

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

BY R. J. SMITH, M. D.,
HOMEOPATHIC PHYSICIAN AND SURGEON, 35 KING ST., EAST, TORONTO.

PUBLISHED BY SPECIAL REQUEST.—PRICE 7½d.

SEE LAST PAGE OF COVER.

TORONTO :
BLACKBURN'S CITY STEAM PRESS, 63 YONGE STREET.
1857.

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

BY R. J. SMITH, M. D.

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 endowments 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 favor 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 organizations, 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 diseases 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 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 countries 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 probable that the cure of diseases 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 diseases, 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 in nearly 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 disease, so that they could be recognized by his description. The result of all his labors 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 succes-

sors, 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 cotemporaries, 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 labours 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 the sciences generally seems 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, Bœrhaave, 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 epoch in medicine, extending from the twelfth to the middle of the eighteenth century, systems rose and fell about as often as the 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 en-

deavouring to bring prominently to view, namely: that medicine was still practiced 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 doctrine, has outlived his offspring theory, and been called to witness to 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 everything, 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 is it 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 who richly deserve to be classed with the great and 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 therapeutic principle. He learned that medicines can cure only diseases analagous 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 accumulated 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 anti-

* 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 of 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 cure only diseases analagous 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.

quity ; 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 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 have 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 men of the allopathic school, for opinion's sake among themselves, is directed against homeopathy ; for we find them equally as much embittered 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.

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 one 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 of 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 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 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 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 the 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 superseded its slow moving predecessors, the stage coach and Conestoga waggon. 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 unmixed 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.

A query naturally arises here. If the principles of the Homeopathic system are really so obvious and well established, why is it that the whole medical profession have not adopted it? To give a full answer to this question would require a lecture by itself. It must suffice here to say, that several causes, such as natural indolence—the dread of being obliged to go into new trains of laborious investigations, the pride of learning—an unwillingness to acknowledge that others have learned what they do not know; a veneration for old and supposed established doctrines; the reputed weakness of credulity, which can be easily induced to believe new things, with the supposed dignity of unbelief, have all conspired, in every age, to deter men from adopting, and to produce resistance to new discoveries.

It took a hundred years before Harvey's discovery of the circulation of blood was generally acknowledged.

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 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 Pare, 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 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 Wharncliffe, 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 descanted 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 the 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 succeed, 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.

Solomon de Caus, the discoverer of steam-power, was imprisoned in 1615, and it was only in recent time that this agent has been generally introduced. Said Lord Worcester, who visited him:— Misfortune and captivity have deprived him of reason, and when

you put him into the cell you shut up the greatest genius of the age. Our own Fulton brought to perfection that of which poor Solomon de Caus conceived the first glimpse of truth.

The history of all new discoveries teach us such sad lessons, we may hardly expect that our law of cure will be universally acknowledged before the close of this century.

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 greatest 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 operation 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 a 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 produces an effect, or symptoms, *not*

like, but entirely *different* from those produced by the disease. The former is *homotios*, homogeneous, or like in its effects pathogenetically; and the latter, *allos*, heterogeneous, or *unlike*. Then, in principle, the two systems differ widely.

Suppose, gentlemen, that one of you were to apply to me with a cold in the head, attended with a copious secretion of mucous from the nostrils and wish me to prescribe for you. I address you thus with due professional gravity: "Sir, your nose is foul, you have an accumulation of vitiated secretions in the nostrils. It is indispensable that this be evacuated. I advise you to blow your nose."— You answer that you have done this every five minutes for the last twenty-four hours, but experience no improvement, and enquire what shall be done next? I reply, "This product of disease must first be removed—blow your nose as often as the accumulation takes place, until this is effected, then we will do something further." This prescription, I perceive, excites a smile. Why should it? I ask in all seriousness. It is but acting upon, and carrying out a principle with which we have all been familiar from our earliest childhood. It is just as amusing to hear a physician say to his patient, "Your stomach is foul—take an emetic, or a cathartic," as to hear him say, "Your nose is foul, blow it." It will puzzle you or your physician to give a more philosophical reason for the practice in one case than in the other, for it is equally true of these and all similar cases, that these secretions are not the *cause*, but the *product* of disease, and the mere removal of this continually recurring product can have no effect in removing the disease which produces it, any more than emptying the waters of a reservoir can dry up the fountain that supplies it.

Among prevailing medical theories, one supposes all fevers to arise from inflammation of the brain, another of the stomach, another of the spleen, another of the arteries, &c. One supposes fever to be the product of local inflammation, another that the local inflammation is the product of fever. The theories in regard to individual diseases, their nature and treatment, are innumerable. There are at least twenty of delirium tremens. There are no less than one hundred of fevers, and an equal number of cholera. But in the most important and only practical particular, all these clashing and contradictory theories agree. They are all directed in the application of medicine to disease by no higher or surer guide, than disconnected and insulated experiments at the bedside, or pure hypothesis. The *best* reason, perhaps, which a practitioner of these schools can assign for a given prescription is, that he has seen or known of its being beneficial in similar cases. But as no two cases of disease are ever alike in all their circumstances, we can scarcely speak of our experience in any given case, as we have never witnessed one which was in all respects like it. Experience here is

but analogy at best, and in all new cases of disease, analogy extremely loose and vague. If there be any apparent exception to the remark that there are in the Allopathic schools no fixed laws, controlling the application of medicine—if there be any approach to such a law, it consists in giving such articles of medicine as are supposed to be opposite in their effects to the disease to be treated. Thus if the patient is too hot, cooling remedies, called refrigerents, are administered—if too cold, heating stimulants are applied. If he is weak, supposed strengthening remedies, called tonics, are given. If the stomach is sour, soda or other alkalies, are prescribed. Diarrhœa is sought to be counteracted by opiates and astringents and constipation by laxatives. But this method of curing by contraries expressed by the phrase "*contraria contrariis curantur*," could never be reduced to a law, for it did not fail to be observed that this mode of treating disease was generally but transient in its effect, leaving the system in a worse permanent condition than before, with the disease permanently aggravated. Thus a cathartic to remove constipation, generally left the patient more constipated—bleeding rendered a repetition the more necessary, and repeated repetitions placed him in a condition in which, apparently, he could not exist without it. But again, this practice could not be reduced to a law, because we were presented with the puzzling fact, and it has greatly puzzled physicians in all ages, that medicines effected their most prompt, permanent and surprising cures, on a precisely opposite principle, viz: that "*like cures like*." Thus it was observed that instead of cooling a burn with cold water, as the first rule would require, it was much more speedily and effectually cured by heating stimulants, as turpentine or alcohol, or even by holding it to the fire. Diarrhœa was more effectually treated by small doses of laxatives than by opiates and astringents. Much more permanent warmth was given to the extremities by rubbing them in snow or plunging them in cold water than by a warm foot bath. A sour stomach was more effectually treated by small doses of sulphuric acid, one of the sourest things in nature, than by soda. Two laws thus in diametric opposition to each other, could not, of course, be both true. Thus all the opposing theories of the Allopathic schools converge to a common point of doubt and uncertainty. If I might be allowed the apparent egotism of a reference to my own experience, I would say that during twenty years study and practice of these systems, I have felt the truth of this uncertainty most painfully. Having a clear perception of the hypothetical and uncertain character of all prevailing systems of practice, I have felt like one in search of truth indispensable to the proper discharge of the fearful responsibilities, which crowd upon one who takes the health and life of others in his hands—truth which my reason taught me must exist in the established laws of nature, but which I could

no where find. Besides an anxious examination of the hypotheses of the so-called orthodox schools, I have not considered an examination of the Thompsonian and Botanical systems and mesmerism as compromising the dignity of a searcher after truth. And though in all these there is more or less developed that is curious or wonderful, or in various ways useful, yet none of them supply the great practical desideratum—general and fixed principles on which we can depend in our fearful position at the bedside of those who are looking to us for the preservation of life and a restoration to health. With these results before me I have often said to my brother practitioners that all the systems of medicine extant appeared to me to constitute but one great system of learned empiricism. I venture to express the opinion, that medicine, in its present state, can prefer no just claims to the appellation of science.* A science implies a collection and knowledge of the great principles or laws which relate to a given subject. The science of astronomy supposes a collection and knowledge of the laws which govern the motions of the heavenly bodies. They enable us to foresee what will take place among those bodies at a given future period—to foretell their future course and localities, and thus to predict an eclipse or the return of a comet. A science of medicine would suppose a knowledge of laws governing the action of remedies, which would enable us to determine that action under given circumstances. If a new and unheard of disease presents itself, the science of medicine, if it be a science, should enable the physician to select and apply the appropriate remedy and confidently predict its effects. *But such a law is unknown in any of the Allopathic schools of medicine, and it was the painfully conscious want of it that induced the venerable*

* In this view I am abundantly sustained by many of the brightest luminaries of the profession. Bichat, the father of pathology, says: "There is not, in the *Materia Medica*, any general system; but this science has been by turns, influenced by those who have ruled in medicine"—"hence the vagueness, the uncertainty which now present themselves. The incoherent assemblage of opinions, themselves incoherent, is perhaps, of all sciences the best representation of the caprices of the human mind. What do I say? It is not a science for a methodic mind; it is a shapeless assemblage of inexact ideas; of observations often puerile, of deceitful means, of formulas as absurdly conceived as they are fastidiously collected." The same idea is expressed more quaintly and keenly by D'Alembert. "The physician being truly a blind man armed with a club, who as chance directs the weight of the blow will be certain of annihilating either nature or the disease."

A present distinguished medical lecturer in London, does not hesitate publicly to declare the whole machinery of existing medical doctrine a sheer humbug. "Gentlemen," says he, "you now see the correctness of the late Dr. Gregory's statement, that medical doctrines are little better than "stark staring absurdities." A volume might be filled with similar sentiments from the highest authorities.

Dr. Parr to retire from the profession, assigning as a reason that he was "tired of guessing."

Such a law however, exists, and it was reserved for the immortal Hahnemann to discover and apply it to the cure of disease.*

The Cholera, for the first time within the authentic records of history, has broken from its native jungles on the Ganges, and with steady stride, from day to day, approaches the confines of Eastern Europe. Terror and dismay precede it, and its course is marked by heaps of blue and ghastly corpses. The nations of Europe begin to tremble at its anticipated approach, and with puny efforts set up their sanitary cordons and quarantines, as though the pestilence travelled in a coach-and-four and upon the solid ground and not upon the viewless wings of the air. Born in the pestilential heats of the tropics, it seems to revel in the fiery temperature of India, and to rage with equal fierceness in the frosts of a Russian winter. No precautions can escape it, no travel avoid, no constitution resist, no prescription cure its fierce attack. The resources of the medical science of Europe are deployed in anticipation, but the confused and turbulent medley of cries that arises from the theorizing phalanx gives no promise of healing virtue in its sound, and the onset of the destroyer is awaited in despair. But, unknown to the world there is hope. In a little chamber in a small town in Germany, sits a grey-haired old man, unknown to fame. The cholera has not yet reached his land; he has seen no case of it, but he is intently perusing the descriptions of the disease as given by those who were eye-witnesses of its deadly march, and ever and anon comparing it with a pile of manuscript that lies before him; he works

*The venerable Hahnemann is flippantly spoken of as an insignificant quack by upstarts in medicine and even by older members of the profession as ignorant of his doctrines and the depth of his knowledge as they are of lunar botany. Not so with those who enjoyed the pleasure and the honor of his acquaintance or an acquaintance with his writings. Hear the testimony of Dr. Valentine Mott, of New York, the boast and glory of American Surgery. During his tour in Europe, he visited and formed an acquaintance with him. He says of him: "Hahnemann is one of the most accomplished and scientific physicians of the present age."

Hufeland, the patriarch of German medicine, in his celebrated Medical Journal, bears the following testimony: "Homeopathy is advancing in importance, and its author is a man to whom we *must* concede our respect."

Dr. Kopp, a very celebrated physician and elaborate writer on legal and practical medicine, thus speaks: "Whoever has traced Hahnemann's career with a critical eye, whether as an author, teacher, or founder and master of a new school, must be struck with his genius for investigation, originality of reflection and gigantic powers of mind." "His researches respecting the specific virtue of medicines and the amount of susceptibility in the human organization to their impression, are of imperishable importance to art."—We might multiply similar quotations to any amount. How ridiculous to hear small men in the profession, apply to such a man the epithet of quack!

steadily on, and a gleam of quiet exultation lights up his noble features as he takes a pen and writes three words only: CAMPHOR, COPPER, HELLEBORE. Out of the realms of nature, without ever having seen the disease, he has selected these three substances as the remedies to subdue its power. And experience confirms the choice! In the presence of these three, as it were controlling powers, the pestilence has lost its sway; it yields gently, kindly and rapidly; the most opposite theorists, the most varied minds, the most prejudiced observers, in the most widely separated lands, all concur in bearing a unanimous testimony to the efficacy of the remedies of the old man's choice.

Yet once more. A warlike encampment appears in that blood-stained battle ground of Europe, Central Germany. Excess, riot, intemperance, filth, and the closeness of a crowded camp have bred a pestilential fever; the hospitals are full, and yet the sick abound and the dead cannot be removed in time to make way for new candidates for a similar place and a similar removal. In the midst of the dead and dying we behold the same benevolent figure that we saw before, his back slightly stooping from age and the gray hair streaming around his venerable temples. He examines the sick with great care and minuteness, passes from one to another, gathering with earnest attention the various symptoms, and after a day spent in this toil, reaches his home in deep thought. His books and manuscripts are referred to for a moment, and his figure appears to expand, as with one hand he seems to reach to a neighboring hedge and pluck thence a *bryony vine*, while with the other he stretches across the broad Atlantic to the forests of the New World to obtain the *poison ivy*. These he declares to be the remedies for the fever he had witnessed, and

“—as the bright sun compacts the precious stone,”

so the light from the multiplied experience of nearly half a century, far from weakening his assertion, has compacted it into the strength and solidity of adamant.

Here, indeed, is a brilliant, a glorious solution of that terrible problem of therapeutics! By what magic has this been effected?—What league has this old man entered into with the secret intelligences of Nature that he stands at the bedside of the sick, and when all the powers and agencies of the universe throng around him, entreating to be used, he can with discriminating finger select that one and that alone, that shall be serviceable in the case before him? He has dived deep into the recesses of Nature and has brought up a pearl of price—a universal principle, by the aid of which the question, “What will relieve?” is satisfactorily solved, not only for an isolated case or two, but for all possible cases in all possible forms. He has called it the *homeopathic* principle, and

the secret is this : when you find a patient suffering, select that remedy which, having been previously administered to a healthy man, has produced in him a similar suffering. How simple is this rule ! It is no theory—it is a *practical law*—it obviates entirely the necessity of the intermediate step which we have seen to introduce so much fallacy and falsity into practice, and brings the very sufferings of the patient face to face with the remedy without the chance of mistake or misconception. It admits of no theory, it interferes with no theorising ; if the physician choose to befog himself with hypotheses of irritation, or inflammation, sthenia or asthenia, humorism or solidism, so much the worse for him, but he leaves them in his closet—at the bedside they have no place ; there the sole questions are—What does the patient suffer ? and—What agency has produced similar suffering in the healthy ? The simple answer to these questions settles the whole difficulty, and whether the vital force be in excess or defect, whether the brain or the intestines be inflamed, the cure takes place in accordance with the unailing law. He who asks and answers these questions at the bedside, and administers the remedy accordingly, is a homeopathic physician—he who selects a remedy on any other ground is not.

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 commonsense 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 sub-

serviency 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, and 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 beskirtd 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.

On examining the records of medicine, he found the writings of others to confirm his own observation. He found that medical writers had recorded oppression of the stomach, vomiting and diarrhœa, indigestion, debility and jaundice among the effects produced by the bark, and yet that this was precisely the combination of symptoms for the cure of which, the highest authorities recommended and all employed the bark with success. Here was a strange fact which could not escape the observant eye and the logical scru-

tiny of Hahnemann. He pondered and queried. The same article produced in the healthy oppression of the stomach and indigestion, and cured them in the sick—produced great prostration of strength and restored strength to those who were debilitated by disease—produced jaundice and cured it. He asked himself: “Is this an anomaly in medicine? or do other articles act on this same principle?” He employed his own unrivalled powers of observation and his almost boundless reading to collect facts on this subject. The results produced astonishment which every day’s investigation increased. He found the bark far from being a solitary example. On the other hand, he found an example of the same law in almost every medicine, in the works of almost every medical author in every age, though not one of these authors, probably, had ever dreamed of the existence of the law of which they had furnished so many examples. The following examples will illustrate the character of these facts. He found from the medical records of that period, that the sweating sickness in England in the 15th century, carried off about ninety-nine out of every hundred attacked with it, until physicians, in the process of experimenting, resorted to the use of diaphoretics, that is sweating medicines, after which scarcely a patient died. Strange indeed, that a disease, the prominent feature of which is, that the patient is sweating to death, should be speedily cured by giving him medicines to make him sweat.

Tobacco, every one knows, produces giddiness nausea, anxiety, trembling, and prostration, yet he found that the physicians, when attacked with this train of symptoms, while attending the victims of a peculiar epidemic in Holland, promptly relieved themselves by smoking.

Medical writers had recorded attacks of epilepsy with tremors and convulsions produced on the inhabitants of Kamtschatka by the use of the *agaricus muscarius*, a species of mushroom, while other writers had recorded examples of epilepsy, attended with similar tremors and convulsions, cured by the same article.

The oil of anise had been used for centuries to cure pain of the stomach and colic, but the examples were numerous in medical writers, of the oil of anise *producing* pain of the stomach and colic.

He found high authorities recommending, from their own observation, the use of jalap and senna to cure griping and pain of the stomach and bowels; but no fact is better known than that both these articles produce these very symptoms, and hence the domestic practice of combining anise seed with them to prevent these effects.

One writer had published an account of the *solanum nigrum*, taken by mistake producing enormous dropsy of the whole body, while two physicians were publishing cases of the cure of dropsy by the same article.

He found, on equally good and equally numerous authorities, that stramonium produced and cured, delirium, convulsions and chorea.

While some physicians had seen hyosciamus produce convulsions resembling epilepsy, as many more had attested the cure of such convulsions with it. The same article had been seen to produce a certain variety of mental derangement, and just this variety of derangement had been frequently cured by it, while it had failed to cure other varieties. One of the most marked effects of the same article, as often observed, was a spasmodic constriction of the throat, so as to prevent swallowing; but the celebrated Dr. Withering, having such a case of constriction of the throat to treat, could make no impression on it, till he gave the hyosciamus, which speedily cured it.

He found, among the acknowledged effects of the free use of nitric acid, salivation and ulceration of the mouth, while the same article was generally recommended for the cure of mercurial salivation and ulceration.

Tea produces, in those not accustomed to its use, anxiety, trembling and palpitation of the heart; yet every lady knows that a moderate quantity of tea is an excellent remedy for these very symptoms. These few examples will serve to indicate the character of the facts which Hahnemann's reading and observation daily accumulated, until he found that what was true of the bark was equally true of every medicine whose action he had been able accurately to ascertain by reading or observation. These facts had at length become as numerous as the medicines whose effects had been at all minutely detailed, and as numerous as their various applications, and they were all but so many examples and proofs of the law, "*similia similibus curantur*," not an exception to which he had yet been able to find. This would have been sufficient, and more than sufficient to satisfy any man who had ever constructed a medical theory. Not so with Hahnemann. His logical mind had already become thoroughly disgusted with the universal prevalence of theories based upon insufficient facts or undisguised hypothesis. These facts, numerous as they were, were not sufficiently numerous to justify his rigidly inductive and truth-loving mind in inducing from them the universality of the law. In order for *him* to be satisfied of the universality of the truth, that medicines cure in the sick, the symptoms which they produce in the healthy, it was necessary for him to know precisely what symptoms they were capable of exciting in the healthy. But here he, with the whole medical world, was sadly at fault. Physicians had not been accustomed to give medicines to the healthy. No experiments had ever been instituted for the purpose of arriving at this knowledge.—Hitherto the effects of medicines had only been observed in cases of poisoning, or when medicinal substances had been taken by

mistake, or when given to the sick. In the two former cases the instances had been too unfrequent and too loosely observed to be essentially useful. The latter must be a very imperfect method of ascertaining the effects of medicine, since it is impossible to distinguish the effects produced by the medicine from those produced by the disease. Besides, medicines were then given, even oftener than now, in compounds of two, three, half-a-dozen or a dozen articles combined together. In all these cases it is manifestly impossible to distinguish the effects produced by each of these ingredients in the compounds, mingled, modified and counteracted as they are by each other. Such was the meagre knowledge of the properties of medicines possessed by the medical world but about half a century ago. In order, then, to arrive with certainty, at the truth of the Homeopathic law, it was indispensable to prosecute a long series of original and difficult experiments. It was necessary that persons should take, in succession, each of the remedies to be employed in medicine, until it should produce all the effects which it was capable of producing, compatible with safety. But the establishment of this great law of medicine, if true, was of inconceivable importance. It would at once convert the *Art* of medicine into a *Science*—endless conjecture into certainty. In view of its importance, the great heart, the philanthropic spirit, the truth-loving intellect of Hahnemann did not hesitate. He resolved to become himself the subject of experiment, and to offer himself, if need be, a sacrifice upon the altar of truth, of science and of humanity. With an insatiable thirst for knowledge, and an unconquerable love of truth, and a self-sacrificing devotion to the interests of mankind never surpassed, he commenced administering medicines to himself, observing a rigid system of regimen, removing himself from all influences which could interfere with their action and noting with great exactness, all their effects. To his great relief, he was soon afterwards joined by several other highly scientific members of the profession and numerous pupils, who each, with their families, became the subject of experiment. Each of the medicines was given to persons of different ages, sexes and temperaments until they had produced all the effects they were capable of producing compatible with the safety of the subject, and all these effects were carefully recorded in the order of their production. All the properties of some two hundred articles of medicine were thus minutely ascertained under the scrutinizing eye of Hahnemann himself. Similar experiments have since been incessantly prosecuted by Homeopathic physicians, to the present time, and thus the *Materia Medica* continually enlarged. This process of experiment, even by the admission of the most learned and candid of the Allopathic schools, was the first reliable foundation that was ever laid for a correct *Materia Medica*—

for a work containing a true record of the properties, and all the properties of the medicines of which it treats.

Homeopathy has during sixty-seven years of existence, a vastly more perfect *Materia Medica*, an incomparably better knowledge of the properties of medicines than Allopathy has obtained in two thousand years, or can obtain while the world stands by its present method. We have a minute and complete knowledge of about 400 remedies, all the medicines we employ. There is more knowledge to be obtained from one work of Homeopathic *Materia Medica*, than in all the Allopathic libraries of the world. And this knowledge of the properties of medicine is obtained in the only possible way of obtaining it, viz: by each medicine being taken by persons in perfect health sufficiently long and in sufficient quantity to produce all the effects they are capable of producing compatible with safety, and carefully recording all these effects.

There was now an opportunity to test the universality of the truth of the Homeopathic law. It now only remained in the treatment of disease, to select and apply such medicines as had been found by former experiments, to produce the same group of symptoms, and in the same order as those presented by the disease to be cured. If, in curable diseases, these remedies, thus applied always produces prompt and permanent cures, then this law of the action of remedies would be established. It must suffice to say that Hahnemann's absolutely enormous practice—a practice perhaps exceeding in amount that of any man in any age, and its amazing successful results for more than half a century, fully satisfied even his perhaps over-scrupulous mind, and dissipated every doubt of the universality of the great law "*similia similibus curantur*"—of the final establishment of a principle upon which the physician could rely, instead of spending his life in guessing and experimenting at the expense of his patients. The only thing in which Hahnemann hesitated was in publishing the results of his experiments to the world. In answer to the earnest entreaties of Doctor Guenther, one of his early friends, not to keep from the world the benefit of his discoveries, he used to reply: "My dear friend, you do not know what nest of wasps I shall stir thereby. The physicians will kill me." The same test has equally satisfied thousands of the most gifted minds in Europe and America, who have been converted to this doctrine from the Allopathic schools. Every day in the life of every Homeopathic practitioner, adds new and delightful confirmation to this truth. Not an exception has yet been found in relation to any article that has yet been employed in medicine. We claim, then, that no natural law is established by a more legitimate and unquestionable induction. With as much propriety might it be demanded of us, that we should elevate every individual ponderous body from the surface of the earth, to see if it will

fall again, before we admit the truth of the law of gravitation, as that we should delay induction of the truth of the Homeopathic law until it shall be tested by experiments with every medicinal substance that may hereafter be discovered.

But I am fully sensible, from the experience of my own incredulity, of the difficulty of admitting it even after it is philosophically established. It is in such direct opposition to all our educational notions of the action of remedies! But let us familiarize ourselves a little with the principle, inquire into its *rationale*, and see, if upon further acquaintance, it does not commend itself to our approval, by conforming to our common sense and experience.

We shall find that this law of "*similia similibus*" is founded upon, and necessarily grows out of, a law of vitality—a law regulating the vital principle. It is necessary that we become acquainted with the *modus operandi* of this vital principle. Let us in this, as in all other cases of science, question nature. My hands are of a low temperature, and I plunge them into cold water or rub them in snow. What is the result? In a short time they are glowing with warmth. Is this result a freak of nature—an anomaly? or is it an example of a law in nature, like all her laws, universal and invariable? Let us learn, if we have not yet learned, that nature has no freaks—no anomalies. This result is but an example of a law of vital reaction which it shall be our aim briefly to illustrate. The law may be thus stated: "Whenever any agent having the power to excite an unnatural action in the system, is so applied as to be felt, the vital principle is excited to oppose its effects, and to produce a state the opposite of that which this agent tends to produce." This vital reaction against unnatural agencies, (and all medicines are of course such,) invariably manifests itself, unless the power of the agency is so great as to overpower vital reaction altogether. Thus when I rub my hands, though already cold, in snow, by this law the vital principle re-acts against it, and endeavors to produce a state the opposite of that which the snow tends to produce; and it is so successful in this attempt that it not only overcomes the influence of the cold which I have applied, but it has acquired such an impetus in consequence of being rallied by the additional cold, that it overcomes that which previously existed, and my hands in spite of this double opposition become hot. Take an opposite example. I burn my hand. It is now hot, red, inflamed and painful. On the principle of the prevalent schools of medicine, ("*contraria contrarius, opponenda*,") I shall apply cold. And what would be the effect? Why, the heat and pain would be alleviated for a short time, but the vital principle is aroused in opposition to it, and it soon becomes more red, hot and painful than ever. Hence, experience, without a knowledge of the principle, has taught the profession that cold to a burn, though a comfortable temporary palliative, is a bad curative.

But let us adopt an opposite treatment, and apply a highly heating stimulant, such as spirits of turpentine or alcohol. The vital principle re-acts against this also, and endeavors to produce a state the opposite of that which this application tends to produce. It succeeds in this, and in a short time the heat, pain and inflammation subside and a comfortable coolness comes on, in spite of the heat of the burn and the additional heat applied.

Take other and varied examples. A man takes a glass of brandy. Its tendency is to produce increased strength, activity and vivacity of mind and body. But there is a vital principle within which will certainly re-act against it, and overcome it, and establish a state directly the reverse of it, and a few hours afterwards, we shall find this man weak, languid and inactive.

Strong coffee stimulates the faculties to unnatural activity, but it leaves behind a sensation of heaviness and drowsiness.

A restless patient is put to sleep on opium, but on the following night he is more restless and sleepless than before. A patient takes a laxative to relieve constipation; after its action constipation is increased. But we can only dwell on these examples sufficiently to illustrate the principle. Examples might be adduced as numerous as medicines and their applications. I have selected these few from their familiarity to those who have made medicine a study. But a sufficiently extended examination will show the principle to be universal. It is to this re-active principle that the Homeopathist addresses all his prescriptions, while the Allopathist acts on a directly opposite principle, depending on the primary effects of his medicines which are always transient, to produce the desired state, while the re-active effort which is lasting and permanent is of a directly opposite character from that which he aimed to produce. How many examples of this deceptive and short lived improvement, followed, necessarily, by permanent and lasting injury, crowd upon the mind! Permanent constipation following the use of laxatives, lasting debility succeeding the use of tonics and stimulants, permanent irritability and restlessness the use of opiates, &c., &c., *ad infinitum*.

As it is my main object to imbue your minds with a knowledge of the great law of cure, as a sure and scientific basis of the treatment of disease by medicine, in contrast with Allopathic empiricism, you will pardon me if I enlarge on this branch of the subject a little farther, and contrast the manner in which the Allopathic and the Homeopathic physician treats disease.

What an Allopathic student learns of the practice of medicine amounts to this: He takes up the study, for example, of fever, with the view of preparing himself to treat it. He reads, first, a description of the disease, and then proceeds to the treatment. He reads that one distinguished writer recommends cold affusions, while

another disagrees with him and thinks them dangerous. One advises wine, and another insists that the patient should have the most cooling drinks only. Many prescribe Peruvian bark, or quinine, a part of them because they think it a febrifuge, and another part because they deem it a tonic. Others object to these remedies altogether, because they believe them heating and fever producing remedies. Some recommend a free use of cathartics, and others warn the young practitioner against their use. And so on to the end of the chapter, almost every remedy in the *Materia Medica* being recommended by some and repudiated by others. The author closes his lucid account of treatment by giving his own practice, and the student, thus furnished, goes forth to take the lives of men in his hands, at liberty, under the sanction of high authorities to employ just what remedies he pleases, and sadly puzzled to make a choice. But in all his study he does not get the first glimpse of a law of cure. The best reason he can give for administering any remedy is, that somebody thinks he has found it useful.

Medicine, has therefore, certainly been no fitting study to any one as a matter of science, simply because there was no science in it, and it is not strange that the profession have discouraged the practical investigations of laymen.

But we repeat that the application of medicine to a disease is, nevertheless, a science, with laws fixed, simple and easily understood, and therefore open to the knowledge of all.

Let us refer to two of these laws as intimately connected with the great law of cure, even at the risk of some repetition of thought.

First law. Every medicine produces two directly opposite effects in the order of time—the first primary and transient, the other, secondary and permanent. To illustrate by an example: A patient takes a cathartic. Its first or primary effect is, to stimulate the intestines to an unusual and unnatural effort to expel their contents. But this effect is transient, continuing only a few hours. The secondary effect is just the reverse, viz: unusual and unnatural inactivity and torpor, or constipation.

Again. An opiate is given to allay pain and procure rest by diminishing or benumbing sensibility to the causes of suffering. This purpose is transiently answered by its primary effect, but this soon ceases, and then comes the opposite or secondary effect, viz: increased sensibility to the causes of annoyance. And so true is nature to herself—so inflexibly adherent to her own laws, that the physician may persist as long as he pleases in his infractions of this vital law, and she will maintain her resistance to the last, or until the struggle ends in exhausted vitality and death. The same is true of all other remedies.

If you send for a physician who prescribes a cathartic, or laxative, you can very properly ask your medical adviser; "What, sir,

is to be the primary effect of this dose?" If he answers: "To stimulate the bowels to greater activity," you may then very properly reply: "My dear sir, as I have learned the laws of cure, this effect will be but transient, while a secondary and opposite effect, viz: increased torpor and constipation will inevitably follow, which will be lasting, and the effect of your prescription will be to afford me temporary alleviation at the expense of a lasting aggravation of the very difficulty which you aim to cure. I should certainly be glad to be relieved of my present embarrassment, but this is obtaining present liquidation at a higher rate of interest than I can afford to pay. I prefer to suffer a little now to suffering so much more hereafter. I am obliged to you for your offer of present relief, even on such hard terms, but really, sir, I feel obliged to decline it." And the same reasoning applies to all remedies administered on Allopathic principles.

Second law. All medicines produce two exactly opposite effects, according to quantity; that is, small and large doses produce opposite effects. A small dose of opium produces exhilaration and wakefulness—a large dose languor, stupor and sleep. Very small doses of rhubarb, mercury and other cathartics allay irritability of the bowels, and thus cure dysentery—large doses produce irritability and diarrhea. Very small doses of emetic tartar, ipecac, &c., allay irritability of the stomach and thus cure vomiting and cholera-morbus—large doses produce these very states.

The one is the disease-curing and the other the disease-producing effect. This law is equally practical with the first. Guided by it, the physician will so administer his medicines as to secure their secondary or curative effects, and avoid their primary or disease-producing effects. And patients when properly informed, will be wise enough to refuse a prescription made in violation of this law. They will say to the physician who prescribes for them large doses, (and *all* Allopathic doses are large, though they may call them small,) "Sir, I consulted you for the purpose of being cured, and you offer me a drug in a dose that will make me sick. The law of cure, as I understand it, makes it no part of the business of a physician to produce disease, but his exclusive business is to cure it. I must insist on your treating me in obedience to, and in harmony with the now well understood laws of cure, or I must take the treatment into my own hands."

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 large 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.

Those who have apprehended the principle of "*similia similibus curantur*," cannot fail to see the necessary consequence of *small* doses. They will see that we do not give medicine to obtain its primary or direct effect, but to excite the reaction of the vital principle, and thus enable us to overcome the very slight primary effect produced by the medicine, and the disease at the same time, as in the case of applying cold to the hands to excite warmth. A patient is attacked with nausea and is on the point of vomiting. We give him an article which will produce such nausea and vomiting in a healthy subject. But will a large dose be likely to cure his sickness? Will it not on the other hand be certain to aggravate it? In like manner, will a patient with inflammatory fever bear large doses of stimulants with impunity? Another is laboring under headache, closely resembling that produced by belladonna. Will he bear large doses of belladonna without aggravating it? Medicine by Allopathists given to produce an indirect effect upon the diseased part, through sound and distant organs; thus a headache is treated by acting upon the healthy stomach or bowels by an emetic or cathartic. Here large doses may be borne; but very different is it if we give a remedy which acts directly and specifically upon the diseased organ, as belladonna does upon a diseased head and an emetic upon a nauseated stomach. In Homeopathic practice we always prescribe medicines which act directly upon the diseased part. How preposterous the argument that our doses can produce no effect upon the sick, because a man in sound health can bear a much larger dose with impunity! Suppose I meet one of these objectors with

a burnt finger. I place my finger at a comfortable distance from the fire and invite him to place his at its side. He does so, but instantly withdraws it in agony of pain. I ridicule his pretended sensitiveness to such a moderate degree of heat, because it produces no uncomfortable effects on me. I find him shut up in a profoundly dark room with inflammation of the eyes. I admit a ray of light by raising the corner of a curtain, and he screams with pain. I laugh at him for pretending to feel a powerful effect from such a quantity of light, because I have borne the full blaze of day without inconvenience. This is no more preposterous and absurd, than to ridicule the idea of small doses producing an effect when acting directly on a diseased organ which is therefore peculiarly sensitive to its effects, because the same doses produce no palpable effects upon an individual free from disease.

In health, there are certain natural stimuli which are essential to the continued well-being of the individual, like food and drink, pure air, exercise, rest and sleep. Under circumstances of health, these stimuli not only serve the purpose of keeping the functions of the body in operation, but their action is a constant source of pleasure. In certain diseased conditions of the organism, the perceptive and sensitive faculties acquire a susceptibility to impressions which is truly extraordinary. The hearing becomes so acute that a whisper may be distinctly understood from one apartment to another. The smallest particle of food or drink will irritate a gastritis stomach. One inhalation of cold air will irritate an inflamed lung. One ray of light will produce the most exquisite pain to the inflamed eye. How intolerable do condiments become to the taste, or odors to the smell, or music and sound to the ear. The impartial observer can now understand why minute doses of specific medicine can produce such powerful impressions upon diseased structures, when it is brought into *actual* contact with the sensitive, *diseased fibres*, as it is when given Homeopathically. Many modern writers are fully aware of the great changes which takes place in the living fibres during disease, and their susceptibility to impressions. They concede, also, that no two distinct diseased actions can exist in the same structure at the same time, but that the more powerful action must supersede the weaker one, and usurp its place. They are perfectly familiar with these important facts, yet their prejudices, their veneration of the antiquated dogmas of the schools, and in many instances, their lack of moral courage, prevent them from even investigating the subject in its practical bearings. It is owing to the culpable perversity of Medical men, that medicine has made such slow advancement, and were it not for the few bold spirits which now and then spring up, and break through the absurd mists of centuries, scattering venerated errors to the wind and illu-

minating their course by facts, the art would ever remain a stigma upon the intelligence, and a curse to the world.

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 compound we know not what.

It is not at all surprising that our opponent should sound the note of alarm, and contend for the inefficiency of the *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 laboring 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 favorable 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.

Allopathy 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 tenuous 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 argument 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 and 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 thousandth part of oil, equal to the third 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 virtue.

Cinchona is composed of ten or twelve ingredients, of which all, but quinia and cinchonina, 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 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 succussion, and thus not only retains all 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 sensitive absorbents, and are thrown off with the fecal 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 fashion, 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 the specific medication resting on a thorough experiment upon the human system in health, of different ages, sexes, and conditions in life, and by closely observing 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 to 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,) DR. 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.

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 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, would 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 animals*, so minute as 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 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 absorbents, 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 super-induce small-pox? No, sir. An impalpable and an entirely unap-

preciable 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 but 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 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 effectually to 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 boundless 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 recognizes the odoriferous 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 blood-hound 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 system is so great, that it is a matter of course for people to mistrust its efficiency. They have been too 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 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.

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.

Professor Forbes 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. 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.”

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 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 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.”

“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 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 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 "endeavor to enlighten the public as to the actual powers of medicines, with a view to reconcile 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 principle 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 guarantee 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 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 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 of the same disease, treated allopathically, at the Edinburgh Infirmary, there were 212 deaths, being about one-fourth.

Out of 223, of plitiris, 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, about one-eighth.

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

Le Moniteur, the official organ of the French Government announces that Dr. Mabbit, a homeopathist, has been created Knight of the Legion of Honour, as a reward of distinguished success in his treatment of Cholera. That journal publishes the following statement of his cases in comparison with the popular medical treatment of that disease in France.—

Treated Homeopathically,	- - - - -	2,239
Cured,	- - - - -	2,068
Died,	- - - - -	171
Per centage of Deaths,	- - - - -	8½
Treated Allopathically,	- - - - -	405,027
Cured,	- - - - -	254,788
Died,	- - - - -	250,239
Per centage of Deaths,	- - - - -	49

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 clime.

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 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. Homeopathists, 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.

R. J. SMITH, M. D.,
HOMEOPATHIC PHYSICIAN & SURGEON
35 KING STREET EAST,
TORONTO, C. W.,

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 *Acute and Chronic Diseases, Difficulties of Long Standing,—given up by other persons as incurable,—to call and consult him.*  *No charge for Consultation or Advice.* 

 **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, by leaving their request at the Office, if possible, before 10 A. M.

Dr. R. J. SMITH'S
HOMEOPATHIC PHARMACY,
35 KING STREET EAST, TORONTO, C. W.,

Keeps constantly on hand and for sale a large assortment of HOMEOPATHIC BOOKS & JOURNALS, TINCTURES, TRITURATIONS, DILUTIONS, MEDICATED PELLETS and ATTENTATIONS, OF VARIOUS POTENCY.

CASES OF MEDICINE,

For Physicians and Families, embracing every variety, from 10 to 200 remedies. Homeopathic Vials of all sizes, Globules, Sugar of Milk, Velvet Corks, Labels, Arnica Plaster, &c., &c., including every thing pertaining to the profession, *wholesale and retail, at New York prices!*

REFERENCES :

M. M. MATHEWS, M.D., Rochester.	G. W. PEER, M.D., Rochester.
GEORGE LEWIS, M.D., " "	S. M. LUCKEY, M.D., " "
HILEN BENNET, M.D., " "	E. H. HURD, M.D., " "
D. A. BALDWIN, M.D., " "	L. D. FLEMING, M.D., " "

J. T. S. SMITH, Pharmaceutist, New York.

On Dr. Smith's leaving Rochester for Toronto, the following Resolutions were kindly passed by the Rochester Homeopathic Medical Association :

1st.—*Resolved*,—That in the removal of Dr. R. J. Smith from Rochester, this Association has to regret the loss of one of its most active and efficient members.

2nd.—*Resolved*,—That we regard him as a gentleman well qualified in his profession as a medical practitioner, and well worthy all the confidence and respect reposed in him by this or any other community.

3rd.—*Resolved*,—That he carries with him to his new location our best wishes for his prosperity and success; and that we cheerfully commend him to all true friends of Homeopathy.

4th.—*Resolved*,—That a vote of thanks be herewith tendered to Dr. Smith, for the faithful discharge of his duty as Secretary and Treasurer of this Association during the past year.

5th.—*Resolved*,—That a copy of these Resolutions be signed by the President and Secretary, and transmitted to Dr. Smith.

GEO. LEWIS, M.D., *President.*
 SAMUEL M. LUCKEY, M.D., *Sec'y.*