



Revisiting Charcot's Role in the History of Parkinson's Disease

(History of Neurology)

Angelo Antonini¹

¹ Parkinson and Movement Disorders Unit, Department of Neurosciences (DNS), University of Padua, Padua, Italy

Corresponding Author:

Angelo Antonini

E-mail address: angelo.antonini@unipd.it

Abstract

The history of Parkinson's disease is deeply connected to Jean Martin Charcot. Building on James Parkinson's *Essay on the Shaking Palsy*, Charcot transformed a loosely described disorder into a coherent clinical syndrome, recognizing that "the essential clinical elements of the disease had already been described" by Parkinson. His synthesis of clinical observation, autopsy material, and earlier accounts established a diagnostic framework that remains central to modern teaching. Charcot refined the description of rest tremor, distinguishing it from the tremor observed in multiple sclerosis and cerebellar disorders, and underscored the role of emotional excitation in modulating symptom severity. His descriptions of posture, gait, rigidity, and facial expression remain strikingly accurate. He also used visual media—including clinical illustrations and a commissioned sculpture—to convey the typical Parkinsonian posture. Despite extensive pathological investigations, Charcot and his collaborators could not identify the underlying lesion, a gap later filled by the work of Paul Oscar Blocq (1860-1896), Gheorge Marinescu (1863-1938), and Constantin Tretiakoff (1892-1956) on substantia nigra degeneration. His therapeutic explorations ranged from plant alkaloids with transient benefit to mechanical vibration devices that anticipated later neuromodulatory approaches. Charcot's methodological clarity and clinical precision continue to shape contemporary understanding of Parkinson's disease.

Keywords: Charcot, Jean Martin; Parkinson's disease; History of Neurology; Tremor classification

The history of Parkinson's disease is closely intertwined with the work of Jean-Martin Charcot (1825-1893) and the Parisian neurological school of the late nineteenth century. Speaking about Parkinson's disease inevitably leads to reflecting on the relationship between Charcot and the earlier observations of James Parkinson (1755-1824). Although Parkinson had published his seminal monograph, *An Essay on the Shaking Palsy*, it was Charcot and his students who systematized the condition and gave it the clinical form in which it is recognized today.

One interesting historical point is that Charcot himself refused to name the disease after himself. Instead, he insisted that the disorder should bear Parkinson's name. The reasons for this decision were probably several, but they likely reflected Charcot's cultural and intellectual background. In the small treatise written by Parkinson in 1817, Charcot recognized that the essential clinical elements of the disease had already been described. Many of the symptoms that Charcot later discussed in his lectures were, in fact, derived from Parkinson's original observations.

It is also worth remembering that Parkinson was not only a physician. He was in many respects a naturalist and geologist, and his scientific interests extended well beyond medicine. Indeed, in museums dedicated to geological discoveries, collections associated with Parkinson can still be found. He practiced general medicine, but his scientific curiosity extended across several disciplines. Charcot likely recognized that an observer who was not confined within the strict boundaries of academic medicine could still make an important cultural and scientific contribution to the identification of disease.

Charcot's lasting influence stems not only from his originality but from his ability to synthesize disparate observations into coherent clinical entities. Even in today's environment—defined by instantaneous access to vast digital resources and the growing role of artificial intelligence—the act of synthesis remains essential. Information alone does not produce understanding; it must be organized, interpreted, and integrated.

Charcot excelled precisely at this. He gathered clinical descriptions, autopsy findings, and earlier accounts—most notably Parkinson's—and shaped them into a unified diagnostic framework. The clinical picture he articulated continues to underpin the diagnosis of Parkinson's disease nearly two centuries later, a testament to the durability of his method.

If one explains Parkinson's disease to medical students today, the core symptoms described by Charcot still form the foundation of clinical teaching. The tremor, the rigidity, the slowing of movement, and the progressive postural alterations that develop over time remain the essential elements of the syndrome. This continuity between nineteenth-century observation and modern clinical practice is remarkable.

One of the most striking aspects of Charcot's work concerns his attention to tremor. His analysis of tremor and its differential diagnosis was extraordinarily refined. He carefully described the frequency and characteristics of tremor and distinguished the tremor of Parkinson's disease from other forms. In particular, he separated it from what he called "senile tremor," which likely corresponds to what we now identify as essential tremor. His descriptions demonstrate a remarkable sensitivity to clinical detail.

These insights emerge clearly from works derived from Charcot's lectures, particularly those compiled by his students. Among them, Leopold Ordenstein (1835–1902)'s 1868 thesis stands out for its examination of the differential diagnosis between *paralysis agitans*—the term then used for Parkinson's disease—and multiple sclerosis (*sclérose en plaques*). In these texts, tremor is described as a pattern of continuous, spontaneous oscillations that may intensify under emotional excitation. Charcot repeatedly noted that emotional stimuli could amplify the manifestations of tremor, an observation that remains clinically relevant today.

Charcot also described how, with advancing years of disease, postural deformities and structural changes become more prominent. Patients develop a characteristic forward flexion of the trunk and an increasingly distinctive gait pattern. The clinical picture becomes dominated by postural instability and rigidity. These descriptions are strikingly consistent with modern observations of Parkinson's disease.

Charcot's clinical acuity also manifested in his skill at distinguishing Parkinson's disease from other movement disorders capable of producing tremor or abnormal motor patterns. He described the characteristic facial expression of the Parkinsonian patient and contrasted it with that seen in other conditions, including what we now identify as supranuclear palsy, later described by Richardson, Steele, and Olszewski in 1963 as a form of progressive parkinsonism. His clinical illustrations and atlas plates reveal both the precision of his bedside observation and his uncommon ability to translate complex clinical phenomena into clear visual form.

In these works Charcot also attempted to classify tremors according to their origin. He compared the tremor of Parkinson's disease with cerebellar tremor and other neurological tremors. The analytical clarity of these comparisons is impressive, especially considering the limited physiological knowledge available at the time.

Another fascinating element of Charcot's work is his effort to represent the typical posture of the Parkinsonian patient visually. Remarkably, he even commissioned a sculpture of a patient with Parkinson's disease, intended to illustrate the characteristic posture and facial features of the condition. This representation captured the flexed posture, the incomplete closure of the lips, and the distinctive facial expression associated with the disease. Such artistic and anatomical representation reflects Charcot's deep interest in the visual communication of neurological signs.

At the same time, Charcot and his collaborators were investigating the pathological basis of the disease. Despite their careful autopsy studies, however, they were unable to identify the specific lesion responsible for Parkinson's disease. They examined numerous brains and described various structural changes, but the crucial alteration—the degeneration of neurons in the substantia nigra—remained undiscovered.

Part of the difficulty stemmed from the expectations that shaped nineteenth century pathology. Disease was typically identified through visible, macroscopic lesions, and conditions such as multiple sclerosis offered precisely that: clear structural abnormalities that could be demonstrated in the nervous system. Parkinson's disease, by contrast, involved subtle and localized neuronal degeneration that left no obvious trace with the investigative tools then available. The absence of a demonstrable lesion made it harder for clinicians to anchor the disorder within the prevailing pathological framework, delaying its integration into the anatomical–clinical method that defined Charcot's era.

As a result, Charcot and his colleagues concluded cautiously that the true lesion responsible for the disease had yet to be identified. They acknowledged that although various anatomical alterations could be observed, none provided a consistent explanation for the clinical syndrome.

The link between Parkinsonian symptoms and damage to the substantia nigra was clarified only later, when Paul Oscar Blocq (1860-1896) and Gheorge Marinescu (1863-1938), studying midbrain tuberculomas, observed that lesions involving this region produced clinical features resembling Parkinson's disease. Their findings laid the groundwork for Constantin Tretiakoff (1892-1956)'s subsequent work, which identified degeneration of the substantia nigra as central to the pathophysiology of the disorder.



Charcot's therapeutic explorations reveal a clinician who, despite working within the limits of nineteenth-century medicine, pursued every plausible avenue for symptom relief. His interest extended from pharmacology to mechanical intervention, and although the tools at his disposal were

Charcot tested several preparations derived from plant alkaloids, noting that they could temporarily lessen tremor and rigidity. Their effect was attributed to anticholinergic properties, which would later become a recognized pharmacological mechanism in the management of Parkinsonian symptoms. He emphasized, however, that these improvements were short-lived—often only a few hours—and insisted on the need for further systematic observation before drawing firm conclusions. This caution reflects his broader methodological stance: clinical impressions were valuable, but they required careful corroboration.

Charcot also explored mechanical stimulation as a therapeutic strategy. He designed a vibrating chair and even a vibrating helmet intended to reduce tremor and stiffness, inspired by his observation that certain mechanical stimuli could transiently diminish motor symptoms. The device attempted to reproduce these effects in a controlled therapeutic setting. Although primitive by modern standards, such experiments illustrate an early attempt to modulate motor circuits through external physical input—a concept that resonates, in a distant way, with later developments such as physiotherapy techniques and even deep brain stimulation.

A decisive therapeutic breakthrough would not arrive until the twentieth century. In 1967, George Cotzias (1918-1977) introduced high-dose Levodopa, demonstrating that replenishing dopamine could reverse many of the motor symptoms Charcot had described with such precision. This discovery established the central role of dopamine in Parkinson's disease and transformed clinical practice. What had been a largely symptomatic and palliative field became one in which dramatic, measurable improvement was possible.

Despite the extraordinary advances that followed, Charcot's clinical descriptions remain strikingly accurate, also with regards to their details. For instance, his observations on the influence of emotional states on tremor and posture continue to hold true: stress and emotional excitation can still exacerbate Parkinsonian symptoms, precisely as he noted in his lectures.

Modern research has revealed, however, that Parkinson's disease is far more complex than nineteenth century clinicians could have imagined. It is now understood as a multisystem disorder marked by widespread pathological changes, including the accumulation of Lewy bodies in neurons throughout the nervous system and even in peripheral organs. The disease extends well beyond the motor system that first drew Charcot's attention.

Charcot also speculated about hereditary influences in neurological disease, an idea that later provoked debate among figures such as Sigmund Freud, who questioned whether familial predisposition had been overstated. Contemporary genetics has shown that hereditary factors play a significant role in many neurological disorders—including Parkinson's disease, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, and Alzheimer's disease—confirming the prescience of Charcot's intuition. Even without access to modern genetic tools, he recognized patterns that would only be scientifically validated many decades later.

For these reasons, Charcot's contribution to the understanding of Parkinson's disease remains foundational. By refining Parkinson's initial observations and shaping them into a rigorous clinical framework, he laid the groundwork for modern neurology and for the systematic study of movement disorders. His legacy endures not only in the accuracy of his descriptions but in the methodological clarity with which he approached the complexities of disease.



Background Bibliography

Charcot JM, Vulpian A. De la paralysie agitante: à propos d'un cas tiré de la clinique du Professeur Oppolzer. *Gazette Hebdomadaire de Médecine et de Chirurgie*. 1861.

Goedert M, Compston A. Parkinson's disease – the story of an eponym. *Nat Rev Neurol*. 2018;14(1):57–62.

Goetz CG. Charcot on Parkinson's disease. *Mov Disord*. 1986;1(1):27–32. doi:10.1002/mds.870010104

Hurwitz B. Coinage of the eponym “maladie de Parkinson”. *Nat Rev Neurol*. 2019;15(4):243. doi:10.1038/s41582-019-0160-x

Kapur SS, Stebbins GT, Goetz CG. Vibration therapy for Parkinson's disease: Charcot's studies revisited. *J Parkinsons Dis*. 2012;2(1):23–27. doi:10.3233/JPD-2012-12079

Riederer C, Goetz CG, Walusinski O. Constructing Neurology: Jean-Martin Charcot (1825–1893): A Bicentenary Tribute. *Mov Disord Clin Pract*. Published online January 30, 2026. doi:10.1002/mdc3.70538

Walusinski O. Jean-Martin Charcot and Parkinson's disease: Teaching and teaching materials. *Rev Neurol (Paris)*. 2018;174(7–8):491–505. doi:10.1016/j.neurol.2017.08.005

Funding

The author received no specific funding for this work.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

Provenance and peer review: Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed. Submitted: March 5, 2026. Received in revised form: March 6, 2026. Accepted: March 6, 2026.

Disclaimer

The content provided on The Charcot Journal website is for informational and educational purposes only. It is not intended as a substitute for professional medical advice, diagnosis, or treatment. Always seek the advice of your physician or other qualified health provider with any questions you may have regarding a medical condition. Never disregard professional medical advice or delay in seeking it because of something you have read on this site. The Charcot Journal and its contributors do not accept any responsibility for any loss which may arise from reliance on information contained on this site.

Terms and Conditions

Unless otherwise stated, all content is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0). You may share the content for non-commercial purposes, provided that (a) proper attribution is given to the original authors and The Charcot Journal; (b) the content is not modified or adapted in any way. Commercial use and the creation of derivative works are not permitted without prior written permission from the copyright holder. Authors retain full copyright and may reuse their own work in any form, including for commercial purposes. The website may contain links to third-party websites. We are not responsible for the content or practices of these external sites. We reserve the right to update or modify these terms at any time without prior notice.