

would be recognized by us as a presumptive remedy for some forms of pneumonia. The more exact the correspondence between its physiological effects and the morbid changes of the natural disease, the more perfect should we expect to be the fitness of the remedy. To determine, however, in what forms of pneumonia the relation was most complete, it would be necessary also to regard other symptoms which might occur, even though their significance and bearing were as yet undetermined. If tartar emetic causes in health pustular eruptions in the skin or mucous membranes, the concurrence of such phenomena with pneumonia would be regarded by us as further indication for its use. If we knew precisely what set of nerves was most likely to receive a painful impression from tartar emetic, the existence of such pain, as a symptom of disease, would start the inquiry, whether the other phenomena of the case did not also point to it as a remedy. Resemblance at a few points might suggest a useful remedy, but in seeking a true counterpart to the disease, it is important that the effects of the medicine (or of the medicines, if one such cannot be found) should correspond, not merely in the organic changes which it produces, but by all means, in the method, order, and degree in which the different parts of the vital organism are affected. If an arrest of some secretion marks one stage of the disease, and an excess of the same secretion occurs at another period, it is by no means unimportant to note the order of sequence of these phenomena. Though we fall far short of our aim, we deem it worthy of the highest ambition and the most faithful labor to increase our knowledge of disease and of medicinal action, as means of developing in its minute details the principle which we call *Homeopathic*.

With the property thus indicated, we suppose God has endowed all remedial agents. In proportion as this is true, to that extent are our views worthy of respect. If it is entirely imaginary,—if in no case it even approaches the truth, as would be inferred from the positions taken by some of your authorities, then indeed is homeopathy the baseless fabric of a vision. Whatever may be the truth in regard to it, the evidence for and against it, ought to be candidly considered.

We beg you to observe that we do not say whether medicines have or do not have other remedial powers not included in this one, though at least we know of none so general as this—nor that this power may not be modified by circumstances, or even counteracted, for that would not be true. Neither do we offer this principle of similitude to you as a *theory* mainly, though to us it has proved a suggestive one; nor as an *explanation* of the action of medicines, though in one sense it may serve as such. But we do offer it as affording the ground for a convenient grouping of facts—so far as the facts are determined by adequate evidence, each one by itself. It may then serve to suggest where you will be likely to find other facts, but not to prove in advance they will be found. Many of the objections urged by your writers are irrelevant to its true intent, and are, we think, the result of misapprehension.

Here is the true issue between our system and others. It should be made such in the discussions between them. Other issues are important, but it is only as they bear on this.