ERRORS.

BY ADOLPH LIPPE, M.D.

In No. 7, vol. x, page 203, of this journal, we find a paper by Prof. S. Lilienthal, on the physiological action of homœopathically selected remedies, with illustrations.

The Professor, at the close of his elaborate paper, tells us that, in Dr. Wright's case of "palpitation" (hypertrophy of the heart?), because the palpitations and weariness were spinal, and there was needed a remedy that nourished and strengthened the spinal cord, *Cactus grand.* cured the doctor. What are we expected to learn from this apparently very scientific remark? Why only this, that a person suffering from palpitation of the heart, with weariness which is spinal, must have a remedy which nourishes and strengthens the spinal cord, and that Cactus grand. is that remedy. Who knows how Cactus grand. nourishes and strengthens the spinal cord? And does the selection of this spinal nutriment depend upon our "guessing" of the spinal condition, and its need of nourishment to strengthen it? And pray where do we find such therapeutics sustained by any of Hahnemann's teachings? Are we to go back to guesswork? The homœopathist not anxious to display a physiological livery, but who is really desirous to cure the sick, learns by a less circuitous mode of reasoning why Aconite, Belladonna, and Lachesis did not, and why Cactus grand. did give such great relief to the patient. Aconite could not benefit him, because he found relief when he laid down *quietly* on his back. If Aconite had been the proper remedy, the sick man would not have been able to lie *quiet*. He would have sought relief by tossing about in anxious restlessness. Belladonna could not relieve him because the palpitation was not simultaneously felt in the head; nor does he report that his breathing was slower than usual. Lachesis could not relieve because the sick person, suffering from palpitation of the heart, to be benefited by it, must sit up, and cannot bear to have anything touch the neck, for fear of suffocation. Cactus grand. did relieve promptly because the sick man was relieved by lying on the back *perfectly quiet*, while the suffocating constriction of the throat, similar to that indicative of Lachesis, did not become any worse while lying down. That is the lesson the homœopathician learns; nothing more, nothing less. If he chooses to apply a physiological paint-brush to the picture he can thus amuse himself. It is

his "liberty" to do so. But to teach that Aconite is good for vascular excitement, and exerts its influence *profoundly* upon the delicate arterial capillary vessels, suppressed nerve-power, etc.; or that Belladonna, according to that prince of physiological perverters, Brown-Sequard, is a stimulant to the capillary circulation, or according to Hughes, is characteristically indicated in *excitement with perversion of function*, and that it is more a cerebro-spinal than a ganglionic remedy; or that Teste considers Lachesis the chronic Belladonna, is to teach ERRORS which we really had hoped could never be resuscitated after Hahnemann so successfully exposed, and, as it was supposed, annihilated them, giving us in their place rational, comprehensible, and valuable advice, based on fundamental principles.

The paper alluded to begins with this proposition: "Three distinct factors are necessary to produce a cure. *First. The exploration of the disease;* in other words, the totality of the subjective as well as objective manifestations of the diseased state in particular persons. *Second. The exploration of the effects of the medicine; i. e.*, to find out the action of a given remedy on certain tissues. *Third. The proper application of the medicine.*"

Hahnemann gives these three factors in § 70 of his *Organon*, but our Professor puts his own interpretations upon at least factor second, and therein falls into grave errors. Will he not let us know how he can possibly reconcile his explanation of the second factor with common sense, applicability to homœopathic practice, or to Hahnemann's explanation of it, which he gives in §§ 120–145 of his *Organon?* "We must find out the action of a given remedy on certain tissues to know the effects of a medicine," says Prof. Lilienthal. Of course we have to find *that* out, but if we understand the Professor rightly, we need know nothing more. The knowledge of the locality on which a remedy acts is only one point; another point is the kind of pain produced by the remedy; but the most characteristic symptoms of a remedy are the aggravations and ameliorations, according to time and circumstances, which belong to it, and last but not least, the effects upon the mind. The "mind" is left out by our learned Professor, and he only deals with "matter." Do we understand him aright when we assume that he utterly ignores mental symptoms and all that makes them characteristics, and that he advocates *materialism?* The allopathic school, from

the days of Hippocrates to those of Hahnemann, has advocated materialism; and it would seem that Prof. Lilienthal is desirous of smuggling this belief into the homœopathic school. He teaches that all that is necessary for us to know is the action of a remedy upon certain tissues. This is indeed an extraordinary "new departure." Possibly the *motive* of the learned author of a variety of papers intended to show how much better our school would look if it were bedecked with a physiological livery, returned to the worship of men and authorities, gave three cheers for Brown-Sequard, Headland & Co., and abandoned the fundamental principles taught by Hahnemann, accepted by his true disciples, who were, by and through them, enabled to attain to "unparalleled success in curing the sick," is undoubtedly to secure "peace," "union," and "harmony." But truth and error should never be combined; they will not mix more readily than will oil and water. A school of medicine based solely on materialism, and which has offered new theories every few years, to be rejected that other theories, perhaps yet more false and pernicious, might be accepted, can lay no claim to a right to swallow homœopathy and its practitioners. Let us read the *Organon*, and be governed by its elementary and fundamental principles.

OPIUM IN INTESTINAL OBSTRUCTION AND FECAL TUMOR.

BY CLARA C. PLIMPTON, M.D.

(*Read before the Homœopathic Medical Society of the County of New York.*)

Mrs. M., age 32, Irish, a cheerful, fresh-looking woman in health, entered the Hospital for Women, 301 Lexington Avenue, at about 3 P.M. December 11th; she was suffering very much from what was supposed, by the one applying for her, to be uterine tumor. From the physician who had occasionally treated her for a year or two previously, I learned that in December, 1873, she was treated for cervical endometritis and ulceration of the os. Again was seen November 31st, 1874, and then reported that her menses had stopped for five months, but had returned six weeks before. At that date it was almost impossible to introduce a speculum, from the obstruction by the tumor, which was thought to be uterine. The history I obtained from the patient after her admission was as follows: She had borne seven children in about eight years, all of which, except the second and third, were foot