entirely cured the weakness of her back, but almost invariably produced suppression of urine for two or three days after taking the powder of *Zinc.*, but not in such a degree as to necessitate the introduction of the catheter.

NOTE.—The symptoms given in this paper are all taken from the *Symptomen Codex*, except some of those given in discussing diarrhœa. Many of these symptoms are taken from Bell's work on diarrhœa, etc., to which the writer is under many obligation for useful hints in this paper and in practice. The asterisk (*) when prefixed to a symptom shows it to have been verified, that it has been observed by provers, and has been cured in the sick. The cipher (°) marks symptoms that are empirical mainly,—that is, we have not as yet observed them in provings on the healthy.

HAHNEMANN AND SCHUESSLER.

BY ADOLPH LIPPE, M.D.

IN the *Hahnemannian Monthly* for February, under the report of the proceedings of the Philadelphia Homœopathic Medical Society, page 333, we find that one of the debaters is reported to have said: "*Regarding the tissue remedies, it may be affirmed that though the idea has been much abused—and what good thing has not?—still Hahnemann gave it to us, all praise to him for his farsightedness, his depth of penetration, which discerned in the future such progress that his then advanced views must at some time be generally accepted, that while opinions necessarily differ, facts still remain the same. Who gave us Calc. c. and Silicea for bone affections, Phosphor. in diseases of nerve-tissues, and many other similar remedies, but Hahnemann?*" To be sure the debater endeavored afterwards to cover this hideous picture with a homœopathic domino, and spoke of "*the province of the thinking mind and reasoning man to seek farther and higher for truth, which will enable him to select with greater certainty between closely allied remedies.*"

Now may we be permitted to present the debater's reported remarks "*analytically?*" He admits that the idea, viz., the idea of *tissue remedies* is really a good thing, but has been a little bit abused by Schuessler. In the paper which was debated and published in the February number of the journal, it was shown that Schuessler, while trying to illustrate his

wisdom and the feat of putting the physiological livery on the homœopathic school, had in reality exposed his "lunacy;" and now we are told, "*still Hahnemann gave it to us.*" What *it?* Why the good thing, the tissue remedies; and, says the debater, who gave us our Calc. c. and Silicea for bone affections, Phos. in disease of nerve-tissues, and many other similar remedies, but Hahnemann?

When Hahnemann had proved Calc. c. and Sil. on the healthy and found the peculiar changes these drugs produced on the human organism, he applied them for the cure of the sick, guided by no speculation that they were bone remedies because constituents of the bones (Schuessler-like), but he found his provings, the law of applying his newly acquired knowledge for the cure of the sick, correct, corroborated by the clinical experiment, and *finally*, as a sequence of all this, he found them to be acting very beneficially on the development of bone-tissue (Calc. c.) and on diseased conditions of the bones (caries, Sil.)

Schuessler *a priori* gives it as his opinion that the chemical constituents of tissues, when by a diseased condition these tissues are changed or altered, will cure the diseased condition, changes and alterations. The fact is that all that Schuessler has taken from Hahnemann's observations is, that even insoluble substances were imbued by a hitherto unknown world of power if they were triturated with milk sugar. Schuessler in his therapeutic remarks says: "*As in all inflammatory cases, no matter which organ is the seat of it, Ferr. phosph. should be given in the first stage, Kali mur. in the second, the medication will be right, even if the diagnosis is wrong. This will be welcomed even by unskilled diagnosticians.*"

How much homœopathy (which teaches that each case is a case *per se* and must be individualized) is there in this Schuesslerism? And what an amount of absurdities besides! Diagnosticate, if you please, "inflammation," and if even your diagnosis be wrong the treatment is "right!" And now we are told in so many words: All praise to Hahnemann, his farsightedness, his depth of penetration discerning in the future such progress. What progress is it to reduce our Materia Medica to twelve remedies? What progress to set aside all individualizing and go back to generalization, to treat "*inflammations?*" Here are "facts," and there may be a diversity of opinion regarding them, to be sure. Men who are fond of a multiplicity of opinions may see in Schuessler's

lunacy an immense amount of high truths, only discernible to "the thinking mind of reasoning man." But it is our "*opinion*" that Schuessler is a poor guide. Diagnosis with him is at one time unnecessary, while at another time, as we have shown by his own writings, he diagnosticates that a number of tissue-cells of the brain had lost their Natr. mur., and had thereby lost their ability to retain their watery contents, etc. What a heap of wisdom and science! If the great Doctor had not found that out, he would not have promptly cured the overdosed boy. One thing we feel inclined to praise him for, viz., that he honestly exposed his lunacy; and while he does so, he is sure to find good faithful friends in possession of that thinking mind of reasoning man, who never listen to "arguments," but who stubbornly stick to their own infallible opinions, right or wrong. It is further our *opinion* that Schuessler is not a homœopathician.

A Reply from Dr. Korndœrfer.

Dear Editor: By your favor of to-day I am in receipt of a communication, signed by Dr. A. Lippe, to which a brief answer must suffice.

It appears to be the intention of the Doctor to make a persistent effort not to understand the position held in reference to pathology by the homœopathic school in general, and by those he is exerting himself so fruitlessly to throw ridicule upon in particular. This want of penetrability seems still more inexcusable, when we take into consideration the fact, that every effort has at all times been made to give sufficient explanation for every ordinary mind to comprehend, the true position held by the advocates of exploration in pathology, and the applying of knowledge so gained to the advancement of homœopathy.

In the last edition of Schuessler we find the following notice: "Owing to wilful misrepresentations of the object of this publication, it becomes our duty to say that the intention was to bring before the profession the remedies herein contained in such form that some use might be made of them, if occasion offered, without the delay consequent on thorough proving. At the same time it was hoped that it would stimulate some to make efforts at proving these most valuable remedies.

"Not with any desire to sanction in an unqualified manner such use of drugs not proved, nor yet indorse the substance