



# International Journal of Homoeopathic Sciences

E-ISSN: 2616-4493  
P-ISSN: 2616-4485  
[www.homoeopathicjournal.com](http://www.homoeopathicjournal.com)  
IJHS 2023; 7(3): 429-431  
Received: 22-07-2023  
Accepted: 25-08-2023

**Dr. Anjali S**  
HOD & Associate Professor,  
Department of Obstetrics &  
Gynaecology, Alva's  
Homoeopathic Medical  
College, Mangalore,  
Karnataka, India

## Homoeopathy in theory and practice

**Dr. Anjali S**

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.33545/26164485.2023.v7.i3g.946>

### Abstract

This article's goal is to examine the theory and application of homoeopathy during Hahnemann's lifetime. A revolution in homoeopathy will be brought about by new theoretical research and activity that is emerging. We homoeopaths continue to adhere to Hahnemannian doctrines without ever modernizing homoeopathy. Not everyone is prepared to accept new homoeopathic theories and studies. Every science needs the most recent system development changes. We will have the same designation of "Pseudo science" if we carry on in the same manner in the future. Homeopathy should advance as much as is humanly possible in research to support the system, as this will secure its survival in the future.

**Keywords:** Homoeopathy, miasm, pseudoscience

### 1. Introduction

Theoretical explanations of homeopathic action date back to Hahnemann's time, and most of them are quite sophisticated and at odds with conventional wisdom among non-homeopaths. In most situations, there is insufficient evidence to support homeopathy's efficacy. To the homoeopathic community, the scientific validity of homoeopathy remains unclear. While using evidence-based research, homeopathy should be given an opportunity to demonstrate its worth, it should not be used in place of established homoeopathic beliefs...

### 2. Discovery of Homoeopathy & Theories

#### 2.1 Hahnemann's changes of practice from time to time

If we compare homoeopathy to other systems, it is a young science. In 1790, Hahnemann developed the fundamental idea behind the system, giving rise to the system's origin. The first edition of his organon was released in 1810, and he announced his discovery in 1796. Without altering the fundamental concept, namely the similia principle, Hahnemann created and improved homoeopathy. He advanced through the practice phases, from prescribing diluted Belladonna to administering mother tinctures of medicine, until arriving at the dynamization of medicine, a brand-new level of therapeutic action used only in Hahnemann's homoeopathy [2].

From a physical level to an abstract form, Hahnemann elevated homoeopathy. Homoeopathy was widely misunderstood [6, 7].

#### 2.2 Discussion of Homoeopathic theories on practice

In the world of medicine, the idea of wholeness is still unique to homoeopathy. The discovery of miasms gave homoeopathy a clear sense of uniqueness. Additionally, this discovery provided a mystical therapeutic power for numerous diseases that no other branch of medicine could even imagine. The key concept in homoeopathic practice today is individualization, and it is every homoeopathic doctor's difficult duty to do so by using all available data. The ability of the doctor to individualize the case is essential for success in homoeopathic practice. Regarding how to individualize the patient, perspectives can occasionally differ.

The homoeopaths' ability to work together has often been jeopardized by disagreements over this issue. Arguments were frequently more or less biased and one-sided, placing too much stress on certain intellectual ideas while ignoring the genuine holistic superiority of homoeopathy [15, 16].

Although Hahnemann's discoveries were beyond the capabilities of modern physical science, they can all be tested in our everyday work. In clinical practice, the ideas of miasms,

**Corresponding Author:**  
**Dr. Anjali S**  
HOD & Associate Professor,  
Department of Obstetrics &  
Gynaecology, Alva's  
Homoeopathic Medical  
College, Mangalore,  
Karnataka, India

dynamization, drug proving, and similia are provable. The underlying issue with homoeopathy is that certain theoretical justifications are weak, unpersuasive, and most likely unscientific, but patient-based practical verification is proven to be feasible [14]. The current theoretical explanations can never fully establish the science of homoeopathy without the aid of successful outcomes. Numerous theories, such as the dynamization in homoeopathy, called into question more than just the fundamental laws of physics and chemistry. That was a significant obstacle to the acceptance of homoeopathy. In general, homoeopathy ran counter to many accepted scientific theories, but the outcomes of homoeopathic treatment unequivocally demonstrate homoeopathy's effectiveness as a means of treating the world's suffering population [12, 13].

### 2.3 Development of modern medicine v/s homoeopathy

Since Hahnemann's time, modern medicine has been evolving gradually. In that evolution, man learned so much about how diseases work, progressing from basic etiological and pathological conceptions to the current concept of aetiology, pathogenesis, and finally the matching therapies. But we really struggled to apply this understanding to the homoeopathic paradigm that already existed. The followers of homoeopathy had limited opportunity to improve upon Hahnemann's system because he completed the majority of the work himself. He attained the state of potency and put forth the idea of miasm. However, after Hahnemann's death, as disease knowledge advanced and the medical industry underwent a revolution, homoeopaths were unable to process and integrate it into the system because they lacked the necessary information [5, 3].

When Hahnemann was alive, homoeopathy was in its initial stages. Homoeopathy developed along its own course based on the precepts established by Hahnemann, spread around the world, and came to be recognized as an efficient form of medicine. There was not much progress made because the fundamentals of homoeopathy remained the same as those outlined by Hahnemann. Dr. Richard Hughes and Dr. James Tyler Kent somewhat filled this gap later, toward the end of the 19th century [9]. For more than a century, Kent had an impact on homoeopathy. All allopaths follow the same standardized principles used in modern medicine to treat patients. The group as a whole is prepared to accept the discoveries. But we homoeopaths follow a variety of prescriptions, some of which are tincture-based, some of which are single medicines, some of which are blended prescriptions, and all of which are successful. In our own unique way, we are adhering to instructions. The ability to choose how to treat our patients is beneficial in one way. It also undermines homoeopathy's legitimacy in other ways. The art of case taking, prescription, and potency selection all differ greatly among homoeopaths, who have divergent views on these topics [8]. I think that when it comes to case-taking and prescribing, homoeopaths should all adhere to the Hahnemannian principles.

### 4. Conclusion

Hahnemann provided us a system that is incredibly useful but too challenging to learn. More uncertainty was caused by some of Hahnemann's theoretical justifications. A

thorough examination of homoeopathy demonstrates that nothing has qualitatively changed over the past 200 years. Homoeopaths bear enormous responsibility for spreading the truth of this science and assisting in the alleviation of human suffering. Every homoeopath should be a competent doctor with adequate patient care skills in order to accomplish this goal. The only way for homoeopaths to show their significance is by coming out and not hiding behind Hahnemann [10].

Constantine Hering writes: "It is the duty of all of us to go further in the theory and practice of homeopathy than Hahnemann has done" on page 9 of the prologue to Hahnemann's *Chronic Diseases* (1845 edition). We should look for the truth that is there in front of us and abandon the mistakes of the past. Seeking the truth and forgetting the mistakes of the past, let us try to move homeopathy theory and practice further. Hahnemann would have significantly changed homoeopathy if he had lived in the 20th century 1.

### 5. Conflict of Interest

Not available

### 6. Financial Support

Not available

### 7. References

1. Samuel H. *The Chronic Diseases their Peculiar Nature and Their Homoeopathic Cure*, New Delhi, Indian Books and Periodical Publishers, Reprint Edition; c2009. p. 12, 90-91, 40, 102-103, 172-174, 181, 157, 153, 155.
2. Richard H. *the principles and practice of homoeopathy*, leath & ross, London. 1902;4(10):11-24.
3. Allen JH. *The Chronic Miasms, Psora, Pseudo Psora*, New Delhi, B Jain Publishers; c1996. p. 32.
4. Patel RP. *Introduction to Chronic Miasms and Human Relationship*, Published by Dr R P Patel; c2006. p. 37-41, 42-43, 54-57, 60-62, 65-69, 74-76.
5. Speight Phyllis, *A comparison of Chronic miasms*, New Delhi, B Jain Publishers. p. 43.
6. Rajendran ES. *New Lights- Lectures on Homoeopathy and Philosophy*, Mohna Publications; c2013. p. 30-45.
7. Rajendran ES. *Nucleus-lectures on chronic diseases and miasm*, B Jain Publishers Pvt Ltd; c2013. p. 33-60.
8. Hahnemann S. *Organon of medicine: Sixth edition*. New Delhi, India: B Jain; c2021.
9. Gevitz N. *Unorthodox medical theories*. In: Bynum WF, Porter R (Eds.). *Companion Encyclopedia of the History of Medicine* London: Routledge; c1993. p. 603-3.
10. Riley D, Fisher M, Singh B, Haidvogel M, Heger M. *Homeopathy and conventional medicine: an outcomes study comparing effectiveness in a primary care setting*. *J Alt Complementary Med*. 2001;7:149-159.
11. Dudgeon RE. *Lectures on the theory and practice of Homoeopathy*, B. Jain Publishers, New Delhi; c1987. p. 26.
12. Diwan Harish Chand, *A Compendium of lectures on Homoeopathy*, National Homoeopathic Pharmacy, New Delhi; c1995. p. 208.
13. Kent JT. *Lectures on homoeopathic materia medica*. Jain Publishing Company; c1980.

14. Sarkar BK. Organon of medicine. (14 Ed.). Delhi: Birla publications; c2013-2014.
15. Nagendra BG. Comprehensive study of organon. (1 Ed.). Noida, UP: Bjain publishers; c2009.
16. Dawdle ML. Principles and practice of homoeopathy. New Delhi: B Jain publishers.

**How to Cite This Article**

Anjali S. Homoeopathy in theory and practice. International Journal of Homoeopathic Sciences. 2023;7(3):429-431.

**Creative Commons (CC) License**

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.