

Bœnninghausen and Lippe.

Much has already been said and many pages have been written—and with justice to—in praise of Dr. Lippe as a master in the art of prescribing. But in some particulars methods differed so widely from those of Bœnninghausen that a comparison can scarcely do justice to either. The former was slower, more cautious and, as they say, "dug out the remedy" by hard work, and like all workers of that kind, made fewer mistakes. Each man was great, was remarkable, in his own way, but their ways differed widely, as the ways of all great men often do. Dr. P. P. Wells says: No doubt he was as near being a master of the healing art as any one we have had with us. But the eulogist who compared him to Bœnninghausen could not have rightly appreciated either. There was but one element of character common to both, and that was loyalty to truth. In this neither knew the least of wavering neither, I think, was susceptible to a temptation to a departure from it. But in their processes of its practical administration they were very unlike. The one was often found exhibiting flashes of true genius in his searches for and seizing upon the true remedy for his case, the other, with utmost coolness and deliberation, sought for the secret of relationship between sickness and their causations, which when once struck was pursued with the pertinacity and unwearied persistency of the sleuth hound, till he found the true remedy for his case, and this he did with a certainty which came near to uniform success.

The following example of Dr. Lippe's prescription of Lac can., by Dr. W. P. Wesselhœft, in *The Homœopathic Physician*, is very instructive:

I have treated the patient more than eighteen months without improvement, except that his great liability to take cold had become less.

I copy from my record, taken December, 1881: G. R., aged 45, light brunette, married ten years, general appearance healthy.

For six years has had no discharge of semen during coitus. Occasionally, nocturnal emissions.

Erections usually weak, give out during coitus.

Burning in perineum, worse after going to bed, and when thinking of it.

Drawing pains in testicles, with sensation of weakness of genitals.

Occasional itching, dry eruptions in crotch and inner upper surface of thighs and anus.

With the sensation of weakness of genitals, his eyes feel weak.

Very sensitive to cold and changes of atmosphere.

Takes cold easily, usually affecting nose and throat first with dryness, then with watery catarrh and sneezing, or he has aching pains in different parts of body and limbs, changing location frequently.

Twenty years ago had African fever. Never had gonorrhœa, syphilis, or other eruptions than those above mentioned.

All other functions normal.

While on a visit to Philadelphia, at my advice, he applied to Dr. Lippe, from whom I received the following letter: I find that your patient had diphtheria about ten years ago and was treated with inappropriate Mercurials and gargles by Dr.—. The character of the attack was that it went from one side to the other and finally back again to the original side. Great weakness, almost paralytic, followed the attack, and he thinks he has never regained his full vigor and usual strength since this illness. His acute colds have always the character of shifting pains and change of location. I have given him a dose of *Lac can. cm.*, which may be required to be followed by a dose of *Pulsatilla*."

Suffice it to say that my patient never needed the suggested dose of *Pulsatilla*. In three months after his visit to Philadelphia his wife was pregnant. She has since borne two remarkably healthy children.

As far as we know Lac can. has no sexual weakness. But that fact disturbed Dr. Lippe very little in his selection. He looked deeper and found the cause and the remedy. *This is true homœopathic pathology.* All the knowledge in the world of the special pathology of this case could have revealed the remedy to no one. To the homœopathic artist, however, it was revealed, and the man regained his manhood and became the father of two children, after ten years of impotence.

Why did I not discover that my patient had had diphtheria ten years before? All I can answer is that he did not tell me, and that I had not the sagacity to ask. And if I had discovered it, I doubt very much if I would have thought of Lac can. for this case. I was far too much impressed with the importance and necessity of eliminating a remedy *for the special weakness for which he had appealed for help.* This is one of the great mistakes many of us are constantly making, and I hope this case may be as instructive to others as it has been to me. Dr. Lippe knew the value of our art so well that the commonplaces of every disease were almost instinctively avoided by him, and he never lost time in noting worthless signs, always looking and finding with unusual rapidity the salient points in the case before him. He lived up to the greatest thought of the master: "The physician's business is only with patients, not with diseases."

It is only the master who prescribes like that. Our college graduates never do it now. They have not been taught how, for the very sufficient reason, it would seem, that their teachers did not know how. Some of them at least know enough when mentioning aught characteristic of homœopathic philosophy, to hold it up to ridicule and make it an object for their classes to laugh at. But such teachers and such pupils are never the successful administrators of homœopathic law that were Benninghausen and Lippe.

The Medical Advance
