

nature of curing agents correspondent to it; that to cure violent diseases ponderous doses of mighty drugs were alone equal to the task and only to be depended on. It is not an easy work, nor the work of a day, getting rid of such impressions, false as they are. Have they not come from teachers and books who have had our reverence? Are they not the only remaining fruits of that reverence? Have these not told us, and told us at all times, that the true answer to the question as to the dose, How much? is found in the other, How much will he bear? And did they not know, these who have been since the days of our pupilage our ultimate authorities? Have we not been virtually taught that the patient was to be permitted to escape with his life, and that this was all he had a right to expect at the hands of his prescriber, who began his clinical duties with the inquiry, "How much will he bear?" Verily, sometimes the poor victims bore a good deal,* and then sometimes did escape! It is not a work of ease, or the work of a day, to escape from prejudices and teachings like these. And then, it may be, the poor man who is struggling for this freedom has to meet another and powerful influence impelling him to remain in the philosophy and practice of his teachers. He meets ridicule, perhaps of himself personally, certainly of the results and convictions he has realized from his experiments, and ridicule is often harder to face than arguments. His experiments have given him facts. These cannot be gainsaid or set aside by other facts, but they can be met by this devil's argument, ridicule, and as his opponents have this and nothing more, they resort to it as best they may. Ridicule, especially from good men, is hard to bear, and even good men in all else have not scorned resort to this in attacks on God's law and its logical use, so different from all pertaining to their own teachings and practice.

* The following prescription was read on the files of a retail apothecary, in a village near Boston, by the writer in his early professional life. It was written by one who stood high in that city with those who stood highest in public estimation as healers:

R.	Ol. Ricini	ʒii
	Bals. copaibæ,	ʒi
	Kreosoton,	ʒii

Mix; dose a teaspoonful.

Who was to take this? I asked of the apothecary. J. A. B's baby, was the answer. The baby was two weeks old; was a grandniece of our late excellent Governor Dix, and did not die! I repeated the prescription and the facts to my most excellent professor of theory and practice, telling him the little patient survived the dose. In his own peculiar quiet way he remarked: "I have always regarded Dr. S. as a remarkably fortunate practitioner!" This time the Doctor had a very fortunate patient.

In all this the man who will so use this law and the appliances it requires for the cure of the sick has more than an equivalent for all his struggles and all possible opposition, in his practical successes, and the approval of a good conscience, and any one may share these with him who will do, as he presumably has done, in coming to this right use of our materia medica. He has only to follow Hahnemann's direction:

"*Mach's nach, aber, mach's genau nach.*"
Do it exactly as I have done.

P. P. WELLS.

CURANTUR OR CURENTUR.

AD. LIPPE, M. D.

Dr. Dudgeon comes out in the July number of THE HOMŒOPATHIC PHYSICIAN, and espouses the cause of Dr. Hughes, and with him contends that the complete homœopathic formula should always read *curentur*; that *curantur* would be a blunder because it would show that our formula (with *curantur* accepted) was an acknowledgment of "a law," while *curentur* would mean that we had only to do with a rule, good at times, but never to be accepted or applied imperatively. The plain fact is, that a question of vital importance has been asked and this question is: Did Hahnemann establish an exclusive system of therapeutics, or did he advocate eclecticism and call it Homœopathy? Did Hahnemann call Homœopathy a healing art, based on an immutable law expressed under the formula *similia similibus curantur*? Has not this law become obnoxious to men who, professedly homœopaths, in reality adhere to and advocate eclecticism, and to shield themselves from censure and exposure boldly claim that Hahnemann advocated their eclecticism. The formula, *similia similibus curantur*, has been the accepted formula of all medical men who profess to practice Homœopathy till a dose of *Ruta graveolens* was administered to Dr. Richard Hughes through the medium of THE HOMŒOPATHIC PHYSICIAN, and on a sudden the dimness of sight for which Dr. R. Hughes had discovered *Ruta* to be a specific vanished, and it appeared before his sharpened sight that the finding of specifics for specific diseases and the proposed incorporation into our materia medica pura of pathological notions had been detected and that his heroic means to extinguish Homœopathy and replace it by vile eclecticism. On a sudden this learned man detected that the

perpetuity of pure Homœopathy was secured as long as the old formula prevailed, and, following in the footsteps of the *Homœopathic Times*, his aim was to make it appear that Hahnemann gave us not an immutable law, but a good rule, which could be applied if the individual judgment of the healer thought proper to do so, or it could be set aside at will. Hahnemann clearly shows in paragraphs 53-56 that there can be but one sole aid-bringing law in therapeutics. He advocates an exclusive law, and that law the homœopathic law of cure.

The most remarkable fact is that the *British Journal of Homœopathy*, the organ of Drs. Hughes, Dudgeon & Co., still shows upon its paper cover the old and well-known formula, *similia similibus curantur*. The question that at once occurs is, If this rendering is wrong, how is it that they still permit it to occupy so conspicuous a place upon their journal? What do they mean by flaunting upon the outside of this periodical a creed which within its pages they are engaged in vigorously denouncing? If it is an error, why have they not discovered one so obvious years ago? If they have the hardihood to display it upon their title-page, right over the very pages that expose their disbelief in it, what probability is there that they believe anything at all connected with the cause they profess to serve? Did they ever believe in it? Have they not always, as they evidently do now, pirate-like, sailed under false colors?

Certain it is that the pages of that journal have given increasing evidence from year to year that its editors used the formula only as a blind; and that their settled purpose was to instill into the minds of their readers a profound distrust of its truth. Now after the administration of a dose of *Ruta* one of the learned editors is enabled to discover that the formula upon the title-page (which formula he still flourishes in its old place) is all wrong!

History always repeats itself. In America, where we are in the habit of moving more rapidly than the people of the "old country," we had, a few years ago, an ably conducted journal known as the *New York Homœopathic Times*. By and by the exactions of a natural law of cure became an onerous burden to the freedom-seeking editor, whereupon he repudiated it, denying its existence, and waging war upon its followers.

The *British Journal of Homœopathy* has caught the same epidemic disease and exhibits the same symptoms. Perhaps Professor Pasteur may be able to find the cause of the disease, and to raise a graft of it in his "nursery" with which to inoculate the learned editors and cure them. If that fail, perhaps they

may apply to the other wing of the homœopathic school and take a potentization of the product of the disease—say Dr. Hughes' or Dr. Dudgeon's papers raised to the CMM potency in a patent bottle-washing machine. If this sovereign specific fail to cure them, then their fate is inevitable. Like the *Times*, they will be obliged to drop the formula, and even the name, and thus, like the *Times*, become honest.

In conclusion, let us hope that the next number of the *British Journal of Homœopathy* will show its conversion to honesty by showing *curantur* upon its cover. Should it do so, we will have something to say on that subject. But if *curantur* remains, as of old, upon the cover, the editors will thereby confess themselves beaten badly—and that's all there is about it.

NOSODES.*

EDWARD BAYARD, M. D., NEW YORK.

The law of Homœopathy that like cures like has been invoked to give authority to the practice of administering the product of disease to cure the same disease, and these remedies have been termed nosodes.

There is nothing singular, in fact, of this new word since all the diseases flesh is heir to may enter into each pseudo specific. Drugs have no curative or healing properties in themselves and no direct curative action, whether administered in homœopathic or allopathic doses.

The contrary of this proposition cannot be maintained without establishing that not one but all drugs have directly opposite action in large and small doses, that Arsenic, Lachesis, Belladonna, Nux vomica, and other potent drugs, which, in appreciable quantities are poisons, cease to be such, or in effect have a reverse nature, when used in high potencies or dilutions; and, as a corollary to this proposition, it follows, that between the maximum and minimum doses, between the poisonous and beneficial action of drugs, there must be some neutral point where they cease to have either effect, or at least where their effect passes from the deleterious to the beneficial, that drugs have positive and negative poles, and act upon the body accordingly.

Any attempt to establish these propositions either in theory or practice results in their refutation and rejection.

* Read before I. H. A., June 14th, 1884.