

## CLARKE J. H., Homoeopathy Explained

Preface.

One hundred and fifty years ago there was born to a porcelain-painter of Meissen, in Upper Saxony, a son who was destined to revolutionise the world of medicine, to inaugurate a new era in medical thought. If ever the story of Samuel Hahnemann and his discoveries should fail to attract, the fault must lie with the teller and not with the story itself. For whether it be regarded from the human, the historic, the scientific, or the economic point of view, there is nothing in the world's history of more enthralling interest than the record of the patient, persistent, heroic labours of Hahnemann in his endeavour to bring to the light of day the Law which he knew must underlie the seemingly chaotic phenomena of drug-action. At the dawn of the nineteenth century, when Autocracy in the political world of Europe was tottering to its fall, Hahnemann, then in his prime, was making his first attacks on the power of Authority in medicine, and leading all who would to take their stand on the ground of Natural Fact. The battle is yet far from won; but Hahnemann had led the way into a new world of thought, and now all who wish to know the thing that is, are no longer obliged to accept that only which bears Authority's imprimatur.

At this stage of progress there is no longer any need to treat homoeopathy as a question of belief. It is nothing of the kind : it is a matter of science – a thing which may be known. No one has any right to claim either belief or disbelief in homeopathy – he must either know it; he must either understand it, or fail to understand it. To understand homoeopathy is not such an easy matter as some think it ought to be; but it is not more difficult than is the understanding of other sciences. The object of this work is to make the understanding possible to all who wish to understand. To those who wish not to understand – and they are, unhappily, a very numerous body – I have nothing to say. The wish to know is all I ask of my readers; if, inspired with this wish, they fail after a careful reading of my book, the blame must lie with me.

When one comes to think of it, that drug-action should have more than one side to it would seem to be a matter of course. The scientific mind revolts at the notion that an active cause can produce identical results in opposite conditions. That a drug should act differently when given to a person under conditions of disease from what it would do in the same person when in health, is only what common sense would expect. And common sense next demand to know just exactly what that difference may be; The answer to that query is Hahnemann's life and work – the discovery of the Law of Cure. It would seem to the unprofessional mind a trite observation to make, that the business of a doctor is to cure. It seemed so to Hahnemann, and the first sentence of his *Organon* states plainly enough that the "high and only business of the physician is to heal the sick – to cure, as it is termed." And yet we have respected teachers at this time of day telling their students that they may "treat" patients – they cannot cure them. They speak learnedly about the "decadence of drugs", as if Mother Earth could not produce plants and minerals of the proper potency in these latter days. The fault according to them lies with Nature – not in their hands! Homeopathy disposes of all this childish nonsense.

There is an Art of cure, but it must be learned and practised with brains. Cures rarely take place by accident, and unless a man makes up his mind to master the art of curing, he will not achieve much in that line. The Faculty says, "You cannot cure patients – you can only treat them; if you pretend to cure, you are a quack." Homoeopathy says, "You

may cure if you will take the trouble to learn the art. Curing is the only excuse for your existence as a physician, and if you do not cure, you are a failure.”

The object of this work is to put the facts of the facts of the case before the public, and before those members of the profession who have closed their intelligence at the bidding of the goddess Authority.

For a long time past my publishers have been urging me to give them a revised edition of my little work entitled “Homoeopathy : All about it.” Hitherto pressure of other work has prevented me from complying with their request. Now that I have been able to give some thought and time to the subject, it has seemed to me desirable to recast the work, enlarge its scope, and adapt it to more recent requirements. Thus it has come about that although the former work is embodied in this volume, the work itself is rather a new book than a new edition, and I have therefore regarded it in this light and have given it a new title.

Now that more than ten years have elapsed since its predecessor appeared, there is no harm in telling the story of how it came to be written at all. The author was a member of a debating club composed of literary and professional men, and when his turn came to read a paper he chose Homoeopathy for its subject. A number of medical men – some of them lecturers in medical schools – were members of the club, all of them being allopaths with the exception of the author. When the paper was read, the author had with him, as visitors, Dr. Pullar and the late Drs. Cooper and Dudgeon. The occasion was a very pleasant one; a lively but amicable discussion followed, in which the lay members freely joined. The latter, who were in a somewhat judicial position as between the two medical factions, had, curiously enough, nearly all of them, some personal experience to relate which told heavily on the side of homeopathy.

At the end of the debate there were no conversions announced on either side – as was quite to be expected. But having taken the trouble to put the paper together, I thought some permanent use might be made of it, and so published it, with additions, in book form.

Within the ten intervening years many things have happened. The Homoeopathic League has given place to a much larger and much more powerful body – the British Homoeopathic Association. To the insight and energy of Dr. George Burford this Association owes its origin; and the cause of homoeopathy in Great Britain owes it that a new interest is being taken in the advancement of Hahnemann’s reform, and a new desire has sprung up, on the part of the public, to know what homeopathy is.

It is hoped that this book may help to meet this appetite for knowledge, and may stimulate the interest which has been awakened in the forward movement. As the English Homoeopathic Association of a former generation founded the London Homeopathic Hospital, the British Homoeopathic Association has determined to provide the complement to the Hospital by establishing a College in London for the teaching of homeopathy. It is felt that this, and nothing short of this, will suffice to do justice to the cause of homeopathy in this country and Empire.

Although the Homoeopathic League has ceased to exist, it has left a permanent monument of its labours in the three volumes of Homeopathic League Tracts, to which frequent reference is made in the following pages. The great majority of these Tracts were written by Dr. Dudgeon, and all were edited by him. The quotations which I make from Hahnemann’s *Organon* and *Materia Medica Pura* are taken from Dr. Dudgeon’s translations of these works; and for this, and for so much besides, my warmest

acknowledgements are due to him.

The likeness of Hahnemann which appears on the title-page of this work is taken from Jung's's portrait, painted in 1819. Of this, in 1828, Stölzel made an engraving, which forms the frontispiece to one of the later editions of the Organon. From Stölzel's engraving a block has been cut expressly for this work.

JOHN HENRY CLARKE.

8, Bolton Street, W.

April 10, 1905.

How i became a homoeopath?

Perhaps it may not be uninteresting to readers if I state at the outset how my own conversion to homoeopathy came about. As is usually the case, I knew nothing whatever about it when I took my degree, since it is rarely mentioned by professors in the ordinary medical schools, and then only to be misrepresented. After my graduation at Edinburgh, by the advice of the late Dr. Angus Macdonald (one of the best friends I ever had), I took a voyage to New Zealand in charge of emigrants. On my return, having fixed on Liverpool as a likely field in which to start practice, I asked Dr. Macdonald to introduce me to some of the leading doctors in that city. This he promised to do, and eventually did – I have the letters to this day. They were never presented. The relatives with whom I was staying happened to be homoeopaths; and they suggested that I might do worse than go to the Homoeopathic Dispensary in Hardman Street and see what was being done there. As the letters came not, by way of utilizing my time I went. Like Caesar, I not only “went”, but I “saw”; but here the parallel ended – I did not conquer; homoeopathy conquered me.

I may say that at this period, having absorbed over 80 per cent. (if marks go for anything) of the drug-lore Sir Robert Christison had to impart, and having had sufficient opportunity for testing its value in practice, I had come pretty near the conclusion Oliver Wendell Holmes arrived at and put so neatly in his well-known saying : -“If all drugs were cast into the sea, it would be so much the better for man and so much the worse for the fish.” I believed then (and the belief has become rather fashionable since) that the chief function of a medical man was to find out what was the matter with people – if he could; and supply them with common sense – if he happened to possess any. His duty was to treat people; to cure them was out of the question; and it would be the better for his honesty if he made no pretence to it.

After a few weeks' observation at the Liverpool Homoeopathic Dispensary, a case was presented to me in private. A small boy of five, a relative of my own, was brought to me by his mother. Two years before, he had been badly scratched on the forehead by a cat, and when the scratches healed, a crop of warts appeared on the site of them. And there they remained up to that time in spite of diligent treatment by the family doctor; As an allopath to homoeopathy to see if that could help me. I consulted the authorities, and found that the principal drug which is credited with producing crops of warts is *Thuja occidentalis*. I ordered this, more by way of experiment than expecting much result; but I said, if there was truth in homoeopathy, it ought to cure. In a few days improvement was manifest; in three weeks the warts were all gone. Rightly or wrongly I attributed, and still attribute, the result to *Thuja*, though it will no doubt be said that “charms” have done the same thing. Very well; if any one will give me a system of charms that I can use with precision and produce with it such definite effects, and better, I shall be very glad to try it. As it was, I concluded that if homeopathy could give me results like that, homoeopathy

was the system for me. And with all due modesty be it spoken, homoeopathy has been doing this kind of work for me ever since – for a period, that is, of some thirty years. Now I will leave personal matters and go on to my subject proper.

Homoeopathy, allopathy and enantiopathy : three ways of utilizing drug action.

Why the allopathic section of the profession should be so wrathful with Hahnemann is not a little surprising. For not only did Hahnemann discover homoeopathy, he discovered allopathy as well. Allopathy existed before his time, just as homoeopathy did in a way, but it was unconscious of its own existence. The profession had been resisting allopathy all its life – as M. Jourdain had been talking prose – without knowing it. It was Hahnemann who gave it its name; and if he is the father of homeopathy he is at least the godfather of allopathy as well, and on that account deserves to have his bust in the medical schools of both sections.

Hahnemann pointed out there were three principal ways of using drugs – the homoeopathic, the allopathic, and the antipathic or enantiopathic. The homoeopathic is the like-to-like method, in which a medicine is given to a sick person because it is capable of producing a similar state when given to a healthy one – *similia similibus*. The allopathic (or heteropathic) method is that in which the drug given, being “without any pathological relation to what is naturally diseased in the body, attacks the part most exempt from the disease.” The enantiopathic is the opposite of the homeopathic, and is treatment by contraries. This treatment is palliative merely. When a large dose of opium is given to overcome sleeplessness; or when an astringent is given to arrest diarrhoea, or a purgative is given to remove constipation – these are examples of antipathic treatment. But many diseases, such as inflammations, for example, have no “opposites” except health, and these cannot be treated by this method, and must be treated, if at all, in one of the other two ways.

When an emetic is given to relieve a cold on the chest, an action is produced different in place and kind from the condition treated, and this is allopathic. Again, when a patient treats himself for headache by taking an aperient, he practises allopathy; and again, when a medical man puts a blister behind a patient’s ear to cure inflammation of his eye, the treatment is allopathic. When on the other hand, in a case of headache we give a drug like Belladonna or Glonoin (nitro-glycerine), both of which produce a variety of headaches of great intensity when taken by the healthy, then we are practising homoeopathy.

It is true that the majority of the medical profession scorn the idea of there being any rule to guide them in practice, and for this reason, I suppose, on the *lucus a non lucendo* principle, insist on being called nothing else but “regular”. If they did not scorn logic as well as rule, these practitioners would call themselves medical anarchists.

The principle of cure by medicines revealed by hahnemann.

The late Sir Andrew Clark was one of those who boldly proclaimed the reign of medical anarchy. In a lecture published shortly after his death, Sir Andrew said, in reference to a disease about which he was lecturing, “There are no fixed principles for the treatment of the disease”; and he immediately added, “Medicine is the most unprincipled of Sciences.”

A statement of this kind, though true enough of the medicine he knew on Hahnemann and his work that it calls for strenuous repudiation. Less than a hundred years ago it might have been said truly enough; but ever since the consciousness of a want of principle in medicine was impressed with crushing force upon the mind of Hahnemann, and impelled him to the gigantic labours by which he brought order out of chaos, the

reproach of unprincipledness lies only with that section of the profession which has steadily refused to accept the gift he has offered to the world.

How long it will take to bring about the change none can tell; but sooner or later the school of Sir Andrew Clark will have to open its eyes to the fact that medicine is not the unprincipled, anarchic thing they delight in proclaiming it to be. Again and again in his earlier writings, Hahnemann bewailed the “absence of any principle for discovering the curative powers of medicines”. That in an ordered universe some law – some principle – must exist, he could not doubt. How he set about the search which ended in his discovery of the law of similars, on which he has built a real Science and Art of Cure, will be duly set forth later in my sketch of Hahnemann’s career. But I will append to the remarks of Sir Andrew Clark another utterance by one of his own school, recorded in Dr. Granier’s Conferences on Homeopathy. Sir Andrew Clark’s predecessor, whilst giving a graphic description of the anarchic state of traditional medicine, has the candour to admit that homoeopathy stands on an entirely different footing.

In the course of a debate on “Revulsion”, which took place in the Academy of Medicine of Paris about the year 1853, Dr. Marchal of Calvi contributed a paper in which, whilst taking care to say “he did not constitute himself a defender of homeopathy”, he thus described the want of principle in his own school, and the possession or principle or doctrine by the homoeopathic.

“In medicine”, says Marchal, “there is not, nor has there been for some time, either principle, faith, or law. We build a tower of Babel, or rather we are not so far advanced, for we build nothing; we are in a vast plain where a multitude of people pass backwards and forwards; some carry bricks, others pebbles, others grains of sand; but no one dreams of the cement : the foundations of the edifice are not yet laid, and as to the general plan of the words, medical literature swarms with facts, of which the most part are periodically produced with most tiresome monotony; these are called observations and clinical facts, a number of labourers consider and reconsider particular questions of pathology or therapeutics – that is called original labour. The mass of such labour and facts is enormous; no reader can wade through them – but no one has any general doctrine. The most general doctrine that exists is the doctrine of Homeopathy. This is strange and lamentable, a disgrace to medicine, but – such is the fact.”

The disgrace to old-school medicine in 1853 is very much greater when it is unblushingly proclaimed by one of its leaders in 1893, and this time without any reserve in favour of the only system that exists – the only system which has the principle of Cure for its foundation – the System of Homoeopathy.

Allopathy or orthodox medicine has, however, this much to be said for it. Though it has no rule, no “doxy”, no system, it has one fairly definite aim, namely, to palliate. It has developed with a great deal of success many measures for relieving pain and for getting rid of symptoms. That this is often a matter of very great importance and advantage, as in the use of anaesthetics, will not be denied. But it is not without its dangers also; A writer in the daily press has recently put this point very forcibly in the following passage :

“Where modern pharmacy works its wonders is in the treatment of symptoms, and herein is its danger for an impatient and unthinking public. Who can tell how much of the nervous and physical breakdown of modern life may not be due to the abundant means which the chemist has provided for extinguishing the danger signals of nature?” 1

The answer to this question is, that very much mischief is most certainly due to this

cause; but homeopathy is a science which is able to make use of symptoms without obscuring them; to take them for its guide and remove them by curing the patient. Whereas allopathy seeks first of all to extinguish the signals of danger, homoeopathy by means of the signals is able to reach and annihilate the danger itself.

Homoeopathy, by revealing the principle of cure, sheds a new light on all other methods of using drugs. The homeopath can avail himself of any of their uses which may seem to him to his patient's advantage. Only, he does not delude himself with the idea that palliating symptoms is equivalent to curing patients.

The word "homoeopathy". advantages of the homeopathic method of studying drugs. examples.

It may be well here to make it plain that the word "Homeopathy" in no way includes "infinitesimally small" in its signification. It is of Greek origin, and means literally "like suffering". Those who like to have Scripture authority for all things may be interested to know that, in its adjective form, it occurs twice in the New Testament, and is translated in both instances "of like passions" (Acts XIV. 15; James V. 17). Curiously enough, St. Luke, the physician among the Evangelists, is one of the two writers who used the word. So far as I am aware, there is no Scripture for "allopathy".

How the notion of infinitely little became attached to the word "Homeopathy" is not difficult to trace; and the importance of Hahnemann's discovery of the power of infinitesimals will be dealt with later on, but Hahnemann chose "Homeopathy" as embodying in a single word the "like to like" idea. *Similia similibus curantur* – likes are cured by likes – expresses the same thing in Latin. This, and this only, is the etymological signification of the word. The idea Hahnemann did not pretend to have originated; in fact, he very laboriously collected from previous writers in all ages a mass of evidence to show that others before himself had recognised a relation between the diseasing action of drugs on the healthy and their curative action on the sick. What Hahnemann did that others had not done before, was to study drugs systematically by testing them on the healthy.

The other way of studying drugs is the one which has existed from earliest times – that of trying them on the sick and seeing what will happen. And, I may say, a great deal of very valuable information has been gained in this way; but until Hahnemann studied medicines by systematically testing them on the healthy, this information was more or less indefinite. Further, the old system had generated a sort of vicious circle in medical thought. A drug "X" being found by experience to allay spasms in a case is called an "antispasmodic", and the word "antispasmodic" is imagined to explain its virtues. Henceforward it is given in cases of "spasms" because it is an antispasmodic. But in reality the dubbing of a drug "antispasmodic" tells us no more about its actual powers than Moliere's "*Quia est in eo virtus dormitiva*" tells us of the soporific properties of opium. By his experiments Hahnemann supplemented the old knowledge in this way : he showed that the drugs which have the power of relaxing spasms in the sick have also the power of causing spasms in the healthy; and he also showed that each spasm-producing drug has some peculiarity of its own which will be a guide to its selection in any case of disease. There are no such things as "diseases" in the abstract to treat, only diseased persons; and each case must be individualised and treated on its own merits, and not according to the name of the disease by some drug that has been named the "anti" to it.

To take a concrete example, let us look at two drugs – Bryonia and Rhus toxicodendron.

Each of these drugs, when taken by the healthy, produces intense rheumatic pains in the joints, ligaments, and muscles. But Hahnemann noticed in himself and fellow-experimenters this marked difference – that whereas the rheumatic pains of Bryonia caused the experimenter to keep as still as possible since every movement increased them, the pains of Thus, on the other hand, made him extremely restless, motion giving temporary relief. This gave Hahnemann the key to their employment in disease, - Bryonia relieving cases in which the pains are made worse by motion, Rhus those in which motion relieves. It would have been of no service to have dubbed them both “anti-rheumatics”, so he dispensed with such useless and misleading designations, and contented himself with recording their positive effects.

A new science necessitates a new terminology, and it may be well to explain here one of Hahnemann’s technical terms. When Hahnemann experimented on healthy persons with a drug, he called it proving the drug. He used, of course, the German word “Prüfung” – a testing. In mathematics we “prove” our results by doing our sum the reverse way. So Hahnemann “proved” the powers of drugs to cure the sick by observing the symptoms they caused when given to the healthy. One who took a drug for the purpose of observing its effects he called a “prover”. The recorded effects of such an experiment he called “a proving”.

Sketch of hahnemann’s career : the search for a principle in medicine.

But now it is time to tell something about Hahnemann himself, and how he came to discover this systematic method of studying the powers of drugs – to discover the principle in medicine which Sir Andrew Clark said does not even now exist.

Samuel Frederick Christian Hahnemann was born at Meissen, in Saxony, on the 10th of April in the year 1755. At the age of 20 he commenced his medical studies at Leipzig, and earned his living by translating into German foreign scientific works at the same time that he pursued his studies. After two years at Leipzig he removed to Vienna, to gain practical knowledge in the great hospitals there. He took his M. D. degree at Erlangen in 1779.

Hahnemann was an excellent linguist, being perfectly familiar with English, Italian, French, Greek, Latin, and Arabic.

Whilst yet a student he translated from English into German, among other works, Nugent’s Essay on Hydrophobia, Stedman’s Physiological Essays, and Ball’s Modern Practice of Physic. From 1779 onwards he contributed to periodical literature, and in 1784, at the age of 29, he published his first original work, On the Treatment of Chronic Ulcers. In this work he expressed pretty much the same sentiment as that I have quoted from Sir Andrew Clark as to the want of principle in medicine. He lamented “the absence of any principle for discovering the curative powers of medicines”. He could not deny that drugs had curative powers, but what he wanted was some principle to guide him in discovering and defining what those powers were, and the indications for their use. Hahnemann was a master of practical chemistry, and wrote much on chemical subjects. His book on Arsenical Poisoning, published in 1786, was quoted as an authority by Christison in his work on Poisons. In 1787 Hahnemann discovered the best test for arsenic and other poisons in wine by means of acidulated sulphuretted hydrogen water, having pointed out the unreliable nature of the “Württemberg Test”, which has been in use up to that date. In 1788 he announced his discovery of a new preparation of Mercury, known to this day as “Hahnemann’s soluble Mercury”, and still retained under that name

in the German Pharmacopoeia. His intimate acquaintance with drugs and their modes of preparation enabled him to write his *Apothekerlexicon*, or *Pharmaceutical Dictionary*, which appeared in several volumes from 1793 to 1799, and was for many years the standard work on that subject.

It is not by any means exclusively as the discover of the homoeopathic system that Hahnemann is distinguished. He was a pioneer in many other medical reforms.

For example, it was he who was the first to adopt the non-restraint system of treating lunatics. I will quote from Dr. Dudgeon an account of an historic instance of this :

“In 1792 Hahnemann undertook the medical care of the celebrated Hanoverian statesman Klockenbring, who had gone mad, and had already been treated in the usual barbarous manner of the period in an asylum of the ordinary stamp, with no benefit, but the contrary. Hahnemann treated this dangerous lunatic on a non-restrain plan, without the use of chains or corporal punishment, which were in universal use at that period. His treatment was perfectly successful, and Klockenbring was restored to his family and friends perfectly cured. Hahnemann says in an account he gives of this case : - ‘I never allow an insane person to be punished either by blows or by any other kind of corporal chastisement, because there is no punishment where there is no responsibility, and because these sufferers deserve only pity, and are always rendered worse by such rough treatment, and never improved.’”

After his cure, says Ameke, Klockenbring showed his deliverer, “often with tears in his eyes, the marks of the blows and stripes his former keepers had employed to keep him in order.”

But we will now go back again a little. After 1788 Hahnemann seems to have given up practice in disgust. In a letter to Hufeland, the Nestor of medicine of his day (to whose journal – *Hufeland’s Journal* – Hahnemann was a constant contributor), he says his withdrawal was chiefly occasioned by his disgust at the uncertainties of medical practice, owing to the want of any principle for the administration of drugs in disease. During this time he occupied himself with chemical researches and the translation of works on chemistry, agriculture, and medicine, from the English, French, and Italian.

It was whilst engage in translating Cullen’s *Materia Medica* in 1790 that he made the classical observation which has proved to be to the science of drug study what the falling apple observed by the boy Newton has been to physical science. As his mind was always occupied with the search for some guiding principle for the selection of medicines in disease, he was struck with the unsatisfactory nature of Cullen’s explanation of the action of Cinchona bark in the cure of ague. That it did cure many cases of ague Hahnemann could not deny; and it occurred to him that if he took some of the drug when quite well he might obtain some clue to an explanation of its curative action. He took it in considerable quantities, and produced in himself all the symptoms of an ordinary attack of intermittent fever. The account of the experiment will be found in a footnote to page 108 of vol. II. of his translation of Cullen’s *Materia Medica*. Here Hahnemann was in possession of two related facts : Cinchona bark cured ague, and it also caused, in a sensitive, healthy person, symptoms indistinguishable from an attack of ague.

An observation of this kind was not likely to remain unfruitful in a fertile brain like Hahnemann’s. In the following year, 1791, he translated Monro’s *Materia Medica*, and in a note he again refers to his experiments with Cinchona. Five years later, in 1796, being then 41 years of age, he published in *Hufeland’s Journal* his essay on a New Principle for



Discovering the Curative Powers of Drugs. In this he discusses the several ways in which drugs had formerly been studied and used, and then describes the “similar” method, the rule “likes by likes” (*similia similibus*) being first formulated in this essay thus :

“Every powerful medicinal substance produces in the human body a peculiar kind of disease – the more powerful the medicine the more peculiar, marked, and violent the disease. We should imitate Nature, which sometimes cures a chronic disease by super-adding another, and employ in the disease we wish to cure that medicine which is able to produce another very similar artificial disease, and the former will be cured, - *similia similibus*.”

In this essay he referred to his early note on Cullen, and said after mature experience he could say that not only probably, but quite certainly, bark cured ague because it had the power to produce fever. He quotes examples of well-known drug actions to support his proposition, and sketched in a masterly way the characteristic features of a number of drugs.

In 1805 – Hahnemann being no 50 years old – appeared two works of great importance : first, his *Aesculapius in the Balance*, which takes a general survey of traditional medicine and pronounces on it the verdict “weighed in the balances and found wanting” – a verdict which has since received very ample endorsement. Second, in two vols. in Latin, *His Fragmenta de viribus medicamentorum positivis sive in sano corpore observatis* (Fragments on the Positive Powers of Drugs, - that is to say, their effects observed in the healthy body). This contained the first effort towards the reconstruction of the *Materia Medica* on a rational basis of pure experiment on the healthy human body.

In 1806 appeared his *Medicine of Experience*, in which is contained the first complete exposition of the homoeopathic method now thoroughly thought out by him after sixteen years of unremitting work – observation, experiment, and research. This was published in *Hufeland’s Journal* – that is to say, in the leading professional journal of this time. The same year Hahnemann published the last work he translated – *Haller’s Materia Medica*, Haller being one of Hahnemann’s forerunners in recommending the testing of drugs on the healthy body; but Haller did nothing towards carrying his recommendation into effect.

In 1807 Hahnemann first used the word “Homoeopathic” in the title of a work – an article also contributed to *Hufeland’s Journal* – on “Indications of the Homoeopathic Employment of Medicines in Ordinary Practice;”

The year 1810 may be said to be the birth-year of Homeopathy, for in that year appeared the first edition of the *Organon*, which is an expansion of the *Medicine of Experience*, and a complete statement of the Homoeopathic method. The publication of Hahnemann’s *Organon* marks an epoch in the history of therapeutics. It constitutes a complete, practical, and philosophical statement of the art of cure. It sets out clearly with the statement that the business of the physician is – not to “treat” but – to cure. “The physician’s high and only mission is to heal the sick – to cure, as it is termed” – this is the first aphorism of the *Organon*. Four other editions of the work followed the first; the fifth edition appearing in 1833. The year following the first appearance of the *Organon* – 1811, that is, - saw the first part of the *Materia Medica Pura*, the third edition of which appeared in 1830.

During these years of independent thought and action, as may easily be imagined, Hahnemann had no very easy time of it with his medical brethren, whose ideas he was

upsetting, or with the apothecaries, whose trade he bade fair to undermine. The latter were paid according to the number and quantities of the drugs in the prescriptions they dispensed, and Hahnemann insisted on giving only one drug at a time, and not too much of that. Consequently he was driven from one place to another, until, in 1812, he gave up all hope of influencing the older men in the profession, and determined to proceed to Leipzig and there devote himself to teaching the pupils of the medical department of the University. Certain conditions had to be fulfilled before he could obtain permission to do this : he had to write a thesis, and defend it before Faculty of the University, and pay a fee of fifty thalers. In compliance, he wrote and read his thesis entitled *The Helleborism of the Ancients*, and so amazed his auditors with his mastery of his subject and the immense learning and research his essay displayed, that the Faculty congratulated him publicly and granted him his license to teach forthwith. Any one who wishes to read the treatise (which is exceedingly interesting still) will find it translated in Dr. Dudgeon's collection of Hahnemann's Lesser Writings. At Leipzig he continued lecturing twice a week, giving two courses of lectures a year until 1821. During this time he gathered about him an enthusiastic band of disciples, who helped him in proving medicines, and whose names are now immortalised in the Homeopathic *Materia Medica* by the experiments they made on themselves with different drugs.

In 1819 persecution was commenced by the apothecaries, who took action against him for preparing his own medicines (which they were incompetent to prepare). The persecution was at last successful, and Hahnemann was driven from Leipzig in 1821 to find an asylum with a former patient, Duke Frederick Ferdinand of Anhalt, who made him his private physician, with liberty to engage in general practice at his capital town of Coethen.

By this time Hahnemann's fame as a practitioner had spread far and wide. The result was that invalids flocked to the little town of Coethen in search of his aid. The majority of these were affected with ailments of long standing, and thus it came about that Hahnemann had abundant opportunity of observing the symptoms and course of chronic diseases, and in amplifying and perfecting the homoeopathic means of curing them. In Coethen there was comparatively little in the way of acute illness to distract him from this special line of work. It was during this period that Hahnemann's first work on *Chronic Diseases* was written and the first edition was published. In 1828 the first three volumes appeared, nine years after his arrival in Coethen. The fourth volume was published in 1830, and the fifth not till after the Coethen period, when Hahnemann had removed to Paris.

But it was not in Coethen that the true nature of chronic diseases had become plain to Hahnemann. Three years before he was driven from Leipzig the problem had presented itself to him; and the same overmastering consciousness of the existence of Natural Law impelled him to solve this difficulty as he had already solved the problem of the homoeopathic relationship of drugs and diseases.

In the "Essay on the Nature of Chronic Diseases", which forms the introductory part of his work on *The chronic Diseases*, Hahnemann tells the story of its inception. "Ever since the years 1816 and 1817", he writes, "I had been employed, day and night, to discover the reason why the homoeopathic remedies which we then knew, did not effect a cure of the above-named chronic diseases. I tried to obtain a more correct idea of the true nature of those thousands of chronic ailments which remained uncured in spite of the

incontrovertible truth of the homeopathic doctrine, when behold! the Giver of all good permitted me, about that time, to solve the sublime problem for the benefit of mankind, after unceasing meditation, indefatigable research, careful observations, and the most accurate experiments.”

In a later chapter I deal somewhat fully with Hahnemann’s doctrine of the nature of the chronic diseases; but I wish to point out here that in Coethen he found ample opportunities for practically testing his observations, for the proving of new remedies, and for perfecting the homoeopathic armamentarium.

On March 31, 1830, Hahnemann had the misfortune to lose his first wife, he being then near the completion of his seventy-fifth year. She had been the stay and companion of his stormy life, and had borne him eleven children, two sons and nine daughters.

Nearly five years after this event there came to Coethen among the number of those who sought the aid of the modern Aesculapius, the brilliant and talented Mélanie d’Hervilly Gohier. As all the world knows, the acquaintance ended in the second marriage of Hahnemann, he then being in his eightieth year, and his bride thirty-five. But it was anything but an ill-assorted match, for all that. The second Madame Hahnemann perceived that her husband might fill a much larger sphere of usefulness of he left Coethen and made his home in Paris. Thither she induced him to travel, and through her influence with the Government of the time she obtained for Hahnemann a license to practise in the French capital. A student of science, an artist, and something of an anatomist as well, under her husband’s tuition, she rapidly developed no little skill in the practice of medicine and homoeopathy. She became practically his assistant, as it was impossible for Hahnemann to attend to all who came to see him. Madame Hahnemann acted as his protector, and would not allow more to have access to him than he could attend to. For eight years the Hahnemann’s led in Paris a life of great activity and unclouded happiness, the centre of a brilliant circle. Hahnemann’s presence in Paris gave a great impetus to the study and practice of homoeopathy, and the influence of his work in that city remains to this day. On Sunday, July 2, 1843, he breathed his last. He was buried in the cemetery of Montmartre.

The year 1900 was marked by two events of great importance in connection with Hahnemann. After prolonged negotiations with the executors of the late Madame Hahnemann, permission was obtained to remove Hahnemann’s body from its obscure position in Montmartre to a site purchased in the cemetery of Père Lachaise. There a monument of Scotch granite from Peterhead, raised by his admirers from all parts of the world, and surmounted by his bust in bronze, was unveiled on July 21, 1900, in the presence of the members of the International Homoeopathic Congress then in session in Paris.

The other event was the unveiling of the Hahnemann monument in Washington, erected at a cost of £ 70,000 by Hahnemann’s followers in the United States of America. This monument, which is one of the finest pieces of sculptural art in the States, has a commanding position in the famous Scott Circle at Washington, and was unveiled June 21, 1900, by President McKinley.

Whilst on the subject of Hahnemann’s statues, I may mention that Leipzig, which refused to Hahnemann a home in his lifetime, accepted his statue a few years after his death (1851), when his friends desired to erect one in his memory.

Hahnemann's criticism of the practice of his time. some old-school appreciations of Hahnemann.

So much for Hahnemann himself, and how he came to discover and develop the Homoeopathic method of studying drug action and prescribing drugs for the sick. It may serve to give an idea of the state of medical practice as Hahnemann found it, and at the same time to illustrate the courage and independence of the man, if I refer to two pieces of public criticism written in the early part of his career.

The one thing Hahnemann was blamed for by his contemporaries more than anything else was his neglect of blood-letting.

“Seignare, purgare, clysterium donare” was the rule in Hahnemann's time, and “fool”, “criminal”, “murder”, were the epithets applied to Hahnemann for his departure from the prevailing custom. “Without shedding of blood”, as it has been put, “there was no salivation” for patients in those days. However, that did not prevent Hahnemann from speaking his mind.

The Emperor Leopold II died after repeated blood-letting on the 1st of Marc, 1792. Commencing on the case, Hahnemann said : “His physician, Lagusius, observed high fever and swelling of the abdomen early on February 28th; he combated the malady by venesection, and as this produced no amelioration, three more venesections were performed without relief. Science must ask why a second venesection was ordered when the first had produced no amelioration. How could he order a third; and, good heavens! how a fourth, when there had been no amelioration after the preceding ones? How could he tap the vital fluid four times in twenty-four hours, always without relief, from a debilitated man who had been worn out by anxiety of mind and long-continued diarrhoea? Science is aghast!”

Another custom of the time (which has not by any means yet died out) against which Hahnemann ran a tilt was the prescribing of a variety of drugs in the same mixture. It was done quite artistically. There was a “base” (basis), a “receiver” (excipients), a “corrective” (corrigens), a “helper” (adjuvans), a “director” (dirigens), and more besides, in every prescription, and the larger it was, the more the prescriber was thought of – by the apothecary, at any rate, if not by the patient who has to swallow the dose.

In 1797, the year following that in which his “Essay on a New Principle” was published, Hahnemann contributed another notable paper to Hufeland's Journal, entitled, “Are the Obstacles to Certainty and Simplicity in Practical Medicine Insurmountable?” In this article he delivers himself as follows on this practice :

“Who knows whether the adjuvans or the corrigens may not act as basis in the complex prescription, or whether the excipients does not give an entirely different action to the whole. Does the chief ingredient, if it be the right one, require an adjuvans? does not the idea that it requires assistance reflect severely on its suitability, or should a dirigens also be necessary? ... The more complex our prescriptions are, the darker is the condition of therapeutics ... How can we complain of the obscurity of our art when we ourselves render it obscure and intricate?”

I will conclude this chapter by quoting some opinions of the man and his works expressed by eminent representatives of the opposite school. First, I will give the opinion of Hufeland himself; next, that of Sir John Forbes, editor of the quarterly Medical Review; and, lastly, of the eminent surgeon Liston. The extracts are taken from Tract VII of the Homoeopathic League Series.

“Hufeland”, writes Dr. Dudgeon, “who knew Hahnemann intimately, repeatedly expresses his high opinion of his talents. Already in 1800 (it will be remembered that Hahnemann’s first essay on the homoeopathic principle appeared in 1796), Hufeland writes : ‘This principle enunciated by Hahnemann, may doubtless serve to guide us to the discovery of useful remedies’. Writing of homeopathy in 1826 he says : ‘The subject becomes all the more important if the originator is a man who commands our respect; and no one will be able to deny that this is the case with Hahnemann, and least of all one who is in the position of the author of this essay, whose acquaintance with Hahnemann is of long standing, and who, connected with him for more than thirty years by ties both of friendship and of letters, valued him always as one of our most distinguished, intelligent, and original physicians’. Four years later he writes : ‘Added to this was the respect I had long left for the author, which was inspired by this earlier writings, and the important services he had rendered to medicine. I had subsequently the opportunity of observing many instances of good results from the use of homoeopathic medicines, which necessarily drew my attention to this subject, and convinced me that it ought not to be contemptuously pushed on one side, but deserves careful investigation. It is necessary to remind my readers that medicine has to thank Hahnemann for the discovery of the wine-test and of the soluble mercury, which is, in my opinion, still the most efficacious preparation of mercury, as well as for so much else. He has given sufficient proof in many of his earlier writings of a grand philosophical acumen and of a rare power of observation””.

“Sir John Forbes, in his celebrated critique of homeopathy, says of Hahnemann (1846) : - ‘No careful observer of his actions or candid reader of his writings can hesitate for a moment to admit that he was a very extraordinary man, one whose name will descend to posterity as the exclusive excogitator and founder of an original system of medicine, as ingenious as many that preceded it, and destined, probably, to be the remote, if not the immediate, cause of more important fundamental changes in the practice of the healing art than have resulted from any promulgated since the days of Galen himself. Hahnemann was undoubtedly a man of genius and a scholar, a man of indefatigable industry, of undaunted energy. In the history of medicine his name will appear systematists and theorists, surpassed by few in the originality and ingenuity of his views, superior to most in having substantiated and carried out his doctrines into actual and most extensive practice. By most medical men it was taken for granted that the system is not only visionary in itself, but was the result of a mere fanciful hypothesis, disconnected with facts of any kind, and supported by no process of ratiocination or logical inference; while its author and his apostles and successors were looked upon either as visionaries or quacks, or both. And yet nothing can be farther from the truth. Whoever examines the homoeopathic doctrines as announced and expounded in the original writings of Hahnemann and of many of his followers, must admit, not only that the system is an ingenious one, but that it professes to be based on a most formidable array of facts and experiments, and that these are woven into a complete code of doctrine with singular dexterity and much apparent fairness. Many among his followers are sincere, honest, and learned men””.

“‘It is interesting to remember’, says Dudgeon, ‘that these merely polite and candid statements respecting homoeopathy and its practitioners proved fatal to the quarterly periodical which Forbes had conducted with eminent ability for more than twelve years.

His subscribers would have nothing to do with a periodical which treated homoeopathy with a semblance of fair play, and which admitted that its practitioners might be sincere, honest, and learned men; and so for lack of support the Medical Review, after lingering for another year, was compelled to terminate its useful and honourable career.”

“Professor Liston, the eminent surgeon, in a lecture reported in the Lancet, after detailing the particulars of the cure of cases of erysipelas which he had treated with homoeopathic remedies, says : ‘Of course we cannot pretend to say positively in what way this effect is produced, but it seems almost to act by magic; however, so long as we benefit our patients by the treatment we pursue, we have no right to condemn the principles upon which this treatment is recommended and pursued. You know that this medicine, belladonna, is recommended by homoeopaths in erysipelas, because it produces on the skin a fiery eruption or efflorescence, accompanied by inflammatory fever. I believe in the homoeopathic doctrines to a certain extent, but I cannot as yet, from inexperience on the subject, go the length its advocates would wish in so far as regards the very minute doses of some of their medicines. The medicines in the above cases were certainly given in much smaller doses than have hitherto ever been prescribed. The beneficial effects, as you witnessed, are unquestionable. I have, however, seen similar good effects of belladonna, prepared according to the homoeopathic pharmacopoeia, in a case of very severe erysipelas of the head and face, under the care of my friend Dr. Quin. The inflammatory symptoms and local signs disappeared with very great rapidity. Without adopting the theory of this medical sect, you ought not to reject its doctrines without close examination and inquiry.’”

Homoeopathy and pathology or the theory of disease.

Homoeopathy is a science and an art of comparisons.

All we really know of any disease is the sum total of the manifestations – symptoms and tissue changes it has produced in patients. Symptoms are the language of disease. Nobody has ever seen “anaemia”, “measles”, “scarlatina”, or a “headache”, stalking abroad as a separate entity. Symptoms are the language in which the disturbing forces, which we know as diseases, speak to us.

In the same way, all we really know of the powers of any drug over the human organism, is the sum-total of the symptoms and alterations it has caused when introduced into a healthy organism, and the symptoms and morbid changes it has removed when given to the sick. Symptoms are the natural language of drug forces, in exactly the same way as they are of disease forces.

In any case of disease, the problem before the homoeopathic doctor is to find the drug which has caused symptoms similar to those of his case. It is not necessary for him to draw an exact comparison in every detail, but the most characteristic symptoms of the case must be matched in the symptoms of the remedy chosen, or else a cure cannot be looked for.

Homoeopathy theorises about nothing. In its Materia Medica it admits no theories – no explanations of actions –but only the facts. The business of the Homeopathic Materia Medica is to present the symptoms and bodily alterations which each drug has actually caused. Homeopathy also, whilst accepting the proved facts of pathology (the science of disease), discards all merely pathological theories as useless for drug selection.

Hahnemann has been severely criticised for discarding pathology. It is very much to his credit that he did not accept the pathology of his day; but neither he nor his followers

neglect anything which can help to throw light on the nature of disease. As a matter of fact, several of Hahnemann's most distinguished followers were professors of pathology, including Arnold of Zurich, Rapp of Tübingen, d'Amador of Montpellier, Zlatarovich of Vienna, and Henderson of Edinburgh. A true appreciation of the essential pathology of a case is often of vital importance in selecting the remedy. But it very frequently happens that the symptoms which decide the choice of a drug are of little significance from the standpoint of the pathology of the schools, as in the instance of the differential indications of Rhus and Bryonia above mentioned.

It is a common saying among teachers of medicine, "First diagnose your case, and then treat it." This may be all very well when the case is one of which is clearly understood. But a vast number of cases are not such.

A short time ago a picture appeared in one of the comic papers, showing two adjoining rooms in section – in one a patient, and in the other two doctors who had just been examining him and had retired to consult over his case. The patient, wishing to get an unbiased view of his state, had left his bed, and was shown with his ear at the keynote of the door in the party wall; and this is what he heard :

1st Doctor. – "Have you any idea what is the matter with him?"

2nd Doctor. "Not the least; have you?"

1st Doctor. "Not the faintest; but never mind – it will all be cleared up at the post-mortem."

I hope I shall not be accused of telling tales out of school when I say that there is many a case that is not cleared up, even at the post-mortem. What is to be done in cases such as these to avoid the catastrophe? It is here that homoeopathy is of such enormous advantage in knowing the value of symptoms. Symptoms are the natural language of disease, and in any case the sum-total of altered sensations and appearances gives solid ground on which the homoeopath can work. Reading the symptoms he can find the remedy, and many a case has been cured without having received a satisfactory name. The signs and symptoms give an accurate picture of the actual state of the organic life; and if we match that picture with a like symptom-picture from a drug-proving, and give the corresponding drug, the symptoms will be removed and the patient cured. If we had to wait until pathology had settled what is the true nature of all diseases before we cured our patients afflicted with them, we might all retire from practice at once without being much missed in the world. The Lancet once remarked, "Our knowledge of the true pathology of most diseases is still indefinite." 1 This is quite true; but still we go on treating our cases all the same; and taking Hahnemann for our guide, we are on solid ground. Pathological theories are bound to change with every fresh addition to our knowledge; but disease manifestations remain the same from the days of Hippocrates till the present.

It is a matter of no little importance to grasp the idea Hahnemann formed of the essential nature of disease. With him, disease was not primarily a change of structure or function, but an alteration of the invisible vital force which animates the whole organism. The nature of this invisible change is outwardly pictured in the bodily changes and sufferings produced; and thus, according to his view, it is necessary to observe accurately all the symptoms occurring, in order to get a true picture of the vital substance in any case. Symptoms are the language of the disturbed vital force, and hence symptoms are the guide to treatment.

Superficial critics often accuse homoeopathy of treating only symptoms. Nothing could be further from the truth. Homeopathy attaches importance to symptoms as revealing the real state of the patient; but it no more regards them as mere symptoms, than readers of Shakespeare's works look upon them as composed of mere words. In both cases they have a meaning in them, and are of significance only so far as that meaning is revealed.

In Hahnemann's day diseases were looked upon as something material to be got rid of by bleeding, purging, vomiting, salivation, sweating, issues, or in some such way, just as they are now looked upon as consisting principally of microbes to be killed. Hahnemann perceived that they are nothing of the kind; that the critical discharges which frequently occur in disease are not the cause of the disease, nor the disease itself, but simply manifestations of the working of the vital force. A fit of anger in a nursing woman will so change the quality of her milk, that if she nurses her child just after it, the child will be poisoned. But the poisonous milk is not the cause of the woman's mental disturbance, nor is the changed milk the disorder from which she is suffering. The invisible, intangible emotion has so disturbed her invisible, intangible vital force that physical changes in her tissues and secretions have resulted. The changes in her secretions are symptoms of the inward change. So the causes of most diseases (excluding mechanical injuries) are of an invisible, intangible nature – "dynamic" or "spirit-like", as Hahnemann called it.

The outward symptoms, which reveal the nature of the inward change in the vital force, only declare themselves after the "dynamic" disturbance has been some time in operation. In any case of disease we can estimate the nature and gravity of the vital disturbance only by a careful survey of the symptoms and signs in the patient; so that, for practical purposes, the "totality of the symptoms" constitutes what we have to deal with, and the only way to get rid of the symptoms is to restore the vital force to its normal condition.

Now, as Hahnemann pointed out, drugs are capable of producing artificial disease; and, as his experience and experiments showed, they do it by virtue, not so much of their brute poisonous force, so to speak, as of their "dynamic" powers. They act on the vital force, producing disturbances peculiar to themselves which reveal their presence. It cannot be simply and solely by absorption and distribution through the circulation that remedies act, for in that case their action would manifest itself with all drugs in the same period of time. This we know does not occur. Pure prussic acid acts with lightning-like rapidity, before it has time to be absorbed and distributed through the blood-vessels. Some other drugs do not show some of their actions until many days after they have been taken.

I shall deal presently with the whole question of the infinitesimal dose, and show how Hahnemann came to discover its power; but I may say here that this discovery was subsequent to his discovery of the homoeopathic principle. He did not discover homoeopathy from any preconceived notion of the nature of disease; but his views of disease were the outcome of his observation of the action of drugs on provers and patients.

No account of Hahnemann's pathology would be complete without a mention of his doctrine of chronic diseases, but this I must deal with in a separate chapter.

Hahnemann's doctrine of the chronic miasms.

By "chronic disease" Hahnemann did not mean exactly the same thing as is now generally understood by the phrase – a disease that lasts a long time and is incurable. To make his meaning clear, I cannot do better than quote Hahnemann's own definition of



acute and chronic diseases, from paragraph 72 of his Organon :

“The diseases to which man is liable are either rapid morbid processes of the abnormally deranged vital force, which have a tendency to finish their course more or less quickly, but always in a moderate time – these are termed acute diseases; or, they are diseases of such a character that, with small, often imperceptible beginnings, dynamically derange the living organism, each in its own peculiar manner, and cause it to deviate from the healthy condition in such a way that the automatic life energy, called vital force, whose office it is to preserve the health, only opposes to them, at the commencement and during their progress, imperfect, unsuitable, useless resistance, but is unable of itself to extinguish them, but must helplessly suffer (them to spread and) itself to be more and more abnormally deranged, until at length the organism is destroyed; these are termed chronic diseases. They are caused by infection from a chronic miasm.”

By “miasm” Hahnemann means an infectious principle, which when taken into the organism, may set up a specific disease. According to Hahnemann, there were not only miasms acute diseases, like the infectious principle of scarlatina, for example, but also of chronic diseases. Among the latter he recognised three – syphilis, sycosis and psora. The first is the lues venerea, which is recognised by all schools alike. The second is allied to this, but is distinguished by the production of characteristic warty growths. The third is a discovery of Hahnemann’s about which there has been the greatest misconception.

Before giving an account of what Hahnemann meant by “psora”, I will give a familiar instance of a chronic miasm – the disease set up by vaccination. Vaccinia or “Cow-pox”, as the late Dr. Matthews Duncan pointed out, is extremely analogous to syphilis in many of its characters, and not the least in the appearance of secondary disorders after the primary illness is over. The course of the disease is well known. The virus having been introduced through an abrasion of the skin, in about a week inflammation occurs at the spot. Then there appears first a vesicle, then a pustule, then a scab, and finally a scar when the scab drops off. During the time that this series of events is occurring, constitutional symptoms manifest themselves, chiefly in the form of fever and undefined malaise. When the healing has taken place, there may be nothing more occur. The organism may have reacted perfectly and discharged the miasm. But this is not often the case. The diminished susceptibility to small-pox infection shows a change of a deep constitutional character. This constitutional change has been named “vaccinosis” by Burnett, and, as I can attest, is the parent of much chronic illness. Often skin eruptions occur, lasting for years, or various other kinds of ill-health, lasting, it may be, as long as life lasts, and not seldom shortening life. When such a series of disorders occurs, it is not (according to Hahnemann’s doctrine, though he did not use this illustration) a succession of new diseases, but different evolutions of one and the same disease, the “miasm” of vaccinia producing the chronic malady, vaccinosis.

In the early years of his homoeopathic practice Hahnemann noticed that in certain cases the remedies he gave only produced temporary benefit. In these cases he found that the homoeopathicity of the remedies given was not complete. There was some factor in the case which had not been matched. It became apparent to him, then, that he had not only to take account of the malady from which the patients were then suffering, but also of previous and apparently different maladies. And he found that remedies which corresponded, in their action, to the whole course of the pathological life of a patient were needed for a cure; and through his provings he discovered what these deeply acting

remedies were.

Many cases he met with in practice in which the ill-health dated from the suppression of a skin disease, probably years before. That skin disease, said Hahnemann, is really a part of the present disorder. To take a common example, asthma is often found to appear after the “cure” by external means of a skin disorder. The patient is not suffering from two diseases; there is, according to Hahnemann’s pathology, one chronic miasm at work producing the two effects.

The large majority of chronic diseases Hahnemann traced to the chronic miasm he termed “psora”, and he maintained that the characteristic manifestation on the skin of this miasm was an eruption of itching vesicles, of which the itch vesicle was a type. It has been stated that Hahnemann ascribed to the itch the production of nine-tenths of chronic diseases, and he has been accused of ignorance in not knowing that itch was caused by an insect. But Hahnemann not only knew of the itch-insect, he actually figured it in one of his works. But he maintained that, in spite of the presence of the insect, this was not the whole of the disease – just as the tubercle bacillus is not the whole of pulmonary consumption. If it were, no doctors would escape consumption, since they inhale the bacillus constantly from their patients. “The itch”, Hahnemann maintained, “is chiefly an internal disease”. “Psora is an internal disease – a sort of internal itch – an may exist with or without an eruption upon the skin.” “Psora forms the basis of the itch.” To the reckless suppression of the chief external symptoms of psora Hahnemann ascribed the prevalence of chronic disorders.

To put it in other words, the psora doctrine of Hahnemann is practically the same as the doctrine of certain French authorities who ascribe a great variety of chronic diseases to what they call a “herpetic diathesis”, that is to say, a morbid state of the organism liable to manifest itself on the skin by an itching vesicular eruption.

The essential truth of Hahnemann’s doctrine may be seen by taking a glance at the history of individuals and families. The skin eruptions of childhood, the late development of bones and teeth, the anaemia of puberty, and the consumption which finally carries off the patient, are not so many different diseases, but different manifestations of one and the same disease, whether we call it “psora” with Hahnemann, or “herpetic diathesis” with the French. Then, again, take a family : one member has enlarged and inflamed glands, one ulceration of the eyes, one a chronic cough, one hysteria, one eczema. They are all children of the same parents, with the same elements of heredity, and their diseases are essentially one and the same, only manifesting itself differently in different individuals. This disease Hahnemann called a “chronic miasm”. The seat of its operations is the vital force, which can only be freed from it by dynamically acting homoeopathic remedies.

In his study of the chronic miasms Hahnemann found many other very characteristic symptoms besides the occurrence of eruptions on the skin; and he found remedies having corresponding symptoms, which he gave to patients with signal success. Among those remedies which he found to produce symptoms likeliest to those occurring in psoric patients, Sulphur takes the foremost place.

Hahnemann’s great work on Chronic Diseases gives the symptoms of these remedies at length. This work, of which the full title is “The Chronic Diseases : their Specific Nature and Homoeopathic Treatment”, is the crowning work of Hahnemann’s career.

It will be seen from the above sketch that Hahnemann’s theory of disease is profoundly philosophical and intensely practical. It is as far as possible removed from the tentative

and fragmentary theories of disease current in his own and in our day. Hahnemann's pathology goes hand in hand with treatment, and is thus checked at every step by the test of practice.

The infinitesimal dose

In an early chapter I mentioned that the infinitesimal dose has become in the popular mind the most characteristic feature of homoeopathy, though the word "Homeopathy" itself in no way includes "infinitesimal" in its meaning. Its use arose in this way. When Hahnemann began to employ drugs with the precision his method required, he found that the ordinary doses acted much too powerfully, and caused great aggravation of symptoms before the cure took place. He then by degrees reduced his doses until he found he could get the curative effect without aggravating. In some instances he found that the attenuating process actually developed and increased the curative powers of the medicine. The method he adopted was to dilute tinctures in the proportion of 1 to 99 of rectified spirit, and to grind insoluble substances with sugar of milk in the same proportions. For the higher attenuations the process was repeated, the same proportions being observed at each step.

The importance of the invention of this method of preparing drugs is very great, scarcely second, in my opinion, to that of the discovery of the law of similars itself. It is highly probable that but for the question of the infinitesimal dose, homoeopathy would have been recognised by the profession at large long ago. But homoeopathy (though it may be practised by those who never use anything but material doses) never can be dissociated from a knowledge of the power of the infinitesimal, and never could have been developed to anything like the perfection and power in which Hahnemann left it, apart from the use of infinitesimals. Hence the popular association of the two ideas of homeopathy and infinitesimals is fundamentally true, though it may be etymologically faulty.

It will be seen that in Hahnemann's centesimal scale, each step of the process divides the original quantity by 100, and hence each higher number represents a higher degree of attenuation. But the attenuation is so graduated that, no matter to what high figure it is carried, something of the original substances must remain, though it may be far beyond the power of chemistry to detect its presence.

Homoeopaths have also used a decimal scale of attenuation. This makes each remove a divisor of ten. This is noted by the letter "x", 1x being 1/10th, 2x being 1/100th, 3x being 1/1000th, and so on. Graduated attenuation is the essence of the method, and the result is development of power.

The researches of Faraday, Tyndall, Helmholtz, Crookes, and, later, of the Curies and other investigators of the phenomena of radio-activity, have made it easier to conceive of infinitesimal quantities and their powers, and the infinitesimals of homoeopathy should not therefore prove such stumbling-blocks to its friends and foes as they have done heretofore. When we find Helmholtz saying that at the period when our planetary system consisted of a sphere of nebulous matter reaching to the path of the outermost planet, it would require "several millions of cubic miles of such matter to weigh a single grain"; and when Faraday tells us that "each atom extends, so to say, throughout the whole of the solar system", it is plain that the everyday conceptions of matter and its possibilities will have to be revolutionised. There is nothing more worthy of investigations by masters of physical science than the facts connected with the action of homoeopathic infinitesimals. The human body is a much more sensitive reagent than anything known to natural

philosophy, and in conceiving and demonstrating the powers of infinitesimal quantities Hahnemann was as much ahead of his time as he was in demonstrating the existence of the law of similars.

The quotations I have just made are taken from a pamphlet entitled *The Science of Homeopathy*, by Mr. Buist Picken, in which the author seeks to apply the known facts of the phenomena in the world of physics to explain the fact of homoeopathic cures. To this pamphlet (which the late Prof. Tyndall characterised as “marked by extreme ingenuity”) I contributed a short introduction, summarising the argument, and it may be interesting to quote a passage therefrom. It will serve at once to show the line in which a scientific explanation of the apparent paradox of “like” curing “like” may be found, and of the other paradox of a smaller quantity of the right remedy being actually more powerfully curative than a larger one would be.

Here is my summary of the argument :

“The forces of the human organism are identical with the forces of nature, and obey the same laws. Health and disease are dynamic or spiritual in nature, and originate in molecular and atomic motions. The laws of motion apply to the phenomena of health and disease, and the action of remedies is identical with the phenomena of “interference” recognised in the natural sciences. As equal waves of water proceeding from different directions intersect each other (‘interfere’), and either increase (as summit corresponds to summit), or annul (as summit corresponds to furrow), the motion of the molecules of water, so a medicine (whose power is dynamic) acts in disease. When the molecular disturbance of the organism corresponds to the molecular motion of the medicine given, the intensity of the disturbance is either aggravated or annulled, according as the action is in the same or the opposite direction. The action of the curative agent is like in appearance, but contrary in direction.”

This is the main thesis of Mr. Picken’s article, but there are several other points brought out which well deserve serious attention. For instance, the author shows that each substance possesses the property of absorbing any motion which corresponds to its own molecular motion (illustrating the like-to-like formula). He brings forward the fact that (in Prof. Tyndall’s words) “the waves which are most effectual in shaking asunder the atoms of compound molecules are frequently those of least mechanical power. Billows, to use a strong expression, are incompetent to produce effects which are readily produced by ripples” – as showing a possibility of elucidating a law of dosage on the grounds of physical science. He contends that, as Boscovich says, atoms are to be regarded as “centres of force”, or, according to Faraday, that “force constitutes matter”; - that there is no “space” other than some quantity of matter between the particles of vapours, liquids, and solids alike; - that, for example, “water is not two particles of oxygen and hydrogen side by side, but the two spheres of power mutually penetrated, and the centres even coinciding”; or, as he puts it in another place, “Gravitation is a property of matter dependent on a certain force, and it is this force which constitutes matter. In this view, matter is not merely mutually penetrable; but each atom extends, so to say, throughout the whole of the solar system, yet always retaining its own centre of force.” “What do you know of the atom”, asks Faraday, “apart from its force? You imagine a nucleus which may be called a, and surround it by forces which may be called m; to my mind the a, or nucleus, vanishes, and the substance consists in the powers of m” : - which provides the highest scientific authority for the suggestion that it may be impossible to reach the

limit of the attenuation to which homoeopathic medicines may be carried.

This conception of the action of infinitesimals provides a serviceable working basis; but it need not be regarded as either essential or final. It is an attempt to provide an explanation of the facts, but the facts are in no way dependent on its correctness.

Many old-school authorities have adopted homoeopathic remedies into their text-books, but the effect on general practice has not been great, principally for the reason that they have not had the courage to adopt homoeopathic dosage. They reduced their own doses very far – as far as one-tenth or one-hundredth of a grain, or a drop of some remedies – but they have not gone far enough. Pasteur and Koch, who have been working on homoeopathic lines, have spoiled their work for the same reason. If Pasteur had simply taken the homeopathic preparation of hydrophobic virus, which has been in use since 1833, and which was prepared without any resort to cruelty, he would have gained no kudos, it is true; but he might have advanced science, and saved himself from the reproach of having killed numbers of persons with laboratory hydrophobia. Koch, again, if he had taken the tuberculin of the homoeopaths, and adopted the homoeopathic dosage, might have spared himself the trouble of experimenting on guinea-pigs, and have saved Virchow the trouble of making a number of post-mortem examinations on the bodies of human beings who died before their time in consequence of his tuberculin treatment. Koch reduced his dosage as far as he dared – down to milligrammes – but these doses proved powerful enough to kill, and to scare most practitioners from ever using the drug again. Homoeopaths, however, use it with perfect safety in their own dosage, guided by the effects it has produced on persons who took it in the trials that were made with it at first, and by the symptoms of homoeopathic provings.

The power of infinitesimals recognised by non-homoeopathic authorities

Hahnemann has been derided for his assertion that metallic bodies like flint and copper become, after being triturated to the fourth centesimal degree, so far soluble as to yield up their dynamic powers to a watery solution, and beyond that to solution in alcohol. That such is the fact, the effects of these solutions on healthy and diseased human beings, who have taken them, abundantly prove; and now we have plenty of evidence from the opposite camp to confirm Hahnemann's observation. The late professor Stokvis, of Amsterdam, at the International Medical Congress, held at Rome in April, 1894, practically acknowledged the truth of it. Professor Stokvis's address appeared in an English translation in the *Lancet* of April 26th of that year, and from this I will make three quotations, the italics being my own :

“How are we to understand the fact that the ingestion of infinitesimal quantities of certain substances which pass through the organism without causing in it the least change can provoke such disordered chemical actions as to occasion death? How are we to understand the fact that different parts of the organism seem to be able to distinguish these substances one from the other? We must admit special elective functions proper to the life of the cells. How are we to understand the facts that nothing but a change in the quantity of their dosage, the duration of their administration, and the method of their application suffices to make of certain toxic substances stimulants or paralyzants? How are we to understand the fact that insoluble substances like arsenic, copper, and lead can defy that well-known axiom, *Corpora non agunt nisi soluta* (substances do not act except in a state of solution), and manifest therapeutic and toxic action? We must admit the presence and agency of some unknown power within the living cell. How, again, are we

to understand the therapeutic power exhibited by solutions of iodine and bromine which have apparently been diluted to the deprivation of all chemical action, unless we attribute to the living cell the power of liberating the iodine and the bromine from such dilute solutions?"

"By warming pure chlorate of potassium we obtain pure oxygen, but the presence of the smallest quantity of chloride of potassium is sufficient to change part of the oxygen into ozone. In giving rise to this development of ozone, the chloride of potassium remains itself completely unaltered; but, what is more remarkable yet, this chloride of potassium itself has, like peroxide of manganese – which acts in an identical manner – the property of destroying ozone."

"As for the manifestation of therapeutic and toxic action by bodies considered to be insoluble, of which Nägeli, in a posthumous work, has made so profound a study, they are also capable of the simplest interpretation. The insolubility of these bodies is not absolute, but only relative. If we throw, for example, metallic copper into water and wait for some days, we shall find that a certain proportion of the copper has dissolved – i.e. , one part to seventy-seven million parts of water."

If Professor Stokvis can account for the power of copper to produce symptoms in the human body by its being soluble in 77,000,000 parts of water, where is he to stop? The only answer to this is, that there is no stopping anywhere. If "every atom extends throughout the whole solar system", there is no possibility of our finding the limits of its capacity for being attenuated.

But Professor Stokvis was far within the mark in ascribing an active power to a solution of the strength of one in seventy-seven millions. Dr. William P. Wesselhoeft, in a paper published in the Journal of Homoeopathics of September, 1898, tells how Nägeli demonstrated the presence of an active copper force, which he termed Oligodynamis, in solutions ranging from one in 100,000,000 to one in 1,000,000,000. Nägeli showed that when once a glass vessel has been "infected" with "oligodynamic water" it is almost impossible to get rid of the force by simply diluting it. "He distilled one litre of water in glass retorts, suspended four clean copper coins in this water during four days, and found that this solution killed his Spirogyra plants in a very few minutes. When this water was poured away, the glass rinsed and washed carefully, and again refilled with neutral water, the Spirogyra also died in a very short time. If, however, the glass was washed out with diluted nitric acid, and refilled with fresh neutral water, the plants flourished and remained healthy. This proved conclusively that a copper force was imparted to water from the walls of the glass vessel. Rinsing, washing, brushing, and even boiling had little effect upon the glass; not until a mineral acid had been used did the glass vessel lose its oligodynamic properties. Again, he found that this oligodynamic water poured into a new, clean glass vessel transferred its poisonous properties to the walls of the glass, and this, in turn, was again able to medicate neutral distilled water. He says : - 'Glasses with oligodynamic after-effects (nachwirkung), lose their power very slowly after being repeatedly refilled with neutral water, which is allowed to stand in them for a while, and somewhat more rapidly if they are boiled in neutral water.'" This refers to the direct action of the copper force on small vegetable organisms. But the human organism is infinitely more sensitive; and experience has shown that when dilution has been carried beyond the point of direct poisoning power, a health-restoring dynamis remains in undiminished force, which the homoeopathic law enables us with certainty to direct.

In this connection I may refer to Darwin's researches with the fly-catching plant, Drosera, or Sun-dew. Darwin found that solutions of certain salts of ammonia stimulated the glands of the tentacles and caused the latter to turn inwards. He made this solution more and more dilute, but still the plant was able to detect the presence of the salt.

Darwin was almost frightened by his results. Writing to Donders he says :

“The 1 - 4,000,000th of a grain absorbed by a gland clearly makes the tentacle which bears the gland become inflected; and I am fully convinced that 1 - 20,000,000th of a grain of the crystallised salt (i.e. , containing about one-third of its weight of water of crystallisation) does the same. Now I am quite unhappy at the thought of having to publish such a statement.”<sup>1</sup>

Poor Darwin! Where would homoeopathy have been if Hahnemann had been so different about publishing proved but unpalatable facts? And Darwin, it should be remembered, was once under the care of a homoeopath, the late Dr. Gully, the father of the present Speaker of the House of Commons, and derived much benefit from his treatment.

The world is moving rapidly, and since the above-named observations on the power of the infinitesimal were made, they have been eclipsed and illuminated by the astounding discoveries in relation to radio-activity. These were well summed up by Dr. Burford in his address as President of the British Homoeopathic Congress of 1904. Dr. Burford's authority is the well-known work on Radium by Professor Rutherford, who has shown that “these radio-active bodies are continually forming in their own interstices a product, which in the case of radium is many thousand times more active than radium itself; which, moreover, induces the same radio-activity in all bodies exposed for some time to it, and which, to the extent of 1/20000th of its original potency, remains a new and permanent property of the acquiring body. These processes are above and beyond the cognisance and scope of the most refined chemical methods. Here is a demonstration : A tube out of which a perfectly invisible emanation from radium, and possessing absolutely no weight, has been emptied, is next washed out with an acid; this is evaporated, leaving a radio-active residue more potent in some respects than radium itself, requiring 200 years to decay to half value. Moreover, in rooms where radium has been exposed to the air, an invisible radio-activity, perfectly undetectable by the balance or the spectroscope, is produced on the walls of the apartment, persisting even though the radium has been removed for some time.”

“Now”, says Dr. Burford, “facts parallel to these, but where the human body, in certain defined states of disease, acted with similar susceptibility to the electroscope in the former instance, were observed by Hahnemann a century ago, and have been confirmed by innumerable observations since. That matter too attenuated to be obvious to the test of the balance, or of chemical reaction, or of spectroscopic analysis should yet be detected by a suitably sensitive instrument, that of diseased protoplasmic condition; that initiation of new conditions may be effected in a responsive state by inconsiderable material agencies, and bearing absolutely no relation in point of quantity to the effects produced; that transmission of specific qualities through a series of indifferent media may be effected, leaving the ultimate product still potent to act; that media thus used for transmission retain permanently their new character; and that a specific and definite parallelism controls the interaction of remedy and organisms – these facts, I say been known to homoeopaths since Hahnemann, and may be verified by any competent observer who cares to take the trouble.”

Dr. Burford does well to point out that the phenomena of radium illustrate how it is that “indifferent media” like water, spirit, or sugar of milk, once having been infected, as it were, with the power of a remedy can transmit that drug-power to the patient who takes it. Radium can transmit its own power to indifferent media which come in contact with its emanation, can endow these with its own properties without itself appreciably losing either power or substance.

Thus have the observation of physicists demonstrated the truth of Hahnemann’s teaching from another side. Homoeopathic attenuations have been described as “bottle-washings”; Well, Professor Rutherford practically tells us that once a bottle has held radium or its intangible, unweighable emanation, no amount of bottle-washing can get it out. The bottle may be filled and emptied a million times and the power of radium will be still present. Homeopaths who have seen the power of remedies, which have been attenuated in the same way, manifested in their patients, find nothing startling in this. But it is well that it should be put clearly before the public. On the professional mind I do not anticipate that it will have any effect at all. The ray has not yet been invented which can pierce that.

Hahnemann’s conception of the “dynamic”, spirit-like, vital force animating the material organism as being the primary seat of all disorders which appear outwardly in the symptoms of disease, makes it easy for his followers to apprehend the potency of medicines in the “dynamised” form.

Before quitting this part of my subject it may be interesting to point out that M. Pierre Curie, the joint discoverer of radium, comes of a good homoeopathic stock. His father, with whom he now lives, is a retired homoeopathic practitioner. His grandfather was the celebrated Paul Francis Curie, who, apparently on Hahnemann’s nomination, was induced by Mr. William Leaf to settle in England for the purpose of introducing homoeopathy to the British public and to British medical men. Dr. Curie administered the first homoeopathic dispensary in London under medical auspices; and, later, when the Hahnemann Hospital was established, he was appointed one of the physicians. There he delivered his well-known lectures. He died in London, and was buried in Norwood Cemetery. A cousin of M. Pierre Curie – Dr. Depouilly – is respected homoeopathic practitioner of Paris at the present time.

Examples of homoeopathic cures from hahnemann’s own practice

Exceedingly few of Hahnemann’s own cases have been published. He refrained from publishing many, lest his disciples should fall into routine ways and give certain medicines to patients affected with certain diseases, because he had given the same medicines to patients with the same diseases, and not because the medicines corresponded to the cases to be treated. In the second volume of the *Materia Medica Pura*, however, Hahnemann gives, at “the request of some friends halting half-way on the road”, two cases which I will now quote just to show the way in which he went to work, and also to show that homoeopathy is not, as some would make out, a mere affair of a little book and a box of pilules. Every genuine homoeopathic prescription is made on the same plan as that followed in the two cases I am about to quote; only, the working out of the problem is generally done mentally, and more rapidly than a reading of these cases might lead one to suppose.

The figures in brackets refer to the number of the symptom referred to in Hahnemann’s *Materia Medica Pura*.



I. "Sch - , a washerwoman, somewhere about forty years old, had been more than three weeks unable to earn her bread, when she consulted me on the 1st Sept., 1815.

"1. On any movement, especially at every step, and worst on making a false step, she has a shock in the pit of the stomach, that comes, as she avers, every time from the left side.

"2. When she lies she feels quite well; then she has no pain anywhere, neither in the side nor in the pit of the stomach.

"3. She cannot sleep after 3 a.m.

"4. She relishes her food, but when she has eaten a little she feels sick.

"5. Ten water collects in her mouth and runs out of it, like water-brash.

"6. She has frequent empty eructations after every meal.

"7. Her temper is passionate, disposed to anger. When the pain is severe she is covered with perspiration. The catamenia were quite regular a fortnight since.

"In other respects her health is good.

"Now, as regards symptom 1, Belladonna, China, and Rhus toxicodendron cause shootings in the pit of the stomach on making a false step, but none of them only on movement, as is the case here. Pulsatilla (see symptom 386) certainly causes shootings in the pit of the stomach on making a false step, but only as a rare alternating action, and has neither the same digestive derangements as occur here at 4 compared with 5 and 6, nor the same state of the disposition.

"Bryonia alone has among its chief alternating actions, as the whole list of its symptoms demonstrates, pains from movement, and especially shooting pains, as also stitches beneath the sternum (in the pit of the stomach) on raising the arm (448), and on making a false step it causes shooting in other parts (520, 600).

"The negative symptom 2 met with here answers especially to Bryonia (638); few medicines (with the exception, perhaps, of Nux vomica and Rhus toxicodendron in their alternating action – neither of which, however, is suitable for the other symptoms) show a complete relief to pains during rest and when lying; Bryonia does, however, in an especial manner (638 and many other Bryonia symptoms).

"Symptom 3 is met with in several medicines, and also in Bryonia (694).

"Symptom 4 is certainly, as far as regards sickness after eating, met with in several other medicines (Ignatia, Nux vomica, Mercurius, Ferrum, Belladonna, Pulsatilla, Cantharis), but neither so constantly and commonly, nor with relish for food, as in Bryonia (279).

"As regards symptom 5, several medicines certainly cause a flow of water like water-brash, just as well as Bryonia (282); the others, however, do not produce symptoms similar to the remaining ones. Hence Bryonia is to be preferred to them in this particular.

"Empty eructation (of wind only) after eating (symptom 6) is found in few medicines, and in none so constantly, so commonly, and to such a degree, as in Bryonia (252, 259).

"To 7. One of the chief symptoms in diseases (see Organon, sec. 213) is the 'state of the disposition', and as Bryonia (772) causes this symptoms also in an exactly similar manner, Bryonia is for all these reasons to be preferred in this case to all other medicines as the homeopathic remedy.

"Now, as this woman was very robust, and the force of the disease must consequently have been very considerable to prevent her, on account of pain, doing any work; and as her vital powers, as stated, were not impaired, I gave her one of the strongest homoeopathic doses, a full drop of the undiluted juice of Bryonia root, to be taken immediately, and bade her come to me again in forty-eight hours. I told my friend E.,

who was present, that within that time the woman would assuredly be quite cured; but he, being but half-converted to homoeopathy, expressed his doubts about it. Five days afterwards he came again to learn the result, but the woman did not return then, and, in fact, never came back again. I could only allay the impatience of my friend by telling him her name and that of the village where she lived, about a mile and a half off, and advising him to seek her out and ascertain for himself how she was. This he did, and her answer was : ‘What was the use of my going back? The very next day I was quite well, and could again get to my washing; and the day following was quite well, as I am still. I am extremely obliged to the doctor, but the like of us have no time to leave off our work; and for three weeks previously my illness prevented me earning anything.’”

II. “W -, a weakly, pale man of 42 years, who was kept constantly at his desk by business, consulted me on Dec. 27, 1815; he had been already five days ill.

“1. The first evening, without manifest cause, he became sick and giddy, with much eructation.

“2. The following night (about 2 a.m. ) sour vomiting.

“3. The subsequent nights violent eructation.

“4. To-day also severe eructation of fetid odour and sourish taste.

“He felt as if the food lay crude and undigested in his stomach.

“6. His head felt wide, hollow and dark, and as if sensitive internally.

“7. Sensitive to the smallest noise.

“8. His disposition is mild, soft, and patient.

“Here I may observe :

“To 1. That several medicines cause vertigo with nausea, as does also Pulsatilla (3), which produces its vertigo in the evening also (7), a circumstance that has been observed of very other medicines.

“To 2. Stramonium and Nux vomica cause vomiting of sour and sour-smelling mucus, but as far as is known, not at night. Valerian and Cocculus cause vomiting at night, but not of sour stuff. Iron alone causes vomiting at night (61, 62), and can also cause sour vomiting (66), but not the other symptoms that should be attended to here. Pulsatilla, however, causes not only sour vomiting in the evening (349, 354), and nocturnal vomiting in general (355), but also the other symptoms of this case not found among those of Iron.

“To 3. Nocturnal eructation is peculiar to Pulsatilla (297, 298).

“To 4. Fetid, putrid (260), and sour eructation (302, 303).

“To 5. The sensation of indigestibility of the food in the stomach is produced by few medicines, and by none in such a perfect and striking manner as by Pulsatilla (321, 322, 327).

“To 6. Besides Ignatia (2), which, however, cannot produce our other symptoms, the same state is caused by Pulsatilla (39 compared with 42, 94, 98).

“To 7. Pulsatilla produces the same state (997), and it also causes over-sensitiveness of other organs of the senses; for example of the sight (107). And although intolerance of noise is also met with in Nux vomica, Ignatia, and Aconite, yet these medicines are not homeopathic to the other symptoms, and still less do they possess symptom 8, the mild character of the disposition, which, as stated in the preface to Pulsatilla, is particularly indicative of this plant.

“The patient, therefore, could not be cured by anything more easily, certainly, and

permanently than by Pulsatilla, which was homoeopathic to the case. It was accordingly given to him immediately; but, on account of his weakly and exhausted state, only in a very minute doses, i.e. , half a drop of the quadrillionth [12th dil.] of a strong drop of Pulsatilla. This was done in the evening.

“The next day he was free from all ailments, his digestion was restored; and a week thereafter, as he informed me, he remained free from complaint and well.”

More illustrations. Meissonier’s dog. Count Radetsky

I will now quote the case of the homoeopathic cure of an animal. It is taken from The Times of Jan. 6, 1888, being communicated in a letter to the editor in the course of the Odium Medicum correspondence, afterwards published in book form under the title of Odium Medicum and Homoeopathy.

Meissonier’s Testimony in favour of Homeopathy.

To the Editor of The Times.

“Sir, -In the present controversy on this subject, you may, perhaps, in your spirit of fairness, think the enclosed document worth publishing. It has been in my possession for some time.

“I was studying painting a few years ago with Meissonier, whose valuable dog – which had been given to him by his great friend Dumas – was struck with paralysis in its hind quarters; it had also its neck twisted.

“I had long studied Homeopathy for my own use, and my little globules were the subject of much good-humoured fun to Meissonier and his friends and family, who did not believe in them at all.

“The dog in question was condemned to death by a great ‘vet.’ in Paris, who attended to Meissonier’s very valuable horses, as will be seen in the enclosed testimony. The same evening I was dining with him and his family, and the dog was in the room – a subject of much lamentation – when, in his sudden and animated manner, he challenged me to cure it with ‘my Homoeopathy’.

“I accepted the challenge and gave the dog at once in their presence a single dose of Rhus tox., of a rather high dilution.

“The next morning I was at work with him alone in his garden studio before breakfast, when his clever and energetic daughter came rushing into the studio as if the house were on fire, crying out that ‘the dog walked’.

“We ran out of the studio – Meissonier with his brush in his mouth and his large palette on his thumb, in his earnest eagerness about everything that freshly caught his attention – and there was the animal running about on its four legs as strongly as ever.

“It still had its neck twisted, however, and I was much puzzled to know how to proceed with my patient. I then perceived that its coat was rough and staring. Here came in one of the great principles of Homeopathy – that every symptom must be taken into account – and the proper remedy at once suggested itself. I gave it two doses of Arsenicum 3x; the dog quite recovered, and is, I believe, alive and well to this day.

“Yours faithfully,

“A Pupil of Meissonier.

“Messieurs Meissonier père et fils apprenant qu’on met en doute la guérison d’une petite chienne condamnée à mort par les vétérinaires de Paris, affirment que cette petite bête a été radicalement guérie, d’une attaque de paralysie extrêmement violente, par leur ami - -, qui l’a traitée par l’homoeopathie. Cette petite chienne de race très pure va parfaitement

bien et fait l'admiration de tous.”

“E. Meissonier”,

“Ch. Meissonier, fils.”

Cure of Count Radetsky.

I will next quote from Tract 5 of the Homeopathic League Series the historic cure of the famous field-Marshal Count Radetsky :

“It is not only in acute diseases that homoeopathy shows its superiority to every other method of treatment. Chronic diseases of the most obstinate and intractable nature, which have resisted all the appliances of the old school, are often rapidly and radically cured by the remedies of the new school. Diseases which have been pronounced incurable and necessarily fatal have, as every homoeopathic practitioner knows from his own experience, been frequently perfectly cured by the mild but potent remedies of homoeopathy. Not only has homoeopathy lessened the mortality of serious but not necessarily fatal diseases, it has also extended the boundaries of remedial medication. The limits of this tract will not allow us to give many proofs of this statement, but one which is of historical celebrity may be here mentioned. In January, 1841, the celebrated Austrian Field-Marshal Count Radetsky was suffering from a tumour in the orbit of the right eye, which pushed the eyeball outwards and forwards. The tumour had been growing since the previous October. The Emperor, with whom the Field-Marshal was a great favourite, sent his staff-physician Dr. Jaeger, Professor of Ophthalmology in the Joseph's Academy of Vienna, to Milan, where the patient resided, to consult with Dr. Flarer, Professor of Ophthalmology in Pavia, and the Field-Marshal's ordinary medical attendant, Staff-surgeon Hartung, a homoeopathic practitioner, to make a report upon the disease, and to advise as to the appropriate treatment. The three consultants met on the 26th of January, and after careful examination, unanimously pronounced the disease to be of a fungous cancerous character. The two professors held it to be incurable by any means known to them; that a fatal termination was only a question of time; and as they held medicine to be powerless in such a case, they would offer no suggestion as to treatment. Dr. Hartung, while agreeing with the learned professors as to the hopelessness of a cure under ordinary treatment, thought that benefit might be derived from homoeopathic remedies. The patient declared that he would have no other than homoeopathic treatment. Under Dr. Hartung's homoeopathic remedies, this formidable disease in this septuagenarian patient steadily declined. By the 19th of March the disease was perfectly cured, and no difference was observable in the two eyes. Count Radetsky lived a good many years after this, and was sufficiently active in mind and body to win the decisive battle of Novara in 1840.”

What are homoeopathic medicines

Having sketched the origin of homoeopathy and described many of its salient features, it seems to me that it might be well to devote a few chapters more particularly to certain practical details. For, as before remarked, there is no excuse for any one to either believe or disbelieve in homoeopathy : the proof lies within the reach of any person of intelligence, if he likes to take the trouble to put the principle to the test.

But before one can make the trial, it is necessary to know something of the agents which are to be made use of and tested. This brings us to the query which I have put at the head of this chapter – “What are Homoeopathic Medicines?” Possibly my readers will say, “Aconite, Bryonia, Belladonna, Chamomilla, Hepar sulphuris, Mercurius, Nux vomica,

and Sulphur – these are homoeopathic medicines.” And my readers will be right so far – and only so far. “Homoeopathic remedies” may be defined for ordinary purposes as “Medicines used by homoeopaths”; and every one of the remedies named above comes under this definition. But a number of these remedies are also used by allopaths; and, therefore, by the same process of reasoning it would be correct to describe these as allopathic remedies also.

Strictly speaking, a medicine is neither allopathic nor homoeopathic in itself, but only in its use – the same remedy is either one or the other according as it is prescribed in a case of disease. For example, it is just as true to say that Opium is an allopathic medicine as it is to say that it is a homoeopathic medicine. One of the well-known effects of Opium (when taken, for instance, to deaden the sufferings of neuralgia) is that, among other effects, it causes constipation; when, therefore, it is given to cure a patient of constipation it is a homoeopathic remedy. On the other hand, when it is given to a patient suffering from diarrhoea, to check the diarrhoea, it is an allopathic, or, rather, to be perfectly accurate, an antipathic remedy.

There is a sense in which some remedies are peculiar to homoeopathy, having been introduced to medicine through the homoeopathic provings, and having been used almost exclusively by homoeopaths. Pulsatilla, Sepia, Silica, and Thuja may be named as examples of these. But homoeopathy claims the whole realm of drug action as its rightful property, awaiting its service for homoeopathic use. It is only necessary that the positive effects of a drug shall be known, for homoeopaths to be able to make their own peculiar use of it. The constipation-causing action of Opium is a positive effect, which a homoeopath may make use of for curing cases of constipation. This is the homoeopathic or negative effect, as it has been called.

But we have not even yet exhausted the reply to our query – What are homoeopathic medicines? We have arrived at this answer – “Homoeopathic medicines are medicines which can be used homoeopathically.” But then comes this further consideration – Are there not special homoeopathic chemists? And if the question whether a medicine is homoeopathic or not is only one of use, why cannot any chemist supply the same remedies for both schools?

The answer to this very proper query is, that remedies need to be differently prepared when used in different ways. Going back to our example of Opium, the homoeopath who wished to cure a case of constipation would not give it in the same way, or in the same form, as an allopath would, who gave it to relieve pain. Hahnemann soon found out that patients were infinitely more sensitive to the remedies which were homoeopathically related to their cases than they were to other remedies. Therefore he was compelled to reduce the quantities very much below the ordinary dosage current in his day. He gave single drops, or half drops, of the original tinctures, where the dosage in the books was set down as teaspoonfuls. Then he found that even these apparently minute doses were too great in many cases, and thus he was led to invent his method of attenuating remedies, which I have described in another chapter, and to discover the powers of infinitesimal quantities.

Hence arises a new definition for the term “Homoeopathic medicines” – Homoeopathic medicines are medicines which have been specially prepared for homoeopathic use. Their preparation needs special skill, and herein lies the necessity for a separate class of trained chemists to supply the wants of homoeopathic doctors.

The full reply to our query, therefore, must be – Homoeopathic medicines are medicines which, having been tested on the healthy body, can be used homoeopathically, and which have been specially prepared for homoeopathic use.

The different meanings of the word “dose”

Having arrived at a conclusion as to what homoeopathic medicines are, it is now essential that we should clear our minds as to what is a homoeopathic dose, because the two schools of medicine attach very different meanings to the word. When an allopath uses the word “dose”, he means so many drops by measure or so many grains by weight – enough to produce the direct, positive, or physiological effect he desires, and not enough to endanger the patient. To go back to the example of Opium, the “dose” recommended to stay the action of the bowels in a case of diarrhoea is from one to three grains. So for the meaning of the word “dose” when used by an allopath.

In common speech a homeopathic dose of anything means an infinitesimal dose. But that is not exactly the meaning attached to the word by the professional homoeopath. If a homoeopathic doctor who had prescribed Opium for a patient suffering from constipation were asked, “What dose did you give it in?” he would not think of weights or measures at all – as the allopath would. He would reply to the query that he gave the mother tincture (of which the sign is f or q), or the 3rd, the 6th, the 12th, or the 30th, as the case might have been. So we see a homoeopathic “dose” means the particular preparation of the remedy used, in the first place. In the second place it means simply the quantity of that preparation or the form of that preparation. For example, say Opium 30 was given : it may have been given in one or two drops of the tincture, one or more pilules, one or more globules; or the drops may have been given pure on the tongue, or diluted in water, or mixed with sugar of milk. To an allopath the word “dose” would convey none of these meanings, whereas to the homoeopath the mention of the word “dose” naturally calls them all up in his mind.

It will be seen that “quantity” has very little to do with the idea of “dose” in the homoeopathist’s mind, and it has everything to do with it in the allopaths. The doctor who, as we have supposed, prescribed Opium 30 for the case of constipation, might have been further asked, “Did you give a single dose, or did you repeat?” And until that query had been answered we should not have known exactly how the remedy had been given. So that the word “dose” in homoeopathy implies not only drug-impact, the form in which the drug-impact is communicated, but the further question whether it is a single impact or a repeated one.

It is necessary to make all these points clear if misunderstandings are to be avoided. Half the difficulties in the scientific world arise from different observers attaching different meanings to terms in common use.

The homoeopathic materia medica

Having explained “Homoeopathic Medicines” and “Homeopathic Doses” it will be well now to say something about the Homoeopathic Materia Medica. Here, again, it is a pity that the use of old terms cannot now be avoided. “Materia Medica” means medical materials, that is to say, drugs. A work on “Materia Medica” is a work which tells about drugs. The allopathic “Materia Medica” describes the drugs used in the ordinary schools, their physical properties and tests. So far it is in line with the Homoeopathic Materia Medica; but now comes the difference. The allopathic Materia Medica goes on to tell us of a drug that it is “narcotic, stimulant, sedative, antispasmodic, anaesthetic”; or “irritant,

cathartic, diuretic”, or whatever it may be, and to tell the maladies it is used in and the quantities to be administered.

Now Hahnemann pointed out that these terms, “stimulant”, “sedative”, “antispasmodic”, and c., were more or less question-begging terms, and conveyed no real information. He, therefore, proceeded to construct his *Materia Medica*, not of adjectives, but of facts. Therefore it is that in opening a Homoeopathic *Materia Medica* we are confronted with a list of symptoms, arranged in definite order under the heading of each remedy described. These symptoms are the effects – “positive” effects, Hahnemann called them – experienced by Hahnemann himself and the other “provers”, who tested them on their own healthy persons. Hahnemann called his *Materia Medica* a “Pure” *Materia Medica*, since it was made up of the unadulterated effects of the remedy in question, free from the taint of question-begging adjectives. In order to use a drug with definite effect, it was necessary, as he showed, to be able to find out just what the drug had done. The homeopathic *Materia Medica* consists of the record of these definite effects of drugs, observed either in provings or in poisonings.

Since Hahnemann’s day thousands of observers have been at work adding to the provings he made, and it has been necessary to arrange and rearrange the matter which has accumulated. First of the *Materia Medica* compilers after Hahnemann was George Heinrich Gottlieb Jahr. Next came Timothy Field Allen, whose *Encyclopaedia of Pure Materia Medica*, in ten volumes, completed in 1879, is a permanent endowment of the homeopathic school. Contemporary with Allen, and earlier in the field, though his work was later in appearing, was Constantine Hering, whose name I place second only to that of Hahnemann himself in the annals of homoeopathy. Hering has left also ten volumes, which he has named *The Guiding Symptoms of the Materia Medica*. Only three of these appeared in his lifetime; the rest were ably and faithfully edited by his literary executors.

My own contribution to this work of arrangement consists of the three volumes of my *Dictionary of Practical Materia Medica* completed in 1902, in which I have sought to give a somewhat new setting to the material gathered by my predecessors. The bald list of symptoms hitherto presented in homoeopathic *materia medicae* wanted, it seemed to me, a practical introduction of a more extended nature than had been heretofore attempted. Moreover, it seemed desirable to bring the entire number of remedies hitherto used into one uniform arrangement, so that they could be got at any time. This my work has effected. It has also, as I think, made the Homeopathic *Materia Medica* a more readable entity, and a more possible study than it had previously been. Hahnemann introduced many of his remedies with prefatory remarks of the greatest practical value, but it was no part of his plan to do this systematically. I have endeavoured to present in my introductions the clinical experiences which have accumulated since Hahnemann’s time.

The symptom-lists which constitute the real body of the Homoeopathic *Materia Medica*, are arranged, for the sake of reference, under the different anatomical regions of the body. Thus it is possible to find out under any remedy the exact symptoms it has produced in the head, eyes, ears, stomach, limbs, and c.; so that when any case of disease arises, presenting symptoms in any of these regions, the medical man is able to compare his case with the remedies which seem to him most closely to correspond.

But for the full use of the Homoeopathic *Materia*, another kind of work is required, namely, the *Repertory*. The *Repertory* is an index or concordance in which all remedies having caused any particular symptom may be found. So that the prescriber who has a

case for which he knows no corresponding remedy may find one by consulting the Repertory, which will tell him which remedies have produced the symptoms which his case presents.

I say “the” Repertory, but there are really many repertories, and the building of repertories is one of the most arduous tasks that fall to the lot of the homoeopathic writer. The most complete of symptom-repertories at the present date is Dr. Kent’s. My own Clinical Repertory only deals with certain sections of my Dictionary of Materia Medica, particularly indexing the clinical section, with which I have prefixed the account I have given of each of the remedies. Clinical repertories have a distinct place in homoeopathic work; but the principal repertories must always be those which index the actual symptoms. The Materia Medica gives all the symptoms produced by each remedy under the heading of each remedy. Repertories, which are the counterpart of the Materia Medica, give lists of symptoms, the name of all the remedies which have produced any given symptom being appended to it.

Sensitives. the case of caspar hauser

It may seem to some that the mass of symptoms contained in the Homoeopathic Materia Medica must be due to the imaginations of the provers. That some may be such need not be denied. But there is always this check in homoeopathy – the provings can be tested in practice. Attempts have been made to criticise the provings of Hahnemann by making other provings, and these have always ended by confirming his observations, and adding to, instead of detracting from, the body of symptoms available for use. Some experimenters have endeavoured to apply a more rigorous test. They have sought to apply the test of numbers to the provings. They have given a remedy to a number of different persons, and have rejected all symptoms which have not been manifested in more than one or two provers. This method leaves out of account the existence of sensitives.

I have mentioned above that in illness a person becomes in an exaggerated degree sensitive to the action of the remedy which is homeopathic to his condition. But there are some persons who are naturally sensitive to stimuli of all kinds. Hahnemann and a number of his provers were undoubtedly of this class, and their symptoms are of much greater value than those whose organisms react but little to any kind of drug.

Perhaps the most remarkable example of extreme sensitiveness to medicines is the case of the mysterious and unfortunate Caspar Hauser, who was found by the police aimlessly wandering about the streets of Nuremberg in the spring of 1828. Dr. Dudgeon has told his story in the Homoeopathic World of October, 1897. From this we learn that he was placed under the care of Professor Daumer who taught him to speak, and gradually elicited from him that he had hitherto lived in a dark, underground cellar, had been fed on black bread and water, and had been deprived of all intercourse with his fellow-creatures. At first he had no more intelligence than a baby; but he learned rapidly. For a long time he was painfully affected by bright light and loud noises. He could distinguish colours in the dark, and felt acutely the slightest blow or touch. Perfumes would bring on convulsive attacks. For long he would not eat anything but black bread on which he had been reared. He was very subject to convulsive attacks, and became seriously ill. In his illness he was under the care of Dr. Preu, an ardent homoeopathist, and it is from Dr. Preu’s article - published in the eleventh volume of the Arch. für die homoeopatische Heilkunst – that Dr. Dudgeon’s account is taken. Caspar Hauser was sensitive in many ways. His vision was so acute that he could count the berries on a bunch of elderberries at a distance of



one hundred paces. He could distinguish colours in total darkness, and he saw best in twilight. He was clairvoyant, and had many premonitions. He foretold his attempted assassination of the 17th of October, 1829. (He was actually assassinated a few months later.)

The special interest to homoeopaths in the historic case of Caspar Hauser lies in the fact that he exemplifies a sensitiveness to remedies which occurs in many persons to a degree only somewhat less exaggerated than his. And the reason I here refer to the case is to show that strength of dose, in the allopathic sense, has not necessarily anything to do with either the causation or the cure of conditions.

An attempt is sometimes made to explain homeopathic action on the hypothesis that remedies "have opposite effects in large and small doses", and that, consequently, homoeopathic remedies cure in small doses what they cause in large ones.

This argument is very specious on the face of it, but cases like that of Caspar Hauser upset it entirely. For the remedies were all given to him in more or less infinitesimal form, and yet they produced not only curative but pathogenetic or disease symptoms, and it was not necessary for him even to take the remedy – olfaction was quite sufficient to set up their action. The 30th centesimal potency of Hahnemann represents one decisional part of the original substance. Understanding this, let us take one or two examples of the action of remedies on this youth. I quote Dr. Dudgeon's account :

"Smelling at the 30th dilution of Sepia caused a great number of the symptoms recorded by Hahnemann and some others. The voice became rough, as from catarrh. Speech was slow; gait unsteady. In the afternoon a febrile attack like that recorded in the pathogenesis of Sepia. Sudden, burning eruption on the neck that declined towards evening. Face very red, veins of arms and hands distended. When walking in the evening felt as though ants crawled up his legs to the pit of the stomach, when he felt pressure on the chest; profuse sweat, pain in the limbs. The febrile attack lasted an hour, and ended with a violent rigor. Great prostration next day, pressure in the forehead. In bed, before falling asleep, tearing pains in joints and other parts of the body. Night-sweat so profuse he had to change his night-shirt. Second day, in evening, ringing like a bell in right ear, with headache; then he felt as if a drop fell down on the right side of the head, whereupon the ringing ceased but the headache increased."

All the above was the result of one drug-impact of the decisional dilution of a preparation of Indian ink – the dried contents of the ink-bag of the cuttle-fish. This proves that the question of "large" and "small" in homoeopathic drug-dosage is entirely relative. The "dose" of Sepia which Caspar Hauser received was absolutely beyond the powers of chemical science to measure or estimate, and yet it was enough to bring out striking features of the Sepia effects already pictured by Hahnemann in his own provings.

Now let us take another example. In August, 1829, Caspar Hauser was gaining flesh. He objected to becoming fat, and Dr. Preu treated him for it. Hahnemann had pointed out that Calcarea is useful in the obesity of youthful subjects. Dr. Preu gave Caspar Hauser an olfaction of Calcarea 30, and with this result : Immediately there occurred cough and compression of head; strong smell from the mouth; and he had a feeling of debility after stool. On the second day his clothes had already become looser. He became excoriated by walking and riding; loathing at meat; great falling out of hair; swelling of veins of hands, and heat of face.

Here we have a remedy which, whilst correcting the trouble for which it was given,

produces, in addition, its own characteristic symptoms. There was no question here of a large dose causing symptoms and a small dose curing symptoms, for one and the same dose did both.

The attempted assassination of October 17, 1829, interrupted the series of observations. The wound and the shock threw Caspar back into his previous condition of hyper-sensitiveness to all external impressions, and it was long before he recovered from the effects. His restoration was chiefly effected by mesmerism, to which he was extremely responsive; and Lycopodium was also of use.

After this Caspar Hauser passed out of the care of Professor Daumer and Dr. Preu; and a second attempt at assassination terminated the career of this mysterious and interesting youth.

Caspar Hauser may be taken as a type of homoeopathic sensitives, examples of which are met with by no means unfrequently. In my own practice I have met with many examples of hyper-sensitiveness, scarcely less marked than his. Unless such cases are recognised for what they really are, the patients are apt to be put down as romancers by their medical attendants and given up in despair; whereas, once the truth is perceived, their sensitiveness can be utilised for their own good, and at the same time they will afford a fertile ground of observation to the medical man who has the care of them. What are “likes”?

The Homoeopathic Law says that “Likes cure likes”. Therefore it becomes necessary to make it clear just wherein the likeness between case and remedy lies. The cases already quoted from Hahnemann’s practice have given readers an idea of the points of resemblance which the prescriber has to look for, but it will be useful to look at the matter more in detail.

No long ago it was announced in the daily press that an assistant of Edison’s had lost his life through cancer set up by X-ray burns. This fact made some impression on the public mind, since at the present moment the treatment for cancer most in vogue in the profession (if the case is beyond the reach of the surgeon’s knife) is by these sale X-rays. “Is not this homoeopathy?” asked several inquirers; “X-rays have caused cancer, and they are also used to cure it.” One wise allopathic medical man replied to the query that “he could not see nay resemblance between X-rays and cancer.” Very likely he could not! But then Hahnemann never said that the likeness was to be sought between the physical characters of the remedy and the appearance of the disease from which a patient may be suffering. And it must be remembered that it is Hahnemann’s definition of “likes” which counts, and nobody else’s. The “likes” of homoeopathy are resemblances between drug-effects and disease-effects. The effect of X-rays on some persons is to cause cancer; therefore, says Hahnemann, under favourable conditions, and in suitable persons, X-rays must prove a cure for cancer. That X-rays will not cure all cases of cancer is certain; the suitable cases must be found out by future observation of both the causative and curative effects of the rays themselves.

The “likeness”, then, which homoeopathy looks for is resemblance in effects. There are some drugs which produce such complete pictures of natural diseases that cases of poisoning have been mistaken for them. The annals of poisoning are full of instances of this kind : the medical practitioners in attendance have given certificates of death from natural disease, when later investigation has proved that the death was caused by poisoning. An instance of this kind occurred not long ago in America, when poisoning by

Cyanide of Mercury was certified as death from diphtheria. Again and again cases of Belladonna poisoning have been mistaken for scarlatina. When the resemblance between a drug disease and a natural disease is so close as this, it can be inferred with absolute certainty that the drug which manifests the "likeness" will be a remedy of wide usefulness in the treatment of cases of the disease. Accordingly Mercurius cyanatus is a remedy which homoeopaths of proven usefulness in diphtheria; and Belladonna not only modifies the course and symptoms of scarlatina, but it also acts as a prophylactic against infection. If Belladonna in the 3rd centesimal potency be given to the healthy members of a household when scarlatina breaks out in it, the epidemic will not spread. Were this fact generally known among school proprietors, an enormous amount of trouble, anxiety, and loss might be saved to them. This is one small point in the immense importance of a knowledge of homoeopathy to the community at large.

But it is necessary to guard against the idea that because certain drugs produce a more or less perfect facsimile of certain natural diseases, that every disease must have its natural counterpart and cure. The instances in which a single drug produces such a perfect picture are rare; and when they do occur, it must be understood that many cases of the disease will require other remedies for their cure. Homoeopathy has no cut and dried remedies for cut and dried diseases.

Wherein, then, are we to look for the likeness? It lies in the character of the symptoms produced by the drugs, corresponding with the character of the symptoms present in every case of disease.

Hahnemann quickly discovered that symptoms observed in provings did not all possess equal value. He noticed that when any peculiar or out-of-the-way effect came out in a proving this had especial value in prescribing when the same symptom was met with in a case of disease.

This peculiarity need not be in the actual symptom itself, it may be in the conditions under which it manifests itself; or it may be in some concomitants, which is found associated with it. It is in being able to discern and utilise these points that most of the art of homoeopathy lies, and it is on this that success in treatment largely depends.

To give one or two illustrations. A patient who suffered severely from headache complained that one of her sensations was "as if woollen were wrapped round the head inside the skull." Now that is a most peculiar sensation, and to cure the case it would be necessary to find a symptom somewhat like it accredited to some remedy. In my search, by the aid of repertories, I found this; "Sensation as if a cold cloth were wrapped round the brain." This was produced by the salt of the American spring named Sanicula. I gave it to my patient in the 1000th potency, and it rapidly removed the entire train of symptoms, which also corresponded to other effects of the remedy. In this case the sensation of there being something wrapped round the brain was the peculiar feature in which drug and disease were "like". And although the sensation of the wrapping material was different, the likeness was close enough to effect a cure.

In other cases the point of correspondence that it is essential to match lies in the conditions under which the symptoms appear, or are either better or worse. An octogenarian patient of mine, of very fine physique, a devotee of the morning cold bath, was troubled with a rheumatic pain in the right arm and elbow, which annoyed him very much, as it interfered with a favourite occupation, namely, driving a spirited pair of horses. Now the drugs which produce pains in the arms are legion. It was necessary,

therefore, in this case to ascertain if there was anything peculiar in the time or circumstances under which the pain occurred I elicited that the pain woke him in the night, and the only way in which he could get relieve was by getting into his cold bath; after this he could return to bed and sleep.

Now here was a marked peculiarity – relief from cold bathing. Most rheumatic conditions are worse from contact with water of any kind, and especially cold water. Among the drugs which cause rheumatic pains which are relieved by cold baths there is one which stands out pre-eminent, and this is *Ledum palustre*. *Ledum palustre* 30 was given and quickly cured the patient. (It may interest some of my readers, and enable them to tack this characteristic condition to their memories, if I mention that the plant flourishes in cold water – that the marshes are its home). I instance this case to show the usefulness in homeopathy of noting peculiar conditions. All repertories to the *Materia Medica* must, to be complete, include in their indices a list of Conditions under which symptoms are better or worse, or appear or disappear.

Another class of conditions which are of great importance to watch in prescribing are Conditions of Time. It is well known that some complaints are worse at certain hours of the day or night, and very often this condition is of as much importance from the prescriber's point of view as the symptom itself. A very common symptom in connection with many diseases is a "sinking", "empty" sensation, occurring at times when the patient would not ordinarily be hungry. Now many remedies have caused this sensation, and among them is Sulphur. But the time when the Sulphur sensation is most marked is from 11 a.m. to noon. Other medicines have the same peculiarity but not so markedly at this hour; when a 'sinking' sensation is complained of at about 11 o'clock, Sulphur will be the most likely remedy to relieve the whole condition.

A very characteristic time of aggravation has been noticed in connection with *Lycopodium*, and this is from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m. or to 8 p.m. When this particular time of aggravation appears in any complaint, the likeness to the time-aggravation of *Lycopodium* will give a very strong point, indeed, in favour of that remedy being the right one; and if other symptoms correspond it must be given.

Conditions of motion or rest, of heat or cold, are other points of importance in the "likeness" between remedies and cases, which the homeopath has to take into careful account in making his prescriptions.

Another point of "likeness" lies in accompanying conditions, or "concomitants", as they are called. Some patients manifest certain morbid symptoms as a regular accompaniment of other complaints. For instance, a patient has neuralgia, and every time the pain comes on it is accompanied by an attack of sickness and vomiting. Now of all the remedies which cause sickness, *Ipecacuanha* is one of the first which will be thought of. We all know *Ipecacuanha* wine, and most of us have experienced its effect at one period or other of our lives. The nauseating property of *Ipecacuanha* dominates, in a sense, all its other effects. If it causes pain, the pain is accompanied by nausea or vomiting. If it causes fever, the chill is accompanied by nausea or vomiting. Thus it comes about that any kind of illness which sets up as a concomitant effect nausea or vomiting may find in *Ipecacuanha* its "likeness" or counterpart, and hence its remedy.

In a similar way the sleep-causing power in *Opium* dominates its effects, and whenever excessive drowsiness accompanies other complaints it will very probably be found that

Opium will prove the remedy most like to the case.

These are a few of the points of “likeness” which the homoeopath must look for if he is to make successful prescriptions. This is the “likeness” which Hahnemann referred to when he formulated his law that “Likes cure Likes”. To the unprofessional observer it might seem a more desirable thing to find pictures of entire diseases, and thus find a remedy for each; but in practice that would not work so well. Hahnemann has by the art he revealed liberated the *Materia Medica* and the prescriber. Any remedy is thus available for use in a case of any disease, and the prescriber is free to select his remedy throughout the entire range.

Serum therapeutics and nosodes

It can hardly have escaped the notice of intelligent observers that the recently introduced treatment of diseases by “serums” and “vaccines” is a species of homeopathy – of likes curing likes. This was, indeed, admitted by Dr. Roux, one of the discoverers of the anti-diphtheritic serum. 1 The process by which this serum is obtained is by diluting the original poison by introducing it into the blood-current of the horse. The blood drawn from the horse after such treatment correspond to a homeopathic attenuation of the original virus. The method of administering the serum – by injection under the skin – is not a method much in favour among homoeopaths; but the treatment is certainly on the like-to-like principle.

Homoeopaths, as I mentioned above in my reference to Tuberculin, have recognised the possibility of making remedies from the viruses of diseases themselves, in the same way as they have tamed for therapeutic use the poisons of serpents and stings of insects. Hahnemann himself was the first to recognise this possibility. Only, in homoeopathy, a diseases-remedy must be used like every other remedy on the indications afforded by its effects. Take Tuberculin for an example. Tuberculin will not cure every case of tuberculosis; whilst, on the other hand, Tuberculin will cure many affections which are only remotely allied to tuberculosis, or which are not tuberculous at all. Tuberculin and all other “nosodes”, as they are called in homeopathic terminology, must be studied like all other remedies in their effects on the healthy. To this end they must be proved, and proved in the high potencies. This is rendered possible by the homoeopathic method of preparing the potencies, and by the existence of persons sensitive to agencies in this form. Hahnemann made the first proving of a nosode, namely, the nosode of Psora, named Psorinum is one of the most trusted agents in the *Materia Medica*, answering curatively in any case in which its leading features are prominent.

It has been contended that this is not homoeopathy – cure by “likes” – but isopathy – cure by “identicals”. Hahnemann met this objection by showing that the homoeopathically prepared nosode is not identical with the original virus, but only like it, the process of preparation having altered it. “I call Psorinum”, he says, “a homoeopathic antipsoric, because, of the preparation of Psorinum did not alter its nature to that of a homeopathic remedy, it never could have any effect upon an organism tainted with the same identical virus. The psoric virus, by undergoing the processes of trituration and shaking, becomes just as much altered in its nature as gold does, the homeopathic preparations of which are not inert substances in the animal economy, but powerfully acting agents.” (*Chronic Diseases*, vol. i., p. 196.)

The value of nosodes in homoeopathic practice is becoming every day more and more apparent. The late Dr. J. C. Burnett did more than any other single observer to develop

the great therapeutic powers which lie ready to our hands in these altered disease agents.

Among the first observations made by Hahnemann was the fact that diseases which are like each other are incompatible in the same patient at the same time, whereas two unlike diseases can be actively present together in one and the same patient. Like diseases, he noticed, would cure the effects of each other. The relation of vaccinia to small-pox is a case in point; and how the advocates of vaccination can get over this glaring piece of homoeopathy it is difficult to see.

An instance of how one disease may cure an effect of another disease came under my own notice and may be mentioned here. A girl of about 10 or 11 had scarlatina whilst away in the country for her holiday. She recovered from the attack of the disease, but it left her with an affection of the kidneys resulting in passing blood with the urine. This condition persisted and was present when she returned to London and came under my care. It took a considerable time to get rid of the trouble, which was always liable to return from any slight cause. At last she was well enough to go back to school and she had not been there many days before she caught measles. This she had pretty severely, and at the height of it a great aggravation of the old haematuria set in. After that it never occurred again. The measles-poison cured the case homoeopathically, first producing a severe aggravation. For measles can cause haematuria as well as scarlatina.

This was an instance of a homeopathic cure by one disease of a part of another disease. The resemblance between the two diseases is not close enough for the one to cure or prevent the other entirely. But nosodes are like other homeopathic remedies, and can be used as freely : it is not necessary for a case and a remedy to correspond at all points in order that therapeutic action may ensue. When some points of similarity exist, curative action will follow to the extent of the correspondence.

How to practise homoeopathy

There is no need for any one to depend on Hahnemann, or any one else, in the practice of homoeopathy. If he does not trust Hahnemann's provings, Hahnemann has taught him how to make provings for himself. Hahnemann's crowning virtue is that he has brought us into immediate contact with Nature's forces, stripped from all artificial academic veils. The Law of Similars is ready to serve any one who wishes to make use of it. Hahnemann could no more take out a patent on his law than Newton could on the Law of Gravity.

This is not the place in which to describe in detail a complete system of homeopathic practice. Larger works must be consulted by medical students and practitioners, and the various domestic works by the laity. But I can give my readers one little bit of practice which most of them will be able to test sooner or later.

In homoeopathy we have, as I have shown over and over again, no specifics for diseases. At the same time there are some remedies which cover such a large number of cases of a given disease that they may be regarded as quasi-specifics. Now we most of us know something of the properties of the common onion. It is the recognised agent for procuring artificial tears and a artificial cold in the head – sneezing, nose-blowing, and the rest. Should any of my readers not be content to accept this as a genuine effect of the onion, let them procure from a homeopathic chemist the tincture of onion (*Allium cepa f*) and take a teaspoonful of that in a little water two or three times a day. They will find that this will produce the same effect, only more marked, and a great many other effects besides. They will probably also find that the cold produced by *Allium cepa* has this peculiarity, that the nose-blowing and cough is better out of doors and worse in a warm room.

Now the suggestion I am going to make is that any one who wishes to know by experience whether or not homeopathy is a true law of Nature, should procure from a homeopathic chemist of repute a bottle of discs, or pilules, medicated with tincture of *Allium cepa* 12, and the next time they take a cold let them take a dose every hour and see what happens. I do not promise that it will cure every cold, but it will cure a large number; and if the characteristic condition, “worse in a room, better in the open air”, is present, it can hardly fail to cure the cold in a remarkably short space of time.

Those who are content to take the provings as they stand may save themselves the trouble of re-proving the *Materia Medica* and use the remedies on the indications given. In homoeopathic nurseries, castor oil, Gregory’s powder, and brimstone and treacle are unknown. *Nux vomica*, Sulphur, and a few other remedies, in tasteless preparations, are equal to all the common wants. The deadliest poisons under homoeopathic manipulation become household friends. Take, for example, the deadly Aconite.

One of the greatest crimes Hahnemann was supposed by his contemporaries to have committed was his neglect of blood-letting. In Aconite Hahnemann found the agent which enabled him to meet the conditions for which blood-letting was most in request. In proving Aconite Hahnemann noticed it produced the chill, anxiety, fear, and irritable restlessness which characterise the first stage of fevers and inflammatory states. And experience proved that Aconite, in homeopathic form, was a most potent means of remedying these dangerous conditions at the outset. But Aconite will not cure all fevers, and it is not to be used unless its leading indications are present.

I mention this because the success of homeopaths in curing states of fever with Aconite has led allopaths to use the same remedy in fevers regardless of its finer indications. They give it in the strong tincture to “knock down temperatures” – a very dangerous practice, because Aconite is not a thing to trifle with in these low preparations.

However, most homoeopathic mothers can sing its praises from what they have observed of its effects. There is no need for actual fever – or raised temperature – to be present in order to obtain its curative action. For simple sleeplessness, with restless tossing, it is one of the leading remedies; and here again it has often proved one of the best friends of the nursery.

For further practical details other works, as I have already said, must be consulted; but before leaving the subject, I should like to make one remark in reference to homoeopathic remedies. Any one who wishes to test them should obtain them direct from some homoeopathic chemist, and not from a general chemist or from “stores”. The preparation of homoeopathic remedies demands care and honesty on the part of the chemist, and it is only right that these should be recognised in the only possible way by paying a fair price for them. He who buys homoeopathic medicines at a stores because they are a few pence cheaper is apt to fare indifferently for his economy. Years ago a patient of mine complained to me that the medicines I prescribed did not act. I asked where he had had them dispensed. He referred to a certain large establishment at which he held a high appointment. I told him I would not take the trouble to prescribe for him if he ever went there again for his medicines. He went to a homoeopathic chemist after this, and the result was so entirely satisfactory that he had no temptation to be “economical” in this direction thereafter.

Some comparative statistics.

From Tract V. I will now give a few figures of comparative statistics. The first set relates

to cases of pneumonia treated in Vienna, and are taken from Dr. Routh's pamphlet, *Fallacies of Homoeopathy*. Dr. Routh tries to discount the lesson of the figures by saying that in the homoeopathic hospital "the severe cases were few and far between". Here, however, we have an independent witness, who actually saw the cases and testifies to their gravity.

"Sir William Wilde, the eminent Dublin oculist, who personally inspected the same hospital, says in his work on Austria: 'I am bound to say that the cases I saw treated in the Vienna Homeopathic Hospital were fully as acute and virulent as those that have come under my observation elsewhere'. Here are Dr. Routh's statistics of the comparative mortality in particular diseases:

Pneumonia, or Inflammation of the Lungs.

Cases Died.- Mortality.

Under homoeopathic treatment 782 45 5.7 per cent, or 1 in 17

Under allopathic treatment 1522 373 24.5 percent, or 1 in 4

Pleurisy, or Inflammations of Serous Membrane of the Lungs.

Under homoeopathic treatment 384 12 3 per cent, or 1 in 32

Under allopathic treatment 1017 134 13 per cent, or 1 in 7

Peritonitis, or Inflammation of Serous Membrane of the Abdomen.

Under homoeopathic treatment 187 8 4 per cent, or 1 in 23

Under allopathic treatment 628 84 13 per cent, or 1 in 7 ½

The superiority of homeopathy in the treatment of cholera is almost too well known to need repetition. Here, however, are some of the figures.

At Tischnowitz on Moravia, Dr. Quin, the introducer of homeopathy into Great Britain, witnessed the effect of homoeopathy in an epidemic of cholera, and himself treated twenty-nine cases with only three deaths. The total number of cases treated is as under:

Cases. Deaths. Per cent.

Under allopathy 331 140 42

Under homoeopathy 278 29 10

Under camphor only 71 11 15.5

Of the Vienna epidemic of 1836, Sir William Wilde says in his work on Austria (p. 275): "Upon comparing the report of the treatment of cholera in this hospital with that of the same disease in the other hospitals in Vienna during the same period, it appeared that while two-thirds of the cases treated by Dr. Fleischmann recovered, two-thirds of those treated by the ordinary methods in the other hospitals died."

The superiority of the homeopathic treatment was so evident on this occasion that it led to the repeal by the Austrian government of the ordinances prohibiting the practice of homeopathy in the Austrian States which had hitherto disgraced its statute-books.

The figures of the London epidemic of 1854 give the mortality at the Homeopathic Hospital as 16.4 per cent. against 51.8 per cent. in the allopathic hospitals. The credit of the above result is due to Dr. Hamilton, Mr. Cameron, and Dr. Mackechnie, who treated all the cases brought to the Homeopathic Hospital; and the government Inspector, Dr. Macloughlin, wrote to Mr. Cameron, one of the medical officers of the hospital: - "All I saw were true cases of cholera in the various stages of the disease, and I saw several cases which did well under your treatment, which I have no hesitation in saying would have sunk under any other." He further added that, though an allopath, if he were unfortunate enough to take cholera himself, he would have himself taken to the



Homeopathic Hospital for treatment.

I will make a final quotation from Tract 5 before leaving the subject of cholera.

“In 1831, on the appearance of cholera in Germany, Hahnemann published a pamphlet, in which he recommended camphor as the true remedy for the first stage of cholera. The experience of homeopathic practitioners in that epidemic and in every subsequent epidemic amply confirmed the curative power of camphor in this stage of the disease. The most brilliant illustration of Hahnemann’s prescient wisdom was afforded by the experience of Dr. Rubini in the epidemic of cholera in Naples in 1854-5. With camphor alone he treated in the R. Albergo dei Poveri (corresponding to our workhouse infirmary) 225 cases of cholera without a single death, and 166 soldiers of the 3rd Swiss Regiment with similar success. In the last epidemic in Naples, in 1884, Dr. Rubini, then eighty-four years old, was absent from the town in attendance on a sick brother in the country, but the medical men attached to the homeopathic dispensary there treated 83 cases with camphor alone, and of these only three died. This extraordinary success of the camphor treatment in the early stage of cholera is a splendid testimony to the genius of Hahnemann and to the sufficiency of Homoeopathy to grapple successfully with the most terrible diseases.”

In the Homeopathic World of July, 1889, are given the comparative statistics of the treatment of an epidemic which visited Melbourne, Australia, in the first three months of that year. The following is a list of the cases treated at three hospitals, two of them allopathic, with the number of deaths and percentage in each case. They are taken from the Melbourne Herald of April 29th, 1889 :

N° of Beds N° of typhoid cases Deaths Per cent.

Melbourne

Hospital, 318 431 78 18.1

Alfred

Hospital, 144 324 50 15.4

Homoeopathic

Hospital, 60 305 22 7.2

It will be observed that the Homoeopathic Hospital, with much smaller accommodation than the others, was able to treat nearly as many cases, the reason being that the patients were got well in a much shorter time.

Is homoeopathy spreading?

Considering that homoeopathy (dating from the appearance of the Organon) is only ninety-five years old, and that its founder has only been dead little over sixty years, the extension of the system throughout the world does not leave very much to complain of. In essential characteristics the medical profession has not changed much since the days of Molière. The famous saying of the men of Harvey’s day – “We would rather be in error with Galen than think rightly with that upstart Harvey”, sounds ridiculous in our ears, but the lineal descendants of these men are quite ready to say, either openly or in their hearts, the very same thing of Hahnemann and homoeopathy at the present day. Considering, the, that in this comparatively short time, in the face of unheard-of persecutions and difficulties, homoeopathy has abolished bleeding from general practice, has done away with wholesale mercurialisings, and has spread itself to every quarter of the civilised globe, there is certainly no room for despondency. At the present moment there are some 18,000 duly-qualified medical practitioners openly practising according to Hahnemann’s method. How many more there are who practise homeopathy secretly, for fear of the

medical scribes and pharisees, it is impossible to say; but their numbers cannot be small. In the free atmosphere of the United States homoeopathic institutions have flourished amazingly. Homoeopaths have their own fully-equipped medical schools, in perfect equality with allopathic institutions in the eye of the law; many most important Government hospitals and asylums are manned by homoeopathic practitioners; and other homoeopathic institutions are partly subsidised by the more important of the States.

In the British Islands and on the Continent of Europe, the “Molièrian” conditions are too powerful to admit of the generality of medical men looking at a question on its bare merits : they look at it in the light of the sentiments they have imbibed in the schools.

Have any of the scribes and pharisees believed? we are sometimes asked. Not a few, we reply, have stepped out of the ranks, and emancipated themselves from the paralysing traditions of their order. Others have made a show of liberality, but have been driven back again into evil ways by the force of the uninstructed professional opinion they encountered. An amusing instance of this occurred some years ago. At the Annual Meeting of the British Medical Association held at Ryde in 1881, Mr. Barrow, the President of the Meeting, Dr. Bristowe, President of the Medical Section, and Mr. Jonathan Hutchinson, President of the Surgical Section, each, in his opening address, advocated the adoption, on the part of the Association, of a spirit of fairness towards homoeopathy and homoeopaths. Nothing more than this was suggested, yet the storm the suggestion aroused was such that each of the speakers was promptly silenced, and never ventured to refer to the subject in public again. The following year, at the Worcester Meeting, the Council of the Association reported on the incident as follows :

“The question of homoeopathy ... unfortunately mooted in the addresses in medicine and surgery at the Annual Meeting at Ryde, has occupied much time and thought on the part of the Committee of Council.

“Immediately on the delivery of those addresses the idea arose in many minds that the views enunciated by the readers of the addresses had in some way been put forwards [through them] by the Committee of Council itself” – terrible thought! – “and it was not until the President of the Council, Dr. Bristowe, and Mr. Hutchinson had severally and in the most public manner shown that this was not so, that the feeling was allayed.”

I quote the above to show the slavish state of feeling that exists in the profession. If men like !Dr. Bristowe and Mr. Hutchinson, at the head of the profession, are capable of being coerced by the ignorance and prejudice of the rank and file in this ignominious way, how is it likely that much liberty of thought and action is to be expected of medical students? It is not likely; and yet, in spite of the unlikeliness, many do come forward to recruit the ranks of homoeopathic practitioners. But the number who come is not sufficient to minister to the wants of the homoeopathic public. Among the public, homoeopathy is spreading rapidly; but as many of the converts have no doctor of their faith to minister to them when taken ill, they are obliged to send for an allopath to advise them; and they use their own judgement as to whether they take his medicines or not.

The allopathic medical journals are always crying out against the multiplication of quacks and quack remedies. They have nothing but their own stupid prejudice to thank for it. A stiff and starchy professionalism prevents them from learning how to cure their patients, and the public are not slow to find this out. What wonder, then, that they largely patronise the skilful and daring advertisers of patent nostrums? Homoeopathic practitioners are very little troubled with defections of their patients to the pill-

manufacturer; and if the old school would only consent to learn the art of curing from Hahnemann, its journals would have little cause to lament the success of unlicensed medicine-men.

In another way homoeopathy is spreading – by the adoption of its remedies into the practice of allopathic doctors, and their incorporation in allopathic text-books. This latter kind of “conveying” has been carried on wholesale by the authors of several medical works – almost invariably without acknowledgement of the source of their appropriations.

A large number of these appropriations have been collected by Dr. Dyce Brown in a pamphlet published by the British Homoeopathic Association. This pamphlet is entitled “The Permeation of Present-day Medicine by Homoeopathy”.

But this method of spreading homoeopathy is of little use; the drugs may be appropriated, but unless the principle is apprehended, no real progress is made. This the British Homoeopathic Association is well aware of, and has set itself the task of redeeming the situation. It aims at nothing less than the establishment and endowment of a permanent College of Homoeopathy in the heart of the British Empire. In the furtherance of this object it confidently relies on obtaining the moral and material support of every homoeopath.

Some objections answered

In the course of conversion at a public dinner the subject of homoeopathy cropped up, and my neighbour, a layman of intelligence, frankly stated the objections he had to the system, looked at from the outside. He owned that he had no personal acquaintance with homoeopathy, and had not studied it; but it seemed to him that a man who did not pin himself to a system was more free to use any and every means of benefiting a patient than one who did. Further, he thought that medicines which were of such an innocent nature that they could be safely prescribed in domestic practice, must have very little power of doing any good at all. I will take these two objections and discuss them in their order.

Homoeopathy trammels its adherents

This is a very natural view for any one not acquainted with the system to take. Really the very opposite is the case. Homeopathy does not fetter its adherents : it sets them free. It gives those who follow it a point of view from which they can discern clearly all remedial means that are brought forward, and judge them at their proper worth. By its double-sided method of studying drugs it can estimate their power and use them with a precision unknown to allopathy. Further, it can take advantage and make good use of the mistakes and over-dosings of the allopaths, which invariably occur with drugs newly brought out. For example, when chloral was first launched upon the medical world, it was declared to be perfectly harmless, and was given in large doses to numbers of patients. In some instances severe attacks of nettle-rash followed its use. This at once showed to homoeopaths its power over skin disease, and it has been used by them in certain cases of nettle-rash ever since. Again, when salicylic acid and its salts were first given in cases of rheumatism, it produced in many patients who were over-dosed with it, deafness, noises in the ears, and vertigo. The hint was at once taken by homoeopaths, and salicylate of soda in its homoeopathic form has cured many patients suffering from a disease which presents this distressing set of symptoms, and is called after the man who first described it; “Menière’s disease”. I may mention also the drug Thyroidin, lately brought forward as a remedy for a disease called myxoedema. This drug (prepared from the thyroid gland of

the sheep) has produced alarming symptoms in many patients, and in the hands of homeopaths has been used successfully in cases presenting similar symptoms. Homoeopaths are free to use anything, - just as free as allopaths; only they have this advantage : knowing the doublesidedness of drug action – that a drug can cure conditions like those it can produce in the healthy – they have a much more intimate knowledge of any drug that is brought forward than an allopath can have. The latter has to blunder on in the dark, and learn from his mistakes can never teach him so much as they teach a homoeopath.

But, really, there is no comparison between the system of homeopathy and the no-system of allopathy. There is reason, light, and orderly progress in the one; there is nothing but chaotic fragments in the other. Homoeopathy no more trammels its adherents than the laws of Nature trammel the mechanician.

Homoeopathy is too harmless to be of any use

It is quite true that homoeopathy is of no use for poisoning vermin or for killing patients. If patients must die, it prefers that they shall die a natural death. It is also true that the homoeopathic preparations of deadly poisons may be used with perfect safety in household practice. But it does not follow that because a preparation cannot kill, therefore it cannot cure.

I may here mention incidentally another objection that has been raised : - “If homoeopathy is true”, it is said, “a drug must cure in the same dose as that in which it has caused the symptoms for which it is given.” But the objector in this case leaves out of account the difference in the sensitiveness of the human organism under the different conditions of health and disease. Homoeopathy simply demands that there shall be a correspondence between the disease symptoms and the drug symptoms. The rest is a matter of experience, and experience shows that in a normal healthy state the organism requires a larger dose of a drug to disturb it than it does to restore it when similarly disturbed by disease. The difference in the sensitiveness of an organ in health and disease may be seen any time. Take an inflamed eye and compare that with a normal eye in its reaction to light. A normal eye can bear a very strong light which to an inflamed eye would cause exquisite pain.

This fact supplies the answer to the objection to homeopathic medicines, on the score of their harmlessness. Remarking, by the way, that it would be well for the world if all drugs were equally harmless, I may add that the sensitiveness of the diseased human organism to the homoeopathically indicated drug is intensified beyond conception. It is impossible to get the dose too small if attenuated in the graduated manner directed by Hahnemann. And even in certain individuals when not diseased there is a peculiar sensitiveness to certain drugs infinitely transcending the sensitiveness of Drosera to phosphate of ammonia, which gave Darwin such a fright. Some persons cannot be in the attic of a house whilst a few grains of Ipecacuanha are being powdered in the basement without being powerfully affected thereby. In the Homeopathic World on July, 1885, I quoted the report of a case from the British Medical Journal of February 7, of the same year, in which a medical man tells how he nearly killed a patient by simply applying a linseed poultice, though the patient protested that every time such a poultice had been applied she had had an intense attack of asthma. The doctor pooh-poohed her statement, insisted on the poultices being applied to her leg (which was ulcerated), with the result that three hours later he was “summoned to see her, as her sister thought she was dying”. And he

continues : “I found her livid, and struggling for breath, and certainly in as bad an attack of asthma as I ever saw”. To an allopath an observation of this kind is a curiosity and nothing more To a homoeopath it is full of useful significance.

It is exceptional to find a patient as sensitive as this to a remedy not homoeopathically related to the case. But in disease, the patient becomes excessively sensitive to the remedy which has caused corresponding symptoms, that is to say, to the remedy which is homeopathic to his condition. Experience taught Hahnemann that a very much smaller amount of the corresponding drug was needed to cure than that required to produce the symptoms. Experience has confirmed the fact in the practice of thousands of his followers; and it now remains established beyond the possibility of disproof.

I will now pass on to answer other objections we sometimes hear.

Homeopathy has no tonics

On the contrary; every properly chosen homoeopathic remedy is a tonic to the case treated. Again and again I have been asked by patients, “Was not that a tonic you gave me? my appetite has been so much better since I took it”, when it was merely the appropriate homoeopathic remedy. By “tonic”, people generally understand something which increases the appetite and the feeling of strength. The appropriate remedy will do both; but this implies that the patient is in a state of debility. There are no such things as “tonics” in an absolute sense. Quinine is only “tonic” when given for debility; when taken in health it is one of the most debilitating drugs known. The same may be said of Arsenic, Iron, Phosphorus, and Strychnine. They are only “tonic” to special kinds of debility, like those they are capable of creating. There is thus an inconceivable amount of harm done by indiscriminate indulgence in “tonics”. It is a relic of the old barbarous treatment of names of diseases by names of drugs, against which Hahnemann protested. A patient is feeling “want of tone”; what could be simpler than to take a “tonic”? In nine cases out of ten the result is slow poisoning. In homoeopathy we differentiate the different kinds of debility, and prescribe the remedy which corresponds, in a dose which is quite large enough to remove the debility without depositing a mineral or vegetable poison in the patient’s body to breed future trouble. In a large number of cases of debility there is one of the chronic miasms at the bottom of it. Relieve the system of that by the appropriate homeopathic remedy, and the feeling of wellness and natural appetite at once return without the help of strong drugs.

Homoeopathy has no aperients

This is often alleged against homeopathy as a grave defect. Homeopaths hold themselves free to make use of the physiological effects of any drug it they think the occasion calls for it, only they do not delude themselves with the idea that they are curing a patient of constipation by simply ordering a purge. Homeopaths have a much higher opinion of the unaided powers of nature than allopaths, lay or medical, entertain. Some of the latter think that no natural function can be properly carried out unless assisted by some drug – no meal can be digested without the aid of some digestive, or else some mineral water. The perpetual resort to aperients on the part of such vast numbers is another relic of barbarism, and a survival of the Faculty’s teachings in the days when the whole of medical practice was summed up in bleeding, purging, and administering lavements. A young medical man, fresh from one of the London schools, recently told me that there was always a sigh of relief from the physician when examining a patient in the wards if he found that he had constipation, for ten he knew what to prescribe – a purgative.

The thing that is lost sight of by allopaths is that constipation is a constitutional disease. A purgative does not cure it, but only gives temporary relief, and aggravates the actual condition. Homoeopathy cures constipation without any purging. The drugs most used by the allopaths to check diarrhoea – Opium, Sulphur, Nux vomica, Lead, Alum, and many other so-called astringents – have cured in their homoeopathic form the most inveterate cases of constipation without any disturbance whatever. Homoeopathy has thus the very best of aperients; and though it does not possess and does not want active purgatives, homoeopaths are free to use drugs in that way if in any case they think it worth while as a temporary expedient. The need for that is so rare, however, in the practice of many homoeopaths, as to be scarcely worth taking into account.

Homoeopathy cures too quickly

The most valid argument against homeopathy was given me by a doctor in the navy who related a case. The ship this doctor was appointed to was stationed in the Red Sea during one of the Egyptian wars, and acted as hospital ship to the fighting force on shore. During this time many cases of dysentery were received on board, and as my friend found no satisfactory treatment for it under allopathy, and as he knew something about homeopathy, he determined to treat his cases according to Hahnemann's method. The cases all presented symptoms like those produced by Mercurius corrosivus, and this he gave in minute doses with the result that his patients got well in a very short time.

One officer – and it is his case that I particularly allude to – was brought on board exceedingly ill with dysentery; but to every one's astonishment he recovered under the treatment by Mercurius corrosivus so rapidly that he became perfectly well and ready to return to duty in a very short time. The day after he rejoined his regiment, the next battle of the campaign was fought, and he was the first man to be killed on the British side! Under allopathy he could not possibly have got well in time.

The hopefulness and harmlessness of homoeopathy. conservative medicine

From what has already been said, many of the advantages of the new system over the old "no-system" will have become apparent to all. But there is one pervading advantage, and that is, the hopefulness of homoeopathy as compared with allopathy. Homeopathy is a system of "cure", whereas allopathy professes to do nothing more than "treat" or palliate. Homoeopathy actually restores sick persons to health; and if they are past cure it affords the most perfect palliation that can be found. The hopefulness of homoeopathy is an outcome of the idea Hahnemann formed of the nature of disease, as not being so much a gross material alteration of the structures and functions as a disorder of the vital force. Looking at disease in this light, homoeopaths are not dismayed in the presence of tumours and changes of solid structures, as are the members of the old school.

Homoeopaths know from experience that a very large proportion of tumours can be acted upon by medicines, and that the vital process which has produced them can be reversed. Whilst the allopath knows no better way of dealing with morbid growths than by cutting them off (which, whilst it cuts off the growth, leaves the disease behind in the organism), homoeopaths seek to get rid of the growth by curing the patient of the diseased state of which the growth is but a manifestation.

In the same way homoeopaths approach many other diseases which in allopathy are relegated to the surgeon, such as fistulae of various kinds, diseases of bones, and haemorrhoidal tumours. This is what I venture to call "conservative medicine". In days gone by the remedy for many serious affections of the limbs was amputation. Later

improvements in surgical methods have shown that it is possible to save many limbs which were formerly condemned. This is what is called conservative surgery. But there is room for much improvement yet. Many operations which are now performed would be spared to the patient if only the conservative powers of homoeopathic medicine were widely known.

It is true the ways of homoeopathy are very gentle and unobtrusive, whilst surgical methods are attended with much pomp and circumstance – and expense. To cut off a breast for tumour, and leave a patient mutilated for life, is only the work of half an hour; to cure the patient of her diseased state, and leave her sound and healthy, may be the work of months or years. Many patients, who fancy the tumour is the whole of their disease, prefer the shorter plan, as they think it; and in the majority of cases it is the shorter plan, for it materially shortens the patient's life. Homeopathy, rightly understood and practised, saves the operating surgeon a vast amount of work.

#### Gentleness of homoeopathy

There is a motto which has come down to us from the medical world of antiquity which, until homoeopathy came, was more honoured in the breach than in the observance. The motto runs : “Primum non nocere”; and may be translated : “Whatever you do, don't damage your patient in your attempt to help him.” If this motto had always been respected, the patient-world would never have had to undergo the wholesale bleedings and mercurialisings of the past; nor should we now encounter patients made deaf by quinine or salicylates, or damaged in some way or other by the fashionable drugs of the day.

The action of homoeopathic remedies is essentially gentle. There is no compelling of the organs to act in certain ways at all costs. The dynamised homoeopathic remedy is freed from all crude, poisonous drug effects, and if it fails to help a patient it will not leave a residue of a crude drug in the blood.

The working of a homoeopathic remedy is like the working of nature itself – it is often imperceptible. The patient finds himself cured, and does not know how it took place. As Hahnemann described the effects of drugs on the healthy as “positive effects”, the action of homoeopathic remedies on the sick be described as “negative effects”. They do not force the organism, but they relieve the organism from the influence which hindering the return to health, and induce the vital force to resume its normal healthful reaction and vibrations. The gentle action of homeopathic remedies is, therefore, the true fulfilment of the ancient motto, “Primum non nocere”.

#### Conclusion : homoeopathy in aphorisms

I will conclude this treatise by summing up the elements of Homoeopathy in a series of Aphorisms.

##### The law

I.

All medicinal substances have the power of causing disease when given to persons in health.

II.

Each medicinal substance has a power of producing peculiar to itself.

III.

Symptoms are the natural language of disease, and symptoms are also the natural language of drug-action.

IV.

A drug's power can be learned by studying the symptoms it has produced when given to persons in health.

V.

Hahnemann was the first to systematically study the powers of medicines in this way; taking them himself when in health, and giving them to his friends; observing and recording the effects which followed.

VI.

This he called "proving" (or testing) medicines; those who allowed themselves to be experimented on he called "provers"; and the records of the symptoms produced he called "provings".

VII.

Out of these provings he constructed his *Materia Medica*; so arranging the symptoms of each drug as to present a picture of its disease-producing power.

VIII.

Drug diseases resemble natural diseases.

IX.

The Law of similars affirms that, in a given case of natural disease, that drug which has produced symptoms most like the symptoms of the case, will be the most certain, when administered, to work a cure.

X.

The practical Rule which is the outcome of this Law is formulated thus :

"*Similia similibus curentur.*"

"Let likes be treated (or cured) by likes."

XI.

Homoeopathy is the art of selecting and administering medicines in accordance with this Rule and the Principle on which it is founded.

XII.

A medicine is said to be homoeopathic to a given diseased condition when it has produced in a healthy person symptoms similar to those which characteristic that condition.

The dose

I.

The susceptibility to the action of medicines varies greatly in different persons.

II.

It also varies in the same person at different times according to the peculiar state of health or disease the person may be in.

III.

In disease the human body is infinitely more susceptible to the action of a drug which is homoeopathic to the morbid condition than it is to the action of the same drug in health : it is also, in disease, infinitely more sensitive to the homoeopathic drug than it is to one that is not homeopathic.

IV.

A drug which may have produced a morbid condition when given in large dose, will remove a condition, presenting similar symptoms (if arising from another cause) when given in a dose exceedingly small.

V.



One and the same drug may be homoeopathic to a great variety of diseased conditions.

VI.

All that is needed is that the leading symptoms of a case should find their counterpart in characteristic symptoms produced by the drug.

VII.

The drug may have produced many other symptoms which do not correspond to symptoms of the disease besides those which do, but this in no way impairs its efficacy in any particular case.

VIII.

When, in a case of disease, we wish to evoke one part of the action of a drug for the cure, without exciting those other disease-producing powers of the drug which are not homoeopathic to the case, we are able to do so by diminishing the dose.

IX.

We are enabled to do this because of the increased susceptibility in disease, and because this increase of susceptibility only extends, as a rule, so far as the drug is homoeopathic.

X.

We can in this way use the most deadly poisons as remedies without fear of producing anything but good effects.

XI.

For this discovery, and for the invention of an effectual method of graduated attenuation of medicinal substances, we are also indebted to Hahnemann.

XII.

There are some substances which, though inert or nearly so when taken in their natural state, become, when finely divided after Hahnemann's method, powerful agents both for deranging health and restoring it when deranged. Graduated attenuation by Hahnemann's method increases dynamic power.

XIII.

In many cases the more highly attenuated a medicine is, the more powerful is its medicinal action. "Dynamisation" is therefore a more correct term to employ than "attenuation".