masses constituting the crust of the globe, and forming the foundation of the modern science of Geology, has been delivered and settled within the same period. In astronomy, many discoveries have recently been made. Many departments of mathematical and physical science, which scarcely had an existence before, and some which were absolutely unknown, have of late years risen to great importance. Electricity has assumed a form in science and been made subservient to the arts, in a manner altogether distinct, and very far in advance of that which it bore previously. The entire science of galvanism, which has exerted so great an influence on that of chemistry, as well in theory as in practice, and given rise to so many discoveries, has risen into being since. The true nature of thunder and lightning was unknown before.

To name all the discoveries made in chemical science, within the last century, we would be obliged to particularize almost every principle that is at present positively known. But it will answer our purpose for the present, to name a few of these discoveries. Such as the constitution of the atmosphere, the composition of water, the principles of caloric, and the radiation of heat, the science of crystallography, and the doctrine of definite proportions, or the atomic theory. Many substances then believed to be simple bodies, are now known to be compounds. Two-thirds of all metals known, have been discovered since. The polarization of light, which holds an important relation to the science of optics has been discovered within a few years. And optical instruments are undergoing wonderful improvements every day. The use of the microscope in its improved condition, promises to open to us new fields of science, heretofore unexplored.

The use of the steam engine has been pressed into the service of man within a comparatively short period. And to cap the climax of discovery in these departments of science, comes up the revelation of the magnetic telegraph.

One hundred years ago, nay, forty years since, horse power and speed was the most expeditious means in use, for conveying intelligence and merchandize from one part of our country to another. Soon after, the steam-boat made its appearance on our water courses, and then the animated steam car was seen puffing along its ironed track, at a rate of speed far beyond all precedent in this or any previous age. These discoveries and improvements were great in their day, but they have ceased to strike us with astonishment, for now we send our thoughts in hieroglyphics by the lightning's flash.

While these discoveries and improvements have been going on in *science*, the wonder working power of the human mind has not been confined to it alone. But the arts also have demanded and received great accessions. The improvements of machinery and the application of the science of chemistry to the arts, have advanced them beyond all calculation. The certain knowledge of the science of colors, has taken the place of guess work in dyeing, and of exposure to the atmosphere, and the consumption of time in bleaching. The Jenny, the Throstle and the Mule, have been substituted for the ancient distaff and spinning wheel. The wind out-travelling Locomotive, has superceded its slow moving predecessors, the stage coach and Conestoga wagon. And we are lost in astonishment, when we consider the increase within a short period, of the facilities for the dissemination of knowledge afforded by the press. Calculation here can hardly keep pace with improvement.

From the hasty review just taken, we may justly conclude that more useful discoveries, and greater advancement in science and the arts have been made within the last few years, than have taken place in the same length of time in any part of the previous history of the world. And we perceive with joy, that the light of science has at last penetrated the deep and dark recesses of the speculative theories of the *Practice of Medicine*, and dissipated the long cherished superstitions of the Old School.

But it is a source of deep regret that *medicine* has not, formerly, kept pace with the other arts of life. Sir William Knighton, who stood at the head of his profession, and who was moreover physician to George IV. King of England, in one of his private letters published after his death, touching this point, says: "It is somewhat strange that, though in many arts and sciences, improvement has advanced in a step of regular progression from the first, in others, it has kept no pace with time; and we look back to ancient excellence with wonder, not unmingled with awe. Medicine seems to be one of those ill-fated arts, whose improvement bears no proportion to its antiquity. This is lamentably true, although Anatomy has been better illustrated, the *Materia Medica* enlarged, and Chemistry better understood."

We might give a volume of extracts of this character, from those highly distinguished in their profession; but we have not now the time, nor would it be wholly befitting this occasion.

In the first place we shall take occasion to show that one of the chief causes why the science of Medicine has not kept pace in its progress, with the other arts of life, is, that every new step has been met with

virulent opposition; it has been treated as an *innovation*, it has been denounced as *empiricism*, as quackery.

How were the teachings of the immortal Harvey, in regard to circulation, first received? They were treated with irony and contempt, and a torrent of persecution followed him through life. He was, in derision, called the *Circulator!* a word in the Latin meaning *quack* or *vagabond*. The united efforts of his enemies to destroy him, were so far successful, that he lost the greater part of his practice.

The eminent men of *Rome* and *Greece*, the schools of *Egypt* and *Arabia*, the great anatomical teachers of the middle ages, were ignorant of the circulation of the blood, and it was not till the seventeenth century that it was understood and demonstrated by Harvey. The same College of Physicians, who, in after years, opposed the improvements of *Montague* and *Jenner*, made the circulation of the blood the subject of their bitterest satire, and many refused to meet him in consultation, a practice which is scrupulously imitated by many of their brethren at the present time. But Harvey lived to *neutralize* the malice of his enemies, and became physician to the two first English kings of the Stewart race, *James* and *Charles*.

In the time of *Francis I.* it was customary to stop the blood after amputating a limb, by applying boiling pitch to the bleeding stump; *Ambrose Paré*, principal surgeon to that king, introduced the *ligature* as a substitute; he *tied* the arteries. And what was his reward? He was ridiculed, and howled down! and by whom? Why sir, by the Faculty of Physicians, who hooted at the idea of hanging human life upon a thread, when boiling pitch had served the purpose for centuries. In vain did he plead the success of the ligature, and the agony of boiling pitch. They pursued him with the most heartless rancor.

When antimony was first introduced as a medicine, by *Paracelsus*, the French Parliament, at the instigation of the College of Physicians, passed an act making it *penal* to prescribe it. Yet who, at present, disputes its value as a medicine, when properly administered?

The curative power of *Cantharides*, in dropsy, was discovered by *Dr. Groenvelt*, in 1693. But the Doctor was soon committed to *Newgate*, by a warrant from the President of the College of Physicians, for administering *Cantharides* internally!

Inoculation for small-pox, previously to the discovery of vaccination, was found greatly to mitigate that loathsome disease. *Lady Mary Montague*, who had witnessed its success in *Turkey*, was the first to introduce it into *England*. But how was it received? She came possessed of the facilities of rank, talent, beauty, genius, and sex, yet, she was the

sharer of the common reward of the great benefactors of the human race, namely, persecution and reproach! Lord Wharnclyff, the distinguished gentleman who wrote her life, says: "Lady Mary protested that in the four or five years immediately succeeding her arrival at home, she seldom passed a day without repenting of her patriotic undertaking; and she vowed she never would have attempted it if she had foreseen the vexation, the persecution, and even the obloquy it brought upon her. The clamors raised against the practice, and of course against her, were beyond belief. The faculty all rose in arms to a man, foretelling failure and the most disastrous consequences; the clergy descended from their pulpits on the impiety of thus seeking to take events out of the hands of Providence; and the common people were taught to hoot at her as an unnatural mother who had risked the lives of her own children. We now read in grave Medical Biography, that the discovery was instantly hailed, and the method adopted by the principal members of that profession. Very likely they left this recorded; for, whenever an invention or a project, and the same may be said of a person, has made its way so well by itself, as to establish a certain reputation, most people are sure to find out that they always patronized it from the beginning, and a happy gift of forgetfulness enables many to believe their own assertion. But what says Lady Mary of the actual fact and actual time? Why, that the four great physicians deputed by the government to watch the progress of her daughter's inoculation, betrayed not only such incredulity as to its success, but such an unwillingness to have it succeeded, such an evident spirit of rancor and malignity, that she never cared to leave the child alone with them one second, lest it should in some secret way suffer from their interference."

Vaccination, the discovery of the immortal *Jenner*, which has been of such incalculable value to mankind, like other discoveries, was received with ridicule and contempt. *Jenner* was taunted and oppressed; and the Royal College of Physicians refused to grant him their license to practice his profession in London, even after the value of vaccination had been admitted. The tide of opposition did not stop here. The Bible and religious pretensions were made engines of attack against him. Not only did some of the clergy unite their ordinary influence with the Medical Profession against him, denouncing it as a quackery, but endeavored to prove from the Scriptures and the writings of the Fathers of the Church, that vaccination was verily *Antichrist*.

Is it a marvel that medical science should have been so tardy in its progress, when environed by such contingencies? We have made the foregoing observations for the purpose of showing what obstacles may

be expected to intercept the advancement of every, and any new principle that may be discovered; and furthermore, for the purpose of showing that opposition, irony, and bitterness, from the profession, is no certain proof that it is error they are opposing, or that *wisdom* is in imminent danger of dying with them.

We come before you on this occasion with a full conviction of the superlative advantages of the Homeopathic over the Allopathic, or any other system of medicine now in use; and with the assurance that it is based upon the *eternal laws of Nature*. We do not claim for it perfection in all its details; it is yet in its infancy; but we claim for it true philosophical principle, and an immutable basis.

One of the great obstacles in the way of the reception of Homeopathy by the people, is the vast difference between it and Allopathy. They are separated in principle by a great gulf. Allopathy rushes over the organism like a volcano, or an avalanche, exhausting all her resources; or, perhaps we may illustrate it by the tornado that tosses the mariner's bark so furiously upon the lap of the ocean, as to try, and strain, and crack every timber in her works, while Homeopathy carries on its curative operations with a stillness and quietness that is in perfect accordance with the normal functions of life. "Allopathy seems to consider disease a material something which has unaccountably introduced itself into the system, and is to be expelled by emetics, cathartics, bleeding, blisters, sweating, spitting, &c." "Homeopathy arrests morbid excretions, by restoring the diseased organ to its natural condition. Thus while Allopathy would expel the mucus collecting in the larynx during croup, by vomiting, Homeopathy would apply a remedy which would prevent the secretion altogether, by restoring the mucous membrane to its normal condition." "Allopathy seeks to cure by removing the product of disease. It aims at the effect, rather than the cause. Homeopathy accomplishes its work by restoring the integrity of the suffering organ."

Homeopathy and *Allopathy* are terms used in reference to two systems of medical practice, quite at variance with each other in principle. Homeopathy is based upon the premises, that every disease is best cured by that medicine which is capable of producing in the *healthy* body, symptoms, similar to those produced by the disease, in the *sick* body. Or, as more briefly stated, *similia similibus curantur*; that is, like is cured by like. This is Homeopathically. Hence the name of Homeopathy for the system, and Homeopaths for those who practice it. In contradistinction, the common medical doctrine has been termed *Allopathy*, and its professors, *Allopaths*, from the fact that it employs in the

treatment of disease, medicines which produce an effect, or symptoms, **not like**, but entirely *different* from those produced by the disease. The former is *homios*, homogeneous, or like in its effects pathogenetically; and the latter, *allos*, heterogeneous, or *unlike*. Then, in principle, the two systems differ widely.

The Homeopathic philosophy, is, that nature, always, in the contingency of disease, puts on a curative effort. The concomitant symptoms *are not the disease*, but a recuperative effort of Nature to repulse it, and to restore the equilibrium of the system. Consequently, the first inquiry of the scientific practitioner, is, How is Nature at work to dislodge this enemy? *What* is she trying to do? And *how* is she trying to do it? He seeks to make himself perfectly acquainted with the *modus operandi*, or the phenomena put on by Nature in the case in hand, and when he has, by careful inquiry and observation, satisfied himself of the character of Nature's efforts, he then seeks a remedy that will excite the *very same class of functions* that Nature is already employing for her own salvation or recovery.

For instance: A person takes a violent cold, and is thrown into a fever. Now, the *fever* is not the *cold*, but it is a phenomena; a symptom put on by Nature to relieve herself of the obstructions, or derangements produced by the cold. Hence, it is the most common-sense thing in the world, that if we would help Nature out of this difficulty, we must act in perfect harmony with her efforts. It is certainly *unphilosophical* that our first efforts should be of a character calculated to cripple her chief facilities! Instead of increasing her embarrassment, by reducing her strength, and inflicting upon her new sources of irritation, we must (to use familiar illustrations) lift just where Nature is lifting. We must try to excite the same class of functions that she is fetching into requisition. We must seek a perfect acquaintance with her efforts. We must act in entire subserviency to her will. Nature must be the Captain, and we must be her well-disciplined and obedient servants. She must hang out the indications, and we must second her efforts. We must not do the work for *her*, but we must work *with her*, and in entire *subserviency* to her. We must not take the work into *our own hands*, but let the *hand of Nature* direct, and we hold ourselves in readiness to give her a *helping hand* in the whole of her undertakings.

The great secret, then, of the healing art is, to seek *first*, as far as possible, a perfect familiarity with the symptomatic phenomena of nature in any given case of disease; and, *secondly*, to become acquainted with the pathogenetic action, or therapeutical properties of remedies, so that we may appropriately second every recuperative effort of nature.

This is the crowning glory of *Homeopathy*, viz.: it is based upon a fixed and invulnerable law in nature; a law which is unchangeable, inviolable, *eternal!* It is a demonstrated principle, which entitles it to a rank among the sciences. Nay, qualifiedly among the *exact sciences*. All other systems of medicine are destitute of such a principle, and hence their whole horizon is beskirted with cloudy uncertainty. They give such a drug for such a disease, &c. &c., without any regard to a great unchangeable principle in its pathogenetic action, and hence their frequent disappointment, and common disagreement.

To Hahnemann the world is indebted for the discovery of the great *homeopathic* principle. In 1790, while engaged in the translation of Cullen's *Materia Medica* into German, dissatisfied with the author's explanation of the action of bark in curing intermittent fevers, he resolved to try it on his own person. He did so, and found the symptoms it produced resembling those of ague. And here the great principle burst upon his mind. He pursued it, and found, to his astonishment, in his various experiments, that medicines produced symptoms altogether similar to those in the diseases against which they were known to act as specifics. Thus was the great principle conceived, and time and testings have demonstrated its truth; and as easily might the maniac hush the roarings of the Niagara, as the onward rushing of this great truth can be hushed by the opposition it may encounter.

Homeopathy being established on a fixed law, an invulnerable principle, its practitioners can never disagree; while among the allopathic schools, nothing is more common than disagreement. It is so common that, "Who shall decide when doctors disagree!" has become an adage. But in Homeopathy it cannot be so. It is true, a comprehensive mind associated with an extensive experience, may prescribe much more successfully than another; but it is utterly impossible for them to disagree in the principle of therapeutical agency.

We shall now proceed to take into consideration the subject of *infinitesimal*, or minute, doses. This is what constitutes the front of our offending; the great hobby of our opponents; and they have ridden it quite threadbare, "without understanding what they say, or whereof they affirm." The doctrine of *infinitesimal doses*, constituted no original or necessary part of Homeopathy. In perfect accordance with both the theory and primary experiments, medicines may be given homeopathically and still in strong doses. But experience has proved, that, in the treatment of disease, to create a medicinal excitement greater than that superinduced by the disease, is not only injurious, but highly dangerous. If the medicines are too strong, an aggravation is the result, and it is

much less hazardous to have the exciting influences rather feeble, than a little too strong. When the medicinal influence is too strong it over excites, and instead of simply aiding or supporting nature's efforts, it throws her out of balance, confuses her energies, and gives her new and increased difficulties to contend with.

It should be borne in mind, that the object *is not* to give medicine in such appreciable, or strong doses, as to produce great chemical changes in the system. Nature is her own best chemist; and to take that work out of her hands is meddling with what is none of our business. The normal action of animal life is quiet and imperceptible, and if our efforts to assist her are truly philosophical and scientific, they will be in perfect harmony with this great and universal law. There is not a function in the whole of the phenomena of animal life, but what has a pathogenetic answer in some medicinal agent. Compounding these agents is wholly discarded by homeopathy; because compounding them neutralizes their specific properties, forming a new chemical preparation; and we have in this compounding we know not what.

It is not at all surprising that our opponents should sound the note of alarm, and contend for the inefficiency of *infinitesimal* and minute doses of medicine, when we reflect that it has been customary for three thousand years, when disturbance prevailed in the human citadel, to storm it with agents of destruction. Blood is made to flow; the delicate membranes of the stomach and intestines are racked with broadsides of emetics and drastics; the nervous system is shattered by narcotics and stimulants, and the functions of every organ deranged, by the showers of destructive allopathic missiles with which the enfeebled body is constantly assailed.

By these summary means the resources are exhausted, the strength fails, and the citadel soon falls.

Homeopathy resorts to a different mode of procedure. She uses no unnatural violence, nor seriously disturbs the function of any organ. But she usually administers her medicaments *in infinitesimal doses*; and now comes the question, Whether such minute doses are capable of impressions upon the organism when labouring under disease?

No one will deny that the human body during health is constantly being acted upon and disturbed by influences or agents so subtle, that neither the chemist or physiologist can analyze or even detect them.

One inhalation of a noxious miasm, under favourable circumstances, is as capable of causing its specific contagion, as a thousand, or more.— One thousandth part of a grain of natural or morbid virus, is as capable

of imparting the peculiar action of the poison to all parts of the organism susceptible to its influence, as a larger quantity.

Indeed, so minute and subtle are miasms from vegetable and animal decomposition and exhalations arising from contagious disorders, that no one has yet been able to appreciate their physical or chemical properties, by the most accurate tests of chemistry or optics. Who, however, for this reason, will presume to deny or doubt their tremendous, although mysterious, power upon the human system?

So, also, when an atom of medicine is absorbed into the system, and comes *in contact* with an organ or tissue already diseased, upon which it exercises a specific influence, it communicates to the surrounding organs its peculiar action, until the whole tissue is involved, and thus, if the remedy be homeopathic to the malady, it will supersede the primary affection. Let it be borne in mind, that most substances, both in the organic and inorganic kingdoms, possess certain active principles, which are latent in a natural state.

Heat, electricity, and magnetism, become apparent when certain physical substances operate upon each other in such a manner as to disturb or change the original state of cohesion of particles.

Caloric is a property common to all material substances. In the natural state of these substances, this active principle is latent, and cannot be appreciated by the senses; but if *friction* be used, this agent is set free, and its power becomes manifest. Electricity also pervades all material bodies, and only becomes sensible when the natural state of these bodies is disturbed by *friction*.

Large quantities of vegetable, animal, or mineral substances, may be taken into the stomach, in a crude state, with impunity; but if their elementary particles become separated by decomposition, or otherwise, and then introduced into the system, they give rise to the most baneful results. It is a matter of little consequence, whether this minute subdivision of particles is effected by the action of solar heat and moisture, by trituration or succession—the ultimate effects are the same. The elements of the substance are separated, the essence or medicinal part is set free from the crude, material, and non-medicinal portions, and reduced to such a state of attenuation, as to become readily absorbed, and yet retain all the specific qualities pertaining to the original agent.

Alopathy has long since taught us, that mercury, taken in the mass, is inert, and that its effects is in proportion to the minuteness of the division; and will you place a limit to this patentization by division? Have we not been directed to carry the rubbing and trituration to an extent in

the manufacture of the blue pill, which would tire the arm and patience of Hahnemann himself?

Again, have we not been taught, that corrosive sublimate, diluted eight thousand times, may be detected by the protomuriate of tin test?—This looks to us much like Homeopathic dilution, but it is universally received. Homeopaths suppose that the mode in which their attenuations operate, is analogous to that of infection by miasms; that the inert matter of the substance is destroyed, and the active principle is set free; and that the smallest quantity of this active principle, triturated with sugar of milk, or diffused in water or alcohol, is capable of communicating to the vehicles its properties, and thus to the organism its peculiar action.

The principal arguments of our opponents have been irony and ridicule. They have entered into a computation respecting the *weight* and *strength* of the different attenuations, and have displayed before us tabular views, shewing the strength of each attenuation, and then assured us, without the trouble of testing the question practically, that such exceedingly small doses can produce no effect upon the system.

We would, however, request those gentlemen who judge of the potency of substances by their *weight* and dimensions, to enter into a still further calculation, and inform us which possesses the greatest *weight*—the medicinal particles pertaining to a drop of a thirtieth attenuation of homeopathy, or the charge of electricity, which lays prostrate and senseless the strongest man—or the quantity of sulphuretted hydrogen, or carbonic acid gas, requisite to cause immediate death when inhaled?

Which can be most easily detected and appreciated by *analysis*, the atoms of a high attenuation of Hahnemann, or the deleterious miasms which arise from vegetable or animal decomposition?

Which present the greatest difficulties in examination and description, the *physical* structure of the particles of a homeopathic medicament, or that of caloric or light?

Let it be remembered, that not one atom of matter in the whole universe can be *annihilated*!—transformation may be effected—the cohesion of particles may be changed—atoms in their ultimate state of chemical combination may be *physically* divided into molecules, and again subdivided into lesser atoms to such an extent as to baffle detection from the most perfect tests of chemistry or optics—new powers may be developed in these atoms, but in no instance can we destroy one such particle of matter.

In regard to the preparation of medicines, there are several points of difference worthy of notice, between the old and new schools. Allopathy

employs her drugs in a crude and consequently inactive form; Homeopathy makes use only of their pure essential principles, unencumbered by foreign matters.

The medicinal quality of *cod liver oil*, the universal panacea of Allopathy for consumption, consists of *iodine* distributed in infinitesimal quantities throughout the oil. The *iodine* forms only one forty-thousandth part of the oil, equal to the fourth attenuation of homeopathy *iodine*.

Ipecacuanha is indebted for its virtues, to a principle called *emetia*. We find by analysis, that of one hundred parts of crude ipecacuanha, only five parts possess the medicinal virtues of the drug.

Opium contains but about eight or nine per cent. of *morphia*—its narcotic principle. The crude substance contains, in addition to morphia, fourteen other ingredients, all of which are destitute of any particular virtues.

Cinchona is composed of ten or twelve ingredients, of which all, but quinia and cinchonia, are inert.

The same rule obtains in relation to most other substances. The essential properties are distributed but sparingly, and it is only by the utmost care and nicety, that we can separate and develop these properties.

Allopathy employs so great an amount of artificial heat in her pharmaceutical operations, that a large proportion of the active properties of her drugs is expended in evaporation; while homeopathy makes use only of expression, trituration, and succession, and thus not only retains all of the virtues inherent in the drug, but actually develops powers which would have remained latent under other circumstances.

On account of the peculiar mode of preparation, the remedies of allopathy are offensive to the taste, nauseous to the stomach, and by their indigestible and irritating qualities are excluded by the sensitive absorbents, and are thrown off with the faecal matter as foreign substances; having failed of producing any other effect, than an irritation of the gastro-intestinal membrane.

The medicines of Homeopathy are liable to none of these objections. The attenuated remedies being innocuous to the lacteals and absorbents, are readily admitted into the circulation, and conveyed to those parts upon which they exert a specific action, thus impressing *directly* the organs or tissues actually diseased, and none other.

The practice of Allopathy must always be indirect, uncertain, and empirical. The violence of the remedies employed, necessarily induces medicinal and sympathetic affections, which, mingling with the symptoms of the natural disease, renders it impossible to distinguish between the two classes of symptoms, or to judge whether the malady or

the medicine, or both combined, are killing the patient. The fact that so few Allopathic practitioners agree in the treatment of diseases, proves conclusively that their system is one of *guessing*, rather than one founded on scientific knowledge and ascertained facts.

Therapeutics with them is found to fluctuate with the advent of each new and eloquent teacher, and even with the introduction of each new medicine.

This wavering is not found in science. There great principles exist, fixed, eternal expressions of the divine will, and doubtful or controversial points are brought to the test of these expressions.

Therapeutics is not alone of all nature, destitute of law, given up to the dominion of chaos. Nature has not so mismanaged her universe, that this important, most practical law, is past finding out—that we should lay hold upon the hidden chemical forces—that we should determine the course of the stars, and remain hopelessly ignorant of the relations of medicinal agents to the cure of disease.

Thus it is that the profession is groping and stumbling along, to-day exalting an article to the pinnacle, and to-morrow flinging it away; and that medicine has its fashions almost as variable as millinery. To-day purging, and to-morrow bleeding, is the order of the day; now tartar emetic, and again iodine, is the Sampson of the Profession.

At present, cod-liver-oil is in the ascendant. Not Morrison's pills are more potent. To only one article can the profession be said to pay constant allegiance, (calomel,) perhaps because that is more destructive.

One might laugh, but for the tragic associations, at the curious and even ludicrous illustrations of the extra fickleness of medical fashions, as well as at the humble parentage of some of the Sampsons of the medical army.

To-day, Broussais will induce a host of physicians almost to discard the use of medicine, and to-morrow, Professor Cook will send out an army of young men to bleed, vomit and purge a people to death, &c. &c.

Homeopathy being established on a fixed law in nature, which is unchangeable, inviolable, *eternal*—its practitioners can never disagree in therapeutics. For nature will not change to suit a hypothesis, and specific medication is as inimitable as gravitation.

In thus contending for specific medication, we do not intend merely a bundle of specifics, whether obtained from diligent nurses or benevolent old ladies, or some partial experiment on a cat, dog, or horse. We mean specific medication resting on a thorough experiment upon the human system in health, of different ages, sexes, and conditions in life, and by observing closely their effect, their specific action may be ascertained with certainty.

This is the manner in which Homeopaths proceed, and is it not preferable to ascertaining the effects of medicines upon cats and dogs? If we were going to treat diseases of the feline and canine races, the latter course might be preferable to the former. This explains why our minute doses are efficient. They have a specific action upon the diseased tissue, and act *directly* upon it, and not upon the healthy portions of the system, to disturb its functions and exhaust its strength.

Homeopathy is not, as its enemies pretend, a mere hypothesis, destined to share the fate of ten thousand transient hypotheses, which have flourished their brief hour, and then died, but a great practical truth, based upon experiment, and demonstrated by success.

But, as I before observed, it is not so much our *principle of cure*, at which the shafts of the old school are directed, as to the doctrine of *small doses*.

It is not because the adherents of Allopathy cannot make themselves acquainted with the powers of attenuated drugs, but it is because their inveterate prejudices will not allow them to investigate the facts which are involved. They prefer *to die* of vomiting, purging, and sweating, as their predecessors have done for three thousand years, rather than be cured quietly under a *new system*.

But why have our opponents dwelt so much upon our doses? Does not every homeopath give sufficient quantity of medicine at a time to effect a cure? and is not the quantity determined by experience? We have different strength of attenuations of each medicine, from the strongest tincture up to the most minute attenuation; and every homeopath selects that strength which most speedily and safely *cures his* patient. The great point with him is, to select such a medicine as shall be homeopathic to the disease, and then administer just enough of it to effect his object in the most safe and speedy manner.

We shall conclude this part of the subject by quoting a few observations of the distinguished modern chemist, (an Allopathist.) KANE, respecting the divisibility of matter, and some of the phenomena witnessed, when a very high state of attenuation has been arrived at. We make these extracts for the benefit of those whose boundlessness of ideas are not already made up.

It has been proved, if a grain of copper be dissolved in nitric acid, and then in water of ammonia, it will give a decided violet color to 392 cubic inches of water. Even supposing that each portion of the liquor of the size of a grain of sand, and of which there are a million in a cubic inch, contains only one particle of copper, the grain must have divided itself

into 392 million parts. A single drop of a strong solution of indigo, wherein at least 500,000 distinctly visible portions can be shown, colors 1000 cubic inches of water; and as this mass of water contains 500,000 times the bulk of the drop of the indigo solution, the particles of indigo must be smaller than twenty-five hundred millionth of a cubic inch.

If we dissolve a fragment of silver 00.1 of a cubic line in nitric acid, it will render distinctly milky 500 cubic inches of a clear solution of common salt. Hence the magnitude of each particle of silver cannot exceed, but must fall short of a billionth of a cubic line. To render the idea of this degree of division more distinct than the mere mention of so imperfectly conceivable a number as a billion could affect, it may be added, that a man, to reckon with a watch, counting day and night, a single billion of seconds, would require 31,675 years.

An Irish girl has spun linen yarn of which a pound was 1,432 English miles in length, and of which consequently, 17 lbs. 13 ounces would have girt the globe. Cotton has been spun so that a pound of thread was 203,000 yards in length. And yet these so far from being ultimate particles of matter, must have contained more than one vegetable or animal fibre; that fibre being of itself of complex organization; and built up of an indefinitely great number of more simple forms of matter.

According to Deppler, a cubic inch of brimstone, broken into a million equal pieces, a sand grain each in size, is magnified in sensible surface from six square inches to more than six square feet. It is calculable in this way, that if each trituration of the homeopathist diminishes his drug a hundred times, the *sensible surface* of a single inch of sulphur, or any other drug, shall be two square miles at the third trituration.

The microscope has revealed to us still greater wonders as to the degree of minuteness which even complex bodies are capable of possessing. Each new improvement in our instruments displays to us new *races of anima's*, so minute not to be observed before, and of which it would require the heaping together of *millions upon millions to be visible to the naked eye*. And yet these animals *live* and *feed*, and have their organs for locomotion, their appetites to gratify, and their dangers to avoid. They possess circulating systems often highly complex, and blood, with globules bearing to them, by analogy, the same proportion in size, that our blood globules do to us; and yet these globules themselves organized, possessed of definite structure, lead us to a point where all power of distinct conception ceases; where we discover that nothing is great or small but by comparison.

Finally, the advantages which we obtain from a minute subdivision of crude substances are as follows:—

1. We develop every part of the active principle, by breaking up all natural organization between its molecules, and thus expose a large amount of active surface which would have remained latent.

2. By distributing their molecules intimately throughout an inert vehicle, (sugar or water) they are more readily absorbed by the delicate lacterals and absolvents, than coarse and irritating particles of matter.

3. When these minute atoms have been conveyed by the blood to those parts with which they have an affinity, they penetrate the smallest vessels, impress the minutest sentient nerves, and are productive of results entirely unattainable by drugs in a crude state.

But again; the action is evidently electrical, for the whole of the phenomena of life is carried on by electricity, and hence the slightest possible action, if properly directed, will find a prompt answer in nature. Does it require a spoonful of infection to superinduce small-pox? No, sir. An impalpable and an entirely inappreciable atom that may chance to float upon the breeze, if it comes in contact with the organism, will engender in the system the most loathsome disease and rottenness. We had dip the fine point of a needle in the virus of kine pock, and put it in contact with the circulation of the skin, and what is the result? Why, the whole system is affected by it with a class of symptoms that bear a perfect similarity to those of the small-pox. Now the virus of kine pock exciting the same class of symptomatic functions that nature brings into requisition in resisting *varioid*, or small pox, enables her to effectually ward off the latter. We have in this a demonstration of both the principle and practice of homeopathy. *Similia similibus curantur*—like cures like. And *one* infinitesimal dose accomplishes it.

There are thousands of instances in nature which fully corroborate the homeopathic practice in regard to minute doses. I have had full proof myself of the potency of the invisible poison that has come from a single leaf perhaps of the *Rhus Vernix*, or poison ivy. By simple olfaction, the whole system has become affected with medicinal erysipelas.

There are doubtless some who hear me to-night, who may have had the same sad experience; and they could not be persuaded, they could not be hired to even smell a twig of these poison vegetables. It would cost them perhaps weeks of the most painful sickness, afflicting them at the same time with hideous swellings and loathsome running sores. Now, in the face and eyes of such facts as these, people still ridicule the idea of the potency of minute doses! Yet here is a minuteness entirely beyond the power of the strongest microscope, producing the most distressing results.

Only think; a mighty oak is wrapped up in a little acorn; a bound-

less crop may come from a single germ that floats on the air. It is not the quantity, but the *quality* that accomplishes the thing. It is just so in the application of remedies in the treatment of disease. Inoculate the system with the right thing, no matter in how minute a quantity, and it is a law of nature that it shall go on accomplishing its work.

Think of the boundless diffusion of odor. A single grain of musk will impregnate the atmosphere of a thousand dwellings. A single drop from the *Miphitis Putorius* (polecat) will medicate an ocean of atmosphere. The fragrance of a single flower will sometimes produce fainting. The wild buffalo scents the hunter for more than a mile, and hastens from the vicinity of danger. The carnivorous bird recognises the odiferous particles arising from a dead carcass miles distant in the air, and with hasty wing, pounces upon the prey. What is it that is imparted from the master's foot through boots and socks, by which his faithful dog can trace his footsteps long after he has gone? What is it, by which the bloodhound traces its game through the thick windings of the dark forest? Think of the invisible miasm that rides unsuspected on the stilly air, diffusing misery and death. And are all these hints without signification? Is there no lesson of wisdom to be learned from them? With such an array of facts, disputed by none, is it a thing incredible that minute medications should produce marked effects upon the vital organism? True, contrasted with the common medical doctrines, it seems incredible; but when compared with nature, examined in a philosophical light, and tested by facts, it is invulnerable. The difference between the common and the reformed practice is so great, that it is a matter of course for people to distrust its efficiency. They have been accustomed to suppose that the efficacy of medicine lies chiefly in its powerful physical influences; that to be benefited by it, they must first be made to feel its morbid effects; that they must be made worse before they are better. This is a mistake. No powerful medicinal excitement is necessary to restore the equilibrium of nature. When she is menaced and jaded, and aggravated by disease, she calls not for, she needs not medicinal torturing, but a kind friend to come gently to her aid and act in perfect concert with herself. When she is agonizing and writhing in her conflicts with disease, she needs not to be goaded on like the baited brute in the amphitheatre; but it is then she needs the well-timed and soothing aid of a modest and discreet friend.

These principles are destined to prevail. Just as certain as the announcement of Newton's better philosophy broke up the beautiful speculations of former days, and scattered them like the fragments of an aerial vision, just so certain will these immutable principles make an entire revolution in the science of medicine.

An objection is frequently raised against Homeopathy, from the fact that children and adults also sometimes take a tumbler of the medicine, or a great number of doses at once, without experiencing any serious consequences. Hence they infer that it possesses no power to heal, because, forsooth, it does not kill! But it should be borne in mind that the diseased body is vastly more susceptible than the healthy. The highly-inflamed eye cannot endure the bright glare of day, while the health eye is unimpaired by a double brightness. The din of business and the clamor of pompous festivity throws the patient, whose nerves are all unstrung, into an agony; while to the healthy the whole is pleasing. The faint radiations of a distant fire pour a flood of anguish into the scalded hand, while to the healthy it is unfelt. A morsel of food will cause the dispeptic exquisite anguish, while ten times the quantity will produce no unpleasant effect on the healthy stomach. In like manner the diseased body is highly susceptible to the action of appropriate remedies.

I shall now proceed to call your attention to some remarks of Professor Forbes, who stands at the head of the medical profession in England. He is one of the editors of the "Cyclopædia of Practical Medicine," and also editor of the "British and Foreign Medical Review." He is undoubtedly, good authority. He has published a work against Homeopathy, from which I shall make a few extracts.

"We think it impossible," (says Dr. F.) "to refuse to Homeopathy the praise of being an ingenious system of medical doctrine, tolerably complete in its organization, tolerably comprehensive in its views, and as capable of being defended by as feasible arguments as most of the systems of medicine which preceded it." This is an important concession.

After giving a statistical report of the practice of Drs. Fleischmann and Henderson, in the Homeopathic Hospital Vienna, Professor Forbes proceeds to say:—

"We do not hesitate to declare, that the amount of success obtained by Dr. Henderson in his cases, would have been considered by ourselves as very satisfactory, had we been treating the same cases according to the rules of ordinary medicine.

"In making these admissions in respect to the instances of treatment supplied by Drs. Fleischmann and Henderson, we wish formally to guard ourselves against being supposed to admit, . . . that the result of the Homeopathic treatment, *generally*, is, and will be as successful as the result of the ordinary treatment generally."

Why not? If Homeopathy, in fair trials in both hospital and ordinary

practice, has given results of which the very first men in the Allopathic ranks would be proud, what reason is there for supposing that it may not *generally* be as successful?

This position of Professor Forbes' is *petitio principii*, or a begging of the question. He now proceeds, in imitation of the cuttle-fish, to shed his ink, for the purpose of raising a cloud, under which to make good his retreat; but in trying to put out one of his neighbor's eyes, he sadly blears both his own. He proceeds to show, that all the quack nostrums of the day can boast their numerous cures; and taking it for granted, that *nature*, as a *general thing*, has helped herself out of the difficulty, not only independent of the nostrums but in spite of them, *so*, likewise, Homeopathy has succeeded. He then adds,—

“We must advert to what is, perhaps, the most extensive and valuable source of all—the actual practice of the more scientific physicians of all ages, in the latter part of their career; men of philosophic minds as well as much experience. It is well known, from the history of physic, that a large proportion of men of this class have, in their old age, abandoned much of the energetic and perturbing medication of their early practice, and trusted greatly to the remedial powers of nature. The saying of a highly-respected and very learned physician of Edinburgh, still living at an advanced age, very happily illustrates this point. On some one boasting, before him, of the marvellous cures wrought by the small doses of the Homeopaths, he said, ‘this was no peculiar cause for boasting, as he himself had, for the last two years, been curing his patients with even less, viz: with nothing at all.’”

I would here respectfully ask, What does the solution of the Professor's problem amount to? What is the most natural inference to be drawn from these remarks? Why, simply, that *no medicine at all*, is safer and better than “the energetic and perturbing medications” of Allopathy. He says, the most scientific and intelligent allopathic physicians of all ages, in the latter part of their career, have abandoned strong medications as fraught with danger, and have found it much safer to trust to the remedial powers of nature; and because the allopathic school have found that no medicine is safer and better than their general treatment, that, therefore, the great secret of the success of Homeopathy lies in the fact, that they gave no medicine at all. This, again, is begging the question. It is taking it for granted, that because *allopathists* are more successful when they give no medicine at all, that the success of *Homeopathy* must be contingent on the same course.

The following suggestion of Professor F. is very true; and it should

not be forgotten, that, "while he is thus exalting the powers of nature at the expense of Homeopathy, he is at the same time exposing the nakedness of his own cherished Allopathy." He is like the man that would put out both of his own eyes for the sake of putting out one of his antagonist's. By his own admission we have only to infer that the treatment of disease, by the ordinary or allopathic method, is, at the very best, useless, and worse than useless; because it not only does not cure, but actually interferes with the cure in many instances; and puts the patient under the painful necessity of swallowing loathsome and costly drugs, which generally produce unpleasant sensations in their operation, from all of which Homeopathy is free.

We will now hear a few momentous words from Professor Forbes on the merits of *Allopathy*. He says, 1st, "In a large proportion of cases treated by Allopathic physicians, the disease is cured by nature, and not by them." 2d. "In a less, but still not a small proportion, the disease is cured by nature, *in spite* of them; in other words their interference opposing instead of assisting the cure."

"3rd, In a considerable proportion of diseases, it would fare as well, or better, with patients, in the actual condition of the medical art, as more generally practised, if all remedies, at least all active remedies, especially drugs, were abandoned."

"Although Homeopathy has brought more signally into common daylight this lamentable condition of medicine, it was well known before to all philosophical and experienced physicians."

After speaking at length in the same general strain, of the imperfection of the Allopathic system, he adds,—

"As thus reflected in our critical mirror, the features of our *ancient mother* assuredly look somewhat unattractive. She seems neither happy nor prosperous; yea, she seems sick, very sick; her countenance is 'sicklied o'er by the pale cast of thought,' from the strength of her inward throes. 'The genius and the mortal instruments are now in council, and her state, like to a little kingdom, is suffering the nature of an insurrection.' And such, in truth, do we believe to be, literally, the condition of physic at this moment. Things have arrived at such a pitch that they cannot be worse. They must mend or end. We believe they will mend."

After thus deploring the forlorn condition of the Allopathic science, Professor Forbes proceeds to give certain rules to guide the future action of the profession, among which are the following suggestions, viz:—

We should banish from the treatment of disease the harsh or heroic system, and inculcate a milder and less energetic mode, and thus "give

nature the best chance of doing the work herself, by leaving her operations undisturbed by those of art."

Here he recommends his brethren to pursue the same course that he accuses us of. Again he says:—

We should "discountenance all active and powerful medication, as much as possible, and eschew the habitual use of certain powerful medicines in large doses, in a multitude of different diseases, a practice now generally prevalent, and fraught with the most baneful consequences." "This is one of the besetting sins of English practice, and originates partly in a false theory and partly in the desire to see manifest and strong effects resulting from the action of medicines. Mercury, iodine, colchicum, antimony, also purgations in general, and blood-letting, are frightfully misused in this manner."

We should "make every effort to destroy the prevalent system of giving a vast quantity and variety of unnecessary and useless drugs." "Our system is here radically wrong;" and our fashion of doubling, that is compounding, mixing, &c., is "most absurdly and mischievously complex," and "is a most serious impediment in the way of ascertaining the precise and peculiar powers of the individual drug, and thus interferes in the most important manner with the progress of therapeutics."

We should "teach students that no systematic, or theoretical classification of diseases, or of therapeutic agents, ever yet promulgated, is true or anything like truth, and that none can be adopted as a safe guide in practice."

We should "endeavour to enlighten the public as to the actual powers of medicines, with a view to reconciling them to simpler and milder plans of treatment.

Such, ladies and gentlemen, is the language of one who stands at the head of the Allopathic school in Europe. And is it at all strange, that in view of this forlorn condition of common medical science, (a picture given by one of the great masters in the art,) I ask, is it strange that some should have sought a better way? or is it a great marvel that they should have found it?

We have not made these quotations from an enemy of the common medical school; but from one of its champions—one of its strongest sons. One who is capable of appreciating its claims, and yet he candidly confesses its foibles.

The great principles which he has laid down, as a means of redeeming, reforming and saving the art from an utter overthrow, are identical with the great principles of Homeopathy; and if his counsel is adopted

and appropriated, it will inalienably guide them to the same great ocean of truth.

Hence it is evident that Homeopathy is destined to triumph. It is enlisting some of the best influence and talent in both hemispheres, which of course will serve to speed it on. But the greatest guaranty of its complete conquest is its unrivalled success. Its statistical reports, both in promiscuous and hospital practice, are the certain precursors of its great and rapid extension.

I will here take occasion to exhibit the comparative results of the two modes of treatment, when put to the test at the sick-bed. The following are authentic reports, made without any reference to such a comparison.

Out of 299 cases of pneumonia, treated *homeopathically*, by Dr. Flieschmann, in his hospital practice, Vienna, there were 19 deaths, which is only about one death in fifteen cases.

Out of 909 cases of the same disease, treated allopathically, at the Edinburgh Infirmary, &c., there were 212 deaths, being nearly one quarter.

Out of 224, of pleritis, treated homeopathically by Dr. Flieschmann, there were but *three* deaths—not far from one in a hundred.

Out of 111 cases of the same disease, treated allopathically at the Edinburgh Infirmary, there were 14 deaths, or about one eighth.

The results of the two practices in the treatment of the Cholera in Hospitals and elsewhere, according to the most reliable statistics, are, Allopaths have lost upon an average *one third*. Homeopaths one twentieth.

Now, it will be observed, in the above well-authenticated statistics, that the mortality is *five times* greater under Allopathic, than under Homeopathic treatment; and I will hazard the bold assertion, and call upon the world to signalize it, that ordinary practice in the two schools will exhibit as great a disparity in every disease, and in every climate.

With these reflections I conclude, not forgetting, however, to recommend the claims of this important subject to the notice of the public, and to the attention of the medical profession in particular; as the object of our profession is to lengthen human life and to alleviate human woe.

Let each physician test the principles of Homeopathy by its practice. Let him do it fairly and impartially, as he would sit in judgment on the life of a fellow-being, not hoping to find it untrue, but earnestly seeking the truth. Let him do it for himself, and stand by his own convictions, and he will no longer wonder why any embrace it, but why all do not.

We have thus attempted to show you that Homeopathy has at least a

show of reason for its principles and its practice—if you intend to be honest, you are bound to investigate it. Homeopathy courts investigation. Homeopaths, fortified by the success of their practice, wish you to examine their system. Do this candidly and fairly, take not the assertion of its opponents, but read and judge for yourselves; and if you find the system unreasonable, unphilosophical, and the practice unsuccessful, then, but not till then, pronounce it a humbug.

A few remarks upon Hydropathy. Hydropathy is the name of a method of curing diseases by the application of cold water, in various ways. To Prissnitz, a farmer in Germany, belongs the honor of having first boldly proclaimed and sustained by facts, the high qualities of cold water, as a remedy for diseases. Although its healing effects are wonderful, and entitled to all consideration and praise, yet its universal application, as the only curative agent, superseding direct medication, is impossible. The judicious application of water strengthens the powers of nature, and thus aids her in throwing off disease. This principle of Hydropathy is true in chronic as well as acute diseases; but in the latter, its application is more limited, and this in proportion to the acuteness and severity of the disease. Neither would it be necessary or right to trust in the thousands of medical cases, to one healing agent alone, which at best only assists in keeping up sinking nature, when we have the knowledge of other agents which have a direct annihilating effect upon the disease itself. And this is Homeopathy, whose application in diseases does not prevent the use of cold water; but in most cases, prescribes its use, to strengthen nature, that the remedies may destroy the diseases in a direct or specific manner.

These two systems, properly combined and practised together, will form the most complete code of medical rule and action which has ever existed. Allopathy and Hydropathy can never act together; because the principle of the former, to break down the natural strength, is too antagonistic to the objects of the latter, which tries to elevate, and not to destroy the strength of nature. There is no other alliance left, neither could any other be conceived as natural, harmonious, and effective as that of Homeopathy and Hydropathy, each one supporting and strengthening the doings of the other. Providence was evidently at work in permitting the former to be discovered by the most learned and philosophic mind of the age, the illustrious Hahnemann, and the latter to be practised first by an unlearned, but unsophisticated peasant; the first being the result of deep reasoning and research, the latter of simple and clear observation.

The pretensions of Hydropathy to constitute a perfect medical system, in which light some of its most modern practitioners have tried to esta-

blish it, must and will be abandoned, as they have neither theoretical bases nor practical demonstration. It needs but a slight acquaintance with the workings of Homeopathy, in comparison with Hydropathy, to come to the conclusion that the former could sooner dispense with the assistance of the latter, then *vice versa*, but that a judicious union of both insures the most brilliant success.

IMPORTANT
TO THE AFFLICTED.

R. J. SMITH, M. D.,
HOMEOPATHIC AND HYDROPATHIC
Physician and Surgeon,

Would respectfully announce to the Ladies and Gentlemen of Toronto and vicinity, that his experience and success in the practice of Medicine, justifies him in inviting those afflicted with *Cancers, Pulmonary Consumption, Coughs, Tubercular Difficulties, Bronchitis, Scrofula* in all its forms, *Glandular Affections, Female Difficulties, and Weaknesses*, with all their concomitant evils; *Fevers, Inflammations, Diarræha, Dysentery, Cholera, Cholera Morbus, Billious Affections, Fever and Ague, Rheumatism, Dropsy, Dyspepsia, Constipation, Headache, Deafness, Sore Eyes, Catarrh, Asthma, Debility, Nervous Affections, Epilepsy, St. Vitus's Dance, Palsy, Erysipelas, Eruptions, Scald Head, Salt Rheum, Rickets, Ulcers, Abscesses, Tumors, Fever Sores, Chillsains, Gravel, Sterility, Critical Age, Venereal Diseases, Gonorrhœa, Syphilis, Affections of the Mind, Head, Eyes, Ears, Nose, Mouth, Neck, Windpipe, Lungs, Chest, Stomach, Bowels, Back, Liver, Heart, Pleury, Kidneys, Urinary and Genital Organs, &c., &c.*, including all *Acute and Chronic Diseases, Difficulties of Long Standing*, given up by other Physicians as incurable—to call and consult him. No charge for consultation or advice. All will be successfully treated, specifically.

DR. SMITH feels so confident of success in treating the above diseases, that he will enter into a written contract with those who desire it, to cure them for a specified sum, that may be agreed upon, on condition that no charge will be made for Medicine or services, if the cure is not effected.

☞ Office and Residence, 43 BAY STREET, near King, where a few Patients can be received and furnished with the best of accommodations and Medical Treatment—Homeopathic and Hydropathic.

☞ TERMS—\$5 to \$10 per week, including Board, Professional Services and incidental expenses.

☞ OFFICE HOURS—from 8 to 10, A. M.; from 1 to 3, P. M., and from 7 to 9, in the evening.

☞ Patients who desire it, will be visited at their residences, at any time of the day or night.

☞ I will not occupy the space requisite to give a detailed account of the numerous cures that I have effected, but will refer those who desire such information to persons who have been afflicted with the above diseases, who, after having expended hundreds and thousands of dollars, and been given up as incurable by the most scientific and successful practitioners of the old school, I have cured in a short time, for from \$5 to \$100.