

day stage as given above; if they are guided by the only law known to the true homœopathic prescriber, there is no question as to the remedy which will be selected by every one. We do not look for a single exception to the selection of—— in this case. Fill in the blank space, please, and forward to the editor of *The Medical World*, Philadelphia; we feel confident that no one will make a mistake in this matter as every one knows the remedy as well as they know their own name — *The Critique*.

### THE VALUE OF DIAGNOSIS IN HOMŒOPATHIC PRACTICE.

“Be sure you are right, then prescribe,” would be a good motto for us all. To be right is more than half that is required in the practice of medicine, and to be right requires more than prescribing on lines of symptomatology. True, many brilliant results follow the exhibition of the “indicated” remedy on purely symptomatic lines; but many obscure cases in which only negative results are secured after the use of the “indicated” remedy result in cures after more care is taken to secure a diagnosis.

Symptoms may oftentimes be misleading, as in reflex conditions. Then, too, organic lesions many times demand something more than the indicated remedy. Surgical interference may prove to be the only means of relief after a proper interpretation of Nature’s pathological symptoms, and a careful diagnosis many times saves valuable time for the patient and embarrassment for the physician.

The effort toward diagnosis never interferes in the selection of the proper remedy, but may be of much assistance to the remedy in its action. Obscure and supposedly incurable cases have more than once been changed into simple ones, and afforded relief after months of prescribing, as soon as the diagnosis was determined. The writer has seen obstinate symptoms, treated for months by careful prescribers, readily clear up after it was found that the case had chronic nephritis. The remedies, formerly used with negative results, acted promptly after measures were taken to lessen the burden of an impaired organ.

Cases of gastro-intestinal trouble have been relieved after countless prescriptions, by examining the stomach contents and remedying the diet to meet the necessities.

In the neurotic symptoms of diabetic cases, how little relief is secured with symptomatic prescribing until the diagnosis is made and the diet outlined.

How much more satisfactory it is in cases of persistent headaches to refer to the Oculist or Gynecologist rather than have to admit our oversight to the family later, or after several months of unsuccessful prescribing.

To reach and maintain the standard in our school of practice that is desired by all of us, the writer believes that diagnosis is absolutely essential. It is at least to our interest to secure the best possible result in the shortest time, and diagnosis is certainly an important factor in this.

The practice of medicine according to Similia is founded upon a principle which approximates an exact science. It would seem inconsistent to neglect so important a factor as diagnosis when we lay so much stress upon totalities. Symptoms are at times overlooked or, as has been already suggested, they may be misleading; hence it would seem necessary to secure a diagnosis before one could be right.

While the symptomatology of a drug is necessary to its successful employment, unless there is a clear interpretation of Nature’s pathological changes as expressed by symptoms both subjective and objective only half of our armamentaria is available. One without the other and homœopathy would be a farce. Since it is necessary to know the pathology (toxicology) of the drug, just so necessary is it to know the pathology (histologically) of the tissue disease, else we are not practicing Similia Similibus Curantur. A picture of the pathology of the disease and the mirrored reflection of the drug pathology should go hand in hand.

Rapid strides have been made in the approximately exact mechanical appliances that are invaluable as aids to the physician in securing a diagnosis. These laboratory appliances have kept close pace with the development of the medical sciences and are materially aiding in the advancement of our methods.

While the writer wishes it plainly understood that he discourages the tendency to arbitrary clinical diagnosis in the laboratory; at the same time no one is doing full justice to his patient nor himself who willfully disregards the aid of laboratory proof in determining lesions for which they are employed to treat.