

THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE REMEDIES.¹

C. V. BÖNNINGHAUSEN

By

A. McNeil, San Francisco

Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Session of the International Hahnemannian Association, Geneva Lake, Wisconsin, June 6-9, 1893

200 When a remedy possesses the property of extinguishing the symptoms produced by another medicine by the similarity of its own action (also in its secondary effects) to that of the other, I designate the mutual affinity which exists between them by the word “*Relationship*.”

It is seen by this definition I make an essential distinction between relationship and the merely antidotal properties of the one to the other. In the latter case it is intended to weaken or neutralize the deleterious effects in sudden poisoning. If we administer an antidote against the morbid effects which are produced sufficiently early and thus remove them by its primary action, experience shows that we have only got rid of the same class of effects, while all other morbid conditions of the sufferer have not been at all improved. It is different in such cases when an antidote is given which by its secondary action effects a cure. If we have selected a remedy for the patient which best corresponds homœopathically to the group of symptoms (it consequently is *related* to the drug first taken), we will find as a rule that it has not only recently produced drug symptoms but it has also extinguished

201 curatively all the complaints within its sphere of action. This experience appears to be the principal explanation of what doubtless has been observed by every attentive homœopathic physician, viz, that *some remedies act far more curatively when they have been preceded by certain other (related) medicines*.

For the first intimation of this (as of all other demonstrated truths in Homœopathy) we are indebted to the sagacious and observant founder of our school. ‘See Organon, section 172 *et sequitus*, on the method of treating one-sided or partial diseases. For example, we may mention the proved efficiency of Calcarea Carb. after Sulphur; of ‘Causticum after Sepia; of Lycopodium after Calcarea; Nitric Acid after Calcarea and Kali Carb.; of Sulphur after Arsenicum and Mercurius, and of Sepia after Silicea, Nitric Acid or Sulphur. What homœopath has not had the opportunity of demonstrating the truth of his observations, presuming that in so doing he has always scrupulously observed the fundamental principle of Homœopathy, similia.

Some have claimed that it was essential that the order which related remedies are administered should be observed, for example that, A. must not be preceded by B. and so on. But if we carefully examine all the cases which seem to bear this out we will find that some contra-indications have been overlooked and that thus the fundamental principle of Homœopathy has not been strictly observed. This was asserted particularly of Calcarea and Lycopodium, but I can assure you that I have very often seen Calcarea accomplish good results after Lycopodium, when the symptom complex was such at first that Lycopodium should be selected and after it had exhausted its action that Calcarea corresponded to the remnant of the case, which does not always occur.

The importance of a knowledge of the relationship of the remedies early occurred to me, and caused me to institute comparisons, particularly in the last two years; and in my numerous cases to constantly direct my attention thereto. An excellent opportunity to increase my knowledge of this subject was afforded me in arranging my repertories, and a still better one in writing the Uebersicht der Haupt—Wir-

202 kung’s—Sphäre der Arzneien (Summary of the Principal Spheres of Action of the Remedies), and this I have always kept in my mind. In this way, although difficult, I reached many unexpected results, which I further confirmed by experience. The fruits of the studies and observations, although imperfect, in many parts doubtful (which I have put in parentheses), I now lay before the masters of our science for further confirmation and perfecting, in order to bring this, so important and practical a subject, before the profession, to be improved by their experience and observation. If this is thus taken up, my object will be attained, and I do not fear any censure in thus bringing it before the learned world.

An understanding of how to use this Summary of the Relationship of the Remedies I have already given at the beginning. However, it may not be superfluous to briefly mention the following:

1. *The related remedies are mutual antidotes*, and may be more especially administered as such according to the similarity of the symptoms than on the medicines even if they have partially similar symptoms and will thus prove curative of the drug symptoms and that not palliatively or by their primary action. The reason probably is that every remedy possesses

¹ Versuch über die Verwandtschaften der homœopathischen Arzneien nebst einer abgekürzten Uebersicht ihrer Eigenthümlichkeiten und Hauptwirkungen [Search (investigation) on the Relationships of homœopathic Remedies with a brief Overview of their Singularities and Main-Effects], Münster, 1836.

besides the strong and clearly marked symptoms, always also many weaker and therefore unnoticed alterations of the normal condition, which frequently do not correspond to the unrelated drug, which is therefore not homœopathically related to the symptom-complex. It must not be overlooked that every related remedy is not capable of extinguishing every morbid symptom which the previously administered drug has produced, but every medicine can only manifest such curative effects as lie within its sphere of action.

2. *Experience shows that the related remedies act far more curatively when administered after each other, than the unrelated medicine can do.* That the principle of *similia* always deserves the first and most indispensable consideration is self-evident. But usually when we find that where several drugs are competing for the choice, that one or another is among the related remedies, and then if no contra-indication is discernable then it is advisable that *that* remedy should always
203 be given the preference more particularly in complicated chronic cases. It has occurred to myself that on a further and more careful examination many hitherto overlooked symptoms have been discovered which gave a related remedy a decided preference, and then every time the result was highly satisfactory.
3. *The so-called one-sided diseases present an excellent opportunity for the utilization of the relationship of the remedies,* the treatment of is rendered so difficult by the-lack of a sufficient number of characteristic symptoms. In this case an imperfectly chosen remedy² very frequently brings about such a change in the general condition, and at the same time brings out characteristic indications so that it is no longer difficult to select a related remedy which accurately corresponds to the new symptom-complex, and thus to cure the entire principal disease and with it the new concomitant symptoms. On this, for example, among others rests the (exaggerated) reputation in the cure of intermittents of Nux after Ipecac, and Cina after Capsicum, which they obtained several years ago. The disease was so constituted that the last administered remedy corresponded to the case after the system was prepared by the one first given. I have also in other forms of disease, chronic as well as acute, several times seen something similar occur.
4. *The advantage of an accurate knowledge of the relationship of the remedies is even greater in the chronic than in the one-sided diseases,* which nearly always require for their cure several remedies in succession. In every case I learned to appreciate its essential benefit when, after the exhaustion the action of a carefully selected remedy, I had always to choose another which stood in very near relation to the preceding. The salutary effect of such a remedy accurately chosen according to the law of the similars, usually exceeds all expectation. I have often found it very advantageous in such chronic cases as were poor in symptoms, and therefore
204 difficult to cure, to so arrange the order in which the remedies should follow each other in advance, and of course *there* must be related ones, if symptoms did not appear during the cure which rendered a change necessary. In doing this, *one remedy should correspond to the principal complaint, another to the concomitant ones.* In my recent practice, as a general rule, the result is more favourable and more rapid to give related remedies in succession than to repeat, which I now only do but seldom, and then only when the medicine has only produced a quantitative lessening of the symptoms without causing the least qualitative change in the picture of the disease.³
5. More than once it has happened to me that *two related remedies competed so closely that a choice was difficult,* and each had some concomitant symptoms of the case that the other did not possess. In these I saw the best results when I continuously alternated with both and with not too long intervals, so that always the one was given before the other had fully exhausted its action. *The primary effects become gradually weaker and lasted a shorter period.* The improvement increased and often no other medicines were necessary to complete the cure.

I recently have found the advice of our court councillor, Hahnemann, very useful, viz., when repetitions were necessary in these as in all other cases to give different and better lower potencies.

6. It happened occasionally *that after the administration an apparently indicated remedy that the symptoms increased as in a severe aggravation without improvement following.*⁴ This is not always the result of a former abuse of the same medicine and the reason is in many cases undiscoverable. In this case a dose of a related remedy which corresponds extremely well to the symptoms is to be exhibited. I do not wait long for the reaction, but soon give another drug which is related as closely as possible to the former. Thus, I have
205 nearly always had the joy not only of obtaining a quick relief of the aggravation, but also a very considerable improvement of the entire original morbid condition.

² Then one-sided cases in which frequently the organism manifests but slight sensitiveness to the action of remedies and concomitant symptoms are very desirable, have been lately the only ones in which it becomes necessary to administer stronger doses. In all other cases I succeeded with the smallest part of a drop of the decillionth dilution in fact with a fluxion of that potency. Consequently I suppose that as a rule every external disturbance is at fault when only stronger doses of the *remedy* act.

³ Even with the latter circumstances since I have paid particular attention to the repetition of the remedies I have very seldom seen sufficient benefit from other doses than the first, and in fact have seen injury, and that too more particularly when the highest potencies were given.

⁴ It only happened once that under these circumstances a second dose of the same remedy caused an improvement and even this was not permanent.

Finally, we must add to the advantages of an acquaintance with a tolerably complete summary of the relations of the remedies that we thereby *obtain a clearer view of the more or less extensive sphere of action of the medicines and of their manifold curative powers*. Certainly such benefits can only be partly obtained by such an attempt as this is. However, when we have acquired, by mutual co-operation and the experiences and observations that I hope will result, a summary with a higher degree of completeness, which will contribute a great deal to our knowledge of the true genius the remedies. This will happen when by comparative study of their pure effects on the human body and their kindred relation to other medicines is kept in view.

I conclude this by cordially inviting all observant homœopaths to communicate to me, privately, or better through the homœopathic journals, their reliable indubitable experiences in relation to this subject; the importance of which has been clearly shown.

Of scarcely less importance in practice is an accurate knowledge of the incompatibility of remedies, and this too has been to me a subject of earnest investigation. But that which I have accomplished is so little and incomplete that I feel it better to retain them for the present, and I renew the above request to my colleagues to communicate to me their observations on this subject also.
