

Commented version of Hahnemann's Organon of Medicine (sixth version).

For brevity, parts of the original text have been omitted here and there, if I have judged that this would not disturb the understanding. Omitted text is indicated by: (.....)

No text is changed, not even to correct or modernize spelling. My comments are in a *slightly larger, italic typeface*.

§ 1

The physician's high and only mission is to restore the sick to health, to cure, as it is termed. 1

1 His mission is not, however, to construct so-called systems, by interweaving empty speculations and hypotheses concerning the internal essential nature of the vital processes and the mode in which diseases originate in the interior of the organism, (whereon so many physicians have hitherto ambitiously wasted their talents and their time); nor is it to attempt to give countless explanations regarding the phenomena in diseases and their proximate cause (which must ever remain concealed), (.....) it is now high time that all who call themselves physicians should at length cease to deceive suffering mankind with mere talk, and begin now, instead, for once to act, that is, really to help and to cure.

Here is the very first jab at other medicine, many more are to come. Already at this point, Hahnemann rejects the notion of searching for causes. While his first paragraph looks noble and right, the addendum means he closes the door to research and, to a degree, prophylaxis.

§ 2

The highest ideal of cure is rapid, gentle and permanent restoration of the health, or removal and annihilation of the disease in its whole extent, in the shortest, most reliable, and most harmless way, on easily comprehensible principles.

I cannot imagine anyone would disagree with this, except perhaps on the "easily comprehensible principles"; patients don't really care if the principles are comprehensible, as long as they work.

§ 3

If the physician clearly perceives what is to be cured in diseases, (.....) if he clearly perceives what is curative in medicines, (.....) and if he knows how to adapt, (.....) what is curative in medicines (.....) so that the recovery must ensue (.....) if, finally, he knows the obstacles to recovery in each case and is aware how to remove them, so that the restoration may be permanent, then he understands how to treat judiciously and rationally, and he is a true practitioner of the healing art .

§ 4

He is likewise a preserver of health if he knows the things that derange health and cause disease, and how to remove them from persons in health.

Elaborating on what must be the golden goal to any medicine.

§ 5

Useful to the physician in assisting him to cure are the particulars of the most probable exciting cause of the acute disease, (.....) In these investigations, the ascertainable physical constitution of the patient (especially when the disease is chronic), his moral and intellectual character, his occupation, mode of living and habits, his social and domestic relations, his age, sexual function, etc., are to be taken into consideration.

An interesting and very modern insight.

§ 6

The unprejudiced observer (.....) takes note of nothing in every individual disease, except the changes in the health of the body and of the mind (.....) which can be perceived externally by means of the senses; that is to say, he notices only the deviations from the former healthy state of the now diseased individual, which are felt by the patient himself, remarked by those around him and observed by the physician. All these perceptible signs represent the disease in its whole extent, that is, together they form the true and only conceivable portrait of the disease.¹

Basically saying that good observation techniques are essential. But also claiming that all there is to look for is external.

1 I know not, therefore, how it was possible for physicians at the sick-bed to allow themselves to suppose that, without most carefully attending to the symptoms and being guided by them in the treatment, they ought to

seek and could discover, only in the hidden and unknown interior, what there was to be cured in the disease, (.....)

So, here his dogma shines through. He thinks it futile to search for causes other than in the Vital Force. Here, of course, modern science must disagree.

Is not, then, that which is cognizable by the senses in diseases through the phenomena it displays, the disease itself in the eyes of the physician, since he never can see the spiritual being that produces the disease, the vital force? nor is it necessary that he should see it, but only that he should ascertain its morbid actions, in order that he may thereby be enabled to cure the disease. What else will the old school search for in the hidden interior of the organism, as a *prima causa morbi*, whilst they reject as an object of cure and contemptuously despise the sensible and manifest representation of the disease, the symptoms, that so plainly address themselves to us? (.....)

Elaborating on the conviction that no "hidden causes" can exist, and that searching for them is a waste of time. In his era, micro-organisms were known, but their connection to disease was only just being guessed at yet, still from a modern point of view, it is a little strange to see this absolute conviction that a whole area of research is totally irrelevant.

§ 7

(.....)

1 It is not necessary to say that every intelligent physician would first remove this where it exists; the indisposition thereupon generally ceases spontaneously. He will remove from the room strong-smelling flowers, which have a tendency to cause syncope and hysterical sufferings; extract from the cornea the foreign body that excites inflammation of the eye; loosen the over-tight bandage on a wounded limb that threatens to cause mortification, and apply a more suitable one; lay bare and put ligature on the wounded artery that produces fainting; endeavor to promote the expulsion by vomiting of belladonna berries etc., that may have been swallowed; extract foreign substances that may have got into the orifices of the body (the nose, gullet, ears, urethra, rectum, vagina); crush the vesical calculus; open the imperforate anus of the newborn infant, etc.

A few good, if elementary, points on good clinical practice. Rather outdated now, of course. How he proposes to crush bladder stones with the means at his disposal without hurting the patient is unexplained.

2 In all times, the old school physicians, not knowing how else to give relief, have sought to combat and if possible to suppress by medicines, here and there, a single symptom from among a number in diseases - a one-sided procedure, which, under the name of symptomatic treatment, has justly excited universal contempt, because by it, not only was nothing gained, but much harm was inflicted. A single one of the symptoms present is no more the disease itself than a foot is the man himself. (.....)

Interesting, because Homeopathy is also a symptom-treating regimen, although of a different character.

§ 8

It is not conceivable, not can it be proved by any experience in the world, that, after removal of all the symptoms of the disease and of the entire collection of the perceptible phenomena, there should or could remain anything else besides health, or that the morbid alteration in the interior could remain uneradicated.¹

Since Hahnemann is convinced that symptoms are the only manifestation of disease, the basic failure of palliative treatments to cure should have made him think a bit.

1 When a patient has been cured of his disease by a true physician, in such a manner that no trace of the disease, no morbid symptom, remains, and all the signs of health have permanently returned, how can anyone, without offering an insult to common sense, affirm in such an individual the whole bodily disease still remains interior?

We now know of several diseases that can be completely dormant and symptom-free for years, yet still exist and break out later.

And yet the chief of the old school, Hufeland, asserts this in the following words: "homeopathy can remove symptoms, but the disease remains." (.....).

Hahnemann repeatedly attacks contemporary main-stream practitioners, and not without cause; at the time he wrote the Organon, the general medicine, while slowly moving in a scientific direction, was mainly snake-oil. Of course, this fact does nothing to vindicate his own methods.

§ 9

In the healthy condition of man, the spiritual vital force (autocracy), the dynamis that animates the material body (organism), rules with unbounded sway, and retains all the parts of the organism in admirable, harmonious, vital operation, as regards both sensations and functions, so that our indwelling, reason-gifted mind can freely employ this living, healthy instrument for the higher purpose of our existence.

§ 10

The material organism, without the vital force, is capable of no sensation, no function, no self-preservation ¹, it derives all sensation and performs all the functions of life solely by means of the immaterial being (the vital principle) which animates the material organism in health and in disease.

¹ It is dead, and only subject to the power of the external physical world; it decays, and is again resolved into its chemical constituents.

§ 11

When a person falls ill, it is only this spiritual, self acting (automatic) vital force, everywhere present in his organism, that is primarily deranged by the dynamic ¹ influence upon it of a morbid agent inimical to life; it is only the vital force, deranged to such an abnormal state, that can furnish the organism with its disagreeable sensations, and incline it to the irregular processes which we call disease; for, as a power invisible in itself, and only cognizable by its effects on the organism, its morbid derangement only makes itself known by the manifestation of disease in the sensations and functions of those parts of the organism exposed to the senses of the observer and physician, that is, by morbid symptoms, and in no other way can it make itself known. ²

¹ Materia peccans!

So, in §9 through 11, we get one of the very basic doctrines of Homeopathy: The Vital Force (VF) controls everything and disease is only disturbances in the VF.

What is dynamic influence, - dynamic power? Our earth, by virtue of a hidden invisible energy, carries the moon around her in twenty-eight days and several hours, and the moon alternately, in definite fixed hours (deducting certain differences which occur with the full and new moon) raises our northern seas to flood tide and again correspondingly lowers them to ebb. Apparently this takes place not through material agencies, not through mechanical contrivances, as are used for products of human labor; and so we see numerous other events about us as results of the action of one substance on another substance without being able to recognize a sensible connection between cause and effect. (.....).

OK, here H gets out in the deep. He calls upon gravity as another example of a non-physical power (he ought to say force). He should have known better, since Newton had laid out the Law of Gravity a century earlier. We have here our first indication that H might not have been quite the objective scientist that his present-day adherents want us to believe.

For instance, the dynamic effect of the sick-making influences upon healthy man, as well as the dynamic energy of the medicines upon the principle of life in the restoration of health is nothing else than infection and so not in any way material, not in any way mechanical. Just as the energy of a magnet attracting a piece of iron or steel is not material, not mechanical. One sees that the piece of iron is attracted by one pole of the magnet, but how it is done is not seen. This invisible energy of the magnet does not require mechanical (material) auxiliary means, hook or lever, to attract the iron. The magnet draws to itself and this acts upon the piece of iron or upon a steel needle by means of a purely immaterial invisible, conceptual, inherent energy, that is, dynamically, and communicates to the steel needle the magnetic energy equally invisibly (dynamically). The steel needle becomes itself magnetic, even at a distance when the magnet does not touch it, and magnetises other steel needles with the same magnetic property (dynamically) with which it had been endowed previously by the magnetic rod, just as a child with small-pox or measles communicates to a near, untouched healthy child in an invisible manner (dynamically) the small-pox or measles, that is, infects it at a distance without anything material from the infective child going or capable of going to the one to be infected. A purely specific conceptual influence communicated to the near child small-pox or measles in the same way as the magnet communicated to the near needle the magnetic property.

A similar venture into magnetics. He compares this with contagious diseases. Now, of course, we know better. We could expect him, as a scientist, to understand the difference between a force and an energy, however.

In a similar way, the effect of medicines upon living man is to be judged. (.....). The medicinal property of those material substances which we call medicines proper, relates only to their energy to call out alterations in the well-being of animal life. Only upon this conceptual principle of life, depends their medicinal health-altering, conceptual (dynamic) influence. Just as the nearness of a magnetic pole can communicate only magnetic energy to the steel (namely, by a kind of infection) but cannot communicate other properties (.....). And thus every special medicinal substance alters through a kind of infection, that well-being of man in a peculiar manner exclusively its own and not in a manner peculiar to another medicine, as certainly as the nearness of the child ill with small-pox will communicate to a healthy child only small-pox and not measles. These medicines act upon our well-being wholly without communication of material parts of the medicinal substances, thus dynamically, as if through infection. Far more healing energy is expressed in a case in point by the smallest dose of the best dynamized medicines, in which there can be, according to calculation, only so little of material substance that its minuteness cannot be thought and conceived by the best arithmetical mind, than by large doses of the same medicine in substance. That smallest dose can therefore contain almost entirely only the pure, freely-developed, conceptual medicinal energy, and bring about only dynamically such great effects as can never be reached by the crude medicinal substances itself taken in large doses.

It is not in the corporal atoms of these highly dynamized medicines, nor their physical or mathematical surfaces (with which the higher energies of the dynamized medicines are being interpreted but vainly as still sufficiently material) that the medicinal energy is found. More likely, there lies invisible in the moistened globule or in its solution, an unveiled, liberated, specific, medicinal force contained in the medicinal substance which acts dynamically by contact with the living animal fibre upon the whole organism (without communicating to it anything material however highly attenuated) and acts more strongly the more free and more immaterial the energy has become through the dynamization.

(.....)

In this part, Hahnemann explains his thesis based on his pretext about gravity and magnetism, a pretext we know is false. His observations that a contagious disease jumps from patient to patient, still being the same disease is, of course, well explained in modern medicine. He also, without any obvious logic base, claims that the more thinned but "dynamized" the medicine, the more effect. This claim he then uses as an argument for his Vital Force thesis, thus presenting a circular argument. It also deals with one of the enigmas of homeopathy; the notion of dynamized or potentialized medicines. Without any explanation, Hahnemann claims that there exists some "conceptual medical energy". The discussion of this is still raging to this day.

§ 12 h
(.....).

1 How the vital force causes the organism to display morbid phenomena, that is, how it produces disease, it would be of no practical utility to the physician to know, and will forever remain concealed from him; only what it is necessary for him to know of the disease and what is fully sufficient for enabling him to cure it, has the Lord of life revealed to his senses.

Again discouraging any research into the inner workings of the body.

§ 13

Therefore disease (that does not come within the province of manual surgery) considered, as it is by the allopathists, as a thing separate from the living whole, from the organism and its animating vital force, and hidden in the interior, be it ever so subtle a character, is an absurdity, that could only be imagined by minds of a materialistic stamp, and has for thousands of years given to the prevailing system of medicine all those pernicious impulses that have made it a truly mischievous [non-healing] art.

Finally going straight out and denouncing the notion that disease can be caused by any cause not part of the body. In this short paragraph, he even calls such a notion mischievous. Obviously, later research proved him dead wrong.

§ 14

There is, in the interior of man, nothing morbid that is curable and no invisible morbid alteration that is curable which does not make itself known to the accurately observing physicians by means of morbid signs and symptoms - an arrangement in perfect conformity with the infinite goodness of the all-wise Preserver of human life.

Again an incorrect assumption. Dormant infections exist.

§ 15

The affection of the morbidly deranged, spirit-like dynamis (vital force) that animates our body in the invisible interior, and the totality of the outwardly cognizable symptoms produced by it in the organism and representing the existing malady, constitute a whole; they are one and the same. The organism is indeed the material in-

strument of the life, but it is not conceivable without the animation imparted to it by the instinctively perceiving and regulating dynamis, just as the vital force is not conceivable without the organism, consequently the two together constitute a unity, although in thought our mind separates this unity into two distinct conceptions for the sake of easy comprehension.

§ 16

Our vital force, as a spirit-like dynamis, cannot be attacked and affected by injurious influences on the healthy organism caused by the external inimical forces that disturb the harmonious play of life, otherwise than in a spirit-like (dynamic) way, and in like manner, all such morbid derangements (diseases) cannot be removed from it by the physician in any other way than by the spirit-like (dynamic¹, virtual) alterative powers of the serviceable medicines acting upon our spirit-like vital force, which perceives them through the medium of the sentient faculty of the nerves everywhere present in the organism, so that it is only by their dynamic action on the vital force that remedies are able to re-establish and do actually re-establish health and vital harmony, after the changes in the health of the patient cognizable by our senses (the totality of the symptoms) have revealed the disease to the carefully observing and investigating physician as fully as was requisite in order to enable him to cure it.

1 Most severe disease may be produced by sufficient disturbance of the vital force through the imagination and also cured by the same means.

Elaborating on the doctrine. At the end an interesting insight on psychosomatic disease. It is interesting that Hahnemann should have this insight and yet fail to realize how profoundly it might influence his own investigations and observations.

§ 17

(.....)

1 A warning dream, a superstitious fancy, or a solemn prediction that death would occur at a certain day or at a certain hour, has not unfrequently produced all the signs of commencing and increasing disease, of approaching death and death itself at the hour announced, which could not happen without the simultaneous production of the inward change (corresponding to the state observed internally); and hence in such cases all the morbid signs indicative of approaching death have frequently been dissipated by an identical cause, by some cunning deception or persuasion to a belief in the contrary, and health suddenly restored, which could not have happened without the removal, by means of this mortal remedy, of the internal and external morbid change that threatened death.

Again he recognizes the immense power of self-suggestion. How can it be that he does not draw the obvious conclusion that self-testing and –reporting is rendered totally unreliable by the very same thing?

2 It is only thus that God the preserver of mankind, could reveal His wisdom and goodness in reference to the cure of the disease to which man is liable here below, by showing to the physician what he had to remove in disease in order to annihilate them and thus re-establish health. (.....)

Calling on the inscrutable ways of God. Well, this IS the early 19th century.

§ 18

From this indubitable truth, that besides the totality of the symptoms with consideration of the accompanying modalities (§ 5) nothing can by any means be discovered in disease wherewith they could express their need of aid, it follows undeniably that the sum of all the symptoms and conditions in each individual case of disease must be the sole indication, the sole guide to direct us in the choice of a remedy.

As we have seen, his conclusions are very far from meriting the label “indubitable truth”. In fact, given our modern knowledge, they are at this point completely unfounded. Even given only the knowledge of his own time, they build on dubious evidence.

§ 19

Now, as diseases are nothing more than alterations in the state of health of the healthy individual which express themselves by morbid signs, and the cure is also only possible by a change to the healthy condition of the state of health of the diseased individual, it is very evident that medicines could never cure disease if they did not possess the power of altering man's state of health which depends on sensations and functions; indeed, that their curative power must be owing solely to this power they possess of altering man's state of health.

Restating the basic doctrine, and concluding that a useful medicine must address the symptoms. The conclusion is logical on the premises he uses, however, findings of modern science show that those premises are false.

§ 20

This spirit-like power to alter man's state of health (and hence to cure diseases) which lies hidden in the inner nature of medicines can in itself never be discovered by us by a mere effort of reason; it is only by experience of the phenomena it displays when acting on the state of health of man that we can become clearly cognizant of it.

Again this "don't ask questions". But we shall, nevertheless, do just that (and, fortunately, other researchers in the field also neglected to heed this advice).

The following part is crucial, as it is here Hahnemann develops the chain of reasoning that leads to his doctrine of Homeopathy. Unfortunately, the text is somewhat difficult to penetrate, but we shall try:

§ 21

Now, as it is undeniable that the curative principle in medicines is not in itself perceptible, and as in pure experiments with medicines conducted by the most accurate observers, nothing can be observed that can constitute them medicines or remedies except that power of causing distinct alterations in the state of health of the human body, and particularly in that of the healthy individual, and of exciting in him various definite morbid symptoms;

Again, the claim that medicines work by some unknowable principle. Hahnemann's first premise is that no effect of medicines are knowable except such symptoms as it may cause in the person who receives them, again indirectly dismissing the idea of targeting causes:

so it follows that when medicines act as remedies, they can only bring their curative property into play by means of their power of altering man's state of health by the production of peculiar symptoms; and that, therefore, we have only to rely on the morbid phenomena which the medicines produce in the healthy body as the sole possible revelation of their in-dwelling curative power, in order to learn what disease-producing power, and at the same time what disease-curing power, each individual medicine possesses.

He then infers that the only effect a medicine can have on disease is interaction between symptoms caused by the medicine and symptoms caused by the disease. This follows from the earlier made premise that the sole presentation of a disease was through its observable symptoms:

But as nothing is to be observed in diseases that must be removed in order to change them into health besides the totality of their signs and symptoms, and likewise medicines can show nothing curative besides their tendency to produce morbid symptoms in healthy persons and to remove them in diseased persons; it follows, on the one hand, that medicines only become remedies and capable of annihilating disease, because the medicinal substance, by exciting certain effects and symptoms, that is to say, by producing a certain artificial morbid state, removes and abrogates the symptoms already present, to wit, the natural morbid state we wish to cure.

The logic consequence of the premises presented is that symptom profile of the medication must in some way exactly fit the symptom profile of the disease:

On the other hand, it follows that, for the totality of the symptoms of the disease to be cured, a medicine must be sought which (according as experience shall prove whether the morbid symptoms are most readily, certainly, and permanently removed and changed into health by similar or opposite medicinal symptoms¹) have the greatest tendency to produce similar or opposite symptoms.

He now discusses that such matching can be either similar or opposite. Later he will explain why he believes the right choice is similar.

1 The other possible mode of employing medicines for diseases besides these two is the allopathic method, in which medicines are given, whose symptoms have no direct pathological relation to the morbid state, neither similar nor opposite, but quite heterogeneous to the symptoms of the disease. This procedure plays, as I have shown elsewhere, an irresponsible murderous game with the life of the patient by means of dangerous, violent medicines, whose action is unknown and which are chosen on mere conjectures and given in large and frequent doses. Again, by means of painful operations, intended to lead the disease to other regions and taking the strength and vital juices of the patient, through evacuations above and below, sweat or salivation, but especially through squandering the irreplaceable blood, as is done by the reigning routine practice, used blindly and relentlessly, usually with the pretext that the physician should imitate and further the sick nature in its efforts to help itself, without considering how irrational it is, to imitate and further these very imperfect, mostly inappropriate efforts of the instinctive unintelligent vital energy which is implanted in our organism, so long as it is

healthy to carry on life in harmonious development, but not to heal itself in disease. For, were it possessed of such a model ability, it would never have allowed the organism to get sick. When made ill by noxious agents, our life principle cannot do anything else than express its depression caused by disturbance of the regularity of its life, by symptoms, by means of which the intelligent physician is asked for aid. If this is not given, it strives to save by increasing the ailment, especially through violent evacuations, no matter what this entails, often with the largest sacrifices or destruction of life itself.

But first he ventures into another denouncing of allopathic medicine, which, when judged by symptoms, produces various symptoms that are basically unconnected to those of the disease:

For the purpose of cure, the morbidly depressed vital energy possesses so little ability worthy of imitation since all changes and symptoms produced by it in the organism are the disease itself. What intelligent physician would want to imitate it with the intention to heal if he did not thereby sacrifice his patient?

In §23 comes the next conclusion; based on the poor results of contemporary medicine, Hahnemann concludes that medicine with opposite symptoms will not cure:

§ 23

All pure experience, however, and all accurate research convince us that persistent symptoms of disease are far from being removed and annihilated by opposite symptoms of medicines (as in the antipathic, enantiopathic or palliative method), that, on the contrary, after transient, apparent alleviation, they break forth again, only with increased intensity, and become manifestly aggravated (see § 58 - 62 and 69).

Thus, believing he has eliminated all else, Hahnemann concludes that the truth lies in Homeopathic regiments; the symptoms generated by the medicine must match the ones of the disease:

§ 24

There remains, therefore, no other mode of employing medicines in diseases that promises to be of service besides the homœopathic, by means of which we seek, for the totality of the symptoms of the case of disease, a medicine which among all medicines (whose pathogenetic effects are known from having been tested in healthy individuals) has the power and the tendency to produce an artificial morbid state most similar to that of the case of disease in question.

If we examine this conclusion, we see how it is flawed:

Premise 1: There are no external causes to diseases, and internal causes are only in malfunction of the Vital Force.

Premise 2: The only effect a medicine can have is in the symptoms it causes.

Premise 3: Based on experience, medicine that causes unrelated symptoms and opposite symptoms do not work.

Conclusion: Homeopathic medicine is the thing that works.

Hahnemann may have had other reasons to come his conclusions, but the above is, in essence, the arguments he has so far presented in the Organon of Medicine. Premises 1 and 2 have been shown to be wrong by later research. Premise 3 basically holds true to this day: We do not design or judge drugs based on their symptoms.

However, even given all three premises, the conclusion does not follow. There is no proof of the homeopathic principle in the premises. The valid conclusion would be:

Valid conclusion: Medicines based on their ability to cause symptoms may not work at all.

-And this is the conclusion reached by modern medicine and backed by research evidence.

§ 25

Now, however, in all careful trials, pure experience,¹ the sole and infallible oracle of the healing art, teaches us that actually that medicine which, in its action on the healthy human body, has demonstrated its power of producing the greatest number of symptoms similar to those observable in the case of disease under treatment, does also, in doses of suitable potency and attenuation, rapidly, radically and permanently remove the totality of the symptoms of this morbid state, that is to say (§ 6 - 16), the whole disease present, and change it into

health; and that all medicines cure, without exception, those diseases whose symptoms most nearly resemble their own, and leave none of them uncured.

So having now explained his principle, Hahnemann goes on to claim that it is backed by practical experience. He does not, at this point, offer any evidence, just that bold sweeping statement, even to the extent that it ALWAYS works. Not even after thorough testing would a modern scientist dare to make such a claim.

1 I do not mean that sort of experience of which the ordinary practitioners of the old school boast, after they have for years worked away with a lot of complex prescriptions on a number of diseases which they never carefully investigate, but which, faithful to their school, they consider as already described in works of systematic pathology, and dreamed that they could detect in them some imaginary morbid matter, or ascribe to them some other hypothetical internal abnormality. (.....)

Note 1 to §25 would just be another jab at the competition, except that this is the start of a series of disclaimers where Hahnemann slowly, but steadily veils his argumentation in special cases, distancing himself from anything that might constitute comparative evaluation. This stance still very wide-spread among present-day homeopaths and sometimes makes serious discussions difficult.

§ 26

This depends on the following homœopathic law of nature which was sometimes, indeed, vaguely surmised but not hitherto fully recognized, and to which is due every real cure that has ever taken place:

A weaker dynamic affection is permanently extinguished in the living organism by a stronger one, if the latter (whilst differing in kind) is very similar to the former in its manifestations.¹

At last, here comes the holy grail of Homeopathy! How Hahnemann has developed this thesis is unclear; his practical examples are not convincing, but the message is clear: Hahnemann believes that a strong symptom will not only suppress, but permanently remove a weaker, similar symptom.

1 Thus are cured both physical affections and moral maladies. How is it that in the early dawn the brilliant Jupiter vanishes from the gaze of the beholder? By a stronger very similar power acting on his optic nerve, the brightness of approaching day! - In situations replete with foetid odors, wherewith is it usual to soothe effectually the offended olfactory nerves? With snuff, that affects the sense of smell in a similar but stronger manner! No music, no sugared cake, which act on the nerves of other senses, can cure this olfactory disgust. How does the soldier cunningly stifle the piteous cries of him who runs the gauntlet from the ears of the compassionate bystanders? By the shrill notes of the fife commingled with the roll of the noisy drum! And the distant roar of the enemy's cannon that inspires his army with fear? By the loud boom of the big drum! For neither the one nor the other would the distribution of a brilliant piece of uniform nor a reprimand to the regiment suffice. In like manner, mourning and sorrow will be effaced from the mind by the account of another and still greater cause for sorrow happening to another, even though it be a mere fiction. The injurious consequences of too great joy will be removed by drinking coffee, which produces an excessive joyous state of mind. Nations like the Germans, who have for centuries been gradually sinking deeper and deeper in soulless apathy and degrading serfdom, must first be trodden still deeper in the dust by the Western Conqueror, until their situation became intolerable; their mean opinion of themselves was thereby over-strained and removed; they again became alive to their dignity as men, and then, for the first time, they raised their heads as Germans.

Interestingly, several of his rather poetic analogies are not similars, and none of them show an example where the suppression is more than temporary. Still not clear how he gets the idea that similar but stronger can cure.

§ 27

The curative power of medicines, therefore, depends on their symptoms, similar to the disease but superior to it in strength (§ 12 - 26), so that each individual case of disease is most surely, radically, rapidly and permanently annihilated and removed only by a medicine capable of producing (in the human system) in the most similar and complete manner the totality of its symptoms, which at the same time are stronger than the disease.

Restating his central thesis, but no further evidence.

§ 28

As this natural law of cure manifests itself in every pure experiment and every true observation in the world, the fact is consequently established; it matters little what may be scientific explanation of how it takes place; and I do not attach much importance to the attempts made to explain it. But the following view seems to commend itself as the most probable one, as it is founded on premises derived from experience.

Hahnemann claims the idea is based on experimental evidence, with a very interesting provision: " every pure experiment and every true observation in the world" – Thus, it follows that he might reject any result that does not support his theory as not being pure or true, and this is exactly what we see some present-day homeopaths do: Whenever a negative test result is pointed out, the thing tested was not TRUE homeopathy. Some even go as far as claiming that the fact that is submitted to tests in itself invalidates it as true homeopathy, thus presenting an impenetrable circular argument against testing.

§ 29

As every disease (.....) consists only in a special, morbid, dynamic alteration of our vital energy (of the principle of life) manifested in sensation and motion, so in every homœopathic cure this principle of life dynamically altered by natural disease is seized through the administration of medicinal potency selected exactly according to symptom-similarity by a somewhat stronger, similar artificial disease-manifestation. By this the feeling of the natural (weaker) dynamic disease-manifestation ceases and disappears. This disease-manifestation no longer exists for the principle of life which is now occupied and governed merely by the stronger, artificial disease-manifestation. This artificial disease-manifestation has soon spent its force and leaves the patient free from disease, cured. The dynamis, thus freed, can now continue to carry life on in health. This most highly probable process rests upon the following propositions.

Hahnemann explains how his theory works, based on the same earlier premise. Basically you might express his reasoning this way: Since diseases do not have causes, adding a cause and then removing it (by the medicine effects wearing off) takes the disease away. Not only is the premise flawed, since we now know that diseases in fact do have causes, but the logic is also weak: Why exactly is it that the original problem should not resurface, once the medicine wears off? It's like saying that if your balance is impaired, just take half a dozen stiff drinks; when you sober up, your balance will be fine. Or, if you have spent too much money, spend some more, and the problem will go away.

§ 30 Sixth Edition

The human body appears to admit of being much more powerfully affected in its health by medicines (partly because we have the regulation of the dose in our own power) than by natural morbid stimuli - for natural diseases are cured and overcome by suitable medicines.¹

This is pure speculation. Hahnemann has chosen to believe that this effect exists and is now speculating on how it could function.

(.....) The cures of diseases of many years' duration (§ 46), by the occurrence of smallpox and measles (both of which run a course of only a few weeks), are processes of a similar character.

Hahnemann here and later points out some examples of one disease suppressing another. Whether his examples are based on fact or not, it is entirely thinkable that this effect may exist for some diseases. If the body's way of dealing with one disease is effective against the other, this may happen.

§ 31

The inimical forces, partly psychical, partly physical, to which our terrestrial existence is exposed, which are termed morbidic noxious agents, do not possess the power of morbidly deranging the health of man unconditionally¹; but we are made ill by them only when our organism is sufficiently disposed and susceptible to attack of the morbidic cause that may be present, and to be altered in its health, deranged and made to undergo abnormal sensations and functions - hence they do not produce disease in every one nor at all times.

(.....)

Here, Hahnemann tries to use the fact that diseases do not always hit us even after exposure to an assumed cause as evidence of the Vital Force theory. We know a better explanation now: Exposure to adverse environment like cold only results in disease if infectious agents are present, and exposure to infectious agents only result in disease if the immune system cannot deal with them.

§ 32

But it is quite otherwise with the artificial morbidic agents which we term medicines. Every real medicine, namely, acts at all times, under all circumstances, on every living human being, and produces in him its peculiar symptoms (distinctly perceptible, if the dose be large enough), so that evidently every living human organ-

ism is liable to be affected, and, as it were, inoculated with the medicinal disease at all times, and absolutely (unconditionally), which, as before said, is by no means the case with the natural diseases.

A correct observation; a certain chemical substance (no reason to restrict the statement to medicines) will cause a certain effect, regardless of the status of the immune system. The statement of "under all circumstances, on every living human being" is a bit too sweeping; some people react in different ways to some substances, and actually, Hahnemann is going to amend this statement later.

§ 33

In accordance with this fact, it is undeniably shown by all experience¹ that the living organism is much more disposed and has a greater liability to be acted on, and to have its health deranged by medicinal powers, than by morbid noxious agents and infectious miasms, or, in other words, that the morbid noxious agents possess a power of morbidly deranging man's health that is subordinate and conditional, often very conditional; whilst medicinal agents have an absolute unconditional power, greatly superior to the former.

This conclusion, however, is false: The reason we react more consistently to chemical substances than to disease agents is that the way they affect us is different. But remember: Hahnemann does not recognize causes.

1 A striking fact in corroboration of this is, that whilst previously to the year 1801, when the smooth scarlatina of Sydenham still occasionally prevailed epidemically among children, it attacked without exception all children who had escaped it in a former epidemic; in a similar epidemic which I witnessed in Konigsutter, on the contrary, all the children who took in time a very small dose of belladonna remained unaffected by this highly infectious infantile disease. If medicines can protect from a disease that is raging around, they must possess a vastly superior power of affecting our vital force.

One of the relatively few references to real life experience. Seemingly he has not actually witnessed the Sydenham epidemics (Hahnemann lived in Germany), so he relies on second-hand information here. The claim that ALL not affected in the first epidemic were in the second looks a bit too absolute, however, the general tendency of one epidemic to give immunity against the next is well-known and easily explained by knowledge of micro-organisms and immune effects.

Afterwards, Hahnemann relates a personal experience. This could hardly be termed an experiment, though. What he claims is that a dash of belladonna kept a number of children free of disease. Even if entirely correct, it does not prove a causal connection, as there might have been other reasons. Also, there is the small clause "who took in time", so he might simply be rejecting the cases that don't fit his theory. The weird thing about this example is that he is indirectly recognizing the infectious agent as a cause; otherwise the example is obviously moot, but this runs contrary to his basic doctrine!

§ 34

The greater strength of the artificial diseases producible by medicines is, however, not the sole cause of their power to cure natural disease. In order that they may effect a cure, it is before all things requisite that they should be capable of producing in the human body an artificial disease as similar as possible to the disease to be cured, which, with somewhat increased power, transforms to a very similar morbid state the instinctive life principle, which in itself is incapable of any reflection or act of memory. It not only obscures, but extinguishes and thereby annihilates the derangement caused by the natural disease. This is so true, that no previously existing disease can be cured, even by Nature herself, by the accession of a new dissimilar disease, be it ever so strong, and just as little can it be cured by medical treatment with drugs which are incapable of producing a similar morbid condition in the healthy body.

Stressing further that for one disease to replace another, it must be similar and concluding that this is evidence that medicines must also be similar (=homeopathic). This claim is unbased; none of Hahnemann's own earlier examples fulfill the criteria. In my opinion, this shows that he starts with the conclusion, then tries to construct evidence for it. Also, he is later going to claim that symptoms can be removed piecemeal, by a sequence of medicines, each addressing part of the symptom profile.

§ 35

In order to illustrate this, we shall consider in three different cases, as well what happens in nature when two dissimilar natural diseases meet to in one person, as also the result of the ordinary medical treatment of diseases with unsuitable allopathic drugs, which are incapable of producing an artificial morbid condition similar to the disease to be cured, whereby it will appear that even Nature herself is unable to remove a dissimilar dis-

ease already present by one that is unhomœopathic, even though it be stronger, and just as little is the un-homœopathic employment of even the strongest medicines ever capable of curing any disease whatsoever.

Hahnemann claims that he will now present evidence for the claim from §34 and earlier.

§ 36

I. If the two dissimilar diseases meeting together in the human being be of equal strength, or still more if the older one be the stronger, the new disease will be repelled by the old one from the body and not allowed to affect it. A patient suffering from a severe chronic disease will not be infected by a moderate autumnal dysentery or other epidemic disease. The plague of the Levant, according to Larry,¹ does not break out where scurvy is prevalent, and persons suffering from eczema are not infected by it. Rachitis, Jenner alleges, prevents vaccination from taking effect. Those suffering from pulmonary consumption are not liable to be attacked by epidemic fevers of a not very violent character, according to Von Hildenbrand.

1 "Memoires et Observations," in the Description de l' Egpte, tom. i.

Strangely, this first example instead seems to CONTRADICT his claim of the need for similarity, or else his definition for "similarity" is much different from the current one (we would hardly consider "plague of the levant" similar to the deficiency syndrome rachitis). Anyhow, he is relating second-hand information, including some from one Jenner, who works with vaccination. So, the claim from Jenner that some disease prevents vaccination from working is somehow to be taken as evidence, although this, by common logic, seems to contradict Hahnemann's basic theory about disease: If disease is a malfunction of the Vital Force, how can you inoculate against it? Modern understanding of diseases explains this much better.

Finally, whether the related cases are true or not, it is not really evidence for Hahnemann's theories that some diseases may prevent others, since this can be explained in terms of immunity reactions as well.

§ 37

So, also under ordinary medical treatment, an old chronic disease remains uncured and unaltered if it is treated according to the common allopathic method, that is to say, with medicines that are incapable of producing in healthy individuals a state of health similar to the disease, even though the treatment should last for years and is not of too violent character.¹ This is daily witnessed in practice, it is therefore unnecessary to give any illustrative examples.

1 But if treated with violent allopathic remedies, other diseases will be formed in its place which are more difficult and dangerous to life.

Based on the shaky and anecdotal evidence from §36- 37, Hahnemann offers yet another denouncing of allopathic practice. It is pertinent to rest a little on this because this denouncing is used by some present-day homeopaths to denounce modern medicine, claiming it to be allopathic. In the strict definition of the word, this may be true, but not in practice, since the goal of modern medicine is not to induce symptoms at all, but to target disease causes. Like in vaccination, the efficiency of which Hahnemann somehow acknowledges.

§ 38

Or the new dissimilar disease is the stronger. In this case the disease under which the patient originally labored, being the weaker, will be kept back and suspended by the accession of the stronger one, until the latter shall have run its course or been cured, and then the old one reappears uncured. Two children affected with a kind of epilepsy remained free from epileptic attacks after infection with ringworm (tinea) but as soon as the eruption on the head was gone the epilepsy returned just as before, as Tulpius¹ observed. The itch, as Schopf² saw, disappeared on the occurrence of the scurvy, but after the cure of the latter it again broke out. So, also the pulmonary phthisis remained stationary when the patient was attacked by a violent typhus, but went on again after the latter had run its course.³ If mania occur in a consumptive patient, the phthisis with all its symptoms is removed by the former; but if that go off, the phthisis returns immediately and proves fatal.⁴ When measles and smallpox are prevalent at the same time, and both attack the same child, the measles that had already broken out is generally checked by the smallpox that came somewhat later; nor does the measles resume its course until after the cure of the smallpox; but it not infrequently happens that the inoculated smallpox is suspended for four days by the supervention of the measles, as observed by Manget,⁵ after the desquamation of which the smallpox completes its course. Even when the inoculation of the smallpox had taken effect for six days, and the measles then broke out, the inflammation of the inoculation remained stationary and the smallpox did not ensue until the measles had completed its regular course of seven days.⁶ In an epidemic of measles, that disease attacked many individuals on the fourth or fifth day after the inoculation of smallpox and prevented the development of the smallpox until it had completed its own course, whereupon the

smallpox appeared and proceeded regularly to its termination.⁷ The true, smooth, erysipelatous-looking scarlatina of Sydenham, with sore throat, was checked on the fourth day by the eruption of cow-pox, which ran its regular course, and not till it was ended did the scarlatina again establish itself; but on another occasion, as both diseases seem to be of equal strength, the cow-pox was suspended on the eighth day by the supervention of the true, smooth scarlatina of Sydenham,⁸ and the red areola of the former disappeared until the scarlatina was gone, wherein the cow-pox immediately resumed its course, and went on its regular termination.⁹ The measles suspended the cow-pox; on the eighth day, when the cow-pox had nearly attained its climax, the measles broke out; the cow-pox now remained stationary, and did not resume and complete its course until the desquamation of the measles, had taken place, so that on the sixteenth day it presented the appearance it otherwise would have shown on the tenth day, as Kortum¹⁰ observed.

Even after the measles had broken out the cow-pox inoculation took effect, but did not run its course until these measles had disappeared, as Kortum likewise witnessed.¹¹

I myself saw the mumps (angina parotidea) immediately disappear when the cow-pox inoculation had taken effect and had nearly attained its height; it was not until the complete termination of the cow-pox and the disappearance of its red areola that this febrile tumefaction of the parotid and submaxillary glands, that is caused by a peculiar miasm, reappeared and ran its regular course of seven days.

And thus it is with all dissimilar disease; the stronger suspends the weaker (when they do not complicate one another, which is seldom the case with acute disease), but they never cure one another.

1 Obs., lib. I, obs. 8.

2 In Hufeland's Journal, xv, 2.

3 Chevalier, in Hufeland's Neuesten Annalen der franzosichen Heikunde, ii, p.192.

4 Mania phthisi superveniens eam cum omnibus suis phaenomenis aufert, verum mox redit phthisis et occidit, abeunte mania. Reil Memorab., fasc. iii, v, p.171.

5 In the Edinb. Med. Comment., pt. i, 1.

6 John Hunter, On the Venereal Disease, p.5.

7 Rainey, in the Edinb. Med. Comment., iii, p.480.

8 Very accurately described by Withering and Plenciz, but differing greatly from the purpura (or Roodvonk), which is often erroneously denominated scarlet fever. It is only of late year that the two, which were originally very different diseases, have come to resemble each other in their symptoms.

9 Jenner, in Medicinische Annalen, August, 1800, p.747.

10 In Hufeland's Journal der praktischen Arzneikunde, xx, 3, p.50.

11 Loc. cit.

A number of case stories, again mostly second-hand, as evidenced by the reference list. One problem with these stories is, of course, that there is absolutely no way to verify or even substantiate the diagnoses. Likewise, the claim that one disease receded is basically unverifiable; it could be a case of shifted attention focus, re-infection, or a true suppression. Hahnemann's conclusion, while shakily founded, is that dissimilar diseases will suppress each other, but cannot cure each other. Obviously, even if this was true, it would not be evidence that similar diseases could cure.

§ 39

Now the adherents of the ordinary school of medicine saw all this for so many centuries; they saw that Nature herself cannot cure any disease by the accession of another, be it ever so strong, if the new disease be dissimilar to that already present in the body. What shall we think of them, that they nevertheless went on treating chronic disease with allopathic remedies, namely, with medicines and prescriptions capable of producing God knows what morbid state - almost invariably, however, one dissimilar to the disease to be cured? (.....)

Another long attack on allopathic practice. What Hahnemann really is saying is that others did not follow his theories and he chastises them for this. This is a demonstration of the totally different paradigms of homeopathy and mainstream medicine. As viewed from either side, the other simply does not make sense.

§ 40

(.....) yet there have also been severe epidemics of this kind, where, in rare cases, two dissimilar acute diseases occurred simultaneously in one and the same body, and for a short time combined, as it were, with each other. (.....)

Zencker⁶ saw cow-pox run its regular course along with measles and along with purpura.

The cow-pox went on its course undisturbed during a mercurial treatment for syphilis, as Jenner saw.

(.....)

In this paragraph, Hahnemann does acknowledge that two or more diseases can coexist, although he still claims it to be a rare occurrence. Nevertheless, even a rare occurrence undermines his basic theory. In modern medicine, we recognize that several simultaneous diseases occur frequently, but we must bear in mind that our principle for distinguishing between different diseases is fundamentally different from Hahnemann's. He defines a disease by its symptoms, we by its cause, thus what Hahnemann sees as a sequence A, B, A (where A is one set of symptoms and B is another) could very well be exactly the same as that which we would see as a, a+b, a (where a is one causal agent and b is another).

§ 41

Much more frequent than the natural diseases associating with and complicating one another in the same body are the morbid complication resulting from the art of the ordinary practitioner, which the inappropriate medical treatment (the allopathic method) (.....) which then, when not quite incurable, can only be transformed into health with the greatest difficulty.

Again, attack on allopathic practice. Actually, at Hahnemann's time, much of general medical practice was indeed deplorable, but we see this attitude remaining among certain homeopathic practitioners even today. The last sentences, especially, have severe consequences, because it induces some homeopaths to discourage patients from using modern medicines on the grounds that this is believed to make diseases unreachable for homeopathic treatment. Since homeopathic treatment has not been shown to have any real effect, patient's health and even lives might be threatened by this attitude. Fortunately, many modern homeopathic practitioners have left this position.

1 For mercury, besides the morbid symptoms which by virtue of similarity can cure the venereal disease homœopathically, has among its effects many others unlike those of syphilis, for instance, swelling and ulceration of bones, which, if it be employed in large doses, causes new maladies and commit great ravages in the body, especially when complicated with psora, as is so frequently the case.

Hahnemann observes, correctly, that the mercury treatment earlier used for some diseases, especially syphilis, has severe side effects.

§ 42

Nature herself permits, as has been stated, in some cases, the simultaneous occurrence of two (indeed, of three) natural disease in one and the same body. This complication, however, it must be remarked, happens only in the case of two dissimilar disease, which according to the eternal laws of nature do not remove, do not annihilate and cannot cure one another, but, as it seems, both (or all three) remain, as it were, separate in the organism, and each takes possession of the parts and systems peculiarly appropriate to it, which, on account of the want of resemblance of these maladies to each other, can very well happen without disparagement to the unity of life.

Notable in §42 is another call to "eternal laws of nature", a hyperbole that appears throughout the Organon.

§ 43

Totally different, however, is the result when two similar disease meet together in the organism, that is to say, when to the disease already present a stronger similar one is added. In such cases we see how a cure can be effected by the operations of nature, and we get a lesson as to how man ought to cure.

§ 44

Two similar diseases can neither (as is asserted of dissimilar disease in I) repel one another, nor (as has been shown of dissimilar disease in II) suspend on another, so that the old one shall return after the new one has run its course; and just as little can two similar diseases (as has been demonstrated in III respecting dissimilar affections) exist beside each other in the same organism, or together form a double complex disease.

No! Two diseases, differing, it is true, in kind 1 but very similar in their phenomena and effects and in the sufferings and symptoms they severally produce, invariably annihilate one another whenever they meet together in the organism; the stronger disease namely, annihilates the weaker, and that for this simple reason, because the stronger morbific power when it invades the system, by reason of its similarity of action involves precisely the same part of the organism that were previously affected by the weaker morbid irritation, which, consequently, can no longer act on these parts, but is extinguished 2, or (in other words), the new similar but stronger morbific potency controls the feelings of the patient and hence the life principle on account of its pecu-

liarity, can no longer feel the weaker similar which becomes extinguished - exists no longer - for it was never anything material, but a dynamic - spirit-like - (conceptual) affection. The life principle henceforth is affected only and this but temporarily by the new, similar but stronger morbidic potency.

Since Hahnemann has specifically stated in § 6 that a disease is characterized only by the symptoms it produces, it is difficult to understand how he can now talk about diseases that differ in kind but produce similar symptoms. According to his own definition of a disease, he should regard them as the same disease, albeit maybe of varying severity. How he proposes to distinguish between diseases with similar symptoms while at the same time rejecting the notion of causative agents is unclear, and indeed, since he did not believe in searching for internal causes, we may assume that many of his observations are indeed cases of the same disease in varying severity. Which would of course explain why he observes one disease annihilate the other.

(.....)

2 Just as the image of a lamp's flame is rapidly overpowered and effaced from our retina by the stronger sun-beam impinging on the eye.

Another little symbolism which actually contradicts his point, since the lamp is still burning, which we might ascertain by touching it, even if we cannot see its light for the glare of sunlight.

§ 46

(.....)

Smallpox coming on after vaccination, as well on account of its greater strength as its great similarity, at once removes entirely the cow-pox homœopathically, and does not permit it to come to maturity; but, on the other hand, the cow-pox when near maturity does, on account of its great similarity, homœopathically diminish very much the supervening smallpox and make it much milder 8, as Muhry 9 and many others testify.

The inoculated cow-pox, whose lymph, besides the protective matter, contains the contagion of a general cutaneous eruption of another nature, consisting of usually small, dry (rarely large, pustular) pimples, resting on a small red areola, frequently conjoined with round red cutaneous spots and often accompanied by the most violent itching, which rash appears in not a few children several days before, more frequently, however, after the red areola of the cow-pock, and goes off in a few days, leaving behind small, red, hard spots on the skin; - the inoculated cow-pox, I say, after it has taken, cures perfectly and permanently, in a homœopathic manner, by the similarity of this accessory miasm, analogous cutaneous eruptions of children, often of very long standing and of a very troublesome character, as a number of observers assert.¹⁰

After a number of examples, all second-hand, Hahnemann here mentions smallpox and cowpox, how they influence each other and how the relatively benign cowpox can be used to inoculate against the more dangerous smallpox. While this was one of the first massive clues that medical researchers had to the functioning of the immune system, Hahnemann tries to claim it as evidence for the homeopathic principle. This is a bit weird, since without acknowledging the concept of cause, in this case microbial infection, it does not seem to make sense at all. Another example of Hahnemann interpreting observations to fit his theory.

(.....)

8 A new footnote is added here in the Sixth Edition, as follows:

This seems to be the reason for this beneficial remarkable fact namely that since the general distribution of Jenner's Cow-pox vaccination, human small-pox never again appeared as epidemically or virulently as 40-45 years before when one city visited lost at least one-half and often three-quarters of its children by death of this miserable pestilence.

(.....)

In this very interesting, short note, Hahnemann recognizes the great success of vaccination against smallpox. This fact is worth of notice, especially as I have seen present-day homeopaths rejecting even this vaccination as being useless allopathy.

§ 47

Nothing could teach the physician in a plainer and more convincing manner than the above what kind of artificial morbidic agent (medicine) he ought to choose in order to cure in a sure, rapid and permanent manner, conformably with the process that takes place in nature.

§ 48

Neither in the course of nature, as we see from all the above examples, nor by the physician's art, can an existing affection or malady in any one instance be removed by a dissimilar morbidic agent, be it ever so strong, but

solely by one that is similar in symptoms and is somewhat stronger, according to eternal, irrevocable laws of nature, which have not hitherto been recognized.

Yet another reiteration of the doctrine, yet another attack on allopathy based on the assumption that the purpose of allopathy is to cure by inducing symptoms.

§ 49

We should have been able to meet with many more real, natural homœopathic cures of this kind if, on the one hand, the attention of observers had been more directed to them, and, on the other hand, if nature had not been so deficient in helpful homœopathic diseases.

§ 50

Mighty Nature herself has, as we see, at her command, as instruments for effecting homœopathic cures, little besides the miasmatic diseases of constant character, (the itch) measles and smallpox¹, morbid agents which², as remedies, are either more dangerous to life and more to be dreaded than the disease they are to cure, they themselves require curing, in order to be eradicated in their turn (.....) And yet, as is seen, we can point to some striking homœopathic cures effected by this lucky concurrence, all so many incontrovertible proofs of the great, the sole therapeutic law of nature that obtains in them: Cure by symptom similarity!

1 And the exanthematous contagious principle present in the cow-pox lymph.

2 Namely, small-pox and measles.

Elaborating on the claim that some diseases giving immunity against others, like the small-pox/cowpox) example, is evidence for the homeopathic principle, and at the same time sensibly pointing out the dangers and problems inherent in giving patient a disease in order to cure another.

§ 51

This therapeutic law is rendered obvious to all intelligent minds by these instances, and they are amply sufficient for this end. But, on the other hand, see what advantages man has over crude Nature in her happy-go-lucky operations. How many thousands more of homœopathic morbid agents has not man at his disposal for the relief of his suffering fellow-creatures in the medicinal substances universally distributed throughout creation! In them he has producers of disease of all possible varieties of action, for all the innumerable, for all conceivable and inconceivable natural diseases, to which they can render homœopathic aid - morbid agents (medicinal substances), whose power, when their remedial employment is completed, being overcome by the vital force, disappears spontaneously without requiring a second course of treatment for its extirpation, like the itch - artificial morbid agents, which the physician can attenuate, subdivide and potentize almost to an infinite extent, and the dose of which he can diminish to such a degree that they shall remain only slightly stronger than the similar natural disease they are employed to cure; so that in this incomparable method of cure, there is no necessity for any violent attack upon the organism for the eradication of even an inveterate disease of old standing; the cure by this method takes place by only a gentle, imperceptible and yet often rapid transition from the tormenting natural disease to the desired state of permanent health.

After another slightly veiled insult directed at people who disagree, Hahnemann marvels at the possibilities for designing cures by artificially induced symptoms, the homeopathic method. He would be right, of course, provided we had any evidence that the homeopathic principle worked.

§ 52

There are but two principle methods of cure: the one based only on accurate observation of nature, on careful experimentation and pure experience, the homœopathic (before we never designedly used) and a second which does not do this, the heteropathic or allopathic. Each opposes the other, and only he who does not know either can hold the delusion that they can ever approach each other or even become united, or to make himself so ridiculous as to practice at one time homœopathically at another allopathically, according to the pleasure of the patient; a practice which may be called criminal treason against divine homœopathy.

For the umpteenth time stoking the enmity between homeopathy and allopathy, and ending by declaring homeopathy a divine principle (and allopathy criminal treason)!

§ 53 Sixth Edition

(.....)

The pure homœopathic healing art is the only correct method, the one possible to human art, the straightest way to cure, as certain as that there is but one straight line between two given points.

The self-appraise seems never-ending.

§ 54 Sixth Edition

The allopathic method of treatment utilized many things against disease, but usually only improper ones (alloea) and ruled for ages in different forms called systems. (.....)

Every builder of such a system cherished the haughty estimation of himself that he was able to penetrate into the inner nature of life of the healthy as well as of the sick and clearly to recognize it and accordingly gave the prescription which noxious matter² should be banished from the sick man, and how to banish it in order to restore him to health, all this according to empty assumptions and arbitrary suppositions without honestly questioning nature and listening without prejudice to the voice of experience. Diseases were held to be conditions that reappeared pretty much in the same manner. Most systems gave, therefore, names to their imagined disease pictures and classified them, every system differently. To medicines were ascribed actions which were supposed to cure these abnormal conditions. (Hence the numerous text books on *Materia Medica*.³)

(.....)

2 Up to the most recent times what is curable in sickness was supposed to be material that had to be removed since no one could conceive of a dynamic effect (§ 11 note) of morbid agencies, such as medicines exercise upon the life of the animal organism.

3 To fill the measure of self infatuation to overflowing here were mixed (very learnedly) constantly more, indeed, many different medicines in so-called prescriptions to be administered in frequent and large doses and thereby the precious, easily-destroyed human life was endangered in the hands of these perverted ones. Especially so with seton, venesection, emetics, purgatives, plasters, fontanelles and cauterization.

Again, Hahnemann lashes out viciously at the competition. It is worth repeating that he is not without cause; in fact many of his observations are accurate. For centuries, medical science did blunder inefficiently around, working through trial and error, with much human suffering as a result. However, his accusation about the futility of these strivings is unjust. Medical science kept searching for the causes for diseases, and it found them. Once causes were found, cures often followed.

§ 55

Soon, however, the public became convinced that the sufferings of the sick increased and heightened with the introduction of every one of these systems and methods of cure if followed exactly. Long ago these allopathic physicians would have been left had it not been for the palliative relief obtained at times from empirically discovered remedies whose almost instantaneous flattering action is apparent to the patient and this to some extent served to keep up their credit.

At this point, I will stop defending Hahnemann's position against medical science; even at his time, it was apparent that results were being achieved: Causative agents were discovered, useful remedies were being found. Hahnemann is now in the process of building the conspiracy theory that will become ever more apparent as he tries to explain why his homeopathic regimen has not swept triumphantly across the world, competition crumbling before it, which should had happened, had it been even half as effective as Hahnemann wants us to believe.

After the best part of two centuries have passed, this dilemma becomes even more obvious. While medical science rules the day, homeopathy stays relegated to its obscure corner of pseudoscience, and only by ever shriller claims of conspiracy can present-day homeopaths try to explain this situation.

§ 56

By means of this palliative (antipathic, enantiopathic) method, introduced according to Galen's teaching "Contraria contrariis" for seventeen centuries, the physicians hitherto could hope to win confidence while they deluded with almost instantaneous amelioration. But how fundamentally unhelpful and hurtful this method of treatment is (in diseases not running a rapid course) we shall see in what follows. It is certainly the only one of the modes of treatment adopted by the allopaths that had any manifest relation to a portion of the sufferings caused by the natural disease; but what kind of relation? Of a truth the very one (the exact contrary of the right one) that ought carefully to be avoided if we would not delude and make a mockery of the patient affected with a chronic disease¹.

Hahnemann here turns his wrath upon palliative treatment, at the same time showing how he misunderstands the principle. Completely focused as he is on SYMPTOMS, he assumes palliative medicine to be seeking to produce opposite symptoms, but this is, of course, not necessarily the case. The real goal of palliative treatment is to remove or suppress the symptoms of a disease. While

this will in most cases do nothing to cure the patient, it will certainly relieve suffering, and in most cases not interfere with a possible cure. It seems somewhat illogical that somebody who is convinced that a disease IS its symptoms can be so opposed to removing or suppressing same symptoms.

1 A third mode of employing medicines in diseases has been attempted to be created by means of Isopathy, as it is called - that is to say, a method of curing a given disease by the same contagious principle that produces it. But even granting this could be done, yet, after all, seeing that the virus is given to the patient highly potentized, and consequently, in an altered condition, the cure is effected only by opposing a simillimum to a simillimum.

To attempt to cure by means of the very same morbid potency (per Idem) contradicts all normal human understanding and hence all experience. Those who first brought Isopathy to notice, probably thought of the benefit which mankind received from cowpox vaccination by which the vaccinated individual is protected against future cowpox infection and as it were cured in advance. But both, cowpox and smallpox are only similar, in no way the same disease. In many respects they differ, namely in the more rapid course and mildness of cowpox and especially in this, that is never contagious to man by mere nearness. Universal vaccination put an end to all epidemics of that deadly fearful smallpox to such an extent that the present generation does no longer possess a clear conception of the former frightful smallpox plague.

Moreover, in this way, undoubtedly, certain diseases peculiar to animals may give us remedies and thus happily enlarge our stock of homœopathic remedies.

But to use a human morbid matter (a Psorin taken from the itch in man) as a remedy for the same itch or for evils arisen therefrom is ---- ?

Nothing can result from this but trouble and aggravation of the disease.

Despite the length, I will not shorten the account of isopathy. While the idea of trying to CURE a disease by more of the same does indeed sound strange, the idea of vaccination, which derives from this method, has claimed significant victories in the struggle against disease. So something good did come of the idea after all.

§ 57

In order to carry into practice this antipathic method, the ordinary physician gives, for a single troublesome symptom from among the many other symptoms of the disease which he passes by unheeded, a medicine concerning which it is known that it produces the exact opposite of the morbid symptom sought to be subdued, from which, agreeably to the fifteen - centuries - old traditional rule of the antiquated medical school (contraria contrariis) he can expect the speediest (palliative) relief. He gives large doses of opium for pains of all sorts, because this drug soon benumbs the sensibility, and administers the same remedy for diarrhoeas, because it speedily puts a stop to the peristaltic motion of the intestinal canal and makes it insensible; and also for sleeplessness, because opium rapidly produces a stupefied, comatose sleep; he gives purgatives when the patient has suffered long from constipation and costiveness; he causes the burnt hand to be plunged into cold water, which, from its low degree of temperature, seems instantaneously to remove the burning pain, as if by magic; he puts the patient who complains of chilliness and deficiency of vital heat into warm baths, which warm him immediately; he makes him who is suffering from prolonged debility drink wine, whereby he is instantly enlivened and refreshed; and in like manner he employs other opposite (antipathic) remedial means, but he has very few besides those just mentioned, as it is only of very few substances that some peculiar (primary) action is known to the ordinary medical school.

Notice how Hahnemann does not distinguish between the original antipathic method, which is long obsolete, and palliative treatment, which is still a useful (and for some diseases our only) tool.

§ 58

(.....)

More denouncing antipathic methods. As long as we are talking about the antiquated practice of trying to cure by inducing opposite symptoms, I don't think modern practitioners will disagree much with Hahnemann.

§ 59

Important symptoms of persistent diseases have never yet been treated with such palliative, antagonistic remedies, without the opposite state, a relapse - indeed, a palpable aggravation of the malady - occurring a few hours afterwards. (.....)

Still denouncing antipathy, but here it is really what we would call palliative treatment. Hahnemann gives a number of generalized examples where palliative treatment seems to have worsened the disease. Actually, palliative treatments rarely do this, but if it is the only treatment given, the disease might progress while masked by the treatment. Modern practitioners take great care not to mask symptoms that might provide a warning of progressive disease. Curiously, Hahnemann also mentions treating burns with cold water, a practice we have later found to be quite useful. That Hahnemann claims it to worsen the situation might be due to infections from unclean water. I have snipped most of the long paragraph, since it otherwise bears little relevance to modern medical practices. As an interesting aside, I have had a modern homeopath suggest treating burns with HEAT.

§ 61

Had physicians been capable of reflecting on the sad results of the antagonistic employment of medicines, they had long since discovered the grand truth, THAT THE TRUE RADICAL HEALING ART MUST BE FOUND IN THE EXACT OPPOSITE OF SUCH AN ANTIPATHIC TREATMENT OF THE SYMPTOMS OF DISEASE; they would have become convinced, that as a medicinal action antagonistic to the symptoms of the disease (an antipathically employed medicine) is followed by only transient relief, and after that is passed, by invariable aggravation, the converse of that procedure, the homœopathic employment of medicines according to similarity of symptoms, must effect a permanent and perfect cure, if at the same time the opposite of their large doses, the most minute doses, are exhibited.

Hahnemann in full swing. And committing a basic logical fallacy: Since A is wrong, B must be right. While we can join him in shaking our heads at practices like blood-letting and leeches, the fact that some methods are deplorable means just that. It does not in any way support any different methods.

But neither the obvious aggravation that ensued from their antipathic treatment, nor the fact that no physician ever effected a permanent cure of disease of considerable or of long standing unless some homœopathic medicinal agent was accidentally a chief ingredient in his prescription, nor yet the circumstances that all the rapid and perfect cures that nature ever performed (§ 46), were always effected by the supervention upon the old disease of one of a similar character, ever taught them, during such a long series of centuries, this truth, the knowledge of which can alone conduce to the benefit of the sick.

Deeply engulfed in his own convictions, Hahnemann overlooks, or turns the blind eye to, the fact that some remedies, even at his time, did help patients. As a very simple example, more than a century before, Captain James Cook had prevented scurvy by forcing his crew (against threat of lashing) to eat lemons. This simple remedy was well-known and widespread at Hahnemann's time, and he must have heard of it. He apparently choose to ignore it.

§ 62

But on what this pernicious result of the palliative, antipathic treatment and the efficacy of the reverse, the homœopathic treatment, depend, is explained by the following facts, deduced from manifold observations, which no one before me perceived, though they are so very palpable and so very evident, and are of such infinite importance to the healing art.

(.....)

Through a couple of paragraphs, Hahnemann reiterates the basis for his theory, not really adding anything not already mentioned.

§ 67

These incontrovertible truths, which spontaneously offer themselves to our notice and experience, explain to us the beneficial action that takes place under homœopathic treatment; while, on the other hand, they demonstrate the perversity of the antipathic and palliative treatment of diseases with antagonistically acting medicines.¹

Here we go again, and with another logical fallacy: Since A is true, B must be false. Even if his arguments did support the homeopathic principle, it does not follow logically that other methods must be wrong, unless they have somehow been shown to be mutually exclusive.

¹ Only in the most urgent cases, where danger to life and imminent death allow no time for the action of a homœopathic remedy (.....) is it admissible and judicious, (.....) (the physical life) with a palliative, (.....) When this stimulation is effected, the play of the vital organs again goes on in its former healthy manner, for there is here no disease* to be removed, but merely an obstruction and suppression of the healthy vital force. To this category belong various antidotes to sudden poisoning: alkalies from mineral acids, hepar sulphuris for metallic poisons, coffee and camphora (and ipecacuanha) for poisoning by opium, etc.

At least he recognizes the above. This no doubt kept him from losing a few patients.

It does not follow that a homœopathic medicine has been ill selected for a case of disease because some of the medicinal symptoms are only antipathic to some of the less important and minor symptoms of the disease; if only the others, the stronger well-marked (characteristic), and peculiar symptoms of the disease are covered and matched by the same medicine with similarity of symptoms - that is to say, overpowered, destroyed and extinguished; the few opposite symptoms also disappear of themselves after the expiry of the term of action of the medicament, without retarding the cure in the least.

Here, he somewhat contradicts earlier statements about allopathic regimens making diseases inaccessible to homeopathy.

* And yet the new sect that mixes the two systems appeals (though in vain) to this observation, in order that they may have an excuse for encountering everywhere such exceptions to the general rule in diseases, and to justify their convenient employment of allopathic palliatives, and of other injurious allopathic trash besides, solely for the sake of sparing themselves the trouble of seeking for the suitable homœopathic remedy for each case of disease - and thus conveniently appear as homœopathic physicians, without being such. But their performances are on a par with the system they pursue; they are corrupting.

And right thereafter, again denouncing mixing the two methods. This paragraph seems to make dissidents out of many modern practitioners of homeopathy.

§ 68

(.....)

The Organon of Medicine can be said to be the Bible of homeopathy. It resembles the Bible in one more way: Everything important is reiterated at least twice. In § 68-69, Hahnemann repeats the virtues of homeopathy and the vices of anything else.

§ 70

From what has been already adduced we cannot fail to draw the following inferences:

That everything of a really morbid character and which ought to be cured that the physician can discover in diseases consists solely of the sufferings of the patient, and the sensible alterations in his health, in a word, solely of the totality of the symptoms, by means of which the disease demands the medicine requisite for its relief; while, on the other hand, every internal cause attributed to it, every occult quality or imaginary material morbid principle, is nothing but an idle dream;

Another reiteration, but notable by its brief clarity. In a few sentences, Hahnemann restates his firm belief that medical practitioners should only concern themselves with the symptomatic manifestations of a disease. He specifically out rules the idea of finding causes.

That this derangement of the state of health, which we term disease, can only be converted into health by another revolution effected in the state of health by means of medicines, whose sole curative power, consequently, can only consist in altering man's state of health - that is to say, in a peculiar excitation of morbid symptoms, and is learned with most distinctness and purity by testing them on the healthy body;

Clearly stating the principle that ONLY the SYMPTOMS induced by the medicine count.

That, according to all experience, a natural disease can never be cured by medicines that possess the power of producing in the healthy individual an alien morbid state (dissimilar morbid symptoms) differing from that of the disease to be cured (never, therefore, by an allopathic mode of treatment), and that even in nature no cure ever takes place in which an inherent disease is removed, annihilated and cured by the addition of another disease dissimilar to it, be the new one ever so strong;

Even granted Hahnemann's premises this argument does not hold water: Vitamin C produces no symptoms similar to those of scurvy, what symptoms it does produce in large doses are clearly different from scurvy, yet it cures scurvy. This particular example is so pertinent because it was well known at Hahnemann's time, although the substance had not been named yet. Being a medical practitioner he is in a no-win situation about this: If he did not know about it, he must have been negligent in his studies. If he did know, he is intellectually dishonest by willfully ignoring it because it does not fit his theory.

(.....)

That, however, the third and only other possible mode of treatment (the homeopathic), in which there is employed for the totality of the symptoms of a natural disease a medicine capable of producing the most similar symptoms (.....)

Well, no matter how often a fallacy is repeated, it remains a fallacy. Hahnemann, who repeatedly scoffs at scholars having academic discussions instead of doing practical experiments, nevertheless spends many words on attempted logic proofs for his theory, whereas practical proof would speak infinitely louder.

§ 71

As it is now no longer a matter of doubt that the diseases of mankind consist merely of groups of certain symptoms, and may be annihilated and transformed into health by medicinal substances, but only by such as are capable of artificially producing similar morbid symptoms (and such is the process in all genuine cures), hence the operation of curing is comprised in the three following points:

- I. How is the physician to ascertain what is necessary to be known in order to cure the disease?
- II. How is he to gain a knowledge of the instruments adapted for the cure of the natural disease, the pathogenic powers of the medicines?
- III. What is the most suitable method of employing these artificial morbid agents (medicines) for the cure of natural disease?

Having convinced himself of the fundamental truth of his theory, Hahnemann now sets out to implement it.

§ 72

With respect to the first point, the following will serve as a general preliminary view. The disease to which man is liable are either rapid morbid processes of the abnormally deranged vital force, which have a tendency to finish their course more or less quickly, but always in a moderate time - these are termed acute diseases; - or they are diseases of such a character that, with small, often imperceptible beginnings, dynamically derange the living organism, each in its own peculiar manner, and cause it gradually to deviate from the healthy condition, in such a way that the automatic life energy, called vital force, whose office is to preserve the health, only opposes to them at the commencement and during their progress imperfect, unsuitable, useless resistance, but is unable of itself to extinguish them, but must helplessly suffer (them to spread and) itself to be ever more and more abnormally deranged, until at length the organism is destroyed; these are termed chronic diseases. They are caused by infection with a chronic miasm.

Although Hahnemann does not recognize the at his time fairly recently discovered micro-organisms as disease agents, he does recognize some kind of infectious mechanism. Replace "vital force" with "immune system" and "miasm" with "micro-organism", and you get a decent, if simplified, description of many infectious diseases.

§ 73

As regards acute diseases, they are either of such a kind as attack human beings individually, the exciting cause being injurious influences to which they were particularly exposed. Excesses in food, or an insufficient supply of it, severe physical impression, chills, over heatings, dissipation, strains, etc., or physical irritations, mental emotions, and the like, are exciting causes of such acute febrile affections;

Now, it becomes interesting. Hahnemann has, of course, noticed that various kinds of exposure can trigger disease. He groups these diseases as a distinct group.

in reality, however, they are generally only a transient explosion of latent psora, which spontaneously returns to its dormant state if the acute diseases were not of too violent a character and were soon quelled.

Except for a few diseases, his explanation is wrong. Most of the exposure-triggered diseases are what we now call opportunistic infections. Typically of a type that is ubiquitous, but suppressed by the healthy immune system. We now know that no amount of exposure to cold will make you "catch a cold", unless there is cold virus present.

Or they are of such a kind as attack several persons at the same time, here and there (sporadically), by means of meteoric or telluric influences and injurious agents, the susceptibility for being morbidly affected by which is possessed by only a few persons at one time. Allied to these are those diseases in which many persons are attacked with very similar sufferings from the same cause (epidemicallly); these diseases generally become infectious (contagious) when they prevail among thickly congregated masses of human beings. Thence arise fevers¹, in each instance of a peculiar nature, and, because the cases of disease have an identical origin, they set

up in all those they affect an identical morbid process, which when left to itself terminates in a moderate period of time in death or recovery. The calamities of war, inundations and famine are not infrequently their exciting causes and producers - sometimes they are peculiar acute miasms which recur in the same manner (hence known by some traditional name), which either attack persons but once in a lifetime, as the smallpox, measles, whooping-cough, the ancient, smooth, bright red scarlet fever² of Sydenham, the mumps, etc., or such as recur frequently in pretty much the same manner, the plague of the Levant, the yellow fever of the sea-coast, the Asiatic cholera, etc.

Hahnemann describes his second group of acute diseases, but he does not offer any real explanations. This is not surprising, because epidemical diseases are indeed very difficult to explain using Hahnemann's basic theory of disease. Not only is it difficult to explain how a disease can be contagious, but the life-long immunity gained after suffering certain diseases does not make sense at all in Hahnemann's universe.

1 The homœopathic physician, who does not entertain the foregone conclusion devised by the ordinary school (.....)

Time to flog the competition a bit (again).

§ 74

Among chronic diseases we must still, alas!, reckon those so commonly met with, artificially produced in allopathic treatment by the prolonged use of violent heroic medicines in large and increasing doses, by the abuse of calomel, corrosive sublimate, mercurial ointment, nitrate of silver, iodine and its ointments, opium, valerian, cinchona bark and quinine, foxglove, prussic acid, sulphur and sulphuric acid, perennial purgatives¹, venesections, shedding streams of blood, leeches, issues, setons, etc., (.....)

The 19th century medical practices mentioned are surely deplorable, but Hahnemann's category of chronic diseases are exactly those of long endurance, to which physicians of his time knew no cure, so his conclusion that "allopathy" can't cure them is for free: It is in the definition.

(.....)

Yet another furious attack of the medieval practices that were still applied by many physicians all through the 19th century. We can only agree that such practices were indeed deplorable, but it needs to be pointed out, again, that this in no way constitutes a vindication for homeopathy.

§ 75

These inroads on human health effected by the allopathic non-healing art (more particularly in recent times) are of all chronic diseases the most deplorable, the most incurable; and I regret to add that it is apparently impossible to discover or to hit upon any remedies for their cure when they have reached any considerable height.

§ 76

Only for natural diseases has the beneficent Deity granted us, in homœopathy, the means of affording relief; but those devastations and maimings of the human organism exteriorly and interiorly, effected by years, frequently, of the unsparing exercise of a false art,¹ with its hurtful drugs and treatment, must be remedied by the vital force itself (appropriate aid being given for the eradication of any chronic miasm that may happen to be lurking in the background), if it has not already been too much weakened by such mischievous acts, and can devote several years to this huge operation undisturbed. A human healing art, for the restoration to the normal state of those innumerable abnormal conditions so often produced by the allopathic non-healing art, there is not and cannot be.

Another set of paragraphs that is sadly used by some modern homeopathic practitioners to justify advising patients to discontinue modern medicine, thereby potentially putting them in danger.

1 If the patient at length succumbs, the practiser of such a treatment is in the habit of pointing out to the sorrowing relatives, at the post-mortem examination, these internal organic disfigurements, which are due to his pseudo-art, but which he artfully maintains to be the original incurable disease (see my book, *Die Allopathie, ein Wort der Warnung an Kranke jeder Art*, Leipzig, bei Baumgartner [translated in *Lesser Writings*]). Those deceitful records, the illustrated works on pathological anatomy, exhibit the products of such lamentable bungling. Deceased people from the country and those from the poor of cities who have died without such bungling with hurtful measures are not opened up through pathological anatomy as a rule. Such corruption and deformities would not be found in their corpses. From this fact can be judged the value of the evidence drawn from these beautiful illustrations as well as of the honesty of these authors and book makers.

Note the claim by Hahnemann of what would be found if... A self-admittedly unsubstantiated claim.

§ 77

Those diseases are inappropriately named chronic, which persons incur who expose themselves continually to avoidable noxious influences, who are in the habit of indulging in injurious liquors or aliments, are addicted to dissipation of many kinds which undermine the health, who undergo prolonged abstinence from things that are necessary for the support of life, who reside in unhealthy localities, especially marshy districts, who are housed in cellars or other confined dwellings, who are deprived of exercise or of open air, who ruin their health by overexertion of body or mind, who live in a constant state of worry, etc. These states of ill-health, which persons bring upon themselves, disappear spontaneously, provided no chronic miasm lurks in the body, under an improved mode of living, and they cannot be called chronic diseases.

We can hardly disagree with this.

§ 78

The true natural chronic diseases are those that arise from a chronic miasm, which when left to themselves, and unchecked by the employment of those remedies that are specific for them, always go on increasing and growing worse, notwithstanding the best mental and corporeal regimen, and torment the patient to the end of his life with ever aggravated sufferings. These, excepting those produced by medical malpractice (§ 74), are the most numerous and greatest scourges of the human race; for the most robust constitution, the best regulated mode of living and the most vigorous energy of the vital force are insufficient for their eradication.¹

¹ During the flourishing years of youth and with the commencement of regular menstruation joined to a mode of life beneficial to soul, heart and body, they remain unrecognized for years. Those afflicted appeal in perfect health to their relatives and acquaintances and the disease that was received by infection or inheritance seems to have wholly disappeared. But in later years, after adverse events and conditions of life, they are sure to appear anew and develop the more rapidly and assume a more serious character in proportion as the vital principle has become disturbed by debilitating passions, worry and care, but especially when disordered by inappropriate medicinal treatment.

OK, presenting his idea of the category of chronic diseases, of course including the jab at you know who.

§ 79

Hitherto syphilis alone has been to some extent known as such a chronic miasmatic disease, which when uncured ceases only with the termination of life. Sycosis (the condylomatous disease), equally ineradicable by the vital force without proper medicinal treatment, was not recognized as a chronic miasmatic disease of a peculiar character, which it nevertheless undoubtedly is, and physicians imagined they had cured it when they had destroyed the growths upon the skin, but the persisting dyscrasia occasioned by it escaped their observation.

§ 80

Incalculably greater and more important than the two chronic miasms just named, however, is the chronic miasm of psora, which, while those two reveal their specific internal dyscrasia, the one by the venereal chancre, the other by the cauliflower-like growths, does also, after the completion of the internal infection of the whole organism, announce by a peculiar cutaneous eruption, sometimes consisting only of a few vesicles accompanied by intolerable voluptuous tickling itching (and a peculiar odor), the monstrous internal chronic miasm - the psora, the only real fundamental cause and producer of all the other numerous, I may say innumerable, forms of disease¹, which, under the names of nervous debility, hysteria, hypochondriasis, mania, melancholia, imbecility, madness, epilepsy and convulsions of all sorts, softening of the bones (rachitis), scoliosis and cyphosis, caries, cancer, fungus nematodes, neoplasms, gout, haemorrhoids, jaundice, cyanosis, dropsy, amenorrhoea, haemorrhage from the stomach, nose, lungs, bladder and womb, of asthma and ulceration of the lungs, of impotence and barrenness, of megrim, deafness, cataract, amaurosis, urinary calculus, paralysis, defects of the senses and pains of thousands of kinds, etc., figure in systematic works on pathology as peculiar, independent diseases.

Now it gets interesting! In one sweeping statement, Hahnemann claims a wide range of totally different ailments, from venereal diseases, over cancer and imbecility, to deficiency symptoms like rachitis, to be really something he calls psora. He also tells us that it is useless to try to distinguish these as discrete diseases. In other words, he literally claims that hemorrhoids and caries are basically the same disease!

¹ I spent twelve years in investigating the source of this incredibly large number of chronic affections, in ascertaining and collecting certain proofs of this great truth, which had remained unknown to all former or contemporary observers, and in discovering at the same time the principal (antipsoric) remedies, which collectively are

nearly a match for this thousand-headed monster of disease in all its different developments and forms. I have published my observations on this subject in the book entitled *The Chronic Diseases* (4 vols., Dresden, Arnold. [2nd edit., Dusseldorf, Schaub.]) before I had obtained this knowledge I could only treat the whole number of chronic diseases as isolated, individual maladies, with those medicinal substances whose pure effects had been tested on healthy persons up to that period, so that every case of chronic disease was treated by my disciples according to the group of symptoms it presented, just like an idiopathic disease, and it was often so for cured that sick mankind rejoiced at the extensive remedial treasures already amassed by the new healing art. How much greater cause is there now for rejoicing that the desired goal has been so much more nearly attained, inasmuch as the recently discovered and far more specific homœopathic remedies for chronic affections arising from psora (properly termed antipsoric remedies) and the special instructions for their preparation and employment have been published; and from among them the true physician can now select for his curative agents those whose medicinal symptoms correspond in the most similar (homœopathic) manner to the chronic disease he has to cure; and thus, by the employment of (antipsoric) medicines more suitable for this miasm, he is enabled to render more essential service and almost invariably to effect a perfect cure.

So, in spite of his earlier statements about the futility of such efforts, Hahnemann now tells us that he spent twelve years investigating the hidden source of chronic diseases. He also claims that he found a "great truth" and cures for most of these diseases. One has to be a little skeptical of this claim since all those diseases were still around a century later, and only the advent of modern medicine has led to the conquering of some of them.

§ 81

The fact that this extremely ancient infecting agent has gradually passed, in some hundreds of generations, through many millions of human organisms and has thus attained an incredible development, renders it in some measure conceivable how it can now display such innumerable morbid forms in the great family of mankind, particularly when we consider what a number of circumstances¹ contribute to the production of these great varieties of chronic diseases (secondary symptoms of psora), besides the indescribable diversity of men in respect of their congenital corporeal constitutions, so that it is no wonder if such a variety of injurious agencies, acting from within and from without and sometimes continually, on such a variety of organisms permeated with the psoric miasm, should produce an innumerable variety of defects, injuries, derangements and sufferings, which have hitherto been treated of in the old pathological works², under a number of special names, as diseases of an independent character.

So here we actually see Hahnemann acknowledge an infectious agent as the cause of a disease. Yet by a peculiar slip of logic, he still proposes treatment based on the homeopathic principle, stimulating the hypothetical vital force, instead of targeting the infectious agent, DESPITE his assumption made in §78 that the VF cannot cope with this type of disease.

(.....)

² How many improper ambiguous names do not these works contain, under each of which are included excessively different morbid conditions, (.....) The candid Sydenham alone perceived this, when he (*Obs. med., cap. ii, De morb, epid.*) insists upon the necessity of not considering any epidemic disease as having occurred before and treating it in the same way as another, since all that occur successively, be they ever so numerous, differ from one another (.....)

From all this it is clear that these useless and misused names of diseases ought to have no influence on the practice of the true physician, who knows that he has to judge of and to cure diseases, not according to the similarity of the name of a single one of their symptoms, but according to the totality of the signs of the individual state of each particular patient, whose affection it is his duty carefully to investigate, but never to give a hypothetical guess at it.

(.....)

After having claimed that the wide range of chronic diseases come from the same basic cause, in this long paragraph, Hahnemann concludes that it is wrong to name them individually, and he goes as far as claiming that different outbreaks of the same disease should not be treated as if they were the same. This is another area where later experience has showed him to be thoroughly wrong.

§ 82

Although, by the discovery of that great source of chronic diseases, as also by the discovery of the specific homœopathic remedies for the psora, medicine has advanced some steps nearer to a knowledge of the nature of the majority of diseases it has to cure, yet, for settling the indication in each case of chronic (psoric) disease he is called on to cure, the duty of a careful apprehension of its ascertainable symptoms and characteristics is as indispensable for the homœopathic physician as it was before that discovery, as no real cure of this or of other diseases can take place without a strict particular treatment (individualization) of each case of disease -

only that in this investigation some difference is to be made when the affection is an acute and rapidly developed disease, and when it is a chronic one; seeing that, in acute disease, the chief symptoms strike us and become evident to the senses more quickly, and hence much less time is requisite for tracing the picture of the disease and much fewer questions are required to be asked¹, as almost everything is self-evident, than in a chronic disease which has been gradually progressing for several years, in which the symptoms are much more difficult to be ascertained.

1 Hence the following directions for investigating the symptoms are only partially applicable for acute diseases.

§ 83

This individualizing examination of a case of disease, for which I shall only give in this place general directions, of which the practitioner will bear in mind only what is applicable for each individual case, demands of the physician nothing but freedom from prejudice and sound senses, attention in observing and fidelity in tracing the picture of the disease.

Here starts the description of how patients should be treated.

§ 84

The patient details the history of his sufferings; those about him tell what they heard him complain of, how he has behaved and what they have noticed in him; the physician sees, hears, and remarks by his other senses what there is of an altered or unusual character about him. He writes down accurately all that the patient and his friends have told him in the very expressions used by them. Keeping silence himself he allows them to say all they have to say, and refrains from interrupting them¹ unless they wander off to other matters. The physician advises them at the beginning of the examination to speak slowly, in order that he may take down in writing the important parts of what the speakers say.

1 Every interruption breaks the train of thought of the narrators, and all they would have said at first does not again occur to them in precisely the same manner after that.

§ 85

He begins a fresh line with every new circumstance mentioned by the patient or his friends, so that the symptoms shall be all ranged separately one below the other. He can thus add to any one, that may at first have been related in too vague a manner, but subsequently more explicitly explained.

Excellent investigation technique! Hahnemann tells practitioners to actually LISTEN to their patients. Lots of modern doctors might take heed here!

§ 86

When the narrators have finished what they would say of their own accord, the physician then reverts to each particular symptom and elicits more precise information respecting it in the following manner; he reads over the symptoms as they were related to him one by one, and about each of them he inquires for further particulars, e.g., at what period did this symptom occur? Was it previous to taking the medicine he had hitherto been using? While taking the medicine? Or only some days after leaving off the medicine? What kind of pain, what sensation exactly, was it that occurred on this spot? Where was the precise spot? Did the pain occur in fits and by itself, at various times? Or was it continued, without intermission? How long did it last? At what time of the day or night, and in what position of the body was it worst, or ceased entirely? What was the exact nature of this or that event or circumstance mentioned - described in plain words?

Caveats here! In this phase, the account runs the risk of being heavily influenced by the practitioner; if he is not VERY careful, people will tell him what they think he wants to hear.

§ 87

And thus the physician obtains more precise information respecting each particular detail, but without ever framing his questions so as to suggest the answer to the patient¹, so that he shall only have to answer yes or no; else he will be misled to answer in the affirmative or negative something untrue, half true, or not strictly correct, either from indolence or in order to please his interrogator, from which a false picture of the disease and an unsuitable mode of treatment must result.

1 For instance the physician should not ask, Was not this or that circumstance present? He should never be guilty of making such suggestions, which tend to seduce the patient into giving a false answer and a false account of his symptoms.

Hahnemann addresses the abovementioned problem well in this paragraph, but it remains as a likely source of error since no objective validation of findings takes place.

§ 88

(.....)

Two further paragraphs on which information to try to get from the patient. These paragraphs talk about a number of physical facts, like character of stool, etc., but still only based on the interrogation of the patient and, when possible, people close to him/her. No actual examination takes place, and it is difficult to imagine that a practitioner should be able to extract such detailed information from a patient and expect to receive only objective information.

§ 90

When the physician has finished writing down these particulars, he then makes a note of what he himself observes in the patient¹, and ascertains how much of that was peculiar to the patient in his healthy state.

¹ For example, how the patient behaved during the visit - whether he was morose, quarrelsome, hasty, lachrymose, anxious, despairing or sad, or hopeful, calm etc. Whether he was in a drowsy state or in any way dull of comprehension; whether he spoke hoarsely, or in a low tone, or incoherently, or how other wise did he talk? what was the color of his face and eyes, and of his skin generally? what degree of liveliness and power was there in his expression and eyes? what was the state of his tongue, his breathing, the smell from his mouth, and his hearing? were his pupils dilated or contracted? how rapidly and to what extent did they alter in the dark and in the light? what was the character of the pulse? what was the condition of the abdomen? how moist or hot, how cold or dry to the touch, was the skin of this or that part or generally? whether he lay with head thrown back, with mouth half or wholly open, with the arms placed above the head, on his back, or in what other position? what effort did he make to raise himself? and anything else in him that may strike the physician as being remarkable.

This is the closest we get to an objective examination.

(.....)

Several more paragraphs giving detailed and good advice on how to get information from patients, including patients that are exaggerating or the opposite.

§ 100

In investigating the totality of the symptoms of epidemic and sporadic diseases it is quite immaterial whether or not something similar has ever appeared in the world before under the same or any other name. The novelty or peculiarity of a disease of that kind makes no difference either in the mode of examining or of treating it, as the physician must any way regard to pure picture of every prevailing disease as if it were something new and unknown, and investigate it thoroughly for itself, if he desire to practice medicine in a real and radical manner, never substituting conjecture for actual observation, never taking for granted that the case of disease before him is already wholly or partially known, but always carefully examining it in all its phases; and this mode of procedure is all the more requisite in such cases, as a careful examination will show that every prevailing disease is in many respects a phenomenon of a unique character, differing vastly from all previous epidemics, to which certain names have been falsely applied,

A spectacular statement when viewed from the reference frame of modern medicine. It comes, naturally, from the fact that Hahnemann does in principle not bother about causative agents (although, as we have seen, he does recognize some). From this standpoint, each case should be viewed independently. As causes for diseases were discovered, the medical profession concentrated on identifying the cause, which makes it pertinent to do the opposite of what Hahnemann teaches, and compare cases.

with the exception of those epidemics resulting from a contagious principle that always remains the same, such as smallpox, measles, etc.

A remark without which Hahnemann would be in serious self-contradiction. How such a class of diseases fit into his general principle remains, however, unexplained.

§ 101

It may easily happen that in the first case of an epidemic disease that presents itself to the physician's notice he does not at once obtain a knowledge of its complete picture, as it is only by a close observation of several cases of every such collective disease that he can become conversant with the totality of its signs and symptoms. The carefully observing physician can, however, from the examination of even the first and second patients, often arrive so nearly at a knowledge of the true state as to have in his mind a characteristic portrait of it, and even to succeed in finding a suitable, homœopathically adapted remedy for it.

§ 102

In the course of writing down the symptoms of several cases of this kind the sketch of the disease picture becomes ever more and more complete, not more spun out and verbose, but more significant (more characteristic), and including more of the peculiarities of this collective disease; on the one hand, the general symptoms (e.g., loss of appetite, sleeplessness, etc.) become precisely defined as to their peculiarities; and on the other, the more marked and special symptoms which are peculiar to but few diseases and of rarer occurrence, at least in the same combination, become prominent and constitute what is characteristic of this malady.¹ All those affected with the disease prevailing at a given time have certainly contracted it from one and the same source and hence are suffering from the same disease; but the whole extent of such an epidemic disease and the totality of its symptoms (the knowledge whereof, which is essential for enabling us to choose the most suitable homœopathic remedy for this array of symptoms, is obtained by a complete survey of the morbid picture) cannot be learned from one single patient, but is only to be perfectly deduced (abstracted) and ascertained from the sufferings of several patients of different constitutions.

¹ The physician who has already, in the first cases, been able to choose a remedy approximating to the homœopathic specific, will, from the subsequence cases, be enabled either to verify the suitability of the medicine chosen, or to discover a more appropriate, the most appropriate homœopathic remedy.

Is it just me, or is this a direct contradiction of §100?

§ 103

In the same manner as has here been taught relative to the epidemic disease, which are generally of an acute character, the miasmatic chronic maladies, which, as I have shown, always remain the same in their essential nature, especially the psora, must be investigated, as to the whole sphere of their symptoms, in a much more minute manner than has ever been done before, for in them also one patient only exhibits a portion of their symptoms, a second, a third, and so on, present some other symptoms, which also are but a (dissevered, as it were), portion of the totality of the symptoms which constitute the entire extent of this malady, so that the whole array of the symptoms belonging to such a miasmatic, chronic disease, and especially to the psora, can only be ascertained from the observation of very many single patients affected with such a chronic disease, and without a complete survey and collective picture of these symptoms the medicines capable of curing the whole malady homœopathically (to wit, the antipsorics) cannot be discovered; and these medicines are, at the same time, the true remedies of the several patients suffering from such chronic affections.

So it would seem that after all cases should be compared. One can only say that Hahnemann's writings are sometimes difficult to penetrate.

§ 104

When the totality of the symptoms that specially mark and distinguish the case of disease or, in other words, when the picture of the disease, whatever be its kind, is once accurately sketched,¹ the most difficult part of the task is accomplished. The physician has then the picture of the disease, especially if it be a chronic one, always before him to guide him in his treatment; he can investigate it in all its parts and can pick out the characteristic symptoms, in order to oppose to these, that is to say, to the whole malady itself, a very similar artificial morbific force, in the shape of a homœopathically chosen medicinal substance, selected from the lists of symptoms of all the medicines whose pure effects have been ascertained. And when, during the treatment, he wishes to ascertain what has been the effect of the medicine, and what change has taken place in the patient's state, at this fresh examination of the patient he only needs to strike out of the list of the symptoms noted down at the first visit those that have become ameliorated, to mark what still remain, and add any new symptoms that may have supervened.

That is it! Period. Having now "examined" the patient, Hahnemann turns to prescribing the proper treatment.

¹ The old school physician gave himself very little trouble in this matter in his mode of treatment. He would not listen to any minute detail of all the circumstances of his case by the patient; indeed, he frequently cut him short in his relation of his sufferings, in order that he might not be delayed in the rapid writing of his prescription, composed of a variety of ingredients unknown to him in their true effects. No allopathic physician, as has been said, sought to learn all the circumstances of the patient's case, and still less did he make a note in writing of them. On seeing the patient again several days afterwards he recollected nothing concerning the few details he had heard at the first visit (having in the meantime seen so many other patients laboring under dif-

ferent affections); he had allowed everything to go in at one ear and out at the other. At subsequent visits he only asked a few general questions, went through the ceremony of feeling the pulse at the wrist, looked at the tongue, and at the same moment wrote another prescription, on equally irrational principles, or ordered the first one to be continued (in considerable quantities several times a day), and, with a graceful bow, he hurried off to the fiftieth or sixtieth patient he had to visit, in this thoughtless way, in the course of that forenoon. The profession which of all others requires actually the most reflection, a conscientious, careful examination of the state of each individual patient and a special treatment founded thereon, was conducted in this manner by persons who called themselves physicians, rational practitioners. The result, as might naturally be expected, was almost invariably bad; and yet patients had to go to them for advice, partly because there were none better to be had, partly for fashion's sake.

But not before one of the more slanderous slashes at the competition. I include it in full, because while treatment methods have improved much, we still meet physicians with a behavior much like the one Hahnemann describes here

§ 105

The second point of the business of a true physician related to acquiring a knowledge of the instruments intended for the cure of the natural diseases, investigating the pathogenetic power of the medicines, in order, when called on to cure, to be able to select from among them one, from the list of whose symptoms an artificial disease may be constructed, as similar as possible to the totality of the principal symptoms of the natural disease sought to be cured.

§ 106

The whole pathogenetic effect of the several medicines must be known; that is to say, all the morbid symptoms and alterations in the health that each of them is specially capable of developing in the healthy individual must first have been observed as far as possible, before we can hope to be able to find among them, and to select, suitable homœopathic remedies for most of the natural disease.

Beginning to describe how to select medicine.

§ 107

If, in order to ascertain this, medicines be given to sick persons only, even though they be administered singly and alone, then little or nothing precise is seen of their true effects, as those peculiar alterations of the health to be expected from the medicine are mixed up with the symptoms of the disease and can seldom be distinctly observed.

§ 108

There is, therefore, no other possible way in which the peculiar effects of medicines on the health of individuals can be accurately ascertained - there is no sure, no more natural way of accomplishing this object, than to administer the several medicines experimentally, in moderate doses, to healthy persons, in order to ascertain what changes, symptoms and signs of their influence each individually produces on the health of the body and of the mind; that is to say, what disease elements they are able and tend to produce¹, since, as has been demonstrated (§§ 24-27), all the curative power of medicines lies in this power they possess of changing the state of man's health, and is revealed by observation of the latter.

*Here comes the idea of **self-proving**, that is, the charting of symptoms induced in healthy persons by the medicines.*

¹ Not one single physician, as far as I know, during the previous two thousand five hundred years, thought of this so natural, so absolutely necessary and only genuine mode of testing medicines for their pure and peculiar effects in deranging the health of man, in order to learn what morbid state each medicine is capable of curing, except the great and immoral Albrecht von Haller. He alone, besides myself, saw the necessity of this (vide the Preface to the Pharmacopoeia Helvet., Basil, 1771, fol., p.12) (.....) But no one, not a single physician, attended to or followed up this invaluable hint.

First of all, Hahnemann is either ignorant or lying; even at his time, medical researchers had long been busy testing potential medicines on healthy people, including themselves, and observing the effects. Second, only his own doctrine about a symptom treating a symptom makes such testing a crucial method. To researchers looking for medicines to target causative agents, such testing has second priority.

§ 109

I was the first that opened up this path, which I have pursued with a perseverance that could only arise and be kept up by a perfect conviction of the great truth, fraught with such blessings to humanity, that it is only by the homœopathic employment of medicines¹ that the certain cure of human maladies is possible.²

1 It is impossible that there can be another true, best method of curing dynamic diseases (i.e., all diseases not strictly surgical) besides homœopathy, just as it is impossible to draw more than one straight line betwixt two given points. He who imagines that there are other modes of curing diseases besides it could not have appreciated homœopathy fundamentally nor practised it with sufficient care, nor could he ever have seen or read cases of properly performed homœopathic cures; nor, on the other hand, could he have discerned the baselessness of all allopathic modes of treating diseases and their bad or even dreadful effects, if, with such lax indifference, he places the only true healing art on an equality with those hurtful methods of treatment, or alleges the latter to be auxiliaries to homœopathy which it could not do without! My true, conscientious followers, the pure homœopaths, with their successful, almost never-failing treatment, might teach these persons better.

Hahnemann's firm belief in having found the holy grail of medicine can only be termed as religious. Certainly, already at his time, there were observations that would have put some doubt in a more skeptical mind. For instance the phenomenon of vaccine.

(.....)

§ 110

I saw, moreover, that the morbid lesions which previous authors had observed to result from medicinal substances when taken into the stomach of healthy persons, either in large doses given by mistake or in order to produce death in themselves or others, or under other circumstances, accorded very much with my own observations when experimenting with the same substances on myself and other healthy individuals. These authors give details of what occurred as histories of poisoning and as proofs of the pernicious effects of these powerful substances, chiefly in order to warn others from their use; partly also for the sake of exalting their own skill, when, under the use of the remedies they employed to combat these dangerous accidents, health gradually returned; but partly also, when the persons so affected died under their treatment, in order to seek their own justification in the dangerous character of these substances, which they then termed poisons. None of these observers ever dreamed that the symptoms they recorded merely as proofs of the noxious and poisonous character of these substances were sure revelations of the power of these drugs to extinguish curatively similar symptoms occurring in natural disease, that these their pathogenetic phenomena were intimations of their homœopathic curative action, and that the only possible way to ascertain their medicinal powers is to observe those changes of health medicines are capable of producing in the healthy organism; for the pure, peculiar powers of medicines available for the cure of disease are to be learned neither by any ingenious a priori speculations, nor by the smell, taste or appearance of the drugs, nor by their chemical analysis, nor yet by the employment of several of them at one time in a mixture (prescription) in diseases; it was never suspected that these histories of medicinal diseases would one day furnish the first rudiments of the true, pure materia medica, which from the earliest times until now has consisted solely of false conjectures and fictions of the imagination - that is to say, did not exist at all.¹

1 See what I have said on this subject in the "Examination of the Sources of the Ordinary Materia Medica," prefixed to the third part of my *Reine Arzneimittellehr*: (translated in the *Materia Medica Pura*, vol. ii).

§ 111

The agreement of my observations on the pure effects of medicines with these older ones - although they were recorded without reference to any therapeutic object, - and the very concordance of these accounts with others of the same kind by different authors must easily convince us that medicinal substances act in the morbid changes they produce in the healthy human body according to fixed, eternal laws of nature, and by virtue of these are enabled to produce certain, reliable disease symptoms each according to its own peculiar character.

It is a little difficult to see what Hahnemann has really discovered here, except that certain effects on the human body are characteristic for certain substances. For a modern mind, this is hardly a revelation, but we must again remember that Hahnemann's idea of how the organism functions is fundamentally different.

§ 112

In those older prescriptions of the often dangerous effects of medicines ingested in excessively large doses we notice certain states that were produced, not at the commencement, but towards the termination of these sad events, and which were of an exactly opposite nature to those that first appeared. These symptoms, the very reverse of the primary action (§ 63) or proper action of the medicines on the vital force are the reaction of the vital force of the organism, its secondary action (§§ 62-67), of which, however, there is seldom or hardly ever the least trace from experiments with moderate doses on healthy bodies, and from small doses none whatever. In the homœopathic curative operation the living organism reacts from these only so much as is requisite to raise the health again to the normal healthy state (§ 67).

Hahnemann hints at a mechanism he has found, but gives no examples. We are simply assumed to take his word for it.

§ 113

The only exceptions to this are the narcotic medicines. As they, in their primary action, take away sometimes the sensibility and sensation, sometimes the irritability, it frequently happens that in their secondary action, even from moderate experimental doses on healthy bodies, an increased sensibility (and a greater irritability) is observable.

§ 114

With the exception of these narcotic substances, in experiments with moderate doses of medicine on healthy bodies, we observe only their primary action, i.e., those symptoms wherewith the medicine deranges the health of the human being and develops in him a morbid state of longer or shorter duration.

A few more exceptions. The trouble is that Hahnemann's earlier sweeping and absolute statements do not really leave room for exceptions (§32: "... acts at all times, under all circumstances, on every living human being, and produces in him its peculiar symptoms ") Hahnemann is fond of claiming his theories to be natural (even divine) law, but then it does not look good with exceptions.

§ 115

Among these symptoms, there occur in the case of some medicines not a few which are partially, or under certain conditions, directly opposite to other symptoms that have previously or subsequently appeared, but which are not therefore to be regarded as actual secondary action or the mere reaction of the vital force, but which only represent the alternating state of the various paroxysms of the primary action; they are termed alternating actions.

So, it always works, and if it doesn't, we just give it a different name. When you look closely, Hahnemann uses a lot of this type of hedging.

§ 116

Some symptoms are produced by the medicines more frequently - that is to say, in many individuals, others more rarely or in few persons, some only in very few healthy bodies.

§ 117

To the latter category belong the so-called idiosyncrasies, by which are meant peculiar corporeal constitutions which, although otherwise healthy, possess a disposition to be brought into a more or less morbid state by certain things which seem to produce no impression and no change in many other individuals.¹ But this inability to make an impression on every one is only apparent. For as two things are required for the production of these as well as all other morbid alterations in the health of man - to wit., the inherent power of the influencing substance, and the capability of the vital force that animates the organism to be influenced by it - the obvious derangements of health in the so-called idiosyncrasies cannot be laid to the account of these peculiar constitutions alone, but they must also be ascribed to these things that produce them, in which must lie the power of making the same impressions on all human bodies, yet in such a manner that but a small number of healthy constitutions have a tendency to allow themselves to be brought into such an obvious morbid condition by them. That these agents do actually make this impression on every healthy body is shown by this, that when employed as remedies they render effectual homœopathic service² to all sick persons for morbid symptoms similar to those they seem to be only capable of producing in so-called idiosyncratic individuals.

¹ Some few persons are apt to faint from the smell of roses and to fall into many other morbid, and sometimes dangerous states from partaking of mussels, crabs or the roe of the barbel, from touching the leaves of some kinds of sumach, etc.

² Thus the Princess Maria Porphyrognita restored her brother, the Emperor Alexius, who suffered from faintings, by sprinkling him with rose water in the presence of his aunt Eudoxia (Hist. byz. Alexias, lib. xv, p. 503, ed. Posser); and Horstius (Oper., iii, p.59) saw great benefit from rose vinegar in cases of syncope.

More hedging and backing off from the earlier, sweeping claims. It almost seems like reality has started to make an impact. It is this thick veil of exceptions that enable homeopaths to always make observations fit their expectations.

§ 118

Every medicine exhibits peculiar actions on the human frame, which are not produced in exactly the same manner by any other medicinal substance of a different kind.¹

(.....)

A new sweeping statement, but its interpretation, of course, depends on how you define "different kinds" of medicine.

§ 119

As certainly as every species of plant differs in its external form, mode of life and growth, in its taste and smell from every other species and genus of plant, as certainly as every mineral and salt differs from all others, in its external as well as its internal physical and chemical properties (which alone should have sufficed to prevent any confounding of one with another), so certainly do they all differ and diverge among themselves in their pathogenetic - consequently also in their therapeutic - effects.¹ Each of these substances produces alterations in the health of human beings in a peculiar, different, yet determinate manner, so as to preclude the possibility of confounding one with another.²

¹ Anyone who has a thorough knowledge of, and can appreciate the remarkable difference of, effects on the health of man of every single substance from those of every other, will readily perceive that among them there can be, in a medical point of view, no equivalent remedies whatever, no surrogates. Only those who do not know the pure, positive effects of the different medicines can be so foolish as to try to persuade us that one can serve in the stead of the other, and can in the same disease prove just as serviceable as the other. Thus do ignorant children confound the most essential different things, because they scarcely know their external appearances, far less their real value, their true importance and their very dissimilar inherent properties.

More of the absolute, sweeping claims that Hahnemann is so fond of. This one obviously does not hold water, unless one is ready to back it with some really broad definitions. Earlier, Hahnemann has (§115 -118) already taken exception to some differences in symptoms for the same substance when administered to different persons. With this, he cannot avoid contradicting the statements in §119, since there will be numerous substances that produce the same effects, under the definition of "same" given in §115-118. Especially among those that produce little or no symptoms at all. Also, numerous poisonous herbs, although of different species, contain the same poisonous substance, and will therefore produce the same symptoms. So we are forced to conclude that Hahnemann is simply making an unfounded claim because it happens to fit his purpose. Unfortunately, he uses this baseless claim to launch yet another attack at people who disagree with him. This can only be termed as intellectual dishonesty:

² If this be pure truth, as it undoubtedly is, then no physician who would not be regarded as devoid of reason, and who would not act contrary to the dictates of his conscience, the sole arbiter of real worth, can employ in the treatment of diseases any medicinal substance but one with whose real significance he is thoroughly and perfectly conversant, i.e., whose positive action on the health of healthy individuals he has so accurately tested that he knows for certain that it is capable of producing a very similar morbid state, more similar than any other medicine with which he is perfectly acquainted, to that presented by the case of disease he intends to cure by means of it; for, as has been shown above, neither man, nor mighty Nature herself, can effect a perfect, rapid and permanent cure otherwise than with a homœopathic remedy. Henceforth no true physician can abstain from making such experiment, in order to obtain this most necessary and only knowledge of the medicines that are essential to cure, this knowledge which has hitherto been neglected by the physicians in all ages. In all former ages - posterity will scarcely believe it - physicians have hitherto contented themselves with blindly prescribing for diseases medicines whose value was unknown, and which had never been tested relative to their highly important, very various, pure dynamic action on the health of man; and, moreover, they mingled several of these unknown medicines that differed so vastly among each other in one formula, and left it to chance to determine what effects should thereby be produced on the patient. This is just as if a madman should force his way into the workshop of an artisan, seize upon handfuls of very different tools, with the uses of all of which he is quite unacquainted, in order, as he imagines, to work at the objects of art he sees around him. I need hardly remark that these would be destroyed, I may say utterly ruined, by his senseless operations.

Declaring his self-contradictory statement "pure truth", Hahnemann launches what he no doubt sees as a devastating attack on non-homeopathic practitioners. As always, when unfounded, such an attack hurts the attacker more than the attacked.

§ 120

Therefore medicines, on which depend man's life and death, disease and health, must be thoroughly and most carefully distinguished from one another, and for this purpose tested by careful, pure experiments on the healthy body for the purpose of ascertaining their powers and real effects, in order to obtain an accurate knowledge of them, and to enable us to avoid any mistake in their employment in diseases, for it is only by correct selection of them that the greatest of all earthly blessings, the health of the body and of the mind, can be rapidly and permanently restored.

Taken completely out of context, this is a sound and undoubtedly true statement. In context, it is tainted by the shaky grounds upon which Hahnemann's definitions rest.

§ 121

In proving medicines to ascertain their effects on the healthy body, it must be borne in mind that the strong, heroic substances, as they are termed, are liable even in small doses to produce changes in the health even of robust persons. Those of milder power must be given for these experiments in more considerable quantities; in order to observe the action of the very weakest, however, the subjects of experiment should be persons free from disease, and who are delicate, irritable and sensitive.

*Beginning to define the grounds for **self proving**. And already putting the basis for fallacy: **Delicate, irritable and sensitive persons are needed. The soil is fertilized for **observer bias**.***

§ 122

In these experiments - on which depends the exactitude of the whole medical art, and the weal of all future generations of mankind - no other medicines should be employed except such as are perfectly well known, and of whose purity, genuineness and energy we are thoroughly assured.

§ 123

Each of these medicines must be taken in a perfectly simple, unadulterated form; the indigenous plants in the form of freshly expressed juice, mixed with a little alcohol to prevent it spoiling; exotic vegetable substances, however, in the form of powder, or tincture prepared with alcohol when they were in the fresh state and afterwards mingled with a certain proportion of water; salts and gums, however, should be dissolved in water just before being taken. If the plant can only be procured in its dry state, and if its powers are naturally weak, in that case there may be used for the experiment an infusion of it, made by cutting the herb into small pieces and pouring boiling water on it, so as to extract its medicinal parts; immediately after its preparation it must be swallowed while still warm, as all expressed vegetable juices and all aqueous infusions of herbs, without the addition of spirit, pass rapidly into fermentation and decomposition, whereby all their medicinal properties are lost.

A call for care and exactitude in preparing pure test substances. This is good basic science.

§ 124

For these experiments every medicinal substance must be employed quite alone and perfectly pure, without the admixture of any foreign substance, and without taking anything else of a medicinal nature the same day, nor yet on the subsequent days, nor during all the time we wish to observe the effects of the medicine.

More good scientific practice.

§ 125

During all the time the experiment lasts the diet must be strictly regulated; it should be as much as possible destitute of spices, of a purely nutritious and simple character, green vegetables,¹ roots and all salads and herb soups (which, even when most carefully prepared, possess some disturbing medicinal qualities) should be avoided. The drinks are to be those usually partaken of, as little stimulating as possible.²

1 Young green peas, green French beans (+ 'boiled potatoes' in the Sixth Edition) and in all cases carrots are allowable, as the least medicinal vegetables.

2 The subject of experiment must either be not in the habit of taking pure wine, brandy, coffee or tea, or he must have totally abstained for a considerable time previously from the use of these injurious beverages, some of which are stimulating, others medicinal.

Now it gets problematic. The special diet during the test period, instead of avoiding disturbances from other substances, is likely to produce its own set of observations in the "delicate, irritable and sensitive" test subjects, thus providing potential serious noise in the result. As an aside, one cannot help wonder how many modern self-provers follow these rules.

§ 126

The person who is proving the medicine must be pre-eminently trustworthy and conscientious and during the whole time of the experiment avoid all over-exertion of mind and body, all sorts of dissipation and disturbing passions; he should have no urgent business to distract his attention; he must devote himself to careful self-

observation and not be disturbed while so engaged; his body must be in what is for him a good state of health, and he must possess a sufficient amount of intelligence to be able to express and describe his sensations in accurate terms.

Again, special conditions. Persons must devote their time to careful self-observation. What makes this so absurd is that Hahnemann IS perfectly aware of the power of self-suggestion: In §17 note 1 he goes as far as saying that a person may cause his own death by self-suggestion, yet now he bases his investigation on delicate, irritable and sensitive persons concentrating on self-observation while on a special diet! Somehow, incredibly, Hahnemann manages to miss the perspective that these test subjects could experience practically ANYTHING through self-suggestion.

§ 127

The medicines must be tested on both males and females, in order also to reveal the alterations of the health they produce in the sexual sphere.

That, in itself, is certainly a good idea.

§ 128

The most recent observations have shown that medicinal substances, when taken in their crude state by the experimenter for the purpose of testing their peculiar effects, do not exhibit nearly the full amount of the powers that lie hidden in them which they do when they are taken for the same object in high dilutions potentized by proper trituration and succussion, by which simple operations the powers which in their crude state lay hidden, and, as it were, dormant, are developed and roused into activity to an incredible extent. In this manner we now find it best to investigate the medicinal powers even of such substances as are deemed weak, and the plan we adopt is to give to the experimenter, on an empty stomach, daily from four to six very small globules of the thirtieth potency of such a substance, moistened with a little water or dissolved in more or less water and thoroughly mixed, and let him continue this for several days.

Again, we are presented to another of homeopathy's great dogmas, and, from a scientific view, great weaknesses: The "potentializing" of medicines. This implies successive dilution processes where the original solution is diluted to and beyond the point where not a single molecule of the original substance can be expected to exist in the end-product. A special form of vigorous stirring called "succussion" is used. Needless to say, this is an obvious point of attack for any scientifically minded critic: Homeopathic medicines are chemically indistinguishable from pure solution medium (usually distilled water).

Much pseudoscientific mumbo-jumbo is presented from modern homeopaths to try to explain how such medicines can retain any effect, let alone an amplified effect, but none of the explanations can withstand even the most superficial chemical and/or logical scrutiny.

§ 129

If the effects that result from such a dose are but slight, a few more globules may be taken daily, until they become more distinct and stronger and the alterations of the health more conspicuous; for all persons are not effected by a medicine in an equally great degree; on the contrary, there is a vast variety in this respect, so that sometimes an apparently weak individual may be scarcely at all affected by moderate doses of a medicine known to be of a powerful character, while he is strongly enough acted on by others of a much weaker kind. And, on the other hand, there are very robust persons who experience very considerable morbid symptoms from an apparently mild medicine, and only slighter symptoms from stronger drugs. Now, as this cannot be known beforehand, it is advisable to commence in every instance with a small dose of the drug and, where suitable and requisite, to increase the dose more and more from day to day.

§ 130

If, at the very commencement, the first dose administered shall have been sufficiently strong, this advantage is gained, that the experimenter learns the order of succession of the symptoms and can note down accurately the period at which each occurs, which is very useful in leading to a knowledge of the genius of the medicine, for then the order of the primary actions, as also that of the alternating actions, is observed in the most unambiguous manner. A very moderate dose, even, often suffices for the experiment, provided only the experimenter is endowed with sufficiently delicate sensitiveness, and is very attentive to his sensations. The duration of the action of a drug can only be ascertained by a comparison of several experiments.

A clearly non-scientific approach. Doses are simply increased till something is observed! More or less directly, Hahnemann has repeatedly chastised allopathic practitioners for exactly the same thing.

§ 131

If, however, in order to ascertain anything at all, the same medicine must be given to the same person to test for several successive days in ever increasing doses, we thereby learn, no doubt, the various morbid states this medicine is capable of producing in a general manner, but we do not ascertain their order of succession; and the subsequent dose often removes, curatively, some one or other of the symptoms caused by the previous dose, or develops in its stead an opposite state; such symptoms should be enclosed in brackets, to mark their ambiguity, until subsequent purer experiments show whether they are the reaction of the organism and secondary action or an alternating action of this medicine.

Hahnemann realizes that even according to his own theories, this practice poses a problem.

§ 132

But when the object is, without reference to the sequential order of the phenomena and the duration of the action of the drug, only to ascertain the symptoms themselves, especially those of a weak medicinal substance, in that case the preferable course to pursue is to give it for several successive days, increasing the dose every day. In this manner the action of an unknown medicine, even of the mildest nature, will be revealed, especially if tested on sensitive persons.

But accepts it nevertheless.

§ 133

On experiencing any particular sensation from the medicine, it is useful, indeed necessary, in order to determine the exact character of the symptom, to assume various positions while it lasts, and to observe whether, by moving the part affected, by walking in the room or the open air, by standing, sitting or lying the symptom is increased, diminished or removed, and whether it returns on again assuming the position in which it was first observed, - whether it is altered by eating or drinking, or by any other condition, or by speaking, coughing, sneezing or any other action of the body, and at the same time to note at what time of the day or night it usually occurs in the most marked manner, whereby what is peculiar to and characteristic of each symptom will become apparent.

More in-deep exercises in order to watch for symptoms. Imagine going through all this, on a special diet, and for days. Who would NOT notice some kind, any kind, of symptoms? How can somebody write that people might die from psychosomatic disease, denounce most of his contemporary colleague medical practitioners as blundering idiots, yet assume that he can trust observations of test subjects under these conditions? This is truly one of the weirdest things in Hahnemann's works.

§ 134

All external influences, and more especially medicines, possess the property of producing in the health of the living organism a particular kind of alteration peculiar to themselves; but all the symptoms peculiar to a medicine do not appear in one person, nor all at once, nor in the same experiment, but some occur in one person chiefly at one time, others again during a second or third trial; in another person some other symptoms appear, but in such a manner that probably some of the phenomena are observed in the fourth, eighth or tenth person which had already appeared in the second, sixth or ninth person, and so forth; moreover, they may not recur at the same hour.

§ 135

The whole of the elements of disease a medicine is capable of producing can only be brought to anything like completeness by numerous observations on suitable persons of both sexes and of various constitutions. We can only be assured that a medicine has been thoroughly proved in regard to the morbid states it can produce - that is to say, in regard to its pure powers of altering the health of man - when subsequent experimenters can notice little of a novel character from its action, and almost always only the same symptoms as had been already observed by others.

Above, experiments were laid wide open to observer bias and error. In §134 and 135, reporting bias is introduced. Hahnemann literally tells us that symptoms can be expected to differ between test subjects, so data has to be collected from numerous tests in order to compile the right set of symptoms.

In other words, subjects are asked to report whatever they think they feel, and the practitioner then picks and chooses at will between reportings! No, there is no mentioning of statistical methods.

§ 136

Although, as has been said, a medicine, on being proved on healthy subjects, cannot develop in one person all the alterations of health it is capable of causing, but can only do this when given to many different individuals, varying in their corporeal and mental constitution, yet the tendency to excite all these symptoms in every human being exists in it (§ 117), according to an eternal and immutable law of nature, by virtue of which all its effects, even those that are but rarely developed in the healthy person, are brought into operation in the case of every individual if administered to him when he is in a morbid state presenting similar symptoms; it then, even in the smallest dose, being homœopathically selected, silently produces in the patient an artificial state closely resembling the natural disease, which rapidly and permanently (homœopathically) frees and cures him of his original malady.

So having examined medicines in a manner that might produce any and all results, we proceed to name it an "eternal and immutable law of nature", and use it for treating sick people. Note the interesting claim that whatever symptoms the medicine may have sometimes produced in test subjects will in some way self-select when needed. A truly fortunate property considering the uncertainties involved in the test method!

§ 137

The more moderate, within certain limits, the doses of the medicine used for such experiments are - provided we endeavor to facilitate the observation by the selection of a person who is a lover of truth, temperate in all respects, of delicate feelings, and who can direct the most minute attention to his sensation - so much the more distinctly are the primary effects developed, and only these, which are most worth knowing, occur without any admixture of secondary effects or reactions of the vital force. When, however, excessively large doses are used there occur at the same time not only a number of secondary effects among the symptoms, but the primary effects developed, and only these, which are most worth knowing, occur without any admixture of secondary effects or reactions of the vital force. When, however, excessively large doses are used there occur at the same time not only a number of secondary effects among the symptoms, but the primary effects also come on in such hurried confusion and with such impetuosity that nothing can be accurately observed; let alone the danger attending them, which no one who has any regard for his fellow-creatures, and who looks on the meanest of mankind as his brother, will deem an indifferent manner.

Some reiteration and a sensible warning against administering overdoses.

§ 138

All the sufferings, accidents and changes of the health of the experimenter during the action of a medicine (provided the above condition [§§ 124-127] essential to a good and pure experiment are complied with) are solely derived from this medicine, and must be regarded and registered as belonging peculiarly to this medicine, as symptoms of this medicine, even though the experimenter had observed, a considerable time previously, the spontaneous occurrence of similar phenomena in himself. The reappearance of these during the trial of the medicine only shows that this individual is, by virtue of his peculiar constitution, particularly disposed to have such symptoms excited in him. In this case they are the effect of the medicine; the symptoms do not arise spontaneously while the medicine that has been taken is exercising an influence over the health of the whole system, but are produced by the medicine.

And of course, the test subjects are not to worry about the symptoms experienced, because they are of transitory character, induced only by the medicine. Well, if the highly diluted types are used, there is no problem, I'm sure, but Hahnemann originally used what he called raw testing, where the original substances WERE present in chemically significant doses. And since several of his basic substances are quite potent poisons, I for one would feel less secure.

§ 139

When the physician does not make the trial of the medicine on himself, but gives it to another person, the latter must note down distinctly the sensations, sufferings, accidents and changes of health he experiences at the time of their occurrence, mentioning the time after the ingestion of the drug when each symptom arose and, if it lasts long, the period of its duration. The physician looks over the report in the presence of the experimenter immediately after the experiment is concluded, or if the trial lasts several days he does this every day, in order, while everything is still fresh in his memory, to question him about the exact nature of every one of these circumstances, and to write down the more precise details so elicited, or to make such alterations as the experimenter may suggest.¹

Apparently practitioners are supposed to often test on themselves, a situation that makes results even more uncertain.

¹ He who makes known to the medical world the results of such experiments becomes thereby responsible for the trustworthiness of the person experimented on and his statements, and justly so, as the weal of suffering humanity is here at stake.

So right Hahnemann is! How this brings in mind his own deplorable testing practices.

§ 140

If the person cannot write, the physician must be informed by him every day of what has occurred to him, and how it took place. What is noted down as authentic information on this point, however, must be chiefly the voluntary narration of the person who makes the experiment, nothing conjectural and as little as possible derived from answers to leading questions should be admitted; everything must be ascertained with the same caution as I have counselled above (§§ 84-99) for the investigation of the phenomena and for tracing the picture of natural diseases.

Before we snicker at supposedly reliable test subjects who cannot write, we must remember the time-frame. We are in the beginning of the 19th century.

§ 141

But the best provings of the pure effects of simple medicines in altering the human health, and of the artificial diseases and symptoms they are capable of developing in the healthy individual, are those which the healthy, unprejudiced and sensitive physician institutes on himself with all the caution and care here enjoined. He knows with the greatest certainty the things he has experienced in his own person.¹

¹ Those trials made by the physician on himself have for him other and inestimable advantages. In the first place, the great truth that the medicinal virtue of all drugs, whereon depends their curative power, lies in the changes of health he has himself undergone from the medicines he has proved, and the morbid states he has himself experienced from them, becomes for him an incontrovertible fact. Again by such noteworthy observations on himself he will be brought to understand his own sensations, his mode of thinking and his disposition (the foundation of all true wisdom gnwqi seuton), and he will be also trained to be, what every physician ought to be, a good observer. All our observations on others are not nearly so interesting as those made on ourselves. The observer of others must always dread lest the experimenter did not feel exactly what he said, or lest he did not describe his sensations with the most appropriate expressions. He must always remain in doubt whether he has not been deceived, at least to some extent. These obstacles to the knowledge of the truth, which can never be thoroughly surmounted in our investigations of the artificial morbid symptoms that occur in others from the ingestion of medicines, cease entirely when we make the trials on ourselves. He who makes these trials on himself knows for certain what he has felt, and each trial is a new inducement for him to investigate the powers of other medicines. He thus becomes more and more practised in the art of observing, of such importance to the physician, by continuing to observe himself, the one on whom he can most rely and who will never deceive him; and this he will do all the more zealously as these experiments on himself promise to give him a reliable knowledge of the true value and significance of the instruments of cure that are still to a great degree unknown to our art. Let it not be imagined that such slight indispositions caused by taking medicines for the purpose of proving them can be in the main injurious to the health. Experience shows on the contrary, that the organism of the prover becomes, by these frequent attacks on his health, all the more expert in repelling all external influences inimical to his frame and all artificial and natural morbid noxious agents, and becomes more hardened to resist everything of an injurious character, by means of these moderate experiments on his own person with medicines. His health becomes more unalterable; he becomes more robust, as all experience shows.

Hahnemann even recommends practitioners to test on themselves. We can assume that he made many of his experiments on himself. While one might applaud his courage and self-sacrifice, this means that his many results are, from a scientific point of view, simply anecdotal evidence.

He emphasizes the health gain from such practice, and as it happened, he was in excellent health himself and lived to a, for his era, high age. However, there is really nothing in his theories that merits the notion that homeopathic preparations should have any prophylactic effect.

§ 142

But how some symptoms¹ of the simple medicine employed for a curative purpose can be distinguished amongst the symptoms of the original malady, even in diseases, especially in those of a chronic character that usually remain unaltered, is a subject appertaining to the higher art of judgement, and must be left exclusively to masters in observation.

¹ Symptoms which, during the whole course of the disease, might have been observed only a long time previously, or never before, consequently new ones, belonging to the medicine.

Ah, hah. So if you do not see things the way Hahnemann does it, it is because you are not good enough? More hedging, really, and obviously in contradiction to §2.

§ 143

If we have thus tested on the healthy individual a considerable number of simple medicines and carefully and faithfully registered all the disease elements and symptoms they are capable of developing as artificial disease-producers, then only have we a true materia medica - a collection of real, pure, reliable¹ modes of action of simple medicinal substances, a volume of the book of nature, wherein is recorded a considerable array of the peculiar changes of the health and symptoms ascertained to belong to each of the powerful medicines, as they were revealed to the attention of the observer, in which the likeness of the (homœopathic) disease elements of many natural diseases to be hereafter cured by them are present, which, in a word, contain artificial morbid states, that furnish for the similar natural morbid states the only true, homœopathic, that is to say, specific, therapeutic instruments for effecting their certain and permanent cure.

Well, how he can call this "real, pure, reliable" considering the uncertainties inherent in his method is certainly beyond a scientific mind.

¹ Latterly it has been the habit to entrust the proving of medicines to unknown persons at a distance, who were paid for their work, and the formation so obtained was printed. But by so doing, the work which is of all others the most important, which is to form the basis of the only true healing art, and which demands the greatest moral certainty and trustworthiness seems to me, I regret to say, to become doubtful and uncertain in its results and to lose all value.

Oops! This is one in the face of modern homeopaths, who collect their information from strangers over the internet. It goes further, however: The real implication is that the only information you can use is what you have collected yourself (and, presumably, that endorsed by Hahnemann). Another clear paradigm difference between homeopathy and modern science, as the latter is intent on making information sufficiently reliable to be used by everybody.

§ 144

From such a materia medica everything that is conjectural, all that is mere assertion or imaginary should be strictly excluded; everything should be the pure language of nature carefully and honestly interrogated.

The big question is: Would that leave us with anything at all?

§ 145 Sixth Edition

Of a truth, it is only by a very considerable store of medicines accurately known in respect of these their pure modes of action in altering the health of man, that we can be placed in a position to discover a homœopathic remedy, a suitable artificial (curative) morbid analogue for each of the infinitely numerous morbid states in nature, for every malady in the world.¹ In the meantime, even now - thanks to the truthful character of the symptoms, and to the abundance of disease elements which every one of the powerful medicinal substances has already shown in its action on the healthy body - but few disease remain, for which a tolerably suitable homœopathic remedy may not be met with among those now proved as to their pure action,² which, without much disturbance, restores health in a gentle, sure and permanent manner - infinitely more surely and safely than can be effected by all the general and special therapeutics of the old allopathic medical art with its unknown composite remedies, which do but alter and aggravate but cannot cure chronic diseases, and rather retard than promote recovery from acute diseases and frequently endanger life.

Self-appraisal and a jab at allopathy.

¹ At first, about forty years ago, I was the only person who made the provings of the pure powders of medicines the most important of his occupations. Since then I have been assisted in this by some young men, who instituted experiments on themselves, and whose observations I have critically revised. Following these some genuine work of this kind was done by a few others. But what shall we not be able to effect in the way of curing in the whole extent of the infinitely large domain of disease, when numbers of accurate and trustworthy observers shall have rendered their services in enriching this, the only true materia medica, by careful experiments on themselves! The healing art will then come near the mathematical sciences in certainty.

(.....)

Now it becomes difficult: Compare this with §143.1. Who is to be trusted? This ought to be a very difficult question for the present-day homeopath. Lacking the protocol requirements and peer-review systems of science, it will be very difficult to know which accounts to trust and which not.

§ 146

The third point of the business of a true physician relates to the judicious employment of the artificial morbid agents (medicines) that have been proved on healthy individuals to ascertain their pure action in order to effect the homœopathic cure of natural diseases.

§ 147

Whichever of these medicines that have been investigated as to their power of altering man's health we find to contain in the symptoms observed from its use the greatest similarity to the totality of the symptoms of a given natural disease, this medicine will and must be the most suitable, the most certain homœopathic remedy for the disease; in it is found the specific remedy of this case of disease.

§ 148

The natural disease is never to be considered as a noxious material situated somewhere within the interior or exterior of man (§ 11-13) but as one produced by an inimical spirit-like (conceptual) agency which, like a kind of infection (note to § 11) disturbs in its instinctive existence of the spirit-like (conceptual) principle of life within the organism torturing it as an evil spirit and compelling it to produce certain ailments and disorders in the regular course of its life. These are known as symptoms (disease). If, now, the influence of this inimical agency that not only caused but strives to continue this disorder, be taken away as is done when the physician administers an artificial potency, capable of altering the life principle in the most similar manner (a homœopathic medicine) which exceeds in energy even in the smallest dose the similar natural disease (§§ 33, 279), then the influence of the original noxious morbid agent on the life principle is lost during the action of this stronger similar artificial disease. Thence the evil no longer exists for the life principle - it is destroyed. If, as has been said, the selected homœopathic remedy is administered properly, then the acute natural disease which is to be overruled if recently developed, will disappear imperceptibly in a few hours.

An older, more chronic disease will yield somewhat later together with all traces of discomfort, by the use of several doses of the same more highly potentized remedy or after careful selection¹ of one or another more similar homœopathic medicine. Health, recovery, follow in imperceptible, often rapid transitions. The life principle is freed again and capable of resuming the life of the organism in health as before and strength returns.

Basically reiterating earlier statements.

¹ But this laborious, sometimes very laborious, search for and selection of the homœopathic remedy most suitable in every respect to each morbid state, is an operation which, notwithstanding all the admirable books for facilitating it, still demands the study of the original sources themselves, and at the same time a great amount of circumspection and serious deliberation, which have their best rewards in the consciousness of having faithfully discharged our duty.

Again, the call for trusting only certain sources. But which? Hahnemann's to be sure, but how can the dedicated practitioner know what else to trust?

How could his laborious, care-demanding task, by which alone the best way of curing diseases is rendered possible, please the gentlemen of the new mongrel sect, who assume the honorable name of homœopaths, and even seem to employ medicines in form and appearance homœopathic, but determined upon by them anyhow (quidquid in buccam venit), and who, when the unsuitable remedy does not immediately give relief, in place of laying the blame on their unpardonable ignorance and laxity in performing the most and important and serious of all human affairs, ascribe it to homœopathy, which they accuse of great imperfection (if the truth be told, its imperfection consists in this, that the most suitable homœopathic remedy for each morbid condition does not spontaneously fly into their mouths like roasted pigeons, without any trouble on their own part). They know, however, from frequent practice, how to make up for the inefficiency of the scarcely half homœopathic remedy by the employment of allopathic means, that come much more handy to them, among which one or more dozens of leeches applied to the affected part, or little harmless venesections to the extent of eight ounces, and so forth, play an important part; and should the patient, in spite of all this, recover, they extol their venesections, leeches, etc., alleging that, had it not been for these, the patient would not have been pulled through, and they give us to understand, in no doubtful language, that these operations, derived without much exercise of genius from the pernicious routine of the old school, in reality contributed the best share towards the cure. But if the patient die under the treatment, as not unfrequently happens, they seek to console the friends by saying that "they themselves were witnesses that everything conceivable had been done for the lamented deceased". Who would do this frivolous and pernicious tribe the honour to call them, after the name of the very laborious but salutary art, homœopathic physicians? May the just recompense await them, that, when taken ill, they may be treated in the same manner!

This, unfortunately, cannot be reassuring to the many modern practitioners, who will let their homœopathic treatment supplement other medical treatment. Hahnemann's emotional cursing stamps them as sacrilegious.

§ 149

(.....)

More allopath-bashing. It does get trivial in the long run. If the trashing of allopathy and reiterations were left out, the Organon would be less than 100 paragraphs long and much easier to read and, presumably, use.

§ 150

If a patient complain of one or more trivial symptoms, that have been only observed a short time previously, the physician should not regard this as a fully developed disease but requires serious medical aid. A slight alteration in the diet and regimen will usually suffice to dispel such an indisposition.

And herein lies, no doubt, the key to some of the clinical successes reported by proponents.

§ 151

But if the patient complain of a few violent sufferings, the physician will usually find, on investigation, several other symptoms besides, although of a slighter character, which furnish a complete picture of the disease.

§ 152

The worse of the acute disease is, of so much the more numerous and striking symptoms is it generally composed, but with so much the more certainly may a suitable remedy for it be found, if there be a sufficient number of medicines known, with respect to their positive action, to choose from. Among the lists of symptoms of many medicines it will not be difficult to find one from whose separate disease elements an antitype of curative artificial disease, very like the totality of the symptoms of the natural disease, may be constructed, and such a medicine is the desired remedy.

§ 153

In this search for a homœopathic specific remedy, that is to say, in this comparison of the collective symptoms of the natural disease with the list of symptoms of known medicines, in order to find among these an artificial morbid agent corresponding by similarity to the disease to be cured, the more striking, singular, uncommon and peculiar (characteristic) signs and symptoms¹ of the case of disease are chiefly and most solely to be kept in view; for it is more particularly these that very similar ones in the list of symptoms of the selected medicine must correspond to, in order to constitute it the most suitable for effecting the cure. The more general and undefined symptoms: loss of appetite, headache, debility, restless sleep, discomfort, and so forth, demand but little attention when of that vague and indefinite character, if they cannot be more accurately described, as symptoms of such a general nature are observed in almost every disease and from almost every drug.

There is some sound advice in this, but also much muddling. These things make it very complex for the practitioner to select the right profile, and that comprises another hedging: If the remedy did not work, maybe the wrong profile was chosen.

¹ Dr. von Bonninghausen, by the publication of the characteristic symptoms of homœopathic medicines and his repertory has rendered a great service to homœopathy as well as Dr. J.H.G. Jahr in his handbook of principal symptoms.

Acknowledgements. So we must assume that the work of these gentlemen is considered reliable and true.

§ 154

If the antitype constructed from the list of symptoms of the most suitable medicine contain those peculiar, uncommon, singular and distinguishing (characteristic) symptoms, which are to be met with in the disease to be cured in the greatest number and in the greatest similarity, this medicine is the most appropriate homœopathic specific remedy for this morbid state; the disease, if it be not one of very long standing, will generally be removed and extinguished by the first dose of it, without any considerable disturbance.

§ 155

I say without any considerable disturbance. For in the employment of this most appropriate homœopathic remedy it is only the symptoms of the medicine that correspond to the symptoms of the disease that are called into play, the former occupying the place of the latter (weaker) in the organism, i.e., in the sensation of the life

principle, and thereby annihilating them by overpowering them; but the other symptoms of the homœopathic medicine, which are often very numerous, being in no way applicable to the case of disease in question, are not called into play at all. The patient, growing hourly better, feels almost nothing of them at all, because the excessively minute dose requisite for homœopathic use is much too weak to produce the other symptoms of the medicine that are not homœopathic to the case, in those parts of the body that are free from disease, and consequently can allow only the homœopathic symptoms to act on the parts of the organism that are already most irritated and excited by the similar symptoms of the disease, in order that the sick life principle may react only to a similar but stronger medicinal disease, whereby the original malady is extinguished.

Here is an attempt at explaining the earlier mentioned automatic selection of the right effects of the medicine among the many that Hahnemann admits it has. It is a bit self-contradictory, however: How are we supposed to believe that the medicine can impose those symptoms in healthy persons, but not in a diseased person? And in this one paragraph, the effects are both referred to as too weak to cause effect and stronger than the disease, depending of whether we have any use for them or not.

§ 156

There is, however, almost no homœopathic medicine, be it ever so suitably chosen, that, especially if it should be given in an insufficiently minute dose, will not produce, in very irritable and sensitive patients, at least one trifling, unusual disturbance, some slight new symptom while its action lasts; for it is next to impossible that medicine and disease should cover one another symptomatically as exactly as two triangles with equal sides and equal angles. But this (in ordinary circumstances) unimportant difference will be easily done away with by the potential activity (energy) of the living organism, and is not perceptible by patients not excessively delicate: the restoration goes forward, notwithstanding, to the goal of perfect recovery, if it be not prevented by the action of heterogeneous medicinal influences upon the patient, by errors of regimen or by excitement of the passions.

And then a partly contradictory paragraph: There is no such effect, but if this should be wrong, there is an effect. The Organon contains a number of tautologies, which by themselves seem trivial, but added up, they provide a typical pseudoscientific smoke-screen that will enable you to interpret observation in every which way it might fit your purpose.

§ 157

But though it is certain that a homœopathically selected remedy does, by reason of its appropriateness and the minuteness of the dose, gently remove and annihilate the acute disease analogous to it, without manifesting its other unhomœopathic symptoms, that is to say, without the production of new, serious disturbances, yet it usually, immediately after ingestion - for the first hour, or for a few hours - causes a kind of slight aggravation when the dose has not been sufficiently small and (where the dose has been somewhat too large, however, for a considerable number of hours), which has so much resemblance to the original disease that it seems to the patient to be an aggravation of his own disease. But it is, in reality, nothing more than an extremely similar medicinal disease, somewhat exceeding in strength the original affection.

§ 158

This slight homœopathic aggravation during the first hours - a very good prognostic that the acute disease will most probably yield to the first dose - is quite as it ought to be, as the medicinal disease must naturally be somewhat stronger than the malady to be cured if it is to overpower and extinguish the latter, just as a natural disease can remove and annihilate another one similar to it only when it is stronger than the latter (§§ 43 - 48).

The so-called homeopathic aggravation. On the premises of homeopathy, this is quite logical: If the medicine is supposed to overcome the disease, there must be a temporary aggravation.

§ 159 Sixth Edition

The smaller the dose of the homœopathic remedy is in the treatment of acute diseases so much the slighter and shorter is the apparent increase of the disease during the first hours.

§ 160

But as the dose of a homœopathic remedy can scarcely ever be made so small that it shall not be able to relieve, overpower, indeed completely cure and annihilate the uncomplicated natural disease of not long standing that is analogous to it (§ 249, note), we can understand why a dose of an appropriate homœopathic medicine, not the very smallest possible, does always, during the first hour after its ingestion, produce a perceptible homœopathic aggravation of this kind.¹

1 This exaltation of the medicinal symptoms over those disease symptoms analogous to them, which looks like an aggravation, has been observed by other physicians also, when by accident they employed a homœopathic remedy. When a patient suffering from itch complains of an increase of the eruption after sulphur, his physician who knows not the cause of this, consoles him with the assurance that the itch must first come out properly before it can be cured; he knows not, however, that this is a sulphur eruption, that assumes the appearance of an increase of the itch.

"The facial eruption which the viola tricolor cured was aggravated by it at the commencement of its action," Leroy tells us (Heilk. für Mutter, p.406), but he knew not that the apparent aggravation was owing to the somewhat too large dose of the remedy, which in this instance was to a certain extent homœopathic. Lysons says (Med. Transact., vol ii, London, 1772), "The bark of the elm cures most certainly those skin diseases which it increases at the beginning of its action." Had he not given the bark in the monstrous doses usual in the allopathic system, but in the quite small doses requisite when the medicine shows similarity of symptoms, that is to say, when it is used homœopathically, he would have effected a cure without, or almost without, seeing this apparent increase of the disease (homœopathic aggravation).

Reiterating, and jabbing at allopathy.

§ 161

When I here limit the so-called homœopathic aggravation, or rather the primary action of the homœopathic medicine that seems to increase somewhat the symptoms of the original disease, to the first or few hours, this is certainly true with respect to diseases of a more acute character and of recent origin, but where medicines of long action have to combat a malady of, considerable or of very long standing, where no such apparent increase of the original disease ought to appear during treatment and it does not so appear if the accurately chosen medicine was given in proper small, gradually higher doses, each somewhat modified with renewed dynamization (§ 247). Such increase of the original symptoms of a chronic disease can appear only at the end of treatment when the cure is almost or quite finished.

When reading the many anecdotal accounts of homeopathic treatment, we often see this pattern: Patient presents with symptoms, gets medication. Initially patient gets worse, then recovers. The homeopathic proponent will interpret this as homeopathic aggravation, followed by cure, thus seeing evidence for both the direct and the curative effect of the drug. In reality, however, the pattern fits a natural recovery just as well.

§ 162

Sometimes happens, owing to the moderate number of medicines yet known with respect to their true, pure action, that but a portion of the symptoms of the disease under treatment are to be met with in the list of symptoms of the most appropriate medicine, consequently this imperfect medicinal morbid agent must be employed for lack of a more perfect one.

Here it becomes interesting. Hahnemann earlier (in §34) said that the symptoms of the medicine must exactly match those of the disease, but now he backs off a bit.

§ 163

In this case we cannot indeed expect from this medicine a complete, untroubled cure; for during its use some symptoms appear which were not previously observable in the disease, accessory symptoms of the not perfectly appropriate remedy. This does by no means prevent a considerable part of the disease (the symptoms of the disease that resemble those of the medicine) from being eradicated by this medicine, thereby establishing a fair commencement of the cure, but still this does not take place without those accessory symptoms, which are, however, always moderate when the dose of the medicine is sufficiently minute.

Backing off more, he opens the path for a part by part cure of the disease. Logically this does not really fly in the face of his basic theory, but he himself denounced it earlier.

§ 164

The small number of homœopathic symptoms present in the best selected medicine is no obstacle to the cure in cases where these few medicinal symptoms are chiefly of an uncommon kind and such as are peculiarly distinctive (characteristic) of the disease; the cure takes place under such circumstances without any particular disturbance.

Here, we are introduced to the strange idea of peculiar symptoms. Since most homeopathic remedies are noted for a plethora of different indications (an obvious effect of the way they are tested), it would right away seem that dozens of medicines should work on any disease. One almost get the feeling that Hahnemann thought this was a tad too easy, so he instructs his practitioners to look for "peculiar" symptoms, and match those, again making a science out of prescribing.

§ 165

If, however, among the symptoms of the remedy selected, there be none that accurately resemble the distinctive (characteristic), peculiar, uncommon symptoms of the case of disease, and if the remedy correspond to the disease only in the general, vaguely described, indefinite states (nausea, debility, headache, and so forth), and if there be among the known medicines none more homœopathically appropriate, in that case the physician cannot promise himself any immediate favorable result from the employment of this unhomœopathic medicine.

A rather obvious statement. Provided you believe your medicine has any effect at all, it goes without saying that using the wrong medicine will not help the patient.

§ 166

Such a case is, however, very rare, owing to the increased number of medicines whose pure effects are now known, and the bad effects resulting from it, when they do occur, are diminished whenever a subsequent medicine, of more accurate resemblance, can be selected.

§ 167

Thus if there occur, during the use of this imperfectly homœopathic remedy first employed, accessory symptoms of some moment, then, in the case of acute diseases, we do not allow this first dose to exhaust its action, nor leave the patient to the full duration of the action of the remedy, but we investigate afresh the morbid state in its now altered condition, and add the remainder of the original symptoms to those newly developed in tracing a new picture of the disease.

This is what is called retaking a disease, that is in effect starting over recording the symptoms and trying to select a new and better prescription. Of course, that is what any doctor must do if his first attempt at cure does not seem to work. You can find several case stories where this happens several times. I suppose any doctor would attribute the eventual recovery of the patient to whatever medications was last given.

§ 168

We shall then be able much more readily to discover, among the known medicines, an analogue to the morbid state before us, a single dose of which, if it do not entirely destroy the disease, will advance it considerably on the way to be cured. And thus we go on, if even this medicine be not quite sufficient to effect the restoration of health, examining again and again the morbid state that still remains, and selecting a homœopathic medicine as suitable as possible for it, until our object, namely, putting the patient in the possession of perfect health, is accomplished.

Opening all the way for piecemeal treatment, one symptom at the time. As homeopathy claims that a disease is only its symptoms, this is only logical.

§ 169 Sixth Edition

If, on the first examination of a disease and the first selection of a medicine, we should find that the totality of the symptoms of the disease would not be effectually covered by the disease elements of a single medicine - owing to the insufficient number of known medicines, - but that two medicines contend for the preference in point of appropriateness, one of which is more homœopathically suitable for one part, the other for another part of the symptoms of the disease, it is not advisable, after the employment of the more suitable of the two medicines, to administer the other without fresh examination, and much less to give both together (§ 272, note) for the medicine that seemed to be the next best would not, under the change of circumstances that has in the meantime taken place, be suitable for the rest of the symptoms that then remain; in which case, consequently, a more appropriate homœopathic remedy must be selected in place of the second medicine for the set of symptoms as they appear on a new inspection.

§ 170

Hence in this as in every case where a change of the morbid state has occurred, the remaining set of symptoms now present must be inquired into, and (without paying any attention to the medicine which at first appeared to be the next in point of suitability) another homœopathic medicine, as appropriate as possible to the new state now before us, must be selected. If it should so happen, as is not often the case, that the medicine which at first appeared to be the next best seems still to be well adapted for the morbid state that remains, so much the more will it merit our confidence, and deserve to be employed in preference to another.

§ 171

In non-venereal chronic disease, those, therefore, that arise from psora, we often require, in order to effect a cure, to give several antipsoric remedies in succession, every successive one being homœopathically chosen in consonance with the group of symptoms remaining after completion of the action of the previous remedy.

Reiterating and clarifying the procedure of retaking, represcription, piece by piece.

§ 172

A similar difficulty in the way of the cure occurs from the symptoms of the disease being too few - a circumstance that deserves our careful attention, for by its removal almost all the difficulties that can lie in the way of this most perfect of all possible modes of treatment (except that its apparatus of known homœopathic medicines is still incomplete) are removed.

Even in this short paragraph, Hahnemann finds space for an appraisal of his system. Note, however, his concern of having too few symptoms; since according to his view, a disease IS its symptoms, the concern is a bit odd. It almost seems like he does not like his cases to be too clear-cut.

§ 173

The only diseases that seem to have but few symptoms, and on that account to be less amenable to cure, are those which may be termed one-sided, because they display only one or two principal symptoms which obscure almost all the others. They belong chiefly to the class of chronic diseases.

§ 174

Their principal symptom may be either an internal complaint (e.g. a headache of many years' duration, a diarrhoea of long standing, an ancient cardialgia, etc.), or it may be an affection more of an external kind. Diseases of the latter character are generally distinguished by the name of local maladies.

§ 175

In one-sided diseases of the first kind it is often to be attributed to the medical observer's want of discernment that he does not fully discover the symptoms actually present which would enable him to complete the sketch of the portrait of the disease.

§ 176

There are, however, still a few diseases, which, after the most careful initial examination (§§ 84-98), present but one or two severe, violent symptoms, while all the others are but indistinctly perceptible.

§ 177

In order to meet most successfully such a case as this, which is of very rare occurrence, we are in the first place to select, guided by these few symptoms, the medicine which in our judgment is the most homœopathically indicated.

§ 178

It will, no doubt, sometimes happen that this medicine, selected in strict observance of the homœopathic law, furnishes the similar artificial disease suited for the annihilation of the malady present; and this is much more likely to happen when these few morbid symptoms are very striking, decided, uncommon and peculiarly distinctive (characteristic).

§ 179

More frequently, however, the medicine first chosen in such a case will be only partially, that is to say, not exactly suitable, as there was no considerable number of symptoms to guide to an accurate selection.

*This seems illogical to an outsider: If there is but a single (or very few) symptom, one would think that it would be very easy to select a remedy. The key to the problem can be found in the *Materia Medica*, which lists all the symptoms associated with each medicine; nearly all medicines have numerous symptoms ascribed to them, with much overlapping. Thus, a single symptom will often*

match dozens of medicines, and for some reason, Hahnemann does not think that just any of them will cure.

§ 180

In this case the medicine, which has been chosen as well as was possible, but which, for the reason above stated, is only imperfectly homœopathic, will, in its action upon the disease that is only partially analogous to it - just as in the case mentioned above (§ 162, et seq.) where the limited number of homœopathic remedies renders the selection imperfect - produce accessory symptoms, and several phenomena from its own array of symptoms are mixed up with the patient's state of health, which are, however, at the same time, symptoms of the disease itself, although they may have been hitherto never or very rarely perceived; some symptoms which the patient had never previously experienced appear, or others he had only felt indistinctly become more pronounced.

A quite logical concern that the rest of the symptoms that the chosen medicine is assumed to cause will show up as side-effects.

§ 181

Let it not be objected that the accessory phenomena and new symptoms of this disease that now appear should be laid to the account of the medicament just employed. They owe their origin to it¹ certainly, but they are always only symptoms of such a nature as this disease was itself capable of producing in this organism, and which were summoned forth and induced to make their appearance by the medicine given, owing to its power to cause similar symptoms. In a word, we have to regard the whole collection of symptoms now perceptible as belonging to the disease itself, as the actual existing condition, and to direct our further treatment accordingly.

¹ When they were not caused by an important error in regimen, a violent emotion, or a tumultuous revolution in the organism, such as the occurrence or cessation of the menses, conception, childbirth, and so forth.

§ 182

Thus the imperfect selection of the medicament, which was in this case almost inevitable owing to the too limited number of the symptoms present, serves to complete the display of the symptoms of the disease, and in this way facilitates the discovery of a second, more accurately suitable, homœopathic medicine.

Then, suddenly, logic is abandoned. Hahnemann has hinted at this earlier, but here it is: He now tells us that the proper symptoms from the medicine are somehow autoselected. Even if the medicine does not quite fit, it will bring just the proper symptoms out into the light, so the next shot can be made more accurate. How handy!

§ 183

Whenever, therefore, the dose of the first medicine ceases to have a beneficial effect (if the newly developed symptoms do not, by reason of their gravity, demand more speedy aid - which, however, from the minuteness of the dose of homœopathic medicine, and in very chronic diseases, is excessively rare), a new examination of the disease must be instituted, the status morbi as it now is must be noted down, and a second homœopathic remedy selected in accordance with it, which shall exactly suit the present state, and one which shall be all the more appropriate can then be found, as the group of symptoms has become larger and more complete.¹

¹ In cases where the patient (which, however, happens excessively seldom in chronic, but not infrequently in acute, diseases) feels very ill, although his symptoms are very indistinct, so that this state may be attributed more to the benumbed state of the nerves, which does not permit the patient's pains and sufferings to be distinctly perceived, this torpor of the internal sensibility is removed by opium, and in its secondary action the symptoms of the disease become distinctly apparent.

Here again, we see the strange idea that the minute amounts of active ingredient (actually, there is nothing, but Hahnemann did not know of Avogadro's number) both renders the homeopathing medicine harmless, and at the same time a potent cure. Hahnemann believes he can get it both ways. And in the note, he suddenly advocates the use of opium! Earlier he has denounced palliative treatment (§57).

§ 184

In like manner, after each new dose of medicine has exhausted its action, when it is no longer suitable and helpful, the state of the disease that still remains is to be noted anew with respect to its remaining symptoms,

and another homœopathic remedy sought for, as suitable as possible for the group of symptoms now observed, and so on until the recovery is complete.

Second reiteration if this information.

§ 185

Among the one-sided disease an important place is occupied by the so-called local maladies, by which term is signified those changes and ailments that appear on the external parts of the body. Till now the idea prevalent in the schools was that these parts were alone morbidly affected, and that the rest of the body did not participate in the disease - a theoretical, absurd doctrine, which has led to the most disastrous medical treatment.

Exhibiting the usual diplomatic style. Here, however, we must tend to agree with him. It is certainly a good idea to take the whole patient into consideration, even if the disease does only manifest itself locally.

§ 186

Those so-called local maladies which have been produced a short time previously, solely by an external lesion, still appear at first sight to deserve the name of local disease. But then the lesion must be very trivial, and in that case it would be of no great moment. For in the case of injuries accruing to the body from without, if they be at all severe, the whole living organism sympathizes; there occur fever, etc. The treatment of such diseases is relegated to surgery; but this is right only in so far as the affected parts require mechanical aid, whereby the external obstacles to the cure, which can only be expected to take place by the agency of the vital force, may be removed by mechanical means, e.g., by the reduction of dislocations, by needles and bandages to bring together the lips of wounds, by mechanical pressure to still the flow of blood from open arteries, by the extraction of foreign bodies that have penetrated into the living parts, by making an opening into a cavity of the body in order to remove an irritating substance or to procure the evacuation of effusions or collections of fluids, by bringing into apposition the broken extremities of a fractured bone and retaining them in exact contact by an appropriate bandage, etc. But when in such injuries the whole living organism requires, as it always does, active dynamic aid to put it in a position to accomplish the work of healing, e.g. when the violent fever resulting from extensive contusions, lacerated muscles, tendons and blood-vessels requires to be removed by medicine given internally, or when the external pain of scalded or burnt parts needs to be homœopathically subdued, then the services of the dynamic physician and his helpful homœopathy come into requisition.

Acknowledging the need for various physical (surgical) procedures. Here is one place, however, where a present-day homeopath needs to be extraordinarily hard-headed to ignore the vast successes in modern medicine.

§ 187

But those affections, alterations and ailments appearing on the external parts, that do not arise from any external injury or that have only some slight external wound for their immediate exciting cause, are produced in quite another manner; their source lies in some internal malady. To consider them as mere local affections, and at the same time to treat them only, or almost only, as it were surgically, with topical applications - as the old school have done from the remotest ages - is as absurd as it is pernicious in its results.

§ 188

These affections were considered to be merely topical, and were therefore called local diseases, as if they were maladies exclusively limited to those parts wherein the organism took little or no part, or affections of these particular visible parts of which the rest of the living organism, so to speak, knew nothing.¹

1 One of the many great and pernicious blunders of the old school.

§ 189

And yet very little reflection will suffice to convince us that no external malady (not occasioned by some important injury from without) can arise, persist or even grow worse without some internal cause, without the co-operation of the whole organism, which must consequently be in a diseased state. It could not make its appearance at all without the consent of the whole of the rest of the health, and without the participation of the rest of the living whole (of the vital force that pervades all the other sensitive and irritable parts of the organism); indeed, it is impossible to conceive its production without the instrumentality of the whole (deranged) life; so intimately are all parts of the organism connected together to form an indivisible whole in sensation and functions. No eruption on the lips, no whitlow can occur without previous and simultaneous internal ill-health.

Hahnemann loves it. Still, his own generalization, his assumption that a local malady is ALWAYS due to a whole-body disease, is not much better. The truth is, of course, that some diseases are indeed local, whereas others are not.

§ 190

All true medical treatment of a disease on the external parts of the body that has occurred from little or no injury from without must, therefore, be directed against the whole, must effect the annihilation and cure of the general malady by means of internal remedies, if it is wished that the treatment should be judicious, sure, efficacious and radical.

§ 191

This is confirmed in the most unambiguous manner by experience, which shows in all cases that every powerful internal medicine immediately after its ingestion causes important changes in the general health of such a patient, and particularly in the affected external parts (which the ordinary medical school regards as quite isolated), even in a so-called local disease of the most external parts of the body, and the change it produces is most salutary, being the restoration to health of the entire body, along with the disappearance of the external affection (without the aid of any external remedy), provided the internal remedy directed towards the whole state was suitable chosen in a homœopathic sense.

§ 192

This is best effected when, in the investigation of the case of disease, along with the exact character of the local affection, all the changes, sufferings and symptoms observable in the patient's health, and which may have been previously noticed when no medicines had been used, are taken in conjunction to form a complete picture of the disease before searching among the medicines, whose peculiar pathogenetic effects are known, for a remedy corresponding to the totality of the symptoms, so that the selection may be truly homœopathic.

§ 193

By means of this medicine, employed only internally (and, if the disease be but of recent origin, often by the very first dose of it), the general morbid state of the body is removed along with the local affection, and the latter is cured at the same time as the former, proving that the local affection depended solely on a disease of the rest of the body, and should only be regarded as an inseparable part of the whole, as one of the most considerable and striking symptoms of the whole disease.

Reiterating and explaining in more detail, interspersed with jabs at you know who.

§ 194

It is not useful, either in acute local diseases of recent origin or in local affections that have already existed a long time, to rub in or apply externally to the spot an external remedy, even though it be the specific and, when used internally, salutary by reason of its homœopathicity, even although it should be at the same time administered internally; for the acute topical affections (e.g., inflammations of the individual parts, erysipelas, etc.), which have not been caused by external injury of proportionate violence, but by dynamic or internal causes, yield most surely to internal remedies homœopathically adapted to the perceptible state of the health present in the exterior and interior, selected from the general store of proved medicines, and generally without any other aid; but if these diseases do not yield to them completely, and if there still remain in the affected spot and in the whole state, notwithstanding good regimen, a relic of disease which the vital force is not competent to restore to the normal state, then the acute disease was (as not infrequently happens) a product of psora which had hitherto remained latent in the interior, but has now burst forth and is on the point of developing into a palpable chronic disease.

Note that Hahnemann in §194 denounces any use of external medicine, even homeopathic preparations, for local symptoms.

§ 195

In order to effect a radical cure in such cases, which are by no means rare, after the acute state has pretty well subsided, an appropriate antipsoric treatment (as is taught in my work on Chronic Diseases) must then be directed against the symptoms that still remain and the morbid state of health to which the patient was previously subject. In chronic local maladies that are not obviously venereal, the antipsoric internal treatment is, moreover, alone requisite.

On more chronic local symptoms, again, the piecemeal approach.

§ 196

It might, indeed, seem as though the cure of such diseases would be hastened by employing the medicinal substance which is known to be truly homœopathic to the totality of the symptoms, not only internally, but also

externally, because the action of a medicine applied to the seat of the local affection might effect a more rapid change in it.

§ 197 Sixth Edition

This treatment, however, is quite inadmissible, not only for the local symptoms arising from the miasm of psora, but also and especially for those originating in the miasm of syphilis or sycosis, for the simultaneous local application, along with the internal employment, of the remedy in diseases whose chief symptom is a constant local affection, has this great disadvantage, that, by such a topical application, this chief symptom (local affection)¹ will usually be annihilated sooner than the internal disease, and we shall now be deceived by the semblance of a perfect cure; or at least it will be difficult, and in some cases impossible, to determine, from the premature disappearance of the local symptom, if the general disease is destroyed by the simultaneous employment of the internal medicine.

¹ Recent itch eruption, chancre, condylomata, as I have indicated in my book of Chronic Diseases.

§ 198

The mere topical employment of medicines, that are powerful for cure when given internally, to the local symptoms of chronic miasmatic diseases is for the same reason quite inadmissible; for if the local affection of the chronic disease be only removed locally and in a one-sided manner, the internal treatment indispensable for the complete restoration of the health remains in dubious obscurity; the chief symptom (the local affection) is gone, and there remain only the other, less distinguishable symptoms, which are less constant and less persistent than the local affection, and frequently not sufficiently peculiar and too slightly characteristic to display after that, a picture of the disease in clear and peculiar outlines.

Reiterating and explaining why homeopathic remedies should not be used externally.

§ 199

If the remedy perfectly homœopathic to the disease had not yet been discovered¹ at the time when the local symptoms were destroyed by a corrosive or desiccative external remedy or by the knife, then the case becomes much more difficult on account of the too indefinite (uncharacteristic) and inconstant appearance of the remaining symptoms; for what might have contributed most to determine the selection of the most suitable remedy, and its internal employment until the disease should have been completely annihilated, namely, the external principal symptom, has been removed from our observation.

¹ As was the case before my time with the remedies for the condylomatous disease (and the antipsoric medicines).

§ 200

Had it still been present to guide the internal treatment, the homœopathic remedy for the whole disease might have been discovered, and had that been found, the persistence of the local affection during its internal employment would have shown that the cure was not yet completed; but were it cured on its seat, this would be a convincing proof that the disease was completely eradicated, and the desired recovery from the entire disease was fully accomplished - an inestimable, indispensable advantage to reach a perfect cure.

Again, essentially discouraging allopathic treatment, on the grounds that it somehow makes diseases unreachable for homeopathy.

§ 201

It is evident that man's vital force, when encumbered with a chronic disease which it is unable to overcome by its own powers instinctively, adopts the plan of developing a local malady on some external part, solely for this object, that by making and keeping in a diseased state this part which is not indispensable to human life, it may thereby silence the internal disease, which otherwise threatens to destroy the vital organs (and to deprive the patient of life), and that it may thereby, so to speak, transfer the internal disease to the vicarious local affection and, as it were, draw it thither. The presence of the local affection thus silences, for a time, the internal disease, though without being able either to cure it or to diminish it materially.¹ The local affection, however, is never anything else than a part of the general disease, but a part of it increased all in one direction by the organic vital force, and transferred to a less dangerous (external) part of the body, in order to allay the internal ailment. But (as has been said) by this local symptom that silences the internal disease, so far from anything being gained by the vital force towards diminishing or curing the whole malady, the internal disease, on the contrary, continues, in spite of it, gradually to increase and Nature is constrained to enlarge and aggravate the local symptom always more and more, in order that it may still suffice as a substitute for the increased internal disease and may still keep it under. Old ulcers on the legs get worse as long as the internal psora is uncured, the chancre enlarges as long as the internal syphilis remains uncured, the fig warts increased and grow while

the sycosis is not cured whereby the latter is rendered more and more difficult to cure, just as the general internal disease continues to increase as time goes on.

Interesting theory, but unfounded.

1 The issues of the old-school do something similar; as artificial ulcers on external parts, they silence some internal chronic diseases, but only for a short time, as long as they cause a painful irritation to which the sick organism is not used, without being able to cure them; but, on the other hand, they weaken and destroy the general health much more than is done by most of the metastases effected by the instinctive vital force.

But always good for a kick at the competition.

§ 202

If the old-school physician should now destroy the local symptom by the topical application of external remedies, under the belief that he thereby cures the whole disease, Nature makes up for its loss by rousing the internal malady and the other symptoms that previously existed in a latent state side by side with the local affection; that is to say, she increases the internal disease. When this occurs it is usual to say, though incorrectly that the local affection has been driven back into the system or upon the nerves by the external remedies.

§ 203

Every external treatment of such local symptoms, the object of which is to remove them from the surface of the body, while the internal miasmatic disease is left uncured, as, for instance, driving off the skin the psoric eruption by all sorts of ointments, burning away the chancre by caustics and destroying the condylomata on their seat by the knife, the ligature or the actual cautery; this pernicious external mode of treatment, hitherto so universally practised, has been the most prolific source of all the innumerable named or unnamed chronic maladies under which mankind groans; it is one of the most criminal procedures the medical world can be guilty of, and yet it has hitherto been the one generally adopted, and taught from the professional chairs as the only one.¹

1 For any medicines that might at the same time be given internally served but to aggravate the malady, as these remedies possessed no specific power of curing the whole disease, but assailed the organism, weakened it and inflicted on it, in addition, other chronic medicinal diseases.

Part of this makes sense, of course. In the cases where the local symptoms are indeed a manifestation of an internal disease, any regimen that treats only local symptoms is very unlikely to cure. As somebody who has claimed unequivocally that we should not waste out time looking for internally hidden causes, Hahnemann is left with generalizations, of course.

§ 204 Sixth Edition

If we deduct all chronic affections, ailments and diseases that depend on a persistent unhealthy mode of living, (§ 77) as also those innumerable medicinal maladies (v. § 74) caused by the irrational, persistent, harassing and pernicious treatment of diseases often only of trivial character by physicians of the old school, most the remainder of chronic diseases result from the development of these three chronic miasms, internal syphilis, internal sycosis, but chiefly and in infinitely greater proportion, internal psora, each of which was already in possession of the whole organism, and had penetrated it in all directions before the appearance of the primary, vicarious local symptom of each of them (in the case of psora the scabious eruption, in syphilis the chancre or the bubo, and in sycosis the condylomata) that prevented their outburst; and these chronic miasmatic diseases, if deprived of their local symptom, are inevitably destined by mighty Nature sooner or later to become developed and to burst forth, and thereby propagate all the nameless misery, the incredible number of chronic diseases which have plagued mankind for hundreds and thousands of years, none of which would so frequently have come into existence had physicians striven in a rational manner to cure radically and to extinguish in the organism these three miasms by the internal homœopathic medicines suited for each of them, without employing topical remedies for their external symptoms. (See note to § 282).

Lifestyle, allopathy, and just three diseases, in Hahnemann's opinion accounts for all chronic diseases. How he makes this conclusion is not clear. And what these "miasms" and "psora" really are in not explained.

§ 205

The homœopathic physician never treats one of these primary symptoms of chronic miasms, nor yet one of their secondary affections that result from their further development, by local remedies (neither by those external agents that act dynamically,¹ nor yet by those that act mechanically), but he cures, in cases where the one or the other appears, only the great miasm on which they depend, whereupon its primary, as also its secondary symptoms disappear spontaneously; but as this was not the mode pursued by the old-school practitio-

ners who preceded him in the treatment of the case, the homœopathic physician generally, alas!, finds that the primary symptoms² have already been destroyed by them by means of external remedies, and that he has now to do more with the secondary ones, i.e., the affections resulting from the breaking forth and development of these inherent miasms, but especially with the chronic disease evolved from internal psora, the internal treatment of which, as far as a single physician can elucidate it by many years of reflection, observation and experience, I have endeavored to point out in my work on Chronic Diseases, to which I must refer the reader.

1 I cannot therefore advise, for instance, the local extirpation of the so-called cancer of the lips and face (the product of highly developed psora, not infrequently in conjunction with syphilis) by means of the arsenical remedy of Frere Cosme, not only because it is excessively painful and often fails, but more for this reason, because, if this dynamic remedy should indeed succeed in freeing the affected part of the body from the malignant ulcer locally, the basic malady is thereby not diminished in the slightest, the preserving vital force is therefore necessitated to transfer the field of operation of the great internal malady to some more important part (as it does in every case of metastasis), and the consequence is blindness, deafness, insanity, suffocative asthma, dropsy, apoplexy, etc. But this ambiguous local liberation of the part from the malignant ulcer by the topical arsenical remedy only succeeds, after all, in those cases where the ulcer has not yet attained any great size, and when the vital force is still very energetic; but it is just in such a state of things that the complete internal cure of the whole original disease is also still practicable.

The result is the same without previous cure of the inner miasm when cancer of the face or breast is removed by the knife alone and when encysted tumors are enucleated; something worse ensues, or at any rate death is hastened. This has been the case times without number, but the old school still goes blindly on in the same way in every new case, with the same disastrous results.

2 Itch eruption, chancre (bubo), condylomata.

Talking about syphilis, here Hahnemann is perfectly right, but for the wrong reasons. Treating the external manifestations of syphilis will not cure the patient, but this is because the bacterial infection still exists, and will make the disease progress. The special thing about syphilis is that it has three distinct states, with symptom-free periods between. These periods can be quite long, several years, and must have made many a practitioner (perhaps including Hahnemann?) believe that some particular regimen had successfully cured the patient. The attack on other practitioners only makes sense if you, like Hahnemann, believe that there is an alternative. Also, in the above paragraph, one of the almost countless reiterations of the claim that the work of the homeopath is made difficult by allopathic treatment.

§ 206 Sixth Edition

Before commencing the treatment of a chronic disease, it is necessary to make the most careful investigation¹ as to whether the patient has had a venereal infection (or an infection with condylomatous gonorrhoea); for then the treatment must be directed towards this alone, when only the signs of syphilis (or of the rarer condylomatous disease) are present, but this disease is very seldom met with alone nowadays. If such infection have previously occurred, this must also be borne in mind in the treatment of those cases in which psora is present, because in them the latter is complicated with the former, as is always the case when the symptoms are not those of pure syphilis; for when the physician thinks he has a case of old venereal disease before him, he has always, or almost always, to treat a syphilitic affection accompanied mostly by (complicated with) psora, for the internal itch dyscrasia (the psora) is far the most frequent fundamental cause of chronic diseases. At times, both miasms may be complicated also with sycosis in chronically diseased organisms, or, as is much more frequently the case, psora is the sole fundamental cause of all other chronic maladies, whatever names they may bear, which are, moreover, so often bungled, increased and disfigured to a monstrous extent by allopathic unskillfulness.

1 In investigations of this nature we must not allow ourselves to be deceived by the assertions of the patients of their friends, who frequently assign as the cause of chronic, even of the severest and most inveterate diseases, either a cold caught (a thorough wetting, drinking cold water after being heated) many years ago, or a former fright, a sprain, a vexation (sometimes even a bewitchment), etc. These causes are much too insignificant to develop a chronic disease in a healthy body, to keep it up for years, and to aggravate it year by year, as is the case with all chronic diseases from developed psora. Causes of a much more important character than those remembered noxious influences must lie at the root of the initiation and progress of a serious, obstinate disease of long standing; the assigned causes could only rouse into activity the latent chronic miasm.

Bundling all venereal diseases

§ 207

When the above information has been gained, it still remains for the homœopathic physician to ascertain what kinds of allopathic treatment had up to that date been adopted for the chronic disease, what perturbing medicines had been chiefly and most frequently employed, also what mineral baths had been used and what effects these had produced, in order to understand in some measure the degeneration of the disease from its original

state, and, where possible, to correct in part these pernicious artificial operations, or to enable him to avoid the employment of medicines that have already been improperly used.

And to this date, homeopaths are very careful to collect information on medical treatment, especially antibiotics and vaccination. I have even seen questionnaires with such questions. It is not unusual to see homeopaths claiming that all kinds of complaints from the patient are caused by a vaccination or antibiotic administered sometimes many years previously.

§ 208

The age of the patient, his mode of living and diet, his occupation, his domestic position, his social relation and so forth, must next be taken into consideration, in order to ascertain whether these things have tended to increase his malady, or in how far they may favor or hinder the treatment. In like manner the state of his disposition and mind must be attended to, to learn whether that presents any obstacles to the treatment, or requires to be directed, encouraged or modified.

Obviously this holistic approach can be beneficial for some patients, while others will probably feel that their privacy is invaded.

§ 209

After this is done, the physician should endeavor in repeated conversations with the patient to trace the picture of his disease as completely as possible, according to the directions given above, in order to be able to elucidate the most striking and peculiar (characteristic) symptoms, in accordance with which he selects the first antipsoric or other remedy having the greatest symptomatic resemblance, for the commencement of the treatment, and so forth.

§ 210

Of psoric origin are almost all those diseases that I have above termed one-sided, which appear to be more difficult to cure in consequence of this one-sidedness, all their other morbid symptoms disappearing, as it were, before the single, great, prominent symptom. Of this character are what are termed mental diseases. They do not, however, constitute a class of disease the condition of the disposition and mind is always altered;¹ and in all cases of disease we are called on to cure the state of the patient's disposition is to be particularly noted, along with the totality of the symptoms, if we would trace an accurate picture of the disease, in order to be able therefrom to treat it homœopathically with success.

Mainly reiterating.

¹ How often, for instance, do we not meet with a mild, soft disposition in patients who have for years been afflicted with the most painful diseases, so that the physician feels constrained to esteem and compassionate the sufferer! But if he subdues the disease and restore the patient to health - as is frequently done in homœopathic practice - he is often astonished and horrified at the frightful alteration in his disposition. He often witnesses the occurrence of ingratitude, cruelty, refined malice and propensities most disgraceful and degrading to humanity, which were precisely the qualities possessed by the patient before he grew ill.

Those who were patient when well often become obstinate, violent, hasty, or even intolerant and capricious, or impatient or disponding when ill; those formerly chaste and modest often frequently become lascivious and shameless. A clear-headed person not infrequently becomes obtuse of intellect, while one ordinarily weak-minded becomes more prudent and thoughtful; and a man slow to make up his mind sometimes acquires great presence of mind and quickness of resolve, etc.

A rather strange theory. It certainly happens that disease changes a patient's personality, but making it a general rule must be ascribed to Hahnemann's disposition to deem almost anything he observes a law of nature.

§ 211

This holds good to such an extent, that the state of the disposition of the patient often chiefly determines the selection of the homœopathic remedy, as being a decidedly characteristic symptom which can least of all remain concealed from the accurately observing physician.

§ 212

The Creator of therapeutic agents has also had particular regard to this main feature of all diseases, the altered state of the disposition and mind, for there is no powerful medicinal substance in the world which does not very

notably alter the state of the disposition and mind in the healthy individual who tests it, and every medicine does so in a different manner.

Establishing the universality and calling on the Creator. One should have thought that Hahnemann had some clinical experiences contradicting this new "law", but it seems he is capable of interpreting anything to fit, once he has conceived of a theory.

§ 213

We shall, therefore, never be able to cure conformably to nature - that is to say, homœopathically - if we do not, in every case of disease, even in such as are acute, observe, along with the other symptoms, those relating to the changes in the state of the mind and disposition, and if we do not select, for the patient's relief, from among the medicines a disease-force which, in addition to the similarity of its other symptoms to those of the disease, is also capable of producing a similar state of the disposition and mind.¹

¹ Thus aconite will seldom or never effect a rapid or permanent cure in a patient of a quiet, calm, equable disposition; and just as little will nux vomica be serviceable where the disposition is mild and phlegmatic, pulsatilla where it is happy, gay and obstinate, or ignatia where it is imperturbable and disposed neither to be frightened nor vexed.

So incorporating another confounding factor, the process of homeopathic prescribing becomes veiled in further mists. This makes the work of homeopaths more complex, but also provides another screen to hide behind.

§ 214

The instructions I have to give relative to the cure of mental diseases may be confined to a very few remarks, as they are to be cured in the same way as all other diseases, namely, by a remedy which shows, by the symptoms it causes in the body and mind of a healthy individual, a power of producing a morbid state as similar as possible to the case of disease before us, and in no other way can they be cured.

§ 215

Almost all the so-called mental and emotional diseases are nothing more than corporeal diseases in which the symptom of derangement of the mind and disposition peculiar to each of them is increased, while the corporeal symptoms decline (more or less rapidly), till it a length attains the most striking one-sidedness, almost as though it were a local disease in the invisible subtle organ of the mind or disposition.

§ 216

The cases are not rare in which a so-called corporeal disease that threatens to be fatal - a suppuration of the lungs, or the deterioration of some other important viscus, or some other disease of acute character, e.g., in childbed, etc. - becomes transformed into insanity, into a kind of melancholia or into mania by a rapid increase of the psychical symptoms that were previously present, whereupon the corporeal symptoms lose all their danger; these latter improve almost to perfect health, or rather they decrease to such a degree that their obscured presence can only be detected by the observation of a physician gifted with perseverance and penetration. In this manner they become transformed into a one-sided and, as it were, a local disease, in which the symptom of the mental disturbance, which was at first but slight, increases so as to be the chief symptom, and in a great measure occupies the place of the other (corporeal) symptoms, whose intensity it subdues in a palliative manner, so that, in short, the affections of the grosser corporeal organs become, as it were, transferred and conducted to the almost spiritual, mental and emotional organs, which the anatomist has never yet and never will reach with his scalpel.

So, in Hahnemann's opinion, mental diseases are rooted in physical disease. He describes a sequence of events that has been observed and interprets it as evidence for his theory. However, the causative connections are entirely speculative.

§ 217

In these diseases we must be very careful to make ourselves acquainted with the whole of the phenomena, both those belonging to the corporeal symptoms, and also, and indeed particularly, those appertaining to the accurate apprehension of the precise character of the chief symptom, of the peculiar and always predominating state of the mind and disposition, in order to discover, for the purpose of extinguishing the entire disease, among the remedies whose pure effects are known, a homœopathic medicinal pathogenetic force - that is to say, a remedy which in its list of symptoms displays, with the greatest possible similarity, not only the corpo-

real morbid symptoms present in the case of disease before us, but also especially this mental and emotional state.

§ 218

To this collection of symptoms belongs in the first place to accurate description of all the phenomena of the previous so-called corporeal disease, before it degenerated into a one-sided increase of the physical symptom, and became a disease of the mind and disposition. This may be learned from the report of the patient's friends.

§ 219

A comparison of these previous symptoms of the corporeal disease with the traces of them that still remain, though they have become less perceptible (but which even now sometimes become prominent, when a lucid interval and a transient alleviation of the psychical disease occurs), will serve to prove them to be still present, though obscured.

§ 220

By adding to this the state of the mind and disposition accurately observed by the patient's friends and by the physician himself, we have thus constructed the complete picture of the disease, for which in order to effect the homœopathic cure of the disease, a medicine capable of producing strikingly similar symptoms, and especially an analogous disorder of the mind, must be sought for among the antipsoric remedies, if the physical disease have already lasted some time.

Reiterating and elaborating.

§ 221

If, however, insanity or mania (caused by fright, vexation, the abuse of spirituous liquors, etc.) have suddenly broken out as an acute disease in the patient's ordinary calm state, although it almost always arises from internal psora, like a flame bursting forth from it, yet when it occurs in this acute manner it should not be immediately treated with antipsoric, but in the first place with remedies indicated for it out of the order class of proved medicaments (e.g., aconite, belladonna, stramonium, hyoscyamus, mercury, etc.) in highly potentized, minute, homœopathic doses, in order to subdue it so far that the psora shall for the time revert to its former latent state, wherein the patient appears as if quite well.

§ 222

But such a patient, who has recovered from an acute mental or emotional disease by the use of these non-antipsoric medicines, should never be regarded as cured; on the contrary, no time should be lost in attempting to free him completely, ¹ by means of a prolonged antipsoric treatment, from the chronic miasm of the psora, which, it is true, has now become once more latent but is quite ready to break out anew; if this be done, there is no fear of another similar attack, if he attend faithfully to the diet and regimen prescribed for him.

¹ It very rarely happens that a mental or emotional disease of long standing ceases spontaneously (for the internal dyscrasia transfers itself again to the grosser corporeal organs); such are the few cases met with now and then, where a former inmate of a madhouse has been dismissed apparently recovered. Hitherto, moreover, all madhouses have continued to be chokefull, so that the multitude of other insane persons who seek for admission into such institutions could scarcely find room in them unless some of the insane in the house died. Not one is ever really and permanently cured in them! A convincing proof, among many others, of the complete nullity of the non-healing art hitherto practised, which has been ridiculously honored by allopathic ostentation with the title of rational medicine. How often, on the other hand, has not the true healing art, genuine pure homœopathy, been able to restore such unfortunate beings to the possession of their mental and corporeal health, and so give them back again to their delighted friends and to the world!

More elaboration on Hahnemann's method of curing mental disease. And a jab at allopathy. Considering the absolutely horrible way his contemporaries treated the mental ill, we can hardly blame him, although it must detract some that the treatment he offered instead consisted of shaken water. It must be assumed that some mental patients have benefited from Hahnemann's holistic clinical practice.

§ 223

But if the antipsoric treatment be omitted, then we may almost assuredly expect, from a much slighter cause than brought on the first attack of the insanity, the speedy occurrence of a new and more lasting the severe fit, during which the psora usually develops itself completely, and passes into either a periodic or continued mental derangement, which is then more difficult to be cured by antipsorics.

§ 224

If the mental disease be not quite developed, and if it be still somewhat doubtful whether it really arose from a corporeal affection, or did not rather result from faults of education, bad practices, corrupt morals, neglect of the mind, superstition or ignorance; the mode of deciding this point will be, that if it proceed from one or other of the latter causes it will diminish and be improved by sensible friendly exhortations, consolatory arguments, serious representations and sensible advice, whereas a real moral or mental malady, depending on bodily disease, would be speedily aggravated by such a course, the melancholic would become still more dejected, querulous, inconsolable and reserved, the spiteful maniac would thereby become still more exasperated, and the chattering fool would become manifestly more foolish.¹

¹ It would seem as though the mind, in these cases, felt with uneasiness and grief the truth of these rational representations and acted upon the body as it wished to restore the lost harmony, but that the body, by means of its disease, reacted upon the organs of the mind and disposition and put them in still greater disorder by a fresh transference of its sufferings on to them.

Truly a weird theory, especially from a modern, evolutionary, point of view. Why should the body comprise such an unfortunate mechanism?

§ 225

There are, however, as has just been stated, certainly a few emotional diseases which have not merely been developed into that form out of corporeal diseases, but which, in an inverse manner, the body being but slightly indisposed, originate and are kept up by emotional causes, such as continued anxiety, worry, vexation, wrongs and the frequent occurrence of great fear and fright. This kind of emotional diseases in time destroys the corporeal health, often to a great degree.

§ 226

It is only such emotional diseases as these, which were first engendered and subsequently kept up by the mind itself, that, while they are yet recent and before they have made very great inroads on the corporeal state, may, by means of psychical remedies, such as a display of confidence, friendly exhortations, sensible advice, and often by a well-disguised deception, be rapidly changed into a healthy state of the mind (and with appropriate diet and regimen, seemingly into a healthy state of the body also.)

Note these paragraphs. Hahnemann again seems to recognize psychosomatic disease, and gives some useful advice for its cure.

§ 227

But the fundamental cause in these cases also is a psoric miasm, which was only not yet quite near its full development, and for security's sake, the seemingly cured patient should be subjected to a radical, antipsoric treatment, in order that he may not again, as might easily occur, fall into a similar state of mental disease.

Nevertheless, he holds on to the claim that the "psoric miasm" (a concept invented by himself) must be treated homeopathically in order for the cure to be permanent.

§ 228

In mental and emotional diseases resulting from corporeal maladies, which can only be cured by homœopathic antipsoric medicine conjoined with carefully regulated mode of life, an appropriate psychical behavior towards the patient on the part of those about him and of the physician must be scrupulously observed, by way of an auxiliary mental regimen. To furious mania we must oppose clam intrepidity and cool, firm resolution - to doleful, querulous lamentation, a mute display of commiseration in looks and gestures - to senseless chattering, a silence not wholly inattentive - to disgusting and abominable conduct and to conversation of a similar character, total inattention. We must merely endeavor to prevent the destruction and injury of surrounding objects, without reproaching the patient for his acts, and everything must be arranged in such a way that the necessity for any corporeal punishments and tortures¹ whatever may be avoided. This is so much the more easily effected, because in the administration of the medicine - the only circumstance in which the employment of coercion could be justified - in the homœopathic system the small doses of the appropriate medicine never offend the taste, and may consequently be given to the patient without his knowledge in his drink, so that all compulsion is unnecessary.

Elaborating. Surely the treatment he suggests is beneficial to the patients, even if the homeopathic drugs be without any effect.

¹ It is impossible to marvel at the hard-heartedness and indiscretion of the medical men in many establishments for patients of this kind, who, without attempting to discover the true and only efficacious mode of cur-

ing such disease, which is by homœopathic medicinal (antipsoric) means, content themselves with torturing these most pitiable of all human beings with the most violent blows and other painful torments. By this unscientific and revolting procedure they debase themselves beneath the level of the turnkeys in a house of correction, for the latter inflict such chastisement as the duty devolving on their office, and on criminals only, whilst the former appear, from a humiliating consciousness of their uselessness as physicians, only to vent their spite at the supposed incurability of mental diseases in harshness towards the pitiable, innocent sufferers, for they are too ignorant to be of any use and too indolent to adopt a judicious mode of treatment.

Well, as already mentioned, Hahnemann's wrath against the way insane people were often treated in his time is understandable. Many institutions treated mentally ill people worse than animals in the early 19th century.

§ 229

On the other hand, contradiction, eager explanations, rude corrections and invectives, as also weak, timorous yielding, are quite out of place with such patients; they are equally pernicious modes of treating mental and emotional maladies. But such patients are most of all exasperated and their complaint aggravated by contumely, fraud, and deceptions that they can detect. The physician and keeper must always pretend to believe them to be possessed of reason.

All kinds of external disturbing influences on their senses and disposition should be if possible removed; there are no amusements for their clouded spirit, no salutary distractions, no means of instruction, no soothing effects from conversation, books or other things for the soul that pines or frets in the chains of the diseased body, no invigoration for it, but the care; it is only when the bodily health is changed for the better that tranquillity and comfort again beam upon their mind.¹

1 The treatment of the violent insane manic and melancholic can take place only in an institution specially arranged for their treatment but not within the family circle of the patient.

While faring better than many of his contemporaries, Hahnemann's ideas as expressed above are certainly not up to modern standards. One might say that he was a century ahead of his time here, unfortunately, one more century has passed by now.

§ 230

If the antipsoric remedies selected for each particular case of mental or emotional disease (there are incredibly numerous varieties of them) be quite homœopathically suited for the faithfully traced picture of the morbid state, which, if there be a sufficient number of this kind of medicines known in respect of their pure effects, is ascertained by an indefatigable search for the most appropriate homœopathic remedy all the more easily, as the emotional and mental state, constituting the principal symptom of such a patient, is so unmistakably perceptible, - then the most striking improvement in no very long time, which could not be brought about by physicking the patient to death with the largest oft - repeated doses of all other unsuitable (allopathic) medicines. Indeed, I can confidently assert, from great experience, that the vast superiority of the homœopathic system over all other conceivable methods of the treatment is nowhere displayed in a more triumphant light than in mental and emotional diseases of long standing, which originally sprang from corporeal maladies or were developed simultaneously with them.

In the very convoluted sentences of this paragraph, Hahnemann seems to be saying that if the symptoms of the mental disease can be charted exactly enough and if enough medicines exist, then homeopathy will certainly be able to cure much better than allopathy. Furthermore, he claims to have great experience in this and to have celebrated great triumphs. An interesting statement which leaves the question of why these triumphs seem to be largely unrecorded, and why homeopathy has been unable, in spite of a head-start of a century and a half, to make any lasting impression on treatment of mental diseases.

§ 231

The intermittent diseases deserve a special consideration, as well those that recur at certain periods - like the great number of intermittent fevers, and the apparently non-febrile affections that recur at intervals like intermittent fevers - as also those in which certain morbid states alternate at uncertain intervals with morbid states of a different kind.

§ 232

These latter, alternating diseases, are also very numerous,¹ but all belong to the class of chronic diseases; they are generally a manifestation of developed psora alone, sometimes, but seldom, complicated with a syphilitic miasm, and therefore in the former case may be cured by antipsoric medicines; in the latter, however, in alternation with antisiphilitics as taught in my work on the Chronic Diseases.

More complications. Hahnemann's attempts to explain the vast diversity and complexity of diseases without acknowledging causative agents, but instead attributing it all do disturbances in the vital force and a few miasms and psora, inevitably gives rise to some very complicated theories.

(.....)

§ 233

The typical intermittent diseases are those where a morbid state of unvarying character returns at a tolerably fixed period, while the patient is apparently in good health, and takes its departure at an equally fixed period; this is observed in those apparently non-febrile morbid states that come and go in a periodical manner (at certain times), as well as in those of a febrile character, to wit, the numerous varieties of intermittent fevers.

§ 234

Those apparently non-febrile, typical, periodically recurring morbid states just alluded to observed in one single patient at a time (they do not usually appear sporadically or epidemically) always belong to the chronic diseases, mostly to those that are purely psoric, are but seldom complicated with syphilis, and are successfully treated by the same means; yet it is sometimes necessary to employ as an intermediate remedy a small dose of a potentized solution of cinchona bark, in order to extinguish completely their intermittent type.

This is not the only place in the Organon where Hahnemann, in spite of his own claims of the individuality of all diseases, suddenly drops the name of a single remedy that is claimed to work as a catch-all for some problem.

§ 235

With regard to the intermittent fevers,¹ that prevail sporadically or epidemically (not those endemically located in marshy districts), we often find every paroxysm likewise composed of two opposite alternating states (cold, heat - heat, cold), more frequently still of three (cold, heat, sweat). Therefore the remedy selected for them from the general class of proved (common, not antipsoric) medicines must either (and remedies of this sort are the surest) be able likewise to produce in the healthy body two (or all three) similar alternating states, or else must correspond by similarity of symptoms, in the most homœopathic manner possible, to the strongest, best marked, and most peculiar alternating state (either to the cold stage, or to the hot stage, or to the sweating state, each with its accessory symptoms, according as the one or other alternating state is the strongest and most peculiar); but the symptoms of the patient's health during the intervals when he is free from fever must be the chief guide to the most appropriate homœopathic remedy.²

1 The pathology hitherto in vogue, which is still in the stage of irrational infancy, recognizes but one single intermittent fever, which it likewise termed ague, and admits of no varieties but such as are constituted by the different intervals at which the paroxysms recur, quotidian, tertian, quartan etc. But there are much more important differences among them than what are marked by the periods of their recurrence; there are innumerable varieties of these fevers, some of which cannot even be denominated ague, as their fits consist solely of heat; others, again, are characterised by cold alone, with or without subsequent perspiration; yet others which exhibit general coldness of the surface, with a sensation on the patient's part, or whilst the body feels externally hot, the patient feels cold; others, again, in which one paroxysm consists entirely of a rigor or simple chilliness followed by an interval of health, while the next consists of heat alone, followed or not by perspiration; others, again, in which the heat comes first and the cold stage not till that is gone; others, again, wherein after a cold or hot stage apyrexia ensues, and then perspiration comes on like a second fit, often many hours subsequently; others, again, in which no perspiration at all comes on, and yet others in which the whole attack consists of perspiration alone, without any cold or hot stage, or in which the perspiration is only present during the heat; and there are innumerable other differences, especially in regard to the accessory symptoms, such as headache of a peculiar kind, bad taste of the mouth, nausea, vomiting, diarrhoea, want of or excessive thirst, peculiar pains in the body or limbs, disturbed sleep, deliria, alterations of temper, spasms, etc., before, during or after the sweating stage, and countless other varieties. All these are manifestly intermittent fevers of very different kinds, each of which, as might naturally be supposed, requires a special (homœopathic) treatment. It must be confessed that they can almost all be suppressed (as is often done) by enormous doses of bark and of its pharmaceutical preparation, the sulphate of quinine; that is to say, their periodical recurrence (their typos) may be extinguished by it, but the patients who suffered from intermittent fevers for which cinchona bark is not suitable, as is the case with all those epidemic intermittent fevers that traverse whole countries and even mountainous districts, are not restored to health by the extinction of the typos; on the contrary, they now remain ill in another manner, and worse, often much worse, than before; they are affected by peculiar, chronic bark dyscrasias, and can scarcely be restored to health even by a prolonged treatment by the true system of medicine - and yet that is what is called curing, forsooth!

2 Dr. von Bonninghausen, who has rendered more services to our beneficent system of medicine than any other of my disciples, has best elucidated this subject, which demands so much care, and has facilitated the

choice of the efficient remedy for the various epidemics of fever, in his work entitled Versuch einer homöopathischen Therapie der Wechselfieber, 1833, Munster bei Regensburg.

§ 236

The most appropriate and efficacious time for administering the medicine in these cases is immediately or very soon after the termination of the paroxysm, as soon as the patient has in some degree recovered from its effects; it has then time to effect all the changes in the organism requisite for the restoration of health, without any great disturbance or violent commotion; whereas the action of a medicine, be it ever so specifically appropriate, if given immediately before the paroxysm, coincides with the natural recurrence of the disease and causes such a reaction in the organism, such a violent contention, that an attack of that nature produces at the very least a great loss of strength, if it do not endanger life.¹ But if the medicine be given immediately after the termination of the fit, that is to say, at the period when the apyretic interval has commenced and a long time before there are any preparations for the next paroxysm, then the vital force of the organism is in the best possible condition to allow itself to be quietly altered by the remedy, and thus restored to the healthy state.

¹ This is observed in the fatal cases, by no means rare, in which a moderate dose of opium given during the cold stage quickly deprived the patients of life.

§ 237

But if the stage of apyrexia be very short, as happens in some very bad fevers, or if it be disturbed by some of the after sufferings of the previous paroxysm, the dose of the homöopathic medicine should be administered when the perspiration begins to abate, or the other subsequent phenomena of the expiring paroxysm begin to diminish.

Interspersed with jabs at the usual suspects, Hahnemann develops and reiterates his strange doctrine about recurring fevers: They should be treated in the dormant state. Presumably he feels that the symptoms of the underlying chronic disease are better seen then. In some cases, no doubt, he is right, but again, his sweeping generalizations seem inappropriate for the real world.

§ 238

Not infrequently, the suitable medicine has with a single dose destroyed several attacks and brought about the return of health, but in the majority of cases, another dose must be administered after such attack. Better still, however, when the character of the symptoms has not changed, doses of the same medicine given according to the newer discovery of repetition of doses (see note to § 270), may be given without difficulty in dynamizing each successive dose with 10-12 succussions of the vial containing the medicinal substance. Nevertheless, there are at times cases, though seldom, where the intermittent fever returns after several days' well being. This return of the same fever after a healthy interval is only possible when the noxious principle that first caused the fever, is still acting upon the convalescent, as is the case in marshy regions. Here a permanent restoration can often take place only by getting away from this causative factor, as is possible by seeking a mountainous retreat, if the cause was a marshy fever.

First some undocumented claims, then a sudden acknowledgement of a causative factor!

§ 239

As almost every medicine causes in its pure action a special, peculiar fever and even a kind of intermittent fever with its alternating states, differing from all other fevers that are caused by other medicines, homöopathic remedies may be found in the extensive domain of medicines for all the numerous varieties of natural intermittent fevers and, for a great many of such fevers, even in the moderate collection of medicines already proved on the healthy individual.

Actually, Hahnemann's own Materia Medica contradicts this statement, as numerous medicines have almost identical symptoms listed.

§ 240

But if the remedy found to be the homöopathic specific for a prevalent epidemic of intermittent fever do not effect a perfect cure in some one or other patient, if it be not the influence of a marshy district that prevents the cure, it must always be the psoric miasm in the background, in which case antipsoric medicines must be employed until complete relief is obtained.

Another of the hit and miss methods: If the homeopathic specific does not work, try antipsoric. And note the passage "until complete relief is obtained". How long is that?

§ 241

Epidemics of intermittent fever, in situations where none are endemic, are of the nature of chronic diseases, composed of single acute paroxysms; each single epidemic is of a peculiar, uniform character common to all the individuals attacked, and when this character is found in the totality of the symptoms common to all, it guides us to the discovery of the homœopathic (specific) remedy suitable for all the cases, which is almost universally serviceable in those patients who enjoyed tolerable health before the occurrence of the epidemic, that is to say, who were not chronic sufferers from developed psora.

Again, it seems that the principle of careful "taking" of the case can sometimes be dispensed with. How a practitioner finds out if all these requirements are met is difficult to see, so one is tempted to perceive this as another smokescreen.

§ 242

If, however, in such an epidemic intermittent fever the first paroxysms have been left uncured, or if the patients have been weakened by improper allopathic treatment; then the inherent psora that exists, alas! in so many persons, although in a latent state, becomes developed, takes on the type of the intermittent fever, and to all appearance continues to play the part of the epidemic intermittent fever, so that the medicine, which would have been useful in the first paroxysms (rarely an antipsoric), is now no longer suitable and cannot be of any service. We have now to do with a psoric intermittent fever only, and this will generally be subdued by minute and rarely repeated doses of sulphur or hepar sulphuris in a high potency.

Another universal cure. And another jab at allopathy.

§ 243

In those often very pernicious intermittent fevers which attack a single person, not residing in a marshy district, we must also at first, as in the case of acute diseases generally, which they resemble in respect to their psoric origin, employ for some days, to render what service it may, a homœopathic remedy selected for the special case from the other class of proved (not antipsoric) medicines; but if, notwithstanding this procedure, the recovery is deferred, we know that we have psora on the point of its development, and that in this case antipsoric medicines alone can effect a radical cure.

§ 244

The intermittent fevers endemic in marshy districts and tracts of country frequently exposed to inundations, give a great deal of work to physicians of the old school, and yet a healthy man may in his youth become habituated even to marshy districts and remain in good health, provided he preserves a faultless regimen and his system is not lowered by want, fatigue or pernicious passions. The intermittent fevers endemic there would at the most only attack him on his first arrival; but one or two very small doses of a highly potentized solution of cinchona bark would, conjointly with the well-regulated mode of living just alluded to, speedily free him from the disease. But persons who, while taking sufficient corporeal exercise and pursuing a healthy system of intellectual occupations and bodily regimen, cannot be cured of marsh intermittent fever by one or a few of such small doses of cinchona - in such persons psora, striving to develop itself, always lies at the root of their malady, and their intermittent fever cannot be cured in the marshy district without antipsoric treatment.¹ It sometimes happens that when these patients exchange, without delay, the marshy district for one that is dry and mountainous, recovery apparently ensues (the fever leaves them) if they be not yet deeply sunk in disease, that is to say, if the psora was not completely developed in them and can consequently return to its latent state; but they will never regain perfect health without antipsoric treatment.

¹ Large, oft-repeated doses of cinchona bark, as also concentrated cinchona remedies, such as the sulphate of quinine, have certainly the power of freeing such patients from the periodical fits of the marsh ague; but those thus deceived into the belief that they are cured remain diseased in another way, frequently with an incurable Quinin intoxication (see §276 note.)

Yet another universal medicine. And another example of either this works, or it doesn't. Obviously, much of the preceding 10 paragraphs or so is about malaria and other tropical diseases. These diseases, with their complex parasite cycles must have been rather confounding for someone with such a simplistic view of disease causes.

§ 245

Having thus seen what attention should, in the homœopathic treatment, be paid to the chief varieties of diseases and to the peculiar circumstances connected with them, we now pass on to what we have to say respecting the remedies and the mode of employing them, together with the diet and regimen to be observed during their use.

Every perceptibly progressive and strikingly increasing amelioration in a transient (acute) or persistent (chronic) disease, is a condition which, as long as it lasts, completely precludes every repetition of the administration of any medicine whatsoever, because all the good the medicine taken continues to effect is new hastening towards its completion. Every new dose of any medicine whatsoever, even of the one last administered, that has hitherto shown itself to be salutary, would in this case disturb the work of amelioration.

A big difference between homeopathy and modern medicine shows here: In modern medicine, if the patient improves, it is usually taken as a sign that the medication should be continued. Homeopathy, on the other hand, works on symptoms only, so since the symptoms have now changed, the prescription must also change. This is logically quite consistent.

§ 246

Every perceptibly progressive and strikingly increasing amelioration during treatment is a condition which, as long as it lasts, completely precludes every repetition of the administration of any medicine whatsoever, because all the good the medicine taken continues to effect is now hastening towards its completion. This is not infrequently the cause in acute diseases, but in more chronic diseases, on the other hand, a single dose of an appropriately selected homœopathic remedy will at times complete even with but slowly progressive improvement and give the help which such a remedy in such a case can accomplish naturally within 40, 50, 60, 100 days. This is, however, but rarely the case; and besides, it must be a matter of great importance to the physician as well as to the patient that were it possible, this period should be diminished to one-half, one-quarter, and even still less, so that a much more rapid cure might be obtained. And this may be very happily affected, as recent and oft-repeated observations have taught me under the following conditions: firstly, if the medicine selected with the utmost care was perfectly homœopathic; secondly, if it is highly potentized, dissolved in water and given in proper small dose that experience has taught as the most suitable in definite intervals for the quickest accomplishment of the cure but with the precaution, that the degree of every dose deviate somewhat from the preceding and following in order that the vital principle which is to be altered to a similar medicinal disease be not aroused to untoward reactions and revolt as is always the case¹ with unmodified and especially rapidly repeated doses.

¹ What I said in the fifth edition of the Organon, in a long note to this paragraph in order to prevent these undesirable reactions of the vital energy, was all the experience I then had justified. But during the last four or five years, however, all these difficulties are wholly solved by my new altered but perfected method. The same carefully selected medicine may now be given daily and for months, if necessary in this way, namely, after the lower degree of potency has been used for one or two weeks in the treatment of chronic disease, advance is made in the same way to higher degrees, (beginning according to the new dynamization method, taught herewith with the use of the lowest degrees).

Immediately modifying the statement made in §245, it now seems that it can, after all, sometimes be right to continue with the same medication. The logical consistency now seems lost.

§ 247

It is impractical to repeat the same unchanged dose of a remedy once, not to mention its frequent repetition (and at short intervals in order not to delay the cure). The vital principle does not accept such unchanged doses without resistance, that is, without other symptoms of the medicine to manifest themselves than those similar to the disease to be cured, because the former dose has already accomplished the expected change in the vital principle and a second dynamically wholly similar, unchanged dose of the same medicine no longer finds, therefore, the same conditions of the vital force. The patient may indeed be made sick in another way by receiving other such unchanged doses, even sicker than he was, for now only those symptoms of the given remedy remain active which were not homœopathic to the original disease, hence no step towards cure can follow, only a true aggravation of the condition of the patient. But if the succeeding dose is changed slightly every time, namely potentized somewhat higher (§§ 269-270) then the vital principle may be altered without difficulty by the same medicine (the sensation of natural disease diminishing) and thus the cure brought nearer.¹

¹ We ought not even with the best chosen homœopathic medicine, for instance one pellet of the same potency that was beneficial at first, to let the patient have a second or third dose, taken dry. In the same way, if the medicine was dissolved in water and the first dose proved beneficial, a second or third and even smaller dose from the bottle standing undisturbed, even in intervals of a few days, would prove no longer beneficial, even though the original preparation had been potentized with ten succussions or as I suggested later with but two succussions in order to obviate this disadvantage and this according to above reasons. But through modification of every dose in its dynamization degree, as I herewith teach, there exists no offence, even if the doses be repeated more frequently, even if the medicine be ever so highly potentized with ever so many succussions. It almost seems as if the best selected homœopathic remedy could best extract the morbid disorder from the vital force and in chronic disease to extinguish the same only if applied in several different forms.

The idea of increasing dose (or potentialization) somewhat restores logic consistency, providing you believe that shaking a vial changes the (already thoroughly shaken) content.

For this purpose, we potentize anew the medicinal solution¹ (with perhaps 8, 10, 12 succussions) from which we give the patient one or (increasingly) several teaspoonful doses, in long lasting diseases daily or every second day, in acute diseases every two to six hours and in very urgent cases every hour or oftener. Thus in chronic diseases, every correctly chosen homœopathic medicine, even those whose action is of long duration, may be repeated daily for months with ever increasing success. If the solution is used up (in seven to fifteen days) it is necessary to add to the next solution of the same medicine if still indicated one or (though rarely) several pellets of a higher potency with which we continue so long as the patient experiences continued improvement without encountering one or another complaint that he never had before in his life. For if this happens, if the balance of the disease appears in a group of altered symptoms then another, one more homœopathically related medicine must be chosen in place of the last and administered in the same repeated doses, mindful, however, of modifying the solution of every dose with thorough vigorous succussions, thus changing its degree of potency and increasing it somewhat. On the other hand, should there appear during almost daily repetition of the well indicated homœopathic remedy, towards the end of the treatment of a chronic disease, so-called (§ 161) homœopathic aggravations by which the balance of the morbid symptoms seem to again increase somewhat (the medicinal disease, similar to the original, now alone persistently manifests itself). The doses in that case must then be reduced still further and repeated in longer intervals and possibly stopped several days, in order to see if the convalescence need no further medicinal aid. The apparent symptoms (Schein - Symptome) caused by the excess of the homœopathic medicine will soon disappear and leave undisturbed health in its wake. If only a small vial say a dram of dilute alcohol is used in the treatment, in which is contained and dissolved through succussion one globule of the medicine which is to be used by olfaction every two, three or four days, this also must be thoroughly succussed eight to ten times before each olfaction.

1 Made in 40, 30, 20, 15 or 8 tablespoons of water with the addition of some alcohol or a piece of charcoal in order to preserve it. If charcoal is used, it is suspended by means of a thread in the vial and is taken out when the vial is succussed. The solution of the medicinal globule (and it is rarely necessary to use more than one globule) of a thoroughly potentized medicine in a large quantity of water can be obviated by making a solution in only 7-8 tablespoons of water and after thorough succussion of the vial take from it one tablespoon and put it in a glass of water (containing about 7 to 8 spoonfuls), this stirred thoroughly and then given a dose to the patient. If he is unusually excited and sensitive, a teaspoon of this solution may be put in a second glass of water, thoroughly stirred and teaspoonful doses or more be given. There are patients of so great sensitiveness that a third or fourth glass, similarly prepared, may be necessary. Each such prepared glass must be made fresh daily. the globule of the high potency is best crushed in a few grains of sugar of milk which the patient can put in the vial and be dissolved in the requisite quantity of water.

Complex and detailed instructions, but how to decide when to use this way of medicating has not been made clear.

Every medicine prescribed for a case of disease which, in the course of its action, produces new and troublesome symptoms not appertaining to the disease to be cured, is not capable of effecting real improvement,¹ and cannot be considered as homœopathically selected; it must, therefore, either, if the aggravation be considerable, be first partially neutralized as soon as possible by an antidote before giving the next remedy chosen more accurately according to similarity of action; or if the troublesome symptoms be not very violent, the next remedy must be given immediately, in order to take the place of the improperly selected one.²

1 As all experience shows that the dose of the specially suited homœopathic medicine can scarcely be prepared too small to effect perceptible amelioration in the disease for which it is appropriate (§§ 275-278), we should act injudiciously and hurtfully were we when no improvement, or some, though it be even slight, aggravation ensues, to repeat or even increase the dose of the same medicine, as is done in the old system, under the delusion that it was not efficacious on account of its small quantity (its too small dose). Every aggravation by the production of new symptoms - when nothing untoward has occurred in the mental or physical regimen - invariably proves unsuitableness on the part of the medicine formerly given in the case of disease before us, but never indicates that the dose has been too weak.

2 The well informed and conscientiously careful physician will never be in a position to require an antidote in his practice if he will begin, as he should, to give the selected medicine in the smallest possible dose. Like minute doses of a better chosen remedy will re-establish order throughout.

Mainly elaborating on the idea of giving as small doses as possible. This is another difference compared to modern medicine, which strives to give the right dose. In many types of modern medicines, e.g. antibiotics, giving a too small dose can be harmful. Apparently, in homeopathy, it is OK to give a too small dose. Actually this does not seem quite logical, since the effects of the medicine is supposed to overcome and supplant those of the disease, but presumably this can be done step-wise.

When, to the observant practitioner who accurately investigates the state of the disease, it is evident, in urgent cases after the lapse of only six, eight or twelve hours, that he has made a bad selection in the medicine last given, in that the patient's state is growing perceptibly, however slightly, worse from hour to hour, by the occurrence of new symptoms and sufferings, it is not only allowable for him, but it is his duty to remedy his mistake, by the selection and administration of a homœopathic medicine not merely tolerably suitable, but the most appropriate possible for the existing state of the disease (§ 167).

Seems rather obvious.

§251

There are some medicines (e.g., ignatia, also bryonia and rhus, and sometimes belladonna) whose power of altering man's health consists chiefly in alternating actions - a kind of primary-action symptoms that are in part opposed to each other. Should the practitioner find, on prescribing one of these, selected on strict homœopathic principles, that no improvement follows, he will in most cases soon effect his object by giving (in acute diseases, even within a few hours) a fresh and equally small dose of the same medicine.¹

¹ As I have more particularly described in the introduction to "Ignatia" (in the first volume of the *Materia Medica Pura*).

Complicating things even more, certain medicines seem to be administered repeatedly in the same dose.

§ 252

But should we find, during the employment of the other medicines in chronic (psoric) diseases, that the best selected homœopathic (antipsoric) medicine in the suitable (minutest) dose does not effect an improvement, this is a sure sign that the cause that keeps up the disease still persists, and that there is some circumstances in the mode of life of the patient or in the situation in which he is placed, that must be removed in order that a permanent cure may ensue.

Here, at last, something we can all relate to. Remove the cause of the disease. Of course, that is rather like "allopathy", but

§ 253

Among the signs that, in all diseases, especially in such as are of an acute nature, inform us of a slight commencement of amelioration or aggravation that is not perceptible to every one, the state of mind and the whole demeanor of the patient are the most certain and instructive. In the case of ever so slight an improvement we observe a greater degree of comfort, increased calmness and freedom of the mind, higher spirits - a kind of return of the natural state. In the case of ever so small a commencement of aggravation we have, on the contrary, the exact opposite of this: a constrained helpless, pitiable state of the disposition, of the mind, of the whole demeanor, and of all gestures, postures and actions, which may be easily perceived on close observation, but cannot be described in words.¹

Basically not bad advice to take heed of how the patient feels. However, the caveat is that this may not always show how well he actually is. In fact an improved mood has been known to mask a progression of the disease.

¹ The signs of improvement in the disposition and mind, however, may be expected only soon after the medicine has been taken when the dose has been sufficiently minute (i.e., as small as possible), an unnecessary large dose of even the most suitable homœopathic medicine acts too violently, and at first produces too great and too lasting a disturbance of the mind and disposition to allow us soon to perceive the improvement in them. I must here observe that this so essential rule is chiefly transgressed by presumptuous tryos in homœopathy, and by physicians who are converted to homœopathy from the ranks of the old school. From old prejudices these persons abhor the smallest doses of the lowest dilutions of medicine in such cases, and hence they fail to experience the great advantages and blessings of that mode of proceeding which a thousandfold experience has shown to be the most salutary; they cannot effect all that homœopathy is capable of doing, and hence they have no claim to be considered its adherents.

Another attack, this time not on "allopathy" as such, but on non-kosher homeopaths.

§ 254

(.....)

§ 255

(.....)

Mainly reiterations.

§ 256

On the other hand, if the patient mention the occurrence of some fresh accidents and symptoms of importance - signs that the medicine chosen has not been strictly homœopathic - even though he should good-naturedly assure us that he feels better, as is not infrequently the case in phthical patients with lung abscess, we must not believe this assurance, but regard his state as aggravated as it will soon be perfectly apparent it is.

Finally pointing out the caveat in §253. It must be slightly confusing to be a homeopathic practitioner.

§ 257

The true physician will take care to avoid making favorite remedies of medicines, the employment of which he has, by chance, perhaps found often useful, and which he has had opportunities of using with good effect. If he do so, some remedies or rarer use, which would have been more homœopathically suitable, consequently more serviceable, will often be neglected.

§ 258

The true practitioner, moreover, will not in his practice with mistrustful weakness neglect the employment of those remedies that he may now and then have employed with bad effects, owing to an erroneous selection (from his own fault, therefore), or avoid them for other (false) reasons, as that they were unhomœopathic for the case of disease before him; he must bear in mind the truth, that of medicinal agents that one alone invariably deserves the preference in every case of disease which correspond most accurately by similarity to the totality of the characteristic symptoms, and that no paltry prejudices should interfere with this serious choice.

Good and sound advice. Somewhat difficult to follow, though, in a school that relies entirely on clinical experience.

§ 259

Considering the minuteness of the doses necessary and proper in homœopathic treatment, we can easily understand that during the treatment everything must be removed from the diet and regimen which can have any medicinal action, in order that the small dose may not be overwhelmed and extinguished or disturbed by any foreign medicinal irritant.

§ 260

Hence the careful investigation into such obstacles to cure is so much the more necessary in the case of patients affected by chronic diseases, as their diseases are usually aggravated by such noxious influences and other disease-causing errors in the diet and regimen, which often pass unnoticed.¹

¹ Coffee; fine Chinese and other herb teas; beer prepared with medicinal vegetable substances unsuitable for the patient's state; so-called fine liquors made with medicinal spices; all kinds of punch; spiced chocolate; odorous waters and perfumes of many kinds; strong-scented flowers in the apartment; tooth powders and essences and perfumed sachets compounded of drugs; highly spiced dishes and sauces; spiced cakes and ices; crude medicinal vegetables for soups; dishes of herbs, roots and stalks of plants possessing medicinal qualities; asparagus with long green tips, hops, and all vegetables possessing medicinal properties, celery, onions; old cheese, and meats that are in a state of decomposition, or that passes medicinal properties (as the flesh and fat of pork, ducks and geese, or veal that is too young and sour viands), ought just as certainly to be kept from patients as they should avoid all excesses in food, and in the use of sugar and salt, as also spirituous drinks, undiluted with water, heated rooms, woollen clothing next the skin, a sedentary life in close apartments, or the frequent indulgence in mere passive exercise (such as riding, driving or swinging), prolonged suckling, taking a long siesta in a recumbent posture in bed, sitting up long at night, uncleanliness, unnatural debauchery, enervation by reading obscene books, reading while lying down, Onanism or imperfect or suppressed intercourse in order to prevent conception, subjects of anger, grief or vexation, a passion for play, over-exertion of the mind or body, especially after meals, dwelling in marshy districts, damp rooms, penurious living, etc. All these things must be as far as possible avoided or removed, in order that the cure may not be obstructed or rendered impossible. Some of my disciples seem needlessly to increase the difficulties of the patient's dietary by forbidding the use of many more, tolerably indifferent things, which is not to be commended.

No doubt, some cures obtained by homeopathy really come from the above recommendations for a healthier lifestyle, even if some of them are a bit, shall we say Victorian, from a modern point of view. Which else his disciples might forbid their patients boggles the mind.

§ 261

The most appropriate regimen during the employment of medicine in chronic diseases consists in the removal of such obstacles to recovery, and in supplying where necessary the reverse: innocent moral and intellectual recreation, active exercise in the open air in almost all kinds of weather (daily walks, slight manual labor), suitable, nutritious, unmedicinal food and drink, etc.

§ 262

In acute diseases, on the other hand - except in cases of mental alienation - the subtle, unerring internal sense of the awakened life-preserving faculty determines so clearly and precisely, that the physician only requires to counsel the friends and attendants to put no obstacles in the way of this voice of nature by refusing anything the patient urgently desires in the way of food, or by trying to persuade him to partake of anything injurious.

§ 263

The desire of the patient affected by an acute disease with regard to food and drink is certainly chiefly for things that give palliative relief: they are, however, not strictly speaking of a medicinal character, and merely supply a sort of want. The slight hindrances that the gratification of this desire, within moderate bounds, could oppose to the radical removal of the disease¹ will be amply counteracted and overcome by the power of the homœopathically suited medicine and the vital force set free by it, as also by the refreshment that follows from taking what has been so ardently longed for. In like manner, in acute diseases the temperature of the room and the heat or coolness of the bed-coverings must also be arranged entirely in conformity with the patients' wish. He must be kept free from all over-exertion of mind and exciting emotions.

¹ This is, however, rare. Thus, for instance, in pure inflammatory diseases, where aconite is so indispensable, whose action would be destroyed by partaking of vegetable acids, the desire of the patient is almost always for pure cold water only.

Elaborating.

§ 264

The true physician must be provided with genuine medicines of unimpaired strength, so that he may be able to rely upon their therapeutic powers; he must be able, himself, to judge of their genuineness.

§ 265

It should be a matter of conscience with him to be thoroughly convinced in every case that the patient always takes the right medicine and therefore he must give the patient the correctly chosen medicine prepared, moreover, by himself.

This is bad news for the billion\$ homeopathic drug industry.

§ 266

Substances belonging to the animal and vegetable kingdoms possess their medicinal qualities most perfectly in their raw state.¹

¹ All crude animal and vegetable substances have a greater or less amount of medicinal power, and are capable of altering man's health, each in its own peculiar way. Those plants and animals used by the most enlightened nations as food have this advantage over all others, that they contain a larger amount of nutritious constituents; and they differ from the others in this that their medicinal powers in their raw state are either not very great in themselves, or are diminished by the culinary processes they are subjected to in cooking for domestic use, by the expression of the pernicious juice (like the cassava root of South America), by fermentation (of the rye-flour in the dough for making bread, sour-crust prepared without vinegar and pickled gherkins), by smoking and by the action of heat (in boiling, stewing, toasting, roasting, baking), whereby the medicinal parts of many of these substances are in part destroyed and dissipated. By the addition of salt (pickling) and vinegar (sauces, salads) animal and vegetable substances certainly lose much of their injurious medicinal qualities, but other disadvantages result from these additions.

This paragraph is interesting in two ways. Hahnemann here claims that most kinds of treatment reduce the medicinal effect of biological preparation. In many cases, he is right, because normal cooking and conservation tends to destroy a lot of active compounds in such materials. What is interesting is that he is certain that HIS way of treating them has the opposite effect. Another interesting remark is in the last sentence. We can surely agree that medicinal effects in foodstuffs

can be harmful, but this statement contradicts the notion that homeopathic drugs are without harmful side-effects.

But even those plants that possess most medicinal power lose that in part or completely by such processes. By perfect desiccation all the roots of the various kinds of iris, of the horseradish, of the different species of arum and the peonies lose almost all their medicinal virtue. The juice of the most virulent plants often becomes inert, pitch-like mass, from the heat employed in preparing the ordinary extracts. By merely standing a long time, the expressed juice of the most deadly plants becomes quite powerless; even at moderate atmospheric temperature it rapidly takes on the vinous fermentation (and thereby loses much of its medicinal power), and immediately thereafter the acetous and putrid fermentation, whereby it is deprived of all peculiar medicinal properties; the fecula that is then deposited, if well washed, is quite innocuous, like ordinary starch. By the transudation that takes place when a number of green plants are laid one above the other, the greatest part of their medicinal properties is lost.

§ 267

We gain possession of the powers of indigenous plants and of such as may be had in a fresh state in the most complete and certain manner by mixing their freshly expressed juice immediately with equal parts of spirits of wine of a strength sufficient to burn in a lamp. After this has stood a day and a night in a close stoppered bottle and deposited the fibrinous and albuminous matters, the clear superincumbent fluid is then to be decanted off for medicinal use.¹ All fermentation of the vegetable juice will be at once checked by the spirits of wine mixed with it and rendered impossible for the future, and the entire medicinal power of the vegetable juice is thus retained (perfect and uninjured) for ever by keeping the preparation in well-corked bottles and excluded from the sun's light.²

Strange that Hahnemann assumes that pickling with salt or vinegar is destructive for the medical powers of his raw substances, but not alcohol. How does he get this idea?

1 Buchholz (Taschenb. f. Scheidek. u. Apoth. a. d. J., 1815, Weimar, Abth. I, vi) assures his readers (and his reviewer in the Leipziger Literaturzeitung, 1816, No. 82, does not contradict him) that for this excellent mode of operating medicines we have to thank the campaign in Russia, whence it was (in 1812) imported into Germany. According to the noble practice of many Germans to be unjust towards their own countrymen, he conceals the fact that this discovery and those directions, which he quotes in my very words from the first edition of the Organon of Rational Medicine, § 230 and note, proceed from me, and that I first published them to the world two years before the Russian campaign (the Organon appeared in 1810). Some folks would rather assign the origin of a discovery to the deserts of Asia than to a German to whom the honor belongs. O tempora! O mores!

Oops! A jab at a colleague, who fails to give Hahnemann credit, it seems. The politically somewhat incorrect reference to the "deserts of Asia" has to be seen in the context of his time, I presume.

(.....)

A long description of how to prepare and store raw biological substances. Quite sensible, except that Hahnemann fails to mention the cause of possible decomposition: Micro organisms. Attributing things to microorganisms is, of course, detrimental to Hahnemann's doctrine.

§ 269

The homœopathic system of medicine develops for its special use, to a hitherto unheard-of degree, the inner medicinal powers of the crude substances by means of a process peculiar to it and which has hitherto never been tried, whereby only they all become immeasurably and penetratingly efficacious¹ and remedial, even those that in the crude state give no evidence of the slightest medicinal power on the human body.

This remarkable change in the qualities of natural bodies develops the latent, hitherto unperceived, as if slumbering² hidden, dynamic (§ 11) powers which influence the life principle, change the well-being of animal life.³ This is effected by mechanical action upon their smallest particles by means of rubbing and shaking and through the addition of an indifferent substance, dry or fluid, are separated from each other. This process is called dynamizing, potentizing (development of medicinal power) and the products are dynamizations⁴ or potencies in different degrees.

Restating one of the homeopathic cornerstone claims. Still without any backing evidence.

1 Long before this discovery of mine, experience had taught several changes which could be brought about in different natural substances by means of friction, for instance, warmth, heat, fire, development of odor in odorless bodies, magnetization of steel, and so forth. But all these properties produced by friction were related only to physical and inanimate things, whereas it is a law of nature according to which physiological and pathogenic changes take place in the body's condition by means of forces capable of changing the crude material of drugs,

even in such as had never shown any medicinal properties. This is brought about by trituration and succussion, but under the condition of employing an indifferent vehicle in certain proportions. this wonderful physical and especially physiological and pathogenic law of nature had not been discovered before my time. No wonder then, that the present students of nature and physicians (so for unknowing) cannot have faith in the magical curative powers of the minute doses of medicines prepared according to homœopathic rules (dynamized).

Pronouncing his thesis (if it even merits that) a law of nature. The last sentence is interesting; calling on magical, and recognizing that it is not strange (in his time) that scientists put little faith in his theory. It only remains to add that they still don't.

2 The same thing is seen in a bar of iron and steel where a slumbering trace of latent magnetic force cannot but be recognized in their interior. Both, after their completion by means of the forge stand upright, repulse the north pole of a magnetic needle with the lower end and attract the south pole, while the upper end shows itself as the south pole of the magnetic needle. But this is only a latent force; not even the finest iron particles can be drawn magnetically or held on either end of such a bar.

Only after this bar of steel is dynamized, rubbing it with a dull file in one direction, will it become a true active powerful magnet, one able to attract iron and steel to itself and impart to another bar of steel by mere contact and even some distance away, magnetic power and this in a higher degree the more it has been rubbed. In the same way will triturating a medicinal substance and shaking of its solution (dynamization, potentiation) develop the medicinal powers hidden within and manifest them more and more or if one may say so, spiritualizes the material substance itself.

Calling on observations about magnetic properties. His observations are imprecise and, as we now know, irrelevant. Since magnetism was already quite well researched in Hahnemann's era, he really cannot be excused for his unscientific approach here; he is not a physicist, but if you want to call in evidence from a different area, the least you can do is to get your data straight.

3 On this account it refers to the increase and stronger development of their power to cause changes in the health of animals and men if these natural substances in this improved state, are brought very near to the living sensitive fibre or come in contact with it (by means of intake or olfaction). Just as a magnetic bar especially if its magnetic force is increased (dynamized) can show magnetic power only in a needle of steel whose pole is near or touches it. The steel itself remains unchanged in the remaining chemical and physical properties and can bring about no changes in other metals (for instance, in brass), just as little as dynamized medicines can have any action upon lifeless things.

Elaborating on the "magnetic connection". Still wrong.

4 We hear daily how homœopathic medicinal potencies are called mere dilutions, when they are the very opposite, i.e., a true opening up of the natural substances bringing to light and revealing the hidden specific medicinal powers contained within and brought forth by rubbing and shaking. The aid of a chosen, unmedicinal medium of attenuation is but a secondary condition.

Simple dilution, for instance, the solution of a grain of salt will become water, the grain of salt will disappear in the dilution with much water and will never develop into medicinal salt which by means of our well prepared dynamization, is raised to most marvellous power.

Claiming that succussion is different from dilution, but not providing any clue to how or why.

§ 270

In order to best obtain this development of power, a small part of the substance to be dynamized, say one grain, is triturated for three hours with three times one hundred grains sugar of milk according to the method described below 1 up to the one-millionth part in powder form. For reasons given below (b) one grain of this powder is dissolved in 500 drops of a mixture of one part of alcohol and four parts of distilled water, of which one drop is put in a vial. To this are added 100 drops of pure alcohol 2 and given one hundred strong succussions with the hand against a hard but elastic body. 3 This is the medicine in the first degree of dynamization with which small sugar globules 4 may then be moistened 5 and quickly spread on blotting paper to dry and kept in a well-corked vial with the sign of (I) degree of potency. Only one 6 globule of this is taken for further dynamization, put in a second new vial (with a drop of water in order to dissolve it) and then with 100 powerful succussions.

With this alcoholic medicinal fluid globules are again moistened, spread upon blotting paper and dried quickly, put into a well-stoppered vial and protected from heat and sun light and given the sign (II) of the second potency. And in this way the process is continued until the twenty-ninth is reached. Then with 100 drops of alcohol by means of 100 succussions, an alcoholic medicinal fluid is formed with which the thirtieth dynamization degree is given to properly moistened and dried sugar globules.

By means of this manipulation of crude drugs are produced preparations which only in this way reach the full capacity to forcibly influence the suffering parts of the sick organism. In this way, by means of similar artificial

morbid affection, the influence of the natural disease on the life principle present within is neutralized. By means of this mechanical procedure, provided it is carried out regularly according to the above teaching, a change is effected in the given drug, which in its crude state shows itself only as material, at times as unmedicinal material but by means of such higher and higher dynamization, it is changed and subtilized at last into spirit-like medicinal power, which, indeed, in itself does not fall within our senses but for which the medicinally prepared globule, dry, but more so when dissolved in water, becomes the carrier, and in this condition, manifests the healing power of this invisible force in the sick body.

1 One-third of one hundred grains sugar of milk is put in a glazed porcelain mortar, the bottom dulled previously by rubbing it with fine, moist sand. Upon this powder is put one grain of the powdered drug to be triturated (one drop of quicksilver, petroleum, etc.). The sugar of milk used for dynamization must be of that special pure quality that is crystallized on strings and comes to us in the shape of long bars. For a moment the medicines and powder are mixed with a porcelain spatula and triturated rather strongly, six to seven minutes, with the pestle rubbed dull, then the mass is scraped from the bottom of the mortar and from the pestle for three to four minutes, in order to make it homogeneous. This is followed by triturating it in the same way 6 - 7 minutes without adding anything more and again scraping 3 - 4 minutes from what adhered to the mortar and pestle. The second third of the sugar of milk is now added, mixed with the spatula and again triturated 6 - 7 minutes, followed by the scraping for 3 - 4 minutes and trituration without further addition for 6 - 7 minutes. The last third of sugar of milk is then added, mixed with the spatula and triturated as before 6 - 7 minutes with most careful scraping together. The powder thus prepared is put in a vial, well corked, protected from direct sunlight to which the name of the substance and the designation of the first product marked /100 is given. In order to raise this product to /10000, one grain of the powdered /100 is mixed with the third part of 100 grains of powdered sugar of milk and then proceed as before, but every third must be carefully triturated twice thoroughly each time for 6 - 7 minutes and scraped together 3 - 4 minutes before the second and last third of sugar of milk is added. After each third, the same procedure is taken. When all is finished, the powder is put in a well corked vial and labelled /10000, i.e., (I), each grain containing 1/1,000,000 the original substance. Accordingly, such a trituration of the three degrees requires six times six to seven minutes for triturating and six times 3 - 4 minutes for scraping, thus one hour for every degree. After one hour such trituration of the first degree, each grain will contain 1/000; of the second 1/10,000; and in the third 1/1,000,000 of the drug used.* Mortar and spatula must be cleaned well before they are used for another medicine. Washed first with warm water and dried, both mortar and pestle, as well as spatula are then put in a kettle of boiling water for half an hour. Precaution might be used to such an extent as to put these utensils on a coal fire exposed to a glowing heat.

* These are the three degrees of the dry powder trituration, which if carried out correctly, will effect a good beginning for the dynamization of the medicinal substance.

2 The vial used for potentizing is filled two-thirds full.

3 Perhaps on a leather bound book.

4 They are prepared under supervision by the confectioner from starch and sugar and the small globules freed from fine dusty parts by passing them through a sieve. Then they are put through a strainer that will permit only 100 to pass through weighing one grain, the most serviceable size for the needs of a homœopathic physician.

5 A small cylindrical vessel shaped like a thimble, made of glass, porcelain or silver, with a small opening at the bottom in which the globules are put to be medicated. They are moistened with some of the dynamized medicinal alcohol, stirred and poured out on blotting paper, in order to dry them quickly.

6 According to first directions, one drop of the liquid of a lower potency was to be taken to 100 drops of alcohol for higher potentiation. This proportion of the medicine of attenuation to the medicine that is to be dynamized (100:1) was found altogether too limited to develop thoroughly and to a high degree the power of the medicine by means of a number of such succussions without specially using great force of which wearisome experiments have convinced me.

But if only one such globule be taken, of which 100 weigh one grain, and dynamize it with 100 drops of alcohol, the proportion of 1 to 50,000 and even greater will be had, for 500 such globules can hardly absorb one drop, for their saturation. With this disproportionate higher ratio between medicine and diluting medium many successive strokes of the vial filled two-thirds with alcohol can produce a much greater development of power. But with so small a diluting medium as 100 to 1 of the medicine, if many succussions by means of a powerful machine are forced into it, medicines are then developed which, especially in the higher degrees of dynamization, act almost immediately, but with furious, even dangerous violence, especially in weakly patients, without having a lasting, mild reaction of the vital principle. But the method described by me, on the contrary, produces medicines of highest development of power and mildest action, which, however, if well chosen, touches all suffering parts curatively.* In acute fevers, the small doses of the lowest dynamization degrees of these thus perfected medicinal preparations, even of medicines of long continued action (for instance, belladonna) may be repeated in short intervals. In the treatment of chronic diseases, it is best to begin with the lowest degrees of dynamization and when necessary advance to higher, even more powerful but mildly acting degrees.

* In very rare cases, notwithstanding almost full recovery of health and with good vital strength, an old annoying local trouble continuing undisturbed it is wholly permitted and even indispensably necessary, to administer in increasing doses the homœopathic remedy that has proved itself efficacious but potentized to a very high

degree by means of many succussions by hand. Such a local disease will often then disappear in a wonderful way.

7 This assertion will not appear improbable, if one considers that by means of this method of dynamization (the preparations thus produced, I have found after many laborious experiments and counter-experiments, to be the most powerful and at the same time mildest in action, i.e., as the most perfected) the material part of the medicine is lessened with each degree of dynamization 50,000 times yet incredibly increased in power, so that the further dynamization of 125 and 18 ciphers reaches only the third degree of dynamization. The thirtieth thus progressively prepared would give a fraction almost impossible to be expressed in numbers. It becomes uncommonly evident that the material part by means of such dynamization (development of its true, inner medicinal essence) will ultimately dissolve into its individual spirit-like, (conceptual) essence. In its crude state therefore, it may be considered to consist really only of this underdeveloped conceptual essence.

Above is the detailed description of how to prepare homeopathic drugs. Hahnemann claims to have made many "laborious experiments and counter-experiments", but fails to provide any details. This rather flies in the face of modern homeopath's claim that homeopathy does not lend itself to objective testing. Logically, you will either have to contend that Hahnemann was able to conduct concise tests enabling him to judge the effect of different potencies and substances, or you must conclude that he is lying.

§ 271

If the physician prepares his homœopathic medicines himself, as he should reasonably do in order to save men from sickness,¹ he may use the fresh plant itself, as but little of the crude article is required, if he does not need the expressed juice perhaps for purposes of healing. He takes a few grains in a mortar and with 100 grains sugar of milk three distinct times brings them to the one-millionth trituration (§ 270) before further potentizing of a small portion of this by means of shaking is undertaken, a procedure to be observed also with the rest of crude drugs of either dry or oily nature.

Again pointing out that the practitioner should prepare his/her own medicines.

1 Until the State, in the future, after having attained insight into the indispensability of perfectly prepared homœopathic medicines, will have them manufactured by a competent impartial person, in order to give them free of charge to homœopathic physicians trained in homœopathic hospitals, who have been examined theoretically and practically, and thus legally qualified. The physician may then become convinced of these divine tools for purposes of healing, but also to give them free of charge to his patients - rich and poor.

A remarkable suggestion, especially in Hahnemann's time. We here get confirmation of his idealism. However, this scenario did not materialize. Homeopathy stayed in the belief realm.

§ 272

Such a globule,¹ placed dry upon the tongue, is one of the smallest doses for a moderate recent case of illness. Here but few nerves are touched by the medicine. A similar globule, crushed with some sugar of milk and dissolved in a good deal of water (§ 247) and stirred well before every administration will produce a far more powerful medicine for the use of several days. Every dose, no matter how minute, touches, on the contrary, many nerves.

1 These globules (§ 270) retain their medicinal virtue for many years, if protected against sunlight and heat.

Trying to explain the effect to some degree, but the claim remains unsubstantiated. There is a strange contrast between the declaration that the effect of the medicines is "spirit-like" and the , very physical, requirement to keep them away from sunlight and heat. It seems that Hahnemann cannot quite make up his mind whether he is dealing with magic or chemistry.

§ 273

In no case under treatment is it necessary and therefore not permissible to administer to a patient more than one single, simple medicinal substance at one time. It is inconceivable how the slightest doubt could exist as to whether it was more consistent with nature and more rational to prescribe a single, simple¹ medicine at one time in a disease or a mixture of several differently acting drugs. It is absolutely not allowed in homœopathy, the one true, simple and natural art of healing, to give the patient at one time two different medicinal substances.

A clear statement. Not all modern homeopaths heed this, however.

1 Two substances, opposite to each other, united into neutral Natrum and middle salts by chemical affinity in unchangeable proportions, as well as sulphurated metals found in the earth and those produced by technical art in constant combining proportions of sulphur and alkaline salts and earths, for instance (natrum sulph. and cal-

care sulph.) as well as those ethers produced by distillation of alcohol and acids may together with phosphorus be considered as simple medicinal substances by the homœopathic physician and used for patients. On the other hand, those extracts obtained by means of acids of the so-called alkaloids of plants, are exposed to great variety in their preparation (for instance, chinin, strychnine, morphine), and can, therefore, not be accepted by the homœopathic physician as simple medicines, always the same, especially as he possesses, in the plants themselves, in their natural state (Peruvian bark, nux vomica, opium) every quality necessary for healing. Moreover, the alkaloids are not the only constituents of the plants.

This is rather illogical. He concedes that plants are complex compounds, yet he considers them to be "pure and simple". He must be assuming that the Creator designed those plants for the specific purpose of becoming medicines.

(.....)

Reiterating.

1 When the rational physician has chosen the perfectly homœopathic medicine for the well-considered case of disease and administered it internally, he will leave to irrational allopathic routine the practice of giving drinks or fomentations of different plants, of injecting medicated glysters and of rubbing in this or the other ointment.

Here we see the origin of the term "rational practitioner" used by some homepaths. And ,of course the usual jab at "irrational" allopaths.

§ 275

The suitability of a medicine for any given case of disease does not depend on its accurate homœopathic selection alone, but likewise on the proper size, or rather smallness, of the dose. If we give too strong a dose of a medicine which may have been even quite homœopathically chosen for the morbid state before us, it must, notwithstanding the inherent beneficial character of its nature, prove injurious by its mere magnitude, and by the unnecessary, too strong impression which, by virtue of its homœopathic similarity of action, it makes upon the vital force which it attacks and, through the vital force, upon those parts of the organism which are the most sensitive, and are already most affected by the natural disease.

Now, we come to dosage. Dosage is an area where modern homepaths really seem to be groping in the dark.

§ 276

For this reason, a medicine, even though it may be homœopathically suited to the case of disease, does harm in every dose that is too large, the more harm the larger the dose, and by the magnitude of the dose and in strong doses¹ it does more harm the greater its homœopathicity and the higher the potency¹ selected, and it does much more injury than any equally large dose of a medicine that is unhomœopathic, and in no respect adapted to the morbid state (allopathic).

Too large doses of an accurately chosen homœopathic medicine, and especially when frequently repeated, bring about much trouble as a rule. They put the patient not seldom in danger of life or make this disease almost incurable. They do indeed extinguish the natural disease so far as the sensation of the life principle is concerned and the patient no longer suffers from the original disease from the moment the too strong dose of the homœopathic medicine acted upon him but he is in consequence more ill with the similar but more violent medicinal disease which is most difficult to destroy.²

A VERY interesting little paragraph. Here Hahnemann clearly stated that, applied wrongly, homeopathy is dangerous. Here, Hahnemann effectively wipes out the claim made by many modern practitioners that homeopathy will not harm the patient and that it is free of side-effects. Hahnemann's stance is really the only logical conclusion to be made from the belief that homeopathic drugs are effective; all potent drugs are dangerous, if administered wrongly.

1 The praise bestowed of late years by some homœopaths on the larger doses is owing to this, either that they chose low dynamizations of the medicine to be administered (as I myself used to do twenty years ago, from not knowing any better), or that the medicines selected were not homœopathic and imperfectly prepared by their manufacturers.

2 Thus, the continuous use of aggressive allopathic large doses of mercurials against syphilis develops almost incurable maladies, when yet one or several doses of a mild but active mercurial preparation would certainly have radically cured in a few days the whole venereal disease, together with the chancre, provided it had not been destroyed by external measures (as is always done by allopathy). In the same way, the allopath gives Peruvian bark and quinine in intermittent fever daily in very large doses, where they are correctly indicated and

where one very small dose of a highly potentized China would unfailingly help (in marsh intermittents and even in persons who were not affected by any evident psoric disease). A chronic China malady (coupled at the same time with the development of psora) is produced, which, if it dose not gradually kill the patient by damaging the internal important vital organs, especially spleen and liver, will put him, nevertheless suffering for years in a sad state of health. A homœopathic antidote for such a misfortune produced by abuse of large doses of homœopathic remedies is hardly conceivable.

Intermingled with allopathy-bashing, we here notice Hahnemann's clear claim that homeopathy can cure syphilis and malaria. Syphilis had been well curbed by modern medicine, but a simple cure for malaria would certainly be welcomed by the world, even today. This alone would be sure to bring homeopathy in from the cold.

We also get Hahnemann's clear indication that higher potency = stronger effect.
§ 277

For the same reason, and because a medicine, provided the dose of it was sufficiently small, is all the more salutary and almost marvellously efficacious the more accurately homœopathic its selection has been, a medicine whose selection has been accurately homœopathic must be all the more salutary the more its dose is reduced to the degree of minuteness appropriate for a gentle remedial effect.

§ 278

Here the question arises, what is this most suitable degree of minuteness for sure and gentle remedial effect; how small, in other words, must be the dose of each individual medicine, homœopathically selected for a case of disease, to effect the best cure? To solve this problem, and to determine for every particular medicine, what dose of it will suffice for homœopathic therapeutic purposes and yet be so minute that the gentlest and most rapid cure may be thereby obtained - to solve this problem is, as may easily be conceived, not the work of theoretical speculation; not by fine-spun reasoning, not by specious sophistry can we expect to obtain the solution of this problem. It is just as impossible as to tabulate in advance all imaginable cases. Pure experiment, careful observation of the sensitiveness of each patient, and accurate experience can alone determine this in each individual case; and it were absurd to adduce the large doses of unsuitable (allopathic) medicines of the old system, which do not touch the diseased side of the organism homœopathically, but only attack the parts unaffected by the disease, in opposition to what pure experience pronounces respecting the smallness of the doses required for homœopathic cures.

§ 279

This pure experience shows UNIVERSALLY, that if the disease do not manifestly depend on a considerable deterioration of an important viscus (even though it belong to the chronic and complicated diseases), and if during the treatment all other alien medicinal influences are kept away from the patients, the dose of the homœopathically selected and highly potentized remedy for the beginning of treatment of an important, especially chronic disease can never be prepared so small that it shall not be stronger than the natural disease and shall not be able to overpower it, at least in part and extinguish it from the sensation of the principle of life and thus make a beginning of a cure.

§ 280

The dose of the medicine that continues serviceable without producing new troublesome symptoms is to be continued while gradually ascending, so long as the patient with general improvement, begins to feel in a mild degree the return of one or several old original complaints. This indicates an approaching cure through a gradual ascending of the moderate doses modified each time by succussion (§ 247). It indicates that the vital principle no longer needs to be affected by the similar medicinal disease in order to lose the sensation of the natural disease (§ 148). It indicates that the life principle now free from the natural disease begins to suffer only something of the medicinal disease hitherto known as homœopathic aggravation.

§ 281

In order to be convinced of this, the patient is left without any medicine for eight, ten or fifteen days, meanwhile giving him only some powders of sugar of milk. If the few last complaints are due to the medicine simulating the former original disease symptoms, then these complaints will disappear in a few days or hours. If during these days without medicine, while continuing good hygienic regulations nothing more of the original disease is seen, he is probably cured. But if in the later days traces of the former morbid symptoms should show themselves, they are remnants of the original disease not wholly extinguished, which must be treated with renewed higher potencies of the remedy as directed before. If a cure is to follow, the first small doses must likewise be again gradually raised higher, but less and more slowly in patients where considerable irritability is evident than in those of less susceptibility, where the advance to higher dosage may be more rapid. There are patients whose impressionability compared to that of the insusceptible ones is like the ratio as 1000 to 1.

Here we may see the reason for the present uncertainty among homeopaths about dosage. The above instructions are complex and difficult to follow in practice. Notice that Hahnemann uses placebo. His procedure is very time-consuming and requires many consultations, and, since it all hinges on describing perceived symptoms, very subjective. Notice how even Hahnemann, who is wont declaring any and all of his theories laws of nature, and his results "indubitable", now says "he is probably cured".

§ 282

It would be a certain sign that the doses were altogether too large, if during treatment, especially in chronic disease, the first dose should bring forth a so-called homœopathic aggravation, that is, a marked increase of the original morbid symptoms first discovered and in the same way every repeated dose (§ 247) however modified somewhat by shaking before its administration (i.e., more highly dynamized).¹

¹ The rule to commence the homœopathic treatment of chronic diseases with the smallest possible doses and only gradually to augment them is subject to a notable exception in the treatment of the three great miasms while they still effloresce on the skin, i.e., recently erupted itch, the untouched chancre (on the sexual organs, labia, mouth or lips, and so forth), and the figwarts. These not only tolerate, but indeed require, from the very beginning large doses of their specific remedies of ever higher and higher degrees of dynamization daily (possibly also several times daily). If this course be pursued, there is no danger to be feared as is the case in the treatment of diseases hidden within, that the excessive dose while it extinguishes the disease, initiates and by continued usage possible produces a chronic medicinal disease. During external manifestations of these three miasms this is not the case; for from the daily progress of their treatment it can be observed and judged to what degree the large dose withdraws the sensation of the disease from the vital principle day by day; for none of these three can be cured without giving the physician the conviction through their disappearance that there is no longer any further need of these medicines.

Reiterations plus special cases. Hahnemann, who is against naming specific diseases, nevertheless names three specific diseases that must be treated in a way exactly opposite than other diseases, dosage-wise.

Since diseases in general are but dynamic attacks upon the life principle and nothing material - no materia peccans - as their basis (as the old school in its delusion has fabulated for a thousand years and treated the sick accordingly to their ruin) there is also in these cases nothing material to take away, nothing to smear away, to burn or tie or cut away, without making the patient endlessly sicker and more incurable (Chron. Dis. Part 1), than he was before local treatment of these three miasms was instituted. The dynamic, inimical principle exerting its influence upon the vital energy is the essence of these external signs of the inner malignant miasms that can be extinguished solely by the action of a homœopathic medicine upon the vital principle which affects it in a similar but stronger manner and thus extracts the sensation of internal and external spirit-like (conceptual) disease enemy in such a way that it no longer exists for the life principle (for the organism) and thus releases the patient of his illness and he is cured.

Experience, however, teaches that the itch, plus its external manifestations, as well as the chancre, together with the inner venereal miasm, can and must be cured only by means of specific medicines taken internally. But the figwarts, if they have existed for some time without treatment, have need for their perfect cure, the external application of their specific medicines as well as their internal use at the same time.

Reiterating his claim that diseases have no material reason. Actually a rather strange idea, that living organisms should be endowed with a mechanism that can make them ill, all by itself. And another exception: Hahnemann is otherwise adamant that local treatment is bad, but the specific disease of figwarts appears to be an exception.

§ 283

In order to work wholly according to nature, the true healing artist will prescribe the accurately chosen homœopathic medicine most suitable in all respects in so small a dose on account of this alone. For should he be misled by human weakness to employ an unsuitable medicine, the disadvantage of its wrong relation to the disease would be so small that the patient could through his own vital powers and by means of early opposition (§ 249) of the correctly chosen remedy according to symptom similarly (and this also in the smallest dose) rapidly extinguish and repair it.

§ 284

Besides the tongue, mouth and stomach, which are most commonly affected by the administration of medicine, the nose and respiratory organs are receptive of the action of medicines in fluid form by means of olfaction and inhalation through the mouth. But the whole remaining skin of the body clothed with epidermis, is adapted to the action of medicinal solutions, especially if the inunction is connected with simultaneous internal administration.¹

1 The power of medicines acting upon the infant through the milk of the mother or wet nurse is wonderfully helpful. Every disease in a child yields to the rightly chosen homœopathic medicines given in moderate doses to the nursing mother and so administered, is more easily and certainly utilized by these new world-citizens than is possible in later years. Since most infants usually have imparted to them psora through the milk of the nurse, if they do not already possess it through heredity from the mother, they may be at the same time protected antipsorically by means of the milk of the nurse rendered medicinally in this manner. But the case of mothers in their (first) pregnancy by means of a mild antipsoric treatment, especially with sulphur dynamizations prepared according to the directions in this edition (§ 270), is indispensable in order to destroy the psora - that producer of most chronic diseases - which is given them hereditarily; destroy it both within themselves and in the foetus, thereby protecting posterity in advance. This is true of pregnant women thus treated; they have given birth to children usually more healthy and stronger, to the astonishment of everybody. A new confirmation of the great truth of the psora theory discovered by me.

§ 285

In this way, the cure of very old disease may be furthered by the physician applying externally, rubbing it in the back, arms, extremities, the same medicine he gives internally and which showed itself curatively. In doing so, he must avoid parts subject to pain or spasm or skin eruption.¹

A couple of interesting claims. It seems that homeopathic medicine might be given externally, as a supplement, and that it can be applied to an infant through nursing.

1 From this fact may be explained those marvellous cures, however infrequent, where chronic deformed patients, whose skin nevertheless was sound and clean, were cured quickly and permanently after a few baths whose medicinal constituents (by, chance) were homœopathically related. On the other hand, the mineral baths very often brought on increased injury with patients, whose eruptions on the skin were suppressed. After a brief period of well-being, the life principle allowed the inner, uncured malady to appear elsewhere, more important for life and health.

At times, instead, the ocular nerve would become paralyzed and produce amaurosis, sometimes the crystalline lens would become clouded, hearing lost, mania or suffocating asthma would follow or an apoplexy would end the sufferings of the deluded patient.

Taking homeopathic credit from another system, and discrediting it at the same time, attributing, in good homeopathic style, anything bad that might happen to the patient later to the competing system.

A fundamental principle of the homœopathic physician (which distinguishes him from every physician of all older schools) is this, that he never employs for any patient a medicine, whose effects on the healthy human has not previously been carefully proven and thus made known to him (§§ 20,21). To prescribe for the sick on mere conjecture of some possible usefulness for some similar disease or from hearsay "that a remedy has helped in such and such a disease" - such conscienceless venture the philanthropic homœopathist will leave to the allopath. A genuine physician and practitioner of our art will therefore never send the sick to any of the numerous mineral baths, because almost all are unknown so far as their accurate, positive effects on the healthy human organism is concerned, and when misused, must be counted among the most violent and dangerous drugs. In this way, out of a thousand sent to the most celebrated of these baths by ignorant physicians allopathically uncured and blindly sent there perhaps one or two are cured by chance more often return only apparently cured and the miracle is proclaimed aloud. Hundreds, meanwhile sneak quietly away, more or less worse and the rest remain to prepare themselves for their eternal resting place, a fact that is verified by the presence of numerous well-filled graveyards surrounding the most celebrated of these spas. *

* A true homœopathic physician, one who never acts without correct fundamental principles, never gambles with the life of the sick entrusted to him as in a lottery where the winner is in the ratio of 1 to 500 or 1000 (blanks here consisting of aggravation or death), will never expose any one of his patients to such danger and send him for good luck to a mineral bath, as is done so frequently by allopaths in order to get rid of the sick in an acceptable manner spoiled by him or others.

Almost an entire paragraph dedicated to denouncing and slandering mineral baths. The funny thing is that I have met homeopaths that were proponents of mineral baths.

§ 286

The dynamic force of minerals magnets, electricity and galvanism act no less powerfully upon our life principle and they are not less homœopathic than the properly so-called medicines which neutralize disease by taking them through the mouth, or by rubbing them on the skin or by olfaction. There may be diseases, especially diseases of sensibility and irritability, abnormal sensations, and involuntary muscular movements which may be cured by those means. But the more certain way of applying the last two as well as that of the so-called electromagnetic lies still very much in the dark to make homœopathic use of them. So far both electricity and Galvanism have been used only for palliation to the great damage of the sick. The positive, pure action of both upon the healthy human body have until the present time been but little tested.

Considering his previous analogies with magnetism, and his view on electromagnetic powers, it is not surprising that Hahnemann sees medical potential here. In his time, electricity was fairly well explored, but its basic character was unknown, and its affects on the body was only superficially researched. So, sensibly, he states that it might have uses, but that not enough is known.

§ 287

The powers of the magnet for healing purposes can be employed with more certainty according to the positive effects detailed in the Materia Medica Pura under north and south pole of a powerful magnetic bar. Though both poles are alike powerful, they nevertheless oppose each other in the manner of their respective action. The doses may be modified by the length of time of contact with one or the other pole, according as the symptoms of either north or south pole are indicated. As antidote to a too violent action the application of a plate of polished zinc will suffice.

On the other hand, he goes all the way on magnet healing. Strangely, this seems not widely adopted by modern homeopaths.

§ 288

I find it yet necessary to allude here to animal magnetism, as it is termed, or rather Mesmerism (as it should be called in deference to Mesmer, its first founder) which differs so much in its nature from all other therapeutic agents. This curative force, often so stupidly denied and disdained for a century, acts in different ways. It is a marvellous, priceless gift of God to mankind by means of which the strong will of a well intentioned person upon a sick one by contact and even without this and even at some distance, can bring the vital energy of the healthy mesmerizer endowed with this power into another person dynamically (just as one of the poles of a powerful magnetic rod upon a bar of steel).

It acts in part by replacing in the sick whose vital force within the organism is deficient here and there, in part also in other parts where the vital force has accumulated too much and keeps up irritating nervous disorders it turns it aside, diminishes and distributes it equally and in general extinguishes the morbid condition of the life principle of the patient and substitutes in its place the normal of the mesmerist acting powerfully upon him, for instance, old ulcers, amaurosis, paralysis of single organs and so forth. Many rapid apparent cures performed in all ages, by mesmerizers endowed with great natural power, belong to this class. The effect of communicated human power upon the whole human organism was most brilliantly shown, in the resuscitation of persons who had lain some time apparently dead, by the most powerful sympathetic will of a man in full vigor of vital energy,¹ and of this kind of resurrection history records many undeniable examples.

If the mesmerizing person of either sex capable at the same time of a good-natured enthusiasm (even its degeneration into bigotry, fanaticism, mysticism or philanthropic dreaming) will be empowered all the more with this philanthropic self-sacrificing performance to direct exclusively the power of his commanding good will to the recipient requiring his help and at the same time to concentrate these, he may at times perform apparent miracles.

¹ Especially of one of such persons, of whom there are not many, who, along with great kindness of disposition and perfect bodily powers, possesses but a very moderate desire for sexual intercourse, which it would give him very little trouble wholly to suppress, in whom, consequently, all the fine vital spirits that would otherwise be employed in the production of the semen, are ready to be communicated to others, by touching them and powerfully exerting the will. Some powerful mesmerisers, with whom I have become aquatinted, had all this peculiar character.

Therapeutically, mesmerism is equal to hypnosis. Perhaps it is not surprising that Hahnemann would think of this as a possible method of cure, but obviously his claims are unfounded.

§ 289

All the above-mentioned methods of practicing mesmerism depend upon influx of more or less vital force into the patient, and hence are termed positive mesmerism.¹ An opposite mode of employing mesmerism, however, as it produces just the contrary effect, deserves to be termed negative mesmerism. To this belong the passes which are used to rouse from the somnambulant sleep, as also all the manual processes known by the names of soothing and ventilating. This discharge by means of negative mesmerism of the vital force accumulated to excess in individual parts of the system of undebilitated persons is most surely and simply performed by mak-

ing a very rapid motion or the flat extended hand, held parallel to, and about an inch distant from the body, from the top of the head to the tips of the toes.² The more rapidly this pass is made, so much the more effectually will the discharge be effected. Thus, for instance, in the case where a previously healthy woman,³ from the sudden suppression of her catamenia by a violent mental shock, lies to all appearance dead, the vital force which is probably accumulated in the precordial region, will, by such a rapid negative pass, be discharged and its equilibrium throughout the whole organism restored. So that the resuscitation generally follows, immediately.⁴ In like manner, a gentle, less rapid, negative pass diminishes the excessive restlessness and sleeplessness accompanied with anxiety sometimes produced in very irritable persons by a too powerful positive pass, etc.

1 When I here speak of the decided and certain curative power of positive mesmerism, I most assuredly do not mean that abuse of it, where, by repeated passes of this kind, continued for half an hour or a whole hour at a time, and, even day after day, performed on weak, nervous patients, that monstrous revolution of the whole human system is effected which is termed somnambulism, wherein the human being is ravished from the world of sense and seems to belong more to the world of spirits - a highly unnatural and dangerous state, by means of which it has not infrequently been attempted to cure chronic diseases.

2 It is a well known rule that a person who is either to be positively or negatively mesmerised, should not wear silk on any part of the body.

3 Hence a negative pass, especially if it be very rapid, is extremely injurious to a delicate person affected with a chronic ailment and deficient in vital force.

4 A strong country lad, ten years of age, received in the morning, on account of slight indisposition, from a professed female mesmeriser, several very powerful passes with the points of both thumbs, from the pit of the stomach along the lower edge of the ribs, and he instantly grew deathly pale, and fell into such a state of unconsciousness and immobility that no effort could arouse him, and he was almost given up for dead. I made his eldest brother give him a very rapid negative pass from the crown of the head over the body to the feet, and in one instance he recovered his consciousness and became lively and well.

Getting out on a limb here, if you ask me. Weird, absolute statements, like about not wearing silk, do not reinforce any impression we might have left of Hahnemann as a serious scientist.

§ 290

Here belongs also the so-called massage of vigorous good-natured person given to a chronic invalid, who, though cured, still suffers from loss of flesh, weakness of digestion and lack of sleep due to slow convalescence. The muscles of the limbs, breast and back, separately grasped and moderately pressed and kneaded arouse the life principle to reach and restore the tone of the muscles and blood and lymph vessels. The mesmeric influences of this procedure is the chief feature and it must not be used to excess in patients still hypersensitive.

Well, simple massage.....

§ 291

Baths of pure water prove themselves partly palliative, partly as homœopathic serviceable aids in restoring health in acute diseases as well as in convalescence of cured chronic patients with proper consideration of the conditions of the convalescent and the temperature of the bath, its duration and repetition. But even if well applied, they may bring only physically beneficial changes in the sick body, in themselves they are no true medicine. The lukewarm baths at 25 to 27° serve to arouse the slumbering sensibility of fibre in the apparent dead (frozen, drowned, suffocated) which benumbed the sensation of the nerves. Though only palliative, still they often prove themselves sufficiently active, especially when given in conjunction with coffee and rubbing with the hands. They may give homœopathic aid in cases where the irritability is very unevenly distributed and accumulated too unevenly in some organs as is the case in certain hysteric spasms and infantile convulsions. In the same way, cold baths 10 to 6° in persons cured medically of chronic diseases and with deficiency of vital heat, act as an homœopathic aid. By instantaneous and later with repeated immersions they act as a palliative restorative of the tone of the exhausted fibre. For this purpose, such baths are to be used for more than momentary duration, rather for minutes and of gradually lowered temperature, they are a palliative, which, since it acts only physically has no connection with the disadvantage of a reverse action to be feared afterwards, as takes place with dynamic medicinal palliatives.

Warm baths may surely be beneficial to some (we should remember that in Hahnemann's time, the average person did not take daily baths). To attribute them to homeopathy, seems a bit far-fetched.