2026 Volume: 02 Issue: 11 www.ijrpa.com ISSN 2456-9995 Review Article

International Journal Research Publication Analysis

Page: 01-06

BEYOND THE SINGLE CAUSE: BIOPATHOGRAPHY IN HOMOEOPATHY—A CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

Dr Angela B. Williams*[1], Dr Manoj Narayan V.[2], Dr M. Murugan[3]

[1]Senior Resident, Dept of Organon of Medicine and Homoeopathic Philosophy, Sarada Krishna Homoeopathic Medical College and Hospital, (Affiliated to The Tamil Nadu Dr. M.G.R Medical University) Kulasekharam, Kanyakumari district, Tamil Nadu – 629161.

[2]Prof., Dept of Organon of Medicine and Homoeopathic Philosophy, Sarada Krishna Homoeopathic Medical College and Hospital, (Affiliated to The Tamil Nadu Dr. M.G.R. Medical University) Kulasekharam, Kanyakumari district, Tamil Nadu – 629161.

[3]PG &Ph.D. Guide, Department of Organon of Medicine, Sarada Krishna Homoeopathic Medical College and Hospital, (Affiliated to The Tamil Nadu Dr M.G.R. Medical University) Kulasekharam, Kanyakumari district, Tamil Nadu – 629161.

Article Received: 23 September 2026
Article Revised: 13 October 2026
Published on: 02 November 2026

***Corresponding Author: Dr Angela B. Williams**
Senior Resident, Dept of Organon of Medicine and Homoeopathic Philosophy, Sarada Krishna Homoeopathic Medical College and Hospital, (Affiliated to The Tamil Nadu Dr. M.G.R Medical University) Kulasekharam, Kanyakumari district, Tamil Nadu – 629161.

DOI: https://doi-doi.org/101555/ijrpa.6561

ABSTRACT

Disease may arise from multiple interacting factors rather than a single isolated cause. Homoeopathy has historically emphasized susceptibility, constitution, heredity, and miasmatic predisposition to explain individual variations in disease expression. To examine the limitations of a single-cause model and explore the conceptual relevance of biopathography in understanding disease causation, susceptibility, and individual disease expression. Biopathography reconstructs the patient's life and disease history, considering significant experiences, environmental exposures, lifestyle, relationships, and factors that may trigger or maintain illness. It provides a longitudinal study for organising antecedent circumstances and understanding individual responses. However, temporal association does not establish causation, and homoeopathic susceptibility and miasmatic predisposition should not be equated with genetically established mechanisms. Biopathography may support individualized case analysis by integrating life history with disease development. Its

application requires critical interpretation and a clear distinction between homoeopathic theoretical concepts and contemporary scientific evidence.

KEYWORDS: Biopathography, causation, susceptibility, multifactorial disease, miasm, individualization, homoeopathy.

INTRODUCTION

Disease is a complex phenomenon that may result from interactions among multiple factors. A single-cause model may not adequately explain why individuals exposed to similar conditions develop different clinical outcomes. The Law of Causation provides a philosophical basis for examining the antecedent conditions associated with an effect. Stuart Close's discussion of causation emphasizes the importance of considering relevant circumstances rather than attributing an outcome to one isolated factor. Contemporary medicine similarly recognizes the multifactorial nature of many diseases, involving genetic susceptibility, environmental exposure, lifestyle, and other modifying influences. Within homoeopathy, susceptibility, constitution, heredity, and miasmatic theory have historically been used to interpret individual differences in disease expression. This review examines these concepts in relation to biopathography, a longitudinal approach to understanding disease within the context of an individual's life history.

Law of Causation and Disease

The Law of Causation provides a philosophical framework for understanding relationships between antecedent conditions and their consequences. Hahnemann emphasized identifying and removing the cause of disease through the principle *tolle causam*, while rejecting the materialistic concept of *materia peccans*.[3] The plurality of causes recognises that different causes can produce similar outcomes, whereas the conjunction of causes considers the combined contribution of several factors.[4,5] These principles trace the limitations of attributing complex disease processes to a single antecedent. In clinical assessment, potentially relevant factors may include heredity, environmental exposure, lifestyle, psychological circumstances, and other modifying conditions. Their presence and significance must be evaluated individually rather than assumed.

Susceptibility and Multifactorial Disease

Modern genetics shows that susceptibility to many diseases depends on interactions between genetic variation and environmental factors.[2] Genetic predisposition does not necessarily

determine the inevitable occurrence of disease other exposures and modifying conditions may influence its development. Homoeopathy also emphasises individual susceptibility and differences in responses to external influences. However, homoeopathic susceptibility and scientifically investigated genetic susceptibility are distinct concepts and should not be treated as mechanistically equivalent. Biopathography extends case-taking beyond the present diagnosis by incorporating the patient's personal and illness history. This may help organise relevant experiences, symptom chronology, exciting circumstances, and maintaining factors. Such information supports individualised case analysis without independently establishing causal relationships.[1]

Miasmatic Predisposition

Within homoeopathic theory, miasms have been proposed to explain chronic disease tendencies and individual predisposition. This concept addresses the question of why individuals may develop different disease patterns under apparently similar circumstances. Miasmatic predisposition and genetic susceptibility can be compared at the conceptual level because both discussions concern individual differences in disease tendency. However, their explanatory foundations differ substantially. Genetic susceptibility is investigated through biological and epidemiological evidence, whereas miasmatic predisposition remains a theoretical construct within the homoeopathic system. Accordingly, miasms should not be presented as biological equivalents of genes or established genetic mechanisms. This distinction is essential when relating traditional homoeopathic concepts to contemporary scientific understanding.

Life Space Investigation and Biopathography: Complementary Approaches

Life space investigation and biopathography are complementary approaches to understanding the patient beyond the immediate presentation of symptoms. Both recognize that an individual’s health and illness cannot always be adequately understood by examining the present clinical condition in isolation. Life space investigation focuses on exploring the various dimensions of the patient’s life, including family background, childhood experiences, education, occupation, interpersonal relationships, socioeconomic circumstances, cultural influences, environmental exposures and significant emotional experiences. It seeks to understand the individual within the context of the personal, social and environmental conditions in which life unfolds. Through this process, the physician may identify relevant stressors, lifestyle patterns, environmental influences and circumstances that coincide with

the onset, aggravation or persistence of illness. Thus, life space investigation provides a broad contextual understanding of the patient's lived experiences and the circumstances that may be relevant to health and disease.[6]

Biopathography involves the systematic reconstruction and interpretation of the patient's life history in relation to the development, progression and course of illness. Rather than merely collecting information about different aspects of life, it organizes relevant biographical and clinical events into a coherent chronological narrative. This may include early-life experiences, familial predispositions, developmental history, previous illnesses, significant emotional events, occupational and environmental exposures, lifestyle factors, disease onset, recurrence, progression, treatment history and responses to interventions. The central concern of biopathography is to examine how these factors are distributed across the patient's life course and how they may be associated with changes in health status. It facilitates the exploration of temporal relationships between antecedent circumstances and subsequent manifestations. In homoeopathic case understanding, this approach may also provide a framework for examining the patient's constitutional characteristics, individual susceptibility and the evolution of symptoms.[3] However, such interpretations should be distinguished from scientifically established causal relationships.

The distinction between these two approaches is therefore primarily one of emphasis rather than complete separation. Life space investigation supplies the broader biographical, psychosocial and environmental information required to understand the patient's circumstances, whereas biopathography integrates relevant information into a longitudinal account of the individual's health and illness. For example, when investigating a patient with a chronic skin disorder, life space investigation may explore family relationships, occupational stress, living conditions, emotional experiences and lifestyle. Biopathography would then arrange the clinically relevant findings chronologically, documenting the patient's health before disease onset, the timing of possible exposures or stressful experiences, the emergence of skin manifestations, subsequent fluctuations, recurrences and responses to treatment. This integrated narrative may help identify patterns that warrant further clinical investigation, although temporal sequence alone cannot establish causation.[7]

From a broader conceptual perspective, life space investigation emphasizes the breadth of inquiry into the patient's lived environment, while biopathography emphasizes the longitudinal integration of biography and disease evolution. The former helps establish the context in which illness occurs; the latter provides a structured framework for understanding how the patient's health trajectory has unfolded over time. When used together, they can

support a more comprehensive, person-centred approach to clinical assessment by integrating biological, psychological, social and environmental dimensions without reducing a complex illness to a single event or presumed cause. In homoeopathy, biopathography may serve as a conceptual bridge between detailed case-taking and longitudinal clinical interpretation, provided that traditional theoretical constructs are clearly distinguished from evidence-based biomedical explanations.

DISCUSSION

The single-cause model may be insufficient for understanding diseases influenced by multiple interacting conditions. The Law of Causation provides a philosophical basis for considering combinations of antecedents, while contemporary multifactorial models explain how genetic, environmental, behavioural, and physiological factors may interact. Biopathography offers a longitudinal method for organizing these factors within the patient's life history. It shifts the focus from identifying one presumed cause to examining the sequence of events, exposures, individual characteristics, and circumstances associated with disease development. The distinction between exciting and maintaining factors is also relevant. In acute illness, an immediately preceding exposure may warrant consideration, whereas chronic disease may involve prolonged interactions among several influences. Nevertheless, chronological sequence alone cannot establish causation. Biopathography may contribute to individualized homoeopathic case analysis by preserving information about the patient's characteristic responses and life circumstances. Its value lies primarily in the systematic organization and interpretation of clinical information, not in proving that a particular experience caused disease. Critical application is therefore necessary. Retrospective histories may be affected by recall bias, selective interpretation, and post hoc attribution. Psychological or social events preceding illness should not automatically be regarded as causal. Similarly, theoretical homoeopathic concepts must remain distinct from empirically established biological mechanisms.

CONCLUSION

Understanding disease requires consideration of multiple antecedent conditions, individual susceptibility, environmental influences, and the temporal development of symptoms. The Law of Causation provides a philosophical framework for this approach, while contemporary medicine recognizes multifactorial interactions in disease development. Biopathography offers a longitudinal framework for organizing the patient's life and illness history and may

support individualized case analysis. Miasmatic theory can be discussed as a historical homoeopathic model of predisposition, but it should not be equated with genetic mechanisms. Moving beyond the single-cause model encourages a more comprehensive and critically evaluated understanding of disease. Biopathography may facilitate this process when used as an organizing framework rather than as independent evidence of causation.

REFERENCES

1. Slomp, Helvo, Feuerwerker, Laura Camargo Macruz and Merhy, Emerson EliasHistórias de vida, homeopatia e educação permanente: construindo o cuidado compartilhado. Ciência & Saúde Coletiva [online]. 2015, v. 20, n. 6 [Accessed 9 September 2026] , pp. 1795-1803. ISSN 1678-4561.
2. Burgio E, Porru A, Pettini C, Vaglini I, Gemignani A, Pettini M, Fratini F, Lucangeli D. From Genetic Determinism to Epigenetic Regulation: Paradigm Shifts in the Understanding of Neurodevelopmental Disorders. Current Issues in Molecular Biology. 2026 Feb 2;48(2):163.
3. Hahnemann S. *Organon of Medicine*. 6th ed. Translated by Boericke W. New Delhi: B. Jain Publishers; 2002.
4. Murugan M. Logic of causes in the treatment of diseases by homoeopathy. International Journal of Homoeopathic Sciences. 2026;10(4):253-255.
5. Close S. The genius of homoeopathy. New Delhi: B. Jain Publishers (P) Ltd.; 2010. p. 269.
6. Moorthi K, Pertin S, Radhika P. Homoeopathy for obsessive-compulsive disorder: A case report. Indian J Res Homoeopathy 2023;17:56-62.
7. Ortega PS. Notes on the miasms, or, Hahnemann's chronic diseases. 1st English ed. New Delhi: National Homeopathic Pharmacy; 1980.