

Canadian Journal of Homeopathy.

"Plus apud nos vera ratio valet, quam vulgi opinio."

VOL. I.

HAMILTON, C. W., JULY, 1856.

No. 7.

ON THE SPECIFIC TREATMENT OF DISEASES.

[From the days of Hippocrates down to the present time, physicians of the allopathic school have occasionally struck upon the principles enunciated by Hahnemann, but, as if frightened with the discovery, never have taken the time or pains to assure themselves if the principle be true.

The subjoined article we take from the *Northern Lancet*, an Allopathic Medical paper, published at Montreal; and, from the unkind cuts which the editor of that paper occasionally gives, we judge he does not "believe in homeopathy," but is willing to advocate the principles of the Hahnemann school when they come from a legitimate source.

We are almost inclined to think the article was written by a homeopathist, and published by the editor in ignorance of the fact, for it is precisely the doctrine we teach, and we not frequently find great discoveries in the *Materia Medica* going the rounds of the allopathic journals as something new and valuable, when it had been used for years with the best success by homeopathists. If "a knowledge of the specific physiological action of medicinal substances is the only true guide in their therapeutic application, and the basis of the specific healing art," why not avail yourselves of the extensive physiological provings of Hah-

nemann and others, as the basis of your application of drugs, in the cure of disease.

In Hahnemann's *Materia Medica* is found more real knowledge of the power of drugs and their relation to disease than in all other *materia medicae* ever written. There is no truer aphorism than this—"That every medicine has a tendency to operate on some particular organ or tissue in preference to all others;" and allopathists, of learning and experience, know this well, but neglect to profit by so valuable a physiological fact, and continue to torture humanity with cathartics, emetics, antiphlogistics, blisters, &c., that have no physiological relation to the recuperative powers of the human organism. An allopath will find himself quite put to the test to discover that relation which should exist between discovered facts in physiology and their heroic practices above-mentioned. Nowhere will physiology instruct us to infer that drawing the life blood, vesicating or cauterizing the surface, and drenching the bowels with powerful cathartics, are necessary to restore the healthy action to diseased organs, nor will common reason bear us out in creating artificial diseases in healthy organs to attract the existing disease from its lodgment, under the insane idea that a change of situation brings the patient near to health.

and the water flowing over his face; though not bargained for, he got a good washing, and he certainly was much in need of ablation. A second syringe full was thrown in, and the corn, swollen to too great a size to be forced through the opening of the nostril, rested against it, and was removed with the finger.

The children did not in either case appear to have swallowed any of the water; there was no coughing nor strangling, and it all flowed out through the opposite nostril. The simplicity and success of this plan are such that it is well worthy of the attention of the physician and the surgeon.—*Nelson's American Lancet.*

DEATH BY CHLOROFORM.

THE unfortunate result attending the inhalation of chloroform by Mrs. Morgan, on Saturday afternoon last, has naturally excited in the community a good deal of distrust in regard to the use of that article as an anæsthetic agent. We publish the following statement of the affair as prepared by Dr. Emery himself. He says:—

"Between the hours of one and two o'clock, on the 5th instant, I commenced to administer chloroform to Mrs. P. A. Morgan, at her request, for the purpose removing of some teeth. I commenced with a small quantity—should think from two to three drachms on a sponge. She inhaled it without difficulty for a minute or two. Her voice was not strong, but uniform. She then commenced to be excited, and said that I was going to extract her teeth, and she should know all about it. She said that Mrs. Paige, the lady who accompanied her, was getting the forceps to extract them with. I think about one minute had passed during this conversation and excitement. I then removed the sponge from her mouth, and in a few minutes she became quiet, and satisfied that there had been no attempts made to remove her teeth. In a few moments I commenced the operation again with the same amount of chloroform.

"She inhaled it without difficulty,

about as long as she did before, and became so much excited that she got up out of the chair, and insisted that I had extracted her teeth. She spat on the floor, and looked to see if it was blood, and she insisted that some one was coming into the room who she did not want to see. I sat her down in the chair again, and she then went into a spasm, closed her teeth, and breathed with difficulty. I sprinkled water on her face, and the muscles relaxed; and I asked her to get up and we would place her on the lounge. She made an effort to rise, and with my assistance she stood on her feet, and then instantly sank to the floor. With the assistance of Mrs. Paige, I placed her on the lounge, and then there was a rush of blood to the brain. I sprinkled water in her face again, but she showed no signs of being conscious. Mrs. Paige went for assistance, and I immediately commenced artificial respiration by insufflation, and kept it up until Dr. Stedman came in, which was but a few minutes."

The jury returned the verdict "that the deceased came to her death from the effects of the chloroform, and that the chloroform was a pure article, and was given at the urgent solicitation of the deceased, and with all proper care and discretion." They further say, "from the testimony and opinion of medical experts in this case, the jury feel compelled to caution the public against the use of chloroform, as being a dangerous anæsthetic agent."—*Boston Journal.*

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF HOMEOPATHY.

THE thirteenth annual meeting of the American Institute of Homeopathy was held yesterday in the Smithsonian building; present, twenty-eight members from various States and the District of Columbia. After the meeting was called to order by Dr. J. P. Dake, of Pittsburgh, Pa., the General Secretary, the list of members of the Institute was read and corrected. At this juncture Dr. A. T. Bull, of London, Canada West, was introduced. He came as a representa-

tive from the Provincial Homeopathic Medical Society of Canada, and was subsequently, by a vote of the Institute, admitted to full membership. Nominations for a chairman being then in order, Dr. George W. Swazey, of Springfield, Mass., was nominated and elected. Having made a brief address in response to the honor done him, the Chairman called up the business next in order, which was the election of officers. Then Dr. F. R. McMannis, of Baltimore, Md., was chosen General Secretary for the next year; Dr. John T. Middleton, also of Baltimore, Provisional Secretary; Dr. S. S. Guy, of Brooklyn, N.Y., Treasurer; and Drs. Williamson, Piper, Green, Gardner, and Janney, the Board of Censors. The Treasurer's report was then read, and his accounts committed to a committee for examination. Being approved of, they were passed. The assets in hand amount to \$1,184. Several committees on various subjects, as cholera, mechanical supports, small pox, and diseases of the respiratory organs, were disposed of, either by being continued to next year or discharged. A message having been brought to the Institute, announcing the presence of the President of the United States and a portion of his Cabinet in the building, it was debated whether the Institute should avail themselves of the opportunity, and call upon the President; but it not appearing that any invitation had been made, the Institute proceeded to other business.

Dr. J. P. Dake read a report from the Rhode Island Homeopathic Society, and moved that it be printed, with the exception of the enumeration of the treatment of particular cases, the information therein not being complete.

Dr. D. M. Dake said that he should prefer to have the whole document printed, and moved that the Secretary be instructed to correspond with the Rhode Island Society, so as to obtain a full report of those cases, if possible, for publication with the proceedings of this year's session.

Dr. J. P. Dake explained his reason for moving to omit that portion of the report. It was too often the case in

homeopathic journals and elsewhere, in reports of cases, the name of the disease would be given, saying that it had been cured by such and such a medicine; but he thought that very little was to be gained by that species of information.— He desired to see a course adopted that would have the effect of getting societies and physicians, in making out their reports, to furnish some of the characteristic symptoms. He was in favor of opening a correspondence, because, if they could procure more information, the publication might be in such a form as to be of some use.

The report was then ordered to be printed, with all the additional information the Secretary could procure.

Other communications were then read, and disposed of; whereupon the Institute adjourned until eight o'clock in the evening.

Before leaving the building the members of the Institute were severally introduced to the President of the United States and his Cabinet, all the members of which happened to be at the Smithsonian on official business connected with the establishment. These introductions were made through Dr. Piper, in the picture gallery.

In the evening at eight o'clock the annual address was delivered by Dr. D. M. Dake, to a numerous and appreciative audience, after which the Institute adjourned to meet at nine o'clock on Thursday morning.

SECOND DAY.

The Institute assembled yesterday morning, and the minutes of Wednesday were read and approved.

A report from Dr. Talbot on "diseases of the respiratory organs" was then read, and referred back, with a view to a more extended report.

On motion, Mr. Michael Demetrius Kalopothakes, a native of Greece, was introduced, and allowed to participate in the proceedings of the Institute. In reply, Mr. Kalopothakes remarked that he had passed through a complete course of medical studies at the University of Athens, in his native land, and trusted

that on his return thither he would have an opportunity, in a periodical he expected to publish, to do homeopathy some service.

Dr. J. P. Dake spoke in approval of the labors of Dr. Henry S. Lentz, of Chesnut Hill, Philadelphia, in the preparation of medicinal articles of high excellence, and eminently worthy the patronage of the profession.

Dr. Warner's report on "cholera" was ordered to be printed.

Dr. Payne's resolution was then amended and passed, as follows:—

Resolved,—That, in accordance with the usages and dignity of scientific bodies, who very properly discountenance all extraordinary efforts on the part of the members of such bodies, to enhance individual interests, to the sacrifice of professional dignity and decorum, we, as an associated scientific body, will discountenance all like extraordinary efforts on the part of the members of this Institute, and whenever such cases come to our knowledge, well authenticated, we will sever such members from our connexion as no longer worthy of our sympathy and fellowship.

Moved by Dr. Dake, and

Resolved,—That upon evidence furnished by members of the Canadian Homeopathic Society, and upon the character of certain hand-bills, "Dioclesian Lewis, A.M., M.D.," be expelled without delay from this Institute, for having made extraordinary and notorious efforts to enhance his individual interests, to the sacrifice of professional dignity and decorum, and to the injury of Scientific Medicine.—Carried unanimously.

After considerable discussion, Chicago was chosen as the place of the next annual meeting, to take place on the first Wednesday of June, 1857.

The thanks of the Institute were then voted to Dr. Piper and Dr. Green and their ladies for distinguished hospitality, to Professor Henry for the use of the hall, and to the Chairman and Secretary, after which the Institute adjourned.

—*National Intelligencer*.

Journal of Homeopathy.

RETROSPECTIVE.

HOPE for the future is sometimes obtained by meditating upon the past. A gradual improvement is best observed by comparing notes of different dates; and when our courage is exhausted with urging the truth and defending the right, we take fresh hope from what has been accomplished, and renewed vigor for the future!

Five years ago there were but two homeopathic physicians in Canada West. Beyond the limit of their influence, reform in medicine was almost unknown. Bleeding, blistering, physicing, and leeching were held as the *ultima thule* of medical accomplishment. Old physic was looked upon as holding a patent for all medical knowledge and skill. To submit to a thorough course of purging, blistering, and sweating was heroic, while to venture having the hooping-cough, measles, or colic without submitting to a course of heroics was unmanly in the patient and ungenerous toward the doctor; to submit to the pill and leeches, to have your mouth salivated, your teeth destroyed, throat ulcerated, and life-blood drawn was applauded, while to refuse to submit to so scientific a method was cowardice.

Since that time the scene is somewhat changed. No longer will sensible and intelligent people submit to the preposterous practice of seeking health by such means as will make well men sick instead of making sick ones well. More and more frequently do old school physicians meet the request, "Please, Doctor, do not bleed me, nor give me mercury," and the flat refusal of taking blue pills or submitting to a blister—thus

driven to a more moderate practice, for which they often take credit to themselves.

Instead of two homeopathsists we have about thirty, and all engaged in good practice, and demands from a number of towns for more physicians of our school.

But we commenced this article to speak of the prospects of the *JOURNAL*. The first half year of its publication is passed, and its permanency secured for the future. For its success we are indebted to many of our friends for the interest they have taken in enlarging its circulation. It might be invidious to particularize, but some of our friends have our most grateful thanks for the kind interest they have taken.

We are publishing a paper more than twice the size promised in our prospectus, and should not have been able to do so had not the friends of homeopathy come nobly up to the task. We are not, however, done with you yet; we want more subscribers. A paper cannot be published in this country without it has the "sinews of war." The low price at which it is afforded requires a good list of patrons to sustain it in its present form, so we hope our friends who wish to see the paper flourish will bestir themselves in its interest.

INTERMITTENT FEVER.

THERE is no disease for which we are called upon to prescribe that requires a more careful diagnosis than intermittent fever, or "ague." It being a form of disease in which an almost immediate favorable impression is looked for, it becomes the homeopathist carefully to examine the symptoms in detail, which being done he will rarely fail in prescrib-

ing a remedy that will effect a speedy and permanent cure.

From the too common practice of "breaking the chill" with crude drugs, of which quinine and arsenic are the most distinguished, and the almost universal prescription of these drugs for every form of intermittent, without regard to the specific affinity which should exist between the remedy and the disease, patients are impressed that the name of the disease only is sufficient to indicate the specific for its cure. Under this impression, patients neglect to give their physician a full detail of the symptoms in their case, thinking it not essential, as it is "only the ague."

Physicians should examine each symptom with care, and patients should be careful to mention every symptom in their case, and each will be rewarded by a happy result in a brief space of time.

A cure is many times retarded, and the disease prolonged for weeks, from the above reasons and from injudicious management by the patients themselves, by exercising violently and finding themselves easily fatigued, sitting down in a cool draught of air or neglecting to make a change of clothing adequate to the changes of the weather, or exposure to rain and damp air at night, and over-eating of hearty and indigestible food.

In selecting the proper remedy for the cure of intermittents we have found no work equal to a small monograph by Dr. J. S. Douglass, published as an appendix to Hull's *Laurie*. We are not aware that it has ever been published separate. We would advise every physician to procure a copy, and they will find themselves relieved of much labor in selecting the proper remedy to effect a cure.

UNRIPE FRUIT AND VEGETABLES.

The season is approaching when the effect of indulgence in unripe fruit and crude vegetables will be quite apparent. Annually we receive a lesson in the form of diarrhoea, dysentery, cholera-morbus, or that fearful scourge—the cholera; but a respite of a few months through the frost of winter obliterates the experience we have so frequently been compelled to receive, and we impatiently wait, and eagerly accept a new opportunity to test the stomach's endurance of all manner of indigestible fruits and vegetables.

There seems to be persons in the world whose whole business is to try how much fruit, soda water, beer, ice water, brandy, and vegetables the human stomach will contain. Always hungry, always thirsty, but never prudent. In hot weather, food taken in the stomach is very liable to undergo fermentation before it can be digested, more especially if too full a meal is taken, and much of any kind of liquid drunk. A deranged state of the stomach or bowels would seldom take place if due attention was given to the quantity and quality of the food and drink. The stomach will digest more food in cold than in warm weather, the ratio being as the temperature of the atmosphere approaches that of the body; hence the necessity of abstemiousness in quantity, and care in the kind of food used. We would not be understood as deprecating all kinds of fruit, but only such as is unripe and stale. Nor would we convey the idea that cholera is caused only by improper diet, but that those who indulge excessively in unwholesome food are more liable to an attack should the epidemic prevail.

The heat of the season, as we before

remarked, is prone to retard digestion, and if we add to this food that readily ferments, and dilute the secretions of the stomach by large draughts of liquid, indigestion follows. The irritation it produces causes it to be expelled by vomiting or passed more quickly to the bowels, where it is rapidly carried off in the form of diarrhoea. "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure," says the adage, and all who desire to avoid contact with pills, potions, and doctors, will take the ounce, and thus escape the pound.

For the Homeopathic Journal.

THE MISREPRESENTATIONS OF HOMEOPATHY.

[CONTINUED FROM OUR LAST NO.]

5. *Homeopaths give no medicine at all.*

This is an assertion frequently made by those who, so far from giving "no medicine at all," give medicine in doses which attack the patient instead of the disease.

It may be thought that the statistics given under the head "Homeopathy is inefficient against violent diseases," would be sufficient to convince any candid mind that homeopaths must give *something*, in order to secure such brilliant results, but as we have some statistics of diseases treated allopathically, homeopathically, and without any medicine whatever, I purpose giving them here, for, after all, the people look to *results*, not *systems*.

The following results of the treatment of cholera in Wischney-Wolotschek, in Russia, is extracted from the Prussian State Gazette, No. 136, Nov. 13, 1831. The report is drawn up by Dr. Sieder, a "Stadt Physicus:"—

Cured by Homeopathy.....	86 out of 109
" Allopathy.....	60 out of 199
" Nature, without the aid of Medicine.....	16 out of 49

Here we find that, while homeopathy saved nearly 79 out of every 100 attacked, nature saved 33, and allopathy about 30, making a difference of 3 per cent. in favor of nature. Nature is, therefore, a little better than allopathy, or allopathy a little worse than nature—our calomel-giving friends are at liberty to read it as suits themselves.

Again, when fever and dysentery were devastating Ireland in 1847, Mr. Kidd, a homeopath, treated one hundred and ninety-two cases in their own homes, amidst all the wretchedness of that most wretched time, and the results of his treatment were as follows:—

Mortality from Fever.....	2 per cent.
“ Dysentery.....	14 “

At the same time, and in the same neighborhood (Bantry), Dr. Abraham Tucky, an allopathic physician, treated a number of cases in the Bantry Union Hospital, with every possible advantage of cleanliness, ventilation, diet, &c., and here the results were:—

Mortality from Fever.....	13 per cent.
“ Dysentery.....	36 “

At the same time an hospital was opened in England for the reception of the sick Irish emigrants, and here the physician abstained from giving any medicine whatever, and contented himself with watching the cases, taking proper care of the diet, ventilation, &c. As a result of this treatment the mortality from fever was only 10 per cent.

Here we find that, while the mortality, under homeopathic treatment was 2 per cent., the mortality under allopathic treatment was 13 per cent., while the loss under “no medicine at all,” was only 10 per cent.

In Dr. Routh's famous book, “The Fallacies of Homeopathy,” I find the following passage:—“Dr. Dietl, the al-

lopathic physician of the Wieden Hospital, in Vienna, anxious to test the efficacy of dietetic regimen in pneumonia (inflammation of the lungs), instituted a series of experiments. In the course of three years that gentleman treated 380 cases of pneumonia. Eighty-five of these cases were treated by repeated bleeding; of this number 17 died, or 20 per cent.; the remaining 38 recovered. One hundred and six were treated with tartar emetic; the mortality was now 20·7 per cent., 22 dying, and 84 only recovering. The remaining 189 were treated by simple dietetic means; the deaths amounted to 14, or 7·4 per cent., 175 recovering.—The above data have been given upon the evidence of Dr. Roth (Homeopathic Times, No. 49), an eminent homeopathic writer”—p. 55.

Here we find that, when Dr. Dietl treated inflammation of the lungs with bleeding and large doses of powerful drugs, he lost 20 out of every hundred; and when he contented himself with simple dietetic management, he only lost 7 out of every hundred.

In a former number I stated that Dr. Fleischmann, of the Gumpendorf Homeopathic Hospital, treated 538 cases of pneumonia with 28 deaths—a mortality of 5 per cent. Compare this with the results of Dr. Dietl's varied treatment:

PNEUMONIA.

Under Allo. treat., the mortality was	20 per cent
“ No medicine at all “ “	7 “
“ Hom. treatment “ “	5 “

It will thus be seen that, while both the homeopath and the allopath give medicines, the former gains by it, and the latter loses by it.

T. N.

London, June, 1856.

[TO BE CONTINUED IN OUR NEXT.]

☞ What has become of some of our friends who promised articles for the

JOURNAL? We still hope to hear from them soon, and that they are redeeming their promise. If not, we shall speak aloud, and if we do shall probably mention MONTREAL.

Mr. R. E., of St. Catherines, is informed that we have mailed copies of the JOURNAL to his address twice, and will do so the third time. Why you have not received them we cannot say, but think if you will ask the P. M. for the "Journal of Homeopathy," you will get it.

Others of our Subscribers at St. Catherines and at other places complain that they do not receive their papers. We attend personally to the mailing, and can say the fault is not ours; so do not make us responsible for all the sins of omission and commission of the whole P. O. Department.

Mr. Kuhn, says the Bourdeaux *Journal of Medicine*, found that vaccination performed on infants, the second, third, or fourth day after a previous vaccination, always succeeded. When performed on the fifth day it took in one half the cases. If attempted on the seventh, eighth, ninth, or tenth day, it failed. Hence, according to these experiments, vaccinia does not begin to be protective until after four days from the inoculation, and as variola has an incubation of three or four days, it may happen that a person exposed to it the fourth day after vaccination may be seized with small-pox at the moment when the vaccine vesicle is at its highest point of development. It is not until the ninth day after vaccination, therefore, that one can be considered secure from small-pox.

Dr. J. J. LANCASTER,
HOMEOPATHIC PHYSICIAN, Junction,
Westminster, Canada West.

J. H. GEMRIC,

MANUFACTURER, of Surgical and Dental Instruments, Trusses and Bandages. No. 43 South Eighth Street, Philadelphia.

B. B. & J. HAGERTY,

MANUFACTURERS of Glass Syringes, Homeopathic Case and Sample Vials, and Dealers in all kinds of Druggists and Apothecaries' Glass Ware, No. 92 John Street, New York, between Pearl and Cliff Streets.

Private Moulds made to order and particularly attended to. Druggists' stores and Doctors' offices fitted throughout. Painting and Engraving done in superior style. Physicians' Cases and Medicine Chests furnished and refitted at the shortest notice.

CHARLES T. HURLBURT,

AMERICAN Homeopathic Pharmacy, 437 Broome Street, second door east from Broadway, New York.

C. T. HURLBURT has always on hand a large stock of Homeopathic Medicines of all forms.—Tinctures, Dilutions, Medicated Globules, Triturations, &c., pure Alcohol Distilled Water, Sugar of Milk, Globules, Arnica Plaster, Corks, Labels, Vials of all sizes, &c.; also, Homeopathic Books.

Physicians' Pocket Cases, and Family Medicine Chests, of all sizes and prices, for sale wholesale and retail.

Orders respectfully solicited, and promptly executed.

F. E. BERICKE,

LATE BERICKE & TAFEL, Homeopathic Pharmacy, No. 18, South Seventh Street, above Chesnut, Philadelphia.

All preparations warranted to be of the purest kind, and prepared with the utmost care.

Physicians' Pocket Cases and Homeopathic Chests for domestic use.

Homeopathic Books, Sugar of Milk, Pure Alcohol, &c., wholesale and retail. The high Potencies genuine.

DR. HENRY S. LENTZ'S HOMEOPATHIC Preparations.

We have prescribed the high attenuations prepared by Dr. Henry S. Lentz, with the most satisfactory results; and, having confidence in their efficacy, we can recommend them to the Profession. We believe them to be prepared with scrupulous regard to purity, and accuracy of manipulation.

There need be no controversy in regard to the utility of the high attenuation of Medicines. They should be administered only when they are *Homeopathically indicated*, and then not too frequently repeated.

"Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind."

February 13th, 1856.

WALTER WILLIAMSON, M.D.,
Professor of Materia Medica and Therapeutics in the Homeopathic Medical College of Pennsylvania.

JACOB BEAKLEY, M.D.,
Professor of Surgery in the Homeopathic Medical College of Pennsylvania.

ALVAN E. SMALL, M.D.,
Professor of Homeopathic Institutes, Pathology, and the Practice of Medicine in the Homeopathic Medical College of Pennsylvania.

WM. A. GARDINER, M.D.,
Professor of Anatomy and Physiology in the Homeopathic Medical College of Pennsylvania.

P.S.—The above Potencies (4000 and upwards) may be had at the residence of Henry S. Lentz, M.D., Chesnut Hill, Philadelphia, Pa.

If the editor of that paper would follow up the opinions advanced in the article, he would find himself doing more to place the practice of medicine on a sure physiological basis than he at present dreams of. From the frequency that we find such articles in old school journals, we are inclined to believe that the light which physiology and pathology affords the physician, an entire change must occur in old physic. *Spes affulsit.*
—EDITOR.]

THAT every medicine has a tendency to operate on some particular organ or tissue, in preference to all others, is highly probable; that many medicines exhibit this tendency in a very marked degree is already well known.

Medicinal substances seem to be endowed with a kind of *elective affinity*, by virtue of which they select from the complicated machinery of the physical organization some part, or organ, or system on which their specific action is manifested rather than on any other.

Examples of the specific operations of medicines are familiar to all. A few will suffice for the purpose of illustration.—Opium, belladonna, and nux vomica act specifically upon the brain and nervous system, and it is asserted by Flourens that “Opium affects more particularly the cerebral lobes; belladonna in a limited dose affects the tubercula quadrigemina, and in a larger dose the cerebral lobes also; and nux vomica the medulla oblongata.”

Tart. antimony operates specifically on the lungs; mercury on the glands and osseous system; secale cornutum on the uterus, and cantharides on the urinary organs.

The local specific operation of medicines is independent of the general irritating and poisonous effects which many medicines produce in common. For example:—Tart. Antimony exerts its specific action on the lungs in pneumonia when the quantity taken is insufficient to produce its more crude and irritating effects on the stomach and intestinal

canal by vomiting, purging, or even nausea.

A medicine may operate specifically on several different organs, as belladonna on the brain, fauces, and skin, yet it is probable that among the various parts with which it possesses specific relations there is one for which it has a greater affinity than for any other, and this *one part* is more susceptible to the action of the medicines, and requires a smaller quantity than any other, for the production of a philosophical or a curative effect.

A knowledge of the specific physiological action of medicinal substances is the only true guide in their therapeutical application. This knowledge is necessarily the basis of the specific healing art.

That method, says Hufeland, which acts by “attacking the internal alteration of life, which is indispensable to disease—indeed is the disease itself—and changing it into the normal state” is called the specific method. Or, in shorter and less ambiguous terms, we may define the specific method to be the curing of diseases by remedies which *act directly* upon the diseased organs. And in this respect—the application of remedies *directly* and *solely* to the affected part—consists essentially the great advantage of the specific method over that of the ordinary plan of practice.

The progress of medical science, and the more extended knowledge of the *materia medica* and pathology, is leading the medical profession towards the general adoption of this method, to the exclusion of the old plan of depletion and derivation, in the treatment of inflammatory affections. And it is inflammation in some form or some grade that we have to combat in the great majority of the maladies we are called upon to treat.

Depletion by bleeding and cathartics, and derivation by vesicants and other counter-irritants, and also by cathartics, are the principal remedial means against the local phlegmasiæ.

In estimating the value of blood-letting in inflammatory affections we have to consider its effects upon the affected

organs and upon the general system. In inflammation there is an engorged state of the capillaries of the inflamed part, and this engorgement depends on an enfeebled condition of those vessels. Now, so far as blood-letting has the effect of relieving the overloaded and dilated capillaries, and allowing them an opportunity to recover their natural tone and contractility, thus far it may be beneficial and no farther. But daily observation teaches us that in many cases of acute inflammation, the relief occasioned by the bleeding is but temporary, the enfeebled capillaries not being assisted by any remedies acting directly upon them, and tending to restore their normal tone and vigor, soon become again engorged with blood, and the symptoms which the blood had for a time relieved are again as bad as ever.

This we often see exemplified in cases of pneumonia and pleurisy. A free bleeding is followed by prompt relief of the pain and dyspnoea, but this amelioration is of short duration; in a few hours all the troublesome symptoms acquire their former severity, and we must bleed again. And thus venesection is not unfrequently repeated several times, each successive bleeding tending to debilitate more and more the general system, and render it less able to resist the morbid action and the disorganization going on in the affected part. But if in fact the blood-letting does finally "control," as is said, the local inflammatory action, a convalescence is rendered thus long and tedious as much by the treatment as by the original disease.

In many delicate and anæmic patients while bleeding seems to be required for the controlling of inflammation, it is, on the other hand, as strongly contra-indicated by the already enfeebled condition of the system, and the physician finds it difficult to decide the question, whether it were better to allow the local disease to take its course *uncontrolled*, or to risk the production of a dangerous and perhaps fatal prostration, which he fears may result from the use of the lancet.

Next in the course of common practice come purgatives. They act by de-

pletion—by detracting from the general circulation through the intestinal exhalents, and by derivation—by producing a determination from the inflamed organs to the intestinal canal. This is the theory—but it is doubtful in a practical point, whether the benefit produced on the seat of the disease is sufficient to compensate for the injury to parts otherwise in a state of health. The bowels which of themselves required no medicine are attacked by cathartic drugs, irritation of their mucous membrane is produced, and general derangement of the digestive functions is the result. Constipation follows the unnatural catharsis, or perhaps on the contrary diarrhoea sets in, and to the original disease is added the medicinal affection in the abdomen, thereby complicating the cases and rendering recovery slower and more difficult.

Vesicants are another means of derivation, and relieve the distended capillaries of the inflamed parts by determining from them to the skin. But in delicate and sensitive patients they increase greatly the nervous irritability, and in those of a cachectic habit the blistered surfaces are liable to ulceration, even gangrene has followed the artificial inflammation in cases where there was great prostration of the vital powers.

Such are the principal remedies (except a few specifics which have already crept into practice, as tartrate antimony in pneumonia) now used in the treatment of the phlegmasie, and it were folly to assert that these are all positively useless or entirely injurious, for many cures have undoubtedly been effected even by such clumsy and indirect treatment.

Could there be some mode devised whereby local diseases might be cured by remedies which operate directly, promptly, and solely on the diseased part without enfeebling the general system like blood-letting, and without disturbing the normal condition and functions of remote and otherwise healthy organs like the whole class of Revellents—surely it were a "consummation devoutly to be wished." This is what the specific method proposes and accomplishes.

By this method of treatment we avoid

almost entirely depletion by bleeding, and the consequent unpleasant and dangerous results which do frequently follow this practice. In those cases of local inflammation, in which the general state of debility will not admit of blood-letting, we are able to cope with the disease in a prompt and efficient manner by means of remedies, which, while they act directly upon the diseased part, do not increase the already existing debility.

Apropos, "in the report of a certain post-mortem examination, it was said that traces of an internal inflammation had been discovered, which could not be controlled in consequence of the feeble condition of the patient preventing a sufficient abstraction of blood. The doctors ought rather to have stated the case thus:—We who do not understand the better method of curing inflammatory diseases without the lancet, have been unable to save this patient's life."

By the specific method we avoid the creating of artificial diseases in healthy parts, diseases which in their turn frequently require remedial treatment, and which at least retard the process of recovery.

When a disease is cured by this method health is at once restored, and the patient does not have a host of medicinal affections to recover from by the *vis medicatrix naturæ*, or to be subjected to further treatment, as is the case many times in practice.

There is another great advantage in the use of specific methods. It is this— a comparatively very small quantity of any medicine is sufficient to produce a curative effect when administered with reference to its specific relations. Thus very minute doses of tart. antimony are efficacious in pneumonia, and I have seen the fractional part of a drop of tinct. of secale arrest promptly a profuse menorrhagia.

An article like this is necessarily too limited for the consideration of all the comparative advantages of the specific healing art, or for mentioning even the names of medicines in connection with those diseases for which they have a specific applicability, and if the author

only succeeds in directing the attention of a few of his professional brethren to this important subject the object of this communication will be fully attained.

On the Administration of Mixed Medicines, and of two or more in alternation.

As this subject has excited some interest of late, we shall make a few remarks, limited by the small space allowed us in these pages.

I. HISTORICAL VIEW.

When there were but few provers and few provings, it often happened that a remedy corresponding to the totality of the symptoms could not be found; but it would then happen, that, of two known medicines, one would correspond with one part or group of the symptoms, while the other would correspond with another group of symptoms; and these two medicines were then given in alternation. With the increase of provings, that necessity ceased to exist; and only such physicians as did not keep themselves posted up in the progressive knowledge of the *Materia Medica* found it necessary to give two medicines in alternation. Still they met with many disappointments, and were less successful in curing the sick than the progressive physicians, who, knowing the effects of medicines, were able to select the *one* curative remedy; and, instead of increasing their small stock of knowledge, they increased the dose, and resorted even to the prescription of the crude tinctures. Backwards still they went; and now began to compound their medicines. Their defective knowledge generated a false logic. They gave all the medicines ever given for the disease in question mixed together, in the vain hope that the *vis medicatrix* would select the suitable remedy out of the many. And here we part with them— first styling themselves rational physicians; afterwards specificists; and still later proclaiming themselves in advance of the times; when, in fact, they were more like the pup or kitten that whirls in a circle with its tail in its mouth.

II. AN ILLUSTRATION.

By the law of similarity it was found that *hepar* and *spongia*, affording symptoms very similar to those of croup, would cure it. It was, and is still, difficult to determine when to give the one or the other; and, because it was so difficult to select the one true remedy in a given case, both were given in alternation; and that course was not only then recommended, but is still recommended in the latest Domestic Physicians.

About eight years ago, when comparing the drug effects of *belladonna*, a homeopathist of the Hahnemannian school was struck with the similarity of the effects of *belladonna* with the symptoms of croup. The pathology of the disease and the provings of croup were similar. *Belladonna* was administered in single very small doses, and the results were astonishing. Other physicians have tried it with satisfactory results, but single smallest doses are indispensable.

III. CONCLUSIONS.

The true mode of cure is, to give one smallest dose of a remedy, selected in accordance with its similarity to the disease.

The alternating of medicines shows a want of knowledge of the *Materia Medica*, affords no opportunity for clear observations, leads to stronger and lower doses—to the tinctures, and finally to the compounding of medicines.—*Homeopathic News*.

ON DIET.

By Dr. HERMAN FORD RUSSELL.

WHETHER it be true, as some historians affirm, that Napoleon lost the battle of Leipzig owing to his having eaten a bad dinner, may well be a matter of doubt; but there can be no doubt whatever that bad dinners and bad food generally are at the bottom of very much both domestic and national misery and disaster. And it seems to me that there is no subject which more imperatively demands our special attention as homeopathists, than the one I have chosen to offer a few observations upon. For, from

the promulgation of the system founded and taught by Hahnemann, numerous specialities in diet have been inculcated with more or less rigor by himself and his followers, and so prominent have these innovations become to the eye both of the public and the medical profession, that while the former frequently seem to suppose that if they consume only a sufficient quantity of homeopathic cocoa, they will be entitled to all the benefits of the new system of medicine, the latter discovers, with its usual sagacity, that, although the success of our treatment is beyond dispute in very many cases, yet that we owe our superiority, not to the total difference of the principle according to which we select our remedies, but to our better judgment in the regulation of the diet of our patients, although the subject of diet has been one carefully studied and ably handled since the time of Hippocrates; and although, by this assumption, our opponents pay us the highest possible compliment, by yielding us the palm of victory in the field common to us and them. In fact, if they are right in this explanation, it would be tantamount to saying, that as there is no law by which we profess to be guided in our choice of food analogous to that which directs us in the choice of the proper medicine, each individual who practises homeopathy displays a higher amount of intelligence than his allopathic brethren, and is in their sense of the term the better physician of the two. This is a fatal argument for young physic, which professes rather to cure diseases by diet and regimen than by medicines. They acknowledge themselves thrown in their own ring; how strange is their inconsistency! It is considered disgraceful to admit the superiority of homeopathic medicine, a novelty which old physicians might pardonably plead ignorance of, and they prefer to proclaim their inferiority in the only branch of the physicians' art on which they build their reputation; while on the other hand we find among ourselves a pertinacious adherence to certain dietetic formulas, which rest on no authority but that of accidental preju-

dice, and which derive no support from the enlarged experience that we have now within our reach.

There are but two methods by which we can hope to arrive at anything like unanimity in our dietetic creed; the one is to assume Hahnemann's writings as our Leviticus, and to ban all he banned, and admit all he admitted, or to inquire into the principles by which he was directed in the rules he lays down, and to follow out these principles, if they be sound, into their full development by all the lights which modern science and observation have shed upon the subject.

As Hahnemann did not assume the infallibility of inspiration, we may safely decline accepting any Leviticus at his hands, and examine with that care and respect which all his writings deserve, what they contain on the subject of diet, and we shall be satisfied that if in some instances he was led into extravagance and error, yet that the principles of his doctrine are eminently sound and sagacious.

In endeavoring to form a just valuation of Hahnemann's dietetic rules, we must bear in mind that before he had discovered his grand formula for the selection of medicines, he had already written extensively upon various topics connected with diet and regimen, and that he carried over into the new province of homeopathy where he so long ruled supreme, some of the old adopted notions which he had already too vehemently expressed to admit of his recanting them. The most striking illustration of this was his antipathy to coffee. "The cold considerate earnestness of our forefathers," such are Hahnemann's words, "the firm steadfastness of will, of resolve and of judgment, the endurance of continued and yet powerful exertions of the body, adapted to the object in view, that used to constitute the original national character of the Germans, the whole sublime stamp of our descent disappears before this medicinal beverage, and changes into over-hasty disclosures, hurried resolves, immature judgments, frivolity, changeableness, talkativeness, irresolution, too easy mo-

bility of the muscles without any enduring result, and theatrical behaviour."

The extravagance of this passage makes it read like a temperance lecture. In fact, what truth is in it is certainly applicable to the abuse, not the use of coffee. It would be interesting if we could discover the origin of this excessive hostility to coffee, which belongs to the family of narcotics, and is a sort of foster brother of tobacco, that "foul and loathsome weed," as an irreverent lecturer calls it, which Hahnemann is said to have loved, if not wisely, at least too well. It may have been an idiosyncratic dislike, or more probably he fell into a common opinion of the time in which he wrote, and which was strongly shared by the philosopher Kant,* and by many French physicians, that coffee was an injurious beverage, and he afterwards rested his opinion upon the basis of unsound experiment. That it was an unsound deduction from the effects which follow the use of coffee when taken in a way to produce derangements in the system, to forbid its use in all circumstances, is obvious, if we reflect that we could all make ourselves as ill as any of our patients, if we were only to take dinner at time of breakfast, and tea at dinner time for a few days.

We cannot however dismiss the subject of experiments in diet, without some further remarks. And the first is, that although in the particular example we have quoted, Hahnemann committed a great mistake, yet that on the whole he is perfectly sound, and does not seek to lay down any positive rules about diet, but acknowledges that food must be regulated by the special appetites and instincts, as well as circumstances of those who take it; and he gives, in his "Friend of Health," several illustrations of the superiority of the popular over the scientific judgment upon this point.

In the whole of his intellectual career he seems to have been looking for some law of relation between diseases and their curative specifics, but nowhere does he hint that there can be any such law

* See De Quincey's Last Days of Kant.

to guide us in the choice of food; and as an obvious corollary to this tacit conviction, while he from the first insists upon the necessity of instituting a series of rigid experiments to discover the effects of a drug upon the animal economy, he nowhere suggests that similar experiments should be made in regard to food. He seems to have recognized the important difference between that kind of knowledge which we reach by experiment, as in chemistry, and that other kind by which we gain by observation, as in geology, where nature has made the experiments for us, extending over incalculable surfaces of space and periods of time. The feeding of the human race has been going on in every conceivable circumstance for many thousand years. In the language of Schleiden, "The Gaucho who in the wild pampas of Buenos Ayres, managing his half-wild horse with incredible dexterity, throws the lasso or bolus to catch the ostrich, the guancho, or the wild bull, consumes daily from ten to twelve pounds of meat, and regards it as a high feast day when in any hacienda he gains a variety in the shape of a morsel of pumpkin. The word bread does not exist in his vocabulary. The Irishman; on the other hand, regales himself in careless mirth on his potatoes and point, after a day of painful labor—he who cannot help making a joke of the name he gives to his scanty meal. Meat is a strange idea to him, and he is happy, indeed, if four times a year he can add a herring to season the mealy tubers. The hunter of the prairies lays low the buffalo with sure bullet, and its juicy, fat-streaked hump, roasted between two hot stones, is to him the greatest of luxuries; meanwhile, the industrious Chinese carries to market his carefully fattened rats, delicately arranged upon white sticks, certain to find a good customer among the epicures of Pekin; and in his hot smoky hut, fast buried beneath the snow and ice, the Greenlander consumes his fat, which he has just carved, rejoicing over the costly prize, from a stranded whale. Here the black slave sucks the sugar cane and eats his banana—there the Af-

rican merchant fills his wallet with sweet dates, his whole sustenance in the long desert journey—and there the Siamese crams himself with a quantity of rice, from which a European would shrink appalled. And wheresoever over the whole inhabited earth we approach and demand hospitality, in almost every little spot a different kind of food is set before us, and the daily bread offered in another form."*

After perusing such a passage as this we naturally ask, what conceivable advantage could the world derive from the experiments of Dr. Stark, who contrived to kill himself in about six months, by a succession of simple dishes?

Before his promulgation of homeopathy, Hahnemann, with the exception of his disapproval of coffee, did not differ in his views on diet from other writers of his age and country. "There is not," he says, "and cannot be anything, which, as a general rule, is absolutely wholesome or unwholesome. . . .

None of the general maxims of the dietist can be accounted good: such as veal is the most wholesome butcher's meat, &c. . . . There is a time for everything, says Solomon, and to my mind he speaks much more sensibly than most of the dietists." (Lesser Writings, page 227.) There is much more to the same effect in his early writings.

It is a very striking fact, that whereas, before he had discovered and taught the great law of healing, his position in regard to medicine was very similar to that of young physic of the present day, and he relied much upon sanitary and dietetic rules; after he had made good his grand discovery, that the obstacles to certainty in medicine were not insuperable, the power of diet as a method of cure, and its general importance seems to have assumed a very insignificant value in his eyes. What before had occupied whole treatises, now shrinks into this solitary observation in the *Organon*, (p. 308):—"Considering the minuteness of the doses necessary and proper in ho-

* The Plant—a biography, in a series of popular lectures, by M. J. Schleiden, Professor of Botany in the University of Jena, &c.

meopathic treatment, we may easily understand, that during the treatment everything must be removed from the diet and regimen which can have any medicinal action, in order that the small dose may not be overwhelmed and extinguished, or disturbed by any foreign medicinal irritant." In a note he adds, "Coffee, fine Chinese and other herb teas, and many other things ought to be avoided by patients, as they should avoid excesses in eating and drinking, sitting up long at night, damp rooms, penurious living, and so forth." The note concludes with the following remark: "Some of my disciples seem needlessly to increase the difficulties of a patient's dietary, by forbidding the use of many more tolerably indifferent things, which is not to be commended." Here we have the common sense rule laid down, that patients are to avoid things hurtful to themselves, and likely to interfere with the operation of a minute dose of medicine.

On this note of things to be avoided have been built, with a somewhat slavish adherence to the text instead of the spirit, the majority of those homeopathic diet tables, which are in such large circulation, although some of the most acknowledged authorities have expressed an opinion in favor of a more liberal interpretation of Hahnemann's doctrines upon this subject. Thus Hartmann remarks: "Every intelligent physician will at once perceive, that every patient cannot be subjected to such a rigorous diet, and that a man of sixty years old, for instance, who had been in the daily habit of taking coffee, tea, wine, brandy, or of smoking tobacco or using snuff, cannot be suddenly deprived of those things without detriment to his organism. Hahnemann allowed smoking and snuffing; he forbade wine, brandy, and coffee with great severity. This seems inconsistent, and leads to suppose that in a more advanced age we may except some other things from the general rule of abstinence." While in this country there

is undoubtedly a disposition to enlarge the table of our patients, in America our energetic friend Dr. Hempel seems inclined to transcend Hahnemann in the rigor of his rules of life—one of his golden rules, as he styles them, running thus: "Avoid all stimulating drinks, brandy, beer, and wine, and content yourself with cold water, milk, unsweetened chocolate, weak black tea, and syrups made of currants, raspberries, strawberries, or other kinds of wholesome and unmedicinal fruits. Never use tobacco in any shape, except for medicinal purposes."* We suspect that beyond the confines of the State of Maine Dr. Hempel's gospel will hardly find believers in the land of liberty and tobacco. Setting aside all extravagances, the subject assumes a very simple form, and may be divided into two questions.

1st.—Is it possible for our patients to avoid all medicinal substances in their diet; and

2nd.—Is it conducive to the better action of the medicine to enforce a very rigorous diet.

At present, let us observe, we are considering the question solely in the view of its relation to homeopathic medicine, not to general health.

1st.—Is it possible to confine our patients to a non-medicinal diet? Suppose we restrict them to a prison fare, and desire them to drink a tumbler of water, and eat four ounces of bread for a meal, and repeat this three times a day. This would appear simple enough with a vengeance. We shall suppose the scene London, and just inquire into the character of the bread and water diet we had prescribed. To begin with the water, it is an incontestable fact, that, in the words of Dr. Hassall, "The waters at present in this metropolis are all hard, and have all the disadvantages of hard water; they are moreover river waters, and for the most part contaminated to a great extent with organic matter, dead and living; add to these points the fact of their further deterioration by contact with lead cisterns, and by the accumu-

* p. 82, Acute Diseases, vol. I.

† See Laurie, Chepmell, and others.

lation and growth of animal and vegetable productions, which take place in these receptacles, and the case is proved against the whole present supply of the metropolis.* It is indeed impossible to contemplate the world of monsters contained in a drop of London water, without being satisfied that a score of globules would go but a little way in affording them a satisfactory repast. Besides these living impediments to the action of our globules, and besides the lead derived from the pipes and cisterns, which will be a stronger dose of Plumbum than our rigorous dietists ever employ, there are no less than from 20 to 30 grains of inorganic matter, carbonate of lime, of magnesia, &c., in every gallon of London water.†

So much for our patient's morning draught of pure water—now for his slice of bread.

[TO BE CONTINUED IN OUR NEXT.]

A NEW PLAN OF EXTRACTING FOREIGN BODIES FROM THE NOSE.

PRACTITIONERS are often called upon to extract various substances introduced into the nose of children, either by themselves in play, or by others in mischief. This little operation is not at all times of easy performance; the struggles of the child; the frequent free bleeding, and the nature or position of the foreign body, often prove serious obstacles in the way of a prompt and harmless success. Various means and instruments have been recommended and devised; but having had to perform the extraction in very many cases I have generally succeeded readily with a very simple instrument—taking a large pin and bending its point just enough to make a small hook, the pin is then held, or secured by a thread in a pair of forceps. The nostril being spread out, the pin is passed behind the object, and with a steady hand—to prevent tearing the mucous membrane—slowly and gradually bring it out at the anterior opening. This plan has always promptly succeeded when

the foreign body, such as a pea, bean, or kernel of corn had become somewhat softened by the nasal discharges. The pin hooks in firmly, and although it may be somewhat swollen, it is no impediment to its easy removal. Not so, however, if the body is of a nature, for example, a metal, pearl or bone button. I have removed such, but not without some trouble, and occasionally with more or less scratching of the nasal membrane.

In May last I was called to see the child of Mr. D., of this village, who had pushed up into the left nostril a fancy pearl button, nearly the size of a five-cent piece. The button could be indistinctly seen at the bottom of the nostril; I prepared a pin as usual, and the child's head being securely held, I passed it into the nose and endeavored to bring out the button, but from its hardness and smoothness the pin slipped over it again and again; I still persisted, but soon had to give up, as a free discharge of blood filled the nostril and obscured everything. Reflecting one moment upon M. Maisonneuve's plan of washing out the nose in ozæna—which had been reported in a late number of my LANCET—by throwing in a stream of water into one nostril it would run out freely through the other; I, at once, resolved to make a new application of this expedient. Having procured a four-ounce syringe and charging it with water, the pipe was introduced into the right nostril, and the piston being suddenly and forcibly pushed home a full stream of water rushed out from the right nostril, but the button was not dislodged. However, I was well satisfied with the simplicity and feasibility of the procedure, and threw in a second syringe-full, when the button was thrown out at some distance upon the floor.

A few days after, a stout Irish boy was brought to my surgery to have a kernel of corn removed from the left nostril. I did not, this time, attempt the pin-operation, but at once had recourse to the syringe. The first syringe-full proved of no benefit, very little water being thrown into the nostril, the movement of the child displacing the syringe.

* Food and its Adulterations, by Arthur Hill Hassall, M.D., p. 52, et seq.

† Johnston's Chemistry of Common Life, p. 38.