

For abortions from over exertion, *Rhus tox.*; from exposure to damp places, *Dulc.*; from fright, *Aconite*, *Gels.*, *Opium*; from injury, *Arn.*, *Rhus tox.*

For abortions in the second month, *Apis* and *Kali carb.*; in the third and fourth months, *Apis*, *Cimic.*, *Sab.*, *Sec.*; in the fifth to seventh month, *Sepia*; in the seventh to ninth, *Opium*. Of all of these I find *Apis* the most useful.

To help tone up the patient after severe hæmorrhage: *China*, *Kali carb.*, *Sepia*.

In conclusion let me remind you that while I have mentioned the remedies I have used most frequently in the above conditions and as an aid to labor and delivery any remedy in the *Materia Medica* may be indicated. The indicated remedy is, of course, always the most useful and must be given. You can always rely on it to do its work. It will not fail you.

The Homœopathic Recorder.

Diagnosis.

DR. N. GHATAK, B. A., CALCUTTA.

Our people are anxious to get a diagnosis of the patient, and they can spend sometimes a fabulous amount over it. They will get urine, sputum, blood and other things microscopically examined, they will take X'ray photo of the disease-ultimates,—simply for the sake of getting a satisfactory diagnosis. When they come to know that the patient is suffering from this and that disorder, and get a name for it,—they are quite satisfied. This is all very good, so far as it goes, and no body says that these examinations are absolutely unnecessary,—but they are of minor importance in comparison with the individuality of the case,—and the ascertainment of individuality is of utmost importance for a cure of the suffering patient. Suppose, in a case in hand, somebody says that it is Pneumonia, another says—it is Broncho-pneumonia, and a third again says it is

simply Bronchitis,—none of these diagnoses will be of any help for curing the patient, unless and until a Hahnemannian comes and finds that it is a Bryonia case, in accordance with the individuality of the suffering man, and administers the remedy in the proper form. The patient will be cured, whether the patient got any of the three surmised diseases. The naming of a so-called disease may satisfy the anxious ignorant mind, but no purpose will be served in the way of curing the sick man. "Diagnosis, diagnosis,"—is the cry. But what will come out of it,—they cannot say. Suppose, in the above case, there is a consensus of opinion amongst a number of physicians as to the diagnosis,—they all are of opinion that it is a case of Pneumonia. But would it throw any the faintest light on the selection of the remedy that will cure the man? No, sometimes it can only point to a group of remedies that can produce Pneumonia. I say,—sometimes, and I say quite deliberately. Because I have seen, as many others do, that the curative remedy is more often found wholly outside the group which can produce the ultimate. Under such circumstances, why is it that our people are so much anxious on that account, is more than I can tell.

Be that as it may, it is painful to see that many of our physicians also, in order to satisfy their patrons, make a great fuss over the diagnosis before they make a prescription. If they are able to ascertain the so-called "disease" from which their patient has been suffering, and as soon as they get the technical name of the ultimate, they think, their work is greatly simplified. They will then open the pages of therapeutics and find a remedy,—one out of so many put in there against the name of the disease. They would then try one after another of the several remedies given under the head, and no wonder, if they fail almost in every case. Is it Homœopathy? If it is, it must be of un-Hahnemannian brand. This type of pseudo-pathy is reigning supreme, and there is hardly any way to control the mongrelists that practise in this way.

Many of our friends coming from the Allopathic School are in the habit of practising Homœopathy, only as a matter of choice,—some of them practise both, according, as they say, to the necessities of the case in hand. Those that are fully convinced as to the truth of the Homœopathic science, and so take to it as being the only curative pathy, are quite welcome, because they acquire a faith in it, and so they try to follow the master. But those that practise it as a matter of creed with the obvious intention of attracting all and every kind of patients, are pseudo-pathists, as they work on the basis of "disease and diagnosis." The idea of a "disease and its cure," that hob-goblin which once possessed them during their college days does not leave them.

The most curious part of the story is that our people are generally under the impression that the Allopathic Homœopaths are "better types", because they are expected to know the secrets of health and disease from the double points of view. I am glad to admit that some of them are really so, but most of them are not. The famous flute-player of Rome charged double fees from those students who would come to him for learning after having learnt a smattering from some other teacher ; because he had to labour so much first to make them forget their original impression and then to teach them in his own ways. It is so difficult to forget the first impression, to unlearn what has been mislearnt and then to proceed in the proper direction. The unhomœopathic idea of "disease and its cure" is firmly impressed upon the brain and cannot easily be brushed aside.

Diagnosis may be useful, but as it is in most cases a matter of surmise, it cannot be safely relied on. I have seen in a number of cases that the microscopical examination results were many times not only different at different hands, but were contradictory. In one case, the Wasserman test gave three results,—one was cent percent positive, another was negative and the third showed 50 percent. That being so, a diagnosis based on such an uncertain data must necessarily

be wholly untrustworthy. There is of course usefulness, that nobody can deny, but if the results are found to vary so much, one must have to pause before he can make use of them in a matter involving question of life and death.

The examinations and their results are of sole importance to the Allopathic School of treatment. With them the results of examinations are everything and they are to base their prescriptions upon them. To us Homœopaths, these things are important only to see whether our patient is improving and to ascertain "which way the wind blows." Suppose, in a diabetes case, it was found, before making any case-records, that the urine contained a certain percentage of sugar. Then, after a few months' treatment, if along with the improvement of the patient in a general way, it is also found on examination that the percentage of sugar is also far less, it will be a certain conclusion that the patient is progressing fairly well towards recovery. Here also, the general improvement of the patient is what is necessary; mere mechanical reduction of sugar is not an end, nor is it an indication of the patient's improvement. So that the reduction is only confirmative or corroborative,—it has no independent value. In this view, the examination results are not of much value for a real cure. We treat patients and not any disease or any symptom; we cure patients in their vital disorder, with the result that the disease will have no *locus standi*, and will necessarily cease to be.

What, then, do we want, or should we want? We want a medicine-diagnosis and not a disease-diagnosis. We take an image of the patient and the totality of symptoms, in order to ascertain a medicine having that image and the symptom-group,—the medicine being technically called a "Similimum." This similimum cures the sick man, whatever denomination be given to the ailment from which he suffers. "A rose with whatever name will smell as sweet".
