

to *terrestrial sulphur*; especially if a bath is of bad liquor as *similars by similars*.

Another evidence of the general conviction of the truth of our proposition is found in the Signature School of medicine, or that which maintained the necessity of actual or closely approximating resemblance between the disease and the remedy. In seeking for a medicinal agent, they sought, so to speak, for the daguerreotype of the disease in the remedy to be applied.

Although in their pursuit after truth they pursued the idea of similars, in physical resemblances, rather than in symptomatic similars, yet they nobly foreshadowed the Hahnemannian theory, and established its claim to a Natural Law.

The bile being yellow, the signaturists sought for yellow substances to cure jaundice. Blood being red, the red juices of plants were used to arrest hemorrhage. Hemorrhoids would be cured by bulbous roots resembling them. *Cassia Fistulata* having the appearance of inflated bowel, was used to cure diseases of the bowels. The elder has a pith resembling the spinal marrow, therefore it was used for spinal diseases.

The seeds of *Letho Spermum* resemble urinary calculi; therefore they would cure the gravel.

The lichen pulmonarius, so called from its resemblance to the lungs, obtained the repute of curing pulmonary diseases.

These examples prove an intuitive idea in favor of a therapeutic principle, which prevailed during the dark ages, and indeed from the foundation of medicine. An idea which was held alike by the learned and the unlearned, amid numberless revolutions in the theory of cure. Why, if this principle of treating diseases by remedies whose action upon the healthy organism would develop like symptoms, is not a law of nature: was it upheld amid the never-ending attempts to establish different theories of cure; and why was it enabled so successfully to assert its right to consideration?

Why, if not an immutable and essential truth, should this principle have been so assiduously preserved and so definitely enunciated by every theorist in medicine?

Why should this homeopathic Law have been kept alive in all ages, amid the rise and fall of theories of cure which have existed by thousands, and which can be known now only by the most assiduous research?

Why, while those have waxed and waned, and totally gone out in oblivion, should this our principle of curing diseases have until the time of Hahnemann been becoming more and more distinctly enunciated, if it had not its foundation in nature?

We have shown already that all important principles of science have had the same fostering experience, and analogy proves for us our strongest argument.

Besides the testimony of the ancients, we have the honest admissions of allopathic physicians for the last two hundred years. Hahnemann gives his immediate predecessors of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the credit of having before him acknowledged the truth of treatment by pathogenesis. Thus Thoury discovered that electricity would quicken the healthy pulse; and when carefully applied, would to the pulse quickened by disease, diminish it.

Bertholon removed in disease with electricity the same pains which electricity will produce.

Van Storck, admitted that stramonium would cure insanity, upon the principle of its producing insanity when given in excess.

Boulduc cured diarrhoea with rhubarb, and attributed the secret of cure to the power of the drug to create the disease.

Detharding cured colic with Senna, being induced to do so, from his knowledge of its colic-producing tendencies.

Stahl declared "that the rule generally acted on in medicine, to treat by means of oppositely-acting remedies, is false, and the very reverse of what it ought to be."

"I am on the contrary convinced,"