

Materia medica study worksheet

A repeatable source-comparison exercise for students and practitioners. Compare what two historical texts actually say and how they organise it. This worksheet assesses source reading, not prescribing correctness or clinical efficacy.

Reading question and entry

[One narrow question; same remedy identity in both sources; date]

Source A and exact location

[Author, full book title, edition if known, entry, section or page, URL]

Source A observation

[Short quotation or labelled paraphrase; distinguish it from your interpretation]

Source B and exact location

[Author, full book title, edition if known, entry, section or page, URL]

Source B observation

[Short quotation or labelled paraphrase; distinguish it from your interpretation]

Agreement and difference

[What overlaps; what differs in wording, scope, organisation or emphasis]

Uncertainty and next check

[Unverified edition, missing context, possible copying or a third source to inspect]

Self check: Can another reader find both passages? Are quotes accurate? Are your conclusions limited to the passages? Did you avoid treating repeated historical claims as independent clinical evidence?

Worked source comparison

An original reading example using two public Nux vomica entries. This compares book formats and author emphasis. It is not a fictional patient case or a recommendation to use Nux vomica.

Question: How do Boericke and Kent organise their descriptions of sensitivity in the Nux vomica entry?

Source A: William Boericke, Pocket Manual of Homoeopathic Materia Medica, Nux vomica, Mind section. Similia digital English entry, accessed 6 September 2026. A print edition was not established from this entry.

Short excerpt: "Cannot bear noises, odors, light". The entry places this within a short Mind section, followed by regional headings such as Head and Eyes.

Source B: James Tyler Kent, Lectures on Homoeopathic Materia Medica, Nux vomica, opening paragraphs and Mind section. Similia digital English entry, accessed 6 September 2026. A print edition was not established from this entry.

Short excerpt: "oversensitive to noise, to light". Kent introduces this theme before the Mind heading and then develops it through longer explanatory passages.

Comparison: Both passages foreground sensitivity. Boericke's regional arrangement makes a short section easy to locate; Kent's lecture develops a theme across paragraphs. These are different reading formats, not competing measurements of a treatment effect.

Uncertainty: Agreement does not demonstrate independent observation, clinical efficacy or the correct remedy for a person. These excerpts alone do not identify each author's underlying evidence or the edition of the digital transcription.

Next check: Read the complete surrounding sections, then compare another entry in both books. Verify a print title page before adding an edition or page number. Do not infer that a claim absent from these two passages is absent from the historical literature.

Read Source A: <https://www.similia.io/materia-medica/boericke/nux-v>

Read Source B: <https://www.similia.io/materia-medica/kent/nux-v>

Both entries are free public reading. Paper or an editable document is enough for this exercise. Similia's Pro annotations and My Notes are optional study conveniences; no subscription is needed to complete the worksheet.