



# International Journal of Homoeopathic Sciences

E-ISSN: 2616-4493  
P-ISSN: 2616-4485  
IJHS 2019; 3(1): 01-05  
Received: 01-11-2018  
Accepted: 04-12-2018

**Dr. Geeta B Adi**  
Assistant Professor,  
Department of Repertory,  
Bharatesh Homoeopathic  
Medical College, Belagavi,  
Karnataka, India

**Dr. Basavaraj S Adi**  
Reader, Department of  
Pharmacy, Bharatesh  
Homoeopathic Medical  
College, Belagavi, Karnataka,  
India

**Dr. Siva Rami Reddy E**  
Faculty of Homoeopathy,  
Tantia University, Sri  
Ganganagar, Rajasthan, India

**Correspondence**  
**Dr. Siva Rami Reddy E**  
Faculty of Homoeopathy,  
Tantia University, Sri  
Ganganagar, Rajasthan, India

## A complete review of principles and cure of homoeopathy

**Dr. Geeta B Adi, Dr. Basavaraj S Adi and Dr. Siva Rami Reddy E**

### Abstract

Homoeopathy based up on similia similibus curenture. Homoeopathy opens up a vista of opportunities for continually seeking new fields for the demonstration of natural laws, for if, as we believe, these laws are fundamental, their application is universal, and had we the vision to see it we would be convinced not from its application in the field of medicine alone, but in every field of natural science and in applied science as well.

**Keywords:** Principles, homoeopathy system of medicine, cure

### Introduction

Homoeopathy offers to the independent mind an opportunity continually to seek new verifications of the natural laws upon which this system of medicine is based. Homoeopathy treats the sick individual, it is therefore a specialty. In spite of the trend toward group practice, group thinking and even group mode of life as seen all about us today. Homoeopathy considers the man as a whole not just his individual parts. Therefore, primarily homoeopathy has less appeal for the man of mechanical bent, for it is this man who makes the best surgeon. Instead, homoeopathy offers a gentler way toward health of the entire individual<sup>[1]</sup>

Must consider is the differentiation between medicine and public health service. Public health service, ideally has to do with the prevention of disease in the community, in guarding food and water supplies in providing facilities and restrictions for adequate healthy housing conditions and in attending to the proper disposal of waste matter, so that the health of the community will be guarded against epidemics borne by impure water, milk or other food supplies or born in insanitary or unhygienic conditions. Homoeopathy looks upon the health of the individual as a precious charge and the return of the individual to health as almost certain if we but follow the fundamental laws. Another growing distinction between public health service, so called and medicine especially homoeopathic medicine is the increasing use of serums and vaccines. A man who adopts the homoeopathic methods must be free from prejudice and able to look fairly at disease conditions from a new angle. He must look at the patient as an individual, not as a disease and he must treat the patient and not the disease. He must possess a sense of values and be able to train himself to observe and interpret those signs which manifest themselves through the habits and circumstances of the patients, in to indications for health restoring medication which he has at his command. The very foundation of homoeopathic practice considers man not only as an individual but as a complete unit in himself, of which all his parts comprise a well balanced whole. Homoeopathy, therefore, does not consider any one part as being ill but considers the manifestation of illness in one part in its relation to the whole man<sup>[2, 3]</sup>

Homoeopathy considers the morbid vital processes in living organisms, which are perceptible represented by symptoms, irrespective of what caused them. Homoeopathy is concerned only with disease per se, that is, in its primary, functional or dynamic aspect not in its ultimate and so called pathological results. Functional symptoms always precede structural changes. In biology, 'function creates and develops the organ'. In disease, function the effort of the vital energy to function under adverse circumstances, precedes and develops the pathological states. For the homoeopathic physician the totality of the functional symptoms of the patient is the disease and constitutes the only perceptible form of disease and therefore the only basis of curative treatment. Symptoms are the outward and visible signs of the inward disturbance of the vital force which will ultimately produce morbid states and when these symptoms are removed the disease ceases to exist.

Dr. S.F. Hahemann regarded the removal of all obstacles to cure as absolutely essential before the attempted to proceed to the selection and administration of the remedy which was homoeopathic to the symptoms of the individual case by which alone the cure is to be accomplished.

The first formulated and recognized law of homoeopathy, *similia similibus curentur*. It was simply an intelligent observation of our natural resources, those in their closest proximity to our daily lives, in the vegetable kingdom, and their relation to disturbed and disordered conditions arising in mankind himself. It was found that the ills of individual man could be successfully treated thus: first doubtless these substances were found in the vegetable kingdom, later in the mineral and animal kingdoms also. Still later came the knowledge that this was not by chance, an occasional means of cure, but that by law these substances acted in an ordered and orderly manner under certain definite conditions and circumstances. This recognition of law underlying cure is of ancient origin: no one knows when the first recognition of this law crept in to use, but ancient hindu manuscripts recorded its application. Certainly, Aristotle recognized it, and Hippocrates sensed the possibilities of this law, and applied it in some recorded cases. From time to time all through medical history this hypothesis was enunciated or demonstrated in greater or less degree. Hahnemann later demonstrated this law to be universal and not an occasional circumstance. He called the science and art of healing which naturally followed, homoeopathy, but the thought is not a new one; it was age old before a science of healing was based solely on this law. In other words, in even the embryonic stages of homoeopathy it was found that law governed. Gradual experimentation widened the possibilities of application of these laws; no amount of experimentation extended the laws themselves. All that experimentation could do was to enlighten our minds regarding the scope of the law<sup>[4-6]</sup>.

A law is a fundamental fact; because we do not recognize a law does not mean that the law does not exist. Even to manmade laws, which in their essence are not laws in the true sense but rules laid down by man for man, it is recognized that ignorance of the law is no excuse. As observation became focused upon the unfolding of the law of cure, other regularities in reaction were discovered, and a second law of cure, this time pertaining to the direction of cure, was formulated. This was: "cure takes place from above downward, from within outward, from an important organ to a less important organ; symptoms disappear in the reverse order of their appearance, the first to appear being the last to disappear". Simple disappearance of symptoms is by no means cure; symptoms often have periods of recurrence, but no true cure has ever been observed that did not follow the law of direction.

Another law, equally applicable throughout the universe is that of mutual action; action and reaction are equal and opposite. To some of us who have thoughtfully considered these things they seem so self-evident that if would be almost unnecessary to speak of them were it not for the purpose of urging you to observe the lawfulness of homoeopathy, and to prove our claim of the fundamental lawfulness of this true science of healing. Let us look at a law which follows naturally the law of mutual action. This is the law designated as the law of least action, which was formulated by maupertius, the French mathematician. To us as homoeopathic physician and students it may be known as

the law of quantity and dose; the quantity of action necessary to effect and change in nature is the least possible; the decisive amount is always a minimum, an infinitesimal.

Another law of quantity to be considered here is: the quantity of the drug required is in inverse ratio to the similarity. In other words, the greater the similarity of the drug symptoms to those of the patient, the less quantity will be required, for the greater will be the state of susceptibility of the patient. A corollary to the law of quantity is: the quality of the action of a homoeopathic remedy is determined by its quantity, in inverse ration. Again this is a problem of the susceptibility of the patient and the similarity of the drug: the laws of quality and quantity go hand in hand. Biology gives us this law: Function creates and develops the organ. It has been observed in this study of homoeopathy that functional symptoms are produced by the vital force in exact proportion to the profundity of the disturbance. Often, however, when pathological changes occur the symptomatic picture changes greatly in that functional symptoms do not manifest themselves in as great a degree; the disease condition has struck deeper and manifests itself less on the surface. Following the biological law therefore, homoeopathy postulates the law of symptom development: functional symptoms precede structural changes.

Now the law of use governing the homeopathic remedy must therefore be: the dose and quantity that will thoroughly permeate the organism and make its essential impress upon the vital force is that which will affect the functional sphere of the individual. We say: "This must therefore be;" if we reason logically, and have observed carefully, keeping our line of reasoning along the lines of laws already formulated and proven sound, we can do no less than believe that this is a truly fundamental law. For many years daily practice has proven the value of the law of repetition of the dose: never repeat your remedy so long as it continues to act. This governs the administration of remedies to individuals in states of disease; let us look at the law that must govern the production of symptoms by artificial means, i.e. drug proving, by which we get our guidance for the administration of drugs to the sick. The object of proving drugs is the production of artificial diseases that we may observe the symptoms and apply the substances so proven in like states of natural disturbance. The law governing this must be closely allied to the law of administration in states of disease, or else our case is not logical. We find this law: Never repeat the dose in a proving while symptoms are manifest from the dose already taken.

All natural forces are based upon law. These laws do not operate in a limited field, but are universal. To illustrate, the law of gravitation is not limited in its scope to the earth, but its influence extends throughout the universe. Hahnemann, by his fine observation and the inductive method of reasoning, became convinced of the law of cure, *similia similibus curentur*, and embraced it and declared it to be universal, a basic law of therapeutics. If there is any general law of cure, that law must express some relationship between the medicine and the disease. To be of any practical use such a relationship must be exhibited, and we must be able to demonstrate such a relation between a disease and its remedy that any examination of the former shall determine the latter. Nothing can be known of the disease save through the phenomena known as symptoms; these are evident to our observation and senses and must be recognized. These

phenomena represent the individuality of the disease in the only way in which we can recognize it. A corresponding capability exists in the drug, of producing an individual, although artificial, disease, which we recognize through the same method of observing the phenomena produced after the administration of the drug. The power to produce these phenomena is what we call the properties of the drug. It is the characteristic of disease to produce certain phenomena which are not observable in perfect health. This is true whether the changes are functional or structural; what we recognize as symptoms are all that can be known of the disease. It is only through the observation of these expressions that we can make any use of the law of cure, and there can be no general consideration of the rule of cure unless it comprises a consideration of symptoms as one of the necessary elements. One might say that a comprehension of the symptoms of a given case was one of the primary factors, and in so far as one comprehends the expression of disease in these phenomena is one equipped to follow the law of cure in any particular case. Symptoms are the only representative expression of the diseased state. We include sensations as expressed by the patient, the appearances in all parts of the body, the varied circumstances under which these symptoms were recorded, and the varied grouping of these symptoms, in any consideration of the case. When a symptom is noted under certain circumstances and not under others, this obvious relation between the symptom and its related circumstance is in itself a symptom, or rather, a part of the symptom, the sensation being quite incomplete without the expressed relationship of circumstance. Very often the concomitant of circumstance is of greater importance to the whole case than the expressed sensation, but sensation is much more frequently expressed by the patient. Two or more symptoms may appear together, or synchronize with each other, so frequently that they are really one symptom and must be considered as such in our analysis. As nothing in nature can be represented by a single property, so no disease can be represented by a single symptom. A law of cure must represent some relation between the properties of a disease and the medicinal qualities of a drug; or in other words, we must have some concept of the character of the drug's action on the living body that will interpret the law of cure in the action of disease. This character of the drug is represented, not by a single effect, but by a group of effects. This group of effects is the only representation we have or can have of the medicinal character of a drug on the living body, and since these same effects are found in disease states, these effects are the only relationship that can be established between the medicinal effects of a drug and disease. There can be no law of cure unless it expresses some definite relation between these two groups, or classes<sup>[7]</sup>

The homeopathic law establishes a definite relation, not only between proved drugs and known diseases, but between all the unexplored medical wealth and the undeveloped requirements of sickness. Like the law of gravitation, the law of cure as taught by Hahnemann is not, and cannot be, limited to a small group of conditions; the limitations rest entirely with our ignorance. Hahnemann and his followers constitute the only group of medical philosophers who have always been true to the inductive method of reasoning, and by scientifically following this method of reasoning, based upon known facts, they have established this law of therapeutics. It has been proven by

experience that a medicine will remove a group of symptoms similar to the group which it is capable of producing. This law, founded upon observation of facts, has been the product of inductive reasoning and has been proven by years of experience to be true and sure. No medicine can cure any disease unless it acts upon all the diseased parts, either directly or indirectly. The more similar the symptoms of a drug resemble to the disease, the nearer is its vital approach to the disease, and the more dynamic its action. The number of parts of the human body susceptible of receiving the curative action of drugs vastly outnumbers those recognized in the anatomy, because disease and cure do not lie in the tissues except as a reflection of the man himself. This we may see from the almost infinite diversity of symptoms producible and curable by drugs. There is an almost infinite number of parts or in each organ, and this vast number are suffering together, some more or some less; the affection of each element may be different from that of any other, the aggregate affection composing the disease of that tissue of that one organ. How much more complicated is the disease of the whole body, even though that manifestation be classed as a "local disease!" One organ cannot suffer alone any more than one cell can suffer by itself. Every disease affects in some way and to some degree every organ, every tissue every molecule. Because of custom we express ourselves in this sense as from the greater toward the smaller, from without inward, yet an analytical study must remind us that the disease manifestation is an exfoliation, an outward manifestation of an inward turmoil, that is not found in the most minute examination known to man of any cell or portion of the human frame. We may find disease manifestations, but we cannot find disease itself. No medicine can affect a perfect cure unless it has a curative action upon every diseased part, and in just the proportion that each part manifests disorder. Potentized medicine, administered according to the law of *similia*, is the true regulator of the vital energy, that vital essence which is synonymous, or at least analogous, to the man himself and lies very close to life itself. The totality of any disease is the totality of the morbid action, sensations and manifestations; any true and complete and comprehensive law of therapeutics must recognize all the morbid phenomena and show some relation between them and the curative agent. This relationship must be direct and clear. The law of cure, *similia similibus curentur*, is as fundamental as any law in nature. It is a law of universal adaptability to human sickness; it ranks in the field of astronomy. This is the only general law for the cure of the physical and mental ills of man; it is the only method of healing that depends, as a whole, upon one general principle, and it is the only method of healing that has continued to withstand the pressure of time and changing circumstances. It is a law of nature, discovered by following the thread of inductive reasoning, and proven to be true by countless tests. The man who sees this glimpses the basis of vitalism; that there is a whole world of causes prior to the world of effects; that matter is indestructible and that force is transmitted through matter and therefore it, too, is indestructible. Matter may change in form but it is always present; force may change its expression but no unit of force is ever destroyed. We hold that force, on energy, or dynamis, whatever you wish to call it, is the *law of nature*; it may express its powers in different ways but in its essence it is that which was breathed into man at his creation which

made him a living soul. The expression of this law may vary and find different expressions, as attraction, gravity, electricity, chemical affinity, dynamis, or spiritual power; it is an expression of, and all combined under one Head and Source of Power God. Hahnemann was a representative of this school of thought and he plumbed deeply into these mysteries. He became dissatisfied with the thought of his day, and read extensively the medical works of the ancients. In his delving he found several, not long before his own time, like Stahl of Denmark and Halle of Switzerland, who had observed that medicines might cure disease by the power they possessed of causing like diseases in healthy human beings. He comprehended that these men had observed this phenomenon but that it had been allowed to fall into disuse without application. At this stage Hahnemann determined to discover the action of drugs upon human beings by observing all the details of their action upon healthy subjects. Hahnemann did not originate this idea of proving drugs upon healthy individuals, but he was the first to so prove with a definite object in view. After thorough, pains taking, intelligent, systematic study and comparisons, after many long, tedious, self-sacrificing ordeals, Hahnemann was able to work out and announce to the world the existence of an heretofore unsuspected universal law of cure-not an occasional means of cure as had been anticipated by those of recent generations. This was the first step which culminated in the evolution of a new rational and scientific system of medical practice<sup>[8]</sup>. The full recognition of the law of similar rapidly succeeded the proving of drugs, and was the second step in the evolution of homeopathic principles. Hahnemann began the experiments of the application of proven drugs for the cure of the sick upon the basis of the law of similars, by using drugs in their full strength. He found that many times the patient became greatly aggravated. Hahnemann reasoned that the dose was too large, and he experimented by diluting the drug on a definite scale; to his surprise he found he secured better results. He continued this process until he discovered that the curative power of drugs bore no proportionate relationship to the crude quantity, but that under the peculiar and systematic reduction by a regular scale, and the proper manipulation, many drugs in common use, and many substances supposed to be inert in their crude states, became endowed with new and hitherto unsuspected activities and powers. So Hahnemann, setting out simply to reduce the quantity of his doses, discovered potentization, an entirely new principle in posology, a wonderful development in the world of therapeutics, without which the law of cure would have been forgotten. This is the principle which gives life and power to the system of medicine which Hahnemann developed and this is the third great step in the evolution of the law of cure. Physicians who have been somewhat trained along homeopathic lines manifest more confusion in the treatment of incurable diseases than in almost any other field of medicine. When faced with incurable cases, the thought occurs to a great many physicians to administer palliative measures in an effort to alleviate suffering and to attempt to hide from the patient and from the family the real seriousness of the situation. Although they may mean well, it is an effort expended in the wrong direction, and does more harm than can well be estimated. There is no place in the field of medicine where obliteration of symptoms will cause so much confusion, so there is no possibility of accurate prescribing, as in these

incurable cases.

The basis of cure is the fundamental law of similars. The law of similars is the fundamental law also in the palliation of incurable states. The administration of narcotics and sedatives suppresses symptoms and destroys the power of elimination by locking up the secretions in all states so completely that we cannot get a true picture of the condition of the vital force and energy upon which we must evaluate our symptomatology. The result of palliative treatment by the use of narcotics demands the continual increase of the drugging, for as soon as the effect seems to be subsiding, more drug must be administered. It becomes a vicious circle from which there is no escape except to be sent to the ultimate end in a confused and half-deadened condition, instead of being helped to live out as many years as possible in the easiest, quietest and most gentle manner.

The insomnia may be treated with crude palliative measures so that the patient secures sleep, but at best this is an unnatural sleep; while if the insomnia is considered as a part of his symptomatic picture, and given its proper place in that symptomatology and the man himself is treated-not alone one or two symptoms-he will gain his natural, refreshing sleep and he himself will be improved in general health. The word modern must always be used in a comparative sense. This is never appreciated more keenly than when considered in the light of medical practice, and those elements of the practice of today that have survived the crucible of time have rightly become recognized as the principles of the art. Medicine, while always dealing with the ills of mankind, has passed through a continuous barrage of "modern" discoveries. Greater possibilities of investigation of the functions of the body have increased our knowledge of life processes and the circumstances of living; and this increase in knowledge has been of inestimable value in dealing with human suffering. But therapeutics, as demonstrated by modern medicine, is still in a state similar to that of the past, in that the discovery or development of the day is the seeming answer to almost all therapeutic problems. This is another way of saying that in spite of the increased knowledge of the mechanism of the body, no guiding principles have been discovered by the dominant school of medicine that are sure and certain indications in the field of therapeutics. That means there is no test but that of experience for any therapeutic agent, and modern medicine, despite the period of its discovery, still finds itself on a basis of empiricism rather than of true science<sup>[9, 10]</sup>

Consider the discovery of the synthetic group of drugs. There has been a continuous procession of these substances over a period of years. Aspirin, luminol, the phenols, the sulphanilamides, the vitamins and numerous others. Each discovery has been hailed as a modern development of science for the conquering or alleviation of the ills of mankind. Sober investigation of the claims of these therapeutic measures astounds us with the conviction that in almost every instance the target at which these measures are aimed is a single symptom or, at most, a small group of symptoms, and not at the patient himself. In most cases the discovery of such a therapeutic agent has been met with loud acclaim and ardent advertising; its use became widespread very shortly. Soon the sincere students of science perceived, through their laboratory research and from clinical observations, that there was another face to the seeming curative action of the substance that was not without danger to the patient; and therefore warnings were

sent out that there should not be too free use of the substances except under the most careful observation. In the meantime the fashion of use had spread, especially among those who always seek the easy road in therapeutics, the uninstructed and those who are addicted to self-dosing, with a corresponding amount of further damage to health. Such an agent was aspirin. First advanced for its harmless sedative properties in the control of pain, it was widely used and in considerable amounts, by physician and laymen alike, until its depressant properties came to be respected by careful therapists <sup>[11]</sup> The American Medical Association found it advisable to publish warnings against the use of this substance which was commonly sold under the trade name of aspirin; but the use of the substance was not curtailed to any marked degree except by the most careful prescribers. It had become a cure-all for domestic use and all too often in hospitals and by physicians who sought first the suppression of the distressing symptoms rather than the cure of the patient. Homoeopathic physicians have long known the dangers of suppressive measures, and have always had due respect for the innate powers of any medicament. It was Hahnemann who observed that any drug was poisonous if dangerous dosage was given. Therefore it is to be expected that homeopathic physicians early recognized the dangers of the synthetic drugs, among them the coal tar derivatives <sup>[12]</sup>. The ability of the trained homeopath to observe and correlate symptoms made it a foregone conclusion that he would easily trace the depressed vitality, the heart attacks, and many collapsed conditions, to the frequent use of aspirin and like pain killers.

The Oxford Medical Companion. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

## References

1. Iris Bell R, Danid Lewis A. Strength of vital force in classical homoeopathy: Bio psychosocial spiritual correlates within a complex systems context. *J Alt Comp Med.* 2002; 10(1):123-131.
2. Vithoulkasg. *The science of homoeopathy.* Grove Weidenfeld, New York, 1980.
3. Rowe T. *Homoeopathic methodology, repertory, case taking and case analysis.* Berkeley. North Atlantic Books, 1998.
4. Rubik B. The bio field hypothesis: its biophysical basis and role in medicine. *J Alt comp med.* 2002; 8:703-717.
5. Samuel F Hahnemann. *Organon of medicine.* 6<sup>th</sup> edition. O'Reily WB, Decker S, trans. Redmond, WA: Birdcage Books, 1996.
6. Herbert A Roberts *The principles and art of cure by homoeopathy.* IBPP, New Delhi, 1936, 152-278.
7. Bell JR, Schwartz GET. Translating a nonlinear systems theory model for homoeopathy in to empirical test. *Alt ther heal med.* 2002; 8:58-66.
8. Hyland ME. Extended network generalized enlargement theory. *J Alt Comp Med.* 2003; 9:919-936.
9. Bell JR, Koithan M, Gorman. Homoeopathic practitioner viewers of changes in patient undergoing constitutional treatment for chronic disease. *J alt comp med.* 2003; 9:39-50.
10. Jonas WB, Kaptchuck T, Linde KA. Critical view of homeopathy. *Ann Intern Med.* 2003; 138:393-9.
11. Fulder S. *The Handbook of Alternative and Complementary Medicine.* London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1996, 5-9.
12. Black D. *Complementary Medicine.* In: Walter J, Walton L, Jeremiah A, Barondess JA, Lock S (eds).