

trine, which maintains that disordered actions in the human body are to be cured by inducing other disordered actions of the same kind, and this is to be accomplished by infinitesimally small doses, often of apparently inert agents; the decillionth part of a grain of charcoal, for example, is an authorized dose."

Having now given the definitions of an allopathic writer, I now turn to "The Organon of Homeopathic Medicine," and at sec. 55 I find Samuel Hahnemann defining thus:—"The second mode of employing medicines in disease is that which I term the *allopathic* or *heteropathic*, which has been in general use till the present time. Without ever regarding that which is really diseased in the body, it attacks those parts which are sound, in order to draw off the malady from another quarter, and direct it towards the latter."

Homeopathy is thus defined by Dr. Alphonse Teste, author of "The Homeopathic Materia Medica, arranged systematically and practically," "Diseases of Children," &c.:—"The whole code of modern therapeutics is reduced to this precept—*To administer for the cure of the sick the medicine which produces upon the healthy a totality of symptoms the most similar to the totality of the symptoms presented by the sick.*"

On examining the definition of allopathy by Professor Dunglison, it will be seen that he maintains a diplomatic reserve on the subject, merely stating that allopathy is "the ordinary medical practice," and "the opposite of homeopathy." In the derivation, he indeed states that it is derived from Greek words signifying "another affection," without, however, specifying where or how that "other affection" is to be induced—a

*hiatus* which Hahnemann, with Saxon bluntness, fills by asserting that allopathy, "without even regarding that which is really diseased in the body, attacks those parts which are sound, in order to draw off the malady from another quarter, and direct it towards the latter." Elsewhere, I have seen an allopathic physician compared to a man who, on discovering that a certain part of a house is on fire, promptly sets fire to another part, in order to extinguish the first conflagration; and the apologue of D'Alembert is well known—"The physician, being then truly a blind giant, armed with a club, who, as chance directs the weight of his blow, will be certain of annihilating either the patient or the disease."

I feel inclined to take exception to the learned professor's definition of homeopathy—for example, to inquire on what grounds he designates it "a fanciful doctrine"—but as such an argument would necessarily be somewhat in the Guy-Patin strain, I will refrain, as that is the appropriate *role* of the London *Lancet* when dealing out to homeopaths such choice specimens of medical Billingsgate, as "fools, knaves, and morally-attenuated dwarfs;" and the hostility of every right-minded homeopath is directed against *systems*, not *individuals*; against *things*, not *men*.

Before proceeding, it will be well to give a fair specimen of the most scientific method of inducing the "other affection," and this I will do by giving an extract from Dr. W. Sharp's admirable tract, "The single Medicine of Homeopathy." For example, laryngismus shedula, or the asthma of Millar—an affection of considerable danger, to which some infants are very subject, and con-