

The influence of homœopathy on general medicine since the death of Hahnemann / by R.E. Dudgeon.

Contributors

Dudgeon, R. E. 1820-1904.
Congress of British Members of the Medical Profession Practising Homeopathy (1874 : London, England)

Publication/Creation

London : Henry Turner, 1874.

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/haygbjh3>

License and attribution

This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.

7

THE INFLUENCE OF

HOMŒOPATHY

ON

GENERAL MEDICINE

SINCE THE DEATH OF

HAHNEMANN.

BY

R. E. DUDGEON, M.D., EDIN.

*Being the Presidential Address delivered at the Congress of British
Members of the Medical Profession practising Homœopathy,
held in London, June 4th, 1874.*

LONDON:

HENRY TURNER & CO., 77, FLEET STREET, E.C.,
AND 41, PICCADILLY, MANCHESTER.

1874.

THE UNIVERSITY OF

HOMER OF THE

GENERAL MEDICINE

BY THE

J. H. HAYES M.D.

W. B. SAUNDERS CO. PHILADELPHIA

Published by W. B. Saunders Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

1907

Copyright, 1907, by W. B. Saunders Co.


EXPLANATORY.

As this Address in its reprinted form is likely to fall into the hands of some who are not conversant with medical language, a few words in explanation of some of the terms employed may not be out of place.

Therapeutics: "That part of medicine which respects the discovery and application of remedies to diseases."—*Webster*. It would, perhaps, be more correct to say "medicines" or "drugs," in place of "remedies."

The "Old School," called also in the Address the "Dominant," "Orthodox," and "Established" School, and sometimes elsewhere the "Galenic" School—after Galen, a celebrated physician of the Second Century, its supposed founder, though most of its peculiar practices are of much earlier date. It is also called "Allopathy," from Greek words signifying "other disease," in consequence of one of its conspicuous practices, which consists in giving for the cure of a disease a drug which causes a different disease, or, rather, which acts on a different part or organ to that affected by the disease. Thus, if the head be affected by natural disease, it will set up an artificial disease in the bowels; if the lungs be naturally diseased, it will excite an artificial disease on the skin. In order to produce these artificial diseases in healthy organs, it has to give the medicines in large doses. It denies that remedies can be discovered otherwise than empirically. Thus, for a given disease it produces artificial diseases in various healthy organs in succession, in order to discover which artificial disease will cure the natural disease. The patient is often unable to hold out against the succession of artificial diseases thus produced in his system, and dies without revealing what artificial disease will cure his natural disease. But even should he recover from his natural disease whilst a prey to some artificial disease, it must always remain a matter of doubt whether he got well in consequence or in spite of the medicinal disease. The "Old School" is fond of assuming the appellation of "regular" (from *regula*, the Latin for *rule*), on the principle, apparently, of *lucus a non lucendo*, as it has no rule of practice, and persecutes the new school of medicine for professing to have such a rule.

The "New School," called also the "School of Hahnemann," its founder, who died in 1843, and "Homœopathy," from Greek words signifying "similar disease," because its chief practice—as far as drug-giving is concerned—consists in giving, for the cure of a disease, a medicine that has the power of producing a disease similar to the one to be cured;—in other words, a medicine that acts on the same parts or organs as the natural disease. A medicine of this sort has to be given in comparatively small doses, otherwise it might cause aggravation of the natural disease. Hahnemann was not the first to make mention of this mode of selecting the remedy, for it was recommended in certain cases by Hippocrates, Asclepiades, Paracelsus, Stahl, and several others. Hahnemann was the first who insisted that it was the general rule for the application of drugs to disease; and he showed how remedies of this sort could be discovered, viz., by testing them in large doses on the healthy.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
Wellcome Library

GENTLEMEN,—Thirty-one years have elapsed since the death of Hahnemann, and I trust you will not consider it time misspent if I devote the hour allowed me for my presidential address to a rapid review of the principal changes that have taken place in the general practice of physic during this period, which may fairly be attributed to the influence of Hahnemann's teachings and the example of his disciples.

Up to the date of Hahnemann's death in 1843, it must be admitted that the effect of his doctrine and practice on the ordinary treatment of disease was inappreciable. The practice of medicine remained pretty much as it had been at the commencement of the present century. The abstraction of blood in acute inflammatory disorders by leeches, cupping and venesection was regarded by most orthodox practitioners not only as allowable but as indispensable. The depleting treatment attained its climax in the *coup sur coup* venesections of the illustrious but sanguinary Bouillaud. Purgation by the most drastic cathartics was regarded as the appropriate medication in almost every case. Mercurialization to the extent of salivation was still in vogue. Counter-irritation by blisters, rubefacients, issues, setons and the actual cautery was in daily use. Sudorifics, diuretics, emetics and so-called alterative treatment were universally employed. The great aim of the practitioner seemed to be to abstract his vital fluids from the unfortunate patient. The veins, the skin, the liver, the bowels, the kidneys and the glands were tapped simultaneously or in succession. As in the time of Molière, "seignare, purgare, clysterium donare" and all the allied forms of depletion were held to be the proper remedies for the most diverse diseases!

If, now and then, the observation of a better result

obtained by the followers of Hahnemann led a stray practitioner to express a doubt respecting the propriety of the ordinary depleting methods, his scepticism was resented by his orthodox colleagues, and the crass humoralism that prevailed was irreconcilable with a method which professed to cure without the evacuation of any of the fluids of the body.

The great and learned Hufeland could not deny that brilliant cures were effected by the mild specifics of homœopathy; but, while admitting so much, he deprecated the adoption of this method, exclaiming that if it should prevail it would prove "the grave of science." It might be supposed that that science was scarcely worth keeping above ground which failed to cure patients as well as its unscientific rival.

In this country the eminent surgeon, Mr. Kingdon, gave mortal offence by extolling the anti-inflammatory virtues of aconite, which had been taught him by a disciple of Hahnemann. He predicted that the time would soon come when aconite would supersede venesection, and "our lancets would be allowed to rust in their cases." An outcry was raised at this heretical vaticination, and the medical periodical which takes its name from the maligned instrument poured all the vials of its wrath on the head of the rash author, who was fain to recant his heresy in order to escape more serious consequences. Since then lancets have everywhere been rusting in their cases to the unspeakable advantage of the patient-world.

The favourable, though limited, testimony to the success of homœopathic treatment given, with all candour, by the most eminent of modern surgeons, Mr. Liston, fell upon unwilling ears. Liston was too great a man to be bullied, and too courageous and independent to be made to retract a well-considered opinion, so he was let alone, and his testimony in favour of homœopathy quietly ignored.

So, in spite of the occasional protest of some distinguished member of the dominant school, the practice of that school remained uninfluenced by Hahnemann's teaching up to the time of his death. Every description of heroic practice (which, being interpreted, means violent interference with the normal processes) had its advocates. The most perturbing methods were held by physicians to be—what they euphemistically termed—their "sheet-anchors" in various affections. Thus, in inflammatory

diseases, bleeding was the sheet-anchor of one set, tartar-emetic the sheet-anchor of another, calomel the sheet-anchor of a third, purgatives, sudorifics, vesicants, diuretics, the sheet-anchors of as many other sets. Other diseases had an equal or greater number of sheet-anchors. How such destructive processes ever came to be called "sheet-anchors" it would be hard to tell; or why "anchors" at all—"torpedoes" seems a more appropriate name for them, as they were designed to blow the disease to bits—but they just as often sent the patient to the bottom.

With faith so strong and so universal in these perturbing methods—which, moreover, harmonized with the gross humoral pathology of the day—it can scarcely be wondered at that the general body of practitioners received with incredulity the allegations of their brethren who had investigated Hahnemann's system, relative to the curative powers of medicines which exerted no disturbing influence on the patient's system, which drew off no fluids and excited no irritation of healthy parts. Impossible, they believed, to cure a disease without evacuating the *materies morbi*. If patients were alleged to be cured by such a preposterous method—one of three things—either the doctor had made an erroneous diagnosis, or he had given secretly some heroic remedy, or he had deliberately stated what was false. Thus, practitioners of homœopathy were credited by their orthodox brethren with being fools or knaves, or both.

There is a great deal to be said in excuse for this attitude of the ordinary medical man towards Hahnemann's system and its practitioners in the early days of homœopathy; for, after all, there is a great deal of human nature in doctors; and, touch their beliefs, or, as some would say, their prejudices, and they will behave pretty much as their non-medical fellow-creatures will do under similar circumstances. Now, in those days, the orthodox doctor had a belief. His *credo* might be formulated something in this fashion: "I believe in the remedial powers of bleeding, purging, puking, salivating and sweating." He had, as we know, no foundation for his belief—no evidence—only tradition; but we know that beliefs are not less stubbornly held because unsupported by evidence.

His belief was time-honoured, traditional, extending up through the great lights of the profession—Cullen, Boerhaave, Sydenham, Avicenna, Celsus, Galen, Hippocrates,

Æsculapius—to the obscurity of pre-historic times, when men were taught by the dog how to give an emetic, by the hippopotamus how to bleed, by the sacred ibis how to administer a glyster.

He was so satisfied with the correctness of his belief that it never occurred to him to put it to the test of experiment. Or perhaps, like Don Quixote, with his patched helmet, he was so determined to believe in its soundness, but yet so doubtful if it would stand the test, that he deliberately refrained from proving it by a blow from the sword of experiment. He accordingly, like the Knight of La Mancha, took its soundness for granted. He would have deemed it the height of presumption to leave an inflammation without the bleeding, the blistering, the tartar emetic or other time-hallowed antiphlogistic treatment; and, if a medical coroner, he would unhesitatingly have directed the jury to return a verdict of wilful murder, or at the least of manslaughter, against any practitioner whose patient had died of inflammation unbled, unblistered, or unantimonialized.

With such strong convictions, it was inevitable that the orthodox practitioner should receive with incredulity the accounts of patients being treated successfully for serious illnesses by a method that produced absolutely no physiological effects on the patient, but only cured his disease without evacuations and without vicarious irritations.

He would believe anything tending to impeach the credit of the homœopathic practitioner, sooner than what would prove his own beliefs to be without foundation, and his practice—that practice transmitted to him through the greatest authorities of all ages—to be useless or worse.

Accordingly he was ready to credit every calumny brought against those who were seeking to overthrow his creed. And the writers of books and medical periodicals were not slow in supplying him with the material he was so willing to receive. Homœopathists, he was told, were unprincipled, dishonest, ignorant cheats and charlatans; though perhaps his fellow-students, and not undistinguished for their medical attainments at college, and their upright behaviour before they investigated homœopathy, he was told, and he professed to believe, that this investigation had caused them to become so ignorant that thenceforth they were unable to tell trivial complaints from

serious diseases, or so dishonest that they would not scruple to represent slight disorders as the gravest maladies. The homœopathic system was caricatured and represented to be a monstrosity of folly and absurdity, which no one in his senses could believe, or could practise if he did believe it. All who prescribed medicines on homœopathic principles—nay, all who associated professionally with those who so prescribed, were held to be guilty of such flagrant immorality that they must be expelled from every medical society, and denied all professional intercourse with the orthodox. The courtesies and amenities of life were to be refused to any one who practised the hated system; the columns of the medical periodicals were to be closed to any reply to the frequent and scurrilous attacks made upon homœopathy and its practitioners; their advertising pages were not to be open to receive the announcement of any works, even on subjects apart from therapeutics, by those who acknowledged the principle of homœopathy as a guide to the treatment of disease. The examining boards of the colleges were converted into inquisitorial Star-chambers, and their diplomas were denied to candidates suspected of homœopathic leanings or who refused to promise never to practise homœopathy. Unworthy intrigues were set on foot to oust Henderson from his chairs of clinical medicine and pathology. Distinguished physicians were summarily expelled from hospitals they had served with honour and success, because they sought to give their patients the benefit of homœopathic treatment. Laws were passed by colleges and societies denouncing all who prescribed medicines according to the principle of similars as unworthy of association with those who prescribed differently. A medical bill was introduced into parliament, one main object of which was to put down what was called “irregular practice”—meaning thereby homœopathy. This object was fortunately frustrated by the vigilance of the practitioners aimed at, but the design was not the less apparent. Inquests held on the bodies of patients who had died under the care of homœopathic practitioners—for they would occasionally be so perverse—resulted in the finding by jurors under the direction of medical coroners of verdicts of “manslaughter;” at least, in one notorious case this verdict was, by the direction of Coroner Wakley, the brilliant editor of the trenchant *Lancet*,

or rather, I should say, by that of his son and deputy, recorded against a practitioner whose own brother had died of Asiatic cholera while nominally under his care—but not really so—for, when the case took an unfavourable turn, the unfortunate practitioner was himself prostrated by an attack of cholera. It was, in truth, a glorious triumph of orthodox physic when the culprit was consigned to a cell in Newgate to await his trial for his life, nominally for killing his brother, but actually for his therapeutic heresies. To relieve the minds of those of you who do not remember the facts of the case, I may mention that on this occasion the majesty of “crown’s quest law” was not vindicated by the culprit’s ignominious death on the scaffold, but that he was speedily released by a grand jury, which thus showed itself devoid of all proper feeling for the maintenance of orthodoxy in medicine.

I have recalled these circumstances to your recollection in order to show you that a conviction of the efficacy of a certain therapeutic method was stigmatized and punished as though it had been a felony, and this, not because this method was proved to be disadvantageous to the sick, but simply because it differed in some important features from the methods generally professed. The only evidence available showed that it was much more successful in its results than the ordinary treatment.

I may remind you of an incident illustrative of my assertion that the hostility of the old school was not owing to the failure, but apparently rather to the uncommon success of the homœopathic treatment. It made a profound impression at the time, and gave occasion to the writing of one of the wittiest and most humorously satirical articles ever penned against the attitude of the old school towards homœopathy, by that most profound of modern mathematicians, the late Augustus de Morgan, which you will find in the 13th vol. of the *British Journal of Homœopathy*. When, after the cholera epidemic of 1855, the House of Commons ordered a return of all cases of cholera treated in the London Hospitals, the College of Physicians, to whom was assigned the task of collecting these statistics, deliberately refused to admit the returns from the London Homœopathic Hospital—then in Golden Square—into their report, on the ground that these returns “would compromise the value and

utility of their"—*i.e.*, the College's—"averages of cure;" the fact being that, while the mortality in the hospitals patronized by the College was 36 per cent., that of the London Homœopathic Hospital was under 16½ per cent. The cases admitted into the London Homœopathic Hospital were certified by the Medical Inspector of the Board of Health—who declared that he was prepossessed against homœopathy when he began his work—as being "all true cases of cholera in the various stages of the disease, that he saw several cases that did well under the treatment, which, he had no hesitation in saying, would have sunk under any other."

But in spite of denunciations, persecutions, caricatures, calumnies, *suppressiones veri*, *suggestiones falsi*, and coroners' inquests, the practice we owe to the genius of Hahnemann gained daily in public estimation. In medical matters the public looks only to results, and this test applied to homœopathic practice showed it to be, in numerous cases, vastly more successful than the ordinary treatment.

The growing confidence of the patient-world in homœopathy, together with the brilliant successes obtained by the practice among their own circle of acquaintances, as well as in public hospitals—more particularly the Homœopathic Hospitals of Vienna, which were visited and reported on by delegates from their own body—gradually forced upon the dominant school a reconsideration of their own methods of treatment.

They could not, or would not, admit that homœopathy was a positive method of medical treatment. They held it to be purely negative, the treatment of disease without medicine. Its undoubted success, its marked superiority to the ordinary methods in many of the most serious diseases, insisted on by so many of their quondam patients, and testified to by the investigations of eminent men of their own school, such as Sir William Wilde, of Dublin, in his work on Austria, and Sir John Forbes in the *Medical Review*, forced on them the enquiry as to the real value of their own perturbing methods. "As homœopathy," they argued, "is a mere negative—a do-nothing—treatment, perhaps its greater success in the treatment of disease is owing to its abstaining from those heroic measures which we have hitherto considered our sheet-anchors."

They therefore began to try how diseases would fare

without being interfered with by active treatment. They found that their patients recovered all the faster. One of their number, Dr. Dietl of Vienna, instituted a crucial experiment on a grand scale in a large hospital at Vienna, of which he was the physician. He selected pneumonia, or acute inflammation of the lungs, as his test disease. The first series of cases he treated by bleeding in the accredited manner; 20 per cent. of the patients died. The next series he treated *secundum artem* with tartar emetic; again 20 per cent. died. The third series he left to nature; 7 per cent. only died. The publication of the results of this carefully conducted experiment gave the *coup de grace* to the old heroic practice, and a tremendous fillip to the so-called expectant or let-alone system, which had hitherto been practised in holes and corners, so to speak, but which now became the almost universally acknowledged creed of allopathy.

Here was an explanation of the success of homœopathy! It was but the expectant method with a pretence of giving medicine! It may be thought that the old school would have felt some gratitude towards its young rival for teaching it to cure its patients better by ceasing to make use of practices which did more harm than good, and that orthodox practitioners would have shown some compunction for their treatment of their homœopathic colleagues. But those who think such a result should have followed only betray their ignorance of human nature, of which, as I before said, there is a great deal in medical man. It is easy enough to forgive those who *tell* us we are wrong, but very hard to pardon those who *prove* us to be so—so homœopathy was abused in medical circles more virulently than ever. The fearful dishonesty of its practitioners in pretending to give remedies when it was obvious that they did nothing of the sort, was the text of many a homily in the medical periodicals, and the paltry persecution of homœopathists by the denial of all professional courtesy was carried on as vigorously as before.

Still the fact remained that owing to the results obtained in homœopathic practice, the time-honoured perturbing treatment of the old school was almost entirely abandoned. Lancets were actually rusting in their cases, cuppers were forsaking their avocation for some more remunerative and haply less sanguinary trade, leeches were left to disport in their native marshes, or only kept in

bottles for the sake of their barometrical properties, blister-beetles were no longer captured by sackfuls, or at most, only used by hairdressers and milliners for cosmetic and ornamental purposes, drastic purgatives remained unasked for on the chemist's shelf, and sudorifics and emetics were a mere drug in the market.

The whole practice of medicine was changed with remarkable rapidity. The mildest drugs were alone employed. Treatment became at once "restorative" and "supporting." Diseases were all weaknesses requiring strengthening treatment. Tonics, nutritious food, and alcohol in every form, as wine, stout, ale, and brandy, were the fashionable medicines.

The complete change that took place in pathological ideas no doubt helped to produce this revolution in medical practice. The investigations of physiologists and pathologists completely discredited the gross humoral pathology by which alone the treatment of disease by evacuants could be justified. The general acceptance of the doctrine of the dynamical nature of disease gave the death-blow to all those monstrous forms of evacuant treatment which owed their origin to an antiquated materialistic pathology.

But some who conformed to the change of practice that discarded all the heroic treatment of former times were not willing to admit that the vigorous treatment of previous years was erroneous. They would not allow that they and their illustrious predecessors had been altogether or at all wrong in their treatment of inflammatory diseases by the violent antiphlogistic methods of bleeding, blistering and the like. To admit the fallibility of themselves or their professional ancestors in the matter of therapeutics would be to derogate from the honour of the profession, and to bring it into contempt. Of course they were right in their present treatment of acute disease by mild restorative medication, but they were equally right when they formerly treated the same diseases by bleeding and other evacuant measures.

A sort of Œcumenical Council was held at the College of Physicians of Edinburgh, whose members issued a decree declaring that the Medical Faculty was now and had always been infallible and unchangeable, and that it was disease that had changed, not they. "Change of type of disease" was the shibboleth that was to reconcile

the altered practice with the recognised infallibility of the faculty, that was to smooth all difficulties and efface all apparent inconsistencies.

It was actually gravely contended that, within a few years, inflammatory diseases had so completely changed their type, that, whereas patients labouring under them formerly required to be treated by depletion, they could not now stand debilitating treatment, but needed to be supported and strengthened by tonics and stimulants. In short, human nature, it was asserted, had so altered that the self-same disease which was formerly a proof of excessive strength demanding all sorts of weakening processes, was now an evidence of excessive weakness calling for all manner of strengthening remedies. It cannot but be a matter of just pride to a graduate of Edinburgh to reflect that this ingenious theory was first put forward by the professors of his *alma mater*.

This "change of type" notion was received with acclamation by medical writers and journalists, and at one time seemed on the point of being universally accepted as the true solution of the difficulty, and a ready method of accounting for the change of practice without admitting the influence of homœopathy in the matter. To any one disposed to be cynical, it was as ludicrous a sight to witness the wild enthusiasm of old and grave doctors over the revelation of this scientific mare's nest, and the intellectual capers they cut round the supposed dead body of homœopathy, as it must have been to his townsmen to see the great mathematician rushing naked through the streets, and shouting "eureka!" like a maniac. But there was an excuse for Archimedes which our allopathic opponents did not possess, viz., that his was a real discovery. It enabled him to detect the fraud of the king's goldsmith; but the imaginary discovery of Alison and Co. did not enable them to convict their homœopathic brethren of deceit.

The chorus of mutual congratulations on the wonderful discovery had scarcely subsided, when the whole theory was upset by a few unenthusiastic sceptics, who pertinently—or as some thought *impertinently*—asked for proofs of the alleged change of type of disease. These were, of course, not forthcoming, so that the talk about "change of type" quickly subsided into ignominious oblivion, and its authors found themselves covered with ridicule, in place of glory.

The fact is, as has been fully pointed out by members of our school, an inflammatory disease, such as acute inflammation of the lungs, though an excellent subject for demonstrating the pernicious effects of the depleting treatment, contrasted with a purely negative treatment, is not so well adapted for showing the positive value of the homœopathic treatment. If not improperly interfered with, pneumonia is by no means a very fatal disease, and a comparison of the results under the expectant system and under homœopathic treatment offers nothing like the disparity to be found in a comparison of the expectant with the depleting system. The difference between 20 per cent., the mortality under the depleting plan, and 7 per cent. that under the expectant method, is much more striking than the latter per centage, and 4 per cent., the mortality under homœopathic treatment. Henderson pointed out that homœopathy possessed the additional advantage of curtailing the duration of the disease. Still, the superiority of the homœopathic, over expectant treatment in pneumonia was only obvious after careful investigation. When merely the comparative mortality of the two systems was regarded, it seemed as though there was but little difference between the two, certainly not nearly so great an advantage of homœopathy over expectancy as of expectancy over the ordinary depleting treatment. Hence it was scarcely an unnatural inference that the superiority of homœopathy over ordinary treatment was mainly attributable to the same cause that accounted for the better results of the expectant treatment, viz.: the non-interference with the disease by depleting and other debilitating procedures.

The experience of Dietl in pneumonia, repeated as it was in many different quarters, and extended with like striking results to other inflammatory diseases, created an unduly favourable opinion of the expectant or do-nothing treatment of all diseases, and for a long time the leaders of medical opinion contended that all active medicinal treatment should be discarded, and that the sole duty of the physician should be to remove from the patient everything that was likely to interfere with the natural course of disease, to place him in the hygienic conditions most conducive to recovery, to attend to his diet and regimen, and to support his strength by generous food, and a more or less liberal use of alcoholic stimulants. In short, that the

physician's chief duties should be a sort of combination of the offices of nurse and cook, and all medicinal interference was deprecated as being useless or even pernicious. In fact, medicine accurately corresponded to the sarcastic description of it given by Mephistophiles to the enquiring student, which we read in the first part of Goethe's *Faust*, and which I may freely paraphrase as follows:—

The secret of med'cine is: Nature's vast forces
 You study in all their relations to man,
 And when you have done this, your only right course is
 To leave them to fight it out just as they can.

But it was impossible that such negative doctrines could obtain any wide-spread or permanent popularity among either the profession or the patient-world. The public naturally thought that the *raison d'être* of the physician was to *cure*, not merely to *nurse* disease. Medicines were justly held to be his curative instruments. The belief in the curative effects of medicines was too deeply implanted in men's minds to be annihilated in this fashion. Patients objected to having their diseases let alone. They had much faith in the remedial powers of drugs, and but little in those of nature, and they insisted on their doctors sharing their faith in physic. Some doctors who had lost their belief in medicines, had acquired a firm persuasion of the remedial virtues of stimulants, and, under the leadership of the late Dr. Todd, a system of treatment by alcoholic preparations was carried on, the consequences of which were in many cases most deplorable.

The school which arrogates to itself the titles of regular and orthodox, since it has discarded the traditions of its art and discredited the heroic practices so long in vogue, has devised no stable substitute for the treatment it has abandoned. The treatment by excessive alcoholic stimulation was unable to survive the distinguished man who was its ablest and principal exponent. In a modified form it still prevails here and there, but its professors are more cautious in its employment, and patients are acquiring a well-founded dread of it; so it may with confidence be predicted that it will soon be thoroughly discredited.

But now a new phase of medical treatment is coming into play. A faith in drugs is reviving, and though the progress of physiological and pathological knowledge forbids the revival of the old depleting and evacuant prac-

tices, an active search is being made for remedies of another sort, and new "sheet-anchors" are taking the place of the old ones which went to the bottom in the disastrous shipwreck of traditional medicine. Expectancy which for a time, as we have seen, threatened to become the general rule is now denounced by those who lauded it. Indeed Harley, who is prominent among specific-seekers, declares expectancy as he declares homœopathy to be "the offspring of ignorance and deception."

There are still some who do not yet put any lively faith in the curative powers of drugs. Thus a learned lecturer, whose business it is to teach the *Materia Medica* to the rising generation of medical students at Guy's Hospital, the other day told his audience who had come to learn from him the curative properties of drugs, that the giving of medicines had just as much to do with the cure of diseases as the "oh-he-yoi!" of a gang of sailors has to do with the progress of the rope at which they are hauling.

Bromide of potassium at one time threatened to assume the character of a universal panacea, but is now rapidly going out of fashion. Chloral hydrate has almost superseded it, but already we observe signs of its waning popularity.

These are mere examples of fashionable medicines, employed for no special indications, but given like stimulants and tonics for merely general indications. It was, to be sure, at one time hoped that the first named salt would prove a specific for epilepsy, but even this hope has gradually died away.

Of late years, however, there has been a manifest tendency to search for real specifics, *i.e.*, medicines that produce their remedial effect without evacuation. The progress of physiological and pathological knowledge has tended more and more to upset the Sydenhamian doctrine, "that a disease is nothing more than an effort of nature, who strives with might and main to restore the health of the patient by the elimination of the morbid matter."—(*Sydenham's Works*, I. p. 29.)

The pathology of modern times has been gradually coming into accord with the homœopathic therapeutics. And this, I take it, is a remarkable and unique phenomenon in the history of medicine, that the therapeutics in consonance with a pathological theory should have pre-

ceded the theory. It would not be far from the truth to say that the therapeutics in this case was the cause of the pathological theory. At all events, it is hard to imagine that the rational pathology of our times would ever have been invented or adopted by a race of believers in the virtues of bleeding and other evacuant treatment.

Hahnemann saw that the pathological theories of his time would not square with his therapeutics, so he was forced to reject them and substitute more appropriate pathological theories of his own. But Hahnemann, though a good observer was an indifferent theorist, and whilst his rule of treatment remains his pathological theories have for the most part fallen into oblivion.

Hufeland's prophecy has been fulfilled to a degree he little dreamt of, for homœopathy has proved "the grave of science"—of such science, pathological and therapeutical, as prevailed in his day, and could Hufeland see the state of medicine now-a-days, he would find the pathological theories and therapeutical methods he professed and practised all decently buried, and the master-spirits of medicine holding pathological views and pursuing pathological investigations in a way that must inevitably lead them, indeed has already led them partially, to adopt therapeutical practices in the sense of the principle promulgated by the illustrious contributor of so many original articles to his *Journal*.

He would see Trousseau practising homœopathy under the euphemistic title of "*médecine substitutive*." He would find Harley writing of belladonna that "its stimulant action is converted in febrile diseases into a tonic and sedative influence," and explaining this phenomenon thus: "Two similar effects, the one arising from a local irritation, and the other from the presence of belladonna, like spreading circles on a smooth sheet of water, interfere with and neutralize each other;" which is an explanation of homœopathic action that has been given in almost the same words by members of the school of Hahnemann. He would see Ringer choosing his remedies for the same indications as those laid down by Hahnemann. He would notice the repeated injunction by allopathic writers to prove medicines on the healthy in order to ascertain their remedial powers in disease, and he would find this advice occasionally acted on by eminent men of the orthodox persuasion. In short, he would observe that medical prac-

tice was undergoing a complete revolution in the homœopathic sense.

There is no possibility of denying the fact that the chief medical authorities of the present day have for some time past been teaching that the physiological action of drugs must be studied in order to enable us to ascertain their therapeutic powers, and that medicines must be given which have a specific action on the self-same parts as the diseases for which they are remedial—this is the therapeutic principle, *similia similibus curantur*—in other words, homœopathy.

Most of you are familiar with the instances of this recommendation of the physiological proving of drugs in order to obtain a knowledge of their therapeutic uses, adduced by Henderson in his celebrated letter to Forbes. But these instances are stale. I will show you that the same plan is still advocated by partisans of the old school. The latest example you will find in the *Medical Record* of the 13th May last. Dr. Hull, of Philadelphia, there says, using the very expression introduced into the language by homœopathists: "When we proceed to investigate the therapeutic powers of a new agent, there are two general heads under which our studies should be conducted. 1. *Prove* its effects on a healthy organism. 2. After having determined its physiological action, proceed on general principles to elicit its remedial powers. A knowledge of drug action on the healthy organism enables us to form some idea of its adaptability to morbid states," &c. Unfortunately neither Dr. Hull nor his allopathic *confrères* who have seen the necessity of proving medicines and made attempts to do so, are content to give us a simple record of the effects observed. They must always overlay them with an attempt to give a physiological explanation of the symptoms—a laudable aim in itself, but for which their meagre provings afford them no sufficient data. They stiffen and glaze their simple material of provings, as the Manchester manufacturer faces his calico, with an elegant coating of pseudo-scientific devil's-dust, which does not add to its practical usefulness, for it is the genuine fibre of symptoms that is alone useful at the bedside, where the artificial gloss of physiological explanation is got rid of as soon as may be.

As for the treatment by homœopathic remedies by conspicuous members of the old school, what do my

audience think of the following specimens of therapeutics, culled from the hospital practice of a distinguished lecturer on *Materia Medica* in University College and physician to University College Hospital, which were communicated to me by a student who had no knowledge or prejudice in favour of homœopathy? Half-drop doses of tincture of aconite in febrile disturbance, $\frac{1}{20}$ th of a grain doses of corrosive sublimate for mucous and bloody stools, $\frac{1}{10}$ th grain doses of hepar sulphuris for inflammation and threatened suppuration of the cervical glands, two-drop doses of the tincture of hamamelis for bleeding piles. Or what do they think of this advice given to his pupils by a lecturer on Medicine at St. Thomas's Hospital and a physician to the hospital? He told them, as the *British Medical Journal* informs us, that they were not "to allow prejudice to blind their eyes against certain remedial measures recommended by good authority, simply because they may have originated among homœopathists." Note the covert sneer implied in the antithesis of "good authority" and "homœopathists." It is as though a lecturer at the beginning of the century had said "do not allow prejudice to blind your eyes against the prophylactic virtues of vaccination recommended by many eminent London physicians, simply because the practice may have been originally proposed by an obscure provincial doctor."

While our medical brethren of the old school are thus inculcating and practising the methods and principles of Hahnemann, and while they are daily pilfering from his *materia medica*, they still pose themselves as our opponents. Whilst adopting the processes and instruments of homœopathy, they affect to despise and contemn it; they never mention the name of homœopathy without a sneer. They still exclude us from their societies, they still deny us professional intercourse, their organs in the press still misrepresent and caricature our practice. And yet all the while the columns of their journals teem with cases treated by homœopathic remedies which could only have been known to the authors from homœopathic sources. Provided these authors never mention the word homœopathy, or only mention it coupled with abuse, their homœopathic articles are commended, the writers are respectfully spoken of, they are honoured by the medical societies, they fill posts of dignity and emolument in the hospitals and col-

leges, and are even appointed professors of therapeutics, while their chief glory is derived from their unacknowledged borrowed homœopathic plumes. Those who fur- tively avail themselves of the medicines given to us by Hahnemann's genius, while they openly revile the giver and continue to enjoy the emoluments and rewards of old physic, might fairly parody the words of Francis, and exclaim, "*Rien n'est perdu fors l'honneur!*"

But let a medical man give due credit to Hahnemann, let him truthfully confess that it is to homœopathy he is indebted for the remedies he finds so efficacious in disease; then at once all the medical periodicals of the dominant school are closed to him, medical societies exclude or expel him, he is deposed from his hospital appointments, deprived of his professorship, or, at the least, he loses all chance of obtaining any of the posts of honour that are generally supposed to be open to the profession and bestowed on the worthiest. In addition to this he loses professional caste and is regarded as unworthy of professional intercourse. Nay more, the Medical Directories refuse to publish the names of his medical writings or his appointments, and the medical periodicals deny him the right to advertise his works—even such as have no bearing on homœopathy—in their advertising pages. There are some conspicuous exceptions to the worst of these petty persecutions, but, as a rule, dishonest pilfering from homœopathy is applauded, while an honest avowal of obligations to homœopathy is vilified by the chief organs of medical opinion. Whatever may be the case in other walks of life, in the medical world as at present constituted, honesty is apparently *not* the best policy.

When homœopathy was new, and when the prevailing practice was still of the pernicious depleting character, and in fact so bad, that, as Sir John Forbes said, "it must either mend or end," it was easy to see that the partisans of old medicine would view the spread of homœopathy as fatal to their system, so it was natural that they should oppose it tooth and nail.

But now that the depleting system is almost universally abandoned; now that a more scientific pathology points to specifics of the homœopathic class as the most hopeful source of new remedies; now that the dominant school is daily enriching its materia medica by purloining from ours, it is difficult to see why the old antagonism to the school of Hahnemann is still kept up.

The honest though ignorant belief in the pernicious effects of homœopathic treatment of the practitioner of thirty years ago, has degenerated in his modern and more enlightened representative into a paltry trades-union jealousy, which encounters us not by arguments or experiments, but by the ignoble arts of detraction and calumny, accusing us at one time of letting our patients perish by withholding all remedial means, at another of killing them by administering virulent poisons.

I beg Dr. Moxon's pardon for asserting that our opponents do not now encounter us by arguments, for doubtless he considers the following passage, which I cull from a recent introductory lecture on *Materia Medica* and *Therapeutics*, as a smashing argument against homœopathy:—

“When like has any strictness at all, it means identical. It means that or nothing. Follow me carefully for a moment. A thing that is entirely like another thing is entirely identical with it. A thing that, without being entirely like another thing, is yet like it for some purposes sufficient for the meaning at the time, is *identical* so far as those purposes are concerned. In short, likeness is identity *so far as the word like has any force*. Stones of the same shape and size are alike for the mason; if they are of different durability, they are not alike for the house-owner. ‘Yahoos’ are like men for the purpose of being laughed at. Thus likeness may be defined as *identity for the purpose in question*. Yet the term like is, from boyhood, used so fast and loose, from the likeness of equilateral triangles to the likeness of Jack to a monkey, that, when the boy grows into a homœopath, he is ready to attach any meaning to like, from identity to the most fanciful resemblance. Now, in a general way, people believe that unlike things oppose each other, whether these unlike things are diseases or any other things. Such a notion is not worth much, unless you apply it strictly; but, in the only sense in which it has a strict application, it is an identical proposition; for you mean really opposite by unlike, or else you do not mean anything definable. You mean opposite so far as unlike; so that your proposition is that opposite things oppose each other so far as they are opposite—a proposition of infantile simplicity: true, surely, and cogent wherever applicable.”

The learned lecturer's notions on the subject of “like” and “opposite” seem rather hazy. Probably it may assist his understanding of the matter if I draw an illustration of the two propositions from this very passage of his amusing lecture. If I say it is “very like” nonsense,

and the "exact opposite" of a sound argument against homœopathy, I believe few will be disposed to disagree with me. The old nursery riddle, "What is likest to a cat looking out of a window?" with its answer, "A cat looking into a window," might have taught Dr. Moxon that likeness, so far from always involving the idea of identity, sometimes coexists with opposition. The confusion in the learned lecturer's mind on the subject of likeness reminds us of the intelligent African who declared Cæsar and Pompey to be "bof bery like, 'specially Pompey." The impossibility of answering such arguments seriously must be my excuse for departing from the grave style which ought to characterise your president's address. But even the wise Solomon admits that folly may sometimes be treated homœopathically. Dr. Moxon's arguments, however, are the wisdom of Solomon compared with the way in which homœopathy has always been treated in the medical societies, whenever the subject has been brought before them. All pretence of argument is eschewed, and the evening is passed agreeably in the recital of stories about homœopathy, of the "cock and bull" order. The latest instance of this is fresh in all your memories. It happened in the youngest of the metropolitan medical societies, the Clinical Society, which was established a few years back on superfine scientific principles. The members of this society had a lively discussion on homœopathy a short time ago, which, of course, as they were all of one mind on the subject discussed, they had all their own way. Each member tried to trump the narrative of the previous speaker by some more harrowing recital of the atrocities perpetrated in the name of homœopathy. Curiously enough the stories told were mutually contradictory. Thus, while one member stated that the homœopathic medicines contained large doses of poisonous drugs, the next speaker asserted that he had it on the best authority—that, namely, of a discharged assistant to a homœopathic chemist—that the globules and tinctures contained no medicine at all. He was followed by an eminent physician, Dr. A. P. Stewart, who gravely repeated the old story first promulgated some thirty years ago by the notorious travelling doctor for Bradshaw's Continental Guide, Dr. Edwin Lee—by the by, the youth on the side of the Tweed Dr. Stewart comes from, when they hear an improbable story, are in the

habit of exclaiming, "That's a *lee!*"—but that is neither here nor there, though the same cannot be said of Dr. Lee, for he is here and there and everywhere. Well, Dr. Stewart came out with the great old Lee story of a certain Italian duke having died after swallowing three globules. There is the uncertainty usually observable in allopathic stories against homœopathy in the details of this case. The very name of the duke is variously stated as Canizzaro and Canigaro. The only thing certain about the matter is the three globules, which, being white, cannot be identified with the three black crows of another equally celebrated story. At the risk of divulging a secret that may hereafter be used against homœopathy, I will mention the real name of the party who fell an untimely victim to the three globules. It was no duke, not even an Italian, nor yet a man, but an English lady of the name of Harris, who may be heard of on application to a distinguished member of the sisterhood of monthly nurses, whose name I forbear to mention from motives of delicacy which I am sure you will appreciate.

What does this exclusion and professional excommunication of homœopaths mean? It means that a majority of the profession allege that some of their colleagues, who possess the same qualifications as themselves, who have been educated at the same schools and walked the same hospitals, are unworthy to be regarded as members of an honourable profession—are, in short, immoral individuals, with whom it would be ignominy to associate. And why? Because this excommunicated minority, taught by careful experiment, are convinced that many diseases are best treated by medicines which direct experiment shows are capable of acting on the same parts as are affected by the disease—a rule of practice which the majority only acknowledge in the case of a few diseases, as they have no experience either for or against the validity of the rule beyond these few diseases. The most exalted virtue could scarcely contend that there was aught of immorality in the belief that a great many—instead of only a few—diseases are best treated by medicines that act similarly to the morbid cause; and yet it is for so believing that we are treated by our colleagues in a so-called liberal profession as though we were guilty of some unpardonable moral delinquency. It may be all very well for non-professionals to laugh at this ridiculous persecution, but

for us who are its victims it is no laughing matter. There is *odium theologicum* enough in the established church; but though the majority can call the minority bad names, they cannot deprive them of their places of emolument and honour. But the *odium medicum* of the established medical hierarchy, besides abusing, can very materially punish those whom it chooses to stigmatize as heretics.

E pur si muove! And yet homœopathy goes on and continues to modify and leaven the whole lump of general practice. The rising generation of medical men are continually being taught to cure diseases homœopathically by their medical instructors. The professor of *Materia Medica* in University College writes a highly lauded book on therapeutics, two-thirds of which are pure homœopathy. Black, Thorowgood and many others recommend bits of homœopathic practice without mentioning the hated word. Wilks filches from us while he abuses us; like Pistol munching his leek, "he eats and eke he swears." Harley pursues investigations into the action of medicines, and finding himself unexpectedly in agreement with the conclusions of homœopathists, deems it the correct thing then and there to denounce homœopathy as "the offspring of ignorance and deception."

At the rate things are going on at present, and under the guidance of his respected teachers, the medical practitioner will soon be practising nothing but homœopathy; but as his teachers carefully keep him in the dark, he will be practising it as M. Jourdain talked prose, without being at all aware of it.

The assimilation of modern practice to that of Hahnemann's followers is indeed admitted by one of the most recent lecturers on *materia medica*, Dr. Moxon, of Guy's Hospital, who says that "the practice of professors of homœopathy no longer differs from that of doctors who do not admit its absurdities." He means, of course, to imply that we have altered our practice in the direction of that of the orthodox school; but the inaccuracy of this statement scarcely requires to be pointed out. Is it we who have adopted bleeding, emetics, purgatives, diaphoretics, blisters, cauteries, salivation? or is it they who have abandoned these practices? Have we discontinued the search for specifics, or is it they who have begun to seek for them? Is there any one among us who could speak in such opprobrious terms of any of Hahnemann's thera-

peutic teachings as Dr. Moxon speaks of the boasted "rational system?" He calls it the *deductive system*, and thus he inveighs against it:—

"The plan assumes that we know enough to act upon about the causes of disease. Gentlemen, it is difficult to speak in measured terms of the horrible results that have followed from this fatal assumption. It is this *irrational deduction* which has been the curse of medicine in all ages. This deduction, so irrational, is drawn from principles generally entirely false, and always so incomplete as to be beyond all bounds insufficient, so as to be worse than false in their effects, even if true in themselves, yet you hear some describing the deductive, or the so-called rational system as the pride of medicine. And those who have said this are so great, and so justified in feeling what the pride of medicine really is as a sensation, that one must submit; only replying, that if it be the pride of medicine, it has been the fatal curse of patients who have been hurried into the next world with the lancet or brandy-bottle on rational principles."

What is this but an amplification of Sir Astley Cooper's celebrated saying: "the art of medicine"—alluding, of course, to the allopathic art; he was not acquainted with homœopathy—"the art of medicine is founded on conjecture and improved by murder"?

After this fierce tirade against the rational system by a distinguished champion of that school which has so long arrogated to itself the title of "rational," we may bear with equanimity what he says about homœopathy, even when he raves about "the width and blackness of this disreputable blot on modern medicine."

Rational medicine being thus openly discarded with horror and contempt, and specific homœopathic treatment being furtively taught from the professorial chairs of the dominant school, and clandestinely practised in its hospitals, the general acceptance of our therapeutic principle must sooner or later inevitably follow; and we, who have consistently maintained that it is the true principle to guide us to the discovery of specific remedies, will then no longer be regarded as heretics, but as the pioneers of progress in medicine.

We have never accepted the position of sectarians which our opponents have endeavoured to impose on us, for in fact we have never been sectarians. We contend that we are simply physicians to whom the whole field of medicine is open, who are interested above all in the cure of

disease, and who are ready and anxious to adopt every means whereby that object may be attained. In pursuing this object we have become convinced that medicines chosen according to Hahnemann's rule are the best remedies yet known for most diseases. If it can be shown that we are mistaken in this matter, and that there is some better rule for selecting remedies we are willing to accept it, but we refuse to give up our tried and valued rule for the less successful and lawless empiricism of our opponents.

If there are sectarians in medicine, the partisans of the dominant school rather deserve the appellation, who, while professing to avail themselves of the whole field of therapeutics for the cure of diseases, explicitly except that large class of remedies that act on the same organs and tissues as the morbid cause, though the efficacy of these remedies is testified to by the thousand-fold experience of large numbers of their medical colleagues, and many of their own favourite remedies are of this character whether they know it or not.

Hence we contend that we, and we only, are the true representatives of progressive medicine, and we protest against our exclusion by a sectarian and bigoted majority from those institutions and societies that were founded for the cultivation and improvement of the healing art, certainly not for stereotyping the prejudices of any medical sect.

We look forward with confidence to the good time coming when homœopathy shall be universally acknowledged as not only one of the recognized methods, but as the very best method of treating most acute and chronic diseases, where medicine is required, and when ignorance of homœopathic treatment will be held to be as disgraceful as a knowledge of it is at present deemed disreputable.

The medical art is not yet so perfect as to be able to dispense with the active co-operation of all its labourers. Quite recently an eminent authority of the old school has publicly declared that the present state of therapeutics is "deplorable." We agree with him, as regards the therapeutics of his school, and are ready to give the most satisfactory proof that the selection of remedies according to the principle of similars, renders the results of medical treatment considerably less "deplorable." Nothing but

a false pride, owing to their having originally taken up a false position with regard to homœopathy prevents our brethren of the allopathic sect availing themselves of the means we offer them, and admitting our experience to be of equal value to their own.

We gladly avail ourselves of all the substantial improvements introduced into medical practice. We profit by the researches of the physiological school, and we hail with satisfaction the development of a more rational pathology, as they all tend to confirm the rationality of specific treatment. We employ with advantage the improved means of diagnosis afforded by the ophthalmoscope, the laryngoscope, the microscope, the stethoscope, the sphygmograph, the thermometer, and chemical analysis. Let our present opponents behave towards us with equal liberality and candour. Let them put our therapeutic method to the most stringent tests they can devise. We are content to abide by the result. If this should prove favourable, as we do not doubt, let them adopt so much of our practice as experience shall show to be good, and the existence of homœopathy as a separate school of medicine will cease. There will then be no allopathy and no homœopathy, but one medicine which will comprise all that is of approved value in therapeutics. There will be no homœopaths and no allopaths, but only medical men combating disease by the best known remedies. The homœopathic principle will be recognized as the rule whereby real curative specifics can be discovered, while the allopathic methods whereby some great physiological disturbance is effected will be assigned their secondary place as a make-shift practice, indispensable, no doubt, in some cases, to enable us to tide over a difficulty and clear the way for the specific curative treatment. We are at one with our old school colleagues in the great and important division of medical treatment, *hygiene*, which includes diet, regimen, and all sanitary conditions, why should there be variance among us in the other great division of medical treatment, *therapeutics*?

We in this country who believe in the excellence of the homœopathic treatment of disease, have always acted as if we expected our colleagues of the old school to share our belief some time or other. It is by no wish of ours that the enmity that is apparent between the two schools exists. We have assumed no aggressive attitude towards estab-

lished medicine. We have never sought to rear schools and colleges for the teaching of homœopathy as something apart from medicine, but have always looked forward to the adoption of our therapeutics by the existing schools and colleges. We have not flaunted our particular banner defiantly in the faces of our opponents. If we have set up periodicals with homœopathic titles, that was because the existing medical periodicals were closed to us, though open to all who chose to vituperate and calumniate us. If we have formed ourselves into homœopathic societies, that was because we were excluded and expelled from existing medical societies. If we have published homœopathic directories, that was because the existing medical directories refused to record our works and appointments. If we have established homœopathic hospitals, that was because we wished to show the success of homœopathic treatment to all enquirers, which can only be done in a hospital, and because the wards of the existing hospitals were shut against us. The small scale on which our hospitals are conducted shows that they were not meant as rivals to the existing hospitals.

We are not responsible for, and indeed have always set our faces against, the well-meant but injudicious attempts of enthusiastic lay adherents of homœopathy, who at its first introduction into this country sought to propagate it by methods admirably adapted no doubt for promoting the sale of an article of commerce, but which are less suitable for the propagation of a medical doctrine, and which doubtless increased the prejudice of the profession against homœopathy and its practitioners, though we, as I said before, and by "we" I mean all British homœopathic practitioners, were entirely innocent of these unprofessional proceedings and always protested against them.

The conciliatory and non-aggressive spirit in which homœopathy has always been advocated by its professional adherents in this country, and in every country of the old world, makes it appear that homœopathy on this side of the Atlantic is in a very stationary and dead-alive condition compared with its extremely demonstrative activity on the other side of the Atlantic.

While the number of professed practitioners of homœopathy in this country is under 300, the United States of America, with a population not much greater, has at least ten times as many homœopathic practitioners.

While we have no schools or colleges for teaching homœopathy, America has several colleges entitled to confer degrees, and which do actually turn out many scores of graduates every year. While we have but one hospital of any considerable size, the one in whose hospitable board-room we are assembled, and which cannot make up much more than half a hundred beds, there are in America many hospitals for general diseases and several for special affections. Again, whilst this great metropolis can hardly raise £2000 by a bazaar for its homœopathic hospital—let us hope that the bazaar to be held this month may prove more productive—the comparatively small town of Boston in New England recently raised for a homœopathic hospital in that town by a bazaar the magnificent sum of more than £20,000.

What is the cause of this great difference? We are an eminently conservative race, preferring to *stare super vias antiquas*, unwilling to change our old fashions and our old laws—*nolumus leges Angliæ mutari*—and often sticking to the shadow after the substance has departed. This conservative feeling renders the public suspicious of new systems of treatment, and it has its influence on the methods we adopt for propagating the truths of homœopathy. We persist in considering ourselves as forming an integral part of general medicine, which is guilty of self-mutilation in excluding us; we assert our right to be admitted on equal terms to a share of all the honours and emoluments in the bestowal of the legally established medicine of the country, and we have no wish to set up any colleges or schools with sectarian appellations.

But it is otherwise in America. In that young country, where there are no old colleges, no time-honoured societies, no venerable periodicals, no hoary hospitals, where, if there is a preference in the national mind, it is in favour of what is novel—it was quite natural that homœopathy should set up its colleges and societies, its periodicals and hospitals side by side, and in distinct rivalry with the existing institutions of the old creed; for in that country one man is as good as another, and things may almost be said to be venerable in the inverse ratio of their ages. The novel system in America rapidly extended its branches in every direction, and enlisted at first starting a vast number of enthusiastic minds, who soon brought homœopathy almost up to an equality with the old school in the

number of its adherents and in influence. But while we admire the real and substantial improvements and additions to our knowledge in *Materia Medica* and therapeutics that have been made by our transatlantic co-believers, we cannot but observe that the sectarian attitude assumed from the first by them has led some of them to run to extremes, which they would scarcely have done had they not cut themselves so completely adrift from the old vessel.

I do not allude to the eccentricities of some of our American brethren in any pharasaical spirit of affected superiority to such weaknesses. I only refer to them in order to point out that we have avoided such extremes by our adhesion to the idea that we belong of right to the established medicine of the country, and by having always endeavoured to act on the prudent maxim: "Behave towards your enemy as if you thought he might one day be your friend."

This spirit, which prevails not only in this country but throughout the old world, has no doubt its disadvantages. It has rendered us much less enthusiastic in working out the development and improvement of our special branch of therapeutics, in comparison with our American colleagues. While they have added scores of new, some of them well-proved and valuable remedies to the *Materia Medica*, our contributions in the same line are scarce worth mentioning. Our literature is insignificant in quantity compared with theirs, and we possess no means of training up youthful medical men in a knowledge of homœopathy.

A little more of the American zeal and industry would certainly be far from undesirable among ourselves. There is great danger of utter stagnation in the matter of the development of our therapeutics throughout Europe. Northern Germany, which when homœopathy was young assisted so materially in its growth, and furnished so many zealous workers at its development, seems to have subsided into a state of otiose contentment with things as they are, and makes but little effort to advance the system that took its rise in her midst. Austria made a noble effort to increase our knowledge of the action of drugs some thirty years ago, but for near a quarter of a century she has hardly given a sign of her vitality by any literary or scientific work, though during that time two Congresses have

vainly tried to galvanize her into life. Hungary is the only country in Europe where homœopathy seems to be in a very vigorous state. With its two chairs in the Pesth University and its wards in the general hospital, it seems to occupy a position that should satisfy its partisans. Other countries of Europe seem to be pretty much as we are ourselves. Each has had its spasm of activity, and each has now subsided into the dulness of indifference or content.

But in spite of the absence of noisy demonstrativeness, I am convinced that in none of the countries of the old world is the real progress of homœopathy very far behind what it is in America. While the new converts of the States come out of the old ranks in an ostentatious manner and enrol themselves openly among the adherents of the new school, our new converts remain in the old ranks and are careful to avoid an open alliance with what is still denounced as a heresy. The Ringers, Harleys, Wilkses, Thorowgoods and Burnesses of America fill chairs in the homœopathic colleges; here they stick to the old craft and are rewarded by professorships and the applause of orthodox journalists.

The influence of homœopathy on the general practice of medicine since the death of Hahnemann may be divided into three stages. There was the stage of fierce defence of all the evacuant and debilitating processes which had existed almost unaltered from the earliest times, and which were in full swing thirty years ago. Old physic would not listen to a word against those time-honoured practices.

The next stage was that of utter unbelief in the remedial powers of drugs in general and of evacuant and depleting agencies in particular. The experience of homœopathy, backed by the results of Dietl's experiments, awoke the orthodox medical world from its fool's paradise of contentment with traditional medicine. The horror then excited at the sanguinary treatment that had hitherto prevailed, exists as strongly as ever among doctors and patients. Were anyone now to propose to revive the plan of bleeding *coup sur coup* in inflammations, which was practised within the memory of most of my audience by one of the foremost teachers of orthodox physic, he would be regarded by his colleagues as a lunatic, and by his patients as on a par as to medical knowledge with the

medicine-man of the South Sea Islands, who professes to cure a headache by scraping a hole in his patient's skull with a bit of broken glass in order to let out the pain—a proceeding as capable of justification on rational principles as opening a vein to let out an inflammation. The feeble attempt of Richardson in recent times to revive blood-letting has been received with contempt by the profession, and even the *Lancet*—the very instrument of venesection—has not a word to say in its defence.

The very surgeons who used in former days to shed blood like water, and who thought, or at least said, that the blood a patient lost during an operation, rather did him good than harm—even they have been seized with a Mosaic respect for the blood, and now all go in for bloodless operations, repelling all the blood from the limb to be amputated into the patient's body before commencing their operation; so that the patient, after his amputation, has relatively more blood in him than before, for he has not lost a drop, and has a limb the less to supply.

The disrepute into which drugs and all active treatment fell gave a temporary impetus to expectant treatment or therapeutic nihilism. However, this merely negative system could not last. For a time it gave way to a vigorous revival of the Brunonian practice, and stimulants were everywhere the order of the day.

But now old physic has entered on another stage, in which expectancy is denounced as “the offspring of ignorance and deception,” and a search is made for specific medicines, *i.e.*, medicines that have a physiological action on the same parts as the diseases they are to cure. Some, like Harley, make researches for themselves, and are disgusted at finding that they arrive at the same results as the homœopathists. Others, like Wilks, and Ringer, and Murchison, spare themselves the trouble of original experiments, and boldly dip into the homœopathic *Materia Medica* for their specifics. By this means Wilks has discovered the antiphlogistic properties of aconite, and Ringer the specific virtues of a host of medicines, the last of his discoveries being the remedial powers of *hepar sulphuris* in the purulent process. As Hahnemann gave his name to a preparation of mercury he discovered, which is called to this day *Mercurius solubilis Hahnemanni*, why should not Ringer have our *hepar sulphuris* renamed after himself, *Calcii sulphidum Ringeri*, for there can be no question

about his singular merit in having discovered its virtues in the purulent process after painful and laborious search in the tenebrous depths of the Homœopathic Materia Medica? And as the Countess of Cinchona gave her name to the plant of antifebrile renown which she first drew from its obscurity among the ignorant natives of Peru, so might not Wilks set up a claim to have *aconite* rebaptized by the name of *Wilksia*, to commemorate his immortal discovery of its anti-inflammatory properties, when poking about among the farrago of drugs employed by the obscure practitioners of what he is pleased to term "an eminently quack system?" I rather fear that posterity will treat Wilks's pretensions to be the great medical authority on the antiphlogistic powers of *aconite* by quoting this line of Juvenal—

"Nulla *aconita* bibuntur *ficilibus*,"

which, I need hardly tell my colleagues of a learned profession that writes its prescriptions in Latin, means—

"We don't drink our *aconite* out of a *Wilksian* mug."

Whilst the practice of the dominant school consisted mainly of those perturbing operations, which had been the ordinary rule of practice for centuries—and again, when, taught by the experience of the homœopathic school, they had lost all faith in heroic treatment, and had drifted into expectancy and alcoholic stimulation, homœopathy spread with wonderful rapidity through the country, and made numerous converts among both doctors and patients, who had acquired a wholesome horror of violent treatment, and who had not lost faith in physic. In those days any practitioner who declared himself a follower of Hahnemann was sure of getting rapidly into a large practice. The mere material inducements to avow oneself a homœopathist were of the most tempting character, and homœopathy was so utterly unlike the treatment of the old school that one could not practise it and remain a nominal adherent of the dominant sect. Hence there was every inducement, and indeed a necessity, for those who were convinced of the truth of homœopathy to range themselves in the ranks of the professed followers of Hahnemann.

But since the partisans of established medicine have abandoned both heroic measures and expectancy, and

busied themselves with the mild medication of specifics, there is no longer the same horror of their treatment among the patient-world, nor the same inducements to practitioners to associate themselves among the professed adherents of the homœopathic school. Indeed the inducements are all the other way. Large practices are not now at once obtained by the profession of homœopathy, and a declaration of adhesion to Hahnemann's therapeutics cuts a medical man off from the honours and emoluments that are in the gift of the old school. Besides, one can now practise pure homœopathy within the bosom of the old school without exciting any opposition on the part of old-school colleagues—indeed, with the applause of old-school journalists, and without disqualifying oneself for professorial chairs and hospital appointments.

Such being the case, it is not to be wondered at that we now obtain few open accessions to our ranks; that the vacancies occasioned by deaths are scarcely filled up by new converts. Apparently homœopathy is almost at a standstill as regards professed adherents in this country. The *Homœopathic Directory* of this year contains few new names of practitioners that were not in the *Directory* of last year. Nor is it surprising that we have renegades, for there are some who are more influenced by what they deem their own interest than by zeal for science and a desire to render justice to the illustrious but unpopular founder of the improved therapeutics. If by a simple renunciation of their connexion with the homœopathic school they can hope to share in the loaves and fishes of established medicine, while they continue to practise the better therapeutics, the temptation to commit this act of moral cowardice is too strong to be resisted. These weak-backed individuals are, to use an Americanism, the "carpet-baggers" of medicine, who, with their meagre modicum of intellectual luggage, squat down on the territory that has been conquered without any aid from them; and when they have obtained their ends, they betake themselves, with their carpet-bags well stuffed with "notions" acquired during their sojourn among us, to "fresh fields and pastures new."

The paucity of recent conversions to homœopathy in other countries of Europe has been admitted and commented on by the homœopathic periodicals, and is, I think, satisfactorily accounted for by what I have stated. The

prospect of obtaining a large practice by the profession of homœopathic treatment is problematical and remote, while the disadvantages of loss of professional status and exclusion from all the great prizes of the medical profession are only too certain and near ; so the young practitioner, whatever may be his convictions of the superiority of homœopathy, feels that he would be too heavily handicapped in the race for professional distinction by declaring his convictions.

Hence we cannot now look for any great increase of the numbers of avowed followers of Hahnemann, but must rest content with the assurance that the principles of homœopathic therapeutics are being largely adopted and acted on by nominal adherents of the old school. In fact, the boundary line between homœopathic and orthodox practice is daily becoming less distinct. As in ancient times there were tribes of men living on the border-land betwixt England and Scotland who committed themselves to no professions of nationality, but as it suited them pillaged either side with perfect impartiality ; so on the border-land of allopathy and homœopathy there dwell many who without professing any particular creed indulge in the practice of "requisitioning" at one time from the homœopathic, at another from the allopathic, *Materia Medica* for the remedies they employ. As the Union of England and Scotland extinguished the border freebooters, so our medical borderers will be extirpated when old and new physic are united in the common cause of true medical progress.

We may marvel at the disingenuousness of those who appropriate the fruits of the labours of Hahnemann and his followers without acknowledgment, but we know the cause of this. As yet they cannot act on the maxim *suum cuique triuere* without incurring losses they have not the courage to face. We may quote "*sic vos non vobis*" for our consolation, and hope for the speedy advent of the day, when those who, under the guidance of teachers who well knew the source of their inspiration, are employing the remedies of our pharmacopœia in the treatment of disease, *sans qu'ils en sachent rien*, will demand of their teachers their authorities for the alleged actions physiological and therapeutical of these new drugs, as the *Dublin Medical Journal* lately enquired of Sydney Ringer for his authorities ; and when they learn the truth, we have sufficient

confidence in the love of justice of our colleagues to believe that they will give to homœopathists the credit they deserve, and where they have been so long endeavouring to rear a Tyburn gallows for our punishment, they will wish to erect a Marble Arch to our honour.

Though the flow of avowed medical converts to homœopathy seems to be diminished or almost arrested, the conversions are not less numerous than in past years, only they are not avowed, and the universal prevalence of the system is assured. The old school still reviles us, while adopting our methods and remedies; she still asserts her exclusive possession of the truth in medicine, while abandoning one by one all her traditional beliefs and practices.

As Cambronne at Waterloo exclaimed, "la Garde meurt mais ne se rend pas!" (or something equivalent), but thought better of it and surrendered, so allopathy, on the eve of her surrender, sings, "Britons never, never, never will be homœopaths," threatens to nail her colours to the mast and rather go to the bottom shouting "Vive l'allopathie!" than yield an inch of her territory or a stone of her fortresses to the advancing conqueror, who has already beaten her out of all her strong places, stormed her Strasburg of bleeding, overwhelmed her with confusion at her Sedan of salivation, battered down her Metz—or as the French pronounce it her *Mess*—of blisters, cauteries and emetics, and now closely invests her in her last fastness, which is already distracted by intestine dissensions, and whose much vaunted citadel the Mont Valérien of rationality, last hope of orthodoxy, has just been basely given up by the traitor Moxon.

Until the leaders of medical opinion in the dominant school shall have ceased their illogical and insincere opposition to us, and shall have admitted our claim to have the homœopathic method recognized as a legitimate mode of ascertaining the remedial virtues of drugs, of value at least equal to their own empirical no-method, our duty clearly is to cultivate our own field of therapeutics diligently, to increase and perfect our provings, and to render them more available in practice. When opportunity and leisure offer we should not neglect the other branches of medical science, and the singularly valuable and profound essays of Henderson, Drysdale, Madden, and my immediate predecessor in this chair, Sharp, on physiology and pathology, the important discoveries of Drysdale in the

life history of the minute organisms revealed by the microscope, and the masterly work of Blackley on the origin of hay-fever, a work which has obtained the well-merited applause of all the organs of medical and scientific opinion, prove that a profound acquaintance with homœopathic therapeutics and skill in their application, by no means disqualify their possessor for attaining the very highest eminence in physiological and pathological science.

APPENDIX.

ALLUSION has been made in the Address to the flourishing state of homœopathy in the United States of America. The following statements, which we cull from a paper by Dr. Holcombe in the January number of the *United States Medical and Surgical Journal*, and from an address by Professor Morgan to the Graduates of the Hahnemann Medical College of Philadelphia, give a good idea of the condition of homœopathy in the New World.

Among other circumstances cited by Dr. Holcombe are the following: A law of the State of New York, that applicants for licences to practise in that State shall be examined upon homœopathy as well as upon allopathy by the State Commissioners. The splendid banquet given by the Common Council of Boston to the members of the American Institute of Homœopathy—a national organization containing more members than the American Medical Association—a banquet given on the spot where, twelve years before, Oliver Wendell Holmes predicted the speedy and utter extinction of the school. The great Fair in Boston, given while the Massachusetts Medical Association was expelling the homœopathic members from its body; a fair which it took three of the largest halls in the city to hold, which realized \$100,000 for a homœopathic hospital. The New York Ophthalmic Hospital—the largest and best-endowed eye and ear hospital in America—passed entirely from allopathic into homœopathic hands. The Legislature of New York appropriated \$150,000 to the establishment of a homœopathic insane asylum. The people of Michigan insisted, through their representatives in the Legislature, that homœopathy should be taught in their State University. The Common Council of St. Louis compelled the allopathic professors to admit homœopathic students to the hospital clinics on an equal footing with their own. The State Hospital of Pennsylvania at Harrisburg was recently given over to homœopathic physicians and surgeons, because the whole allopathic staff resigned, indignant that homœopathic practice was permitted in a certain ward of the institution. A Commissioner of Pensions having been removed by his allopathic superior on the sole ground that he was a homœopathist, the remonstrances of the people were so widespread and influential that the Government of the United States had to reverse the action of its subordinates and to declare that no distinctions should be made on account of differences of medical opinions. The New York judiciary fined an allopathic doctor for calling a homœopathist a quack; declaring quackery to consist in conduct, not in creed.

Professor Morgan's address contains interesting statistics of homœopathy. In Philadelphia, seven years ago the number of homœopathic physicians was 95, now they are 170. There is a College and a large sum in hand for a hospital. New York city in 1848 had 39 homœopathic physicians, 65 in 1853, 99 in 1858, 143 in 1864, and 210 in 1874. The ophthalmic hospital transferred from allopathic to homœopathic hands, and a surgical hospital established in

connexion with the College. The Boston University has adopted the homœopathic system in its medical department. Pittsburg has established a fine hospital; Cincinnati has an endowed College. Cleveland has also a College. Chicago ten years ago had 15 homœopathic practitioners, it has now 95; it has also a College and hospital. In Illinois there are now 400 practitioners, more than twice as many as ten years ago. In Wisconsin the number has doubled in five years.

Some curious statistics are given by Professor Morgan with reference to the mortality in the private practice of the practitioners of both schools, derived from the official records. These records refer to Boston for 1870 to 1872 inclusive, to New York for 1870 and 1871, and to Philadelphia for 1872. The total number of allopathic practitioners is 3,267, of homœopathists 603. The average practice of the homœopaths is said to be larger than that of their rivals. These allopaths gave in those years 54,679 death certificates or 16.73 for each physician, the homœopaths gave 5,903 certificates or 9.75 for each practitioner.

For Philadelphia the details are minute. Excluding hospital physicians of both schools, the number of allopaths is under four times—but say four times—that of the homœopathists. The deaths from apoplexy under homœopathy were 28, under allopathy 162=40 under the same number of allopathic physicians as there are homœopaths. Deaths from cholera infantum under homœopathy, 214; under allopathy, 1149; or, for an equal number of physicians, 214 against 287 and a fraction. From croup, 27 to 218; say, for equal numbers of physicians, 27 to 54½; or, on the allopathic side, more than double mortality. From diphtheria, 19 to 111; equalized as to number of physicians, 19 to 27¾. From whooping-cough, 13 to 121; equalized as to number of physicians, 13 to 30½; a more than double mortality, to be charged to allopathy. From pneumonia, 68 to 663; equalized, 68 against 165¾. From bronchitis and infantile catarrh, 31 to 257; or for like numbers of physicians, 31 to 64½. From peritonitis, 8 to 96; equalized, 8 against 24; a triple mortality! The deaths from inflammation of the stomach and bowels were, under homœopathy, 37; under allopathy, 195; for a like number of physicians, 37 to 48¾. Finally, from small-pox, the deaths were, in private practice, under homœopathy, 256; under allopathy, 1502; equalized, 256 to 375½, or nearly fifty per cent. more.

