

THE HAHNEMANNIAN GLEANINGS.

VOLUME 1

MARCH, 1930.

No. 2

FORM OF HOMŒOPATHIC DOSE.

DR. N. GHATAK B. A., CALCUTTA.

In spite of the Master's clear directions on the subject, there is a good deal of controversy and difference of opinion regarding the form of a dose of Homœopathic remedy selected under the Law of Similars. There are various vehicles through which medicinal doses are generally given to a patient, and it is simply a matter of choice and sometimes of convenience. One may use pellets or globules, another may use milk-sugar, a third may choose distilled water for the purpose, and no difference is at all possible regarding its action, though so many different vehicles are used. But there is a controversy as to the quantity of the medium to be used for a particular dose. We want to make the point clear, so that every one may understand what we really mean.

The Master's injunction regarding the dose of Homœopathic remedy is quite clear. He desires that the *smallest* dose should be given,—and there is hardly any room for controversy. The point wherein opinions differ is the *quantum* of the sugar of milk or distilled water or the *number* of pellets or globules which should be given for a dose. Suppose I want to give a patient of mine a dose of Nux vomica 1M,—the question is, how many globules medicated with that medicine and potency I should give? Suppose I give one or two globules, or I give as many as twelve or fifteen globules, would there be any difference regarding *action*? Instead of giving one or two globules, if I give twelve or fifteen globules, would it be a *bigger dose* and bring in *aggravation*? That is the point to be decided. Would it be necessary, in order to follow the Master's direction to use the *smallest dose*, to use only one or two globules of a particular potency? And if somebody uses five

ten such globules instead, does it follow that he is not obeying the Master? In other words, does the number of pellets of a particular potency given to a patient for a dose, count anything, so as to say that ten or twelve such pellets would seriously aggravate, whereas one or two pellets would produce a milder action? If so, *i. e.*, if the quantity of the vehicle used has *any the least* value or worth regarding *action*, then the difference between a *material* dose and a *Dynamic* one at once vanishes, and sooner the question is finally decided, the better for the students, the practitioners and for all those that follow the Master.

The Master's intention relates to the *potency* whenever he referred to the question of doses, and no idea of *vehicle* or *medium* was there in his mind. As the potency is higher and higher, the *dose* of medicine gets *smaller and smaller*, and when he speaks of *small dose* to be given, he means *high potency* to be given. If a lower potency, say, 3x or 4x is selected, a *big dose* is selected, and if 30th potency is given instead, —a *smaller dose* is given,—and this was the meaning that is found to have been the uppermost in the Master's mind, whenever he spoke of large dose or small dose; and he advised that the *smallest dose* should be given, obviously in the sense that a *potentiated* dose, *i. e.*, a *dynamic dose* should be chosen, instead of *material dose*.

Then, there are many who would argue that everywhere the Master's instruction is to give one small globule like a poppy seed for a dose, and so, in that case, it would be wrong to use more than one such pellet or globule for the purpose. But it may be seen that his instruction does not *fix a limit*,—he says that one such globule is only *enough* for a dose, and nothing else. It is merely *suggestive* and *indicative* and not *admonitory* or *prohibitive*.

Before quoting any authority on the point, it may not be out of place to note what we can ascertain for ourselves from simple common sense. The Homœopathic potency is a *force*, as by the process of potentization, the "mortal coil" or the material portion of the drug is avoided and the real essence, *i. e.*, the *spirit* in it is set free. The process of potentization has therefore been called "*Dynamization*" by the Master, as the drug is just elevated into the region of *Dynamis*—pure and simple, and is now, after the

process, a *spirit* or a *force*. The crudity is absolutely gone and it is now a potent *force*; and being a force, it is capable to affect another force, *viz.*, the vital force in our economy, in a particular way. A crude thing can act on crude things only,—it cannot affect the spirit. Under this circumstance, it is quite inconceivable how any question of *quantity* can come in, *re force*. In the sphere of force like that of gravitation, of magnetism, of electricity &c., no idea of *quantity* is at all admissible; though a *qualitative* difference between one force and another is quite reasonable,—and as a matter of fact, one potency of a particular drug is more “potent” than another, in altering a man’s state of health or disease. But it cannot be claimed that a quantitative difference can be brought about if 8 or 10 pellets are used for a dose, instead of 1 or 2, because *number* cannot change the *potency* of the medicine with which the globules have been charged. Of course it may be said that more than one or two globules for a dose is simply a waste, as the smallest number is quite enough for the purpose.

We think that the word “dose” is quite a misleading term in Homœopathy and it has been loosely borrowed from Allopathic nomenclature which deals in crude quantities and measurements. Homœopathy concerns only in dynamis, spirit, force, energy, potency, simple substance and so forth. The word “dose” can be conceived only in relation to quantity, and hence the confusion. A happier and more correct word should be chosen for our purpose. Push, stroke, impression &c., would be far better and would at least correctly convey the dynamic idea.

We think that the matter is of vital importance inasmuch as lots of students have been obtaining Homœopathic diplomas from our Colleges and Schools every year, and it would be a very serious thing if they are taught differently by the different masters in our Science. For the sake of humanity’s good, for the sake of Homœopathy which we are practising and for the sake of keeping our conscience clear and free, the question should be finally settled. The young Graduates in Homœopathy should be taught the right thing in the right spirit; so that they may be in a position to practise *true* Homœopathy instead of *pseudo* Homœopathy, Allo-Homœopathy and morgelism which are too much to be found in

the country, here and elsewhere. Of course there are many so-called physicians who would like to call themselves Homœopaths and yet have been using injection needles. We do not know what on earth could attract a man to Homœopathy except its inherent truth and beauty which have unfortunately no charm for these pitiable caricatures in medicine. However we are not at all anxious for them, for they commit wilful perversions, and there is nobody in the face of the earth who can mend their ways. But we are really anxious for those sincere students and practitioners who so wistfully look to us for the true guidance and healthy teachings, and we shall stand self-condemned if we teach them different and dubious ways concerning an affair which deals in human lives.

We may be excused if we quote some highest authorities on the subject, and we would quote only to the point.

James Tayler Kent, A.M., M.D., says—"It never matters whether the remedy is given in water in spoonful doses or given in a few pellets dry on the tongue,—the result is the same. It has been supposed by some that *by giving one or two small pellets that a milder effect would be secured but this is a deception. The action or power of one pellet, if it acts at all, is as great as ten.* If a few pellets be dissolved in water, and the water is given by the tea-spoonful, *each tea-spoonful* will act as powerfully as *the whole* of the powder if given at once, and the whole quantity of water if drunk at once will have no greater curative or exaggerative power than one spoonful." (The italics are ours).

Carroll Dunham, A. M., M. D., says—

"Question 4.— ... and how many, as a general rule, constitute a dose, either dry or taken in water ?

Answer.—How many constitute a dose ? If properly medicated, one is as good as *one hundred.* As there is a possibility that, in medicating several thousands in one operation, a pellet here and there may fail to get saturated, we usually give about *four to six.* We use the smallest pellets as most easily and surely medicated." (The italics are ours).

We might have multiplied authorities on the point, but the above two are conclusively convincing. We hope that the student and young practitioners will please take note as they are the persons that are chiefly interested in the solution given.