

PRESENT DAY NEED OF RE-PROVING OF HOMOEOPATHIC DRUGS

DR. VIJAY PAL SINGH, D.H.M.S. (DELHI), PATNA

Towards the end of the eighteenth century, Dr. Samuel Hahnemann of Germany discovered a rational system of medicine which is now known as Homoeopathy. Since the discovery of Homoeopathy, hundreds of drugs have been proved¹ homoeopathically and many are still in the process of proving.

Most of the drugs so far proved, which are recorded in homoeopathic materia medicas, have been proved during the period 1800 to 1855 A.D. They were proved by the pioneers in the profession and nicely recorded. To this day we rely on their findings and keep getting results of varied nature. But there are reasons to think that these drugs should be re-proved thoroughly so that the authenticity of the symptoms, recorded under respective drugs, is re-established with the change of time.

A homoeopathic drug proving is effected by the following factors:

Drug: Homoeopathic drugs are derived from various sources such as plants, animals, minerals and chemicals, healthy human/animal secretions, many pathogens and discharges in diseased conditions and energies. About 60 to 70 per cent of homoeopathic drugs are from botanical source, 2 to 3 per cent from zoological source and the rest from other sources as mentioned above. When a drug is proved, the following factors have also to be considered:

- (a) The form of the drug (mother tincture/solution or potency).
- (b) Quantity of the drug.
- (c) Extent of its action (short acting or long acting).
- (d) Repetition of drug (it is determined by keeping in view the extent of its action).
- (e) Duration of proving.

Prover: The drugs in Homoeopathy are proved on human subjects.² The drug proving is affected by the following factors:

- (a) Age: Different age groups, as observed, respond to a drug differently (may be because of difference in their susceptibilities).
- (b) Sex: It also plays a significant role as constitution of human male differs from that of the female.
- (c) Susceptibility: Different subjects differ in their susceptibilities to a particular drug.

1. Homoeopathic drugs are proved on healthy human beings and the symptoms produced thereby are recorded.
2. Now homoeopathic drugs are also proved on animals to get the picture of pathological changes caused thereby.

(d) Constitution: People are found to have different types of constitution such as hydrogenoid, leuko-phlegmatic, lymphoid etc. which make them sensitive to certain drugs.

(e) Food habits: Food habits of the prover also play an important role in the process of drug proving. Carnivorous subjects are found to differ from herbivorous subjects in respect of their temperaments. A prover may also be habitual of taking something which can act as an antidote to the drug proved.

(f) Behaviour and surroundings: It is observed that different people respond to a stimuli differently under different circumstances. If the mind of the prover is devoid of worries and anxiety, he can bring out a clear drug picture during proving. The behaviour of the others living with the prover also count much.

Climate: Generally climate factor is not stressed much while conducting a drug proving though it plays an important role in the process of a successful proving.³ The symptoms given out by a particular drug during a proving in a particular climate may differ from the symptoms obtained in proving the same drug in a different climate. Since different types of climates exist in different parts of the world, it is not unlikely that pathogenesis of a drug differ if the proving is conducted at two different places where climates are not identical.

DISCUSSION

Since the science of Homoeopathy originated in a foreign country, most of the homoeopathic drugs were proved by foreigners in their respective countries. Many years have elapsed since the origin of Homoeopathy and great changes have taken place since then. This makes one think whether the original provings are as authentic today as they were in the yester years, also if the drugs are re-proved now, whether the recorded pathogenesis will be reproduced. Let us view the problem critically.

The variation in human behaviour and its susceptibility due to ecological factors, is now an accepted fact. Various types of pollutions such as noise-pollution, water-pollution, air-pollution etc. have taken birth in the wake of civilisation. The mankind is subjected to various types of poisonings and most common of which is lead-poisoning. It has brought about various adverse changes. Our ancestors were stronger physically than us, on the other hand today's man is more developed mentally than his ancestors. Peoples' mode of living has changed. And there might have been innumerable changes that mankind has gone through in last so many years which are not known as yet.

The variation in the constituents content of naturally occurring drug substances due to change of time, changing ecological conditions, soil condition, is also an established fact. The extent of reproducibility of recorded prov-

3. Our materia medicas do not mention the climate/weather under which the various drugs were proved.

ings is naturally dependent on the extent of change the human beings and the plants have gone through since the drugs were proved last time.

It is observed that some of the medicines from botanical source give wonderful results when they are prescribed clinically. On the other hand there are some which do not give desired results even when they are clearly indicated. There may be many reasons for such behaviour, on the part of a medicine such as the drug may be spurious, there may be obstacles in the cure etc. One important reason may be that the drug prescribed differ, in respect of constituents, from the drug which was originally proved and on whose symptoms it was prescribed. It is now established that active constituents content of Indian, African, European and American hems differ significantly. While they remain *Cannabis sativa* the world over, the pathogenesis recorded by European provers with European hemp is not likely to be reproduced by Indian provers with Indian hemp. The same is true about Kurchi (*Holarrhena antidysenterica*) and *Aegle folia* which are known to have wide variation in their active constituent contents.

If there exists a relation between the constituents of a drug and its pathogenesis, which ought to be, the variation in symptoms recorded by foreign provers with foreign drugs is not unlikely.

Re-proving of drugs from other sources may not produce results different from those recorded earlier, but since the mankind have gone through many changes in last so many years, possibility of getting different results cannot be ruled out.

Last but not the least important factor is climate which must be given due importance. Most of the homoeopathic drugs so far proved were proved in cold countries and hence the provings were influenced by the climate of their countries. Climate of their country differs from ours significantly which makes one think whether the provings conducted abroad can be confirmed in India, also that the modalities recorded under various drugs are as authentic as they claim to be.

This necessitates re-proving of the drugs proved many years back. Even if the same results, as recorded earlier, are obtained the experimentation will not go in vain because the provings will be confirmed in changed time and possibly the profession may get something new and beneficial out of hidden treasure of nature, during the course of re-proving.

CONCLUSION

Systematic re-proving of the drugs proved earlier should be conducted on provers from different age groups and sex; different regions, and different climates.

Qualitative and quantitative standards of homoeopathic drugs should be fixed stringently, and the limits for their constituents should have a narrow range to check the variation in their pathogenetic quality.