

The great sympathy I feel for my sex in their peculiar sufferings, must be my apology for presuming to lay before the readers of the REVIEW my own views on this matter, without wishing to detract in the slightest degree from the value of others' opinions on this interesting subject.

I will here remark that I have always used the thirtieth potency, about five pellets to half a tumblerful of water, one teaspoonful every two hours.

OBSERVATIONS ON EUPATORIUM.

BY CARROLL DUNHAM, M. D., NEW YORK.

This drug, which has hardly as yet an established place in the pharmacopeia, although it is a much used and highly prized "domestic" remedy, has been but imperfectly studied, and we have nothing approaching to an exhaustive knowledge of its properties and capabilities. Enough is known, however, to give it rank beside Bryonia in regard of its febrile and gastro-hepatic symptoms.

Eupatorium perfoliatum, thoroughwort or boneset, is popularly used as a diaphoretic (a hot infusion in frequent, moderate doses) or as an emetic (hot infusion, large doses) or as a tonic (cold infusion, small doses).

Its history and its uses by allopathic and eclectic physicians are well detailed in Dr. Hale's work. ("New Remedies, etc.," p. 159 et seq.)

Eupatorium is said to have been a principal remedy for intermittent fever with the Indians.

Dr. Anderson, of New York, in 1813, published a number of cases of intermittent fever successfully treated with it in the City Hospital. He proposed it, therefore, as a substitute for Cinchona bark. Subsequent experiments with it in that hospital were not so successful and the remedy fell into disrepute.

This is the history of every drug in the allopathic materia medica. There can be no doubt that the *Eupatorium* did

really cure the cases which Dr. Anderson reported. But there was, assuredly, some peculiarity about these cases, by virtue of which they exactly corresponded to *Eupatorium*. The cases in which it was tried unsuccessfully, unquestionably, did not possess this peculiarity, whatever it was, and which must be the *characteristic* of *Eupatorium*. But the physicians who were testing the remedy took no note of this; they regarded all cases as virtually *alike*, because to all of them the name "intermittent" could be applied. So regarding them, and taking no note of any peculiarities wherein one case differed from another, they could not, of course, perceive why *Eupatorium* might correspond to one case and cure it, and not to another.

The number of cases of intermittent fever to which *Eupatorium* is appropriate is not very large, except during certain seasons, when an epidemic requiring it may prevail (as has been the case in some parts of the State of New York, in the autumn of 1865).

The first proving of *Eupatorium* was made in Philadelphia, and was reported by Dr. W. Williamson to the American Institute of Homœopathy (*Transactions*, vol. 1.) in 1847. Its great action is upon the muscular system (or fibrous tissues), producing great *soreness* and *aching*, and upon the gastro-hepatic system, producing a condition resembling what is known as a "bilious state."

It produces intense headache, throbbing and great sense of internal soreness in the forehead and occiput, with a sensation of great weight in the occiput—distress and painful soreness in the top and back of the head.

Soreness of the eyeball; redness of the face, with dry skin.

Tongue coated whitish or yellow.

Loss of appetite; thirst for cold water.

Eruations tasteless or bitter.

Vomiting after drinking; vomiting of bile, with trembling and with pain in the epigastrium.

Nausea and a sense of extreme prostration (this is not *real* prostration).

Soreness around the epigastric zone; soreness and fullness in the region of the liver.

Constipation; urine high-colored and scanty. Roughness and rawness in the trachea. Hacking, dry cough, with flushed face; the patient *supports the chest with the hand* (like Bry.).

Weakness in the small of the back; deep-seated pain in the loins, with soreness on every motion; pain in the back and lower extremities.

Soreness and aching in hands and wrists, as if broken and dislocated; the same in arms. Stiffness and soreness of lower extremities, as if beaten—worse on motion and touch.

Fever, commencing generally in the morning; thirst begins several hours before the chill, and continues during chill and heat. There is vomiting of bile at the end of the chill.

During the heat the face is of a dull, mahogany-red color and the eye glistens, the sclerotica being yellow.

It is a distinguishing peculiarity, that little or no sweat follows the hot stage.

The peculiar headache, the soreness of the eyes and their yellowness, the yellowish red face, the vomiting of bile, with nausea and prostration, the soreness in the region of the liver, the constipation, etc., are one group of symptoms. The soreness all over the body, from head to foot, both internal and external, are another group. These two groups together furnish an indication for Eupatorium in certain forms of "bilious fever" (in the first stage), too strong to be questioned.

The absence of much perspiration after the heat, showing an imperfect resolution, points to the type of fever as the remittent.

Experience has confirmed these views. I regard the *severe bone pains* and the *absence* of much sweat as especially *characteristic*.

The symptoms of the gastro-hepatic region, and the character and aggravations of the pains in the body and extremities, very closely resemble those of bryonia. But a broad distinction at once appears when we consider the perspiration which, under Bryonia, is profuse and easily provoked, while,

under Eupatorium, it is scanty or absent. Again the Eupatorium pains make the patient restless; those of Bryonia make him keep very still.

Rhus tox. produces pains and aching in the limbs; but these pains are worse during repose, and they keep the patient restless, constantly changing his position, whereas those of Eupatorium are not aggravated by repose.

R. D., a stout mechanic, thirty-five years old, of dark complexion, went into an ice-house one very warm morning in August, to get a piece of ice. Charmed with the coolness of the place, he foolishly remained there for a quarter-hour or longer. Suddenly he felt chills creeping over him and became quite faint. He left the icehouse as quickly as he could and went home. In an hour he had an exceedingly severe chill, lasting several hours. This was followed by burning fever, which continued without abatement until the following morning when it gave place to a severe chill. As this chill was passing away I first saw the patient.

He had already become hot externally; his face was of a dull, red color; the eyes glistened, and the sclerotica were yellowish red. The tongue had a thick, yellowish fur; there was intense headache in the occiput—an insupportable heaviness. Nausea and frequent effort to vomit, extreme tenderness in the epigastrium, fullness and tenderness in the hepatic region, with stitches and soreness on moving and coughing; intolerable aching in the back and limbs, "as if the bones were broken." Urine scanty and of a dark mahogany color; a hard, dry cough and some dyspnoea. The patient, although in so great pain, lay quiet.

I had no Eupatorium, but there was a swamp near the house, and I soon found the plant. From the juice pressed from a few leaves I prepared, with water, the third attenuation, and directed it to be taken in drop doses, every three hours until marked improvement was observed.

In about ten hours the fever was gone; the chill and fever never recurred, and next day the patient was free from pain. On the third day I found him convalescent.

In many cases of influenza, a review of the symptoms will show why Eupatorium proves, as it does, a speedy curative.

MISCELLANEOUS.

WHAT ALLOPATHIC PRACTITIONERS THINK OF HOMŒOPATHY, and how they become convinced of its truth.—Mr. Wynne Thomas, of Birmingham, a comparatively recent adherent of Homœopathy, when acknowledging, at the Annual Meeting of the Governors of the Birmingham Homœopathic Hospital, his appointment as one of its medical officers, gave the following interesting sketch of his views of Homœopathy before he had studied it, and of the investigation which led to his faith in it. Speaking of Homœopathy, he says :

“In my own experience I have found it to be looked upon as either an imposture or a deception. To medical men generally the infinitesimal dose is the distinctive feature of Homœopathy, and they argue that, as it is preposterous to believe that the decillionth of a grain of an inert substance—say charcoal—can have any effect upon the human body, the whole subject may be dismissed as ridiculous. Of the law they know nothing—at least nineteen out of twenty know nothing: I have often conversed with surgeons about the law, and never found one who clearly understood it. One gentleman in large practice, who professed to have investigated it, asserted that we treat a case of gastric or cerebral sickness in the same way; and I have no doubt he expressed what a great many besides himself believe. I confess that for years I felt as the rest do, and scorned to investigate a system of medicine so evidently opposed to my common sense. I made the oft-repeated mistake of deciding by common sense what equally lies beyond it, and should be tested by special sense—i. e., special experience. My common sense, or common experience, told me that to produce a certain effect so many grains of a particular medicine were necessary, and I knew that the billionth part of that quantity could not do the same thing. That, I thought settled the matter, and yet what had I settled? nothing but what was agreed to by all Homœopaths and Allopaths. I had thought only of the dose, and not of the different law according to which the medicine must be administered. A little more than three years ago cases said to have been cured under homœopathic treatment came under my observation; and I said to myself, ‘Perhaps, after all, the new practice, which has got a footing, and is evidently spreading, may have something in it;’ and I asked, ‘Is it wise to ridicule what I do not understand?’ So I came over to my old college friend, Dr. Blake, and asked him to lend me a book on Homœopathy. He gave me Sharp’s Tracts, which I read with intense interest. I saw the beauty of the law of ‘*similia similibus curentur*,’ and what a grand advance it must be for the practice of medicine to be based on a law, if only that could be proved to be a true law. Now came the final step, the practical test. Having mastered a portion of the *Materia Medica*, I selected some simple but marked cases, and was surprised and delighted to find how quickly they were cured; and so I went on studying, and gradually applying it to severer cases, till at last I treated, and very successfully, the most dangerous diseases to which we are liable. Gentlemen, I hope and believe that

before many years we shall succeed in convincing our medical brethren of the superiority of our system; so that, instead of hindering our progress, they may help us in working out one of the grandest truths the world has yet seen.”

Would that more such men as Mr. Thomas would do as he has done!—
[Monthly (London) Homœopathic Review.]

THE MEDICAL SCHOOLS. *The Introductory Addresses at the Commencement of the Medical Session, 1865-66.*—On October 2d the present medical year opened. At each of the Medical Schools a chosen orator addressed a mixed audience of students and their friends. The new student fresh from the surgery of some general practitioner, the second and third year’s men, former pupils who had already won their diplomas, and the parents and guardians of many of the younger men, crowded the lecture theatres to hear addresses, which should point out to them the present state of medicine and surgery, its discoveries, its improvements, its triumphs of the past, its aspirations for the future.

The triumphs which were claimed were almost exclusively for improvements in surgery, or for mechanical inventions for the better discovery of the exact condition of the diseases of parts hitherto hidden from our view.

In medicine only one discovery was claimed, and that dating so many years back as scarcely to deserve the name of recent, i. e. chloroform.

We confess to a feeling of poignant disappointment, when we look over page after page of eloquence and learning, and find the whole result of many years’ steady and continued labor in the field of practical medicine, by a host of able and earnest men, has produced no further result than this—that it has taught them to do less harm than their fathers did before them, and has given them a distrust in their old means of cure, without at the same time giving them a newer and better method.

In the *Times* of October 4th, this discreditable state of the science of medicine was made the subject of deservedly severe criticism, in an article which pointed out, very justly, that medicine has been so strictly preserved as a *mystery*, that public opinion has been less brought to bear upon the profession of medicine, than it has upon the church or the law. “The result of this has, perhaps, been that medicine is not sufficiently regarded as a practical science, subject to the same laws and conditions, and admitting of the same tests and verifications as other sciences, but rather as a secret traditional mystery deposited in the hands of a few persons, and neither to be touched, handled nor discussed, except by its initiated and privileged professors.” “The days are, however, coming when this position of the medical profession will become untenable.”

“The question will ultimately be asked, and have to be answered—On what single general principle is the medical profession really agreed? What points can be considered so clearly established, after the labor, researches and writings of two thousand years, that nothing can be urged to the contrary? Perhaps it will then be found that the study of anatomy and the study of disease have not been conducted so strictly and rigidly on the principles of Bacon as

might have been expected; that *nature has rather been observed than interrogated*, and that there are hundreds of truths of the most vital consequence to the human race, which could be brought to light by a steady application of those methods of investigation which have borne such rich fruits in other departments of science."

The *Times* never more nearly deserved the title of Jove, playfully given it by one of our novelists, than when it wrote the above critical remarks on the Eleven Addresses, published in its columns on the previous day. We hope the lesson will not fall unheeded on the leaders of the allopathic medical schools. By a singular coincidence the *Times* has adopted, almost literally, the views so forcibly expressed by the late Dr. Tessier in the introduction to his *Recherches Cliniques sur le Traitement de la Pneumonie et du Cholera, suivant la Methode de Hahnemann*, where he says, in speaking of the curative effects of drugs: "How is a knowledge of these effects to be obtained? *Nature answers only when interrogated, and only answers correctly those who know how to interrogate her.*"

The question as to how far diseases and remedies have been studied on the principles of Bacon, can only be answered by studying the writings of Hahnemann and his followers.

Sweeping away all previous theories, rejecting all conjectures as to the action of this or that drug, Hahnemann applied himself, on the Baconian principle, to the scientific interrogation of facts, by observing the effects of drugs upon the healthy organism. He conducted a series of experimental observations as to the effects of crude drugs upon persons previously in good health, and then by recording every deviation from health which was induced, he became acquainted with the pure effects of nearly 100 drugs.

In like manner, Hahnemann utterly ignored the fanciful pathology of his day, and discarding all the existing theories of disease, he fell back upon simple observation. He held that the *totality of the symptoms*, those felt by the patient and those observed by the physician, were to be looked upon as the individual disease. This was not to be called by a name and treated by its name, because, according to his views, if the symptoms in two given cases differed, even by a hair breadth, that difference was to be noted, as he conceived it had a practical bearing upon the selection of the remedy.

It would be well were we, even *now*, to fall back upon this rudimentary therapeutics and pathology, and to reconstruct medicine upon this basis.

We need not here repeat the story how Hahnemann was led to the discovery of the homœopathic law by his experiments upon Cinchona bark, nor as to the gradual steps by which he was induced to abandon large and ponderable doses of medicine for the infinitesimal and the imponderable; for all these discoveries he was indebted to his "strictly and rigidly" adhering to the principles of Bacon in his enquiries. But it is not our object now to enlarge upon the history or the principles of Homœopathy, but rather to point out how strongly the public weal demands of the medical profession the recognition of Hahnemann and his labors.

The public has a right to demand from the professors of the medical schools—from the medical officers of the magnificent hospitals within whose walls

these schools hold their *seances*—that they should fairly investigate such new methods of treatment as are affirmed to possess superior curative powers to those hitherto practised. It is not sufficient for these professors to plead, as Dr. Andrews did at St. Bartholomew's, "Men expect too much from us, and by demanding impossibilities, are led to deny the usefulness of the knowledge we do possess." Men expect that the leaders and teachers in our medical schools should be the repositories of the "art of healing," in all its extensions, homœopathic as well as allopathic. Men are not content to be told, "Nature cures you, not the doctor." They want a system which will *heal their diseases*.

When Mr. Bryant says, "Need I dwell on the value of human life, and show you how that life may be *prolonged* or *shortened* by the science you profess?" The public says the science, *if true*, would always *prolong human life* and never shorten it.

When Professor Priestly sneers at that perfection of science which would provide "a specific remedy for every ailment," the public naturally exclaims why should not all diseases prove as amenable to treatment as ague, and why should our professors scout the idea of "the specific power of medicine," as fallacious?

When Mr. Rivington, at the London Hospital, tells his hearers, "Let them extract truth from Homœopathy, and allow its absurdity to find its own level," the public says "how do you propose to test that which is true in Homœopathy? by what series of experimental observations have you arrived at the conclusion that part is true and part is absurd?"

When Dr. Handfield Jones, at St. Mary's, states that physicians may meet, in consultation, those Homœopaths who simply acknowledge the law *similia similibus curentur*, but may not meet those who give infinitesimal doses of medicine, because they are absurd; the public will require by what series of experiments Dr. Handfield Jones has come to the conclusion that "infinitesimal doses" are so absurd, that it "puts it really out of the power of a man of ordinary calibre of mind to consult with him" who so practises Homœopathy.

And if it should be found that all these Eleven Professors have neglected to enquire into the truth of Homœopathy, at the bedside of their patients, may it not be said by the public, that in refusing to investigate Homœopathy, they have neglected the sacred trust reposed in them, when they were made the teachers of the youthful aspirants and the physicians to our public hospitals.

If these men had come before us, saying that they had followed the Baconian method, and after careful experimental observation, were in a position to prove by recorded facts the fallacy of the HOMŒOPATHIC LAW and the utter inutility of infinitesimals, we would give a patient hearing to their denunciations, and weigh their opinions against those of others who have arrived at an opposite conclusion.

But the position they assume is not that of the philosopher, but that of the self-constituted judge. They say, "We so thoroughly disbelieve the system of Homœopathy and infinitesimals, that we will not even investigate the statements made to us in its favor."

The *Times*, in the above quoted article, says, "In these days little is taken upon trust." But these men take their prejudice entirely "upon trust;"

will not even make the experiment whether their prejudices may not really be far more *absurd* than the infinitesimals which, in their ignorance of "facts," they sneer at.

Are there no analogues, in well recognized medical facts, which prove the tremendous power of *infinitesimals*? As an illustration we may cite a case within our own knowledge. A death from scarlet fever occurred in a house; the family left it, had all that was recommended done in the way of precaution against subsequent infection, and *went abroad for twelve months*; on their return the scarlet fever again immediately broke out amongst them. Now here we have a proof of the power of an imponderable agent to induce malignant effects.

Again, will any one of the Eleven Lecturers venture to tell us, from analysis, how we may distinguish the pus of a small-pox pustule and of a vaccine pustule, the one from the other, or simple pus from a healthy wound from either. Yet the small-pox matter may be deadly in its effect, while the vaccine is limited to producing inconvenience, and the third will do no harm. The difference between these and many other poisons is imponderable, infinitesimal, and not to be recognized, save in its effects. How any medical man, who is really conversant with the operations of disease-forces, can deny the power of infinitesimal forces, is to us a mystery.

In these days the appeal to theoretical objections, made by Dr. Handfield Jones and others, will have no weight in deciding the great argument between the two medical systems. The appeal is to facts, and the issue must rest upon the facts.

Let us commend these words of the Swiss philosopher to the Eleven Professors: "*I know that truth resides in the facts, not in my mind which observes them that I shall be the nearest the truth, the less I indulge in theories of my own.*"

We are fully alive to the difficulties in the way of investigating novel methods of cure, which surround the physician who conscientiously desires to do his duty to the poor seeking his aid at the hospitals. We can readily conceive the repugnance a right-minded man will feel to trying hazardous experiments with human life. But we would draw the attention of the lecturers, whose addresses are before us, to the strong "*prima facie*" evidence which is presented to them, in favor of the curative powers of the homœopathic system, in the fact that about 250 physicians and surgeons of their own schools, are now practising Homœopathy in the British Islands.

These men have passed through the full course of medical instruction at the very schools from whence these addresses issued. They have won their diplomas; their certificates and degrees, after full examination at the universities, colleges and halls. The examining boards have conferred these degrees upon them, after they were fully satisfied as to their fitness to practise medicine and to form a judgment as to disease and its treatment.

Many of these men won the highest honors in their respective schools; and their honesty, their probity and their ability are unquestioned.

We hold that it is a great fact that 250 competent witnesses are anxious to bear their testimony as to the superior curative power possessed by the homœopathic method over that of the allopathic; and we would earnestly urge upon the professors and lecturers at our London hospitals, the duty of listening to

the oft-repeated petition of these 250 physicians and surgeons, formerly professors, lecturers and pupils of their own school, that they would, at least, give a scientific and patient investigation to the facts of Homœopathy.

The position hitherto assumed by the medical profession towards Homœopathy will every day become less tenable; and it will be far more consonant with the dignity of the profession, that it should of its own free will investigate the facts, now so numerously attested, upon which the homœopathic theory is based, than that it should be shamed into a tardy recognition of its claims by the remonstrances of an indignant public.—*Monthly Homœopathic Review*, Lond.

HOMŒOPATHIC MEDICAL SOCIETY OF THE COUNTY OF ONEIDA, N. Y.—The ninth annual meeting of this society was held at Bagg's Hotel, in the city of Utica, October 17th. The meeting was called to order by the Vice-President, Dr. S. O. Scudder, of Rome.

After calling the roll, the proceedings of the last meeting were read and approved.

On motion of Dr. Wells, the usual order of business was suspended and the members proceeded to elect officers for the ensuing year, which resulted as follows:

For *President* Dr. S. O. Scudder, of Rome; *Vice-President*, H. Willis, of Clinton; *Secretary and Treasurer*, M. M. Gardner, of Holland Patent; *Censors*, Drs. L. B. Wells, J. C. Raymond, C. J. Hill and W. H. Watson.

Next in order came the appointment of Committees on

Voluntary Communications.—Drs. S. O. Scudder, Thoracic diseases; E. A. Munger, Typhoid Fever; L. B. Waldo, Intermittent Fever; Wm. Landt, Pertussis; H. Willis, Typhus Fever; W. Warren, Dysentery; J. A. Paine, Diseases of Women; W. H. Watson, Diphtheria; W. B. Stebbins, Cephalalgia; L. Bishop, Theory of Homœopathy; A. Guiwits, Pneumonia; L. B. Wells, Paralysis; J. W. Mower, Diphtheria; H. Hadley, Professional etiquette; C. J. Hill, Chronic diarrhoea; J. C. Raymond, Hectic fever; M. M. Gardner, Typhoid fever.

Dr. Wells read a report on the causes of Paralysis. He reported several cases that had come under his observation, showing quite conclusively that a partial paralysis of the muscles of the arm may be produced by the long and constant use of metallic pens and penholders.

Dr. Scudder read a report on Surgical Diseases of Soldiers. He gave the history of several cases that had come under his observation as examining surgeon for invalid pensioners, showing the effects of gun shot wounds through different parts of the lungs. The report was listened to with interest.

The remainder of the afternoon was taken up in the discussion of the treatment of Dysentery.

The Society adjourned to meet at its ninth semi-annual meeting, at Rome, on Tuesday, the 19th day of June, 1866.

M. M. GARDNER, M.D., *Secretary*.

BOOK NOTICES.

ON HIGH POTENCIES AND HOMŒOPATHICS: *Clinical Cases and Observations.* By B. FINCKE, M.D., Brooklyn, N. Y. With an Appendix containing Hahnemann's Original Views and Rules on the Homœopathic Dose, chronologically arranged. 8vo., pp. 132. Philadelphia, A. J. Tafel. 1865.

The series of articles published by Dr. Fincke in THE AMERICAN HOMŒOPATHIC REVIEW, Vols. I, II, III, IV and V, entitled *Clinical Cases and Observations on High Potencies*, have been collected and with additions published under the above title.

The value of the work has been greatly enhanced by the "Historical Argument based on Hahnemann's Observations and Rules," chronologically arranged.

Dr. Fincke's writings, in closeness of reasoning and in logical completeness, surpass anything in our literature. Their very fullness and the strictness with which they are condensed, make them obscure and "dry" to the superficial reader who looks for something of the exciting interest of a novel by Dickens, to be combined with the scientific depth and breath of a treatise by Newton. We believe that Dr. Fincke's writings will grow in the appreciation of thoughtful students, and will have become standard essays when the sensation writers of our day shall be already comfortably forgotten.

THE HAHNEMANNIAN MONTHLY, conducted and published by the Faculty of the Homœopathic Medical College of Pennsylvania. 8vo. pp. 48. Published monthly by A. J. Tafel, Philadelphia.

The appearance, within the same half-year, of two new journals (*The Hahnemannian Monthly* and *The United States Medical and Surgical Journal*) devoted to the science and art of homœopathic medicine, cannot but be regarded as a significant and gratifying token of the rapid growth of our system in the United States.

In our July number, on receipt of the prospectus of the *Hahnemannian Monthly*, we took occasion to welcome it in advance, and the numbers already issued have been eagerly looked for and perused with great interest. In a journal conducted by so eminent a body of Homœopaths as the faculty of the Homœopathic College of Pennsylvania, we are justified in expecting something altogether superior to what has ever been given us from any other source—more knowledge, experimental and theoretical, and broader views of science and practice, in which all minor polemics will be lost sight of. There has been no reason to suppose that these reasonable expectations will not be realized.

We feel it our duty to call attention to a historical error of statement in the introductory article of the *Hahnemannian Monthly*, No. 1. We read:

"Some four years ago, a number of the oldest homœopathic physicians met at New York and agreed to support and sustain a Homœopathic Monthly Journal, &c., &c. In this manner and for that purpose originated the AMERICAN HOMŒOPATHIC REVIEW" * * of which our colleagues speak in very kindly terms of commendation which we should be glad to think fully deserved.

But, at the time of writing the above, the REVIEW was entering on

its sixth yearly volume. It must therefore have started more than "four years ago." In truth the REVIEW was first issued by Dr. H. M. SMITH, with whom was associated, for a few months, the late Dr. R. G. Perkins. It did not result from any deliberation of homœopathic physicians convened for the purpose. The first number appeared in October, 1858. The secession of Dr. Perkins, and the evident oncoming of a great war, induced the publishers to suspend publication at the close of vol. II, and there was an interval of non-issue from December, 1860, to July, 1862, when vol. III began.

It was during this interval that the "meeting of a number of the oldest homœopathic physicians" was held in New York, for the purpose of agreeing on the policy and means of giving a more efficient and cordial support to the REVIEW when its publication should be resumed. At this meeting, too, the editorial staff was re-arranged. Subsequent "yearly meetings" have been held, as the *Hahnemannian Monthly* states, "to devise together how this great object could best be served."

It ought to be known, however, that at the meeting held in Philadelphia on the 3d of June, 1865, and at which the establishment of the *Hahnemannian Monthly* was determined upon, none of those especial "friends of the REVIEW" who constitute its editorial and publishing staff were present; nor had they any knowledge of any intention, on the part of their Philadelphia colleagues and contributors, to establish a journal with objects identical with those of the REVIEW, until in common with the members of the profession, throughout the country, they received the prospectus.

In private correspondence with Philadelphia colleagues, one of the editors of the REVIEW had more than once spoken of the propriety and advantage of an organ devoted especially to the interests of the Philadelphia College, edited by the Faculty; but whether this should be in the form of a volume of transactions, a year book or a journal, had never been the subject of discussion. This REVIEW therefore, in behalf of its editors and publishers, cannot in justice claim any share of the credit which will result from the establishment and success of the *Hahnemannian Monthly*. None the less sincerely, however, do we rejoice at its appearance and wish it an honorable and successful career.

THE UNITED STATES MEDICAL AND SURGICAL JOURNAL. A Quarterly Magazine of the Homœopathic practice of Medicine and Medical Science in general. Edited by G. E. SHIPMAN, M.D. 8vo. pp. 96. Chicago, C. S. Halsey.

We hail with most cordial greetings this "Young Lochinvar" that's "come out from the West."

Not only "throughout the broad border" but throughout the whole country we might look in vain for a journal more creditable in appearance as well as in matter, than this new product of the West.

Our only wonder is, that with the consciousness that they needed a journal (as we think they did—in their own interests, and no less for our advantage at the East), our Western colleagues should have hesitated about establishing one or should have felt occasion to rest on such arguments as were advanced at the meeting of the Western Institute, and are published in the number before us.

"The greater proportion of original matter in the Eastern journals comes

from the West." This will be news to many of our readers, who may wonder what Eastern journals this speaker is in the habit of reading!

"We, here in the West, pay tribute to New York city." This used to be the cry of the *South*, but New York city always thought she gave an equivalent for what she received, and was never conscious of compelling any other section to contribute unwillingly to her exaltation.

"As Western men, we have long paid tribute to the East, and have received little credit for it." Now, if there is *anything* which the West has received from the East, it is "CREDIT," and many a poor fellow in Wall street, whose pockets are full of worthless Western bonds, would be glad to know that the West has ever "paid" anything—even tribute, whatever that may be.

Who are these "men of the West" who propose to "cut loose" from the East and establish their journalistic independence? Was one of them born in the West? Was not every one an Eastern lad? Franklin's very name shows that some distant ancestor was a freeholder in the Saxon heptarchy. Helmuth, we believe, is from Philadelphia, in which city Small passed no small part of his life, and Hale hails from New Hampshire, we think.

Hitherto these Eastern offshoots, our colleagues of the West, have been too busy, in practical ways, to devote themselves to stated literary labors, but while thus engaged they must have gathered rich stores of knowledge and experience. It will be an exceeding profit and pleasure to us at the East, that they have now attained to a position of leisure and of strength that enables them to enter upon the field of journalism, in which, if they please to take it, we shall willingly concede them leadership. If we can fabricate any original matter which they would like, we shall be very happy to furnish it for their pages; we shall willingly serve them in any way, and have no objection to paying tribute to the West. "He that would be the greatest among you, let him be your servant."

The contents of this excellent number are: 1. Practical Remarks on Enterocolitis of Children, by Wm. H. Holcombe, M. D. 2. Fistula in Ano, by E. C. Franklin, M. D. 3. A Case of Fistula in Ano, &c., by T. G. Comstock, M. D. 4. Life, by T. P. Wilson, M. D. 5. On the Abuse of Local Treatment in Ulceration of the Os Uteri, by R. Ludlam, M. D. (a most valuable and convincing paper.) 6. A Medico-Botanical Study, by E. M. Hale, M. D. 7. Pulsatilla nutalliana, by W. H. Burt, M. D. 8. One of the Obstacles to the Progress of Homœopathy, by F. A. Lord, M. D. (very able). 9. Editorial, Review, Notices, Selections, &c.

HALE'S NEW REMEDIES.—We learn from Dr. E. M. Hale that he is preparing a new edition of his work, which he hopes to have ready for the press in a short time. He wishes physicians to report their experience with one or more remedies, which, if sent to him before January 1st, 1866, will be published and for which due credit will be given. In reporting cases he wishes the following to be observed: *First.* The symptoms removed by the medicine, especially the characteristic ones. *Second.* Only report the cases wherein the remedy was used singly and alone. *Third.* Give the size of the dose, and the frequency of its repetition. *Fourth.* Write plainly and only on one side of the sheet. Dr. Hale's address is, Box 550, Chicago, Ill.

THE
AMERICAN
HOMŒOPATHIC REVIEW.

Vol. VI.]

JANUARY AND FEBRUARY.

[No. 7.]

FIDELITY.*

BY A. R. MORGAN, M. D., SYRACUSE, N. Y.

In discussing the subject *who is a Homœopathician*, we find a wide range of opinion, ranging from that requiring absolute fidelity to each and every ripe idea held by Hahnemann, down to the frivolous pretext that the mere use of homœopathic medicines is sufficient.

The Anti-Hahnemannians have, so far, utterly failed in demonstrating any material error in the mature convictions of that grand old man. They have manipulated his ideas to suit their equivocal ends, confounding his first immature impressions (when dazzled and bewildered by the sublime conception just dawning upon his mind, of the newly discovered principle of cure) with the more advanced convictions of his deliberate judgment.

A generous spirit of magnanimity has been at times tortured into admissions of doubt regarding principles already well established in his own mind. They sneer at his philosophy of dynamization—miscomprehend or misrepresent his theory of chronic diseases. They ignore his unmistakable

* Address before the Onondaga Co. (N. Y.) Homœopathic Medical Society, 1865.