

college, the faculty and the class have been those of mutual kindness and courtesy, etc., etc." At the close of the session, the class by a committee appointed for that purpose, under date of March 2d, 1850 :

"Resolved, That Professors Rosa and Gatchell, by their assiduity for our improvement, their kindness and gentlemanly deportment, combined with their suavity and magnanimity, have merited and now receive an expression of our highest esteem.

(Signed),

J. C. BATES,

J. DALBY,

B. F. HATCH,

J. TAFFE,

N. L. VANSANDT,

Committee."

In the meantime the Western Homœopathic Medical College at Cleveland having been founded and organized, Dr. Rosa was called to the Chair of *Materia Medica and Therapeutics*; he entered that Institution, where he remained, teaching to the universal satisfaction of the Board of Management, the Faculty and the Students for, I believe, five sessions, to wit, 1850 to 1855.

As a citizen, neighbor, friend, husband, father and physician, Dr. Rosa had and enjoyed, for a life-time a reputation which few attain to and of which any man, even he who sets the standard of this good name ever so high, might well be proud. After he had finished his course of public teaching, he devoted himself to the care of his family and to the ministration of his office as a skilful, attentive, faithful and "beloved physician," until his last illness which terminated his useful and somewhat lengthened life on the 3d of May, 1864, aged 72 years, 9 months and 15 days. His disease was typhoid fever, of which he was ill fifteen days. He had the best medical aid obtainable in the section of the State in which he lived, being waited upon by Drs. Wheeler, of Cleveland; Storm, of Willoughby, and Stockton, of Painesville. His funeral was largely attended from St. James' Episcopal Church, in Painesville. He fell asleep in the fullest hope and assurance of a blessed resurrection with the just, in the day when "Jesus shall call his sleeping saints."

Dr. Rosa has been said by some to have been the first homœopathic professor in any college in this country; but, much as I could have wished for the truth of that assertion, it must be concluded otherwise, for the Homœopathic College at Philadelphia went into operation with a full corps of professors in 1848. There had, it is true, been some teaching of Homœopathy by way of lectures, in the North American Academy of the Homœopathic Healing Art, which was founded and went into operation at Allentown, Pa., in 1835, but this was, I believe, a voluntary association and not an incorporated college, and was of short continuance. An introductory lecture by Dr. Rosa entitled "The History of Medical Science," was published at Cincinnati, Ohio, in octavo, 1850, pages twenty, other than which I do not know that the doctor published anything. He has left valuable writings on Homœopathy which I have hope to see at some future day.

S. B. BARLOW, M.D.

THE
AMERICAN
HOMŒOPATHIC REVIEW.

Vol. V.

NEW YORK, OCTOBER, 1864.

No. 4.

SCABIES.

BY JAMES B. BELL, M. D., AUGUSTA, ME.

The interesting article of Dr. Morgan, in the August number of the REVIEW, effectually explains the vexed question of psora, and disposes of the not less troublesome question of the treatment of scabies.

In blind and unreasoning devotion to the master, some have not hesitated to deny the existence of the acarus entirely, while others have been driven to the fable of spontaneous generation. It is not thus that our cause is served. A weak point renders the whole armor weak, and those who so easily refute these views think they have refuted Homœopathy and shown Hahnemann to be a charlatan; and they have; indeed, given us a dangerous shot, if these representations of the master's doctrines were true. But happily there are many men at the present time whose broader views and closer insight enable them to demonstrate the complete harmony between the homœopathic and other scientific discoveries, and to inspire, therefore, a deeper respect for that far seeing intellect which looked so deeply into nature's mysteries; and I believe that thus all the chief Hahnemannian teachings will be found to harmonize with the added facts (not fancies) of science.

What is simpler than that the acarus or its ova should be transplanted from person to person, and should impart to each a specific poison—a miasm—and that the death of the acarus does not destroy this miasm, which continues to act under the name of psora until met by specific homœopathic remedies. I believe the acarus to be the source of the psoric miasm, and that all the various eruptions and other consecutive effects accompanying and following scabies, are due to a specific poison imparted to the organism by the acarus scabiei. If Psorin is to be used in medicine, therefore, I believe it should be prepared from the acarus, as the Apis is from the bee, Cimex from the bed-bug, etc., instead of from the secretions of scabies.

I confess I do not fully understand Dr. Morgan's views with regard to the communication of scabies. I think there can be no doubt that it is transmissible by the transplanting of the acarus or its ova, and, only thus. I know it is not communicable by contact. I have seen from three to four hundred cases of scabies in the clinic of Hebra in the space of three months, and there was scarcely one I did not have my hands upon, and the only precaution I took was to take care not to receive any of the cast off scales or scabs, in which the ova and sometimes acari reside, upon my person.

It is the opinion of Hebra that not only the ova but also the acarus may retain life for months without nourishment, and be capable, of course, of reproducing the disease whenever they meet with the necessary conditions, viz.: living human epidermis and time to get under it.

That the disease is conveyed by the acarus and only thus, Hebra regards as a fixed fact, but I have not the means at hand to detail his experiment in proof of it.

There is *one point only* in diagnosis, and this is not rendered sufficiently prominent nor correctly stated by Wilson. The acarus burrows along the skin between the epidermis and its basement membrane, feeding upon the secretion that would otherwise form epidermis. This burrow raises the epidermis immediately over it, somewhat above the sur-

rounding surface, causing the scales to separate and to dry, producing the following appearance:

A somewhat *wavy* line, of the diameter of a coarse hair and one-fourth to one half-an-inch in length, and of a *dark color*, not *whitish* as Wilson states. The color is owing to foreign substances or, in other words, dirt among the loosened scales of epidermis, and is never wanting because not easily removed by ordinary washing. The burrow or canicula terminates in a little papula, out of which a colorless fluid can be pressed. Here resides the acarus, and the papula and the fluid are both results of the irritation caused by his presence. These caniculæ or burrows are best seen in the thin skin between the fingers, or better still if the case is several weeks old, and a male, upon the penis, which is the favorite resort of the acarus. It is easily mistaken for a scratch and thus generally overlooked, but once seen and recognized there is no longer any difficulty in diagnosing scabies. *The canicula is the diagnostic sign of scabies.* Those who claim to have cured scabies by the internal administration of remedies in dilutions (and, therefore, not in sufficient doses to reach the animal through the circulation and poison him), must first prove to us the presence of this diagnostic mark in the cases thus cured and that they use no mechanical means, such as through washing with soap and nail brush, which are sometimes sufficient to destroy the acarus. There can be no better treatment than that of Dr. Morgan—first, kill the acarus then treat the miasm.

Hebra of course denies the psora theory, but his views of the pathology and treatment of skin diseases generally are even more inimicable to the old school theories than to ours, and his ridicule of the routine treatment is very cutting.

He regards all skin diseases as local lesions, accompanied by more or less systemic reaction. In combatting those troublesome popular ideas, imbibed from the allopathic practice, of the necessity of "physicking the blood," "drawing out the humor," etc., etc., no better language could be used by us than that of this high authority in the allopathic school.

His ideas would be regarded as decidedly heterodox by our allopathic neighbors if they came from us. I have heard him address the following language to a large class of physicians and students: "The prevailing pathology and treatment of skin diseases may be summed in two words *shaerfe* and *sheissen*."* "All laxations of any kind, all saline and other purgatives have an injurious effect upon skin diseases." "All counter irritations, sinapisms, vesications, etc., are nonsense and stupidity (*unsinn und dummheit*). If you must use them, apply them to the patient's seat, for there they will do little harm and the scars will not be seen."

"Not Homœopaths, but Allopaths and humanity should raise Hahnemann a monument three times higher than St. Stevens. Had it not been for him we should now be sunk in such a *swamp of dosing* that a thousand hangmen could not free us from our debt to humanity."

ENLARGEMENT OF THE MATERIA MEDICA.†

BY H. B. FELLOWS, M. D., SENNETT, N. Y.

In accordance with an appointment by the Cayuga Co. Homœopathic Society to communicate with the State Society in regard to the enlargement and improvement of our *Materia Medica*, and, in accordance with my own convictions of the necessity of some action in this department, I present this paper to the State Society for its consideration. It contains some of the reasons why we should be more active in proving new drugs or re-proving old ones. Time will not allow a full discussion of this subject in all its bearings on the necessity of the movement, whether it should be a movement to re-prove old drugs, or prove new ones, and how the provings

* Acridity and evacuations.

† Read before the New York State Homœopathic Medical Society.

should be conducted. In fact it naturally divides itself into several heads, each of which would make a communication of itself. I shall, therefore, attempt only a brief discussion that I may call the attention of the society to it, in the hope that some action may be taken in regard to the matter.

Impressed with the importance of as extensive and exact a *Materia Medica* as it is possible to have, I must urge upon the attention of the society the necessity of action in subjecting one or more drugs to careful provings. And it is of the utmost importance that this action be general and concerted. Should this be undertaken generally, the facts would accumulate with sufficient rapidity to make the value of the drug soon known; on the other hand, if there are but one or two who undertake a proving, but little can be accomplished. No one person can produce a perfect proving, even should he spend a series of years in the attempt. One thing essential to any proving before it can be considered complete, is that the effects of the drug on different constitutions, ages and sexes shall be observed. It is, therefore, necessary for a number of persons to prove a drug and that they shall act in concert. If a hundred persons in the State of New York were to begin the proving of a drug, each independent of any concerted action, it is not at all probable, it is hardly possible, that the hundred fragmentary provings would ever be collected; and until this should be accomplished the knowledge gained of the drug would be of comparatively little value to each prover, even though each proving should be carefully conducted. Should this society take hold of the matter and each member not only prove the drug chosen in his district upon himself, but induce some member of his household or some of his friends to do the same, a very complete set of provings might be the result. We have the elements in and under the control of the society, if we but use them to advance the science of medicine; and in no more important way can we serve the cause of Homœopathy and humanity than by making our *Materia Medica* as perfect as possible. If, in any branch of the science of medi-

cine, the homœopathic physician should make greater exertion than in another, it is in this. However accurately he may diagnosticate a case and explain its pathology, if he does not know its corresponding homœopathic remedy, his success can be but partial, and he will frequently fail where he might have succeeded. If the proving of the remedy is so incomplete that it does not point out the homœopathic relation it holds to the disease, the result will be the same and the physician must fail, or only gain success by accident. These accidental cures are familiar to every physician, and teach us the necessity of proving the drug more thoroughly. The following case may serve as an example:

Mr. M., a young man of 21 years, had served through the Peninsular campaign and before Washington, when he was taken with a chronic diarrhoea and was discharged from the army. He returned home and was then treated by both schools with no success. He was then induced to take an infusion of a plant in the vicinity (the botanical name I can not at present give), being encouraged by the history of several cases cured that appeared similar to his own. In a very short time his improvement was marked and decided. His appetite and digestion became good, he gained in flesh and strength, a troublesome cough left him, and to-day he looks and feels as well as ever. Several cases similar to this have fallen within my observation, and though they were treated with rather large doses were effectually cured.

From the cases I have known I can not tell the characteristic of the remedy, and could not use it with any more scientific precision than the quacks who advertise their "cure alls." That the plant has a good deal of medicinal value there can be no doubt; but it must remain almost unavailable until it is properly proved. What I feel in reference to this plant, is felt by every physician in reference to some other drug.

The result of three thousand years experience is an advance of the science of medicine in almost every other branch greater than in this. Anatomy is almost perfect, if we

except its nomenclature; physiology has advanced until the various organs of the system have had their action traced down to the primal cell; pathology now analyses almost every diseased action till it is as well known as are the functions in physiology, and for these results we are in a great measure to thank our brethren of the allopathic persuasion. These branches are based on facts which required only patient observation and study to determine, and so far they have been faithful and we have profited by their industry. But when we leave these and the other collateral branches of medicine and enter the domain of therapeutics, their experience facts avails but little, for therapeutics is not a series of observed facts merely. Therapeutics did not advance with the other branches of the science of medicine until the great governing law, announced by Hahnemann, became known and formed the ground-work of the study. Before this, facts had been loosely observed and conclusions drawn by false reasoning, as we see in the use of such enormous doses of Opium in delirium tremens, and of Mercury in syphilis. When this law of "similia similibus" became known, it was found necessary to reconstruct the entire *Materia Medica* that therapeutics might advance towards perfection, then for the first time possible. The *Materia Medica*, at that time, was a mass of rubbish, much of which could not at all be used in the new structure which was about to be erected, and nearly all the remainder was so imperfect that it would prove almost as valueless. The reconstruction of the *Materia Medica* to be available for the newly discovered law of cure, required that the effects of each drug should be accurately and minutely ascertained by proving it upon the healthy, and from this resulted the *Materia Medica Pura*. Hahnemann and his immediate followers deserve the greatest praise for the energy and perseverance with which they set about and followed up this reconstruction. But they could not accomplish the whole work, and those who have followed in their path until the present have not been able to complete this great work of reconstruction. If we would maintain a suc-

cess and make an advance such as is worthy of the followers of so great a master as Hahnemann, we must take up this work where our predecessors left off and continue it.

By what means can this work be carried on most successfully? Not, as we have endeavored to show by individual effort alone, but through the instrumentality of organized bodies of provers. The County and State Societies and the American Institute of Homœopathy, if that organization still exists, furnish the organizations that should be available for this purpose.

As small bodies of men work together more earnestly than larger ones as a general rule, each County Society should constitute itself a Prover's Union, and use all its powers to ascertain the effects of the drug chosen for investigation. In those counties where there is no society organized, let those physicians who are willing to assist in this work act together by some common argument. These various results should be placed in the hands of the committee on *Materia Medica* sufficiently early to arrange for the meeting of the society, at which the report is to be presented. After its presentation to the county society it should be forwarded to the committee constituting the Bureau of *Materia Medica* of the State society, and I would suggest that the original record of the daily provings should be sent, and not any abstract of them. At least one district should be engaged in proving one drug, and each county should send its report to the member of the Bureau for that district in which the county is situated, to be arranged with other reports for presentation at the meeting of the State society, and subsequently for publication. By this method the provings of several drugs might every year be added to our *Materia Medica* by this State alone; and if other States would adopt a similar course of proceeding, our *Materia Medica* might be rapidly and reliably enlarged. Should the American Institute ever resume its meetings and several States devote some effort to proving drugs, these results could be collected and published under the superintendance of a board of editors appointed by that

body, and a year book of provings furnished that every homœopathic physician would find it difficult to get along without.

This is a brief statement of a method by which it has seemed possible that a worthy result might be accomplished. The details will readily suggest themselves to those who will give the subject a thought. For it I claim no particular originality, and I would willingly adopt and assist, as far as in my power, to carry out any other that will promise as much.

In considering this method, it has appeared that the apathy in this department, not so much from a lack of devotion to their chosen calling on the part of the homœopathic physicians of this State, nor to the unwillingness to subject themselves to the slight inconvenience of proving a drug in the cause of Homœopathy and suffering humanity, as to the fact that it has not generally been carried on so as to assure the aggregation of the individual result. As soon as the profession at large shall be made to feel that this work shall be taken up in earnest under the direction of earnest workers, I think there will be no lack of proving, and for one I am willing to pledge myself for, at least, one proving every year.

WHO IS A HOMŒOPATHICIAN?

BY AD. LIPPE, M. D., PHILADELPHIA, PA.

In the August number of the London *Monthly Homœopathic Review*, Mr. Pope's reply is a mere repetition of a negation-argument, whereas I had asked for a more explicit and positive definition of the position he assumes.

Where I spoke of Mr. Pope and his friends, I did not mean to imply that he officiously thrust himself forward to express, not only for himself but for others, views for which he alone can be held responsible, but I addressed myself to him and such Homœopathicians as, like himself, assume that name under the same erroneous views and false conceptions. By

his own statement Mr. Pope includes among his friends Dr. Hempel, who assumed to define Homœopathy under solemn oath at Toronto, C. W., on the 8th day of April, 1859. His testimony went for naught, the prisoner, in whose favor he testified, was found guilty and confessed his crime before he was hung. So much for the personal explanation.

A remedy can never, under any circumstance, aggravate the disease; nor can a remedy ever cause a disease. There is the same great and important difference between a natural and a medicinal proving creating a change of sensation and even functional disorders, that there is between a progressive disease and the symptoms caused by the remedy administered in the largest or smallest dose to cure the natural disease. Both the symptoms of the prover and the symptoms generally termed "medicinal aggravation" cease of themselves, and if this "medicinal aggravation" occurs, in a curable case after the administration of the smallest possible dose, and it does often occur, this phenomenon is a certain and positive indication that the remedy was rightly chosen, and the improvement will follow without the slightest doubt; this improvement will not follow should the remedy be not rightly chosen—not homœopathic—and the progressive disease will further develop itself in spite of repeated or larger doses.—The remark that the "unchecked progress of disease" frequently follows the higher and highest dilutions is perfectly gratuitous, and if Dr. Cockburn reports to have seen sharp aggravations follow unmedicated globules he does not state what followed—the sharp aggravation was then undoubtedly the unchecked progress of disease and not what is understood among Homœopaths under homœopathic aggravation.

That Dr. Hering does not mean under "rule," or as it should read "rules," the law of cure, the axiom *similia similibus curentur*, is self-evident. A law can never be a rule. A rule is the manner, the means, by which the law is applied. In the preface above referred to, Dr. Hering says "We may differ in regard to the theoretical explanation of

the law *similia similibus curentur*." What can be theoretically explained can not be a *rule* and still less a *practical rule*; therefore it is self-evident that Dr. Hering could not refer to the law of cure, or the axiom expressing that law as a "rule."

In the last paragraph of the same preface, Dr. Hering says, "There will always be a large number of physicians who either do not understand, or will not learn, how to select for each particular case the only proper medicine, and such always find it more comfortable to employ massive doses. There will always be, perhaps, as large a number on the other hand, who will, by and by, know how to hit the nail upon the head, and they will learn to prefer the high potencies." I hope that Mr. Pope who quotes this same preface as an authority to sustain his position, does not mean to adopt this comfortable system of practice. Dr. Hering obviously alludes to those physicians who employ massive doses, as men who think more of comfort than of troubling themselves to understand or seek for the proper medicine adapted to each particular case. "The dynamization theory may be true or false, and Homœopathy remain unaffected." Such is the opinion of Mr. Pope. On this point we differ entirely. The dynamization theory is true and essential to Homœopathy, true in theory and proved so in practice. This theory, is now, and will remain, the test by which we know the true Homœopathician from the pretender.

"The truth of Homœopathy does not depend upon the provings of *Carbo vegetabilis* being correct or otherwise," says Mr. Pope. I called his attention to the provings of *Carbo vegetabilis* as the point (time) when Hahnemann in his onward course developed before and communicated to his pupils, this dynamization theory which he had for years kept prudently to himself, awaiting further proofs of the correctness of the discovery. To doubt the correctness of this theory is to give proof of a shaken and weak faith in the experimental provings above mentioned. Mr. Pope acknowledges "that some symptoms at any rate, said to have occur-

red from persons taking it in some form or other, are correct," and adds that "he is not aware how the symptoms were obtained." It is to be regretted that Mr. Pope knows no more about the history of Homœopathy. In the introduction to *Carbo vegetabilis* Hahnemann says, "A considerable quantity of Charcoal in the crude condition can be swallowed without causing a change in the sensation." The inference from this remark must be, that the provings were not made with the crude substance, and when Hahnemann in the next following sentence continues, "only by rubbing the charcoal, as also other medicinal substances, apparently inert in their crude condition, with a non-medicinal substance, as sugar of milk, and by dissolving this preparation and by *potentization* (shaking) of the solution, the hidden, and in its raw condition, latent, so to say slumbering, dynamical medicinal power is awakened and becomes alive, while the material external disappears," he gives utterance to the dynamization theory. If, as Mr. P. further says, "some drugs by prolonged trituration develop power to effect the human organism," why do not all have the same power, and if not all, which of all? and, if to any extent, where is the limit?

We arrive now at a point of logic which baffles my comprehension of a learned man.

Mr. Pope claims that the man who practises giving crude drugs is a Homœopathician and, as the inference, that the man who gives potencies, and above all high potencies, is not a Homœopathician. Both, certainly, can not claim to belong to the same school, as it becomes evident by the very explanation consequent upon the attack, illiberal and unprovoked as it is, made by Mr. Pope and his friends on the followers of the immortal master, Hahnemann, that this very question of the dynamization theory forms the barrier between the Homœopathicians and the pretenders. As to Mr. Pope's logic—It is admitted that crude drugs cure according to the law of cure. It is asserted and proved that Hahnemann after he became convinced that he had found the true and only law of cure, did also, after becoming more intimately acquainted

with the effects of medicines on the human organism, find it necessary at first to diminish the quantity of medicine, and later discovered the dynamization theory which opened a new era in the cure of formerly incurable diseases. The law of cure and these practical rules were the foundation of Homœopathy. Mr. Pope stands at a great distance from these developed truths and claims to have as good, nay a much better right to be a Homœopathician than those who have accepted the practical rules of the master; he claims the right to ridicule and, if possible, to expel men who have become convinced, by experiment, that Hahnemann's practical rules, one and all, are correct; he claims the right to deny the correctness of these rules without having made the experiment, to make which, indeed, he clearly proves by his own confession that he lacks the requisite knowledge. Mr. Pope says in answer to my declaration "*high potencies cure where the low do not,*" perhaps they do, but the cases illustrating this assertion are marvelously few, and, were they legion, would not effect the argument at issue. Dr. Eidherr's reports, of *marvelously many* cases, remains a closed book to Mr. Pope; and why? If such proofs are not admitted, all argument ceases. If Mr. Pope will not condescend to give the world one single case well stated, in which he has selected the truly homœopathic remedy, and has then administered a high potency according to the homœopathic (Hahnemannian) rules and, the case remaining unchanged, has then given with success the same remedy in its crude state, this *one* solitary, only single case would be the beginning as an offset to the evidences fast accumulating on the other side. Mr. Pope's word is not doubted; he and his friends may think they have seen what they state, their observation may turn out to be an optical illusion, and we must insist on knowing what he or his medical friends profess to have seen so that they may be able to establish their claim as proper judges and witnesses of and in the question at issue. But while we have his own admission that there are cases known establishing my above assertion, and while the cases of Mr.

Wilson's cure of a dangerous pneumonia by *Lycopodium*²⁰⁰, and other cases of the kind, and Dr. Eidherr's report remain on record uncontroverted, and not one single stubborn fact is quoted proving the contrary, I shall insist upon it that "high potencies cure where lower ones do not." I defy Mr. P. and his friends to prove to the contrary, how can it be true that crude drugs cure as well as potencies? I repeat again that no one ever, and in any way, has denied that crude drugs when applied according to the homœopathic law of cure, have cured diseases. But if it is true, as Mr. P. says, and I hold him to his own declaration, *London Monthly Hom. Review*, Vol. 8, p. 8, "It is further necessary that the amount of drug given to cure be less than that required to produce disease." I ask, does Mr. Pope know how the provings of the known drugs were made? how the most characteristic and thereby valuable symptoms which guide us in the selection of the truly curative remedy have been obtained? has he ever investigated the comparative value of the symptoms produced by crude drugs and those produced by potencies? He certainly cannot have done so! Sulphur, for instance, would give him a good opportunity. He would see what were the results of the provings with the crude substance, the lower potencies, the thirtieth potency, and which of the symptoms produced by any of these doses guide him in the selection of Sulphur as a remedy. If he then finds that he is now guided by the Sulphur symptoms obtained from the thirtieth potency, he can no longer administer the crude drug, but by his own admission must give less than was required to produce disease. If he will follow this rule only, we will say, under *Lachesis*, or *Natrum mur.*, or *Lycopodium*, or *Silicea*, or *Carbo animalis* and *vegetabilis*, or *Arsenicum met.*, or *Lachnanthes tinctoria* or any other proved remedy, he will collect sufficient material and will be compelled against his will to prove my proposition correct, his logic erroneous and his assertions unfounded.

When I further say, "that in every instance in which a lower potency has even *relieved*, not *cured* a case to which a

higher potency of the same remedy had been given without success, this relief had proved to be only the palliative effect, not the curative action of the remedy"—I mean this and take no round-about way of saying anything else. I meant further—but did not wish to be rude, depending on the expected good sense of Mr. Pope, who would see at a glance, that I do mean; that when he and his friends assert that they have cured a case with a low potency (or as he has it, "crude drug") where a high potency of the same remedy had been given without effect, this assertion or statement is erroneous, such boasted *cure* invariably, will and must, has been, and ever will be, but a *relief*. As these boasted *cures* do not exist, of course they can not see daylight. Give us one case.

Mr. Pope says he has given *his* definition of Homœopathy on the eighth page of the *Review*, and that he can not be more explicit, for which I am very sorry indeed. The historical development and the consequent fundamental laws with their practical rules are so plain that there should be no dispute about them among the followers of Hahnemann, who all, of course, acknowledge them; nor can one rule be set aside without disturbing the harmony of the whole structure. According to their development they are

1. *Similia similibus curentur.*
 2. Provings of drugs on the healthy (creation of a *Materia Medica*).
 3. The medicinal powers (curative virtues) of medicines are developed by potentization.
- Then follow the practical rules,
- a. The examination of the sick.
 - b. The choice of the remedy (only one at a time no alterations).
 - c. The administration of the remedy (no repetitions before the dose administered has exhausted its action).
 - d. Preparations of medicines (dynamization).

If Mr. Pope would read the *Organon*, Hahnemann's *Materia Medica* and *Chronic Diseases*, and then make the experi-