apparently grave disease, which has only been the result of, first, an erroneous diagnosis of the disease, and, secondly, the following blind heroic treatment with poisonous drugs. A very accurate knowledge of pathology and Materia Medica will make it an easy task to discern between a natural and an artificially-produced disease—will allow us to gain great victories over our erring, blind, allopathic brethren.

If we accept the teachings of the Master, found in this 27th paragraph, we shall never for a moment advocate any of the modern departures—we shall scorn them; and there will be not the slightest danger that the advocates of unlimited liberty, and of that fallacious cry for the supremacy of individual judgment over the application of fixed immutable principles, will ever pervert Homœopathy into Eclecticism—which, in reality, seems to be the aim of every healer who discards HAHNEMANN's teachings, and claims for his own individual judgment superiority to any fixed principles.

COMMENTS ON THE 7TH PARAGRAPH OF HAHNEMANN'S "ORGANON OF THE HEALING-ART."

BY ADOLPH LIPPE, M.D.,

PHILADELPHIA.

Read before the Central New York Homœopathic Medical Society, July 17th, 1879.

HAHNEMANN shows, in this paragraph, that "To cure disease, it is merely requisite to remove the entire symptoms, duly regarding, at the same time, the circumstances enumerated in paragraph 5." In this fifth paragraph alluded to, HAHNEMANN showed that "In the cure of disease, it is necessary to regard the fundamental cause, and other circumstances." In paragraph 6, HAHNEMANN shows that "For the physician, the totality of the symptoms alone constitutes the disease."

The Allopathic school had in vain searched for the *prima causa morbi;* the theories as to that *prima causa morbi* frequently changed, each theory in turn giving place to another more ingenious theory, and still for ever did the hopes of disappointed

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-08-16 03:28 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015013791267 / Public Domain
Digitized by UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

searchers for this cause cling anew to any newly-offered theory. We have now, in these advanced days, a new theory offered us, viz., the Germ-Theory. Elaborate papers have been published on that subject; the germs, the spores, the products of disease, have been carefully and scientifically examined under the microscope. It has been plausibly claimed that to learn how to destroy them would enable the physician to cure the sick. It is an easy thing to destroy or to kill substances, germs, or spores, after they become detached from the human living organism, while then, so detached, they become subject to the known chemical laws; but by those who forget that the chemical laws governing inorganic bodies are not the same, but different from those governing all organic bodies, these very chemical laws will in vain be applied to the destruction of hypothetical causes of disease. And here an illustration. When the yellow-fever raged in New Orleans last year, the scientific speculators arrived at the conclusion that carbolic acid would disinfect the city, and suddenly bring the desired cessation of the pestilential disease. Carbolic acid ran freely through the gutters of the city; the smell became very offensive; the carbolic acid was freely inhaled by *all* residents, young and old; they became saturated by this acid, as were the gutters of the stricken city. What results were produced by this scientific process? *The epidemic pestilence took no other notice of this scientific proceeding than this—that it now attacked children as well as grown persons;* in that particular differing from previously-established facts, viz., that children were almost altogether exempt from this dread disease; this at least was the opinion of the most scientific observers then living in New Orleans.

HAHNEMANN distinctly speaks of the *causa occasionalis*, stating that if that is removed, the indisposition usually yields of itself; he illustrates his *causa occasionalis* just as distinctly as he opposes the search from the interior of the human economy for the *prima causa morbi* which the materialistic old school is now searching for by the aid of the microscope. We might even extend the illustrations given by HAHNEMANN. The *causa occasionalis* in our days is frequently the abuse of alcoholic beverages, the abuse of tobacco, the various violations of the natural laws; and here also must we

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-08-16 03:28 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015013791267 / Public Domain
Digitized by UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

guide psychologically the indisposed individual given to mental occupations, readings, etc., entirely unhealthy to that individual, and in him disturbing the healthy conditions of his organism. The intelligent physician will remove the *causa occasionalis* first, and whatever other symptoms, not traceable to and dependent on this *causa occasionalis* remain to be considered as the disease of the sick individual, have then to be taken up; as this totality of the symptoms, this image of the immediate essence of the malady reflected externally, are to the healer the sole guide to determine the choice of the remedy that is most appropriate. HAHNEMANN gives his very concise advice how the symptoms of the sick constituting the picture of the disease should be explored, in paragraphs 83–104 of his *Organon*.

The burning question of the day is, whether the advice given by HAHNEMANN should be followed in our days, or whether the boasted progress of the pathological discoveries make such acceptance of the Hahnemannian injunction, that the totality of symptoms alone constitutes the disease, or what we know of it, unscientific. It has been said that the progress in pathology since HAHNEMANN'S days enables us to discover to an almost mathematical certainty the causes of the disease and the disease itself; that pathology has become a positive science, and that we may become mere unscientific symptom-coverers; and a strong effort has been made to call HAHNEMANN'S method "unscientific." In order that we, as Homœopathists, may be considered progressively scientific, an effort has been made to pervert our simple Materia Medica, in which we find the changes in feelings and conditions caused by various medicinal substances on the human organism, into a "scientific" Pharmacodynamics, and there attempt to show the similarity of the symptoms found in the Materia Medica Pura, with forms of disease or with physiological conditions. We are reminded that we must read Materia Medica to find how much each remedy resembles sick physiology and forms of disease as they are enumerated in the pathological works of the day. The effort has been made—to state it mildly—to make truth and error join hands, or, as it was lately expressed by one of these scientific men, to marry science to the art medical.

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-08-16 03:28 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015013791267 / Public Domain
Digitized by UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

If HAHNEMANN was right when he said that the totality of the symptoms alone constitute the disease, and that to cure disease it is merely requisite to remove the entire symptoms, the question is—whether he is still in the right to-day, and, if still right to-day, whether, under any circumstances, a more satisfactory way can be found to cure the sick. The healers of to-day who practise Homœopathy not only in name, but who have followed the teachings of the Master consistently, who were true to the principles they professed to have accepted, say with one voice that HAHNEMANN was, is, and for ever will be, right. So much for the testimony of his followers. Those who want to establish the heresy that the advanced knowledge in pathology changes HAHNEMANN's unscientific teachings, are in the wrong first and last:—

Because, while the knowledge of pathology has undoubtedly become more extended, we know to-day no more of the causes of disease than Hippocrates did.

Because their whole argument consists in the fallacious statement that we know what disease is, that we know the cause of it, that we know what structural changes are caused by disease, and that we derive this knowledge from pathological anatomy.

Because, notwithstanding all this increased knowledge, it is a stubborn fact that the most learned physicians of to-day cannot even predict, with any sort of certainty, what will be found on the dead body, even when they had the care of the sick to the bitter end. They base their therapeutics on an hypothesis, on their diagnosis, just as they always did; and behold, in the great majority of cases, the post-mortem examination reveals that these scientific men treated the sick individual for a disease or a condition which never existed; or it has happened that no cause could be found why the sick died, and, while sick, he was but tortured in vain.

Because pathological anatomy only reveals the destructive processes of a disease. Its nature and origin, its cause and its early existence before structural changes and destructive processes set in, are not known, never will be known, to us; or would it not be very likely that the lists of mortality would decrease if pathological anatomy revealed really the origin and cause of disease?

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-08-16 03:28 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015013791267 / Public Domain
Digitized by UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Because, with all our increasing knowledge of pathology, and even if that knowledge were perfect, and we could with positive certainty classify all cases of sickness, and give the disease its proper name, that knowledge would never aid us in the least to cure the sick.

Because the individuality of the sick modifies and changes the form of the disease.

Because different persons sickening with the same form of disease are differently affected, no two cases of sickness being exactly alike; so that it is utterly absurd now, was, and for ever will be, to treat a form of disease as such.

Because experience teaches us that the diagnosis of a disease still remains an hypothesis, and that therapeutics based on a diagnosis which experience shows us to be by no means a certainty, is a fallacy and a dangerous experiment.

To the intelligent healers, these few reasons why we should reject a proposition to graft any hypothesis on our Materia Medica Pura are all-sufficient; but when we come to take into consideration the previously unobserved mental symptoms of the sick, belonging to *our* totality of symptoms, a new revelation, belonging solely and exclusively to our exclusive healing-art, a condition of the sick, to us, of the greatest importance, never entering the materialistic mind of the most progressive and learned pathologist, the demand to make our system more scientific by adding to it a previously rejected hypothesis, is obviously—an absurdity. It must become apparent to the thinking healer that the teachings of the Master cannot be changed, altered, or amended in any way whatsoever; the thinking healer will for ever consider the totality of symptoms, including the mental symptoms of the sick, as constituting the disease. The thinking healer will persistently reject all departures from the teachings of the Master; he will utilise all he can learn, whether this increased knowledge be derived from progressive pathology, or physiology, or chemistry; but he will, true to his principles, not allow this newly-acquired knowledge to lead him into new departures; he will the better be able to collect and arrange the totality of symptoms; he will learn to utilise them; he will classify them as to their importance, as showing the pro-

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-08-16 03:28 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015013791267 / Public Domain
Digitized by UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

gress of a disease, or showing that disease is leaving the sick and health is being restored; not a symptom-coverer, but a symptom-hunter, who carefully learns to attach to each and every symptom a certain importance; and, above all things, this thinking healer, armed with all possible knowledge, will discern in every case, especially of acute disease, such symptoms as do not necessarily belong to the form of disease he finds the sick to suffer from, but belong decidedly to the individual; he will, among the totality of symptoms, first consider just such individual symptoms, including the mental conditions, so different in different individuals and different conditions; and he will observe that these very symptoms, not necessarily belonging to the form of disease before him, are by far the most important guiding symptoms in each individual case; he will surely cover them first before he allows himself to be misguided by those men who claim to be scientific, but only strive to find a remedy similar to the form of disease to be treated; he will learn to consider such treatment *unscientific* and *unhomœopathic;* he will observe the frequent failures to cure under this professedly scientific treatment; and, cherishing the great and eternal truths which HAHNEMANN was permitted to reveal to us for the benefit of poor suffering, sick humanity, he will scorn all innovations and plausible departures, and, above all things, he will honestly and persistently remain, *under all circumstances*, true to the principles of the healing-art he professes to practise, as a disciple of the founder of Homœopathy.

OPHTHALMIC STUDIES. No. 4.

BY E. W. BERRIDGE, M.D.

CASE 6.—*Syphilinum.*—Mrs. ——, suffering from diabetes mellitus, and subject to rheumatism in rainy weather, consulted me February 5th, 1878. For ten days she had had neuralgia every night, beginning between eight and nine p.m., gradually increasing in severity till it reached its height about three or four a.m., and after continuing thus for at least two or three hours, gradually decreasing, and finally ceasing about ten a.m. These

Generated through HathiTrust on 2025-08-16 03:28 GMT
https://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015013791267 / Public Domain
Digitized by UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
Original from UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN