

lessly and resolutely attack every one who presumes to infringe or encroach upon our principles.

Like all men whose popularity depends upon their pretensions, he comes before the people as a titled dignitary. He represents himself as being not only "Doctor of Medicine," but as "Master of Arts." In reference to the latter title, I *know* he has never taken the legitimate course to attain it, nor has he the acquirements which its signification imports, but that it is simply and only honorary. I am at a loss to know what art he is master of, unless it be the art of *humbuggery*.

He advertizes himself as a lecturer upon the subjects of "Health, Homeopathy, Physiology," &c. At the same time calling special attention to the many flattering notices given him by the journals in the various localities where he has lectured, which the dear people little suspect are all written by *himself*.

Was lecturing his only object, and would he sail under his true colors, we would not notice him. But that is only his *ostensible* object, and intended as an advertisement of his real object, which is to treat diseases empirically.

Permit me to briefly institute a comparison between his method of treating diseases and that laid down by our authors, and leave your readers to judge of his merits thereby. He proposes to treat chronic diseases only, which he does after this wise. The afflicted visit him at his rooms, state their cases, and conclude with an appeal to his pretended skill. He answers by assurances of speedy relief, and that he will be a God-send to them. He then prescribes to each patient two bottles of medicine, (sufficient to last six months,) with di-

rections to take of each bottle two or three times per week; charges his usual fee of from £1 to £2 10s., according to the length of their purse; bows them politely from his room, never *expecting* or *wishing* to see them again.

Now this might all appear perfectly right to any one not acquainted with the true homeopathic method of treating chronic diseases. But let us see what our authors say.

Dr. Jhar, than whom there is no better homeopathic authority, says "that *true, durable and radical cures are never effected by the direct action of a medicine, but by a REACTION of nature, excited by it*, whence there follows, as a first general consequence, that every repetition of doses is at least superfluous, *except entirely displaced*, whilst this reaction follows its course."

The same author farther states, when considering chronic diseases, that "by carefully *watching* and *understanding* the progress of the vital reaction, we may frequently obtain, in *two months*, with a *single dose* of a *single* medicine, an acceleration of cure, which could not be done in two years by a continual change of medicines, or by an inappropriate multiplication of doses." Also that "it is never necessary in any *chronic* diseases to change the medicine without having observed, at least during five or six days, the aggravation which seemed to demand it;" and that "the salutary effects of medicines in such diseases continues seven or eight weeks."—Dr. Hartmann, one of Hahnemann's pupils, declares "that it is one of the fundamental principles of homeopathy, not to give a *second* dose of the *same remedy*—or to administer a *different remedy* until the former shall have spent all its power."