

CANADIAN
JOURNAL OF HOMEOPATHY.

Vol. II.

HAMILTON. C. W., MARCH, 1857.

No. 3.

LETTER TO A MEMBER OF THE CONNECTICUT MEDICAL SOCIETY.

Will you listen to the words of one whom you are wont to think of and to treat as a foe? My plea springs from our relations to each other as practitioners of medicine. We have, in common, important interests and serious duties. For the sake of these, the putting away mutual misunderstanding is greatly to be desired.

No thoughtful observer of the position which we and our respective associates hold towards each other, can doubt that there is much wrong pertaining thereto. I will not undertake to say where the blame lies; but I do desire to take that attitude towards you which the claims of truth and right require. Will you meet me in the same spirit, and look at our differences from a new point of view?

The history of other controversies should teach us a lesson pertinent to our relations to each other. How often has it been found, when the strife was over, that the partisans were both mistaken in the position of their opponents! Prejudice and personal antipathies have, it may be, so enveloped them as to prevent their seeing that those with whom they were at variance ought to have been, and might easily have become, friends and allies. Without claiming for myself any less liability to error, I see that you entertain much misapprehension which I hope to do something to remove. To enter on a formal discussion is not my object. Your feelings—and it may be true of my own—seem to be too much embittered to make controversy useful.

My aim is to place before you as strong an assurance as I can give expression to, of my conviction that the differences which separate us are neither in kind nor in degree what you seem to imagine. I hope to do this without cherishing animosity myself, or provoking recrimination in you.

To the extent of my knowledge and belief, the opinions of homeopathic physicians cannot properly be said to be antagonistic to your own. To us, the details of Anatomy, Physiology, and Pathology are necessary, as well as to you. The varied discoveries in science, care-

frown down those whom some are pleased to consider irregulars, build up individuals, rival institutions, and promote the prosperity of those to whom they refuse the right hand of fellowship.—*Medical World.*

LITTLE PILLS—EXPERIENCE.

The enemies of homeopathy love to ridicule it, because of its reliance upon what they facetiously style "those little pills." They will not consider any real proposition basing its merits upon a law, and not upon the simple amount of medicine prescribed. No. "Homeopathy is a humbug," they say, "because it gives such small doses that it is impossible for it to do any good." Now, we would simply inquire what it is that has regulated the dose of medicines as administered by the allopath? Why is a grain of opium recommended instead of an ounce? or an eighth or a fourth of a grain of morphine preferred to a whole grain, as an ordinary dose? Why give so much less of tartar emetic, phosphorus, croton oil, or prussic acid, than of Ipecacuanha, quinine, castor oil, or camphor? If big doses make the distinction between "Regulars" and "Irregulars," why be half-way heroic? What is not ponderous is paltry, remember. If a grain will do good, an ounce *must* do more; and if you give an ounce, why not a pound? As Paddy reasoned that two stoves would economise the whole of his wood if one would save half, so why should you withhold a thumping dose of medicine where it is called for at all? For this reason only—that EXPERIENCE has taught, and is teaching men, that, beyond a certain amount in each particular case, the employment of drugs is positively injurious. Tartar emetic could not be safely given in the same dose as Ipecac.; phosphorus as quinine; neither croton as castor oil. *Experience* has pointed out the general fact that all medicines have both a poisonous and a curative power. Beyond a certain limit in amount, they are constitutionally injurious. Within that limit, if rightly prescribed, they may, and can only be curative. Now, from an experience which allopaths have not had, we unhesitatingly declare them still prone to exceed the limits of safety; and that their ordinary doses occasion such poisonous and unnecessary results as are most grossly unscientific and improper. Experience tells them that too much is only too much, while she would whisper it kindly in their own ears, also, *if they would only hear*, that these "little pills," though so much despised, are a safer, more effectual, and more thoroughly scientific media of cure than can possibly be found in their whole catalogue of aggressives. It is a fact, and yet they will not see it. Experience has completed her mission with them. No use to investigate further. A grain is safer than ounce, but it is absurd to think that grains themselves could be graduated even yet further into divisions capable of multiplying their latent or consequent good. The science has come to a stand-still. Advancement is innovation. "Homeopathy is a humbug, and little pills are all nonsense," they say.

"We've gone far enough, else the ghost of old Galen will pursue us to the death. We must stop here. Hang these homeopaths, who haunt and hunt us round the world. We'll ridicule their little pills, and that will annoy them worse than anything else." And so they prate of faith, and whine about a temporary moonshine, which, somehow, renders their retinae for a long while obtuse. One man will eat a peck of our pellets, while another has discovered them very liable to produce salivation. One doctor declares them powerless, though his friend views them poisonous in the extreme, it may be. Authorities differ, yet each may *lie* in the other's way without in the least compromising veracity or exhibiting anything akin to a spirit of vindictiveness. And all this about these "little pills," that are "going down in Europe and in the East," and that, at the very best, constitute but a very *negation* in the world at large.

Experience is a good teacher. Homeopathy is a safe, and—we will insist—a *satisfactory* experiment to such as have not learned its edifying lessons. There is no good and plausible reason why physicians of any school should refuse to investigate it. The day must yet dawn when the illiberality of the Profession shall not be so exercised toward its great truths and greater results as now. Meantime, those same "little pills" will leaven the lump to a complete revolution, and who treats of their history a century hence, may perchance afford a paragraph to this our humble prophecy.—*Chicago Homeopath.*

RATIONAL HOMEOPATHY.

"Reason moves the wise and cudgels fools."

Homeopathy is, or should be, a rational science. We are aware that there are those who practically question the truthfulness of this proposition, and who seem to take delight in impressing every one with the idea that the more sublimated a science, the greater its effectiveness, and the more imperative its demands upon us for a glowing and appreciative admiration—whose love for the Past and its products of mind is so sincere and universal, that they must sacrifice their own sense at its shrine, and stand ready always to pin their individual faith to the whim or wisdom of such as are styled "Leaders." Yet it is nevertheless a clog to homeopathy, that her ranks contain but too many minds fitted only to be classed in the contemptible category of *copyists*. Every man should be able to give a reason for the faith there is in him, and this is especially true of professional men. It is their province to explain away objections logically, and to support their own views of theory and practice by a more common-sense and satisfactory method, than that of becoming themselves but mere finger-boards to other men's opinions. Nothing argues more feebly for whatever pertains to homeopathy, than to be referred only to the fact that the great Hahnemann said thus and so concerning it; or to be told

that one or another of his *satellites* have supported this or that proposition, and with a dogmatic authority which it may be heretical to question! These authorities may indeed be almost invaluable, oftentimes, yet are they but too frequently imperfect and unsatisfactory to a mind philosophically bent upon reflecting as to the why and wherefore of whatever concerns it.

Hahnemann was a great man, and his a giant intellect. He did much, very much, to reform the most popular and flagrant errors in the so-called science of medicine, as it existed but half a century since. His life and writings abound in examples which merit our esteem none the less than our hearty admiration; while they render his memory as perpetually fragrant with the perfume of his many and noble deeds. Yet it is not impossible that, in correcting an old error, he might easily have run his speculations too far in an opposite direction; and that while denouncing all theoretical tendencies of his age and profession, he should have proved himself the most sublime dogmatist of any or all of his compeers. This is exactly what he accomplished. In healing one extreme he created another. Hence, although he both wrote and taught a great many good things, he has certainly left us much upon record which must be classed as *extremely* worthless. And so of all our medical authorities. The principles which they have severally advocated are of no value unless ratified by reason and substantiated by plain, practical issues. The mere *ipse dixit* of the most renowned is worthless without these securities.

But the first and particular idea which we meant to make prominent and to insist upon in this article, is, that homeopathy, as a science, is not responsible for all the ridiculous mummeries which selfish and designing men have attached to it. Its practice is *not* that of the mere *routinist*. There is, in a word, as much need of skill and science in the personal qualification of a successful homeopathic practitioner, as there is of sense and sobriety in that of any other advocate of the learned professions. He who does not possess such requisites, cannot be a worthy apostle of a science which, like ours, is based upon a Law. —*Ib.*

POSITION IN SLEEPING.

It is better to go to sleep on the right side, for then the stomach is very much in the position of a bottle turned upside down, and the contents are aided in passing out by gravitation. If one goes to sleep on the left side, the operation of emptying the stomach of its contents is more like drawing water from a well. After going to sleep, let the body take its own position. If you sleep on your back, especially soon after a hearty meal, the weight of the digestive organs, and that of the food, resting on the great vein of the body, near the back bone, compresses it, and arrests the flow of the blood more or less. If the arrest is partial, the sleep is disturbed, and there are unpleasant dreams. If the meal has been recent or hearty, the arrest is more de-

cided, and the various sensations, such as falling over a precipice, or the pursuit of a wild beast, or other impending danger, and the desperate effort to get rid of it arouses us; that sends on the stagnating blood, and we wake in a fright, or trembling, or perspiration, or feeling of exhaustion, according to the degree of stagnation, and the length and strength of the effort made to escape the danger. But when we are not able to escape the danger, when we do fall over the precipice, when the tumbling building crushes us, what then? *That is Death!* That is the death of those of whom it is said, when found lifeless in their bed in the morning, "They were as well as they ever were the day before;" and often it is added, "and *ate heartier than common!*" This last, as a frequent cause of death to those who have gone to bed well to wake no more, we give merely as a private opinion. The possibility of its truth is enough to deter any rational man from a late and hearty meal. This we do know with certainty, that waking up in the night with painful diarrhœa, or cholera, or bilious colic, ending in death in a very short time, is properly traceable to a late large meal. The truly wise will take the safer side. For persons who eat three times a day, it is amply sufficient to make the last meal of cold bread and butter and a cup of some warm drink. No one can starve on it, while a perseverance in the habit soon begets a vigorous appetite for breakfast, so promising of a day of comfort.—*Hall's Journal of Health.*

DARING SURGERY.

With vulgar minds, cutting and slashing passes for operative surgery. He who is constantly amputating limbs, establishes the reputation of being a great surgeon; while the quiet, modest man, ambitious to save limbs and succeeds, is scarcely regarded for skill. Exploits, whether for evil or good, with a scalpel or a sword, provided they are freely used, create surprise at first, and then admiration. The inventor of a revolving pistol that enables the possessor to kill seven people in less than a minute, is hailed as a genius, and secures both agreeable notoriety and a fortune for his destructive invention. On the contrary, those who propose contrivances for saving life, whether at sea, or from a burning house, can scarcely find a purchaser for the apparatus.

Modern surgery is exceedingly unobtrusive compared with that of the olden time. It is divested of some of its dangers, and is daily being improved, since it is actually becoming fashionable to avoid operations if there is any prospect that nature can do better than art.—*Medical World.*

☞ An industrious English gentleman is about to publish a volume of "vital statistics," containing a record of four thousand persons who have attained the advanced age of one hundred years, with biographical notes and anecdotes, illustrative of their characters and habits.

BLUE PILLS FOR LIVER COMPLAINT.

T. L. of Benton, Pa., writes—"I am laboring under Liver Disease and Dyspepsia. My physician prescribes *blue pills*. He says they are an effectual remedy. What say you?"

We say they *are not*. They are an abomination. They have made more confirmed cases of these difficulties than they have ever cured. Almost invariably prescribed, and yet these diseases have increased in direct ratio with their prescription. Our streets and highways are crowded with poor and wretched victims of dyspepsia and its concomitant derangements, possessing scarce life enough to drag their benumbed limbs along, while gloomy melancholy sits upon their brow, and holds in subjection both mind and body, rendering the one fearfully alive to coming evil, and the other irrevocably dead to present good. Blue pills, coupled with the Briarean arms and the herculean strength of Allopathy, have been brought to bear, but have not only been found to be inadequate to the destruction of the terrible hydra that both struck so discordant a string, and bid it send forth such inharmonious numbers, but by its harsh and irritating appliances has so destroyed the sensibility of the tissue of nerves supplying the organs involved as to render the present discord an *ultimate wreck*. Temporary relief they afforded, it is true; but when the ultimate results are considered, he that submits to the "remedy," finds that he is compounding at a fearful rate—that he is bartering the blessings and enjoyments of future health for the present temporary relief. Hence we contend that the sacrifice is too great, the benefit too small, for any one to make the one for the other. Such being the results of allopathic practice, well might a blush tinge its sallow cheek, painted though it be with the faded colors of medical science. Instead of furnishing the needed antidote, weeping humanity points her withered finger to its spectral genius brooding over her blighted hope.—*M. S. Reformer*.

MORTALITY AMONG BACHELORS.

The forlorn condition of bachelors has always been a favorite theme for ladies, editors, and other wits to expatiate upon. The untidy room, the buttonless shirts, the stockings full of holes, and the thousand other inconveniences of the unmarried state, are familiar in this way to the most obtuse of us all.

The poor bachelors have, in fact, a hard time of it. They have been ridiculed by the sex, and sometimes taxed by legislators; and now staticians deal them "the unkindest cut of all," by proving that they die earlier than married men. The celebrated Dr. Caspar, of Berlin, estimates the mortality among bachelors, between the ages of thirty to forty-five, at twenty-seven per cent.; while the mortality among married men, between the same ages, is only eighteen per cent. As life advances, the difference becomes even more striking. Where

forty-one bachelors attain the age of forty, there are seventy-eight married men, a difference of nearly two to one in favor of the latter. At the age of sixty there are forty-eight married men to twenty-two bachelors; at seventy, eleven bachelors to twenty-seven married men; and at eighty, nine married men to three bachelors. No bachelor, it is said, ever lived to be a hundred.

The reason for the comparatively short life of the bachelor is obvious. Of two men, exactly similar in other respects, except that one is married and the other not, the bachelor will have the more irregular habits. Gentlemen, when single, are twice as apt, as Dick Swiveller has it, "to pass the rosy," as when they are married, and especially to do it into what Burns calls "the wee sma' hours ayont the twal'." Ten bachelors sing "we won't go home till morning," where one married man vocalizes in the same way. No doubt to bachelor taste all this is very delightful. But brandy and water, cards, *et id omne genus*, especially after midnight, take care to compensate themselves, in due season, for the fun that has been extracted from them. They may cast out the "blues," so incident to the bachelor state, for the time being; but "the blues" thus cast out, invariably return, bringing "seven devils worse than before;" and among them are gout, fever, and rheumatism, if not delirium tremens and death. Too often, indeed, the bachelor lives on the capital of life, and hence exhausts his bank, when the married man is still well to do in health, happiness, and longevity.—*Chicago Homeopath.*

HOW IS IT?—A MEDICAL QUERY.

Only the other day a patient said to us, "Doctor, how is it? I take your medicines, as prescribed, but see no earthly effect from them, except that I get well."

"Well, my dear sir, isn't that sufficient?"

"To be sure it will do, but I've been used to a different way of doing; and it seems to me your medicine does me no good at all until, the first thing I know, I am as well as anybody. Now I want to know *how* it is?"

"I think, Mr. S., we can tell you in a very few words. You must know that disease in the body or in an organ excites an increased sensibility therein to the action of external agents? A very little light will almost distract a person with inflammation of the eyes, oftentimes; and the least particle of food swallowed, or even the smell of it, will increase vomiting and pain in the stomach, and so on with a great many other ailments. Now, if these agents are *medicinal*, they act much more promptly in sickness than in health, and consequently a much less quantity is necessary to produce a *curative* effect than it would take to cause the harsh and poisonous results that follow the use of stronger doses. Homeopathy gives but very little medicine, and so meets and sets aside the susceptibility occasioned by, and belonging to, the disease, and when this is gone, does not hazard subsequent health by having induced a long and formidable train of *constitutional* symptoms.—*Id.*

THE EFFORTS OF NATURE.—Too many physicians do not properly understand what these are—especially those resorting to depletion for the removal of disease. How frequently does it happen that physicians of this class have attended to persons attacked with dangerous disorders, giving largely and freely of the most dangerous poisons in the *materia medica* until at last they give them up, acknowledging them as hopeless, and that they can do nothing for them. And yet the poor patient, deserted by his physician, oppressed by despair, weakened by the combined force of a dangerous disease and active poisons, recovers! The efforts of nature cures him at last! Then can it be proper to oppose them? Every remedy and appliance that tends to oppose the operations of Nature is hurtful and dangerous.

☞ Thirst is generally said to have its seat in the back of the mouth and throat; but the condition of these parts is merely local accompaniment of a want experienced by the whole frame, and perceived by the nervous system. Local applications, accordingly, go but a short way in giving relief, while the introduction of fluids by any other channel—by immersion in a bath, injections in the veins, or through an external opening into the stomach—is sufficient to quench thirst without the liquor touching the throat. The affection of that part, therefore, is merely a result of the state of the system, and not itself the cause of the thirst.

☞ The Dublin Quarterly Journal of Medicine reports a somewhat curious case—that of a laborer who was admitted into the hospital the day after he had swallowed a fish bone, while eating his dinner. Immediately after his admission to the institution, he vomited the bone up, but died the same evening. A post mortem examination by the attending physicians disclosed the peculiar fact that the sharp edge of the bone had cut completely through the œsophagus into the descending portion of the arch of the aorta. Of course the man bled to death.

PROFESSOR LIEBIG recommends the use of saturated solution of lime in cold water for making bread. He regards flour as not a perfectly alimentary substance, and as not sufficient in a state of bread to support life, principally for the want of lime. There can be no question that the use of superfine flour is not as healthy nor as nutritious, as would be the use of unbolted flour. Much of the salts necessary to the formation of bone and muscle are lost. Unbolted flour is therefore preferable on the score of health.

DR. J. H. BLAKE, of North Auburn, mentions a case of poisoning by arsenic, which occurred lately in his practice—the mineral forming an ingredient of the coloring matter used for staining paper. A child was taken sick after chewing a green pasteboard show card, but was restored by prompt and skilful administration of the usual remedies. On examination and analysis, it was found that the card was enameled with a preparation of arsenic.

For the Canadian Journal of Homeopathy.

ON a fine afternoon, late in the autumn of 184—, there chanced to meet on the levee of one of the flourishing little cities, situated on the eastern bank of the great "Father of Waters," a clergyman and an eminent allopathic physician. The former, when on a visit at the East, some few years previously, had been converted to homeopathy. Being acquaintances, and knowing each other's opinion of the rival schools of medicine, the new system soon became the subject of conversation, and the following dialogue ensued.

Doctor.—Well, Mr. Barron, how do you get along in homeopathy now days?

Mr. B.—Very well, indeed, sir. The sugar pills seem to answer the purpose admirably. We have been able to cure with them all our diseases, thus far, since we adopted it; and, as you are aware, we have not been obliged to trouble you as we did formerly.

Dr.—Very true, so far as the last is concerned, at least; but I cannot believe that those very minute doses of medicine have any effect whatever upon actual disease; but that nature performs the cure assisted, perhaps, by regimen.

Mr. B.—Yes; but may not a cure follow their administration, nevertheless, and you not be able to comprehend or believe it, simply, because you have not taken a correct view of the case? May you not have suffered yourself to be too much influenced by education and association, and, consequently, judge erroneously? Such things have occurred to others, and it may have been so with you?

Dr.—Not very much, I think, if at all. But I cannot conceive how such very minute quantities of any medicine can produce the effect homeopathic physicians ascribe to them in curing diseases. It does not seem common sense.

Mr. B.—Though I do not claim to be competent myself to say *how* that effect is produced, or to discuss medical questions with you; yet as my opinion has been formed entirely from my own immediate observation and experience, I must say that the *fact* of a remedial effect *being produced* by them, is, to my mind, perfectly clear and satisfactory.

Dr.—I must confess I do not understand how it can be. It certainly does not correspond with medical facts long since established; neither does it seem reasonable to me.

Mr. B.—Well, Doctor, may not that arise from the fact that you are so thoroughly imbued with the opinions and doctrines of the so-called "old school," that you have never allowed yourself to *think* even

that, after all our opposition and ridicule, homeopathy *may* be true? That you, like many others, have never taken an impartial view of the subject, or made an unprejudiced investigation and trial of the homeopathic remedies, in order to test their effects in the treatment of diseases?

Dr.—The thing appears so ridiculous I have never felt at all inclined to do either. It is not reasonable to suppose that the infinitesimal doses of medicine used in that system have any effect in the cure of disease.

Mr. B.—Allow me, doctor, to make one suggestion for your consideration before we part, and that is this, admit in your own mind, for the sake of the investigation, that the *system may be true*, and then, fairly and fully test and try the remedies under that impression. Set out with the idea settled in your mind that the principles of homeopathy *may* be correct after all, and rest there, until you have made a thorough investigation and trial of the principles and remedies advocated and used in that system of practice; then you will be more competent to decide the question correctly.

Dr.—There can be no harm in that, I admit; and as the idea is new, I will think of it. I am now on my way to Cincinnati for the Lecture term, and while there, I think I will take the opportunity to provide myself with the necessary works on the subject, and commence an investigation on your plan, and see what will be the result.

Mr. B.—Only do that, doctor, and in the end you will be as well convinced of the truth of homeopathy as I am.

I have given the above dialogue in detail, as it actually occurred, in order to show how very easy it is for the mind to arrive at the truth, when placed in a position to view it from a correct stand point. No investigation can be fair or satisfactory unless made with the mind open for the admission of facts, however much they may clash with our previous opinions or doctrines.

The result of the above arrangement was, that Doctor D—, allowing himself to start fairly, in an open field, became within six months, a decided convert to the doctrines of the "new school," and from having been a prominent allopathist, is now, and has been for several years, one of the most successful homeopathic practitioners in the south-western States. Having full and entire confidence in the small doses of specific remedies.

ARETEUS.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

AN APOLOGY AND AN APPEAL.

We abhor apologies, but the Journal is one month late, and it is right our patrons should know the reason why it is so late in its appearance. The time devoted to its publication is such moments as we can snatch from our professional engagements. Since January we have been quite unable to give much attention to its publication, and less to seeing it properly and carefully mailed; all of which we sincerely regret, but trust to the forbearance of our many readers for indulgence, on our promise to be more prompt in future. We are only one month late, while many of our subscribers are many months in arrears. Now, we are not agoing to dun, for that we abhor as much as apologies; but we wish to intimate to those who receive and read the Journal, and to those who are interested in its prosperity and circulation, that we shall not continue it unless it is pecuniarily sustained. We are willing to devote a portion of our time and energy to its support; but we have no disposition to work to our pecuniary disadvantage. We expect no pecuniary gain from its publication; neither are we willing to submit to pecuniary loss further than the time we may devote in arranging it for publication. We have no ambition to gratify, or personal end to serve other than the common interest of all homeopathic physicians, and the advantage of the patrons of the homeopathic practice. So that if we are compelled to discontinue, which we trust will not be the case, we shall have no more regret than many who have taken a deep interest in the Journal from its commencement. Many of our agents we have heard nothing from since the beginning of the year. We hope to hear favorably from all soon. We will endeavor to have the April No. ready for mailing on the 20th of the month, and to soon again be able to publish, as usual, on the first of each month.

THE MEDICAL MONOPOLY.

The truth requires no legal enactments to sustain it with an educated people, while doubtful philosophy needs be hedged about by statutes to prevent encroachments upon its assumptions. The legalization of allopathic medicine to the exclusion of all other systems of medicine, assumes that this system is right beyond a question, and that all others

ful experimenting on the vital functions, the phenomena exhibited by the *corpus mortuum*, the healing properties of medicines, and the sad effects of poisons, all contribute to our knowledge as well as to yours. The essential tenets of our system are not based on visionary speculations. The conflict between them and those principles which you deem most important, exists not of necessity, but springs chiefly from the misconceptions and the alienation of the parties.

Now, I am aware that this is different from what you and your friends suppose. You are gravely told, and you listen to the tale, that by us all knowledge as to the nature and effects of morbid action is disregarded;—that the homeopathist has nothing to do with the causes or seat of disease;—that to him an accurate diagnosis is of no importance;—that he discards all that has heretofore been taught of the *modus operandi* of medicines. It is said, moreover, that we not only reject all the commonly received principles of medicine, but that we offer as substitutes certain dogmas of our own, conflicting with yours, and totally irreconcilable with the accumulated teachings of ages.

I will not stop to inquire whence these impressions originated. Doubtless our views may be stated in such a manner as to seem to justify these conclusions. Perhaps in the heat of controversy, or in the recoil from what we deemed error, we may ourselves have led you to these opinions. We assure you, nevertheless, that they are erroneous. We entirely disavow these conclusions, and assert that all opinions of homeopathy based upon them must be fallacious.

So far from rejecting the aid of Pathology, we believe that all that can be accurately ascertained of the nature of disease, its seat, and its laws, and the changes it produces, ought to be known, and made available in practice. This knowledge should include the organ affected, and the particular tissue involved, even to the minutest fibre wherein change can be traced; the characteristics of these changes, and the order in which they occur: their aggravations and ameliorations, and the mysterious sympathies which exist with distant organs. We desire to know, in short, every variation from the healthy structure and functions. It is often objected to us, that we attach too much importance to *symptoms*. But we mean by symptoms, the entire *ensemble* of morbid phenomena. Everything that can be known of these phenomena, in all their shades and in all their relations, is, or ought to be of importance to the homeopathist. If you pass beyond the limits of ascertained facts, and offer opinions on them, you must surely allow us the liberty you take for yourselves, to accept these or not. But the facts, whether exhibited in the patient before us, or known to exist by pathological or other investigation in similar cases, are each and all adjudged by us indispensable means to perfect the treatment.

We have constant occasion to regret that our best efforts furnish us but an imperfect knowledge of the phenomena of disease. More industry in study, more faithfulness in observation, and more skill in duly appreciating the relative importance of the gathered facts, are greatly to be desired. We acknowledge our indebtedness to you and to your predecessors, for your investigations in these departments of science. New discoveries made by you, we hail with satisfaction, confident that

is not only wrong, but dangerous to the people. If allopathy is right, and the only true system of medication, it cannot suffer from any rival system, but would be able to demonstrate itself to its votaries in a positive and conclusive manner, and should have no fear of competition. If doubtful, it should have an equal opportunity, and no more, with other systems; if false, it should receive that condemnation which it would deserve, and not have the fostering care of government. We have much faith in the maxim of "Truth is mighty and will prevail."

Allopathy is regarded by a great body of the most intelligent physicians throughout the world as an exploded and dangerous fallacy. Again, a large body of our most intelligent people, whose observations justify their convictions, firmly and consistently believe in the homeopathic system of medicine; and in the event of not being able to secure the aid of homeopathy, would sooner rely upon the unaided efforts of nature than submit to the ordeal of rigorous allopathy. But the law steps between them and the physician of their choice, and threatens the latter with fine and imprisonment for practising that upon his friend which reason, philosophy, and experience has demonstrated to be necessary for the alleviation of his suffering, and the saving of his life. It may be said that the law does not prescribe what a man shall pursue in the cure of disease, only that he shall hold a license from the Medical Board of Upper Canada. That the Medical Board could or would grant a license to an homeopath, known to be such, is preposterous, or that an honorable physician would falsify his practice to obtain favor, is equally as absurd. Hence the only course open to medical reformers, those who are convinced of the fallacy of old school, and are humbly laboring to maintain a more safe and rational mode of medical treatment, is to submit to the punishments of a disgraceful statute enforced by the malice of jealous minds, and hope for better and more enlightened enactments. With the man now before the Toronto courts we have no sympathy, believing from what knowledge we have of his career, that he is a most arrant quack; but the same law applies with equal force against the body and property of a class of physicians against whose course no moral objection can be raised, and whose only crime is curing disease in a speedy, safe, and efficient manner, to the discomfiture of envious-minded knights of the lancet and blister. We insert below an extract from the Toronto *Globe*, which contains more good sense than all medical laws that were ever enacted:—

"The *odium theologicum* may be strong, but the bitterness of medical differences is even stronger; and it is vain to imagine that allopathist and homeopathist could be brought to sit at the same board and pass the same examination. In the very nature of things it is impossible. Now let us ask what is to be done under such circumstances? Is the allopathic system, which is dominant at the board, to have a monopoly of provincial practice? Has medical science arrived at such a point that the legislature can say that one system is right and all the rest are wrong? Who will be so absurd as to say so? There is no science on which so much diversity of opinion exists as that of medicine. One uses drugs, and another renounces them entirely; one gives large doses of mercury and another calls them poison; one gives infinitesimal quantities, and another ridicules them as utterly inoperative and childish. Is the Legislature to step in and decide when doctors differ, to say to the homeopathist, you shall not practice under pain of imprisonment; and to the allopathist, you may charge two dollars a visit and poison with morphia and calomel as many as you choose? Yet this is the result of the law put in force in Tumblety's case. If Dr. Grant is successful in his first suit, there is no reason in the world why he should not arrest one of the many respectable homeopathic physicians residing in this city or Hamilton, have his property seized by the Police, and himself committed to gaol. There is no difference between the two parties in the eye of the law. Both parties have given medicine without license, and are equally answerable. Now, we would like to be informed why a man who believes in small doses should be refused the aid of a physician who will give them to him; why he should be compelled by Act of Parliament to call in a man that he believes will poison him. Are we going back to the sixteenth century, that such a law as this should be put in force in Canada?

The present attempt on the part of Dr. Grant and his supporters to get rid of all rivals, is the practical carrying into effect of ideas ventilated at a meeting of the medical profession, held in Toronto some time ago. The *medicos* who assembled on that occasion contended that Parliament should allow them to form an association which would have the power to exclude from practice all who did not come up to the formula which it might select. The same demand, in effect, is now made through the courts. All who will not go before a Board composed of old school physicians, and submit to the views propounded there, must be punished by fine and imprisonment if they give advice and take a fee. We feel convinced that by making this demand, the regular profession will incur much unpopularity, and will gain nothing. It is quite impossible to put bonds on a sick man and say, this person only you must consult, and no one else. The patient must be allowed to go to whom he pleases, to whoever will give him relief. If the regular profession sustain their reputation in public estimation, they will sustain the largest share of practice; but if new discoveries are made, and they are left behind, the people must be allowed to follow the new lights, if they so will."

ADVERTISEMENTS.

Having associated with myself, in the practice of medicine, Dr. Eddy, I would say to those laboring under Chronic Disease, that we are devoting a part of each day to its investigation and treatment; and more especially to diseases of the Lungs and Throat. Those wishing an examination of the Chest, will find us at home from 2 to 5 o'clock, P.M. Office at residence on Gore St., one door below John St.

WM. A. GREENLEAF, M.D.

DRS. GREENLEAF, & EDDY,

Gore Street, one door below John Street, North side, Hamilton, C. W.

PARTICULAR attention given to the examination and treatment of diseases of the **THROAT** and **LUNGS**.

Office hours from 8 to 9, A. M.; from 1 to 4 and 6 to 8, P. M.

SMITH'S HOMEOPATHIC PHARMACY,

484 Broadway and 105 Fourth Avenue, New York.

J. T. S. SMITH

Has for sale a general assortment of Homeopathic Triturations, Tinctures, Dilutions, and Pellets, including the higher attenuations, both imported and of his own preparation.

Cases for Physicians and Family use, of various sizes and prices.

Pure Sugar of Milk, Alcohol, Distilled Water, and unmedicated Pellets, constantly on hand.

C. S. CHITTENDEN,

SURGEON DENTIST. Office over Mills & Wright's Store, corner of King and John Streets, Hamilton.

Mr. CHITTENDEN would now say to his numerous patrons and the public generally, that, having been in constant practice in this city for nearly seven years, he feels no hesitation in asking for a continuation of their patronage. Mr. C. is now prepared to insert Teeth on **GUTTA FEREA PLATES**, which seems to answer much better than Gold in many cases. The testimony of thousands, in regard to his skill, can be given.

J. ADAMS, M.D.,

HOMEOPATHIC PHYSICIAN & SURGEON, 19 Bay Street, Toronto.
At home from 8 to 10 o'clock, A.M., and from 3 to 6 o'clock, P.M.

JENICHEN POTENCIES.

It has been asserted that, at the death of Jenichon, the secret of his mode of preparing Medicines was lost. Be this as it may,

DR. BOENNINGHAUSEN

The most successful physician now living, has during the last ten years, used only

LEHRMANN'S HIGH POTENCIES, (200th),

And finds them fully equal to the *Jenichen Medicines*.

The Subscriber, having imported a suite of these Medicines, offers them at the following moderate prices:—214 drachm vials, in mahogany case, \$30: do. half drachm \$20. A selection of 84 at half these prices.

He is constantly receiving direct from Europe the best *German Tinctures*, and is prepared to furnish Pharmacuists with every thing in their line at a liberal discount. Catalogues by mail. Terms—CASH.

J. T. P. SMITH,

BROOKLYN HOMEOPATHIC PHARMACY,
October, 1856.

HORTON, GRAHAM, & CO,

MANUFACTURERS of Graham's Patent Graduating Truss, Utero-Abdominal Supporter, Adjustable Shoulder Brace, and Femalo Bandage, Middletown, Orange County, N. Y.

Orders received by Schieffelin, Brothers & Co., 170 William Street, N. Y.; by Brown & Knapp, Boston; Demarest and Holman, Buffalo.

MATTHEW'S HOMEOPATHIC PHARMACY,

129 S. *Eight Street*, above *Spruce*, Philadelphia.

SUPERVISED by J. G. HOWARD, M.D., where will be found constantly on hand a good assortment of *Homeopathic Medicines*, in Tinctures, Triturations, and Dilutions. Also, Family Medicine Chests, Physicians' Pocket Cases, Sugar of Milk, Pellets, Refined Sugar of Milk, and all the Homeopathic Books and Pamphlets published in the United States.

DR. W. J. FERGUSON,

HOMEOPATHIC PHYSICIAN, Woodstock, C. W. Professional calls promptly attended to in town or country.

F. M. HAVENS, M.D., Homeopathic Physician, Office over Hopkins & Boles, corner of King and Queen Streets, St. Catharines.

J. H. GEMRIC, Manufacturer of Surgical and Dental Instruments, Trusses and Bandages, No. 34 South Eighth Street, Philadelphia.

DR. J. J. LANCASTER, Homeopathic Physician, Junction, Westminster, Canada W

A. T. BULL, M.D.

HOMEOPATHIC PHYSICIAN & SURGEON.—Office over Gunn & Gordon's, Dundas Street, London, C. W. Office hours from 8 to 10 A.M., and 4 to 6 P. M.

RESIDENCE.—East Dundas Street, nearly opposite that of E. Adams, Esq.

DR. R. J. SMITH'S

HOMEOPATHIC PHARMACY, 35 King Street East, Toronto, C. W.
Keeps constantly on hand and for sale a large assortment of Homeopathic Books and Journals, Tinctures, Triturations, Dilutions, Medicated Pellets and Attenuations, of various potency. CASES OF MEDICINE for Physicians and Families, embracing every variety, from 10 to 200 Remedies. Homeopathic Vials of all sizes, pure distilled Alcohol and Water Globules, Sugar of Milk, Velvet Corks, Labels, Arnica, Plaster, &c. &c.—including every thing pertaining to the profession, wholesale and retail.

F. E. BERICKE,

LATE BERICK & 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.

HOMEOPATHIC PHARMACY, HAMILTON, C. W.

HOMEOPATHIC Medicines, in Tinctures, Dilutions, Triturations, and Pellets—Books, Medicine Cases, Pellets, Arnica, Sugar of Milk, Alcohol, and all other articles required by Homeopathic Physicians, furnished to order.

A. N. WOLVERTON, M. D.

OFFICE—King, one door above James, (South side.)

CHARLES T. HURLBURT,

AMERICAN Homeopathic Pharmacy, 437 Broom 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.

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. ~~35~~ Painting and Engraving done in superior style. Physicians' Cases and Medicine Chests furnished and refitted at the shortest notice.

KUEMERLE & KOLBE,

MANUFACTURERS of Surgical and Dental Instruments and Syringes. No. 45 South Eighth Street, below Chesnut, Philadelphia.

Physicians or Dentists ordering Instruments from K. & K. may depend on receiving articles of the best quality.

they will increase our power as well as yours. In every case which we are called upon to treat, we are glad to obtain from any quarter the minutest fact that will aid us "to know in what way the particular disease exhibits itself;" but mere speculations we distrust. If we have any theories of our own as to the origin or nature of disease, we hold them of secondary importance. Like other theories, their chief use is to suggest where to look for the facts.

The making a diagnosis with us (is it not also with you?) should consist in thus determining the entire aggregate of morbid phenomena. To take a part of these phenomena, even those exhibited in the dissecting-room, and to give them a name, whether it be "dothenteritis," or "neuralgia," or "dropsy," or "pneumonia," and to call that a diagnosis,—to reason upon it as such, and regulate the treatment accordingly,—such a course has been thought a sufficient warrant by some of our writers, but not by them alone, for saying some hard things of pathological doctrines. Of course, we do not object to either of these names where it is used merely as a term of convenience to express a group of facts; but if this group is made the basis of a theory, to accommodate which, other facts are disregarded, because their pathological relations are as yet unknown, we do most heartily object. We think there is nothing in our views of this matter from which you would dissent, if we could secure your attention to what they really are, apart from other views of ours which you deem erroneous. Yet you are told that we discard all use of pathology. It is the old story—an equivocal term has made trouble between us. In one sense we respect it, and avail ourselves of it as sincerely as do you. In another sense, that which includes speculations as well as facts, both of us distrust it, unless the speculations happen to be our own. Are not these things so, and ought they not to suggest a doubt of the justice of our exclusion from all rightful rank in the profession? Is it right that the adoption of pathological hypotheses should be made a test of professional standing?

Another objection urged against us is, we think, equally erroneous. It is said that our views of the *modus operandi* of medicines are at utter variance with yours.

We seek to learn what we can, from every accessible quarter, of the effects produced by a medicine;—what organs, tissues or fibres, its activity is specially exerted upon; what structural changes and functional disturbance it either causes or removes; what effects are produced as the direct result of its action, and what consist in reaction from some previous or remote operation; whether the effects are transient, protracted, permanent, or intermittent; what are the modifications made by dose, age, sex, constitution, disease, and any other of the many circumstances whose influence may be at once certain and inscrutable;—in short, all the effects on every organ, even by the most remote and interchanging sympathies, which are the results of medicinal action, whether morbid or curative, obvious or recondite, ought to be faithfully sought for by us.

But we are pained to realize that in point of fact we know so little of Nature's *Materia Medica*. The medicines we are most familiar with,

we know only in part. All around us are agents with properties, we doubt not, of inestimable value, but quite unknown. The limitation to our knowledge may be our own fault, but it is not the fault of our principles. They call for an accurate knowledge of the properties of medicines. Nor can our *practice* ever be perfected until this is at least measurably secured.

Among the methods of ascertaining the properties of a medicine, we think the best consists in careful trials of it in health. The normal condition of the organic structure and functions should be the standard, all variations from which possess a definiteness and importance which cannot be expected where the symptoms of the remedy are intermixed with, or modified by those of disease. We deem no labor too great, and no care needless, if they aid us in determining the pure effects of medicines. To that end, no attainable facts are to be treated as irrelevant or unimportant, provided they are real changes—not imaginary ones. A slight change of sensation is not (in the present state of our knowledge) to be weighed, as to its pathological import, before it can be accepted. The minute characteristics which distinguish a remedy from all others, and the great features which link it with a class of agents, are all to be sought. If an agent destroys whatever tissue it is brought in contact with, but in small doses merely causes intermittent neuralgia of a particular set of nerves, perhaps the latter fact is as likely as the former, to elucidate its therapeutic power. Nor are we to disregard the effects which occur in special idiosyncracies, as perhaps these cases of extreme susceptibility may best suggest to us where the true force of the medicine is to be found.

If the objection which we are considering is, that we willingly ignore any attainable facts in regard to the action of medicines, you are certainly mistaken. If it means that we hold as facts what are not such, we would say that, if it be so, it is unintentional, and we desire to be set right. We are not conscious of any unwillingness to yield our views of a medicine to evidence acquired by more faithful observation, and more careful experiment. Whenever any one can furnish us a generalization of facts hitherto isolated, we are glad to receive it as a matter of convenience. Even speculations we should feel bound to listen to, as suggesting fields for experiment. In short, all the variations from healthy action caused and remedied by a medicine, we are anxious to learn; but beyond this, we plead ignorance.

The objection admits of a signification which it is most important to distinguish. Beyond the range of ascertained facts, there are some opinions held as to the action of medicines, about whom there is room for difference. We fully admit, on our part, that we cannot explain *how* medicines act, though we have some notions on the subject which seem to us worth as much as any others are. We have indeed a rule which aids us in the selection of our remedies, but of the mysterious processes whereby they change morbid action to healthy, we know but little. Is your position irreconcilable with this?

If there is any medicine whose action is fully understood by you, it would seem that *mercury* ought to be the one. Its long and extended use, its great activity, its good and its bad effects are so strongly

marked, that an amount of attention has been directed towards it second to that bestowed on no other article of the *Materia Medica*. Yet we are told by your highest authority that—

“Of the *modus operandi* of mercury we know nothing, except that it probably acts through the medium of the circulation, and that it possesses a peculiar alterative power over the vital functions, which enables it in many cases to subvert diseased action, by substituting its own in their stead. This alterative power is sometimes exerted, without being attended by any other vital phenomena than the removal of the disease; while at other times, it is attended with certain obvious effects, indicative of the agency of a potent stimulus.”—(*Dispensatory of the U. S. of A., by Wood and Bache.*)

So, too, the very definition of an alterative (in the same work,) is—“that which changes, in some inexplicable and insensible manner, certain morbid actions of the system;” and Pereira says of alteratives—“this class includes nearly the whole of the articles of our *materia medica*.” Your definitions of a tonic, a narcotic, and a deobstruent—what are these meant to be, but statements of general facts? It is usually thought that we are at utter variance with you in this matter, but perhaps the difference is one in appearance only. These definitions, if not made to include theories, we can accept, and transfer to our own remedies. We could hardly desire a better one than that you now give of an alterative. We may be in error in our doses, but this is quite another matter. If we must differ, let us see clearly what it is about. If medicines act in a manner which is at once “inexplicable and insensible,” we can perceive little ground for quarreling over their *modus operandi*; and if so, there has been wrong done between us, which we should hasten to set right.

You know, as well as we, that much of the difficulty which has arisen on this, as on other subjects, is owing to the ambiguity of language. The name which you give to a disease is sometimes used by you merely to express its phenomena,—at other times, it is made to include speculations as to its nature. So, too, the generic names you give to medicines (as tonic, narcotic, &c.) are at times meant only to group their ascertained powers,—at other times, they are used to express your opinions as to the operation of those powers. When chafed by controversy with such poor heretics as we, you sometimes lose sight of these distinctions, and get yourselves and us confused by these equivocal terms. It requires an effort on both sides to avoid mistakes. When such an effort is made, it will perhaps appear that the distance between us, as to disease and medicinal action, is less than we have supposed.

Some physicians, indeed, seem to think that they understand the intimate nature of disease, and that they can explain the action of medicines. We make no such claim. We should as soon think of explaining the law of gravitation. What we undertake to do is to collect facts. These we arrange into two classes. They are,

1st. From the healthy standard wrought by disease.

2d. The changes in the healthy organism produced by medicines.

The perfecting our knowledge of these two classes of phenomena, is

the chief aim of our study. The first class embodies what we know of the nature of disease, and for much of it we are indebted to your own writers. The second class forms the basis of our knowledge of the action of medicines. The latter is to a much less extent derived from your authorities. Our therapeutics is based, and, as far as is yet possible, is built upon the relation which we suppose exists between these two classes of phenomena. All theories, hypotheses, and speculations, as to the nature of disease, or the *modus operandi* of medicines, hold but a subordinate place, and might be excluded altogether without serious loss. But the requirements of our system include a full investigation and a rigid comparison of these two classes of phenomena. Whatever aid can be afforded by mechanical ingenuity or scientific experiment, all that the most minute observation can see, and the most enlightened reason can know, of the history, laws, and phenomena of disease on the one hand, or of the action of medicines on the other, are needed to do justice to that principle wherein consists the peculiarities of our therapeutics.

We will not venture to say but that the time will come when the knowledge of the *nature* of disease will be so complete, and the *therapeutic* action of medicines will be so well understood, that the proper treatment in a given case can be reached, with their aid, by some better process than we can now realize. But as yet, the best results thence attainable seem to us to be casual approximations only. Your "general principles," if we understand them, include a theory of disease and a theory of the action of its remedies. But in practice you, as well as we, constantly seek and use processes and results more direct than those furnished by the most successful theoretical researches in pathology and therapeutics. Yet we would not undervalue these. Their elaboration has been the work of ages. As channels of investigation, they have given an impulse where, perhaps, no other motive would have sufficed, for the most patient researches in anatomy, physiology, and pathology. The end which has been aimed at, the making them the basis of treatment, we are not content with, though we feel that the facts collected in the attempt are of inestimable value.

In tracing what we suppose to be the connexion between the physiological effects of medicines and the phenomena of disease whereby their use is indicated, we have a rule to work by, on which we place a very high estimate. The belief that there is in therapeutics one general principle, is the sum and substance of our heresy.

That medicines tend to cure diseases characterized by symptoms similar to those which the same medicines tend to produce, is the essence of homeopathy. This similitude is understood to include every trace of disorganization and disturbance produced by natural disease and by medicinal action. We should seek to know, as minutely as possible, not merely the obvious changes of structure which take place under these two morbid forces, but beyond these, such manifestations of morbid action as are none the less real, but which are, as to their causes and relations, hidden from our scrutiny. Majendie and others "ascribe to emetic tartar a specific power of causing engorgement or inflammation of the lungs." If this is correct, emetic tartar

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.

It is not our purpose now to lay before you the evidence of the truth of this principle. We do not seek to present an argument, but an appeal to you, and therefore aim to restrict ourselves to such facts as are held by you and us in common. Among these, we think, there are many instances in which its applicability may be recognized, but we admit that they are not sufficient to establish it as a general fact in medicine. The reasons why decisive evidence on this subject has not been reached by you, we trust, will gradually disappear. In the meantime, there are some approximate steps on which substantial agreement between us has been reached, and on these alone would we dwell. Such, we think, to be the following propositions:

1st. Medicines often have a special tendency towards certain organs, and in many instances this tendency is manifested towards the same organs in disease, which the particular medicine is most apt to disturb if taken in health. The bowels, perhaps, will be the seat of the disturbing or remedial action in whatever way the medicine is administered.

2d. The same is true to a great extent in regard to tissues, a given article affecting some tissues more than others, both in disease and in health. The mucous membranes may be reached by one remedy, the muscular tissue or the nervous by others.

3d. The prominent effects of a medicine on the healthy organism may often be divided into two classes, which seem to have a fixed relation to each other. This is manifested variously, according to circumstances. We have, for example, in different forms, excitement and depression; stupor and wakefulness; constipation and diarrhoea; loss of appetite and bulimy; extreme pain and insensibility.

4th. The same is true as to the remedial effects of medicines; the same article modifying favorably two opposite morbid conditions. A medicine will not merely cause diarrhoea and constipation in health; but the same medicine will, very likely, in many cases of disease, remove the same opposite or alternate affections.

5th. These two classes of phenomena, both when morbid and when curative, seem at times to depend in some way upon the dose; so that the existence of one set of symptoms in connection with one dose, does not preclude us from predicating the correlative symptoms from another dose. In large doses, a medicine may cause purging,—in small, constipation. It often depends on circumstances, of which the dose is chief, whether a medicine impairs or restores the functions of an organ.

(Concluded next No.)

IRREGULAR REGULARS.

One of the common charges brought against medical gentlemen who are known to differ in their therapeutic sentiments from those who make themselves needlessly unhappy about their neighbors, is this—*to wit*—"they are not regular practitioners."

What constitutes a regular physician? Those in the majority would

most likely decide in favor of themselves.—However, since the organization of medical societies in states and towns, those belonging to them, by general consent, are considered the regulars; and those who are not members of such bodies, irregulars. Fine talents, unimpeachable character, and superior educational advantages weigh nothing with fraternities.

Are not most, if not all, the different state and county medical societies constituted upon this principle—"that all who differ from us are against us?" Some indeed deserve contempt, who might be in better standing; and scores are in the full tide of empirical success who, had they their proper place in the social scale, would be street scavengers. But excellent physicians and surgeons are branded as infamous by those who have not a shadow of a claim to consideration beyond the fact that they are fellows of some medical society. Yet there is no place recognized as honorable by Anglo-Saxon discrimination, which they could not sustain.

Look at the picture by a light from another direction. Large numbers of medical students are annually graduated at reputable schools, who were esteemed for their virtues, commended for their attainments, and sent into the world's arena, clothed with the benedictions of their instructors, to reflect credit upon the faculties who examined them, and the colleges which conferred their diplomas. By an unaccountable mental process of reasoning, they adopt new theories; consult what are denominated by their heretofore well wishers, heretical authorities; and in the sequel, perhaps, employ remedies which are unknown or forbidden by the medical oligarchy that would rule the minds of thinkers, as despots do the subjects of their governments. A very large and respectable number of active medical practitioners belong to this category, and are therefore unscrupulously denounced as irregulars, empirics, and outcasts from the medical fold.

Let this doctrine prevail, without any ameliorating conditions, and what progress would ever be made in any direction? Harvey was cursed by the medical contemporaries of his time for being an innovator.

They did not relish the idea of having the blood sent out from the left ventricle of the heart and returned to the right auricle. No, they were scientifically determined that the vital fluid should flow out through the day to the extremities, and go back again at night when the body was in a recumbent posture! Galileo suffered severely for announcing the great fact, that the earth revolved about the sun, instead of the sun round the earth; and Jenner came near being sacrificed to the malice of the first medical men in England, who wrote him down as an ass!

These examples are but a drop to an ocean of proofs that might be cited, to show how mistaken we may be in estimating the powers and the qualifications of those who differ from ourselves, not maliciously, but honestly—and it might further be shown, that exclusiveness, contracted views, and belittling exactions in the way of an attempt to