



RXI
AM
U. 4



THE
AMERICAN
HOMŒOPATHIC REVIEW.

Vol. VI. NEW YORK, JULY, 1865. No. 1.

RETROSPECT.

The commencement of a new volume invites us again to a retrospect of the year that has just come to a close.

That year opened upon us, active indeed, each in his individual professional sphere, but with our National and State and smaller organizations suspended or only meeting *pro forma*, and with our minds and hearts only half devoted to the work of our profession.

For, on the great battle fields of Virginia and of the Southwest, were being waged those conflicts which were to determine whether we were to continue to be *States* and a *Nation* and to become indeed a *Free People*. And in the shock of the battles, hardly one of us but knew that the blood of his own kinsmen was being shed. What wonder, that, from the contemplation of interests like these, even our venerated science had no power to avert our eyes.

Thanks be to God, the strife is ended! The Republic is saved, and Freedom, unconditioned, unrestricted, at length inspires its majestic length and breadth!

The armed array of our kinsmen who have saved us, has passed from battle, through pageantry, into history. Our brothers from the armies rejoin us in our studies, and meet us again in our communities.

With heartfelt gratitude to these living heroes—with a benediction on those who, in the storm of war, died that the nation might live for us—with grief for the great and good father and friend, our President, so suddenly taken from us,—a grief that is mingled of tears for the personal loss which comes home to every heart and every fireside throughout the land, of vows to detest still more implacably that infernal institution of Slavery, to the last expiring blow of which he fell a victim and of thanks to God that there was granted us, at this time and for so long in our sore need, a leader, great in intellect, and greater still in goodness—we turn again to the work of our profession and consecrate anew our time and our faculties to the advancement of that particular branch of the science of medicine to which we have devoted ourselves.

The American Institute of Homœopathy, our national representative organization, suspended from the first year of the war, has met again this year and henceforth it is to be expected that a new activity and interest will be infused into all of our associated operations.

Taking a lesson from the times in which we live, let us cherish, as a guiding principle in our scientific career, these golden words of President Lincoln spoken in 1860 and which give the key to his life.

“Neither let us be slandered from our duty by false accusations against us, nor frightened from it by menaces. * * Let us have faith that *right makes might*, and in that faith let us, to the end, dare to do our duty as we understand it.”

In our retrospect for 1864, (Vol. V., 1.) we took occasion to remark that the fundamental principles enunciated by Hahnemann, as the basis of his new system of Therapeutics, were utterly repugnant to all the received doctrines of his day; but that, being founded on exact observation, they had triumphantly endured the test of time and experience. And we showed that those who had accepted these principles, and had shared with Hahnemann the obloquy and reproach which resulted from such acceptance, are now participating

in the final triumph of these truths. Those, on the other hand, who, though convinced that, in the main, Hahnemann was right, yet could not sustain themselves under the ignominy which attached to his followers and who, therefore, sought to find a *middle course* which should reconcile their adherence to Homœopathy and their maintenance of good standing in the ranks of the old school, discover that, in proportion as they come short of the measure of a true disciple of Hahnemann, so are they now behind the foremost mark of accepted medical truth. For we showed that the progress of philosophy and of research in the science of medicine has caused the leading minds of the profession in the old school to adopt and advocate (though without acknowledgement), one after another, nearly all of the essential fundamental principles of Homœopathy, as Hahnemann propounded them.

Thus we showed that the doctrine of the power of small doses, the fact that in the action of drugs in disease, *power* is not in *direct* proportion to *quantity*; but that infinitesimal doses act often much more powerfully to cure disease than large doses do—this doctrine has been admitted by Professor Hoppe, and pronounced by him to be Hahnemann’s most brilliant discovery.

Again, Wunderlich states, as the most decided forward step of the last decade in medical philosophy, the discovery, that a plan of treatment for any given case is to be constructed, not upon a general notion of the disease based upon its pathology, but upon the phenomena of the *individual patient*, no matter what name we may give to his malady. Wunderlich ignores the fact that this was one of Hahnemann’s great principles, but *we* know it right well. It is becoming generally accepted now as a great truth in medicine and so the strict Hahnemannians find themselves in the van of medical philosophy.

But no parts of Hahnemann’s system were more sternly denounced nor more bitterly scorned than the following:

1st. His doctrine of Diseases, viz.: that, instead of being a

new and hostile entity which had intruded itself upon the organism, and which must, in the process of cure, be expelled therefrom; disease is "altered or perverted health;" that the processes of disease are simply "perversions of the normal physiological processes of the healthy body," and that consequently there is no call for *expulsion* or *elimination* of any kind, but rather for such an influence to be exerted on that force which keeps the different organs of the body in activity, as shall restore it to its normal working.

2nd. His doctrine (the direct consequence of the preceding), that disease, being, in its essential nature, a dynamic alteration of the organic forces, it can be recognized and known only by its consequent phenomena. In other words, he held that, disease being perverted or modified *health*, we can recognize *disease*, as we recognize *health*, not as an *entity* but only by its *phenomena*; that as we recognize *healthy* life by the phenomena of the healthy organism, viz.: the functions and tissues of the organs, though we may not understand how these functions and tissues are produced, so we can recognize disease or *perverted* life only through the *modified* functions and tissues. It is not essential whether or not we understand *how* these perverted functions and tissues are *produced*. This is the doctrine that diseases are known only by their *symptoms*, that we treat them *according* to their *symptoms* and that for their successful treatment, a knowledge of their *pathology* is not indispensably necessary.

How sternly, for this doctrine, was Hahnemann rebuked, as the "grave-digger of Medical Science." How few of his followers could brave this storm and could "stand and smile" and still be "symptom coverers!"

And now in the year of grace 1865, the accepted Lecturer of the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburg, Dr. Haldane, states that:

"Important nay, essential as is a knowledge of pathology and diagnosis, it must be borne in mind that those departments are but a means to an end. * * *
In Therapeutics, important improvements have no doubt

been made, but these have consisted rather in the abandonment of time-honored but vicious methods than in the introduction of new remedial measures. * * *

A fundamental and most important principle of pathology has only lately been recognized; it is this, that diseases are not *new and independent entities*, but that they are *perversions of normal or physiological processes*. * * *

"To sum up, therefore, I would say that the present practice of medicine is this: The physician seldom attempts to cure disease, he endeavors to place and maintain his patient in the most favorable condition for recovery; *and he treats symptoms, although he often does not know on what they essentially depend.*"

Here is a recognition by the highest old-school authority of the truths which Hahnemann proclaimed fifty years ago!

Once more, coming to the subject of remedies, Hahnemann taught that drugs cure by virtue of a specific power which each drug possesses to affect in a certain definite way the functions or tissues of certain organs of the body; that this power is different for each drug, being a specific power possessed by each drug; whence it follows that, in treating disease, one drug may not be substituted for another; that this power can be accurately ascertained only by experiment upon the healthy; that the selection of the specific drug for each case of sickness must be made in correspondence with the symptoms which the drug actually produces on the healthy and not on the basis of any general theory of the action of the drug.

We all know how this doctrine has been denounced and ridiculed as the climax of the iniquities of Hahnemann, the "grave-digger of medical science," reducing Therapeutics to a mere mechanical "comparison and covering of symptoms!"

Now, Dr. Haldane, in the same lecture, says, and the Royal College of Edinburg listens approvingly:

"If the power of curing disease by medicine is ever to be attained, it will be by the discovery of agents which shall act in a *specific* manner upon the tissues and organs of the body.

It will be asked, how we are to attain a knowledge of the specific properties of medicines and of the circumstances in which they will be useful. My answer is, by *experiment*. And it is not *sufficient* that we are acquainted with the physiological effect of a medicine, that is to say, with its action *on the healthy.*" * * * * *

Thus, *directly* and by *implication*, this high allopathic authority sanctions these doctrines of Hahnemann respecting the action and the selection of the drug.

And thus, as years go by, the wisdom of our great Master is vindicated and his wonderful clearness of intellectual vision is demonstrated.

How little have those followers of his to glory in, who shrunk from the obloquy that attached at first to his doctrines and, through deference to prevailing opinion which was adverse, modified and modified them out of all resemblance to their original forms!

How cheering, on the other hand, the position of the strict Hahnemannians who find that the very points of doctrine and practice, for adhering to which they have suffered so much from the old school and even more from the half-hearted of the nominal Homœopaths, are being proclaimed and defended, one after another, by the highest authorities of the old school!

How much more solidly would our Science now be established had we all the faith and steady courage to stand on the platform of the great and good Lincoln: "Neither let us be slandered from our duty by false accusations against us, nor frightened from it by menaces; let us have faith that *right makes might*, and in that faith let us, to the end, dare to do our duty as we understand it."

Within the past year the friends of true Homœopathy have been greatly encouraged by the re-organization of our oldest homœopathic college, the "Homœopathic Medical College of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia."

This institution which, having once done good service, had of late years languished, began a new life last year

under a corps of able and active professors, zealous and pure Hahnemannians. We are now gratified to learn that the load of pecuniary and other embarrassments that hampered its operations has been lifted from its shoulders and we have reason to anticipate from it, henceforth, a wide and beneficent influence on the teaching and practice of true Homœopathy in our country.

Already we have the announcement of an instrument from which such an influence may be confidently expected, in the form of a new journal, the *Hahnemannian Monthly*, which will appear in August. It will be "conducted and published by the Faculty of the Homœopathic Medical College of Pennsylvania," and will be the organ of the College. As such, it will, no doubt, embody the results of the joint labors of the faculty and students in the *Materia Medica* as well as in other departments of Homœopathy. If so, it cannot fail to be of value to our Science and we heartily bid it welcome!

D.

OUR MATERIA MEDICA.*

BY CONSTANTINE HERING M. D., PHILADELPHIA, PA.

So you would begin in earnest to study the *Materia Medica*, if you had a "purified" one. You have heard so many say they had found a hair in the soup served up by Hahnemann, that you have lost your appetites! If you intend to wait for Hahnemann's purification, you may have to wait a long while; may the Lord comfort your patients! But to him among you who really means to come and work hard, I will give some good advice that will give him a real appetite, especially if he possesses a sound intellectual stomach. But, first of all, this so-called "purification" must be done away with.

* "Advice to Beginners, Etc.;" a lecture delivered at the Homœopathic College of Pennsylvania, October, 1864.

When purification is spoken of, regarding a *Materia Medica* expressly called "pura" by Hahnemann himself, the beginning of false judgment and the impulse leading to a permanent confusion of ideas is already given.

If it is intended to refute Hahnemann, as his opponents have already done, then it is another matter; their first object being to distort and twist the meaning of words. If it is intended, as all the purifiers have really done, to imitate their opponents in everything, then indeed it may serve its purpose. But all this must be dropped, if we really intend to further the healing art; and in this case we must not use the word "purification" in an entirely different sense from that in which Hahnemann used the word "pure." What Hahnemann meant by "pure" and why he used this expression has been clearly defined by his own words, and has been sufficiently discussed; it certainly is not synonymous with "spotless." In his *Fragmenta* he speaks of "*viribus positivis, absolutis*;" more pertinently and correctly he afterwards called his *Materia Medica* "pure," in order to indicate its *freedom from fiction*, experimental cures, preconceived opinions and abstract ideas. Such impurities are not found in the least degree in the whole eleven volumes.

That much found its way in, which had better come out again, shall not be denied. If this is to be eliminated, it should be called *revision*. But what do the purifiers propose to reject?

1st. Many, perhaps most, of the quotations from ancient authors.

So they have ascended and descended with praiseworthy assiduity the library ladders; have opened old dusty quartos and folios, and shut them again and were happy when they found evidence against Hahnemann. But what is all this for? Strike out, if you will, quotations and all from the *Materia Medica*, and then see what becomes of the remedy. Each one remains exactly as it was, not a single one among them is in the least changed in its characteristic peculiarities. But if nothing is to be gained, why this scrubbing and scouring

of brass buttons? The object is, after all, to vanquish the foe, but that can be done with unscoured buttons as well.

2nd. They intend to root out the symptoms belonging to the individual who proved the remedy, and imagine that the quantity of symptoms *recurring* among *many remedies proved by one individual*, belonged to *him* and not to the *remedy*. The non-recurring symptoms, on the other hand, are regarded as peculiar to the remedy, and not to the prover. Singular! Since we have of one prover but a few provings, of a second a few more, of a third more still, how many provings are requisite in order to be justified in striking out? What could be done with such provings, where the same prover could only prove a few remedies? They would have to be laid aside entirely. Suppose, *e. g.*, we had six or seven provings of one prover, and then erased all repeated by recurring symptoms, say one-half; but then, suppose our prover to furnish six or seven provings of other remedies, in that case a mass of symptoms would again present themselves to be erased from the remedy already half demolished. But that were an endless striking out. Whoever wishes to try it, may begin with the provings in the *Oesterreichische Zeitschrift*, and then see what he has gained. Among Hahnemann's disciples and provers, single symptoms, obtained from male and female friends, were unconditionally added to the report. You are not certain, in a single case, that the prover observed all the symptoms upon himself. Of Hahnemann's own, it is positively known that he observed and collected them without distinction of person, upon many different people. Only in regard to the Austrian provings we are certain; let those who will, begin with the latter their process of assorting and erasing individual symptoms! It will then be found that the symptoms of the same prover of different remedies will indeed coincide much less with one another, than is the case with Hahnemann's provers, and that undoubtedly is progress and a preference; but, alas! another difficulty soon arises. How great must the similarity of symptoms be, how close the coincidences of expression, and how far must either the same or different

organs be affected? Compare, for example, the similarity of Aconite and Bryonia, and the related remedies Bryonia and Colocynth. Where, in this case, is the boundary of that which is to be eliminated? The entire individual-symptom-purification depends on this boundary, which cannot be drawn by arbitrary power like that of the Erlking.

3rd. All the "impure" symptoms of "patients" belong to what should be eliminated. But there a boundary line would have to be drawn through a mass of humanity so dense that even the Erlking's might would be powerless. In a large city of a given number of inhabitants, we have, next to a certain number of daily deaths, a ten or hundred-fold greater number of patients lying in bed; a very rapidly increasing ratio of less and less patients, and an exceedingly great number of those who are still able to attend to their business; and lastly the greatest number of those who are neither sick nor well. Then the proportion of those less sick rapidly decreases; but *entirely, ideally well*, without any complaint at all, even without dormant dyscrasia and unpoisoned, either by Rhubarb or kine pox, we shall see but few, and soon none at all. For the sake of illustration, if this were to be represented by a curve, this mass of humanity arranged according to its degrees of health, would assume the form of a black radish, held by its green tuft, not upwards but downwards, (representing mortality, resurrection etc.,) while its root and few radicles pointing upward, would represent the "pictures of health." If you cut a whole radish transversely across its thickest part, it will be apparent that the upper half at first appearing as the largest, is the smallest when separated. Thus it is with the well and the sick.

The question then is, how far shall the caudal extremity of the radish be bobtailed, since that is to be thrown away when the radish is eaten? In the purification of the *Materia Medica*, on the contrary, *it* is considered as *alone worth keeping*, and as health-bringing.

4th. But the fourth and most prolific activity is manifested in the endeavors to arouse suspicion, and in calumny of indi-

viduals: the casting out of the black sheep. Here one is said to have approached the mirror too often to examine his pupils, without sufficient knowledge of all the optical and physical improvements made tens of years afterwards. Then, another is accused of having used the milliners employed by his wife, for the purpose of manufacturing symptoms; and, just as the peasant women of Tiefenfort decorated themselves with the ribbons and caps obtained from the factory of the mistress, in like manner did Hartlaub and Trink's pure *Materia Medica* 1-3, and, later, Hartlaub and Trink's *Annals*, parade the provings derived from the symptom-factory of the husband. And as the ribbons and caps of those peasants, in the region of Tiefenfort in Bohemia, have become old-fashioned, in like manner have the productions of the symptom-factory of that well-meaning but logically inexperienced Surgeon Cajetan Nennung gone out of fashion and belong in the lumber room along with the bivalvular hoop-skirts of ancient spinsters.

Twenty years ago (not now) another class of doomed provers were subjected to the ordeal of bottle-flies and other insects, and were called bashful, sensitive, timid, more timid, most timid, white-livered sensationalists. In Paris, on the other hand, the work was done more boldly, by placing the necks of such people under the guillotine, and the word was "heads off!" What an enormous lot of symptoms must have tumbled into the pit along with the corpses! The pure *Materia Medica* stood like a man of snow in the March sun, melting away, leaving only the dismal eyes of charcoal and the pipe stem. That is called the foundation of a life saving healing art. Such, it is thought, are the four hinges of the gates that close or open our domains.

But, say the undaunted, if this is not to be called "purification," then call it *revision*, necessary by all means! And in case of insurmountable difficulties, arising out of disagreement regarding the capacity of implements to be employed in the sifting process, one point would stand above all doubt; a security must be demanded, and this, Hufeland would have said, should be demanded in tones of thunder.

This, as a matter of course, is willingly admitted at the outset. Among remedies there is a great difference regarding their value; this applies with equal force to the provers, as well as to individual symptoms of each remedy. On this point, then, we are a unit; why then do our paths diverge henceforth? Indeed, they do not even diverge, but we proceed in directions so entirely opposite that we strike our heads together. It is no ordinary misunderstanding, common among men, leading to this or that side from the right path, but an essentially opposite fundamental idea, not simply leading astray, but in consequence of which "minds burst upon each other." Why must we cut loose from each other, as the school of Hahnemann in its totality does from that of its opponents, who hate and despise us? Why must we witness a repetition of the same hatred and scorn? Do we not wish to cure all our patients? Do we not strive to render the task easier, and to acquire quick, precise decision regarding the one right remedy, in every case? Who would always flounder like the camels in the desert of symptoms, or seek the mountain paths among brambles and rocks, like goats.

The great chief difference is this: we followed the counsels of Hahnemann, and when we found it difficult to cure or failed altogether, we thought the fault lay in ourselves. But the opponents of Hahnemann, within his school, blamed the *Materia Medica* instead of themselves. While we at length achieved artistic facility by dint of perseverance, thereby augmenting our respect towards Hahnemann's *Materia Medica*, the opponents in our own camp made the *Materia Medica* the great scapegoat of their want of success, vying with each other in expositions, kickings and bickerings without end. Who could expect them to approach such a mass of symptoms, replete with uncertainties, much more to enter these newly opened halls of books with reverence, to inspect and search again and again in each new case of disease, baffling all curative efforts. That was the manner in which we mastered the old remedies, as well as the new.

(*To be continued.*)

APIS MELLIFICA.

BY P. P. WELLS, M. D., BROOKLYN, N. Y.

In 1857, Hering published in Leipsic and Heidelberg the first volume of his *Americanische Arzneipruerungen*, the third article of which presents, in the proving of *Apis Mellifica*, a model for all provers who shall hereafter attempt to gather and preserve the known effects of drugs on the living human organism. For thoroughness of treatment, and comprehensive appreciation of the problem of drug-proving, as well as for a happy solution of this problem, we do not know where in the labors of others to look for its parallel; and in no instance, in these respects, has this great master of provers excelled it. The proving of *Apis* also stands as a monument to the industry, faithfulness and learning of the master, which not even his great proving of *Lachesis* surpasses. It early attracted the attention of practitioners of our school in Germany, and its importance was fully perceived and acknowledged. The remedy was extensively used by them, and great successes were declared to have been the result.

This was especially true of Dr. C. W. Wolf, of Berlin, who in the first part of his *Erfahrungen* published his numerous extraordinary experiences of *Apis*, in 1859. His claims for curative relationships of the remedy, based on these experiences, were of so great extent, that to some, who had had less opportunity for observation, they seemed quite extravagant and unworthy of credit.

Unfortunately for the English-reading portion of the practitioners of our school, both the original proving and the *Erfahrungen* were in the German language, and to them, for this reason, wholly unavailable; and to the present time this embarrassment continues. Notwithstanding this, some of the general facts of the proving have become known, and clinical reports of successes with the remedy have induced

its occasional empirical use, and not always without success. In compliance with a request of an esteemed friend, of this class of our school, who has realized many interesting results from the use of Apis, though given empirically, the following translation of the condensed resumé of its pathogenesis by Hering, has been made. It is published, not as a substitute for the complete register of its symptoms, but in the hope that it may serve as a help to those who are unable to avail themselves of the original, till such time (it is to be hoped not distant), as the complete proving shall be given to the English reader. (See *Appendix*.)

The following recent clinical experience with Apis seemed of sufficient interest to warrant giving it to the readers of the REVIEW. On the 25th of March, ult., the writer was called to a child nine years old, just attacked with the miliary form of scarlet fever, with prominent affection of the brain. On the 8th of April, the convalescence seemed established. The child was up, dressed, and engaged with her amusements as usual, there being only a diminished strength to be restored. On the 12th, there was paleness of the face and a very suspicious puffiness of the eyelids, which increased, with swelling of the face, limbs and abdomen. The external swelling was œdematous, while the evidence of water in the abdomen was quite complete. The urine was scanty, very dark colored and frothy. There was less than a pint passed in the twenty-four hours. The pulse was but slightly affected, and the skin moderately harsh and dry. The child had an unquestioned syphilitic taint; both parents were known to have suffered from this plague previous to her birth. For a year before this attack of scarlet fever, she had been under allopathic treatment for a disease of the nose. It was swollen; sensitive to touch; respiration through it obstructed; copious, offensive, acrid and thin greyish discharge; ulcers were to be seen within the nostrils. Soon after the commencement of the treatment of the fever these symptoms were much abated. While under the previous treatment the presence of a polypus in the left nostril was discovered, which much obstructed the passage.

The dropsical swellings were successfully treated by Apis²⁰⁰. In the progress of the case, and when the abdominal and cutaneous deposits of serum had almost disappeared, she succeeded with some little difficulty in discharging from the left nostril a fleshy mass, more than an inch in length and half an inch in breadth. It presented the characteristics of color, consistency and signs of organizations peculiar to nasal polypus. A week after the discharge of this mass, another and smaller was dislodged in the usual, somewhat violent efforts to clear the nose in the morning.

It has not fallen within the experience or reading of the writer to note that nasal polypus has been *spontaneously* separated and discharged. Has it been in the experience of others? Was this the result of the action of Apis? The case is given as an occasion for asking these two questions.

Under the observation of the friend at whose instance the above translation has been made, erysipelatous inflammation and swelling of the scrotum followed bee-stings on the face and neck, in the case of a lad five years old. This symptom does not appear in Hering's proving.

DISEASES DURING LACTATION.

BY C. WESSELHGEFT, M. D., DORCHESTER, MASS.

Among the numerous anomalies and digressions which nature often produces in the female organism, subsequent to parturition, those of the mammary gland are most conspicuous. To call them simply troublesome, would not sufficiently express their effect upon mother and child. The former suffers more pain and heartfelt disappointment, while the latter must, in many instances bear for life, the consequences of imperfect or arrested lactation on the part of the mother. This perhaps applies more widely to female infants. The first deplorable experiences of a physician, however brief