

OOI : 10.15740/HAS/IJMS/9.1/50-61

International Journal of Medical Sciences.

1/50-61 Volume 9 | Issue 1 | April, 2016 | 50-61 e ISSN-09

e ISSN-0976-7932 | Visit us - www.researchjournal.co.in

A REVIEW

Potency Paradox and Homoeopathy

■ JATIN SHAH AND PARTHA P. RAY

See end of the paper for authors' affiliation

Correspondence to:

JATIN SHAH Shri Bhagwan Homoeopathic Medical College, AURANGABAD (MAHARASHTRA) INDIA

KEY WORDS:

Potency, Paradox, Homoeopathy

Paper History: Received: 08.12.2015; Accepted: 30.03.2016 **How to cite this paper:** Shah, Jatin and Ray, Partha P. (2016). Potency Paradox and Homoeopathy. *Internat. J. Med. Sci.*, **9**(1): 50-61.

ahnemann, the founder of Homoeopathy in many places of his vast literature has given full credit to Hippocrates or a discover of law of similia, Vital force, Single medicine but the Law of minimum dose was solely his invention. In available Hippocratic Cannon we cannot find any place for minimum dose though Hahnemann himself writes that this conception he also had borrowed from the Father of Medicine. Being a lifetime inquisitive student he had gone through the relevant literature available to his time, made this theories and postulations upto date and then came to the conclusion. The basic difference lies between drugs and poisons is in its quantity was known to Hahnemann but his search continued to understand what should be the parameter to determine the quantity. As we all know that Hahnemann had started practicing with almost the same drugs used in daily practice of the Galenians. Only the law of similia was minutely maintained. Here we must keep in mind that the word potency varies at a long distance to the dose, but how we would like to be with R. E. Dudgeon. He says, "It is impossible so to separate the dynamization (potehnization) theory from the doctrines

respecting the dose as to be able to treat of the one without reference to other."¹ Actually both these theories were developed simultaneously and they are, if regarded as separate theory, are contemporary to each other. So we are fusing these two topics under the same heading.

The conception of dynamic was often employed at that time; so, for example, Hufeland states in the "System der prakitischen helikunde", of the dynamic type of cure: "it has the purpose to transform only the stimulus relation or the living activity." Hahnemann also at first employed the word in this sense – we would probably today say "functional" – thus, for example, in his publication "Antidotes of some heroic vegetable substances" where he speaks "dynamic" action besides the chemical drug effect. In a quite similar way he employs the word "dynamic" in contrast to "chemical" in the foreword to the "Drug Treasury" (1800, I, 17ff, Stapf)².

Near 1801 - 02 the word dynamic appears for the first time in the conception of diseases. In the 'Monita uber die drei gangbaren Kurarten' (1801) he differentiated disease from materia organism as bladder stone, splinter in the finger, crushed skull