

# THE HAHNEMANNIAN GLEANINGS

Vol. L

DECEMBER 1983

No. 12

## EDITORIAL

### SINGLE REMEDY VS. MULTIPLE OR COMBINATIONS OR PATENTS

The principles of Homoeopathy as we understand are (a) the application of *law of similars*, (b) the use of *single remedy* and (c) the application of *minimum dose*. We shall restrict our discussion to the use of single remedy.

The basis of Homoeopathy consists of a knowledge of the effects of drugs upon the healthy. The practical application of this general conception lies in selecting, out of all the remedies known—the *similimum*, the one whose symptom complex most closely resembles that of the case to be treated. Our experience of the past many years shows that selection of *similimum* is no easy exercise but needs a great wisdom and patience. The job is easy if one quickly finds the *similimum* exactly matching the symptoms presented in a disease. But if it does not, and many remedies come up as close resemblance to each other, then the *similimum* has to be based on the importance of relative value of the symptoms. The sound knowledge of anatomy-physiology-pathology-drug pathogenesis play a great part in determining the ultimate importance of various symptoms. A successful practitioner is the one who grasps these correctly in the selection of his remedy. Very often it is the lack of knowledge of the drug pathogenesis that is responsible for our failure in selection of one and the right remedy. This problem is somewhat solved by the use of repertory. But here, the physician has to be very careful in weighing the relative values of symptoms before he uses them in the right combination. The feed back, therefore, greatly depends upon the right input and programming.

The concept of multiple or combination prescription is not new. Right from Hering, Gross, Rummel, Hartmann, Aegidi, Hirsch, Kaupfer have expressed their opinion in alternating of remedies. All of them have recommended alternating of remedies or giving different remedies in quick succession in a given case for a rapid recovery. However, there is only one reason that such a course is adopted and that is a desperate case, where one lacks confidence in waiting to see the action of the remedy prescribed. Griesselich says that in acute diseases where it is impossible to find a right remedy it

may be allowable and imperative. But Dr. Trink says that giving a different remedy without waiting to see the action of the remedy prescribed earlier is contrary to the principle of Homoeopathy. In chronic cases such multiple remedies should not be employed even if one remedy does not cover all the symptoms of the case. It only boils down to one thing that we are not aware of the total pathogenesis of the drug. Very often it will be noticed that after the prescription of a single remedy, the uncovered symptoms also disappear. This should go in record to enrich the materia medica. It needs diligent and devoted practice.

The hint was taken up and slowly instead of alternating the remedies, physicians started combining the medicines. The combinations were prepared probably from their personal whims and imaginations. Gradually the homoeopathic pharmacies started preparing the so-called successful combinations and marketing under trade names.

Hahnemann was against this type of practice. He always insisted that when one single remedy had been used in proving and eliciting its curative signs and symptoms, using of combinations without the full knowledge of their pathogenesis is contrary to the law of similars. It means that the combination can be used in practice provided it is used as a single remedy and after its thorough proving to understand its full therapeutic possibility. More often than not one will find that it demonstrates altogether a different picture than the original symptomatology of the combining drugs.

The pharmaceutical industry in Homoeopathy claims many such combinations which are available for the use of practitioners. Unlike pharmaceutical industry of modern medicine which are backed by research, homoeopathic pharmaceutical industry has negligible contribution in the field of research. The combinations, which they claim have been the outcome of some imaginary potions, claimed to have relieved some, and such combinations are picked up without carrying out any serious research or proving. The homoeopathic physicians fall prey to such combinations when they find difficulty in selecting the right remedy in acute or chronic case and when they are harassed by their troubled patients. Often the patients demand some tonic or a regular medicine (a legacy of modern medical practice) totally unaware of the homoeopathic philosophy. It must be remembered that when the patient comes to the homoeopathic physician, he has to be educated in the principles of Homoeopathy. This is quite a useful auxiliary method in the long run.

So-called combination drugs prepared by the pharmaceutical companies are sold in the market. They advertise them under trade names and unwary patients get trapped. It is our experience that one who has taken these combination remedies poses a serious problem to the physician later. These combinations become a hindrance to the rational cure. When the indicated remedy fails, the cause may be found in the use of combination drugs in ninety-nine cases out of hundred.

In conclusion, one should practice rational Homoeopathy by use of a single remedy prescription at any one given time of the case and follow-ups can be done through the related remedies as intercurrents or chronic remedies. People who use the combinations and claim quick and magical success soon realise that their success is short-lived; but they are shy of announcing them.

---

*The views and opinions expressed by the authors of articles published in this journal are not necessarily those of the editor and publishers.*